CITY COUNCIL
HUMAN SERVICES COMMITTEE
Monday, October 1, 2007
Civic Center - Room 2402
7:00 P.M.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Aldermen Bernstein, Holmes, Jean-Baptiste, Moran, and Tisdahl

STAFF PRESENT: Judy Aiello, Rolanda Russell, Raphael Molinary, Doug Gaynor, Bob Dorneker, Alisa Dean, Beth Howlett, Jay Terry, Audrey Trotsky

OTHERS PRESENT: Pat Vance, Rosemary Jean-Paul, Evanston Township; Sharon Eckersall, Irwin Lyons, (Miller Cooper) (See attached list of Attendees)

PRESIDING: Alderman Moran

I. CALL TO ORDER
Alderman Moran called the meeting to order at 7:05 p.m.

II. APROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 17, 2007, MEETING
The minutes of the September 17, 2007 meeting were called and unanimously approved (5-0).

III. CONSIDERATION OF THE SEPTEMBER 2007 TOWNSHIP BILLS
Alderman Jean-Baptiste moved approval, seconded by Alderman Tisdahl. Alderman Bernstein inquired regarding the deal made with Mr. Hoover. He understands one bill was discounted but there now appears to be another $1,000 bill and moved to hold payment of this bill. Ms. Vance noted the bill in question was last month’s bill and has been approved and paid. The Aldermen questioned the breakdown of the items for payment on the R. S. Hoover billing. Alderman Moran inquired about the status of this billing and wondered if anyone has talked to Mr. Hoover regarding this. Ms. Eckersall said she spoke with Mr. Hoover last Friday who told her he finally got a clerk that knew something about this case and there won’t be an oral hearing as the briefs are very explicit and a rule will be made shortly. Alderman Moran questioned the 5 calls made about the status of the appeal billed at $200.00 an hour which Ms. Eckersall is saying that money was simply spent to find out there won’t be an oral argument. Ms. Eckersall added that occurred over several conversations. Alderman Moran said Ms. Eckersall should tell Mr. Hoover to let her know when finds out whether there is going to be an oral argument. Ms. Eckersall said all those calls were made in attempt to reach Mr. Hoover, to which Alderman Moran noted we are paying for all those calls.

Alderman Jean-Baptiste moved approval, seconded by Alderman Tisdahl. Alderman Bernstein inquired regarding the deal made with Mr. Hoover. He understands one bill was discounted but there now appears to be another $1,000 bill and moved to hold payment of this bill. Ms. Vance noted the bill in question was last month’s bill and has been approved and paid. The Aldermen questioned the breakdown of the items for payment on the R. S. Hoover billing. Alderman Moran inquired about the status of this billing and wondered if anyone has talked to Mr. Hoover regarding this. Ms. Eckersall said she spoke with Mr. Hoover last Friday who told her he finally got a clerk that knew something about this case and there won’t be an oral hearing as the briefs are very explicit and a rule will be made shortly. Alderman Moran questioned the 5 calls made about the status of the appeal billed at $200.00 an hour which Ms. Eckersall is saying that money was simply spent to find out there won’t be an oral argument. Ms. Eckersall added that occurred over several conversations. Alderman Moran said Ms. Eckersall should tell Mr. Hoover to let her know when finds out whether there is going to be an oral argument. Ms. Eckersall said all those calls were made in attempt to reach Mr. Hoover, to which Alderman Moran noted we are paying for all those calls.

Alderman Bernstein questioned the different initials on the billing statement and also the call made regarding a Freedom of Information Request to the Evanston Newspaper. Ms. Eckersall could not recall that and assumed they wanted some information. Ms. Vance noted it was an Evanston Round Table FOIA request in regards to bills and amounts having been paid to Mr. Hoover.

Alderman Jean-Baptiste did not recall this bill in the last Township bills packet. Mr. Terry said a detailed bill wasn’t in the monthly listing there was just the $880.31 amount. Alderman Jean-Baptiste requested that any future bills have a note addressed to the committee’s attention to avoid future confusion with these bills. He was under the impression all bills were to go through our Legal Department to be sanctioned before giving our approval. Alderman Jean-Baptiste wanted to reiterate he would consider the number of calls made regarding the status of the appeal being abuse. When Mr. Hoover told you he was finally able to get a clerk that is difficult to understand because anyone wanting to know what is going on in the appeals department can just walk over there where they will find about 12 clerks. We have to make sure any bills submitted to this committee have a cover memo requesting payment, the review, and then approval. Alderman Bernstein was going to talk to Mr. Hill about this because we were told we were going to pay Mr. Hoover a discounted amount, which was over some of our extraneous objections, and unless Mr. Hoover had to do more arguments, he was done. This is another $1,000 bill after the fact, which he thinks is wrong. Alderman Holmes noted Mr. Hoover was paid $30,000 the amount settled on after the discount. Alderman Bernstein added we’ve paid this man far more than he’s worth.

Alderman Holmes questioned Ms. Eckersall’s item for Travel and Education from 9/24 to 10/24, to which Ms. Eckersall responded that was for classes she took for the Assessor’s office that lasted an entire week. She did not stay there which was a savings, but for the 5 days had lunch and travel expenses. The other charges were for a Township Officials of Cook County meeting with Ms. Vance, Ms. Jean-Paul and Carlton, and another Cook County Assessors’ Board meeting. Alderman Holmes said her question was if the travel connected to the education. Ms. Eckersall said the classes were held in Naperville.
Alderman Bernstein asked who is now running the Assessor’s office and for how many hours a week, to which Ms. Eckersall responded Daniel is there and is now full time from 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. Alderman Bernstein asked if he now knows what he’s doing, to which Ms., Eckersall said he has a better feeling for it and is doing a good job. She took Daniel to the Cook County Assessors’ meeting where he found out he should be able to take a basic course next spring. Alderman Bernstein remarked you have somebody who does not know what they’re doing running your office for 40 hours a week. Ms. Eckersall said no one can replace someone who has been with Cook County for 34 years as Diane Benjamin was. He does a good job for the amount of money he’s making and the amount of time he’s been in the office. Alderman Bernstein said he heard a rumor that Ms. Eckersall is now charging Ms. Benjamin with theft, to which Ms. Eckersall responded, no, she filed a Police report for some things taken out of the office that they had paid for. Ms. Eckersall said she would rather not discuss that here and could discuss it elsewhere. The information is on a Police report, to which Alderman Bernstein asked when that was filed. Ms. Eckersall responded, about two months ago she filed the report on Ms. Purze’s advice. Alderman Jean-Baptiste stated when something like this occurs we should get a report right away as this is something we should know about.

Alderman Moran recalled the motion that was moved and seconded for approval of the September 2007 Township bills. Motion unanimously accepted (5-0).

IV. CONSIDERATION OF ACCEPTANCE OF THE ANNUAL AUDIT OF EVANSTON TOWNSHIP FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED MARCH 31, 2007

Mr. Lyons, of Miller Cooper & Co., Ltd. was called upon to give a review of the Township audit. Mr. Lyons noted the audit contains four (4) documents, the audit report and letters. The audit report is a prescribed format that has nothing but unqualified opinions which is the highest level of assurance that we can give on the statements. It has the required disclosures and information. There is more detailed information in the back of the report, the front is more summarized. The Township has two (2) funds that are combined together and the information on how they did was based on the modified accrual, which is your budgetary base is on page 11 of the audit. Both funds had an excess of revenue over expenditures. For a number of years there were comments that the fund balances were going down and the Township had to borrow money. This turned around, the fund balances were level because the Township is under tax caps and does not have the flexibility needed to increase and would be limited by what the tax caps are. It has been at the CPI for a number of years because that has been below the 5%. Another letter called the Management Discussion and Analysis letter is part of the new reporting model that has been in effect for a couple of years. If you want a summary pointing out a comparative between the years the easiest place to look is on pages 3 through 7.

Mr. Lyons proceeded to explain the letters. The first letter starts out, “This letter is intended to inform the Township Trustees of significant matters….” this is a required disclosure to the Board and part of the standards that we’re hired by the Board to do but we also work with the staff. Attached to this are our responsibilities for the audit that were some estimates in the statement where there were a couple of audit adjustments. There was one uncorrected misstatement, that is a small dollar amount, $8,800 that came up and wasn’t adjusted but was let flow through the statements so it would clear itself out. That $8,800 amount is not material to the audit. When we do an audit we’re looking at materiality something different than the statements, if that amount wasn’t there somebody may make a different decision on the statements. The $8,800 amount is small enough that it wouldn’t make a difference in what the statements fairly present. The five (5) audit adjustments made were in the statements and this one small amount that came up through the audit process which we didn’t adjust for it was left there because the amount was so small. Alderman Jean-Baptiste asked if that was due to a mistake in accounting, and was informed it was due to a payroll calculation and because payroll is normally paid on a regular basis they decided not to adjust it. It then goes through the statements or is included in another report that we need to be aware of. We didn’t have any disagreements with management nor were there any difficulties in performing the audit. The last part of the letter is about the number of new audit standards that take effect for next year and how that will change the approach of the audit and all audits that will be done for March 2008. Two new standards took effect this year is mentioned in one of the other letters. These standards will have a major affect on changing the focus of the audits, with much more evaluation of assessment of risk. Also, the audit process is changing standards that have to be followed, they have to assess the risk and after doing the work and if you find some differences in your testing you have to go back and reassess, which could change what audit work needs to be done. It’s going back to the pendulum on audits from 25 years ago when you did a lot of testing and controls and then started going more towards risk based audits. In a smaller organization we don’t need to test controls to understand how the entity works we would assess the risk at maximum and do other testing. Now you can’t just assess you have to go through the entire process and still may come up with assessing it at that maximum, but you can’t make that intuitive call up front you have to go through the process. While doing the testing you may have to go back and change it if you find errors, where in the past if we found errors they were put in the manager’s letter. You now have the manager letter, plus you have to go back and expand your test. There will also be a major change in the amount of time it takes to do the audit. That was the key part in the letter to the Board.

The next letter starts out with planning and performing and under significant control deficiencies there is the new terminology. Before there were material weaknesses in the management letters which you now don’t have, you now have control deficiencies and significant deficiencies and material weakness and controls. They have tightened up the standards of what has to be reported. The first item from the standards requires as an auditor the clients are supposed to
be drafting the financial statements. In most cases in Illinois government smaller entities are usually part of the audit engagement which includes accounting services for the firm to help draft the statements and we then have to make an evaluation. This year because of the way the Township and the staffing is set up, there isn’t a finance director or CPA, the Township was not in a position to draft their own statements and we are drafting those statements. When we’d find a control deficiency in a client we used to be able to make a recommendation and because of the size of the organization if it was related to segregation of duties they may not have been able to address it. If the Board would sign off on it we would drop the point as we met our professional responsibilities by telling the Board about it and we’d agree that you wouldn’t go out and hire another half time person just to get rid of the control deficiency. Now we cannot drop those points if they’re there we have to keep repeating them which does not make a lot of sense. The public company standards are being set up to apply to the non public company. You will end up being a smaller entity with types of internal control things that a large public company would never have because they have hundreds of people in the accounting department and will not have a segregation of duties issue. They would address any significant control deficiency that was found at that level. Because of our letters, where there are concerns our resources will be put into addressing control issues rather than program issues in order to get rid of them, otherwise they won’t go away. That will trickle out over the next few years because this is the first year of this.

Ms. Vance said she and her staff have attended some basic workshops dealing with some of the changes and are meeting with their accountant who already knows they will probably have to start doing the financial statements. They are looking at these new auditing procedures and controls and will make a determination if they need additional resources in order to do that.

Alderman Bernstein had a concern with respect to an auditor auditing his/her own work. He’s not casting any aspersions on Mr. Lyons but the audit is supposed to be independent and overseen and you’ve had to help create the numbers you’re now auditing. Mr. Lyons said they’re not creating the numbers they’re helping draft the financial statements that the staff reviews and signs off on. We’re providing technical expertise because you don’t have people that know what all the footnotes and disclosures are. We audit the numbers and put them in the format of the statements and some of the disclosures which are reviewed and accepted by staff before that’s issued. Alderman Bernstein thought Mr. Kent had been providing us with financial statements for many years. Mr. Lyons said this new terminology relates to the new standards that took effect this year. There are eight (8) other standards that change the way the audit ought to be done that take effect next year. Alderman Bernstein said we are now faced with the probability that we’re not going to generate any money from Cook County for an extended period of time beyond the time we usually get our money in for the levy. Ms. Vance said their current fund balance could probably go to the end of this year. Alderman Bernstein noted we have been told Mr. Lyons’ firm has a four (4) year contract and staff wants us to talk to somebody else to do this audit. He asked if we would owe money for the fourth year if we didn’t use Mr. Lyons’ firm for the fourth year, to which Mr. Lyons responded, no.

Mr. Lyons went on to explain the third letter is a separate letter we as a firm decided to have because of the severity of the significant deficiency. This letter and the letter that says observations and recommendations will help clean up and upgrade the accounting that wasn’t at the level of control deficiencies or significant deficiencies. Depending on how they’re affected and what happens in the following year they could end up being controlled, or with significant deficiencies in the future, if there were problems from them. At this point we’ve determined that they’re really recommendations to help with housekeeping type issues and tighten up the processing and financial information.

Alderman Moran called for a motion to accept the Annual Audit of Evanston Township for the fiscal year ended March 31, 2007. Alderman Tisdahl moved approval, seconded by Alderman Jean-Baptiste. Motion unanimously approved (5-0).

Ms. Vance pointed out one of the things you try to have is at least 3 months of some fund balance in case you have an emergency and right now we have managed to do that. There’s not a lot of money but there is 3 months of operating expenses in case of an emergency.

Alderman Holmes moved the item of consideration of a reference and recommendation that the Township engage the firm of Virchow Krause to conduct the FY09 Township Audit cannot be discussed because that meeting has not yet taken place. Mr. Terry said the direction of his understanding was that we come back to this committee after that meeting. Alderman Bernstein thought this wasn’t necessarily an audit of the Township but rather an audit of the Township Assessor’s office relative to the work product. Alderman Moran said that was a separate issue. Mr. Terry added this reference was made at a City Council meeting and is noted in the May 29, 2007 City Council minutes, this item will be brought back to another Human Services Committee meeting.

Alderman Holmes informed Ms. Vance the Rotary membership memo came up in the AP&W committee discussion and the committee had no problem with the Rotary membership if it was a government membership.
V. FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF ORDINANCE 44-O-07 AMENDING THE LANDLORD TENANT ORDINANCE

Ms. Russell noted the only difference in this revised ordinance is in Section 4, on page 2. Alderman Bernstein questioned the language under Rental Agreement, on page 1, as it did not make sense. "Written Agreements (required) only and valid rules and regulations adopted……" Mr. Molinary said the committee wanted everything in writing and suggested we put in the definitions section; this is our attempt to do so. We made sure it was clear to anyone who read this that a rental agreement by definition is a written agreement which was the main thrust of what was discussed. There were valid rules and regulations adopted by this Chapter that could be imputed into that agreement to be considered part of the written agreement. He understands the concern about "required" and "only", one of them could easily be stricken out. Alderman Moran suggested saying, "Required written agreements and taking out the word "only". Ms. Russell’s suggestion was to say, "RENTAL AGREEMENT: A written agreement and valid rules..." The committee was in agreement with those changes.

Alderman Holmes called attention to Section 4, “to read as follows”; there should be a colon after the word follows and then continue on to sections A), B), C).

Alderman Bernstein asked about the printing of the Evanston ordinance and leases. Mr. Molinary said it was agreed that the font would be increased to a legible size. Alderman Bernstein was also concerned when changing the ordinance the model lease form is supposed to include the entire ordinance and rather than changing it every time, which becomes costly and cumbersome, asked if we are going to replicate the model we’re using now or are we going to go through that charade of changing it when it changes. Ms. Russell said we’re going to continue using the model lease, however, when you look at the size of this ordinance there is no way we’re going to be able to capture the entire ordinance on the lease. The model lease will have a larger font and capture some of the important ordinance highlights, but the landlord will get a copy of the entire ordinance. Alderman Bernstein asked what the cost to print the model lease is and how much we charge for the lease to which Mr. Molinary responded, we charge 40 cents. Alderman Bernstein said it’s always a question of whether or not a copy of the Landlord/Tenant Ordinance was given to the tenant. For the people who use the Evanston form there’s never a question if they received a copy of the ordinance its part of the lease. We are now going away from that and he questions why we need the model lease if we’re allowing people to use the old form with this lease. Alderman Jean-Baptiste noted that lease is generally known by people and they have come to have certain expectations. Alderman Bernstein was addressing the cost and practicality, there used to be a valid reason for us to prepare a model lease form. We told people it was better and easier for a landlord to use the lease so everyone was on the same page. We are now saying if you use the model lease form, don’t depend on it because it may be modified like the old form was modified by whatever happens to be the current statute. We originally created this model lease form to preclude the possibility of the likelihood of people walking in and saying they didn’t get it a copy of it. The rational for the model lease form was we wanted people to be sure they got a copy of our ordinance. Ms. Russell said this model lease has excerpts from the ordinance and if the excerpts happen not to be something that the tenant has an issue with they are still at a disadvantage. This is just a representation of what’s in the ordinance, our original thought was not to have this any more but just make sure every tenant got a copy of this to know all of their rights and the landlord could give them whatever lease he wants them to have. Now that we’re going to keep the lease we can still have excerpts from this ordinance on the lease but will still say to landlord, whether you use this or your own form give each tenant a copy of the full ordinance. Alderman Bernstein added, Ms. Russell is saying that every tenant is going to get a copy of the ordinance but it’s not coming from us, its coming from the landlord. How do we now solve the problem of landlords not giving all tenants copies of the ordinance? The reason we created this lease was so the tenants would be informed even to the extent that most of the material portions of this ordinance are contained in the lease. If they change then the model lease doesn’t comply with it. He would still like to know the cost to print the leases.

Alderman Jean-Baptiste wanted to separate the two issues; the old model lease did not include the entire ordinance. Alderman Bernstein understanding was it did. Alderman Jean-Baptiste said the situation would be the same today beyond this ordinance; we should make sure people get the ordinance or update people as to the new modifications of the issues. The cost is another thing. Alderman Bernstein asked if in addition to our ordinance where we mandate a landlord, in the written portion of lease, have people initial that they received a copy of the ordinance. No matter what form is used there has to be this acknowledgement that the tenant has been given a copy of the ordinance, which takes care of problems we have had. We should conceive of some language for that. Ms. Russell said in terms of cost they just had another batch printed which was slightly less than $300 for 1000 copies and they are printed every 3 years or so. Alderman Jean-Baptiste suggested charging $1.00 for a copy of the lease; we now just about give the lease away. Alderman Bernstein was not interested in making money but just paying for the cost of the printing.

Alderman Moran called for the committee to vote on the motion to approve consideration of the Landlord Tenant Ordinance 44-O-07 as amended to clarify the definition “Rental Agreement: A written agreement and valid rules...”, and add a semi colon in Section 4; “to read as follows: . Motion unanimously approved (5-0).
Alderman Bernstein made a reference to this committee to further amend the Landlord Tenant Ordinance to include some mandatory language with respect to tendering and receiving a copy of the ordinance. Alderman Jane-Baptiste asked if we needed to include that the leases be sold at $1.00 as opposed to .40 cents. Ms. Russell said they will make sure they recoup their cost.

VI. REPORT ON 2007 UTILIZATION OF FREE BEACH TOKENS
Mr. Terry noted our annual report to the committee on how the free beach program has worked was included in tonight’s packet. The program has been in place for 2 years. Last year the program started with 700 tokens, in 2007 the number of tokens was increased to 840 tokens distributed, of which 753 were utilized based upon the reports we received from the agencies. As indicated in his memo this summer there were some operational questions raised related to publicity and access, also the policy question in terms of whether this program is to be capped at a certain point. We are recommending that the base line for 2008 be 1,000 tokens because the Recreation Department’s 50% policy could be used for free tokens and would bring us up to about 1,000 tokens. We have received requests from some of the agencies for more tokens in 2008 and also requests that this be a wider ranged program. As indicated in his memo one of the operational questions that has policy implications is the question of when the program was set up we said the agencies best know their clients and it was never intended to be for someone to come in off the street and get a token. That creates the perception that it’s a closed program, a perception we never wanted to create. In 2008 the publicity sales and free token availability will be synchronized and coordinated to happen on the same day. The participating agencies understand that a low income family that meets the income criteria can come in even if they’re not necessarily known to them. The publicity in the community will let people know what agencies they can go to take advantage of the free token program, which we are suggesting as a change in the program for 2008.

Alderman Moran asked if people will be able to come directly to the City as opposed to going to an agency, to which Mr. Terry responded, yes, because the Recreation Department will also be a location where one can receive tokens. Alderman Moran added that will also address the question of whether or not the program is open; you don’t have to be an agency client or familiar to the agency to get a free token. Alderman Tisdahl noted you can come to the City and get a token through the Latino Outreach, to which Mr. Terry added you can also go to the Police Youth Outreach Services.

Rachel Heuman, said she and her husband John came to this meeting and wish to address this committee on behalf of many people within our community who would like to see the beaches become more accessible to everyone in the community. Ms. Heuman proceeded to read her comments to the committee (See Attachment “A”). Ms. Heuman asked if Mr. Terry suggested 50% tokens should go to free tokens and wondered if that is losing money for the City that we might be able to maintain. Mr. Terry responded the staff recommendation is based on the experience of the last 2 years, this 50% is only 100 tokens which Mr. Gaynor can speak to better than he can. We’re acknowledging the fact that it is an income loss but in the interest of consistency with the free token program the Recreation Department uses the same standards. Ms. Heuman also asked Mr. Terry if people could walk into the agencies and receive a free token, to which Mr. Terry responded we are recommending that be one of the requirements of the participating agencies. Ms. Heuman said they strongly endorse that move because people who are not affiliated with the agencies tend to fall through the cracks and there are quite a number of those. She would like to re-emphasize the program not be limited by the constraints of, “first come, first served.” In the past few years the tokens ran out almost immediately, she noticed in the report just a couple of agencies didn’t use all their tokens and one that did not use all tokens was smart to turn them over to somebody else. There were still many people who did not receive tokens for use this year. We are not unaware that there are cost concerns but we’re here to serve the people of the community and these are taxpaying residents. It doesn’t ring true that a person should be denied access to the beach based on economic limitations. There’s enough hardship in someone’s life without having to suffer in another way. We are urging an uncapped program; we don’t know what that will cost. She went to the beach quite a bit this summer and thinks the beaches have always been underused even with the program. Granted the program wasn’t advertised it was by word of mouth that people found out about it.

Ms. Heuman received two brief emails which she read. One was from Karen Allen of Metropolitan Family Services. Ms. Allen wrote, “Our Metropolitan Family Services staff report, report the families who received the beach tokens were very appreciative since it allowed even some large low income families to fit in by getting their children out of the house and active at a place that their friends were also going to. In response to the memo it would be very difficult for most of our families to afford 50% of the standard price for tokens. If free tokens were readily available through the Parks Department rather than through social service agencies that would work for many of the families. The agencies could distribute flyers to our clients where to apply for tokens. Another email was from Mimi Broder, President of Evanston’s Women’s Club, who wrote as a member of the community I have long been concerned about the lack of access to free recreational opportunities for our youth. The fact that the beach use is fee based locks many kids further out of our parks system. The current system of providing some tokens to not-for-profit organizations takes too much time and debate to make it happen. Now we need to take the next step letting people know that the tokens are available, where they might found, and making sure that there is an adequate supply available to meet the needs of the community. I have long thought that Districts 65/202 social workers should have the token to give the children and their families who fall under the state school subsidized lunch program.
**Betsy Clark** said her family moved to Evanston about a dozen years ago from Chicago and the first thing that struck her was the limited access to the beach. She was stunned at this public property. The other thing she'd like to mention is her work is in Juvenile Justice and one of the biggest problems for youths in our state is the lack of summer activities, it leads to all kinds of problems. One of the contributing factors to youths ending up in the justice system is the lack of programming. Ms. Broder works on that through the TED Fund setting up kids with programs through the school social workers. She'd like to echo Ms. Broder's urging you to utilize District 65 to make sure the children have access. She'd like to go one point further and say right across the lake is the community of Holland, Michigan lakefront where residents that feel their children need to know how to swim. She thinks it's critical that our children have access to the lake but also thinks it's critical as a community that we insure that all of our children can swim. She urges this body to think about utilizing the Y's that do exist to set up some sort of free swimming lessons for our youth in the community as well as access to the beach that’s for safety as well. An uncapped program is what she would urge you to have. Thank you for indulging me.

Alderman Tisdahl remarked one of the reasons this program has worked so well is we do not have tons of paperwork and families can come to agencies and not have so many forms to fill out which tends to make people shy away from doing the whole thing. She would not support any program that required agencies to have all kinds of documentation that we concoct because the beauty of the program is not having to fill out a lot of intimidating forms. They can get the tokens because the agencies know who they are. If you want to have a lot of forms filled out here, that’s fine, but it is helpful to a lot of families not to have to prove whatever it is you want them to prove.

Alderman Moran asked if this means the agencies know whether or not a family’s income qualifies them because they can confirm with existing documentation and the families are not required to fill out any other forms. Alderman Holmes said they have already done that by being enrolled in their programs, which is the beauty of this program and why we decided the way to go was with the agencies. She thought it would be wonderful to get the social workers involved particularly at the elementary and middle school level. However, school is out the beginning of June and she does not know how effective that would be. It could be tried this year to see how many we could accommodate but she would imagine those same families would be using one of the agencies listed or some of the other agencies requesting tokens this year. She thinks we could cover that without them but she is not opposed to trying.

Mr. Gaynor said the beaches open the first weekend after school is out. After evaluating this issue they will be making a recommendation to Council to change that date to open up on Memorial Day. Chicago opens up Memorial Day; there have also been discussions about opening earlier in other communities. Alderman Moran asked Mr. Gaynor if he has a staffing issue both in the front and back end of the beach season. Mr. Gaynor’s response was that is correct, our managers indicated we probably could open 2 possibly 3 beaches on Memorial Day with some of staff coming back from college early. Then moving towards the middle of June when we normally open the beaches we’ll have a full staff. We haven’t confirmed that yet, it’s still in the works.

Alderman Tisdahl commented we’re not losing the money because these are people who would not have the money to buy the tokens. Mr. Gaynor said the cost of 800 tokens would be almost $18,000 based on the $22.00 cost. The cost is $22.00 for the pre season token and $30.00 once the beaches open until August 1st. The last day for the pre season token would be June 14th, on the 15th it goes to $30.00. Alderman Holmes asked if there were clients included in the sale of beach tokens last year. Mr. Gaynor said it is difficult for us to respond accurately because sales depend on the weather. Last year on June 28th it was raining and cold, this year it could have been hot and the beaches had a lot more people one day and not the next. This year was a very good year in sales.

Alderman Bernstein noted the report states we allocated 840 tokens; more than 10% weren’t used because they sat at agencies that didn’t have a need for them. We gave away 95 tokens for Health and Human Services Outreach. Was there anyone who requested a token not able to receive one? Mr. Terry responded almost all requests in our department were met; there might have been 1 or 2 that were not met. Unfortunately the Salvation Army had a problem and did not distribute any tokens which explains the large unused number; everybody else’s unused percentage was quite small. Alderman Bernstein said if we’re going to open the beaches to people of low and moderate income all Evanston residents who income qualify should be entitled to use the beaches. Mr. Terry mentioned increasing the number of tokens to 1,000, which would add 160 to the number of tokens from last year. The 160 tokens plus the 87 tokens not given away is an additional 250 tokens. If we weren’t inundated with people requesting tokens that we no longer had to give away we could probably do that. Alderman Bernstein asked Don Baker of Y.O.U., seated in the audience, about his being able to give out 137 out of 150 token and wondered if the 13 were left because nobody asked for them. Mr. Baker said that was because some of the site coordinators with scarce resources were not adequately aggressive in giving them out. We had more people who qualified financially that we would have liked to give tokens to but didn’t feel we had enough tokens to do...
that. Therefore we felt we had to be somewhat careful in our distribution. In fact we had a couple site coordinators who were too careful. Alderman Bernstein did not know how many people are out there who would like to have tokens, although those people could have come to the City. Alderman Tisdahl said they couldn’t have come to the City because they wouldn’t have known to come unless they were part of the Latino community.

Alderman Moran noted one of things we’re talking about here is an expanded amount of publicity which may lead to a greater draw down on the number of requests. He recognizes you’re questioning whether 1,000 is required, but if the program expands along the lines we’re talking about it seems 1,000 tokens would be a reasonable number. Alderman Bernstein thought if we’re assuming people who can’t afford them wouldn’t buy them anyway, we’re not losing any money. Are there kids who scrape money together with bottles/cans and come in and pay for a token, to which Alderman Jean-Baptiste remarked we don’t have that in this generation that was a couple of generations ago. Alderman Tisdahl asked if the people given the tokens had previously bought them. Mr. Baker responded, no, we gave tokens to people who never before had tokens. Alderman Holmes added they never before were at the beach. Alderman Tisdahl thought that was typical of the agency’s experience. Alderman Bernstein remarked as long as we don’t quadruple the number of beach goers putting an additional burden on our lifeguards requiring additional lifeguards, there’s no downside.

Mr. Baker said his agency sees about 500 kids a year which varies a little, but something between 70 and 80% of them are on some assistance and lunch programs, that would be 350 kids. They do not all want a beach token nor is there any way we could give 350 tokens away. There is this substantial number of kids who have never had a token and would like to have one. He’s sure those numbers are very similar at Family Focus. Alderman Moran asked Mr. Baker if he has any idea how many of the 137 people that received tokens used the beach. Mr. Baker said they did not research it but heard from a lot of kids of how much fun it was to go to the beach. Mr. Terry also noted that Mr. Baker is also the Chair of the Steering Committee of the Child and Adolescent LAN which are the local agencies serving youth. At their last meeting they expressed concern about expansion of the program, and Mr. Baker is also here tonight representing them.

Alderman Moran asked for the committee’s decision on the number of tokens to be given away next year. Alderman Jean-Baptiste suggested increasing the number of tokens to 1,000 to which Alderman Moran added along those lines people could come to the City for tokens whether its to Latino Outreach or some other place, to which Alderman Jean-Baptiste interjected we don’t have a Latino Outreach office we have an office that deals with all ethnic groups in the community and he’s hoping that office is not just giving the tokens to Latino folks because he needs to know that others are also receiving the tokens. Mr. Terry assured Alderman Jean-Baptiste that is not the case.

Alderman Bernstein asked Mr. Gaynor if he has a sense of why we limit tokens to people who can’t afford tokens at all, we’re talking about the difference between limiting to any number and giving away tokens to those kids who can’t afford to buy tokens who ordinarily wouldn’t be buying them anyway. Mr. Gaynor said he did not have sense of that, we don’t have a count of how many folks use or do not use the tokens that would be an entirely different program to establish. The tokens at pre season are $11.00 with the 50% off, we sold about 110 of those and based on some of this conversation they would be free. That would be $11.00 time 100, which is not a lot of money but it is real money. He would caution that by opening it up there are a lot of folks out there that can afford it and as well as a lot of folks who can’t afford it. This program is a wash, it costs about a half million dollars to run and we bring in about a half million dollars in revenue. At this point we’re very careful not to mess with that balance because of budget issues. Mr. Terry and I agree if we increase the number by 200 and there is a greater demand we’ll come back to the Human Services Committee. We don’t have a listing of clients’ circumstances that the agencies do, folks that are not affiliated with an agency have to fill out a two page form. We certainly could advertise in the program if you’re coming in for a free token you will need to bring in the following information and will include a sample of the form to make it as convenient as possible.

Alderman Holmes thought we would want to get some feed back from the agencies in terms of how many more requests they had than tokens that they used. Perhaps they could do a small survey to get feedback from the kids and their families in terms of usage, how many times they went to the beaches, etc. She does not think that’s too much to ask from the agencies. Alderman Tisdahl said she would like to have 1,050 tokens if we’re going to cap it as she is always putting Mr. Terry in an impossible position calling him during the summer saying this or that group needs more tokens, then when a group does need more tokens and they run out early he would be authorized to fill the requests and it wouldn’t put him in such an awkward position. She would like another 50 tokens.

Ms. Heuman said once people start going into an agency and the agencies are told there are no more tokens word gets around and the requests don’t come. She wanted to know what we do about the walk in people who say they would like a free token and the agency has no idea of knowing whether that person is qualified or not. Alderman Tisdahl said a walk in would have to go through filing out the forms but she didn’t want everybody to go through a whole new set of forms. Mr. Baker said it would be his preference not to be involved with going through paperwork and forms with people we don’t already know. The families we work with know through the paperwork we already have to do, and we know their financial situation. Our staff is already spread way too thin to ask them to screen more paperwork for people we don’t
have a relationship with and thinks it’s an unfair burden to them. Alderman Holmes said those people should be referred to the City.

Alderman Moran called for the committee’s approval of a decision to distribute 1,050 tokens next year, approval unanimously accepted (5-0).

Alderman Bernstein commented to the extent that there is more need expressed than tokens available he would encourage the agencies to call us and we could reconsider the circumstances.

VII. ITEM FOR FUTURE CONSIDERATION

Alderman Moran wanted to raise an issue for future consideration that has come to his attention, the City of Chicago has unanimously adopted a resolution regarding immigration issues, “Resolution Calling for Escalation of Immigration Raised People Stations and Separation of Family.” We as a Human Services Committee have not addressed to date any of the immigrant issues that have been significantly discussed in the country. He is asking if the committee would be interested in giving some consideration to a resolution that would address the immigration issue which at this point he has no specific language for.

Alderman Jean-Baptiste remarked the wave going on in our country is one that puts restrictions on immigrant rights. At this particular point in time we would open up a can of worms for folks to come forward and advocate for greater restriction even though the resolution Alderman Moran just noted is progressive, it’s protective. We have no power here that advocates for us to restrict anybody’s rights, which he thinks is the status quo and what he would personally like to see. What problem would opening a debate on this issue fix?

Alderman Moran did not know that we have a specific problem but thinks it’s an issue to address that has a very strong and broad concern in the country. Alderman Jean-Baptiste may be right in the sense that if we were to propose such a resolution there would be people coming here opposing it but from his perspective we would be the ones that would have a say. Maybe if there would be a lot of people who came here and opposed it, it might be even more important to adopt a resolution so that the City fathers and mothers can take a position on this issue that would at least be reflective of what the democratically elected representatives of this City believe is just. It would be his own feeling that it would be a cold day in hell when the Evanston City Council would adopt a restrictive ordinance or promote a restrictive statement in a resolution in relation to immigration rights. He supposes he could be wrong which is why he’s bringing this issue up tonight to see if there is interest in addressing this, as he has an interest in addressing it.

Alderman Jean-Baptiste said his position is if it’s not broken don’t fix it. The winds that are blowing are the winds to the extreme right. In Waukegan you have a community that is very divided on this issue. He knows it would be a great statement to make but you would also fan the flames of a lot of different perspectives. This can be put on the table and his colleagues will certainly have to engage in it. Alderman Moran said if there isn’t at least a majority interest in this, if people’s minds are closed to this he does not think that we should continue pursuing the issue. Maybe the biggest opposition is here, which he does not know.

Alderman Jean-Baptiste’s understanding was that the Chicago resolution resulted from a series of raids done on sweat shops where a lot of illegal immigrants were busted, which is what they wanted to stop. He does not know that we have a similar problem nor does he know how many of his constituents are illegal. He knows we have a large number of Hispanics and a lot of Island folks but does not know what their immigration statuses are. Alderman Jean-Baptiste noted the majority of immigrants in the City of Evanston are legal. Alderman Bernstein said he would not want to open this up and then take a vote that we become like Waukegan, which he does not think will happen on this Council. He’s questioning why we need this; it’s nice to state our opinion with respect to that.

Alderman Holmes was also of the opinion if it’s not broke and does not see why we have to try to fix it, but has no problem discussing it. She has an open mind about this, as we went through that with Sanctuary City and we haven’t heard of any raids or anything like that. She’s concerned that when you stir the pot it boils over. Alderman Jean-Baptiste said he hated to confront the hate to which Alderman Moran interjected, you have to confront it. Alderman Jean-Baptiste said he will be on the cutting edge of the fight if the hate shows its ugly head, he’s suggesting in the place we are now in it would hurt him to step into this. He’s not talking about hurt in any way other than the emotions of it. Alderman Holmes added it we put this on the table aren’t we inviting discussions from the overall community. Alderman Jean-Baptiste thought we should bring it out in the open and take a positive stand. Alderman Moran asked if it would be acceptable to the committee to reproduce that resolution and have a discussion of the issues. Alderman Jean-Baptiste said if we request it and people want to do it then we have to do it but he’s not looking forward to it. Alderman Moran asked Mr. Terry if he could pull some material together on this issue.
Ms. Heuman commented that Evanston is a wonderful, very healthy community; however she does not know how many of you are aware that hate groups have multiplied into something like 850 around this country. They’re not afraid of raising the issue of hate, it’s a disease. Even though Evanston is as progressive a community as it is she has had experience being told of incidents that happened in Evanston that wouldn’t have happened before because this disease is contagious. There are right wing haters, who there are probably not too many of here in Evanston, but if someone is in power they can be as vicious as them. Many communities around the United States have made these kinds of endorsements to offer a different faith; we are not Hazelton, Pennsylvania, nor Waukeegan, nor Carpentersville and should take a leadership position against this.

Alderman Bernstein’s recollection when the Nazis walked through Skokie was when you bring attention to a hate group that customarily increases the size of that hate group which he does not want to do. He knows people in this town who would readily join a hate group but they live in this community and can’t say anything because they’re outnumbered. Alderman Jean-Baptiste agreed with Alderman Bernstein’s position because he also thought about the Nazis when they wanted to march in Skokie. His position was, hell no. He has some Jewish friends who said that’s their civil liberty and they have the right to free speech, etc., etc., and they did their thing to profligate their hate. At this particular time he is not seeking to open the door for that kind of discussion, he’s an immigrant himself, he’s a U.S. citizen as well. He knows people will be here saying a lot of hateful things, it would not necessarily be right, but he does not want to hear it. We may want to reaffirm the fact that we are a progressive community and the things we stand for. He, personally, as well as others, does not want to go through that process. There are those who are similarly situated who may be less secure than him going through that discussion. Even as an elected official in this community he does not feel that we are at the crossroad where we need to be crossing that bridge. He understands what Alderman Moran is saying, we have been in the forefront of ending the war position, as well as other issues. His personal view is no, and its not just hate, its ignorance because there are some people who have very close relationships with folks who are immigrants, but whose perspective has been shaped by misinformation that will come here and say a lot of ignorant things that he does think is worth hearing. The minute we find any people begin to collaborate to try to bring this kind of perspective here as an organized movement to try to sway us to do something different, then yes, its time to go and fight that fight. There is no need to fight that fight now, that’s his personal opinion.

VII.  ADJOURNMENT
The meeting was unanimously adjourned at 8:49 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Audrey Trotsky, Department of Health and Human Services