Item #2:
Goals & Objectives Of Peer Reviews & Workshops

Facilitated Board, Staff and Community Civic Engagement

Policy Alternatives Exploration Process

Village of Long Grove, Illinois

Summer-Fall 2014

Reviewed and Presented August 18, 2014

Welcome:

Thank you for volunteering your time to be part of the process in reviewing the Village's past, present and future policies and practices toward the funding of the Village's operations now and into the future. The workshop meetings that you have graciously agreed to participate in are in response to the direction from the Community through the feedback provided during the course of four Town Hall meetings in 2012 and 2013, the results of the failed infrastructure funding referendum and the follow-up three task force meetings with residents this year. The input provided during the past three years has been broken down into the following four (4) distinct areas of Village operations for review during the course of three to five workshops this Summer and Fall.

(1) Community Engagement/Transparency/Trust: The Village Board retained Greg Kuhn, Ph.D. of *Sikich LLP's government practice* to consult on engaging members of the community with the Village Board in the review of Road Costs; Economic Development and Finances through a series of topical and technical background discussion workshops.

Specific comments/suggestions from the Village's previous Town Hall and Infrastructure Task Force meetings included the following:

- Make use of the highly educated professional residents of Long Grove via advisory committees to help address and vet Village Issues.

(2) Road Costs - Workshop #1: The Village Board hired Civil Engineer Michael Shrake of *Gewalt-Hamilton & Associates* (GHA) to perform a village-wide pavement evaluation of all public roads. Specific comments/suggestions from the previous series of Town Hall and Infrastructure Task Force meetings included:

1. Lack of trust/faith in road data presented by the Village
2. Road Maintenance Costs:
   - Village paving costs are higher than other communities and private roads costs experienced by Long Grove homeowner associations (HOAs).
   - Engineering expenses seem really high. 8% engineering fee on top of paving costs is well in excess of what is paid by private HOA's.
   - Neither 8% or 10% annual inflation of roads costs appears reasonable given recent decreases in paving costs.
   - Do a 3-5 year resurfacing plan to increase miles paved and lower costs.
   - Reduce Village Costs by utilizing outside funding from Grants.

Road Costs - Workshop #1 *(Cont. Next Page).*

- Aggregate paving campaigns to reduce paving costs; Long Grove's high cost for paving stems from mobilization costs for performing a limited amount of paving. Specifically (a) develop a 3 to 5 year paving plan (b) combine bids with neighboring villages to obtain better rates and/or (c) use reserves to supplement current funding.
- Make paving decisions more accessible to the public.
- Separately bid out engineering costs for management of paving.
- Pursue grants aggressively.

(3) Economic Development & Finances - Workshop #2: The Village Board engaged Planner Bridget Lane Of Business Districts Inc. (BDI) to review the Village's current codes and practices for encouraging appropriate development that is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan that maximizes revenues and reduces the burden on tax payers.

Specific comments/suggestions from the previous Town Hall and Task Force meetings to evaluate Long Grove's road costs included:

- Long Grove is viewed as anti-business.
- The planning commission board has been an impediment.
- Hiring an economic development/business development manager to help increase our businesses in the Village.
- Get more revenues in the TIF area. Work with property owners to encourage development.
- Look at your allowable businesses and expand the scope.
- Village finances and business development have not been handled well.
- Stop looking for a single solution and develop multiple revenue sources: increase business development; food and beverage tax; pet tags, vehicle stickers, alarm registration fees, electricity tax; etc.

(4) Village Finances - Workshop #3: The Village Board hired Bond Consultant Kevin McKenna of *Speer Financial*, CPA John Rader of *Virchow Krause* and CPA Greg Seidler of *Seidler & Associates* to review the Village's current finances and practices.

Specific comments/suggestions from the Town Hall and Infrastructure Task Force meetings to evaluate Long Grove's road costs included:

- Hire a finance manager
- Refinance the TIF bonds $4.5 million at 7% and the $2.7 million the General Fund provided to the TIF. If you also, need more revenue, bond village-owned property for revenue.
- Get Moody rated, saving approximately $1 – 1.5 million in interest.
- Develop a 5 to 10 year plan with overall revenue goals, including further revenue from
- Sunset Grove, and cost reduction goals; develop new sources of revenue to bring overall finances in line.
- The $3.3 million reserve is excessive, especially when compared to other municipalities; before new taxes are considered, reserves should be reduced to levels commensurate with other municipalities.

Village Finances - Workshop #3 *(Cont. Next Page).*

Community Engagement/Transparency/Trust - Process.

As mentioned previously, it is anticipated that the Civic Engagement Policy Exploration Process will take place over 3-5 sessions/workshops during the late summer and fall of 2014. All schedules and sequencing are tentative until a meeting date and specific workshop agenda is confirmed by the Village.

Workshop #1: August 18, 2014 - Opening Technical Data Review.

The initial session of the community engagement initiative will begin with a *Technical Review and Discussion Workshop* framed by the Village's Engineering Consultant's review of their recent compendium of Village road conditions. The session will be held in a "working group/modified focus group" format consisting of the Consulting Engineers, the Village Board, senior Village staff, and invited community representatives. At-large members of the public and interested community members are also invited to attend the opening session and follow-on sessions of the Group. The primary objectives for this initial workshop will include:

- Introduce the workshop approach and communicate the framework;
- Review and present current and past work that describes, frames, and explores the Village's infrastructure needs, engineering and solution alternatives, and the financial requirements for phased community-wide improvements;
- Provide the results of the Village's engineering specialist's recent technical research, findings and identified ideas and or alternatives;
- Engage participants in a constructive dialogue and exchange of ideas and information;
- Provide staff reflections or contextual data/findings;
- Facilitated discussion of reflections, questions, and possibilities of potential solutions and approaches;
- Initial assessment of consensus of findings and/or potential approaches and alternatives, or, preference to further explore engineering data at a future facilitated workshop;
- Review and confirmation of the "key themes" established for additional research and discussion;
- Summarize session, prepare notes and overview of outcomes to be communicated to the Village Board staff, and Group members.

Workshop #2: *(September TBD)* - Additional Sequential Policy Exploration Workshops:

Follow-up Infrastructure & Economic Development.

This second part of the multi-part/phased community engagement initiative will build on the opening session and will focus on identified technical or policy areas that have been determined to be the most relevant and desirable by the Group. The two topics tentatively identified for Workshop #2 are Infrastructure follow-up and Economic Development. Representatives of the Village Board, senior Village staff, and invited community representatives will comprise the Working Group for these continuing facilitated exploration workshops. Conceptually, two additional "working group/modified focus group" topic-centered workshops are envisioned.

Workshop #2: *(September TBD)* - Additional Sequential Policy Exploration Workshops *(cont'd)*:

The primary objectives during each of the sequential sub-topic discussions will be to:

- Provide the results of specialists and staff research on identified ideas that are expected to include Economic Development, Financial Forecasts and follow-up Infrastructure data;
- Engage participants in a constructive dialogue and exchange of ideas and information on the technical or background data presented;
- Provide staff reflections or contextual data/findings;
- Engage in facilitated discussion of the Group's reflections, questions, and possibilities of most interesting, desirable and viable potential solutions and approaches related to core policy or programmatic issues;
- Work to arrive at an initial assessment of consensus on presented findings and/or identify research or alternatives to further explore or research;
- Review and confirmation of the "key themes" for follow-up established during the session;
- Summarize session notes and outcomes to be communicated to the Village Board, staff and Group members.

Workshop #3: *(October TBD)* - Village Finances, Closing Policy Narrowing, Brainstorming and Findings:
The last phase of the community engagement initiative will include a review of Village Finances as well as a policy narrowing, brainstorming, and findings workshop with the Village Board, senior Village staff, and invited community representatives (Working Group). The public and interested at-large community members will also be invited to attend as was done for the previous workshops and sessions. In this collaborative setting, the session will focus on an overview of the Village's financial profile and financial projections including the anticipated/estimated needs for the various approaches under consideration. In addition, participants will be asked to review the outcomes and findings of each of the sub-group discussions in the previous workshops. The overall focus for the second half of this session is the narrowing of alternatives or action steps into follow-on activities. The primary goals for this wrap-up event will be to:

- Highlight key findings and information from all process sessions;
- Review and confirm the key themes from the engagement workshops;
- Provide a forum for staff and/or technical consultants to summarize, review and highlight the results of their research for Group identified topics/issues;
- Engage participants in a constructive dialogue and exchange of ideas and information about the findings;
- Review session deliberations and consensus alternatives or preferences;
- Facilitate discussions, reflections, and questions, about the narrowing of potential solutions and approaches that are considered most desirable;
- Facilitate consensus identification of further exploration or action/action planning and next-steps.
- Summarize session notes and outcomes to be communicated to the Village Board, staff and Group members.

Facilitated Engagement and Exploration Workshop Participant Framework: Roles and Dialogue Process Description/Guidelines/Expectations

Structured Discussion Guidelines. The following guidelines are offered to form the basis for common expectations and understandings for the Working Group at the center of the community engagement initiative. The guidelines below are offered to create a productive environment for the Group's discussions and the review/consideration of topical information that will be both technical and policy oriented. As such, the exchange of ideas will be most effective when participants agree to, share and follow a set of common "ground rules" for participation to assure the most efficient and effective use of the Group's time together. The following guidelines borrow from similar guidelines prepared by both the Illinois Department of Transportation (IDOT) and the Lake County Division of Transportation. We ask that all participants review, consider and endorse the guidelines and agree to their implementation for moving forward.

- All Group participants (Board, staff, invited representatives), as well as at-large observers, are asked to come the sessions with an open-mind and agree to thoughtfully and respectfully listen to the input, reports and exchange of ideas from others;
- All participants are asked to contribute in an open, honest and respectful manner that reflects the proper decorum for a thoughtful and reflective discussion of civic issues important to the community;
- All input, ideas, reflections and questions by participants should be valued and considered;
- Participants agree that for the best use of the time of all, workshops and discussions should progress and be executed at a reasonable pace and that session time-frames/participant exchanges may follow time limits or set-asides;
- Meetings will be scheduled to accommodate as many participants as possible, but not all schedules may be able to be accommodated and meetings will be required to proceed at times when one or more identified participants may not be able to attend;
- Progress made at prior sessions/meetings will not be revisited (other than summarization) for absent participants at a subsequent session, unless the topic has been rescheduled for continuing or follow-up discussion;
- Process meetings will be chaired by the Village President or designee;
- Summary notes of each session will be compiled and kept by Sikich on behalf of the Village.

Collaborative Discussion and Consensus ***(Cont. Next Page)*****.**

Collaborative Discussion and Consensus. As mentioned and described in the above session summaries for the process' various phases, consensus views are the aim of the discussions and initiative to aid Village policy-makers in formulating follow-on directives to staff, or, in making policy determinations. However, it should be recognized by all that it may not be possible to reach unanimous views on some items or a particular element that surfaces during the Group's deliberations. For the purposes of the exercise, consensus is defined as arriving at the point where there is agreement by a clear majority of participants on a particular element, point, alternative or issue. There may be some dissenting viewpoints, but all participants have agreed that various points of view have been heard and considered. Group discussions will likely use some or many of the facilitated discussion techniques below:

- Structured/workshop dialogue and discussion that is designed and facilitated but more informal/and non-parliamentary in approach, organized by topic, exercise or other framing technique;
- Modified focus group break-outs or key question exploration;
- Nominal group dialogue techniques to pull shared input into discussions;
- Informal polling and/or acceptability exploration;
- Outside document or information review requests/assignments;
- On-site or in-the field group visits or individual observation opportunities.

Member Responsibilities. As members of the initiative's civic engagement Working Group, participants/members will share in various responsibilities to help facilitate the Group's effectiveness.

- Reviewing and considering background information and input from technical specialists, staff and other participants with an open-mind and spirit of knowledge building and community advancement;
- Participating in group dialogue, discussions and deliberations that consider stakeholder concerns and points of view, professional recommendations or findings, factual clarifications, individual perspectives and consensus views;
- Committing to attend each process meeting and related activities;
- Working with others to deliberate and achieve consensus wherever and to whatever extent possible within the framework of the discussion process;
- Working to bring and blend gained knowledge, alternative approaches and community views for near and long term interests in an open, transparent and progressive forum;
- Reviewing recommendations and making decisions/determinations as befits a particular topic, alternative, finding or key element of the overall process.