

Budgeting for Results 6th Annual Commission Report

November 1, 2016

Contents

A Letter from the BFR Co-Chairs	2
Budgeting for Results Commission	3
Staff Support	4
Introduction	5
Progress Report	7
Program Assessment	7
State Program Assessment Rating Tool	7
SPART Pilot and Lessons Learned	9
Program Cost Benefit Analysis	10
Grant Accountability and Transparency Act	12
Stakeholder Engagement: Public Hearings	12
Commission Working Groups	13
Mandates Review Working Group	13
Budget Transparency Working Group	13
Progress Update on 2015 Commission Recommendations	14
Sub-Outcomes	14
Refinement of Program and Priority Metrics	14
Program Evaluation and Comparison	14
Data Collection and Analysis	14
Commission Recommendations and Next Steps	14
Program Analysis – Staffing Resources	15
Program Analysis – Data Collection Resources	15
Procurement Reform	16
Impacts on Federal and Other Funding	16
Community-based Provider Consolidations	17
Conclusion	17
Appendix A	18
Appendix B	20
Appendix C	28

A Letter from the BFR Co-Chairs

November 1, 2016

To Governor Rauner and Members of the General Assembly:

On behalf of the Budgeting for Results (BFR) Commission, we are pleased to submit our Sixth annual report.

Throughout calendar year 2016, the Commission has led an initiative to transition Budgeting for Results from infrastructure building and agency-level data collection towards the development of a framework to compare state agency programs and perform cost-benefit analysis of the programs. The true mandate of Budgeting for Results is the development of a method to rate and compare the performance of state programs to provide decision makers with useful, contextual information when making resource allocation decisions. With the development of the State Program Assessment Rating Tool (SPART) and the recommendations of the Cost-Benefit Analysis Working Group, the BFR Commission has made significant strides.

Through its annual public hearings and state agency outreach, the Commission receives valuable input from not-for-profit community providers and state agencies. These stakeholders emphasized the need for significant, comprehensive procurement reform within the State of Illinois. The Commission recognizes that procurement reform is an active initiative of Governor Rauner's administration and the General Assembly. We acknowledge Senate Bill (SB) 1050, sponsored by Senator Pamela Althoff, a BFR Commission member, as an example of in-process legislation striving to reform Illinois procurement policy. The Commission advocates for the adoption of procurement reform to promote accountability and transparency within State of Illinois procurement transactions through effective and efficient processes, checks and balances.

The BFR Commission respectfully submits the following report to emphasize the significant work accomplished by the Commission during the last year, highlight the evolution of the Commission's focus over the past six years, and articulate plans for the strategic, state-wide efforts the Commission will be undertaking.

Sincerely,

Steve Schnorf
Co-Chair

Heather Steans
Co-Chair

Budgeting for Results Commission

Co-Chair: Steve Schnorf

State Budget and Procurement Consultant, Morrill & Associates, P.C.

Co-Chair: Honorable Heather Steans

State Senator

Honorable Pamela Althoff

State Senator

Honorable William Davis

State Representative

Honorable David Harris

State Representative

Ruth Coffman Ph.D.

Executive Director, University of Chicago Health Lab

Jesse Elam

Director, Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning

Mischa Fisher

Economic Advisor, Office of the Governor Bruce Rauner

Nelson Gerew

Director of Program Investment, Chicago Public Education Fund

Jim Lewis Ph.D.

Senior Advisor, United Way of Metropolitan Chicago

John Maki

Executive Director, Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority

Jose Sanchez

President, Norwegian American Hospital

Paula Worthington Ph.D.

Senior Lecturer, University of Chicago - Harris School of Policy

Staff Support

Office of the Governor

Charlie Weikel

Deputy Director of Transformation and Metrics

Governor's Office of Management and Budget

Jennifer Butler

Deputy Director Accountability and Results

Curt Clemons-Mosby

Acting Director Budgeting for Results

Nana Mkheidze

Budgeting for Results Analyst

Sophia Ronis

Administrative Assistant

Introduction

In the six years since the passage of the Budgeting for Results (BFR) legislation, there has been great progress designing and building the infrastructure necessary to conduct meaningful and constructive analysis of the State's catalogue of over 400 programs. Calendar year 2016 has seen the first steps toward the development of a comprehensive system to translate raw program data collected from state agencies into fact-based information useful to decision makers and the public. This report highlights the BFR accomplishments over the past year and outlines the strategic priorities identified by the BFR Commission.

BFR is "a method of budgeting where each priority must be justified each year according to merit rather than according to the amount appropriated for the preceding year" (Public Act 96-958). BFR is targeted at moving the state budget process towards measuring the contributions of each government program within a set of statewide priority outcomes and informing investment decisions to optimize the achievement of those outcomes.

The goals of BFR are to help the public and government decision-makers understand:

- How tax dollars are being spent;
- If funded programs are operating as designed;
- If funded programs are achieving performance goals;
- If funded programs are achieving statewide outcome goals; and
- How to utilize performance data as a supporting element in funding determinations.

A chronology of the significant events in the Budgeting for Results process over the preceding six years can be found in Appendix A of this report.

BFR Quick Facts:

- State spending is classified into seven statewide result areas.
- The statewide result areas are further delineated into nine statewide priority outcomes, as identified by the Governor and the Commission.
- There are more than 60 state agencies under the Governor.
- State agencies have defined over 400 distinct programs across state government.
- Over 1,200 performance measures have been identified for state agency programs.

The following table shows the seven statewide result areas along with their associated nine outcome areas and definitions.

Result Area	Statewide Outcome	Definition
Education	Improve School Readiness and Student Success for All	Increase percentage of Illinoisans equipped with skills and knowledge needed for postsecondary and workforce success.
Economic Development	Increase Employment & Attract, Retain and Grow Businesses	Close the opportunity gap in Illinois by ensuring the labor force has the skills necessary to meet the needs of employers and maximize earning potential. Increase business investment and entrepreneurship in Illinois.
Public Safety	Create Safer Communities	Reduce incidents of death, violence, injury, exploitation and fraud.
	Improve Infrastructure	Improve the condition of infrastructure to protect citizens and support commerce.
Human Services	Meet the Needs of the Most Vulnerable	Ensure all residents—but particularly children, the elderly, and persons with disabilities—are able to experience a quality life by meeting basic living needs, and providing protection from abuse and discrimination.
	Increase Individual and Family Stability and Self-Sufficiency	Reduce demand on the human service system by providing services to help individuals and families better support themselves.
Healthcare	Improve Overall Health of Illinoisans	Lower health care costs by improving the health of Illinoisans.
Environment and Culture	Strengthen Cultural & Environmental Vitality	Strengthen and preserve our natural, historic, and cultural resources to make Illinois a more attractive place for people to visit, live and work.
Government Services	Support Basic Functions of Government	Improve the basic infrastructure of state government and provide the tools necessary to operate more efficiently and achieve statewide outcomes.

Progress Report

Program Assessment

Over the past six years the Governor's Office of Management and Budget (GOMB), in conjunction with over 70 state agencies, universities, boards and commissions, identified over 400 state programs and nearly 1,200 program performance measures utilized in the BFR process. Starting in fiscal year 2015, agencies began reporting program data utilizing the Illinois Performance Reporting System (IPRS). IPRS is the state's web-based database for collecting program performance data. The IPRS database allows agencies to report programmatic level data to GOMB on a regular basis. The data collection module allows agencies to provide detailed programmatic information obtained from agency program logic models. In addition, IPRS allows agencies to track appropriations with each program, allowing GOMB to link appropriations to programmatic outcomes more efficiently and effectively. IPRS does not currently link expense at the program level. The ability to report program goals, outcomes, appropriations *and* expenses would enhance the application of IPRS data.

In August 2015, GOMB improved government transparency for performance data by making PDFs of IPRS data for all agencies under the authority of the governor public by posting them to the GOMB public website. The PDFs can be accessed by visiting the "Budgeting for Results" tab on the GOMB public website at Budget.Illinois.gov. GOMB updates performance data quarterly.

Since 2015, there has been a significant increase in programmatic data available to decision makers and the public. However, the data in its current form lacks context and supporting analysis. In the spring of 2016, the BFR Commission prioritized the need to establish a program assessment framework which would enable the Commission to utilize raw program data for program comparisons to educate and inform decision makers.

State Program Assessment Rating Tool

Governments all around the country have struggled with the problem of creating a valid and reliable system to rate program performance and compare programs for the purposes of performance based budgeting. There is general agreement in the need to analyze program performance, but the complexities of performing such an analysis appear to have deterred state jurisdictions from institutionalizing this type of framework. To date, only a handful of jurisdictions (the Federal Government, Washington State, and Maryland) have implemented formal program performance comparisons. Without exception, changes in Administration and/or administrative priorities have shifted the focus within these jurisdictions. Still, Illinois remains committed to measure and compare program performance.

The BFR Commission is guiding the collection of best practices in performance based budgeting while the state operates under the challenges of a fiscal crisis and two consecutive years without a fully balanced fiscal year budget. The reality of Illinois' budget crisis strengthens the need for a more informed budget process which remains the impetus for performance based budgeting.

A program performance evaluation methodology must produce data-driven conclusions around which consensus can be built. The Commission must consider all stakeholders: the executive branch, legislators, state agency program administrators, and the public. In addition, feasibility of implementation and maintenance of the methodology must be considered.

The BFR focus has evolved from data gathering to program analysis, evaluation and rating. The Commission recognized the importance of comparing program performance to enable the State of Illinois to analyze cost and benefit-related factors at a program level. The resulting program comparisons would be utilized to inform program management and aid in the program budgeting process. The BFR Commission delegated to the Budgeting for Results Unit within GOMB the responsibility for researching and proposing a framework for program performance comparisons.

GOMB engaged in a search of academic literature and identified best practices from the federal government and states around the nation¹. The search yielded one viable option that successfully implemented and utilized by the federal government for nearly eight years - the Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART).

PART was developed by the President's Office of Management and Budget (OMB) in 2002 to assess federal program performance. The PART rates programs on performance in four key areas: program purpose and design, strategic planning, program management, and program results. The PART places a greater weight on the quality measurement of program *outcomes* rather than program *outputs*. The tool consists of 25-30 weighted questions which tally to give a program a numerical score of 1-100. The numerical scores are converted into qualitative assessments of program performance: effective, moderately effective, adequate and not effective. The PART was administered by OMB from 2002-2008. During that time PART was used to rate the performance of nearly 1,000 federal programs. The use of PART was suspended in 2009, pending review by the Obama administration. The results of the PART program reviews are available on the archived website ExpectMore.gov, which can be found at the following address:

<https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/assets/omb/expectmore/index.html>.

¹ The Commission would like to thank Professor Beverly Bunch, Professor Richard Funderburg and the faculty of the Department of Public Administration at the University of Illinois at Springfield for their generous help and support throughout this process.

Upon analysis, it was determined that the PART questionnaire could be completed by GOMB Budget Analysts based on information compiled from state agencies and external program evaluations, when available. To minimize speculative evaluations, answers to the PART questions must be evidence based. The analyst would be required to provide supporting documentation for each PART answer and conclusion. Once the initial PART review is completed, the state agency would review the results and provide further evidence and clarifying information. Changes to PART answers would be reexamined in light of new information, and the final PART review and score would be posted to GOMB's website for the benefit of policymakers and the general public.

At the federal level, PART was designed to be used by OMB analysts who are not familiar with program performance evaluation. With relatively minimal training and standardized guidance documents, OMB analysts were able to begin PART evaluations of programs.

An effective PART evaluation requires time to gather and review the necessary information and supporting documentation in response to the questions. Due to resource constraints, it was not feasible for a PART evaluation of all programs to be completed annually. OMB mandated that a subset of programs be evaluated each year. Using this method, the full catalogue of federal programs could be evaluated every four to five (4-5) years. A similar schedule for programmatic comparisons could likely be required by the BFR Commission for Illinois.

In March 2016, the Commission authorized GOMB to proceed with the development of a State Program Assessment Rating Tool (SPART), and to pilot the tool with a select agency program. In 2011, GOMB collaborated with Dr. Patrick Mullen, one of the creators of the PART process. GOMB worked with Dr. Mullen to begin converting the PART framework from a federal government to a state government perspective. Significant progress was made during 2011 towards the design of the SPART. GOMB was able to build upon much of the prior SPART efforts to advance this 2016 initiative.

SPART Pilot and Lessons Learned

During the month of April 2016, a team from GOMB in conjunction with the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority (ICJIA) conducted a pilot evaluation of the Adult Redeploy Illinois (ARI) program administered by ICJIA.² Through the pilot, several critical lessons were learned related to the design, development and application of the SPART:

- SPART should be piloted against different types of programs to determine if the assessment questions and the point values provide a valid and reliable evaluation of the full mix of state programs.

² The Commission would like to thank Director John Maki, Research Director Megan Alderden and the staff of ICJIA for their expertise and help during the pilot process.

- State agency *program* staff must be involved throughout the SPART review. SPART should not be completed by agency budget staff alone.
- In the initial stages of the SPART rollout, it is recommended that evaluations be limited to one program per agency per year. This will allow GOMB Budget Analysts and agency personnel time to learn the SPART system and work through implementation issues.
- SPART reviews should be conducted on a rolling basis, with a goal of completing a review of all state programs every three (3) years. Priorities identified by the Administration and the BFR Commission should be considered when determining frequency and/or timing of program assessments.

The number, mix and weight of questions in the SPART questionnaire are currently being revised in response to the pilot process. In addition, guidance and training materials for the SPART are also undergoing significant revision. During calendar year 2017, SPART modifications will be completed and GOMB will conduct additional pilots with the revised tool.

Program Cost-Benefit Analysis

A significant conclusion drawn from the SPART pilot process was consensus that each program should have, at a minimum, a basic cost-benefit analysis in addition to the general program components evaluation. The Commission unanimously agreed that a cost-benefit assessment is needed to provide a comprehensive assessment of a program. Without the comparative cost-benefit component, the assessment lacks the quantifiable valuation that is critical to performance based budgeting. In July 2016, the Commission established the Cost-benefit Analysis Working Group.³ The working group was tasked to examine the catalog of state programs to identify significant gaps in the data available to conduct cost-benefit analysis, and to make recommendations to remediate the deficiencies. Furthermore, the working group was assigned the responsibility to identify a methodology or methodologies that could be applied across the universe of state programs to produce a valid and meaningful cost-benefit analysis.

The Cost-benefit Working Group met throughout the summer of 2016. The group initially reviewed a sample of program data from IPRS to obtain a base-line understanding of available summary program information and measurement data. In total, approximately 150 programs were reviewed. For each program, the group drafted an intermediate measurement goal based on the IPRS program narrative. The intermediate measurement goal was intended to guide program administrators towards the data needed to conduct the cost-benefit analysis.

This review and subsequent measurement goal development solidified issues inherent in the current IPRS data:

³ The Commission would like to thank Dr. Linda Renee Baker, Ph.D.; Dr. Patricia Byrnes, Ph.D.; Dr. Richard Funderburg, Ph.D.; Dr. Carol Jessup, Ph.D.; Dr. Jim Lewis, Ph.D.; Director John Maki, ICJIA; Dr. David Racine, Ph.D; and Dr. Paula Worthington, Ph.D. for their work and expertise as members of the working group.

- The majority of the current performance measures are “legacy measures,” developed for previous performance measurement purposes dating back to the 1990s. State agencies used these measures to satisfy BFR requirements to report performance measures for each program. Using existing measures, state agencies were able to meet BFR requirement with limited resources, but this approach led to the establishment of IPRS performance measures that lack an outcome focus imperative to program analysis.
- In most instances, the legacy measures do not sufficiently align a program’s contribution to the statewide outcome area it most significantly impacts. Consequently, new performance measures are required for the majority of programs. GOMB, the Governor’s Office of Transformation, and agency Chief Results Officers (CROs) strive to identify program-level performance measures that are more directly correlated to state outcomes. This is a long-term effort, and the majority of program measures will go through several iterations before the measure is determined to sufficiently represent a program’s impact on one of the statewide outcomes.
- More fundamentally, it is apparent that IPRS programs and their corresponding descriptions and goals may not align with the current mission and objectives of the state agency. Program inventories must support the strategic focus of the state agency so that performance measures capture meaningful performance data pertinent to the agency. The working group recommends program inventories be addressed before cost-benefit analysis is conducted. GOMB will continue to work with agency CROs and budget staff to refine the mix of programs and program descriptions during the FY 18 budget development process.

The second phase for the Cost-benefit Working Group categorized select IPRS programs into one of three categories. The first category is programs for which the methodology to conduct a valid cost-benefit analysis is known and the appropriate data is available. The second category is programs for which the methodology to conduct a valid cost-benefit analysis is known but sufficient data is not available to conduct the analysis. The third category is programs for which the methodology to conduct a valid cost-benefit analysis is unknown. Under category three, the effective program measurement is not evident based on the IPRS data. The working group vetted its categorizations on a sample of programs from the Department of Human Services, the Department on Aging, the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority, and the Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity. The analysis was submitted to the CROs of the respective agencies for validation. The agencies generally concurred with the categories and provided insight about the evolution of the program narrative and performance measures. The exercise enabled the working group to validate the need for continued refinement of IPRS data in conjunction with the state agencies

Grant Accountability and Transparency Act (GATA)

GATA provides the statutory framework to ensure that grant performance is measured effectively. GATA, 30 ILCS 708, is a product of the Illinois Single Audit Commission (ILSAC), created by Public Act 98-47. During state fiscal year 2017 the pre-award phase of grants management was implemented under GATA. This included centralized grantee registration, federally required pre-qualifications and pre-award risk assessments, and a uniform grant agreement that includes dedicated sections for grant-level performance measurement. Grant award performance reports for all state, federal and federal pass-through awards will be required beginning in fiscal year 2017. A uniform framework for grantee performance reporting is under development through a GATA Performance Measures working group.

GATA also requires performance measures to be incorporated through BFR to evaluate the effectiveness of The Act and the efficiencies realized from GATA implementation. Because the Grant Accountability and Transparency Unit resides under GOMB, GATA programs and performance measures are being grouped within GOMB's IPRS entries. GATA performance data is currently included in periodic IPRS public reporting. Additional measurements will be added as the remaining components of the grant management life cycle are implemented.

Stakeholder Engagement: Public Hearings

The Commission's 2016 BFR public engagement efforts included public hearings held at the following locations:

- Chicago – James R. Thompson Center on September 7, 2016, and
- Springfield – University of Illinois Springfield on August 31, 2016.

The goal of the hearings was to gather feedback and testimonies to help Commissioners understand stakeholder needs and opinions relative to program performance management and the advancement of the BFR initiative. The hearings were attended by private and not-for-profit representatives and stakeholders from diverse sectors, including human services, education, and economic development. State agency CROs and program personnel also attended. As a result of targeted outreach by state agencies and various constituency groups, more than 80 individuals participated in Springfield and over 100 individuals participated in Chicago.

Commissioners engaged with stakeholders and agency representatives in a frank, open and informative exchange of ideas. For the first time ever, the hearings were broadcast live over the Internet. Participants online were able to submit questions to the Commissioners via the web. The Commission plans to broadcast future public hearings via the Internet to enable as large and diverse an audience as possible to engage in these important discussions. The Commission

thanks the staff and campus community of the University of Illinois at Springfield for hosting the hearing for the third consecutive year.

Commission Working Groups

Mandates Review Working Group

Statute 15 ILCS 20/50-25 requires the Budgeting for Results Commission to “review existing mandated expenditures and include in its [November 1st] report recommendations for the termination of mandated expenditures.” In the spring of 2016, Commission recommendations for mandated expenditures were drafted in Senate Bill 2657 and Senate Bill 2884. Senate Bill 2657 proposed to repeal or modify 4 mandates passed both chambers of the legislature and was signed into law as Public Act 99-576. Senate Bill 2884 which proposes to repeal or modify 37 mandates passed the Senate and is awaiting passage in the House of Representatives.

In the summer of 2016, the Budgeting for Results Mandates working group asked agencies to identify statutory mandates the agency considered outdated, duplicative, or unduly burdensome on agency operations. The agency-submitted list of mandates was compiled by GOMB and included approximately 230 mandates.

The Budgeting for Results Mandates working group met in late September 2016 to conduct an initial review of agency recommendations for the elimination or modification of mandates. Following the review, the working group recommended 30 mandates to the full Commission for approval. The Commission approved list of mandates recommended for modification or repeal is included as Appendix B of this report. Additional mandate recommendations requiring clarification from the submitting state agency have been returned to the agency for response. It is anticipated that the Commission will approve additional mandate recommendations later in fiscal year 2017.

Budget Transparency Working Group

In January 2016, the Budget Transparency working group submitted its final report. The purpose of the report was to propose a plan to make the state budgeting process more transparent and publicly accessible. The report contained 22 recommendations to improve budget transparency in Illinois based on best practices from around the country. The list of the recommendations is provided as Appendix C of this report. Because the final report was submitted as required, the Budget Transparency working group was dissolved upon the publication of the report.

Going forward, the BFR Commission will continue the work to ensure that transparency is a cornerstone of Illinois’ budget process.

Progress Update on 2015 Commission Recommendations

Sub-Outcomes

The BFR implementation team, which consists of GOMB, the Governor's Office, and Agency CROs, continues work to define sub-outcomes within each outcome area. In calendar 2017, the implementation team will draw from the knowledge gained through the SPART and cost-benefit analysis pilot projects to inform the process of developing sub-outcome areas.

Refinement of Program and Priority Metrics

The BFR implementation team continues to meet with individual state agencies to review and refine their program inventories and program metrics in the IPRS system. This is an ongoing process elevated by the Commission's prioritization of the SPART and cost-benefit program assessments. Through coordinated efforts with CROs, CFOs, Budget Analysts and BFR staff, state agencies have made significant progress and continued emphasis will be placed on this refinement during the fiscal year 18 budget development process.

Program Evaluation and Comparison

Over the past year the BFR implementation team has aggressively pursued the development of a comprehensive program evaluation tool (SPART) and cost-benefit analysis regime discussed above. The implementation team has leveraged previous efforts and established active program evaluation and cost-benefit working groups to design a statewide, uniform framework for program evaluation and comparison. With further refinement during the coming year, the team is committed to deploy a valid and reliable tool under this BFR Commission.

Data Collection and Analysis

The BFR implementation team continues to work to improve ease of use of the Illinois Performance Reporting System (IPRS). Enhanced data input features allow users to enter performance data for all measures in all programs from a single input screen. Over the coming year, the team will continue to seek solutions to help automate IPRS data input functions where

possible. The team will also continue to work with the Department of Innovation and Technology to ensure the platform for statewide performance reporting minimizes duplication of effort and supports the objective of timely public reporting of state agency performance data.

Commission Recommendations and Next Steps

Program Analysis – Staffing Resources

At the core of the BFR initiative is comprehensive analysis of fact-based program data to compare state agency programs and inform resource allocation decisions. The Commission notes that no funding has been appropriated for staff or systems to advance BFR legislation during the six years the BFR mandate has been in effect. The Commission has made program assessment progress through the dedication of the BFR Commissioners and the efforts of two full time equivalent BFR staff.

The Commission recognizes that current program analysis efforts can be enhanced with additional personnel and resources to more aggressively establish a statewide program analysis framework to accommodate comparisons of a wider variety of programs and funding streams. The Commission is grateful to the pro-bono offer of program analysis leadership from Commissioner Jim Lewis and looks forward to his continued engagement and applied expertise to aid in guiding the Commission’s program analysis efforts.

Program Analysis – Data Collection Resources

Through pilot program analysis efforts, the Commission became aware of the prevalence of program and/or participant performance data overlapping state agencies. For example, an individual may exit one program and enter a different state agency’s program. Currently, the performance measures start and stop at the point of program transfer. These silos of data prevent state agencies from completing an assessment of the longer-term benefits received or best practices in state agency collaboration to enhance overall service delivery. IPRS performance data could provide more informative analysis on the sequence of program offerings and coordination between state agencies relative to program delivery.

The Commission recommends ongoing dialog regarding select, cross-agency data sharing to improve and enhance program analysis. The Commission further recommends that additional resources be directed to build a more robust data collection capacity at GOMB and state agencies.

Procurement Reform

A common issue raised in both public hearings and during the Commission's mandate review process was the desire for procurement reform. In testimony, several speakers stated that outdated and cumbersome procurement rules hamper state entities from responding to service delivery challenges in a timely manner and providing services in an efficient and cost-effective manner. One participant in the public hearings stated, "A state procurement process where we have to look to Springfield to approve every decision before we can proceed is not conducive to an effective and productive environment." Stakeholders agreed that procurement changes were justified because there were problems in the past and reform creates a mechanism to fix those. However, constituents emphasized that current procurement rules added a layer of unnecessary, inefficient processing requirements to all procurements.

Consensus validates that procurement requirements should provide structure and oversight to promote transparency of state expenditures. Stakeholders stressed that current procurement rules penalize entities that attempt to comply rather than streamline necessary oversight and target critical areas of potential procurement abuse.

The BFR Commission acknowledges on-going procurement reform dialog and recommends that the legislature pursue implementation of comprehensive procurement reform with a goal of making state procurement more efficient and cost-effective while maintaining controls for accountability and transparency of expenditures.

Impacts on Federal and Other Funding

During the Commission's public hearings, testimony from several representative of community-based providers and community groups stressed the unintended consequences of decreasing or eliminating small state grant awards to organizations. These participants acknowledged instances where the net effect of decreasing or eliminating a grant award caused the entity to lose dollars from federal funders or other sources. The community groups further emphasized their need to leverage other funders because of the reduction in state funding.

Providers respectfully asked budget authorities to consider the wider repercussions to community-based providers during the ongoing budget dialog. The Commission recommends the state explore opportunities to minimize the information gap with community-based organizations which would increase the likelihood that pertinent information is communicated during the budget development process.

Community-based Provider Consolidations

Public hearing testimony emphasized consolidations among community-based providers in response to the financial impacts of the recent budget impasse. Speakers highlighted efficiencies, economies of scale, and targeted service strengths as positives that have resulted from the provider consolidations. Intentional collaboration and an emphasis on best practices are a necessity in an environment where resources are scarce and needs for services are increasing.

It was suggested that state government may be able to help facilitate these consolidations by providing a clearinghouse for information. The Commission recommends the State inquire about community-based provider consolidations to better understand the need for state-support within the process. In all instances, the Commission notes the need to build provider capacity.

Conclusion

Budgeting for Results has made significant strides over the previous six years to convert raw program data to useful information for decision-makers and the public. The development of IPRS program data reports, the SPART tool and cost-benefit program analysis establish the foundation for BFR to transcend into program comparison analysis. This focus on state program analysis positions the BFR Commission to provide a greater depth of management data to inform the performance-based budgeting process.

The Commission recognizes the significant commitment made towards establishing the framework for program analysis. It acknowledges the challenges associated with such an undertaking. The Commission is committed to ongoing pilots and the statewide implementation of the SPART and the cost-benefit analysis tools.

The Commission looks forward to working with legislators, state agencies, community-based organizations and stakeholders at large to advance progress of the BFR initiative. Working together, we can achieve much for the people of this great state.

Appendix A

Chronology

The following lists chronologically the significant events in the Budgeting for Results process over the preceding five years.

- July 2010
Public Act 96-0958 establishing the Budgeting for Results (BFR) process was signed into law by the Governor.
- August 2010-January 2011,
Governor's Office of Management and Budget (GOMB) in conjunction with the Governor's Office established the first six statewide result areas to evaluate the impact/success of state funds.
- February 2011
GOMB presented the Governor's fiscal year (FY) 2012 budget which included state spending divided into six statewide result areas: Education, Economic Development, Public Safety and Regulation, Human Services, Quality of Life, and Government Services.
- February 2011
Public Act 96-1529 establishing the Budgeting for Results Commission was signed into law by the Governor.
- March 2011-January 2012
GOMB worked with over 70 state agencies, universities, boards and commissions to delineate discrete programs linked to line item appropriations. Each program was assigned to one of the statewide result areas to facilitate future performance measurement.

The Budgeting for Results Commission conducted its first meeting. Among the Commission's many activities, it established the seventh statewide result area, Healthcare.

- February 2012
GOMB presented the Governor's FY 2013 budget with state agency spending delineated by program. Each program was assigned to one of the seven statewide result areas.
- March 2012-Janary 2013
To establish basic performance measures for each state agency program, GOMB in conjunction with the Government Finance Officers Association (GFOA) provided training to state agency personnel on the development of program logic models. Each agency produced a logic model for each program. The logic model helped identify the potential performance measures for each program.

In addition, during the period of July to September 2012, GFOA in conjunction with GOMB engaged experts and stakeholders from across the spectrum of result areas to engage in strategy mapping.

- March 2013
GOMB presented the Governor's FY 2014 budget, including performance measures, to each agency narrative submission.
- April 2013-February 2014
GOMB in conjunction with state agencies worked to refine agency program inventories and performance measures. GOMB, worked with agencies, to identify agency Chief Results Officers (CROs). CROs are senior level agency staff with responsibility for performance and change management at the agency. They serve as conduit for BFR information between the agency and GOMB. In late 2013, GOMB began the process of developing the Illinois Performance Reporting System (IPRS), a SharePoint database that allows for the centralized reporting of program performance measures and summary program information.

In October 2013, GOMB partnered with Mission Measurement, a performance measurement consulting firm, to complete a pilot around one outcome area of BFR. The pilot developed and tested a methodology for evaluating the performance of State of Illinois programs within the Education result area. Funding for the pilot was provided by a number of private foundations including generous contributions from the Chicago Community Trust, the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, and the Steans Family Foundation, along with pro bono support from Mission Measurement Corp.

- March 2014
GOMB presented the Governor's FY 2015 budget with at least one performance measure for each agency program.
- April 2014-January 2015
State agencies were trained on the use of IPRS and begin the process of collecting a full fiscal year's program performance data.

In late 2014, GOMB developed a reporting function in IPRS utilizing a PDF format. This reporting capability enhanced transparency because it allowed the performance measure to be publicly posted to the GOMB website.

- February 2015
GOMB presented the FY 2016 budget with a full year of performance measure data for each agency program.
- February 2015-August 2015
GOMB continued to work with agencies to refine programs and metrics. In August, GOMB posted the first set of IPRS program performance PDFs to the GOMB website: Budget.Illinois.gov.
- September 2015-October-2016
GOMB with support from experts in the academic community began the development and pilot process for the State Program Analysis Reporting Tool (SPART) and the cost-benefit analysis tool.

Appendix B

BFR Agency Mandates FY2017								
Agency Name	Category: 1 - OK, 2 - more info needed, 3 - outside of scope	Mandate Name	Description: What does the mandate do?	Statutory Reference	Background of the Mandate	Agency Recommendation: Should the mandate be Repealed or Made Permissive? Why?	Fiscal Impact (\$ in thousands)	
1	402 Aging	1	Community Care Program reform that includes bi-monthly report	The 98 th Illinois General Assembly passed a number of reforms for the Community Care Program (CCP) in HB 2275, enacted in 2013 (Public Act 98-0008). Among these changes was a provision requiring a bi-monthly report updating the legislature on the agency's progress in implementing the CCP reforms. Beginning in early 2013, these reports detailed IDoA policy changes as outlined in the legislation. On March 26, 2014, the Office of the Auditor General released its Review of the Department on Aging's Community Care Program Reform Implementation, concluding that the requirements of PA 98-0008 had been met.	20 ILCS 105/4.02 (from Ch. 23, par. 6104.02)	Passed in 2013, the chief sponsors of PA 98-0008 (HB 2275) were Rep. Sara Feigenholtz and Sen. Heather Steans. This issue was addressed in a department initiative, HB 4552, introduced earlier this year.	Although the Department on Aging has completed the provisions of PA 98-0008, the statute continues to require a bi-monthly report be created and provided to the General Assembly. The majority of information contained in the report is repeated from the previous report, due to the implementation of reforms, and the remainder identifies how the department is continuing to proceed under changes made in the legislation. As the department has adopted these changes into its everyday operations, using valuable staff time throughout several divisions to create this report is no longer necessary. The mandate which required bi-monthly reporting to the legislature is no longer necessary. All changes have been implemented and creation of the report is a waste of valuable staff time.	This initiative will have a positive fiscal impact on the state, as valuable staff time would no longer be used to create or process this redundant report.
2	402 Aging	1	Circuit Breaker Program	The purpose of this mandate was to inform all property tax payers in the state of the "Circuit Breaker" Program. This program was intended "to provide incentives to the senior citizens and disabled persons of this State to acquire and retain private housing of their choice and at the same time to relieve those citizens from the burdens of extraordinary property taxes against their increasingly restricted earning power, and thereby to reduce the requirements for public housing in this State." Eligibility for this program was administered by the Department on Aging. Though the statute is still in effect, no appropriation was approved by the Illinois General Assembly to fund the Property Tax Relief Grant for Fiscal Year 2013 and as a result, the program was eliminated effective July 1, 2012. Eligibility determinations for the License Plate Discount and the Seniors Ride Free and Disabled Ride free benefits remain the responsibility of the Department on Aging under the "Circuit Breaker Act".	35 ILCS 200/20-15	The mandate to place this information on all Illinoisan's property tax forms was passed in 2000 (PA 91-699, HB 3872) with the chief sponsors being Representative Lee Daniels and Senator Christine Radogno. This issue was addressed in a department initiative introduced earlier this year. SB 2322 passed the Senate 52-0, but did not receive a hearing in the House.	Since the elimination of the property tax relief grant on July 1, 2012, the Illinois Department on Aging's Senior HelpLine (the number for which is listed on all property tax bills) has received 50,363 calls from residents seeking assistance in connection with the program. At the time of elimination, the Department on Aging issued over 120,000 letters explaining that the property tax relief grant would be eliminated and no applications for the grant would be accepted after July 1; however this message is contradicted when bill recipients review their statements. Local government offices, too, may be subject to inquiries regarding this program. Eliminating this requirement allays ongoing confusion for seniors and disabled persons as well as any frustration they may experience upon learning that the program is no longer offered. In addition, deletion of this provision will also free space on the tax bill for other, more accurate, information. The program was defunded in 2012. Specify why this change is recommended? The department proposes the following language be removed from statute: (35 ILCS 200/20-15) In all counties, the statement shall include information that certain taxpayers may be eligible for the Senior Citizens and Disabled Persons Property Tax Relief Act and that applications are available from the Illinois Department on Aging.	Incidental; savings relate primarily to increased productivity at the Senior HelpLine.
3	420 DCEO	1		The DCEO Director, with the advice of the Labor-Management-Community Cooperation Committee, shall have the authority to provide grants to employee coalitions or other coalitions that enhance or promote work and family programs and address specific community concerns, and to provide matching grants, grants, and other resources to establish or assist area labor-management-community committees and other projects that serve to enhance labor-management-community relations.	Repeal 20 ILCS 605/605-855(a) through 605/605-855(h)	20 ILCS 605/605-855 (a) – 605/605-855 (h): P.A. 88-456 enacted on 8-20-1993	Impact on agency? No impact, as the Committee no longer convenes. No, agency did not complete the requirements of the mandate, because it is an obsolete, duplicative committee. The Office of Employment and Training was transferred back to DCEO in 2003 and since then, the committee has never convened. Many of the required committee members are members of the Illinois Workforce Innovation Board and the 21st Century Workforce Development Fund Act. The agency recommends to make repeal the mandate.	\$0.00
4	420 DCEO	1		Pursuant to the Illinois Emergency Employment Development Act, Section 17 provides that the coordinator and members of the Advisory Committee shall explore available resources to leverage in combination with the wage subsidies in this Act to develop a Transitional Jobs program. This Transitional Jobs program would prioritize services for individuals with limited experience in the labor market and barriers to employment, including but not limited to, recipients of Temporary Assistance to Needy Families, Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, or other related public assistance, and people with criminal records.	Repeal 20 ILCS 630/17	20 ILCS 630/17: P.A. 97-581 enacted on 8/26/2011. Sponsors: Sens. Noland-Harmon; Reps. Mathias-Lang-Mayfield-Hatcher-Ford	This is a duplicative program that misallocates agency staff and resources. Yes, the agency completed the requirements of the mandate, through the agency's requirement to administer WIOA. The agency recommends to repeal the mandate. Transitional jobs and priority of service for individuals with limited experience are addressed through WIOA. TANF and SNAP are both required partners under WIOA, making this mandate redundant.	No Impact
5	420 DCEO	1		Illinois Emergency Employment Development Coordinator. The coordinator shall administer the program within the Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity. The Director of Commerce and Economic Opportunity shall provide administrative support services to the coordinator for the purposes of the program.	Repeal 20 ILCS 630/3©	P.A. 96-995 made the mandate permissive. 20 ILCS 630/3(c): Statute enacted via P.a. 84-1399 on 9/18/1986.	No impact as it is completely duplicative of provisions found in WIOA. Yes, the agency has completed the requirements, through agency's requirement to administer WIOA. The agency recommends to repeal the mandate. The Act is unnecessary due to it being entirely duplicative of WIOA.	No Impact

BFR Agency Mandates FY2017								
Agency Name	Category: 1 - OK, 2 - more info needed, 3 - outside of scope	Mandate Name	Description: What does the mandate do?	Statutory Reference	Background of the Mandate	Agency Recommendation: Should the mandate be Repealed or Made Permissive? Why?	Fiscal Impact (\$ in thousands)	
6	420 DCEO	1		The Workforce Task Force For Persons with Disabilities was enacted and named the Director of DCEO as a member.	Repeal 405 ILCS 80/10-5 through 80/10-15	405 ILCS 80/10-5 through 80/10-15 was enacted via P.A. 92-303 / HB 3392 (Rep. Daniels) in 2001.	Requires the Director to serve as a member. Reporting requirement no longer applies. Yes, the agency completed the requirements of the mandate, the Director acts a member of the Board. The agency recommends to repeal the mandate, The task force should be folded into the Governor's Task Force on Economic Employment Opportunities for People with Disabilities as they serve the same function.	No Impact
7	420 DCEO	1		From amounts appropriated for such purpose, the Department in consultation with the Department of Human Services shall solicit proposals to establish programs to be known as family loan programs. Such programs shall provide small, no-interest loans to custodial parents with income below 200% of the federal poverty level an who are working or enrolled in a post-secondary education program, to aid in covering the costs of unexpected expenses that could interfere with their ability to maintain employment or continue education. The Director shall enter into written agreements with not-for-profit organizations or local government agencies to administer loan pools. Agreements shall be entered into with no more than 4 organizations or agencies, no more than one of which shall be located in the city of Chicago. Program sites shall be approved based on the demonstrated ability of the organization or governmental agency to secure funding from private or public sources sufficient to establish a loan pool to be maintained through repayment agreements entered into by eligible low-income families.	Repeal 20 ILCS 605/605-817	The Family Loan Program (20 ILCS 605/605-817) was enacted via P.A. 91-372/HB 1247 on 7/30/1999. The only Sponsor still in the General Assembly is Senator Sullivan.	No impact, because the program is not active or funded. The program is inactive and unfunded and is duplicative of other DCEO administered programs such as CSBG. The agency recommends to repeal the mandate.	No Impact
8	420 DCEO	1		The Governor shall appoint a person within the Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity to serve as the Electric Vehicle Coordinator for the State of Illinois. This person may be an existing employee with other duties. The Coordinator shall act as a point person for electric vehicle related policies and activities in Illinois. The Council shall investigate and recommend strategies that the Governor and the General Assembly may implement to promote the use of electric vehicles, including, but not limited to, potential infrastructure improvements, State and local regulatory streamlining, and changes to electric utility rates and tariffs.	Repeal 20 ILCS 627	The Act was enacted by P.A. 97-89/HB 2902 on 7/11/2011. Current members of the GA who sponsored the bill include Reps. Williams, Turner, Rita, Durkin, Gabel, and Sente and Senator Biss.	The report was issued to the Governor and General Assembly in 2011. Council issued its final report to the Governor and General Assembly prior to its deadline of December 31, 2011. The statute is no longer needed as the Council completed its report by the statutorily required December 31, 2011 deadline.	No Impact
9	420 DCEO	1		The Recycling Newsprint Use Act (415 ILCS 110) imposes various mandates upon DCEO relating to newsprint recycled fibers usages: 1) Requires consumers of newsprint to certify by March 1, 1992 every type of newsprint used by the consumer so DCEO can calculate recycled fiber usage 2) Provides that every consumer of newsprint who submits recycled fiber may be subject to an audit; 3) Requires DCEO to compile a list of every newsprint consumer and supplier in the State; 4) Requires DCEo to set quality standards for each of the grades of newsprint available in the State; 5) Provides that DCEO shall refer all persons who've knowingly submitted a false or misleading certificate to the Attorney General; 6) Provides that any consumer who knowingly provides false or misleading newsprint recycling fiber information is guilty of a Class C misdemeanor and shall be referred to the Attorney General for prosecution; 7) Provides that newsprint prices provided in a certificate is proprietary information and shall not be made available to the public 8) Provides that if the 1993 annual aggregate average of recycled fiber usage does not meet or exceed the statutorily established goal, the consumer shall certify this to the Department and provide DCEO the reason for failing to meet the goal.	Repeal 415 ILCS 110	The oldest known amendatory Act to the mandate is P.A. 86-1443/HB 3183 sponsored by Rep. Edley.	No impact. The Department developed and implemented a program to comply with this mandate in the early 1990s. Consumers of newsprint were surveyed in 1991 and 1992 and it was determined that they had met the recycled fiber standards and no further reporting was necessary. Reports on these activities are on file with the Bureau. The Department developed and implemented a program to comply with this mandate in the early 1990s. Consumers of newsprint were surveyed in 1991 and 1992 and it was determined that they had met the recycled fiber standards and no further reporting was necessary. Reports on these activities are on file with the Bureau. This Act is no longer needed. The Department developed and implemented a program to comply with this mandate in the early 1990s. Consumers of newsprint were surveyed in 1991 and 1992 and it was determined that they had met the recycled fiber standards and no further reporting was necessary. Reports on these activities are on file with the Bureau. It is also of note that newsprint is an outdated form of media that is declining in usage at sharp rates.	No Impact

BFR Agency Mandates FY2017								
Agency Name	Category: 1 - OK, 2 - more info needed, 3 - outside of scope	Mandate Name	Description: What does the mandate do?	Statutory Reference	Background of the Mandate	Agency Recommendation: Should the mandate be Repealed or Made Permissive? Why?	Fiscal Impact (\$ in thousands)	
10	420 DCEO	1		To assist the legislative review required by this Act, the Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity shall conduct a joint study of the impacts on the State's economy which may result from implementation of the emission reduction strategies contained within any proposed memorandum of understanding or State Implementation Plan relating to ozone and from implementation of any alternate strategies. The study shall include, but not be limited to, the impacts on economic development, employment, utility costs and rates, personal income, and industrial competitiveness which may result from implementation of the emission reduction strategies contained within any proposed memorandum of agreement or State Implementation Plan relating to ozone and from implementation of any alternate strategies. The study shall be submitted to the House Committee and Senate Committee not less than 10 days prior to any scheduled hearing conducted pursuant to subsection (c) of this Section.	Repeal 415 ILCS 130/20(b)	The oldest known amendatory Act to the mandate was P.A. 89-566/SB 1408. Sponsors are unknown.	This mandate was compiled in 1996/97 and relied upon REMI Economic Impact Analysis. Subsequent studies of the same topic have been undertaken since, including Governor Blagojevich's Global Warming Initiative through EO 2006-11 which established the Illinois Climate Change Advisory Group. The study was completed in 1997. The study has been completed, and many similar studies/commissions have been established since.	No Impact
11	420 DCEO	1		Under the Solid Waste Planning and Recycling Act, any municipality or combination of municipalities that has a total population of 20,000 or more may apply to the Department for assistance grants to operate a pilot recycling project that demonstrates the economic feasibility and environmental benefits of a recycling method. The Department shall establish guidelines for solicitation of grants under this Section. Applications for assistance shall be filed with the Department on forms provided by the Department and shall set forth such information as may be required by the Department. The Department shall evaluate the application and notify the applicant of the qualification or non-qualification of the application within 45 days of the deadline established. In implementing this Section, the Department shall, pursuant to appropriation, make grants from the Solid Waste Management Fund to municipalities with approved pilot recycling projects. Such grants shall be limited to 50% of the project costs, not to exceed a total of \$50,000 per project. No more than 25 pilot recycling project grants may be made pursuant to this Section.	Repeal 415 ILCS 8(a) through 15(d)	The oldest known amendatory Act to the mandate was P.A. 86-256/SB 638. Sponsors are not known at this time.	A pilot program was developed and projects were funded in the early 1990s. No longer needed on the books. The pilot programs were funded and completed in the early 1990s.	No Impact
12	420 DCEO	1		The Department shall conduct a workshop regarding the feasibility and methods of recycling in high-rise residential and office buildings, including an explanation of financial assistance available. The Department shall provide a report to the General Assembly on high-rise residential and office recycling projects on or before July 1, 1994. The report shall include, but is not limited to, a review of the volume of materials collected and costs associated with such projects compared to other collection methods.	Repeal 415 ILCS 15/8.5	The oldest known amendatory Act to this mandate is P.A. 88-60/HB 1707. Sponsors are not known at this time.	All tasks related to this mandate were met by the July 1, 1994 date established, including the required report. A copy of the report is maintained by the Bureau. Inactive. Workshops held and report submitted by July 1, 1994. No longer needed on the books. All tasks related to this mandate were met by the July 1, 1994 date established, including the required report.	No Impact
13	420 DCEO	1		The Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity, in cooperation with the Environmental Protection Agency, shall maintain a central clearinghouse of information regarding the implementation of this Act. In particular, this clearinghouse shall include data regarding solid waste research and planning, solid waste management practices, markets for recyclable materials and intergovernmental cooperation.	Repeal 415 ILCS 20/5	The oldest known amendatory Act to the mandate is P.A. 89-445. No substantive changes have been made since that public act.	It is currently unfunded and inactive. While the Department once maintained a clearinghouse, this law was originally passed in an era prior to the prevalence of computers. There has been a paradigm shift in the distribution of information and DCEO no longer operates a "clearinghouse." However, the information addressed by this legislation is available from the Departments website and other locations on the internet, including both the Illinois and Federal EPA websites.	No Impact

BFR Agency Mandates FY2017

Agency Name	Category: 1 - OK, 2 - more info needed, 3 - outside of scope	Mandate Name	Description: What does the mandate do?	Statutory Reference	Background of the Mandate	Agency Recommendation: Should the mandate be Repealed or Made Permissive? Why?	Fiscal Impact (\$ in thousands)
14	420 DCEO	1		Repeal 415 ILCS 20/7.1	The oldest known amendatory Act to this mandate is P.A. 89-445. No other substantive changes have been made since then. Sponsors are unknown at this time.	A study was conducted and a final report was submitted by November 1, 1991. Subsequently, the IL EPA developed and administered a waste paint program. The Hazardous Waste Research and Information Center (HWRIC) at the U of I, a part of ENR at the time of this legislation, did research and outreach related to paint reduction at auto body shops. No longer needed on the books. The study was finalized and submitted in November 1991.	No Impact
15	420 DCEO	1		Repeal 415 ILCS 20/7.3	The oldest known amendatory Act to this mandate is P.A. 88-182. No substantive changes have been made to the mandate since. Sponsor are unknown at this time.	All tasks related with this mandate were meet by the March 1, 1994 date established. No longer needed on the books.	No Impact
16	420 DCEO	1		Repeal 415 ILCS 20/8	The oldest known amendatory Act to the mandate is P.A. 88-445. No other substantive changes have been made since. Sponsors are unknown at this time.	The Department complied with this law and did issue the RFP and did fund some projects. Informational meetings were held and technical assistance was given. In accordance with the language of the law the program did not operate longer than 2 years. This was complete 1996. Under different initiatives the Department has continued to support projects that utilize recycled commodities in their manufacturing, most currently through the Recycling Expansion and Modernization Program.	No Impact
17	420 DCEO	1		Repeal 415 ILCS 80	415 ILCS 80 was enacted in P.A. 86-775. No substantive changes have been made since. Sponsors are unknown.	This mandate was addressed in the early 1990's and cumulated in the Final Report of the Degradable Plastics Task Force (ILENR/RR-91-03) March 1991. No longer needed on the books.	No Impact
18	420 DCEO	1		Repeal 20 ILCS 605/605-312	This mandate was established in P.A. 95-494/SB 1097. Rep. Fortner was the Chief House Sponsor. Rep. Arroyo also was a chief co-sponsor.	The mandate is both subject to appropriation and required that the contemplated report be provided to the General Assembly by January 31, 2008. The agency submitted the report by the statutorily required January 31, 2008 date. No longer needed on the books. The report required was submitted in 2008.	No Impact

BFR Agency Mandates FY2017

Agency Name	Category: 1 - OK, 2 - more info needed, 3 - outside of scope	Mandate Name	Description: What does the mandate do?	Statutory Reference	Background of the Mandate	Agency Recommendation: Should the mandate be Repealed or Made Permissive? Why?	Fiscal Impact (\$ in thousands)
19	420 DCEO	1	Whenever the Department issues a certificate for the creation of a housing authority in any county or in any city, village or incorporated town having more than twenty-five thousand inhabitants, the presiding officer of the county or of the city, village or incorporated town, as the case may be, shall as soon as possible thereafter, appoint with the approval of the Department five commissioners with initial terms of one, two, three, four and five years. Upon the approval of such appointments, the Department shall cause a certificate of such appointments and its approval thereof to be filed in the office in which deeds of property in the county are recorded. The appointment of any succeeding commissioners of a housing authority shall be subject to similar approval; and each such appointment shall be effective upon the filing by the Department of a certificate of appointment and of its approval thereof as hereinbefore provided. No officer or employee of the Department shall be eligible to serve as a commissioner of a housing authority.	310 ILCS 5/42	310 ILCS 5/42 eff: The 81st GA was the last known amended change	The responsibilities are no longer practiced by the agency. These responsibilities are no longer exercised by the Department as HUD has assumed a more direct role in the monitoring of Housing Authorities.	Not funded
20	420 DCEO	1	Whenever it shall appear to the Department that a commissioner is incompetent or guilty of neglect of duty or malfeasance, the Department shall require such commissioner to appear before it to show cause why he should not be removed from office. At least fifteen days written notice of such a hearing shall be given to the commissioner whose conduct is in question and to all other members of the authority. At the hearing the commissioner may be represented by counsel and may appear personally and present such pertinent evidence as he wishes or as the Department may request. If after a hearing the Department determines that a commissioner has been incompetent or has been guilty of neglect of duty or malfeasance, it shall remove such commissioner from the authority within seven days, and there shall thereupon be deemed to be a vacancy of such office.	310 ILCS 5/43	310 ILCS 5/43 eff: 81st GA was the last time known amended change	No impact. This responsibly no longer falls under our agency. These responsibilities are no exercised by the department as HUD has assumed a more direct role in the monitoring of Housing Authorities.	No Fiscal impact
21	420 DCEO	1	TO COLLECT AND DISTRIBUTE INFORMATION ON THE ADMINISTRATION OF HOUSING AUTHORITIES, ASSIST IN THE PREPARATION OF LEGISLATION, INSPECT RECORDS AND REQUIRE SPECIFIC REPORTS.	310 ILCS 5/44	310 ILCS 5/44 No amendatory changes have been made since the 81st GA. Sponsors unknown.	These responsibilities are no longer exercised by the agency they have a more direct role within Housing Authority. Repeal: These responsibilities are no longer exercised by the department they have a more direct role in housing authority.	0
22	420 DCEO	1	The Program Administrator shall, in cooperation with the Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity, develop a plan for the use of tax increment financing to increase the availability of affordable housing. The Program Administrator shall recommend ways in which local tax increment financing can be exported from commercial and industrial developments to very low-income, low-income and moderate income housing projects outside the tax increment financing district, subject to limitation on dollar amounts. By March 1, 1990, the Program Administrator shall report to the Governor and the General Assembly the details of the plan and the Program Administrator's recommendations for legislative action.	310 ILCS 65/16	310 ILCS 65/16 eff: 5/19/2006 Rep. William Black/ Sen. William Haine	No impact since March 1, 1990 when the report was due.	N/A

BFR Agency Mandates FY2017								
Agency Name	Category: 1 - OK, 2 - more info needed, 3 - outside of scope	Mandate Name	Description: What does the mandate do?	Statutory Reference	Background of the Mandate	Agency Recommendation: Should the mandate be Repealed or Made Permissive? Why?	Fiscal Impact (\$ in thousands)	
23	420 DCEO	1		The Older Rural Adults Task Force is established to gather information and make recommendations in collaboration with the Department on Aging and the Older Adult Services Committee. The Task Force shall be comprised of 12 voting members and 7 non-voting members. The President and Minority Leader of the Illinois Senate and the Speaker and Minority Leader of the Illinois House of Representatives shall each appoint 2 members of the General Assembly and one citizen member to the Task Force. Citizen members may seek reimbursement for actual travel expenses. Representatives of the Department on Aging and the Departments of Healthcare and Family Services, Human Services, Public Health, and Commerce and Economic Opportunity, the Rural Affairs Council, and the Illinois Housing Development Authority shall serve as non-voting members. The Department on Aging shall provide staff support to the Task Force.	20 ILCS 105/4.14(b)-105/4.14©	20 ILCS 105/4.14(b)-105/4.14(c) eff: 8/13/2007 Sponsors: Rep. Gary Hanning, Rep. Greg Harris, Rep. Michael Smith, and Rep. Aaron Schock Important co sponsors: Rep Brandon Phelps Sen Co sponsors: Sen. Gary Forby, Sen. John Sullivan, and Sen. Michael Frerichs, and Sen. Deanna Demuzio	No impact since 2009 when the report was submitted to the GA. Report completed in 2009. Repeal: The Task Force may hold regional hearings and fact finding meetings and shall submit a report to the General Assembly no later than January 1, 2009. The Task Force is dissolved upon submission of the report.	0
24	420 DCEO	1		A local governmental unit, non-profit organization or educational institution that desires to have an unoccupied or nearly unoccupied building or site designated, in whole or in part, as a small business incubator shall appoint, in conjunction with local governmental units, educational institutions, private individuals or organizations or other entities that agree to contribute monetarily or in-kind to the incubator, a Community Advisory Board to perform the duties required of the Board by this Article. A local governmental unit, non-profit organization or educational institution may designate the board of an existing, consenting economic development entity, such as a local development corporation or a chamber of commerce, as the Community Advisory Board. The Community Advisory Board shall be of a size that the appointing body determines to be appropriate. The members of the Community Advisory Board shall consist of representatives from key segments of the community, including but not limited to government, finance, business, labor and education. The Board shall elect from its members a chairperson. An existing board of an economic development entity designated as a Community Advisory Board pursuant to subsection (b) must meet the composition requirements of subsection (c). Community Advisory Board members shall serve without compensation and shall serve at the pleasure of the appointing body or until the Community Advisory Board's task is completed, whichever occurs first.	30 ILCS 750/11-4	30 ILCS 750/11-4 Has not been amended since the 84th GA	No current impact. The community advisory board fulfilled their duties 25yrs ago. Community Advisory Board fulfilled their duties 25 years ago. Repeal - has not been funded for over 25 years. Community Advisory Board shall serve at the pleasure of the appointing boady or until the Board's task is complete (that was 25 years ago).	N/A
25	420 DCEO	1		The Task Force shall develop a plan containing policy and funding recommendations for expanding and supporting a State local and organic food system and for assessing and overcoming obstacles to an increase in locally grown food and local organic food production. The Task Force shall prepare and submit its plan in a report to the General Assembly by September 30, 2008, for consideration of its recommendations in the 96th General Assembly.	505 ILCS 84/10	505 ILCS 84/10 eff: 8/14/2007 Sponsors; Rep.Hamons,Rep. Mautino, Rep. Cultra, Rep. Dugan, Rep. Phelps, and Rep. Gordon Sen. Collins, Sen. Cullerton, Sen Koehler, Sen. Sieben, and Sen. Sullivan	No impact the report was submitted to the GA in 2008. If applicable, has your agency completed the requirements of the Mandate? If so, when and how? Illinois Local and Organic Food and Farm Task Force submitted September 30, 2008. Repeal. The Task Force shall prepare and submit its plan in a report to the General Assembly by September 30, 2008, for consideration of its recommendations in the 96th General Assembly.	N/A
26	532 EPA	1	The Urban Flooding Awareness Act	The Urban Flooding Awareness Act required the Illinois EPA and several other entities to prepare, by June 30, 2015, a report concerning urban flooding.	315 ILCS 35/Act	The reporting mandate was enacted on August 4, 2014, in Public Act 98-858 (SB 2966). In the Senate, the sponsors were Sens. Steans, Silverstein, Bush, Frerichs, Noland, Kotowski, Althoff, Harris, Morrison, and Biss. In the House of Representatives, the sponsors were Reps. Cassidy, Sente, Gabel, Fine, Martwick, Jakobsson, Moylan, Harris, Nekritz, Welch, Tryon, Fortner, and Currie.	The statutorily-mandated report is now complete. As a result, the Act's reporting mandate has no current impact on the Illinois EPA. The statutorily mandated report was completed in June of 2015. A copy of the report is available online at: https://www.dnr.illinois.gov/WaterResources/Documents/Final_UFAA_Report.pdf . The Illinois EPA recommends that the Commission seek the repeal of the Urban Flooding Awareness Act. The only requirement contained in the Act is the reporting requirement mentioned above. Because that report has been completed, the Act is now obsolete.	There are no on-going costs associated with this mandate.

BFR Agency Mandates FY2017

Agency Name	Category: 1 - OK, 2 - more info needed, 3 - outside of scope	Mandate Name	Description: What does the mandate do?	Statutory Reference	Background of the Mandate	Agency Recommendation: Should the mandate be Repealed or Made Permissive? Why?	Fiscal Impact (\$ in thousands)	
27	532 EPA	1	Brominated Fire Retardant Prevention Act	The provision cited below required the Illinois EPA to prepare a report concerning the flame retardant Decabromodiphenyl Ether (DecaBDE) by January 2, 2006.	410 ILCS 48/25	The cited reporting requirement was enacted in 2005, by Public Act 94-1000 (SB 1445). In the Senate, the sponsor was Sen. Terry Link. In the House of Representatives, the sponsors were Barbara Flynn Currie, Gary Hannig, Harry Osterman, Karen May, Naomi Jakobsson, Kathleen Ryg, Sara Feigenholtz, Karen Yarbrough, Kevin Joyce, Elaine Nekritz, Julie Hamos, William Delgado, Jack Franks, and Linda Chapa LaVia.	The statutorily mandated report has been completed. As a result, this mandate has no current impact on the Illinois EPA. In 2006, the Illinois EPA completed the reporting requirement described above. A copy of the report is available online at: http://www.epa.state.il.us/reports/decabde-study/ . The Illinois EPA recommends that the Commission seek the repeal of Section 25 of the Brominated Fire Retardant Prevention Act because the Agency has satisfied the reporting requirement set out in that Section.	There are no on-going costs associated with this mandate.
28	532 EPA	1	Green Infrastructure for Clean Water	The Green Infrastructure for Clean Water Act required the Illinois EPA, in consultation with the Illinois Department of Natural Resources, the Illinois Department of Transportation, the Capital Development Board, stormwater agencies, and other interested parties, to prepare, by June 30, 2010, a report concerning the use of green infrastructure to control urban stormwater problems.	415 ILCS 56/Act	The reporting mandate was enacted on June 30, 2009, in Public Act 96-26 (SB 1489). In the Senate, the sponsors were Sens. Iris Martinez, Jacqueline Collins, Ira Silverstein, Pamela Althoff, and Martin Sandoval. In the House of Representatives, the sponsors were Reps. Elaine Nekritz, Jehan Gordon, Deborah Mell, Sara Feigenholtz, Elizabeth Coulson, Sandra Pihos, Rosemary Mulligan, Naomi Jakobsson, and Mike Fortner.	The statutorily-mandated report is now complete. As a result, the Act's reporting mandate has no current impact on the Illinois EPA. The Illinois EPA completed the statutorily mandated report before June 30, 2010. A copy of the report is available online at: http://www.epa.illinois.gov/topics/water-quality/surface-water/green-infrastructure/index . The Illinois EPA recommends that the Commission seek the repeal of the Green Infrastructure for Clean Water Act. The only requirement contained in the Act is the reporting requirement mentioned above. Because that report has been completed, the Act is now obsolete.	There are no on-going costs associated with this mandate.
29	587 Elections	1		To reimburse the election authority for cost of furnishing updates copies of tapes or discs of voter registration files.	10ILCS 5/4-8; 5/5-7; 5/6-35	Prior to 1987 last reference noted in statute is PA 87-1241	The applicable portion of the mandate is obsolete. Potential audit issues, if that mandate is selected for testing. Media tapes were original sent to the agency to fulfill the mandate of these sections. The process continued to change throughout the 1990 with the changes in technology. In 2000 a Federal mandate was implemented called the Help America Vote Act (HAVA) which produced the Illinois Voter Registration System that is now used to collect the voter registration data nightly which alleviates the need for the election authorities to furnish updated copies of tapes or discs. As referenced below, 10ILCS 5/1A-25.	N/A - \$0.00
30	507 GOMB	1	OMB capital quarterly 45 day	The mandate relief being sought is in reference to the Capital Spending Accountability Law, enacted as a part of the 2009 Capital Program. The Law requires that GOMB prepare a quarterly report on the status of capital projects statewide.	Amend 20 ILCS 3020/805	The mandate was created in conjunction with the 2009 Capital Program. The Law was enacted by Public Act 096-0034 (HB0255 of the 96th General Assembly). Senate sponsors Cullerton and Trotter. House sponsor Lang.	The mandate creates a burden on the agency with regard to the current deadline in statute. The current deadline is the first day after the end of a quarter. Due to the need to collect data from agencies that have capital projects, it is impossible to produce the report with that timeline. GOMB produces the report as required by statute, but does not meet the timeline prescribed in statute. Changing the report due date from the first day after the end of the quarter to the 45th day after the end of the quarter makes the timeline achievable and makes the timeline more consistent with other reporting requirements.	No fiscal impact

Appendix C

	Item Name	Transparency Measure	Other States
1	COGFA Quarterly Estimates	Require COGFA to produce a quarterly revenue report and update the annual revenue estimate accordingly. Currently, COGFA only produces an annual revenue estimate, which it generally does not adjust. If done quarterly, COGFA will be able to adjust for any revenue variations and the public will have a better understanding of the current rate of spending.	
2	Reduce Number of Appropriation Bills	Require all final appropriations to be in two bills. Operations in one bill and then a second bill for capital.	
3	Legislative Posting Requirements	Prohibit 1 hour Appropriations Committee postings and require committee votes on all appropriation bills. Require a 3 day posting on all BIMP and appropriation bills before passage.	Florida
4	Agency Estimate Expansion	Agency proposed budgets must include estimates of their expenditures for the next 3 fiscal years. Require agencies to analyze and report the three year fiscal impact of any new programs proposed in legislation. This expands on the long-term estimate concept.	South Carolina
5	Agreement on Forecast	Governor and Legislature must agree on a revenue forecast early in the budgeting process. House and Senate shall pass an agreed joint resolution declaring the next year's revenue estimate within 48 hours of the Governor's budget address or by March 1, whichever comes first.	Multiple states
6	Report of Revenue Needs for Proposed Budget	Requires GOMB to provide a singular report giving estimates of fees, taxes, and any other revenues which need to be raised to fund the proposed budget request. The Governor is currently precluded by law from making revenue increase assumptions for GRF and a select few other funds in his introduced budget.	Florida
7	File BIMP with Budget	Require the Governor to submit all proposed budget bills on the day of the Budget Address. BIMP bills should be filed along with appropriation bills on the day of the Budget Address	Multiple states
8	Public Hearings Following Budget Address	Governor's Office must hold public hearings across the State on a proposed budget in a designated time frame after the Budget Address. Legislative budget hearings are sometimes held across the State by each chamber. This proposal would codify this practice and make the hearings more predictable for the public.	Alabama
9	Publish Budget and Regional Hearings	GOMB is required to publish highlights of the Governor's proposed budget in the most cost effective manner (online, newspaper, etc.). Legislative committees must hold regional public hearings before the legislature convenes.	Virginia
10	Comprehensive Summary	Requires GOMB to publish a final budget bill summary to be written in comprehensive language for the public.	Virginia
11	Agency Disclosure of Non-legislated Programs	Agencies must include on separate budget forms any request for programs or activities not previously authorized by law. These must be made easily available to the public. Any new programs should have a 3 year spending plan attached to the disclosure.	Vermont
12	Biennial Budget	Begin 2-year budgeting. This would require longer-term planning.	20 States
13	Transitional Assistance	Requires a tentative budget or transitional report of issues, revenues, and expenditures by agency. These shall be prepared for the Governor-elect by mid-November. The Governor-elect shall have full and free access to GOMB personnel and may hold hearings as considered desirable.	Connecticut
14	Tax Expenditure Reports	Publish tax expenditure reports that detail the impact on the state budget of targeted tax credits, exemptions, or deductions.	
15	Transparency Portal Expansion	Create a single, integrated, public-facing website, which contains information currently captured in the Illinois accountability portal, the website of the Office of the Comptroller, the website of the Commission of Government Forecasting and Accountability, and the website of the Governor's Office of management and Budget. The new website should contain information on appropriations, expenditures and performance. In addition all reports and data specified in this report should be available on this website. The information should be accessible in multiple electronic formats for ease of reference. Produce a transparency report, by agency, of open-ended appropriations such as non-appropriated funds, automatic statutory transfers, and source of funding (GRF, other funds, etc.). This should be done within 60 days of the budget being signed. Expand the new portal to include three year appropriation and expenditure data, grouped by fund type, operational expenses, grants and awards, and capital expenditures by agency.	Multiple states
16	IGA Report	Require GOMB to produce a monthly report that identifies all Intergovernmental Agreements (IGA). The report shall be updated whenever there is a new IGA. The report shall highlight IGAs that permit the movement of funds.	
17	Personnel on Loan	Create a report which identifies agency employees on loan status from one agency to another. It shall include the employee's full name, agency position title, location, CMS personnel position title, and current salary. The report will be used to get a true accounting of what agency budgets actually are and ultimately end the practice of placing employees on loan.	
18	Funds with Excessive Surpluses	Create a multi-year report which examines Other State Fund balances. The purpose of the report would be to ascertain if certain funds are building excessive surpluses.	
19	Tax and Fee Increase Report	Utilize the Comptroller's Fee Imposition Report and other resources to conduct a study designed to identify a true accounting of all taxes and fees imposed on individuals, local governments, and other entities.	
20	Budget Isolation	No bill with a fiscal impact or note, can pass the legislature until appropriation bills are passed. This would force an immediate examination of the budget. In emergency situations this provision could be waived.	Alabama
21	Report of Court Litigation Costs and Outcomes	Create an annual report that examines court litigation costs and possible outcomes of that litigation by agency. The report shall include costs related to budgetary consent decrees.	
22	Review of Funds	Complete a report by agency and source of funding of GRF and non-GRF appropriations, continuing appropriations, non-appropriated funds, and all transfers from fund to fund. This report shall include an analysis of supplemental needs or requests by agency in order to identify underfunded areas of the budget.	