

**CITY OF EVANSTON**

**2006-2007  
BUDGET MEMO  
REQUESTS 35-41**



City of  
**Evanston™**

**CITY OF EVANSTON**

2100 Ridge Avenue  
Evanston, Illinois 60201

Phone: 847-328-2100

Website: [www.cityofevanston.org](http://www.cityofevanston.org)

**City of Evanston**  
**FY 2006-2007 Budget Memo Requests**

1. FY 06/07 Capital Budget Revision
2. Provide a report on the City's fund balances.
3. Provide a report on the Police & Fire Headquarters project including information regarding work that has been done and work that needs to be completed.
4. Provide a summary of anticipated future year budget needs by project.
5. Report back on what entity owns the NU parking lot with the City water storage tank located beneath.
6. Provide a report of fulltime equivalent positions by business unit. Include a multiyear comparison.
7. Provide a 10-month statement for the general fund expenses and revenues.
8. Provide Listing of Vehicles in the City's fleet.
9. Provide an explanation of how the IMFR/Police/Fire Pension contribution is determined, and what factors effect the amount of the annual contribution.
10. Provide a comparison of an Evanston resident's *total* tax bill/rate to comparable communities.
11. Provide the formula for, and an explanation of, the state income tax distribution.
12. Provide the anticipated revenue from the new Sherman Plaza parking garage.
13. Provide a comparison of summer 2005 water usage to prior years.
14. Provide information on the City's selection of new Fleet vehicles: a) Are they more fuel efficient? b) If they are more fuel efficient, then how are they performing? c) Is it saving the City money? Also, how is EVNORSCO doing? Is it saving the City money?
15. Provide information on how the City's sales tax revenue is doing compared to other communities.
16. Provide current detail on sworn vs. civilian staff at Fire and Police.
17. Please explain the activity measures recorded for administrative adjudication on page 102 of the budget book.
18. Provide an explanation of the Personal Property Replacement Tax and why the actual has varied.
19. Provide an analysis on mental health board funding, noting how many years it has been frozen and the amount of the cut in actual dollars. Also, please provide an update on the Mental Health Board 2005-06 estimated actual.
20. Provide updated report on CIP projects.
21. Provide an explanation on the budgeted increase for the Youth Outreach and School Liaisons programs.
22. Provide a line item explanation of the Contingency Budget 1610. Does 1610 contain all of the City's Contingency Funds? If not, please explain.
23. Provide information on the provision of School Liaisons. Do we contract to provide this service? How was it determined that the City would fully fund this service? How

**City of Evanston**  
**FY 2006-2007 Budget Memo Requests**

does the City of Evanston's current situation compare with other communities regarding the provision of these services?

24. Provide information on the provision of Crossing Guards. Do we contract to provide this service? How was it determined that the City would fully fund this service? How does the City of Evanston's current situation compare with other communities regarding the provision of these services?
25. Provide detail on current vacancies with information on the status of the hiring process and the duration of the vacancy. Please provide an accounting of all the positions for which we budgeted in 2005-2006 but never filled. For those positions that were unfilled on March 1 but not vacant all year, please provide info on month filled. What positions became vacant during the year and for what period did they remain vacant? Please give department, job titles and salaries in your responses.
26. Provide details on the City Benefit Policy including: a) what is the policy b) a three year history of sick leave payouts by department c) where the funds come from to pay for payout costs d) what is the City policy on personal business leave e) what is the City policy on vacation. Additionally, is there an employee manual?
27. Provide a property tax bill from another community and compare it to a property tax bill from an Evanston resident.
28. Provide an explanation as to why the 10-month financial report differs from the City Clerk's office report on Real Estate Transfer Tax revenue.
29. Provide information on how Evanston's restaurant sector is performing.
30. Provide a report detailing how the food and beverage tax would affect a restaurant business and how the tax would affect a typical bill.
31. Show what the property tax increase (dollar and percent) would be without an increase to the General Fund non-pension.
32. Follow Up to Budget Memo 14.
  - a. How many cars are using EVNORSKO
  - b. Provide a cost benefit analysis of the facility.
33. Follow up to Budget Memo 15.
  - a. Provide total dollars for sales tax receive by each municipality.
  - b. Identify % of the general fund supported by sales tax.
  - c. Identify % of entire budget supported by sales tax.
34. Provide a cost benefit analysis of Administrative Adjudication, including:
  - a. Breakdown of findings and collection by ticket area (property, police, NU, parking, etc)
  - b. Hourly cost for hearing officers and amount paid year-to-date.

**City of Evanston  
FY 2006-2007 Budget Memo Requests**

---

35. Provide the information in budget memo 30 regarding how the food and beverage tax would affect a restaurant bill and break out the City liquor tax. Also provide analysis of a Food and Beverage Tax that does NOT include taxing liquor and what the projections would be for that revenue.
  36. Follow Up to Budget Memo 34 (Provide a cost benefit analysis of Administrative Adjudication): provide a chart that presents the same statistics as presented in the budget memo by year for each of the last six years for review and comparison.
  37. Please provide a breakdown of what the \$124,028 difference between the Clerk's Office and Finance Department Real Estate Transfer Tax revenue amounts provided in monthly reports.
  38. Provide a five year history of the City's fleet.
  39. Provide an analysis on the use of impact fees including information on comparable communities' use of impact fees.
  40. Provide a listing of the projects used for the current building permit revenue estimate and an explanation of the process used for the revenue projection.
  41. A) Provide a report on the current status of the youth theater - formerly at Levy, and the Fleetwood-Jourdain Adult Theater. Include information about participation levels and satisfaction for residents as well as options for future changes/enhancements to the programs.  
B) Provide a report on the Fleetwood-Jourdain Community Center Theatre, including:
    - a. Information on the CDBG, Capital, and General Funds to be used for the stage (where applicable); and
    - b. Information on the chain of events that led to the current situation
    - c. When the Theatre Manager position became vacant and when the position has been posted.
    - d. Information on why the Fleetwood Jourdain BU is so under-spent for FY05-06
- 

• **The following Budget Memos will be provided by Thursday, February 16, 2006**

42. Provide more information on Evanston's restaurant sector, including:
  - a. A report of the new restaurants in Evanston – as it relates to the sales tax information provided in budget memo 29.
  - b. Information on same-store sales (i.e. are individual restaurant sales growing or is the sales tax increase mostly affected by new restaurants moving into the City?)
  - c. Total number of restaurants;
  - d. Number of restaurants that serve alcohol/do not serve alcohol

**City of Evanston**  
**FY 2006-2007 Budget Memo Requests**

- e. Number of restaurants in corporate chains; and
  - f. The total gain/loss in the number of restaurants.
- 
- 43. Provide a staff recommendation on whether or not the City should continue to support the EVNORSKO station at the fleet service center.
  
  - 44. Provide an updated version of the sales tax memo including library and recreation districts for all communities.
  
  - 45. Provide a five year history of positions in the City.



# Interdepartmental Memorandum

---

To: Julia Carroll, City Manager  
From: Patrick Casey, Director of Management and Budget  
Tracy Roberts Mistry, Management Analyst  
Subject: **Budget Memo #35: Food and Beverage Tax**  
Date: February 10, 2006

---

In response to the Council's request to see restaurant bills with alcoholic beverages broken out and the liquor tax show we have attached a file showing which displays various tabs over five different tax scenarios, including the current situation with 6% Liquor Tax and no separate food and beverage tax. The four new scenarios shown are the various tax schemes that were discussed at the meeting on Monday, February 6<sup>th</sup>.

We have also attached the projections for a Non-Alcoholic Food and Beverage Tax, showing projected revenue for a Food and Beverage Tax which does not tax alcoholic beverages. Please note that there may be a significant cost to establishments to have their registers reprogrammed to properly capture this scenario and staff is looking into the significance of this possibility.

The Legal Department is reviewing case law regarding the feasibility of having different tax rates for liquor, food and beverages. When they have completed their research we will provide the Council with an update.

**SAMPLE RESTAURANT BILLS WITH FOOD AND BEVERAGE TAX SCENARIOS**

	<b>As of Today</b> 0% Food/Bev: 6% Liquor	2% Food/Bev: 3% Liquor Tax	2% NON-Alcoholic Food/Bev: 4% Liquor	1% Food/Bev: 4% Liquor Tax	1% NON-Alcoholic Food/Bev: 4% Liquor
<b><u>Stained Glass</u></b>					
Full Dinner for 2 with Drinks	Subtotal \$111.12	Subtotal \$111.12	Subtotal \$111.12	Subtotal \$111.12	Subtotal \$111.12
2 Flights of wine \$31.90	Sales Tax \$9.72	Sales Tax \$9.72	Sales Tax \$9.72	Sales Tax \$9.72	Sales Tax \$9.72
Appetizer & 2 Entrees \$79.22	Liquor Tax \$1.91	Liquor Tax \$0.96	Liquor Tax \$1.28	Liquor Tax \$1.28	Liquor Tax \$1.28
	Food and Bev \$0.00	Food and Bev \$2.22	Food and Bev \$1.58	Food and Bev \$1.11	Food and Bev \$0.79
	<b>Total</b> \$122.76	<b>Total</b> \$124.02	<b>Total</b> \$123.70	<b>Total</b> \$123.23	<b>Total</b> \$122.91
<b><u>Celtic Knot</u></b>					
After work drinks and appetizers for 2	Subtotal \$33.95	Subtotal \$33.95	Subtotal \$33.95	Subtotal \$33.95	Subtotal \$33.95
4 beers \$17.05	Sales Tax \$2.97	Sales Tax \$2.97	Sales Tax \$2.97	Sales Tax \$2.97	Sales Tax \$2.97
Appetizers \$16.90	Liquor Tax \$1.02	Liquor Tax \$0.51	Liquor Tax \$0.68	Liquor Tax \$0.68	Liquor Tax \$0.68
	Food and Bev \$0.00	Food and Bev \$0.68	Food and Bev \$0.34	Food and Bev \$0.34	Food and Bev \$0.17
	<b>Total</b> \$37.94	<b>Total</b> \$38.11	<b>Total</b> \$37.94	<b>Total</b> \$37.94	<b>Total</b> \$37.77
<b><u>Buffalo Joes</u></b>					
Dinner for two w/ beer	Subtotal \$13.45	Subtotal \$13.45	Subtotal \$13.45	Subtotal \$13.45	Subtotal \$13.45
2 Chicken Sandwiches \$4.95	Sales Tax \$1.18	Sales Tax \$1.18	Sales Tax \$1.18	Sales Tax \$1.18	Sales Tax \$1.18
2 crisscut fries \$3.00	Liquor Tax \$0.33	Liquor Tax \$0.17	Liquor Tax \$0.22	Liquor Tax \$0.22	Liquor Tax \$0.22
2 beers \$5.50	Food and Bev \$0.00	Food and Bev \$0.16	Food and Bev \$0.16	Food and Bev \$0.13	Food and Bev \$0.08
	<b>Total</b> \$14.96	<b>Total</b> \$14.95	<b>Total</b> \$15.01	<b>Total</b> \$14.98	<b>Total</b> \$14.93
<b><u>Firehouse Grill</u></b>					
Burgers for three w/ drinks	Subtotal \$43.75	Subtotal \$43.75	Subtotal \$43.75	Subtotal \$43.75	Subtotal \$43.75
3 Chief Burgers w/ fries \$27.75	Sales Tax \$3.83	Sales Tax \$3.83	Sales Tax \$3.83	Sales Tax \$3.83	Sales Tax \$3.83
4 Sam Adams Pints \$16.00	Liquor Tax \$0.96	Liquor Tax \$0.48	Liquor Tax \$0.64	Liquor Tax \$0.64	Liquor Tax \$0.64
	Food and Bev \$0.00	Food and Bev \$0.88	Food and Bev \$0.56	Food and Bev \$0.44	Food and Bev \$0.28
	<b>Total</b> \$48.54	<b>Total</b> \$48.93	<b>Total</b> \$48.77	<b>Total</b> \$48.66	<b>Total</b> \$48.50
<b>Additional Revenue to Gen.Fund:</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$1,702,216</b>	<b>\$1,354,331</b>	<b>\$784,811</b>	<b>\$544,571</b>

**NON- ALCOHOLIC FOOD AND BEVERAGE/LIQUOR TAX ANALYSIS**

**0.5% FOOD AND BEVERAGE TAX ANALYSIS**

0.5 % FOOD AND BEVERAGE TAX	\$404,880
LESS: 1% POURED LIQUOR TAX	(\$132,595)
NET	\$272,285
LESS: 2% POURED LIQUOR TAX	(\$265,189)
NET	\$139,691
LESS: 3% POURED LIQUOR TAX	(\$397,784)
NET	\$7,096
LESS: 4% POURED LIQUOR TAX	(\$530,379)
NET	(\$125,499)

**0.75% FOOD AND BEVERAGE TAX ANALYSIS**

0.75 % FOOD AND BEVERAGE TAX	\$607,320
LESS: 1% POURED LIQUOR TAX	(\$132,595)
NET	\$474,725
LESS: 2% POURED LIQUOR TAX	(\$265,189)
NET	\$342,131
LESS: 3% POURED LIQUOR TAX	(\$397,784)
NET	\$209,536
LESS: 4% POURED LIQUOR TAX	(\$530,379)
NET	\$76,941

**1.0% FOOD AND BEVERAGE TAX ANALYSIS**

1.0 % FOOD AND BEVERAGE TAX	809,760
LESS: 1% POURED LIQUOR TAX	(132,595)
NET	677,165
LESS: 2% POURED LIQUOR TAX	(265,189)
NET	544,571
LESS: 3% POURED LIQUOR TAX	(397,784)
NET	411,976
LESS: 4% POURED LIQUOR TAX	(530,379)
NET	279,381
LESS: 5% POURED LIQUOR TAX	(662,973)
NET	146,787
LESS: 6% POURED LIQUOR TAX	(795,568)
NET	14,192

**1.5% FOOD AND BEVERAGE TAX ANALYSIS**

1.5 % FOOD AND BEVERAGE TAX	1,214,640
LESS: 1% POURED LIQUOR TAX	(132,595)
NET	1,082,045
LESS: 2% POURED LIQUOR TAX	(265,189)
NET	949,451
LESS: 3% POURED LIQUOR TAX	(397,784)
NET	816,856
LESS: 4% POURED LIQUOR TAX	(530,379)
NET	684,261
LESS: 5% POURED LIQUOR TAX	(662,973)
NET	551,667
LESS: 6% POURED LIQUOR TAX	(795,568)
NET	419,072

**2% FOOD AND BEVERAGE TAX ANALYSIS**

2.0 % FOOD AND BEVERAGE TAX	1,619,520
LESS: 1% POURED LIQUOR TAX	(132,595)
NET	1,486,925
LESS: 2% POURED LIQUOR TAX	(265,189)
NET	1,354,331
LESS: 3% POURED LIQUOR TAX	(397,784)
NET	1,221,736
LESS: 4% POURED LIQUOR TAX	(530,379)
NET	1,089,141
LESS: 5% POURED LIQUOR TAX	(662,973)
NET	956,547
LESS: 6% POURED LIQUOR TAX	(795,568)
NET	823,952



# Interdepartmental Memorandum

---

To: Julia Carroll, City Manager  
From: Wendy Kalina, Administrative Adjudication Manager  
Subject: **Budget Memo #36: Administrative Hearings Cost-Benefit History**  
Date: February 7, 2006

---

This memo is in response to the request from Council for a cost-benefit history of the Administrative Hearings Division. Attached are spreadsheets from the Administrative Hearings Division with information pertaining to the following budget years: 2000-2001, 2001-2002, 2002-2003, 2003-2004 and 2004-2005. There is one spreadsheet per year that includes information regarding the number of tickets adjudicated, dispositions, total fines due, fines paid, the remaining balance due, and the collection rate. Overall the collection rate is between 69-71%. An additional spreadsheet is attached that includes the total Administrative Hearings Division budget per fiscal year and the number of letters per type sent out per year. Information at this detail for fiscal year 1999-2000 is not available.

## **BACKGROUND:**

The Administrative Hearings Division was initially created in 2000 to increase fine collection on municipal ordinance violation that had previously been the responsibility of the Skokie Circuit Court. The Skokie Circuit Court proceedings demanded the attendance of staff from the Law Department, the citing officer and at times supervisor for the following Departments (dependent on the type of citation): Parking, Building, Fire, Health, Parks/Forestry, Police, Police-Animals, Property Standards and Zoning. Increased costs were incurred by the citing Department for travel and overtime costs (Police Department.) Initially the Administrative Hearings Division only heard Parking ticket contests and over the years the jurisdiction grew to include all the Departments listed above.

## **SUMMARIZATION OF BENEFITS FROM THE HEARINGS DIVISION:**

- Reduction of cost regarding travel and overtime.
- Notices sent out on a regular basis at all phases of ticket issuance and fine implementation
- Maintenance of database that tracks all tickets and related fines
- Training provided to effected Departments
- Increased productivity of effected City Departments by eliminating time spent in court

## **FUTURE PLANS TO IMPROVE OPERATIONS:**

- Develop relationship with Collections Agency to further reduce balance due

Hearings Division Summary for March 1, 2000 - February 28, 2001

Department	# Sent to Adjudication	Dismissed	Liabile	Not Liabile	Fines Paid Prior Hearing	Fines Paid After Hearing	Total Fines (due)	Total Paid	Balance Due	Collection Rate	
Building	NA^	NA^	NA^	NA^	N/A***	N/A***	NA^	NA^	NA^	NA^	
Fire	NA^	NA^	NA^	NA^	N/A***	N/A***	NA^	NA^	NA^	NA^	
Health	NA^	NA^	NA^	NA^	N/A***	N/A***	NA^	NA^	NA^	NA^	
NU-Police	NA^	NA^	NA^	NA^	N/A***	N/A***	NA^	NA^	NA^	NA^	
Parks/Forestry	NA^	NA^	NA^	NA^	N/A***	N/A***	NA^	NA^	NA^	NA^	
Police		4	0	4	0 N/A***	N/A***	\$510.00	\$75.00	\$435.00	15%	
Police - Animals		8	0	5	3 N/A***	N/A***	\$125.00	\$125.00	\$0.00	100%	
Property Standards	NA^	NA^	NA^	NA^	N/A***	N/A***	NA^	NA^	NA^	NA^	
Zoning	NA^	NA^	NA^	NA^	N/A***	N/A***	NA^	NA^	NA^	NA^	
Parking (total)		36,594	0*	29,120	1,546	\$135,492.01	\$472,078.08	\$921,834.08	\$607,570.09	\$314,263.99	66%
<b>Totals</b>		<b>36,606</b>	<b>215**</b>	<b>43961**</b>	<b>3596**</b>	<b>\$135,492.01</b>	<b>\$472,078.08</b>	<b>\$922,469.08</b>	<b>\$607,770.09</b>	<b>\$314,698.99</b>	<b>66%</b>

\*Parking tickets dismissed counted in not liable

\*\*Does not include cases not heard because payment made prior to hearing

\*\*\*Fine is not assigned on these cases until after the hearing

^ Not applicable because AHD did not hear these cases during this time frame

Hearings Division Summary for March 1, 2001 - February 28, 2002

Department	# Sent to Adjudication	Dismissed	Liable	Not Liable	Fines Paid		Total Fines (due)	Total Paid	Balance Due	Collection Rate
					Prior Hearing	After Hearing				
Building	10	3	3	4	N/A***	N/A***	\$3,975.00	\$3,800.00	\$175.00	100%
Fire	34	1	24	9	N/A***	N/A***	\$3,960.00	\$3,050.00	\$910.00	77%
Health	3	0	3	0	N/A***	N/A***	\$398.50	\$151.50	\$247.00	38%
NU-Police	11	4	6	1	N/A***	N/A***	\$1,745.00	\$1,285.00	\$460.00	74%
Parks/Forestry	0	0	0	0	N/A***	N/A***	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	100%
Police	212	21	152	39	N/A***	N/A***	\$19,245.00	\$10,005.00	\$9,240.00	52%
Police - Animals	16	2	13	1	N/A***	N/A***	\$2,635.00	\$2,390.00	\$245.00	91%
Property Standards	181	16	137	28	N/A***	N/A***	\$179,372.45	\$106,603.50	\$72,768.95	59%
Zoning	1	0	1	0	N/A***	N/A***	\$75.00	\$75.00	\$0.00	100%
Parking (total)	55,243	0*	33,870	2,579	\$505,227.67	\$589,053.40	\$1,543,430.00	\$1,094,281.07	\$449,148.93	71%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>55,711</b>	<b>47**</b>	<b>34,209**</b>	<b>2,661**</b>	<b>505,228</b>	<b>589,053</b>	<b>\$1,754,835.95</b>	<b>\$1,221,641.07</b>	<b>\$533,194.88</b>	<b>70%</b>

\*Parking tickets dismissed counted in not liable

\*\*Does not include cases not heard because payment made prior to hearing

\*\*\*Fine is not assigned on these cases until after the hearing

Hearings Division Summary for March 1, 2002 - February 28, 2003

Department	# Sent to Adjudication	Dismissed	Liable	Not Liable	Fines Paid Prior Hearing	Fines Paid After Hearing	Total Fines (due)	Total Paid	Balance Due	Collection Rate
Building	3	0	2	1	N/A***	N/A***	\$50.00	\$50.00	\$0.00	100%
Fire	10	2	6	2	N/A***	N/A***	\$1,500.00	\$1,000.00	\$500.00	67%
Health	2	1	1	0	N/A***	N/A***	\$50.00	\$50.00	\$0.00	100%
NU-Police	104	21	76	7	N/A***	N/A***	\$17,070.00	\$12,800.00	\$4,270.00	75%
Parks/Forestry	20	15	5	0	N/A***	N/A***	\$2,913.00	\$1,703.00	\$1,210.00	58%
Police	503	73	364	66	N/A***	N/A***	\$39,450.00	\$18,911.00	\$20,539.00	48%
Police - Animals	12	2	10		N/A***	N/A***	\$5,020.00	\$1,385.00	\$3,635.00	28%
Property Standards	150	58	83	9	N/A***	N/A***	\$36,394.00	\$25,669.00	\$10,725.00	71%
Zoning	2	0	2	0	N/A***	N/A***	\$796.50	\$776.50	\$20.00	100%
Parking (total)	67,515	0*	49,620	3,951	\$606,960.10	\$811,723.50	\$1,962,906.00	\$1,418,683.60	\$544,222.40	72%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>68,321</b>	<b>172**</b>	<b>50,169**</b>	<b>4,036**</b>	<b>606,960</b>	<b>811,724</b>	<b>\$2,066,149.50</b>	<b>\$1,481,028.10</b>	<b>\$585,121.40</b>	<b>72%</b>

\*Parking tickets dismissed counted in not liable

\*\*Does not include cases not heard because payment made prior to hearing

\*\*\*Fine is not assigned on these cases until after the hearing

Hearings Division Summary for March 1, 2003 - February 29, 2004

Department	# Sent to Adjudication	Dismissed	Liable	Not Liable	Fines Paid Prior Hearing	Fines Paid After Hearing	Total Fines (due)	Total Paid	Balance Due	Collection Rate
Building	0	0	0	0	N/A***	N/A***	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	100%
Fire	41	8	33	0	N/A***	N/A***	\$3,650.00	\$1,850.00	\$1,800.00	51%
Health	16	3	13	0	N/A***	N/A***	\$1,676.00	\$525.00	\$1,151.00	31%
NU-Police	249	7	181	61	N/A***	N/A***	\$24,930.00	\$18,472.00	\$6,458.00	74%
Parks/Forestry	4	1	1	2	N/A***	N/A***	\$645.00	\$0.00	\$645.00	0%
Police	698	76	517	105	N/A***	N/A***	\$56,345.00	\$22,656.00	\$33,689.00	40%
Police - Animals	27	1	21	5	N/A***	N/A***	\$1,225.00	\$695.00	\$530.00	57%
Property Standards	82	6	74	2	N/A***	N/A***	\$21,507.11	\$11,861.61	\$9,645.50	55%
Zoning	1	0	1	0	N/A***	N/A***	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	100%
Parking (total)	79,784	0*	49,620	3,765	\$723,976.40	\$959,253.71	\$2,343,724.69	\$1,683,230.11	\$660,494.58	72%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>80,902</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>50,461</b>	<b>3,940</b>	<b>723,976</b>	<b>959,254</b>	<b>\$2,453,702.80</b>	<b>\$1,739,289.72</b>	<b>\$714,413.08</b>	<b>71%</b>

\*Parking tickets dismissed counted in not liable

\*\*Does not include cases not heard because payment made prior to hearing

\*\*\*Fine is not assigned on these cases until after the hearing

Hearings Division Summary for March 1, 2004 - February 28, 2005

Department	# Sent to Adjudication	Dismissed	Liable	Fines Paid		Total Fines (due)	Total Paid	Balance Due	Collection Rate	
				Not Liable	Prior Hearing					After Hearing
Building	2	1	1	0	N/A***	N/A***	\$250.00	\$0.00	\$250.00	0%
Fire	7	3	4	0	N/A***	N/A***	\$950.00	\$950.00	\$0.00	100%
Health	2	0	2	0	N/A***	N/A***	\$1,000.00	\$500.00	\$500.00	50%
NU-Police	119	9	86	24	N/A***	N/A***	\$18,985.00	\$15,325.00	\$3,660.00	81%
Parks/Forestry	6	4	2	0	N/A***	N/A***	\$75.00	\$75.00	\$0.00	100%
Police	707	76	536	95	N/A***	N/A***	\$76,520.00	\$32,286.00	\$44,234.00	42%
Police - Animals	61	4	47	10	N/A***	N/A***	\$3,456.00	\$1,005.00	\$2,451.00	29%
Property Standards	171	32	123	15	N/A***	N/A***	\$34,728.00	\$23,436.50	\$11,291.50	68%
Zoning	5	2	3	0	N/A***	N/A***	\$2,200.00	\$2,200.00	\$0.00	100%
Parking (total)	67,486	0*	42,889	3,418	\$579,338.33	\$802,579.00	\$1,979,920.00	\$1,381,917.33	\$598,002.67	67%
<b>Totals</b>	<b>68,566</b>	<b>215**</b>	<b>43,961**</b>	<b>3,596**</b>	<b>\$579,338.33</b>	<b>\$802,579.00</b>	<b>\$2,118,084.00</b>	<b>\$1,457,694.83</b>	<b>\$660,389.17</b>	<b>69%</b>

\*Parking tickets dismissed counted in not liable

\*\*Does not include cases not heard because payment made prior to hearing

\*\*\*Fine is not assigned on these cases until after the hearing

Hearings Division Summary of Budget and Letters Sent:  
 FY 00/01 - 04/05

	<b>FY 00-01</b>	<b>FY 01-02</b>	<b>FY 02-03</b>	<b>FY 03-04</b>	<b>FY 04-05</b>
<b>Budget</b>	\$442,000.00	\$394,800.00	\$359,500.00	\$359,500.00	\$410,100.00
<b>Notice to Appear-parking</b>	23,136	58,315	63,875	72,276	59,374
<b>35-Day Letter*</b>	N/A	32,615	27,637	34,761	32,637
<b>Boot Letter</b>	1,060	1,385	2,272	3,592	3,259
<b>Suspension Warning</b>	1	396	301	516	404
<b>45-Day Suspension</b>	N/A	N/A	307	284	211

\*Includes all Departments that are adjudicated: Parking, Building, Fire, NU Police, Police, Police-Animals, Parks/Forestry, Property Management, Health and Zoning



# Interdepartmental Memorandum

---

To: Julia Carroll, City Manager  
From: Bill Stafford, Finance Director  
Subject: **Budget Memo #37: Real Estate Transfer Tax**  
Date: February 10, 2006

---

## ISSUE

There was a request from the Council to provide a more detailed explanation as to why the ten month financial report on the Real Estate Transfer Tax revenue number differed with the City Clerk's same number for that tax.

## ANALYSIS

The financial report had the Real Estate Transfer Tax number at \$3,542,107 and the Clerk's number was \$3,666,135. The \$124,028 difference is due to:

\$ 3,395 in downtown Chicago service charges  
60,769 in refunds  
59,864 in audit accruals

\$124,028 Total

These adjustments are part of the City's official financial records and are annually audited.



# Interdepartmental Memorandum

To: Julia Carroll, City Manager  
 From: Catherine Radek, Superintendent, Fleet Services  
 Subject: **Budget Memo #38: Five-Year History of City Vehicles**  
 Date: February 9, 2006

The following table is in response to a Council request for a five-year history of vehicles owned by the City over the last five years.

<b>City of Evanston Vehicle Totals</b>					
<b>Category</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>
Cars, including police	98	102	105	106	104
Vans & SUVs	32	32	32	31	33
Garbage trucks	20	20	20	20	20
All other trucks	94	94	96	98	95
Construction equipment (backhoes, loaders, grader)	11	12	11	11	12
Street Sweepers	4	4	4	4	4
Buses	3	3	3	3	4
Fire Trucks*	13	13	12	12	11
Ambulances	4	4	4	4	4
Miscellaneous (skidsteer, tractor, ice cleaner)	14	14	16	18	18
<b>Totals</b>	<b>293</b>	<b>298</b>	<b>303</b>	<b>307</b>	<b>305</b>

\*The Fire department reflects a net decrease of two vehicles over the five-year period:

- One vehicle was a very old fire engine that eventually became scrap metal. The pump was taken from this truck and put it into one that is still in operation.
- The other vehicle is an air van that was recently taken out of service and will not be replaced. The air equipment will be carried on a new, replacement vehicle for the rescue/dive equipment. This new truck is scheduled for delivery on April 1.



# Interdepartmental Memorandum

---

To: Julia Carroll, City Manager  
From: Vincent Jones, Assistant to the City Manager  
Subject: **Budget Memo #39: Update on Impact Fees**  
Date: February 7, 2006

---

This memo is in response to a request from Council for an analysis on the use of Impact Fees.

Staff is completing research on the topic of impact fees, and will distribute a white paper to the Council by the end of the month that defines impact fees, identifies the issues involved with implementing impact fees, and provides examples and discusses what similar suburbs have in place with regard to impact fees. The paper will also outline the next steps to be taken if the Council directs staff to develop an impact fee policy.



# Interdepartmental Memorandum

---

To: Julia Carroll, City Manager  
From: James Wolinski, Director, Community Development  
Subject: **Budget Memo #40: FY 06-07 Building Permit Revenue Justification**  
Date: February 7, 2006

---

Building permit revenue estimates for the budget are based on information gathered by staff from the two hospitals, Northwestern University, and developers. This information collection is started in the summer prior to the budget year, and finalized in September when budget submissions are due to the City Manager. Revenue projections are based on projects that staff calculates will be permitted in the upcoming budget year. Assumptions are made on what potential projects will receive City Council approval, and which ones that will not. On occasion, revenue estimates may be adjusted after budget submission, due to a project that receives Council approval that staff did not contemplate. For instance, in this year's proposal, staff did not budget revenue for the mixed use development at 1567 Maple. When the project was approved in the fall of 2005, I revised our revenue estimate to reflect permitting of this project in 2006.

Building permit fees are based on the construction value of the project, at \$12 per \$1,000 of construction value. Projected fees include general construction at \$325,000 in base building permit fees. This includes residential & commercial permits such as new single family homes, additions, porches, decks, condominium conversions and commercial build outs. This figure is consistent with adjustments for inflation. Additionally, the following larger construction projects are planned for FY 06-07.

<u>Project</u>	<u>Construction Value</u>	<u>Permit Fee</u>
Mather – Phase 1	\$50,000,000	\$600,000
1515 Chicago/Optima	\$40,000,000	\$480,000
1890 Maple/Hotel	\$10,000,000	\$120,000
Sienna – Phase 3/Rozak	\$15,000,000	\$180,000
Three Crowns Park Addition	\$26,000,000	\$312,000
1567 Maple/Mixed Use	\$35,000,000	\$420,000
	<hr/>	
	Total:	\$176,000,000
		\$2,112,000
	+Base Permit Fee:	\$ 325,000
		<hr/>
	<b>TOTAL PERMIT FEES:</b>	<b>\$2,437,000</b>



# Interdepartmental Memorandum

---

To: Julia Carroll, City Manager  
From: Douglas J. Gaynor, Director of Parks/Forestry and Recreation  
Subject: **Budget Memo # 41-A: Fleetwood-Jourdain Youth Theatre Program**  
Date: February 10, 2006

---

## **Purpose**

The purpose of this memo is to provide information, as requested by the City Council, on the history of the Children's Theatre program, including a review of the issues and recommendations for housing their future performances.

## **Historical Overview**

Until 1998, the Children's Theatre was located at the original Levy Senior Center on Maple Avenue. It was then relocated to Family Focus between 1998 and spring 2003. In spring 2003, the program moved to the recently opened Levy Senior Center.

## **Children's Theatre at the Family Focus Theatre**

In 1998, the Children's Theatre Program was placed under the direction of the Fleetwood-Jourdain Center staff that had more experience in theatre programming and the program was moved from the original Levy Center on Maple Street to Family Focus.

The Children's Theatre averaged about three productions per year (18 shows in total) with an average of sixty children (two casts of 30 for each show) in each production and an average attendance of 60 attendees/ticket purchasers per show. There were additional children who participated in set design, costume design, scene writing and music selection.

From 1984 to 2003, the City paid rent annually to Family Focus for use of the theatre, office, classroom and storage spaces. Fleetwood-Jourdain Theatre's main stage program also operated out of the Family Focus building, performing four productions annually. During the last full year of operation (2002), \$44,000 was paid to Family Focus for rental of the city's leased space. In addition, the City paid for electrical usage (\$2,000 per year) and minor maintenance (\$2,000 per year) for the leased areas at Family Focus.

Improvements to the leased space were also made through City capital funds, in the amount of approximately \$75,000. In addition, CDBG funds were granted to the city explicitly for Family Focus and were used for the following improvements:

1984	Auditorium lighting	\$59,210
1985	Rehab work in the space	\$43,000
1986	Air conditioning of the auditorium	\$34,000
1987	Auditorium renovations	\$5,000
1987	New auditorium seating	\$12,000
1988	Auditorium renovations	\$7,084
	<b>Total</b>	<b>\$160,294</b>

The Illinois Department of Revenue determined that the City’s leased space was a revenue-generating entity and not one used for charitable purposes; therefore, the portion of leased space was subject to real estate taxes. For example, in 2000, Family Focus paid \$15,094.04 for the 1999 taxes, as a result of our programs utilizing space in their building.

In February 2003, a decision was made by city staff to no longer rent the space based on the building’s accessibility violations and the rental costs. For a number of years, the City brought these violations, per the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), to the attention of Family Focus; the City advised Family Focus that the programs would be relocated if the building was not brought into compliance. In November 2000, Family Focus obtained the services of the Chandler-Moore Company, an accessibility consulting firm who conducted a comprehensive survey of the building and prepared a report on what needed to be done in order to bring the building into ADA compliance. Specifically, the report addressed the following major violations in the area that we leased:

- Provide wheel chair access to and inside the theatre
- Provide a visual fire emergency warning device
- Provide an assistive listening system and directional signage for accessibility
- Replace door hardware
- Make restrooms accessible

After the report was completed, the staff believed that Family Focus would be actively seeking funding for architectural services and renovation costs. The extent of the completed repairs is unknown, but Recreation employees, who have been at Family Focus recently, reported that access to and inside the theatre has not been resolved. At the time the space was being used by the City, residents did file complaints that building access and restrooms were not in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act and threatened to sue if the programs were not relocated to an accessible site or the violations corrected. In February 2003, the City sent notification to Family Focus that the lease would not be renewed for the space since the accessibility issues had not been corrected.

### **Use of Levy Center by the Children’s Theatre Program 2003 - 2005**

Similar to the adult theatre program, the Evanston Children's Theatre Program had to be relocated from Family Focus due to ADA issues. In September 2003, the Evanston Children’s Theatre began using space at the Levy Senior Center on Dodge Avenue. The theatre program used two classrooms at the Center, typically three times a week. As the actual performances

approached, the theatre program increased their use of the classrooms to four and needed access to the stage for rehearsals. The week prior to the performance, the theatre required the stage on an exclusive basis while the props remained in place until the production ended. As a result, the stage was not available to other groups. Additionally, the theatre required full-time costume and prop storage space and set construction areas during as well as between productions. With every production, space requirements increased due to the increased number of costumes and props stored.

The Evanston Children's Theatre's space needs for a full-blown production presented a challenge to the Levy Center whose own expanding number of programs, classes, and events (including rentals) required increased space. As a result, the Levy Center has been used only for limited performances that do not require the same space commitments.

### **Current Programs/Budget**

In 2005/06, staff offered programs for Black History Month, liturgical concerts, and summer programs for youth, which were part of the Theatre Program budget. As of January 31, 2006, approximately \$57,792 will have been expended for programs offered, due to the limited amount of programming offered during the 2005/06 year. From that amount, \$7,500 was charged back for the health insurance for the budgeted, vacant full-time position, and approximately \$4,000 was paid for security at the James Park sled hill. Note: Funding for the James Park sled hill security is being charged to this business unit because staff determined that the approved budget would not be over-expended, and it was the recommendation of the Budget Office that the allocation for the security be charged back to this business unit until a budget transfer is completed. Revenue collection to date is \$500. The 2006/07 overall theatre budget is \$122,600 in expenditures and \$28,400 in revenues. Attached is a breakdown of those expenditures.

### **Program Manager Vacancy**

In addition to space issues, the Theatre Program Manager position has been vacant since August 2004. The position was first placed on hold from August 2004 to December 2004 as being considered as a potential budget reduction for 2005/06. The position was taken off the budget reduction list in December 2004 and the Human Resources Department was ready to move forward with posting the position, but the Center Manager supervising this position was not available to participate in the recruitment effort due to illness from December 2004 through February 2005. When the Center Manager returned, there were two other positions in the Division that were determined to be a higher priority than the Theatre Manager. As time permitted, the job description was updated and a requisition for hiring was submitted in August 2005. Then in October 2005, the City Manager froze the position, pending approval in the 2006/07 budget. Staff is ready to move forward in hiring and will continue working on the site location details during the hiring process.

---

### **Current Recommendations for the Theatre Program**

In light of the many issues that have impacted the Theatre Program in recent years, staff has revisited and revised its recommendations for this program. It should be noted that the Center Manager responsible for the Evanston Children's Theatre program and adult main stage Black theatre program (Fleetwood-Jourdain Theatre) is out of the office due to an injury and information for this report was obtained from file notes and previous meetings. The current recommendations are:

**Evanston Children's Theatre Program:** It is recommended that the program have a spring and late fall performance each year, which could be held at the Levy Senior Center in the Maple Room, which is also used as a gymnasium. At a minimum, the stage would have to be secured for three entire weekends during the performance run. The actual program (including rehearsals) would be offered two to three days per week and two rooms at Levy would need to be secured during the hours of 4 pm to 6 pm. Additional time on stage and room space would be needed during the week leading up to the performances.

Staff also recommends the purchase of a drop curtain, that could be installed in the ceiling to cover the windows of the north and west wall of the Maple Room in order to block light from entering the space during performances. (This was a major complaint from parents of the children in the original program who felt that the room was multi-purpose and in no way represented an actual theatre. The current conditions do limit theatrical effects because the Children's Theatre performances usually occur in the daytime or early evening.) The estimated cost of the curtains is \$75,000, which would be submitted as a recommendation for the 2007/08 capital improvement funding budget.

In addition, scenery and sets would need to be purchased because a location for building sets is not available. Once the performances are finished, all items could be stored at the Service Center if space permits. In addition to the show performances, Theatre staff would again offer acting classes and writing workshops on available days either at the Levy Senior Center or one of the other recreation centers. Staff is also recommending transferring the Evanston Children's Theatre program to the responsibilities to Karen Hawk, Program Manager at the Levy Senior Center under the direction of Christina Ferraro, Levy Senior Center Manager. This transfer of responsibilities would resolve some of the prior challenges faced by former Theatre Program Managers. When both the adult and children's programs were running at the same time, former managers incurred additional time traveling between sites each day, had to coordinate available program times at two different locations, and supervise participants and crews at two locations. Based on this recommendation, an additional expense of \$4,000, which is not included in the 2006/07 proposed budget, it would be necessary for the purchase of scenery.

Once the Theatre Program Manager vacancy is filled, he/she would be responsible for the adult Black theatre program (Fleetwood-Jourdain Theatre), Black History Month activities and the summer Arts in the Park program. Arts in the Park is a program held during the summer in various park sites; staff lead arts and crafts activities and provide arts related mini-workshops for children age 7 to 12. If approved, funding for the Evanston Children's Theatre would be reallocated to the Levy Senior Center Business Unit.



# Interdepartmental Memorandum

---

To: Julia Carroll, City Manager  
From: Douglas J. Gaynor, Director of Parks/Forestry and Recreation  
Subject: **Budget Memo #41-B: Fleetwood-Jourdain Community Center Theatre**  
Date: February 10, 2006

---

## **Purpose**

The purpose of this memo is to provide information, as requested by the City Council, on the history of Fleetwood-Jourdain Theatre's main stage program for black adults, including a review of the issues and recommendations for housing their future performances.

## **Historical Overview**

From 1980 to 1983, the adult theatre program was held at Fleetwood-Jourdain Center, 1655 Foster St. From 1984 to spring 2003 it was housed in the Family Focus building at 2010 Dewey Ave, which is adjacent to Fleetwood-Jourdain Center. In spring 2003, a classroom at the Noyes Cultural Arts Center was used for rehearsals and workshops and it was proposed that performances be held at Fleetwood-Jourdain Center. No main stage performances have actually been held to date.

## **History of Using the Family Focus Theatre**

In 1984, the City first began using the theatre in the Weissbourd-Holmes, Family Focus Center for the department's adult Black theatre main stage program. Four productions were held annually. The rented space for the program consisted of four classrooms and an auditorium/theatre area with a stage and seating for one hundred and twenty five on the main floor and fifty in the balcony.

From 1984 to 2003, the City paid rent annually to Family Focus for use of the theatre, office, classrooms and storage space. During the last full year of operation (2002), \$44,000 was paid to Family Focus for rental of the city's leased space. In addition, the City paid for electrical usage (\$2,000 per year) and minor maintenance (\$2,000 per year) for the leased areas.

Improvements to the leased space were also made through City capital funds, in the amount of approximately \$75,000. In addition, CDBG funds were granted to the city explicitly for Family Focus and were used for the following improvements:

1984	Auditorium lighting	\$59,210
1985	Rehab work in the space	\$43,000
1986	Air conditioning of the auditorium	\$34,000
1987	Auditorium renovations	\$5,000

1987	New auditorium seating	\$12,000
1988	Auditorium renovations	\$7,084
	<b>Total</b>	<b>\$160,294</b>

The Illinois Department of Revenue determined that the City's leased space was a revenue-generating entity and not one used for charitable purposes; therefore, the portion of leased space was subject to real estate taxes. For example, in 2000, Family Focus paid \$15,094.04 for the 1999 taxes as a result of our programs utilizing space in their building.

In February 2003, a decision was made by city staff to no longer rent the space based on the building's accessibility violations and the rental costs. For a number of years, the City brought these violations, per the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), to the attention of Family Focus; the City advised Family Focus that the programs would be relocated if the building was not brought into compliance. In November 2000, Family Focus obtained the services of the Chandler-Moore Company, an accessibility consulting firm who conducted a comprehensive survey of the building and prepared a report on what needed to be done in order to bring the building into ADA compliance. Specifically, the report addressed the following major violations in the area that we leased:

- Provide wheelchair access to and inside the theatre
- Provide a visual fire emergency warning device
- Provide an assistive listening system and directional signage for accessibility
- Replace door hardware
- Make restrooms accessible

After the report was completed, City staff believed that Family Focus would be actively seeking funding for architectural services and renovation costs. The extent of the completed repairs is unknown, but Recreation employees, who have been at Family Focus recently, reported that access to and inside the theatre has not been resolved. At the time the space was being used by the City, residents did file complaints that building access and restrooms were not in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act and threatened to sue if the programs were not relocated to an accessible site or the violations corrected. In February 2003, the City notified Family Focus that the lease would not be renewed for the space since the accessibility issues had not been corrected.

### **Proposal to move the adult Black theatre program back to Fleetwood-Jourdain Center**

In the 2003/04 budget process, the City Council approved a staff recommendation of funding \$120,000 to hire architectural services for expanding the stage at Fleetwood-Jourdain Center and for reviewing other necessary changes in order to operate the adult Black theatre program at the center. None of the \$120,000 has been expended to date. Attached is the description of the project that was approved by the City Council in February 2003. In addition to the stage renovations, staff put together additional items that also needed to be addressed:

Renovations items:

- Purchase theatre lighting equipment
- Purchase stage curtains and window treatments for the space
- Purchase portable seating for the space
- Renovate sound system
- Install partitions to enclose the space

Programmatic items:

- Identify a place for rehearsals and office operations
- Identify a location where props and scenery could be built and stored
- Identify a location where costumes could be stored
- Identify dressing room space for the duration of the performance schedules
- Resolve how to store sets between shows

Shortly after the move from Family Focus, Recreation staff began meeting about the relocation of the adult Black theatre program to Fleetwood-Jourdain Center. Until the renovations could be completed at Fleetwood-Jourdain, it was proposed that a scaled-down theatre program could be housed in a room at the Noyes Cultural Arts Center. The room at Noyes was an open classroom of approximately 900 square feet that could be used for play readings or spoken word productions, instructional classes, and rehearsals. The Theatre Program Manager also had an office in the Cultural Arts Division main office and a small storage room was made available for supplies. Staff and Next Theatre discussed the possibility of the City using the theatre during down times; however, Next Theatre's show schedules did not allow time for the space to be used by the adult program.

At the same time, as discussions continued about the renovation of the Fleetwood-Jourdain Center space for the adult program, staff realized that issues with program conflicts and available space at the center could not be resolved. The following items were some reasons why staff delayed moving forward with any renovation work until all options could be reviewed:

- Due to amount of noise that travels into the auditorium space from the gymnasium, gymnasium activities would need to be limited or not scheduled during show performances or activities.
- There are no dedicated dressing rooms and the locker rooms are currently used for gym activities and the fitness center. The locker rooms could not accommodate all three activities, thus some activities would need to be canceled in order to make the locker rooms available for the theatre program.
- A location for constructing props and scenery could not be identified.
- The height of the room in comparison with the stage height would limit scenery and stage productions.
- The plans for the Sculpture Garden, new playground area, tennis courts, and parking expansion were on hold, due to non-finalized lease agreements with District 65.
- Relocation of the theatre would create additional parking problems.
- An architect estimated that renovation costs could be minimally \$300,000 to \$400,000, if the spaced were to be outfitted properly.

Based on these findings, staff decided not to take any action regarding the renovations. While the adult program had once used the stage at Fleetwood-Jourdain prior to Family Focus, expectations and standards had increased drastically from the early 1980s and the program could not return to the same space with its current amenities.

### **Current Programs/Budget**

In 2005/06, staff offered programs for Black History Month, liturgical concerts, and summer programs for youth, which were part of the Theatre Program budget. As of January 31, 2006,

approximately \$57,792 will have been expended for programs offered, due to the limited amount of programming offered during the 2005/06 year. From that amount, \$7,500 was charged back for the health insurance for the budgeted, vacant full-time position, and approximately \$4,000 was paid for security at the James Park sled hill. Note: Funding for the James Park sled hill security is being charged to this business unit because staff determined that the approved budget would not be over-expended, and it was the recommendation of the Budget Office that the allocation for the security be charged back to this business unit until a budget transfer is completed. Revenue collection to date is \$500, which is from participant program fees. The 2006/07 overall theatre budget is \$122,600 in expenditures and \$28,400 in revenues. Attached is a breakdown of those expenditures.

### **Program Manager Vacancy**

In addition to space issues, the Theatre Program Manager position has been vacant since August 2004. The position was first placed on hold from August 2004 to December 2004 as it was being considered as a potential budget reduction for 2005/06. The position was taken off the budget reduction list in December 2004 and the Human Resources Department was ready to move forward with posting the position. However, the Center Manager supervising this position was not available to participate in the recruitment effort due to illness from December 2004 through February 2005. When the Center Manager returned, there were two other positions in the Division that were determined to be a higher priority than the Theatre Manager. As time permitted, the job description was updated and a requisition for hiring was submitted in August 2005. Then in October 2005, the City Manager froze the position, pending approval in the 2006/07 budget. Staff is ready to move forward in hiring and will continue working on the site location details during the hiring process.

---

### **Current Recommendations for the Theatre Program**

In light of the many issues that have impacted the Theatre Program in recent years, staff has revisited and revised its recommendations for this program. It should be noted that the Center Manager responsible for the Evanston Children's Theatre program and adult mainstage Black theatre program (Fleetwood-Jourdain Theatre) is out of the office due to an injury and information for this report was obtained from file notes and previous meetings. The current recommendations are:

#### **Fleetwood-Jourdain Theatre's adult Black main stage program**

At this point, staff does not believe there is viable space within City buildings to hold adult theatre performances. It is recommended that space at Noyes continue to be used for readings, classes, workshops, and, when possible, rehearsals. Next Theatre Company has indicated a willingness to collaborate with Fleetwood-Jourdain Theatre in the presentation of a series of staged readings. They could provide space, lighting, rudimentary sound, marketing support and artistic consulting on casting, direction and work selection. However, for performances, it appears one option is to return to the Family Focus facility--provided the necessary ADA compliance requirements are met. Another option could be to expand the Fleetwood-Jourdain Center if we can obtain the land lease for the area surrounding the center from District 65. Therefore, it is recommended that the City explore negotiating a long-term lease for use of

Family Focus space by the city. As part of the lease negotiations, the ADA violations will need to be addressed and corrected, as well as other areas necessary for the program, prior to the program beginning to use the space. There is \$120,000 available to hire an architect who could make recommendations and cost estimates regarding the two options. It would be also staff's recommendation that this cost be shared with Family Focus. These recommendations/cost estimates would then be submitted to City Council for review which would include the long term lease. It is expected that it will take more than a year for the recommendations to be made, reviewed and approved and for the work to be completed. However, an exact time line cannot be determined before the architect's initial survey is completed.

## **Staffing**

As explained in the Evanston Children's Theatre program memorandum, once the Theatre Program Manager vacancy is filled, he/she would be responsible for the adult Black theatre program (Fleetwood-Jourdain Theatre), Black History Month activities and the summer Arts in the Park program. Arts in the Park is a program held during the summer in four park sites throughout the city; staff lead arts and crafts activities and provide arts related mini-workshops for children age 7 to 12.

The funding for the adult Black main stage theatre, Black History Month activities and summer Arts in the Park would be allocated to the Fleetwood-Jourdain Theatre business unit. If the proposed plan to restart the Evanston Children's Theatre program is approved, its revenues and expenses would be allocated to the Levy Senior Center business unit.