

**Illinois Early Learning Council (ELC) Access Committee
Early Childhood Construction Grant (ECCG) Program Ad Hoc Workgroup
Recommendations to Strengthen the ECCG Program
Approved by ELC Executive Committee – August 5, 2019**

The Need for Early Childhood Capital Investment

Early care and education classrooms are places where young children’s essential relationships develop and attitudes toward school and learning are formed. High-quality facilities have been shown to help improve play interaction, lessen conflicts, and advance school readiness for children. To ensure our most vulnerable infants, toddlers, and preschoolers receive the best possible care, we must maintain high-quality physical environments. On June 28, 2019, Governor JB Pritzker signed into law Public Act 101-029, the state’s new, six-year \$45 billion Rebuild Illinois capital plan, the most robust capital improvement program in Illinois history and the first in nearly a decade – **which includes \$100 million for the Early Childhood Construction Grant (ECCG) program, the largest investment in the program’s history.**

In 2009, state policymakers recognized that first-rate facilities are critical factors in program quality, approving a \$45 million appropriation for the ECCG program as part of the \$31 billion Illinois Jobs Now! capital plan. Illustrating the enormous need, the state received 227 applications requesting over \$539 million – about 12 times the amount of funding available. These grants, approved by the Capital Development Board (CDB) and awarded in 2012, went to school districts and community-based, non-profit providers for the construction or renovation of early childhood facilities. Priority was given to projects located in communities with particularly underserved populations of children under the age of 5. Per state statute, 20 percent of the total investment - \$9 million - was given to the Chicago Public Schools (CPS). Subsequently, CPS implemented its own Request for Applications (RFA) process, in partnership with the CDB, though Chicago-based providers were also able to apply for funding as part of the first round of grants issued by the CDB.

Workgroup Charge

Governor Pritzker spoke often during the 2018 Illinois gubernatorial campaign about the need for the state to pass a comprehensive, multi-year capital plan. Upon his election, and in anticipation of this new proposal, the Illinois Early Learning Council (ELC) initiated the Early Childhood Construction Grant Program Ad Hoc Workgroup (“The Workgroup”) under the Access Committee. The Workgroup¹ was charged with producing recommendations aimed at strengthening the ECCG program.

The Workgroup reviewed the current ECCG program structure and attempted to answer the following questions, among others:

1. How can Illinois ensure that grants are awarded to providers in communities with the greatest underserved populations of children under 5-years old? What information should be used to make those decisions?
2. What should the roles of different state agencies be in the ECCG process? Are roles as currently defined working, or do they need to be revisited?
3. What actions might the Governor’s Office take to support the program?
4. How can the state ensure potential providers are willing *and* able to apply for future grant funds?
5. Are changes to the current statute², administrative rule³, or program rules needed to implement the next phase of the program?

Four meetings were held during spring 2019 to answer these questions. The Workgroup surveyed existing providers about their experience in the program. The Workgroup also reviewed the data methodology from

¹ Members listed in Appendix 1

² <http://www.ilga.gov/legislation/ilcs/ilcs4.asp?DocName=010502300HArt%2E+5&ActID=1028&ChapterID=17&SeqStart=100000&SeqEnd=2300000>

³ <http://ilga.gov/commission/jcar/admincode/071/07100043sections.html>

the previous grant program and discussed changes in the field that should be incorporated into any refreshed version of the program. While we may not have addressed every last issue raised during our meetings, the Workgroup did what it could in the time given.

Committee Values

The Workgroup believes that the best and most important use of *Rebuild Illinois'* historic, \$100 million investment in early childhood facilities would be to increase the equitable access of early childhood education and care in the state's most underserved communities by: (1) investing in new, refurbished, and expanded facilities that allow a mix of school- and community-based providers to offer high-quality programs that align with community needs; and (2) leading a transparent, data-driven, and supportive application process that opens the door for the state's highest-need communities to participate and ultimately benefit from this capital investment.

Table of Contents

Project Selection 3

Training and Technical Assistance 4

Statutory, Rule, and Policy Changes 5

Early Childhood Construction Grant (ECCG) Program Ad Hoc Workgroup Recommendations..... 6

Additional Considerations..... 8

Appendix 1 – Early Childhood Construction Grant (ECCG) Program Ad Hoc Workgroup Membership 10

Appendix 2 – List of 2009 Grantees 11

Appendix 3 – List of 2009 Grantees Locations by the CDB Priority Ranking 12

Project Selection

Previous Request for Applications Process

One important aspect of the ECCG program is the process for selecting local projects. This section summarizes how that process worked in the previous distribution of grants, with recommendations on how that process might be updated.

After passage of the first ECCG program in 2009, the ELC's former Space Capacity Committee reached out to the CDB staff to start a dialogue on how the agency planned to implement the new law. The ELC Space Capacity Committee was especially concerned with how the CDB (whose primary function is construction management and oversight and who had minimal previous experience in early childhood facilities and programs) would implement the law's requirement that priority be given to projects located in underserved communities, as well as with how program quality would be addressed in the application and considered by the CDB. The CDB expressed to the ELC Space Capacity Committee that its expertise was in evaluating project readiness, and that it was open to the Committee's recommendations on related matters. When the final ECCG Request for Applications was released in August of 2011, three criteria would come to define how the CDB prioritized projects for funding:

- (1) community need;
- (2) strength of the proposed program application; and
- (3) project readiness.

The primary factor related to community need considered by the CDB was a project's location and how that location ranked on an index of need developed by the Space Capacity Committee with analysis provided by the Illinois Early Childhood Asset Map (IECAM) and IFF. This index ranked the 706 municipalities in the state with a population of 1,200 or more, and each of Chicago's 77 community areas, both by the percentage of lower-income children ages birth to 5 that were served by slots in current local early childhood education (ECE) programs (weighted at 25 percent) and the number of local slots still needed to serve these children (weighted at 75 percent). Lower-income children were defined as those from families with incomes below 200 percent of the Federal Poverty Level (FPL), and slots from most ECE programs – Preschool For All, Head Start/Early Head Start, as well as licensed and license-exempt child care centers – were included in calculating the capacity of local ECE providers. Only licensed family child care homes, which by statute are not eligible for ECCG funds, were excluded from the analysis.

The CDB relied heavily on the rankings provided by the Space Capacity Committee for its project selection, particularly because there were no other available data on the statewide need for ECE services at the time. Ultimately, the CDB made awards to applicants in the top 53 of 706 municipalities statewide and in the top 27 of 77 community areas in Chicago⁴. (Note: The Workgroup strongly believes that a similar, easy-to-use index on need – one that factors in and aligns with the newly released statewide and more in-depth data that are available today⁵ – is essential to ensuring that new ECCG funds are directed to underserved areas.)

As part of those ECCG efforts, the Space Capacity Committee also suggested that CDB require all applicants to submit certain details about their proposed program. This included the number of children served, their ages, the ECE programs in which they were participating in and the provider's ExceleRate Illinois quality rating. The intent was that, with these details available, the CDB could consult with experts at the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE), the Governor's Office of Early Childhood Development (GOECD), and the Illinois Department of Human Services (IDHS) to make some determination on the strength of each applicant's proposed program. While the CDB did include a section in its application requesting this information, it does not appear that any

⁴ See Appendix 3

⁵ IFF's *Access and Quality for Illinois Children*, Erikson Institute's *Illinois Risk and Reach Report*, and ISBE's *2018-2019 Illinois Kindergarten Individual Development Survey (KIDS) Report*, among others.

substantive interagency consideration was given to each applicant's proposed programs. We believe this part of the review process should be strengthened with the next round of ECCG grants.

Finally, as to determining project readiness, the Space Capacity Committee largely deferred to the CDB given that this relates to its primary focus as an agency. In addition, the basic project details and development budget requested through the application process were not considered onerous by most ECCG applicants, and were consistent with what is typically required for state-funded capital projects.

Considerations for the Next Request for Applications

In general, we believe the first round of the ECCG program worked well and that its three-part project selection framework⁶ should be maintained. This framework led to identification of a range of capital projects in communities across the state with a demonstrated need for additional ECE services. The CDB did not place burdensome requirements on grantees in its implementation, and was open throughout the process to input from varied ECE stakeholders. Our review does suggest, however, that there are several important opportunities for improvement in the project selection process with the new funds available for the ECCG program. These proposed changes are found in the "Recommendations" section of this report.

Training and Technical Assistance

Because state capital funds become available only rarely, it is critical for ISBE and the CDB to direct funding to communities that are home to the children and families most in need of services. To do this well, training and technical assistance (TA) must be offered both before and after grants are awarded. Put another way, the state should make sure applicants in hard-to-serve communities know about this new funding opportunity, feel prepared to apply if they choose, and feel supported by state agency partners once capital funds start to flow. This is critical for fostering equity and efficiency.

The Workgroup knows that to develop a statewide system of supports that are planned and executed thoughtfully, it will take time and resources. It will also take time and resources for many providers to develop project plans and get them to a stage at which they are ready to apply for funding. Moreover, through this important work, we can make sure this historic capital investment contributes meaningfully to increasing the equitable access of high-quality early childhood services and reducing racial and socio-economic disparities.

Before Grants are Awarded

During the fall of 2011 - together with the CDB - GOECD, IFF, and the ELC Space Capacity Committee coordinated a technical assistance webinar for potential ECCG applicants. The group also developed a "Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ)" document to assist organizations during the ECCG application process. The FAQ document included information on applicant eligibility, the availability and use of funds, the application review and grant award process, and reporting, among other topics.

This new grant process should be no different. The administration should make early childhood programs aware of the allowable uses of ECCG funds, especially projects related to timely, statewide pressures.⁷ Statewide technical assistance should be offered to interested school districts and non-profit providers *before* funding decisions are made to ensure future applicants feel well-informed and comfortable in applying if they choose, particularly those in high-need communities. The greatest focus of this outreach should be

⁶ Local need, strength of application, and project readiness.

⁷ For example, licensed child care facilities are currently working to comply with new requirements to test for and mitigate lead in their drinking water. These are critical safety efforts - but also costly, and many early childhood programs lack the resources to pay for long-term mitigation strategies. At this time, there are no state dollars dedicated to funding these testing or mitigation mandates for child care facilities. The Workgroup believes that the existing ECCG language allows funds to be used for lead abatement to improve the health and safety of children enrolled, and we should therefore consider the opportunities to support programs in need of significant construction as part of long-term mitigation efforts.

communities with a history of underinvestment. The types of supports developed and offered could be modeled after the documents and presentations produced by IFF and others several years ago.

Because there are certain restrictions on the types of technical assistance state agencies can offer, we encourage the early childhood philanthropic community to provide the resources necessary for statewide TA. Also, IFF stands ready again to provide similar technical assistance, with a focus on high-need communities and infant and toddler care.

The Workgroup's provider survey suggests that ISBE and the CDB offer a bidder's conference to help answer questions potential providers might have about the application process. Specifically, the conference – and the FAQ document referenced previously – should include information specific to the development of capital projects for infant and toddler sites, considering these are among the state's most pressing early childhood needs.

During the first ECCG grant cycle, grantees used varied funding sources to meet the state's 10 percent matching requirements: funding from organizational reserves, bank loans, private philanthropy, and fee-for-service income from other program offerings, to name several. The state should continue to allow for this type of flexibility in what it determines to be an appropriate match. In addition, ISBE and the CDB should publish guidance to applicants on the types of funding sources providers may use. This guidance will be particularly helpful to smaller providers or those with less experience navigating state RFA processes, who may not know the myriad ways applicants are allowed to match funds.

After Grants are Awarded

The Workgroup also believes training and technical assistance must be offered to grantees once applicants are selected. Initial ECCG grantees reported a lack of information on the grant program's required billing and financial reporting processes. In particular, the CDB should provide a clear timeline on expected reporting, up front. Similarly, providers said it would be helpful and aid consistency to have specific CDB staff assigned to the ECCG program; communication varied greatly depending on who at the CDB was available to answer phone calls, for instance.

Statutory, Rule, and Policy Changes

No major changes to the current statute, administrative rule, or program rules are needed to implement the next phase of the Early Childhood Construction Grant program. Improvements to the program can happen without such changes, but pursued through updated models for program selection, more active engagement from the Governor's Office, better connections among grantees and administering state agencies, and refined technical assistance offerings.

The Workgroup, however, has included in the "Additional Considerations" section of the report some ideas to contemplate for future revisions to state law and administrative rules.

Early Childhood Construction Grant (ECCG) Program Ad Hoc Workgroup Recommendations

The Workgroup believes the initial ECCG program worked well 10 years ago. The recommendations offered in this report do not call for sweeping changes; in fact, the proposed changes seek to strengthen the existing program with the benefit of new data and the experience of processing grants over the last decade. If carried forward, these recommendations will help drive \$100 million in state capital funding to early childhood providers in communities with the greatest underserved populations of children under 5-years old, better-supporting the research-proven and wide-ranging value of early care and education to Illinois.

Recommendation #1: Update the previous statewide index of need and align it with new studies

The quick reference, easy-to-use index of need developed by the Space Capacity Committee 10 years ago was crucial to ensuring that the CDB primarily allocated ECCG funds based on need, and it is recommended that a similar index should be used again. The ECCG Program will have the benefit of three new statewide studies on access to ECE services and the well-being of children: IFF's *Access and Quality for Illinois Children*, Erikson Institute's *Illinois Risk and Reach Report*, and ISBE's *2018-2019 Illinois Kindergarten Individual Development Survey (KIDS) Report*. A review is suggested regarding how a final index of need aligns with these studies as well as the new categories of priority populations that have been approved by the ELC. Given this new information, the Workgroup experimented with different versions of the previous index of need. While we did not reach a conclusion on a final formula, we strongly believe that:

- a new ranking system must be developed that is easy for the CDB to use and requires little or no subjective interpretation;
- the rankings should again consider both relative and absolute need, with a larger emphasis on absolute need – or the total number of slots needed by communities;
- the rankings should incorporate additional program models, such as Preschool for All Expansion (PFA-E) and licensed homes. This would provide a more accurate picture in some communities of current ECE capacity, even if not all of the programs incorporated are eligible to apply for grants; and
- the rankings could be divided into tiers or quartiles, with the CDB first funding the highest-need tier then – once there are no further, qualifying applications for that category - moving down to the next highest-need tier if there are no qualifying applications.

Members of the Workgroup remain interested in assisting CDB and the state with the finalization of the ranking system.

Recommendation #2: Roll-out the ECCG program in three separate rounds – \$20 million up front, for projects already in the pipeline, and two subsequent rounds of \$30 million each for projects to be developed

Although we know there was substantial demand for ECCG grant funds nearly a decade ago, the early care and education sector has undergone substantial change since then. While there is value in quickly funding shovel-ready projects, there is also value in taking the time to reassess statewide need - and to develop and provide appropriate technical assistance for some of the highest need communities. Staggered funding rounds would also make it possible for the State and ECE stakeholder community to ensure that funds are being distributed equitably and to make interim adjustments as needed.

If awards are distributed in multiple rounds, the Workgroup believes the Illinois General Assembly should reappropriate remaining ECCG grant annually, in every state budget, to avoid the types of harmful funding delays experienced by many grantees from the 2009 program.

Recommendation #3: Strengthen the program review of ECCG applicants selected by the CDB

This is an important change that is needed to the previous ECCG program. In some cases, under that program, the selection criteria were not clear -- especially criteria that addressed program quality and capacity. The State should ensure that selected applicants demonstrate their capacity to deliver the services for which they are funded.⁸ To address this issue, we propose that the Governor's Office of Early Childhood Development take the lead in assembling an interagency group of ECE experts to review and help ensure the CDB's selected projects have the track record and capacity to deliver on their proposed ECE program.

Recommendation #4: Statewide technical assistance should be offered to interested school districts and non-profit providers before funding decisions are made, and also once applicants are selected.

As discussed, statewide technical assistance should be offered to school districts and non-profit providers before funding decisions are made to ensure applicants feel well-informed and comfortable in applying, particularly those in high-need communities. The greatest focus of this outreach should be communities with a history of underinvestment, and if needed, the early childhood philanthropic community should provide additional resources to go beyond what the state can legally provide. The types of supports developed and offered should be modeled after the documents and presentations produced by IFF and others several years ago.

Training and technical assistance should not stop once applicants are selected. It is critical to maintain ongoing support from dedicated staff people concerning billing and financial reporting, timelines, and match reporting, among other issues.

Recommendation #5: The CDB should continue to allow for flexibility in what it determines to be an appropriate local match

The state should continue to allow for maximum flexibility in what it determines to be an appropriate source for matching funds, including funding from organizational reserves, bank loans, private philanthropy, and fee-for-service income from other program offerings, to name several. The Workgroup believes ISBE, IDHS, and the CDB should publish guidance to applicants on the types of funding sources providers may use.

Recommendation #6: Strengthen internal capacity at state agencies

The Workgroup recognizes that its requests create new demands on state agencies. To ensure the necessary support for possible applicants and future grantees is brought to bear, agencies themselves will need additional staff time to develop documents, collaborate across agencies, and provide ongoing assistance to applicants and grantees. In that vein, the Workgroup urges the General Assembly and the Governor's Office to direct additional resources to the CDB, ISBE and IDHS so staff have the time and wherewithal to implement the report's recommendations and fulfill their important obligations to ECE programs as well as the young children, families and communities they serve.

⁸ The CDB and ISBE, as part of the application process, should encourage applicants to collect letters of support from community partners as a mechanism to elicit community input and to encourage community collaboration among potential grantees and other social service providers.

Additional Considerations

The Workgroup discussed many issues on which it did not make final recommendations, but it advises the Governor's Office to consider some of the following items as it works to roll out the ECG program. Members of the Workgroup stand ready to assist the Governor's Office in this work.

- The weighting of applications to incentivize the creation of infant and toddler classrooms, considering this is an area of particularly great need in communities statewide.
- The equitable distribution of grants awarded to public schools and non-profit, community-based organizations to ensure appropriate treatment of all arms of our ECE service-delivery system.
- The weighting of applications to strike a balance between projects aimed to house half-day and full-day ECE slots.
- Awarding grants based on community needs and not the needs of single municipalities (whose boundaries often fail to reflect the composition of actual, local communities).
- Reviewing population trends to ensure facilities are built in communities with children to serve both today *and* in future years.
- Whether or not all applicants should be required to generate the 10 percent match.⁹
- Reviewing state law to make sure non-profit, community-based organizations are not inadvertently made to pay property taxes they do not owe.¹⁰
- A review of the licensing process for new ECE centers, to make sure the timing of new licenses align with each project's timeline.
- The development of formal processes to elicit and act upon authentic parent and community voice in project selection and grantee support.

Special Considerations for Chicago Public Schools (CPS) set-aside funds

In 2011, the ELC Space Capacity Committee provided recommendations in order to inform CPS' application to the CDB for the Chicago set-aside funds. We believe similar recommendations should be given to CPS this cycle. To that end, we suggest:

1. CPS should allocate no more than 50 percent of its capital grant funding to school-based programs and at least 50 percent to community-based organizations in order to help support the city's mixed-delivery system and to increase desperately needed space for infant and toddler services (needs that are more frequently delivered at community- than school-based sites);
2. At a minimum, CPS should partner with the Chicago Department of Family and Support Services (DFSS) and the Mayor's Office in decision-making with respect to the selection of community-based organizations for construction-grant help, given DFSS' expertise and strong connection to community-based early childhood providers;

⁹ In May 2019, State Rep. Dan Ugaste introduced HB3847, a bill that would tie the ECG matching requirements to the local wealth of communities as defined by the state's new evidence-based school funding law for K-12 education. More precisely, the legislation lowers the ECG grants' matching requirement for applicants located in Tier 1 school districts to 3 percent of the awarded grant. From there, a sliding scale is put into place: those in Tier 2 districts = 7.5 percent match, those in Tier 3 = 8.75 percent, and Tier 4 = 10 percent of the awarded grant. The idea behind this measure is that providers in poor communities should not be required to put-up the same type of match as a provider in a wealthier community. This is interesting proposal worth exploring further. The Early Childhood Block Grant FY20 Request for Proposals issued by ISBE during the winter of 2019 included language that targeted grant funds to applicants located in Tier 1 and Tier 2 school district boundaries. The thinking behind this change was that Tier 3 and Tier 4 school districts can more easily fund their own early childhood programs with revenue from local tax levies than can property-poorer systems – and that the state therefore should direct its finite (though growing) state resources to providers located in districts areas that can less afford to self-fund. Similar logic extends to capital grants; there are certain districts and non-profit providers that, by virtue of their geography, socioeconomics, and local wealth, have better access to matching funds than others.

¹⁰ The Workgroup knows of one provider forced to pay property taxes because of an ownership change and building expansion. Because of legal precedent established under *Methodist Old Persons Home vs. Korzen*, child care centers are susceptible to paying property taxes if they are not classified as educational facilities.

3. For its grant-selection criteria, CPS should implement a community-need determination methodology that's similar to the CDB's; and
4. CPS should align the RFA that it issues to community-based organizations with the RFA issued by the CDB, in order to minimize the burden on Chicago community-based organizations that are also applying directly to the CDB for funding.

Appendix 1 – Early Childhood Construction Grant (ECCG) Program Ad Hoc Workgroup Membership

Name	Organization
Jose Cerda III (co-chair)	IFF
Jonathan Doster (co-chair)	Ounce of Prevention Fund
Carmen Garcia (staff)	Ounce of Prevention Fund
Jennifer Alexander	Metropolitan Family Services
Cindy Camacho	Latino Policy Forum
Kelly Cox	Parent
Elaine Duensing	Prevent Child Abuse Illinois
Maria Estlund	Illinois Action for Children
Maricela Garcia	Gads Hill Center
FaKelia Guyton	DuPage Early Childhood Collaboration (DECC)
Dan Harris	Illinois Network of Child Care Resource and Referral Agencies (INCCRRA)
Keith Hollenkamp	Illinois Early Childhood Asset Map (IECAM)
Dr. Jamilah R. Jor'dan	Governor's Office of Early Childhood Development
Cindy La	Asian Human Services
Lori Longueville	John A. Logan College
Lauri Morrison-Frichtl	Illinois Head Start Association
Marcy Mendenhall	SAL Family and Community Services
Erika Mendez	Latino Policy Forum
Sean Noble	ReadyNation Illinois & Fight Crime: Invest in Kids Illinois
Elliot Regenstein	Foresight Policy + Law
Erin Stout	Peoria County Bright Futures/Peoria EC Collaboration
Dawn Thomas	Illinois Early Childhood Asset Map (IECAM)
Edie Washington	Illinois Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS)

Appendix 2 – List of 2009 Grantees

Organization	Amount
<i>Statewide Grants</i>	
Brown Bear Daycare and Learning Center (Harvard)	\$3,200,000
Chicago Urban Day School (Chicago-Englewood)	\$183,690
Christopher House (Chicago- Belmont Cragin)	\$5,000,000
Dolton Park (Dolton)	\$3,500,000
Harlem Community Center Hand-n-Hand Child Care Center (Loves Park)	\$4,000,000
Keeneyville School District 20 (Hanover Park)	\$1,600,000
Korean American Community Services (Chicago-Irving Park)	\$847,625
Lighthouse Early Learning (Cahokia)	\$1,300,000
One Hope United (Joliet)	\$3,100,000
Roseland Community Good News Daycare Center (Chicago-Roseland)	\$461,820
Through A Child's Eyes (Cicero)	\$5,000,000
Tiny Tots Villa (Chicago-Chatham)	\$100,000
Tom Thumb Community Childcare Center (Carpentersville)	\$5,000,000
YWCA Kankakee (Kankakee)	\$2,400,000
<i>Chicago Public Schools Grants¹¹</i>	
Chicago Commons	\$999,994
El Hogar del Niño	\$855,000
Metropolitan Family Services	\$731,712
Asian Human Services Award	\$603,900
Chicago Child Care Society	\$563,089
Mary Crane Center	\$464,105
Concordia Place	\$127,100
Northwestern University Settlement Association	\$116,649
Southeast Asia Center	\$78,097
Children's Place Association	\$64,231

¹¹ CPS also awarded funding to Camras, Hanson Park, J. Locke and McCormick elementary schools

Appendix 3 – List of 2009 Grantees Locations by the CDB Priority Ranking

CDB Grants by Ranking (out of 706 municipalities over 1,200):

- Cicero: 1
- Dolton: 3
- Hanover Park: 9
- Joliet: 16
- Loves Park: 23
- Cahokia: 29
- Kankakee: 40
- Harvard: 50
- Carpentersville: 53

CDB Grants by Ranking (out of 77 Chicago Community Areas):

- Belmont Cragin: 2
- Englewood: 3
- Roseland: 21
- Irving Park: 22
- Chatham: 27

City of Chicago Grants by Ranking (out of 77 Chicago Community Areas):

- Belmont-Cragin: 2
- Belmont-Cragin: 2
- New City: 8
- Englewood: 10
- Humboldt Park: 11
- Rogers Park: 16
- Lower W. Side: 19
- Logan Square: 32
- Logan Square: 32
- Montclare: 44
- Montclare: 44
- Uptown: 58
- Uptown: 58
- West Town: 62
- North Center: 71
- Citywide: NA