

JOE AIELLO
SANGAMON COUNTY CLERK

Sangamon County Complex
200 South Ninth Street, Room 101
Springfield, IL 62701
Telephone: (217)753-6700/Fax: (217)535-3233
Website: www.sangamoncountyclerk.com



MINUTES

SANGAMON COUNTY BOARD

NOVEMBER 12, 2013

The Sangamon County Board met in Reconvened Adjourned September Session on November 12, 2013 in the County Board Chambers. Chairman Van Meter called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. Mr. Montalbano gave the Invocation and Mr. Ratts led the Board in the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

Chairman Van Meter asked the County Clerk to call the roll. There were 27 Present – 1 Absent. Mrs. Douglas Williams was excused.

Mr. Bunch recognized Board Member Sam Montalbano, who is a Veteran, for what he did on Veteran's Day to support those who died and fought for our country. He put on one of the best Veteran's Day Parades this city has ever seen. He would like everyone to know there are not many people like him that would get out and do what he did for those who fought for this country.

MINUTES

A motion was made by Mr. Montalbano, seconded by Mr. Bunch, for approval of the minutes of October 8, 2013. A voice vote was unanimous.

MOTION CARRIED
MINUTES ADOPTED

CORRESPONDENCE

A motion was made by Mr. Bunch, seconded by Mr. Montalbano, to place correspondence on file with the County Clerk. A voice vote was unanimous. There was no correspondence filed.

RESOLUTION 1

1. Resolution approving a petition for a bridge replacement on Cox Road in Auburn Township.

A motion was made by Mr. Fraase, seconded by Mr. Snell, to place Resolution 1 on the floor. Chairman Van Meter asked the Clerk to call the roll. There were 26 Yeas – 0 Nays.

MOTION CARRIED
RESOLUTION ADOPTED

RESOLUTION 2

2. Resolution appropriating motor fuel tax funds for the annual maintenance of county highways.

A motion was made by Mr. Fraase, seconded by Mr. Goleman, to place Resolution 2 on the floor. A motion was made by Mr. Goleman, seconded by Mr. Ratts, that the roll call vote for Resolution 1 stand as the roll call vote for Resolution 2. A voice vote was unanimous.

MOTIONS CARRIED
RESOLUTION ADOPTED

RESOLUTION 3

3. 2013-039 – S. Dennis King, 3660 State Route 104, Auburn – Denying a Variance. County Board Member – Sam Snell, District #6.

A motion was made by Mr. Stumpf, seconded by Mr. Snell, to place Resolution 3 on the floor. Chairman Van Meter asked the professional staff to give the procedural history of the case.

Cyndi Knowles, Professional Staff, stated the petitioner is requesting a variance of Section 17.62.030H to allow an off-premise sign. Molly Berns, Professional Staff, stated the staff recommended denial of the requested variance to allow an off-premise sign. The standards for variation are not met. There do not appear to be any unique circumstances related to the property in allowing an off-premise sign at this location. Ms. Knowles stated the Zoning Board of Appeals concurs with the staff's recommendation and recommends denial of the requested variance.

Dennis King, with Dennis King Roofing, addressed the Board. He is a brand new small business owner, and he wants to put a non-premise sign on his parent's property which is east of Auburn on Route 104. He lives in Springfield now, but he did grow up in Auburn. He is just looking for free advertisement.

A voice vote carried on the motion to adopt Resolution 3. Resolution 3, written to deny a variance, was adopted.

MOTION CARRIED
RESOLUTION ADOPTED

RESOLUTION 4

4. 2013-040 – Quinten Fugnitti, 4885 & 4887 Mechanicsburg Rd., Springfield – Granting a Use Variance and Variance. County Board Member – Sarah Musgrave, District #9.

A motion was made by Mr. Stumpf, seconded by Mrs. Musgrave, to place Resolution 4 on the floor. A motion was made by Mr. Stumpf to waive the reading of the professional staff's report. There were no objections. A voice vote was unanimous for the adoption of Resolution 4.

MOTIONS CARRIED
RESOLUTION ADOPTED

RESOLUTION 5

5. 2013-041 – David & Gale Myers, 919 S. Farmingdale Rd., New Berlin – Granting a Conditional Permitted Use and Variance. County Board Member – Harry "Tom" Fraase, Jr., District #1.

A motion was made by Mr. Stumpf, seconded by Mr. Fraase, to place Resolution 5 on the floor. A motion was made by Mr. Stumpf to waive the reading of the professional staff's report. There were no objections. A voice vote was unanimous for the adoption of Resolution 5.

MOTIONS CARRIED
RESOLUTION ADOPTED

RESOLUTION 6

6. 2013-042 – Kaye Barrett, 12001 & 12005 Ackerman Rd., Virden – Granting Variances. County Board Member – Craig Hall, District #7.

A motion was made by Mr. Stumpf, seconded by Mr. Hall, to place Resolution 6 on the floor.

A motion was made by Mr. Stumpf, seconded by Mr. Montalbano and Mr. Bunch, to remand Resolution 6 back to the Zoning Board of Appeals because of an inaccurate legal description listed on the petition and resolution. A voice vote was unanimous.

MOTION CARRIED

RESOLUTION REMANDED TO ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

RESOLUTION 7

7. 2013-043 – Paula Weatherford, 312 East Houston, Springfield – Denying a Rezoning and Variances. County Board Member – Sarah Musgrave, District #9.

A motion was made by Mr. Stumpf, seconded by Mrs. Musgrave, to place Resolution 7 on the floor. Chairman Van Meter asked the professional staff to give the procedural history of the case. Cyndi Knowles stated the petitioner is requesting a rezoning from RM-4 manufactured home district to B-1 Neighborhood Business District, a variance to allow two principal uses on one parcel, and a variance to allow a residence not on the second floor in the B-1 neighborhood business district to allow a single-family residence and a dog grooming business in the detached garage. Molly Berns stated the staff recommends denial of the requested B-1 zoning as it is seen as being spot zoning and too intense for the immediate area. Allowing a business use in the middle of a residential neighborhood could have a negative effect on the character of the area and can be seen as a detriment. Recommend denial of the variances as the standards for variations are not met. There do not appear to be circumstances unique to the property that is unlike other property in the area. Ms. Knowles stated that the Zoning Board of Appeals concurs with the staff report and recommends denial of the requested rezoning and variances.

Paula Weatherford, petitioner, residing at 312 East Houston in Springfield, addressed the Board. She explained that she just wanted to open a very small dog grooming business with anywhere from five to eight dogs per day. There is just one way in and one way out of Clearlake Village, but there is not a lot of traffic during the day when the business would be open. It would be open from 7:30 in the morning till 3:30 in the afternoon for four days a week. That would limit the traffic through the area. There was a concern with the kids. They want to keep the business during basic school hours when the kids are in school. It's not going to be a booming business with a whole bunch of traffic. It is just a plain and simple small business they want to open there.

Mr. Good asked if there are any other businesses currently in the area. Ms. Weatherford stated she is not aware of any directly in Clearlake Village.

Mary Patarozzi, objector, residing at 307 East Houston in Springfield, addressed the Board. She stated she is opposing this because she has a paper stating there are to be no residential businesses in the neighborhood.

Also, there are many neighborhood children that get off the school bus after school, and there are many there during off-school time such as in the summer, weekends, holidays and days when school is called off for meetings. This is a dead-end street so traffic would bottle neck. Traffic would be turning in and out using her driveway and her neighbor's driveway whenever they are trying to find her place, but she is sure the petitioner would have a sign up. There are grandchildren that live right next door to her that do play in the driveway and in the yard. It would add extra noise, extra traffic and also the roads are very narrow.

Mr. Goleman asked if the paper she has is for a covenant in that area. Mr. Goleman asked if she presented it to the Zoning Board of Appeals. Mrs. Patarozzi stated she did not because she didn't have it at the time, but she does now. Mr. Stumpf suggested she officially submit that. Mr. Stumpf asked the professional staff if that would override anything in the Sangamon County Unincorporated Code. Molly Berns stated covenants are only enforced by a court of law. The zoning could be adopted, but the Zoning Board of Appeals did recommend denial of this based on the other evidence. It would be up to a civil court for people to determine whether it was a violation of covenants. Mr. Stumpf asked if she would need to submit this piece of paper. Dwayne Gab, Assistant State's Attorney, stated he sees this as a completely separate issue. He does not think the Zoning Board of Appeals recommendations for denial were based upon that. She may be right that it is a violation of the covenant, but it would be a separate cause of action between the property owners. It would not be something that would affect the County in how they would rule. He does not think it is something for the County Board to even consider. Chairman Van Meter asked if she can still submit it for the record. Dwayne Gab stated she could if the County Chairman would like for it to be part of the record. The document was submitted to the County Clerk for the record.

Mr. Snell asked if the covenant was brought to the Clearlake Neighborhood Association, and if they voted on it. Mrs. Patarozzi stated it was not, nor did the petitioner come to the neighborhood to ask if they minded if she opened up a dog grooming business.

Ms. Weatherford gave her rebuttal. She stated she did bring it up to the Village Board at the August meeting. They said as long as it was taken to the County and approved, they would have no problem with it whatsoever. She even has a neighbor who is a board member that has no problem with it. They did go to the surrounding neighbors to discuss this and nobody had a problem with it at that time. Mr. Goleman asked if she talked to this neighbor. Ms. Weatherford stated she did not, but her fiancé talked to her husband, and at that time there was no problem.

Mrs. Patarozzi gave her rebuttal. She stated that Ms. Weatherford did not come and talk to her, and she does not remember her husband saying he was spoken to. If they did all they mentioned was that they were going to open a dog grooming business. Mr. Montalbano asked her what approximate area she is located from the petitioner. Mrs. Patarozzi stated she is right across the street. Mr. Montalbano asked what her biggest objection is.

Mrs. Patarozzi stated it is the extra traffic, the bottle necking, the roads are very narrow and there is no room for cars to pass or park, though she does know there will be a place to park. The school bus comes in and it stops right there to let the kids off, and they walk through the yards.

Mrs. Hills asked if this would set a precedent in the area for people to ask for B-1 if this is granted. Molly Berns, professional staff, stated it would. When they did the staff analysis, in addition to determining whether or not a petitioner's request meets the findings of fact and standards for variation, they do consider whether or not there has been a precedent or trend that has been established by other actions of the County Board.

Mr. DelGiorno asked if granting of the variance would be personal to just this property or to the owner. Molly Berns explained that the request is for a rezoning, so if the Board were to agree that the property could be rezoned from RM-4 to B-1, it would be only specific to that particular property. Any variances granted to allow the two uses on the property, including the dog grooming business and the single family residence on the second floor, would be specific to that property. When there is a trend of development in the area, staff does look at past actions of the County Board to establish if there is a trend for the rest of the neighborhood. Certainly that would be reflected in a future staff analysis if that request were to come up. Mr. DelGiorno asked for clarification if there could not be another business opened on that property once this business is stopped. Mrs. Berns explained that staff did not recommend, in the alternative, to grant a use variance specific to this property. They did not believe the standards for variation were met to grant a use variance in the alternative.

A voice vote was unanimous on the motion to adopt Resolution 7. Resolution 7, written to deny a rezoning and variances, was adopted.

MOTION CARRIED
RESOLUTION ADOPTED

RESOLUTION 8

8. 2013-044 – Patrick O'Dell, 123 North Stephens, Springfield – Granting a Rezoning.
County Board Member – Rose Ruzic, District #18.

A motion was made by Mr. Stumpf, seconded by Mrs. Ruzic, to place Resolution 8 on the floor. Chairman Van Meter asked the professional staff to give the procedural history of the case. Cyndi Knowles stated that petitioner is requesting a rezoning from R-2 single and two-family residence district to RM-4 manufactured home district. Molly Berns stated that staff recommends approval. The suitability of the current R-2 zoning is inappropriate given the current use of the property. The petitioner would like to replace the existing structure, which is in fair condition, with a newer mobile home which requires rezoning the property to RM-4. Staff recognizes that the property is an existing lot of record and is very small. It would be difficult for the petitioner to build a single-family residence to comply with the current zoning regulations.

Given the setback requirements for the current zoning, the buildable footprint for a single-family residence would be no larger than 25'x75', unless the owner seeks further setback variances. Ms. Knowles stated the Zoning Board of Appeals concurs with the staff report and recommends approval of the requested rezoning.

Patrick O'Dell, petitioner, residing at 19 Acadia in Springfield, addressed the Board. He stated he was born and raised in the neighborhood. His family has been in the area since 1956 or 1957. He has a chance to put his son in a nicer and newer mobile home in place of the older run down mobile home that is there now.

Lee Cloyd, objector, residing at 115 North Stephens in Springfield, addressed the Board. He stated he has been here before because they had another vacant lot and they wanted to put another used trailer on there too. You zoned that one down, and now they are going through the same thing again. He said he went through the neighborhood and got 62 people that said no and 10 people that said yes to this. In their block alone, eight people said no. Mr. Goleman asked what his main opposition is to this. Mr. Cloyd stated the mobile home there now has been condemned. It is only 10 foot x 50 foot long. He had to cut down the trees on the lot to get this used mobile home back in there. They don't want to see another one back in there. They have looked at this condemned one for 15 years. Nobody has done anything about it because it was condemned. Mr. Bunch stated he doesn't know why they would want the eyesore there that is there now. He does think the trees will have to come down. He asked what the purpose is of wanting to leave the old home there when someone wants to beautify the neighborhood. Mr. Cloyd stated he has tried to get them to take it out, and the County Board would not make them take it out. Mr. Bunch stated they could not really make someone take it out. He thinks if someone wants to beautify the neighborhood, it just makes more sense to have something nice there. He does not think the O'Dell's intend to make a junkyard there. Mr. Cloyd stated it is just the idea. He is going to put his boy there he says. But, how long will he live there? It would go back to rental property like the other ones. That is why they don't want it.

Mr. O'Dell gave his rebuttal. He stated he just wants what is good for the neighborhood, and he did bring in pictures for them to look at. Mr. Montalbano asked if there would be skirting or a concrete platform. Mr. O'Dell stated there would be skirting and it would be on a concrete slab.

Mrs. Fulgenzi asked what the size of the lot is. Mr. O'Dell stated it is 40'x80'. Mrs. Fulgenzi asked if there is a 10'x50' on there now. Mr. O'Dell stated there is. Mrs. Fulgenzi asked what the size is of the home they propose to put on there. Mr. O'Dell stated it is 16'x75'. Mr. O'Dell clarified that the lot size is 40'x120'.

Mr. Cloyd gave his rebuttal. There is a trailer across the street that was nice, and now all the windows are knocked out of it. He does not want his property taxes to go down because of all these trailers being there, and the neighborhood does not want it. Chairman Van Meter clarified that he thinks Mr. Cloyd meant they do not want their property values to go down. Mr. Cloyd agreed.

A voice vote was unanimous on the motion to adopt Resolution 8.

MOTION CARRIED
RESOLUTION ADOPTED

RESOLUTION 9

9. 2013-045 – Gary Cooper, 4320 Sage Rd., Rochester – Granting a Rezoning and Variances. County Board Member – Sarah Musgrave, District #9.

A motion was made by Mr. Stumpf, seconded by Mrs. Musgrave, to place Resolution 9 on the floor. A motion was made by Mr. Stumpf to waive the reading of the professional staff's report. There were no objections. A voice vote was unanimous for the adoption of Resolution 9.

MOTIONS CARRIED
RESOLUTION ADOPTED

RESOLUTION 10

10. 2013-046 – Tracy Walker & Kathy Edens, 4014 & 4016 Thornbrook Dr., Springfield – Granting Variances. County Board Member – Abe Forsyth, District #27.

A motion was made by Mr. Stumpf, seconded by Mr. Forsyth, to place Resolution 10 on the floor. A motion was made by Mr. Stumpf to waive the reading of the professional staff's report. There were no objections. A voice vote was unanimous for the adoption of Resolution 10.

MOTIONS CARRIED
RESOLUTION ADOPTED

RESOLUTION 11

11. 2013-047 – Kim Villanueva & Sarah Iaiennaro, 1109 N. Koke Mill Rd., Springfield – Granting a Rezoning and Variances. County Board Member – Harry "Tom" Fraase, Jr., District #1.

A motion was made by Mr. Stumpf, seconded by Mr. Fraase, to place Resolution 11 on the floor. A motion was made by Mr. Stumpf to waive the reading of the professional staff's report. There were no objections. A voice vote was unanimous for the adoption of Resolution 11.

MOTIONS CARRIED
RESOLUTION ADOPTED

RESOLUTION 12

12. 2013-048 – George Backstein, 26 Amberley Rd., Springfield – Granting a Use Variance and Variances. County Board Member – David Mendenhall, District #3.

A motion was made by Mr. Stumpf, seconded by Mr. Mendenhall, to place Resolution 12 on the floor. A motion was made by Mr. Stumpf to waive the reading of the professional staff's report. There were no objections. A voice vote was unanimous for the adoption of Resolution 12.

MOTIONS CARRIED
RESOLUTION ADOPTED

RESOLUTION 13

13. John Staff, 304 W. Browning Rd., Springfield – Granting a Variance of Chapter 16.72, Development in Special Flood Hazard Areas.

A motion was made by Mr. Fulgenzi, seconded by Mr. Stumpf, to place Resolution 13 on the floor. A motion was made by Mr. Stumpf to waive the reading of the professional staff's report. There were no objections.

MOTIONS CARRIED
RESOLUTION ADOPTED

RESOLUTION 14

14. Resolution approving the annual budget and appropriation for Sangamon County for the Fiscal Year December 1, 2013 through November 30, 2014.

A motion was made by Mr. Goleman, seconded by Mr. Preckwinkle, to place Resolution 14 on the floor.

Mr. Goleman stated he is presenting the proposed budget tonight on behalf of the Finance Committee. It is a good balanced budget. It adequately funds all the departments and elected officials' budgets. He called upon Brian McFadden, County Administrator, for a PowerPoint presentation.

Mr. McFadden thanked Terry Viar and Brad Hammond from the Auditor's office for all their work on the budget. Fiscal Year 2014 begins December 1. He stated he is going to start with revenue because they base the budget upon what kind of revenue they have. The General Fund increase this year is a little over \$1 million, with a total budget of \$46 million. This is a 2.5% increase. That is pretty much in line with the All Funds at \$99.6 million. Both of those increases are a little over 2%. It is kind of in line with what they have been seeing the last couple of years.

In 2008 and 2009 when the bottom fell out they did some major cuts. Since then they have been averaging around a 2.5% to 3% growth in General Funds and All Funds. When you look at the major revenue sources, the biggest one is property tax at a little over \$28 million. It is an increase of \$1 million at 3.6%. The second largest revenue item is Fines and Fees. It is also going up this year, but is much more modest at 1.2% in the amount of \$14.7 million. The next largest revenue item is the State Tax Distribution, which is a combination of sales tax, income tax, use tax and personal property replacement tax. It increased by 1%. They are seeing modest growth on the taxes and fines and fees, which is certainly better than what they saw in the past years when the numbers were going backwards. Still, they are not seeing the increases they seen before the recession. The last item is State Reimbursements which is essentially flat. Flat isn't bad compared to what they have dealt with in the past. The good news with the Juvenile Center is that the salary reimbursement went up a little bit by \$65,000. The salary reimbursement to the County Clerk's office went down by \$23,000. Overall, it is pretty much flat for revenue growth.

They have seen modest progress when it comes to the General Fund. The General Fund pays for things like the Sheriff's office, and is kind of the nuts and bolts of County government. With All Funds the numbers got distorted greatly in 2010 and 2011. Primarily, this was because they received a lot of stimulus funding for various programs back in 2010 and 2011 in an amount over \$14 million. None of that went to the General Fund. It was all tied to specific programs. In 2011 they had their first debt certificates issued for the purchase and renovation of the Public Health Department building. That kind of manipulates the numbers a little bit, and does not give you a total picture of what is going on. The General Fund picture is a little more realistic of what the environment is out there.

With sales and income tax, they are still far short from what they were getting back in 2008. They are about \$500,000 from what they were getting then. They have not recovered the loss there, and are also down \$260,000 on the sales tax side and down \$700,000 on the income tax side. These two major revenue sources have not recovered from the recession. The theme here is modest growth to get some of that back, but it is nowhere near where they were. They have seen more growth in the supplemental sales tax, which is the 1/4% they get county-wide. They get the 1 ¼% on anything in the unincorporated county, and 1/4% on everything in the county. The 1/4% they get is recovering much modestly, but more aggressively than the portion in the unincorporated area, which is down this year. There have been some annexations in the city which could be affecting it.

The growth in property tax is \$1 million; with a total amount of \$28.1 million. Over 90% of that really goes to four separate levies. The General Fund gets \$16 million, pension is almost \$5 million, Highway is \$3.3 million and Public Health is \$1.7 million. The rest are the smaller levies, such as Child Advocacy Commission and Veteran's Assistance Commission. As you can see the growth here has been modest, but more on a steady path than what they have seen with the sales and income tax numbers. With the CPI, it is hard to budget and anticipate when it bounces around a lot like that.

The average over the last 10 years has been 2.4%. The average over the last five years has been 1.8%. To the credit of the Collective Bargaining Committee, the planning has been easier because they have been able to get most of the union contracts tied to the CPI, with the exception of the Deputies and the Corrections Unit. That has been great because they can plan accordingly based upon that.

The property tax rate had a dramatic drop off in 2007, which is when the County eliminated the levy for the Public Building Commission. They saw a modest increase in the rate in the last couple years. The rate has been up and down, but is still far lower than what it was in 2006. It's about 7% lower than what it was in 2006 and even lower than what it was in 2005. A couple things have complicated the rate and levy this year. The Park South TIF, which is in the City of Springfield, came off line and expired. Under the PTELL (Property Tax Extension Limitation Law), if a TIF expires the taxing bodies can grab that EAV base and push it back into their levy and rate calculation. That generated about \$130,000 in additional property tax revenue with the expiration of that TIF. For comparison purposes, it was over \$1 million for District 186 because it is located within that school district. That helped push the number up a little bit. For the calculation, they have reduced the new growth number. There is only about four or five numbers to figure into the calculation on the levy, and new growth is one of those. They have been a little aggressive in the past calculating at 3%. In fact, it has been less than 1% in the last two years. So they have lowered that number to 1.5%. If they don't hit the 3% their number is off, and they would have to cut accordingly.

The other issue is the debt service for the Limited Tax Liability Bonds (Tort Immunity Bonds) they have issued. The Finance Committee gave him a directive to push that debt service into the levy so there would be no impact. When they calculated the levy it was calculated as if the debt service wasn't there, and then they came up with a number and pushed the debt service in there. The debt service has no impact on the levy or the rate. It was absorbed within the existing levy. Another thing to point out is they have implemented the TORT Tax where they are charging departments a portion of the cost for the claims against those departments. They have taken 10 years of data and have taken off the low point and high point and averaged it out. It averaged out to approximately \$300,000 a year in claims costs. They then take a ten year average portion and apply it to those departments. The Sheriff's office accounts for about 90% of that. Their assessment this year was over \$80,000. Public Health is 5% and Highway is around 1%. But they are now putting money into Fund 14 to help off-set the claims costs generated by their department. That is new in this year's budget. The departments had to accommodate that and make those cuts within their budgets.

There was a drop with fines and fees when the recession hit in 2008, and they have not yet recovered. Fines and fees are a very large revenue source for the County. It is primarily generated by the Courts Department. The courts generate almost \$5 million of the \$14.7 million. Public Health generates a little over \$2 million and 911 is just under \$2 million. Proposed in this year's budget is a fee increase for the Child Advocacy Commission.

There is also an increase in zoning fees. Those are not budgeted. Per County policy, when they implement a fee increase, they do not budget the revenue for a year to give them a little bit of actual data to see how it is going to perform. There are revenues in this budget from fees that were increased last year. One is video gaming, which has generated over \$100,000 in revenue. They also increased the marriage license fee, which generated \$27,000. Those are in the budget this year. However, those increases have been off-set by reductions in fees generated through the Sheriff's office and Recorder's office. They have adjusted those down based upon past trends, so the gains from the video gaming and marriage licenses are kind of wiped out by those two.

Mr. McFadden discussed expenditures. He stated that the numbers are going to match what was in revenue. These are balanced budgets, and by law they have to pass a balanced budget, so revenue and expenditures will match. As always, personnel is a major part of their costs. Headcount is down 10 positions from last year. In the last three or four years, they have eliminated over 100 positions. Payroll is up about 3.7%, which is \$1.2 million. That is the biggest single expenditure item they have within the budget. Each budget was built to accommodate a 2% COLA. They did apply a lag to that as they have in the past. The hiring lag simply reflects the fact that not every department will be fully funded all the time. There will be vacancies, and they have a 30-day policy for filling vacancies. If you have to lag that position for 30 days, that will equal a 1% lag. So what really went into the budget was 1%, but with the lag they can accommodate a 2% COLA. That lag is much smaller than what they have done in the past. Pension costs continue to increase. This year they are up a little over 5% at \$284,000. The County's contribution to the employee health insurance fund has actually gone down by 4.5%, which is nearly \$200,000. That is a really unusual item and you will not see too many local governments talking about that. Health insurance is really helping them off-set some of their other cost increases. The overall debt has gone down about 2.7%. That is a little misleading, and he will show in the chart why that situation is.

The expense history in the General Fund is going to mirror what they saw on the revenue side. There was a big drop in 2010 when they did the 10% cut across the board. There has been modest growth since then. You will see the same kind of numbers on All Funds. You will see the stimulus funds and bond funds push those numbers artificially up. They dropped back when the stimulus funds went away and the bond proceeds were spent.

Mr. McFadden asked Tim Zahrn, County Engineer, to address the Board regarding the Fleet Maintenance Department. Mr. Zahrn stated a couple years ago they looked at consolidating the Sheriff's Department mechanics with the Highway Department's mechanics, and those two departments were asked to look at that and put them all in one department. On June 1, 2012 the Fleet Maintenance Department was created. They moved the Sheriff's mechanic out to the Highway Department and integrated him with the mechanics out there. During that first year of the consolidation, they worked on 287 vehicles at the Fleet Maintenance Department. Of those 287 vehicles, they performed 1,073 work orders. They had 1,000 different work orders go through the department that year. Prior to that first year of operation, they really didn't have a way to track how work orders were being prepared. Each department was just working on their own vehicles.

They did go back and look at that same year and they worked on 221 separate vehicles, but he doesn't have the number of work orders for that time. They can look at costs for the previous year and look at the costs for the first year of operation of the Fleet Maintenance Department. During that first year they were billed \$166,000 in parts. The way they are operating fleet maintenance is the departments are only seeing parts being billed back to them. They do not see any of the labor costs. That is being covered in the General Fund. They are in essence covering all the labor costs through the General Fund. That compares to \$206,000 in parts that were billed out the previous year with the Sheriff and Highway Departments. A lot of the other departments, during the year of consolidation, contracted \$58,000 worth of outside repairs. These were repairs that were maybe beyond what the mechanics can handle out there, such as a major transmission overhaul or something like that. That compares to \$138,000 the previous year, before consolidation. Those other departments that were not taking vehicles to the Fleet Maintenance Department were obviously billing outside. They also compared their current labor costs. They are currently down a headcount. They are at eight now versus nine. Labor costs for the consolidation year was \$494,000 versus \$522,000 prior to consolidation. This gives the entire budget a total savings of a little over \$148,000 for that first year of consolidation. When they went into this they actually estimated around \$70,000 worth of savings, just counting on the elimination of one headcount and a little bit of savings on outside repairs. But, they have obviously seen much better savings than that. That is about a 17% savings over the previous year's budget. Chairman Van Meter stated that is outstanding. It is really fantastic to see this project work as well as it did. He asked if the labor relations with the guys out there are good. Mr. Zahn stated they are. They did have to combine two unions because the Sheriff's Department had a separate union from the Highway Department. They worked that into one unit. Mr. McFadden stated this did exceed their expectations with savings at about \$75,000 per year. He thinks all the departments are using the department and are thrilled with the service. Their costs have been reduced, mechanics are doing more work, and they are saving money.

Mr. McFadden discussed the headcount numbers. A big chunk of the reductions came out of the Sheriff's office. They have actually eliminated 12 positions. Seven of those came out of the Sheriff's office; three came out of Court Services; one out of Buildings and Grounds; and one out of the Circuit Clerk's office. There was an addition of a position in the Regional Planning Commission that is grant related. There was also the addition of an Inspector for the State Fairgrounds in the Public Health Department, which is funded through a state grant. The new positions are all grant funded, so when the grant goes away the positions go away as well. You can see the dramatic drop in employees since 2007 when there was 807 employees total. There are details in the budget documents showing what the reductions and additions are department by department.

There is a great trend in health insurance. This will be the third year in a row they will see a reduction in the County's contribution to the Employee Health Insurance Fund. He doesn't believe any other local government around here sees that kind of trend. The credit goes to the Board of Managers that consists of employees and County Board members. They run an excellent program. The employees contribute and take their roles seriously.

They guard the fund pretty strongly. They have a strong insurance program that protects them against any huge claim losses in a particular year. All of that is working to their advantage. The reduction this year is almost \$200,000. The last audited fund balance amount was a little over \$8 million. That is projected to grow this year as well. They will not really see the impact of the Affordable Care Act because the implementation date is after their budget year. They do have a couple fees they will have to pay which total up to about \$35,000. They are going to come out of this fund and the General Fund. The impact of the overall law will probably be minimal. The County's plan is considered a large self-funded plan and was exempted from many requirements of the law. They can thank organized labor for this because the prime push to get large self-funded plans like theirs are done by the unions. They push hard to get exempted and they got pulled along with them. They do not anticipate a huge major impact. They are already living within a lot of the caps, such as the people who have to be on the plan up to age 26. The minimum standards for plans will not apply to them. Part of the reason the number is going down in the negative is because they do have fewer employees and a well ran plan. The Board of Managers has done a very good job of estimating claims versus actual claims. The last couple years they dipped into the fund balance to help off-set some premium increases for both the County and employees. Even with projecting a dip into the fund balance, they have still grown the fund balance in that fund. This is a very good success story and the County Board should be proud of everyone's effort on this.

Mr. McFadden asked Paul Palazzolo, Auditor, to address the Board regarding worker's compensation. Mr. Palazzolo stated the worker's compensation situation is very positive. In 2005 it became evident that the worker's compensation situation was not headed in a very positive direction. They have instituted some changes. They added the medical case management company and the Safety Committee they started in 2010. The result is that the premiums they pay to the Illinois Public Risk Funds have finally decreased below \$1 million this coming fiscal year. The highpoint was in 2009 at \$1.5 million, and is at \$925,000 in 2014. Three of the County Board members are on the Safety Committee. Clyde Bunch is chairman and Tim Krell and Dave Mendenhall are also on the committee along with employees who review accidents in the workplace and work on ways to make some changes based on what they have learned from those accidents. You can see the positive result from payments they make for premiums. Claims expenses are down as well. The highpoint was in 2005 at \$1,486,000 and in 2009 \$1,497,000. They are now down to \$249,000. They do not expect it to rise too much farther from 2012 during this current fiscal year. They have positive results from the medical case management firm that shepherds those injured employees once they have experienced an accident in the workplace, and the Safety Committee that works to learn from what those injuries were. There were 188 injuries in 2007, 109 injuries in 2010 when they enacted the Safety Committee, 74 injuries in 2011, 75 injuries in 2012 and 63 injuries in 2013. The Safety Committee is doing a good job in making sure Sangamon County is a safe environment in which to work. Once an injury does happen, the medical case management firm shepherds injured employees once they have experienced an injury in the workplace.

Mr. McFadden addressed the pension costs. The increase this year in pension costs was a little over 5% at \$284,000. The costs have gone up in the last 10 years by 86% on pensions. They are IMRF and are not in a police or fire self-funded plan. When they get the bill they do have to pay it. There is no guessing on returns on investments or those kinds of things to try and drive the number down. Overall the fund is about 60% funded, which is not where everyone wants to see it. It is certainly higher than what you see with a lot of the state plans. This number would have increased more dramatically if they hadn't eliminated 100 positions in the last two or three years. They do expect a long term upward trend on this number.

The County's long-term debt consists of their two outstanding bond issues. One is the debt certificates used to purchase the Public Health building, and the other is for the upgrades done in the County Building. There is also the issue of the Limited Tax Liability Bonds, which actually came in this fiscal year. That is why you see the trend up. They will have their first year of payment on the Tort Immunity Bonds, so this year's budget will drop. They will continue to have the payments on the debt certificates and eat away at the principle on that. The short term debt has been dropping pretty dramatically in the last couple years. It consists of three things including: the payment of the voting systems the County Clerk's office had financed, the payment of the improvements to the roof and cooling and heating systems at the Animal Control Center, and the pay off of the building in general. There is also one round of vehicles in the Sheriff's office they are paying down.

Mr. McFadden concluded his presentation. He thanked Brad Hammond and Terry Viar for their help. He also thanked the department heads and directors. They have a good group that gets the program and understand what they have to do to live within their means. For the most part, they go right along with the program and make it pretty easy for him to work with them.

Mr. Stumpf asked what other mechanisms there are to reduce the contributions to IMRF. Mr. McFadden stated they have made a number of changes. The number is driven by things they do and mostly by what the market returns and investments are. When the market dropped it brought everyone down with it. They smoothed it out over a three year period, but everybody's contributions went up to make up for those market losses. They had a situation where they were doing payouts for some employees on their last day of employment that was artificially bumping up their pensions. The County voted to end that policy, so that does have an impact on it. Some of the payouts are made at a later date so they don't calculate in their final salary. That was one of the biggest steps they have taken to try and mitigate that increase.

Mr. DelGiorno thanked John Fulgenzi, as Chair of Buildings and Grounds, because it was the only committee that did have a full budget meeting scheduled. He asked Mr. McFadden about the \$800,000 plus increase in the Sheriff's office budget that was mentioned in the State Journal-Register. The Sheriff accounted for about \$350,000 in increased medical costs for inmates and he does understand that. He asked what the other \$500,000 is budgeted for in the Sheriff's Department since there are no new deputies being hired.

Mr. McFadden explained that the increases in the Sheriff's office come in a couple different ways. First of all there are just the overall wage increases they have settled. They have settled the Patrol Division and Court Security contracts. There was a 3.8% increase there. They did receive some wage concessions from them in return. There was the creation of a tier-two wage structure for all new deputies. That is built in there. They have also increased the overtime budget, which is being driven primarily by the Corrections Unit. That number went up by at least \$400,000. The jail medical costs were up about \$120,000. Auto maintenance was up maybe \$40,000. So there are a number of small things. If you want to pick out the big things, it would be the personnel costs and the jail medical costs. They do have a contractual arrangement for jail medical which has a cost that comes with it, but once they exceed that cost there is an amount above that is included. It is about a \$50,000 figure, and they are exceeding that number every year. It is getting worse and worse because they are having more and more people coming into the jail who are in bad medical condition. One person is a candidate for a liver transplant and another had a serious heart condition. The County could have potentially been on the line to pay for those items; however, they did not in those cases. The overall increase in the Sheriff's budget was just a little under a \$1 million, which is over a 5% increase. He also pointed out that you saw where the overall increases in wages was 3.6% and he talked about the 2% being built into the budget. Some of the personnel numbers went up a little bit artificially because when they were lagging they brought the number down, brought it back up to a base, added the 2%, subtracted the 1 and brought some people back up. It kind of increased it by more than that 2%. The Sheriff's office has a little bit of that in their budget.

Mr. DelGiorno asked if the new claim assessment being levied accounts for any of that. Mr. McFadden stated it does. The Sheriff's office accommodated that by eliminating two deputy positions that have been vacant for quite some time. The number of positions that were vacant and because those two were eliminated it accounted for about \$70,000 of the \$86,000 the Sheriff's office had to contribute. There was \$16,000 that was reduced in other ways. That really didn't add to the cost. They covered that within the existing budget.

Mr. DelGiorno stated that Josh Langfelder, Recorder, requested an additional position at the Building & Grounds Committee meeting and it was approved. He noticed that it is not included the budget. He asked what the rationale is for that. Mr. McFadden stated he would not say it is denied yet. The Recorder has made the argument for the additional position, and has made the argument that it would ultimately save the County money. The position would be used primarily to scan in documents and get caught up on getting their documents in an electronic format. He made the case and it came late in the process. He told the Recorder they would move forward without that new position in the budget; however, they will have a subsequent meeting with the Recorder. He will then make his case that it will save money. He explained to Mr. Langfelder that they will think outside the box. They have created positions in the past that have actually saved them money, and if that is the case this time they are more than willing to look at that. As you can see, they normally do not create new positions or put new positions in the budget. They are doing just the opposite. It is an unresolved issue right now. The threshold the Recorder would need to meet is to convince the Board and Finance Committee that the position would save the County money.

Mr. Hall asked if all the department heads have met their target budgets. Mr. McFadden stated they have. They were able to resolve everything, with the exception of the one thing with the Recorder.

Chairman Van Meter stated it is a few easy keystrokes to get these graphs showing the lines trending in the right way, but it takes a tremendous amount of work to get these lines moving either up or down depending on the subject matter. It takes work on the part of the entire County community, with everyone pulling in the same direction to deliver the services they deliver to the community with reduced staff, and to live within the budget means they have been given by the taxpayers. It is really a tremendous effort, and the County Administrator deserves the foremost credit for getting the whole team going in the same direction on that. They really do appreciate it.

Mr. Goleman echoed the Chairman's comments. Their trend is not to create more jobs in Sangamon County. They are not an employment agency. They are all about living within their means and to meet the obligations of the department heads and elected officials. They have got to become more efficient. The voters told them back in 1995 that they wanted the tax caps and that is what they have done. They will continue to live within their means. They will sit down and talk with anyone that has a suggestion on why they think they need some additional personnel. But, they do need to have good justification for that, and they will continue to keep doing that. He thinks it is because of that they are able to maintain balanced budgets and able to live within their means and move on. They will continue to keep doing that.

Chairman Van Meter asked for a roll call vote on the motion to adopt Resolution 14. Upon the roll call vote, there were 25 Yeas – 1 Nay. Mr. DelGiorno voted no.

MOTION CARRIED
RESOLUTION ADOPTED

RESOLUTIONS 15 – 19

15. Resolution approving amendments to the Fiscal Year 2013 Sangamon County Budget.

A motion was made by Mr. Goleman, seconded by Mr. Preckwinkle, to place Resolution 15 on the floor. A motion was made by Mr. Bunch, seconded by Mr. Smith, to consolidate Resolutions 15 – 19. Chairman Van Meter asked the Clerk to read Resolutions 16 – 19.

16. Resolution approving a list of contracts for employee benefits for 2014.

17. Resolution approving the renewal of an agreement with R.W. Troxell & Company for the County's self-insurance programs.

18. Resolution approving the renewal of the County's contract with Triune for comprehensive medical case management services.

19. Resolution designating the State's Attorney's Appellate Prosecutor as the County's agent to process appellate court cases.

A voice vote was unanimous on the consolidation. Mr. Montalbano commented on Resolution 17. He stated that they probably have one of the best self-insurance funds around. That is a credit to R.W. Troxell and everyone else. Bruce from Blue Cross is always at their meetings. Mr. Montalbano commended Terry Viar and Brad Hammond for being so good at what they do.

A motion was made by Mr. Montalbano, seconded by Mr. Bunch, to waive the ten-day filing period. A voice vote was unanimous.

A motion was made by Mr. Goleman, seconded by Mrs. Musgrave, that the roll call vote for Resolution 1 stand as the roll call vote for Resolutions 15-19, as consolidated. A voice vote was unanimous.

MOTIONS CARRIED
RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED

OLD BUSINESS

There was no old business.

Mr. Hall encouraged every member of the County Board to make other committee meetings besides the ones they are on so they can see and understand how things work and how things are achieved. He applauds those who are on the committees, but he thinks people who don't understand things maybe need to vote no until they understand it. He would like people that vote no on things to maybe come to a Finance meeting and sit in on some meetings to learn how this thing works. That is just a statement to everybody and is not aimed at any particular person.

NEW BUSINESS

A. Resolutions

There were no new resolutions.

B. Appointments

Appointment of Mike Keafer to the Sangamon County Building Code Board of Appeals for a term expiring November, 2014.

Appointment of Mike Krall to the Sangamon County Building Code Board of Appeals for a term expiring November, 2014.

Appointment of Keith Moore to the Sangamon County Building Code Board of Appeals for a term expiring November, 2014.

Appointment of Henry "Pat" Patterson to the Sangamon County Building Code Board of Appeals for a term expiring November, 2014.

Appointment of Richard Scott Saunders to the Sangamon County Building Code Board of Appeals for a term expiring November, 2014.

Appointment of Rev. Silas Johnson to the Community Services Block Grant Advisory Board for a unexpired term to expire February, 2016.

Appointment of James Davenport to the Woodwreath Cemetery Board for a term expiring November, 2019.

Appointment of Diane Simpson to the Woodwreath Cemetery Board for a term expiring November, 2019.

A motion was made by Mr. Montalbano, seconded by Mr. Bunch, for approval of the appointments. A voice vote was unanimous.

The nominations for appointment in December were also submitted.

MOTION CARRIED
APPOINTMENTS ADOPTED

**REPORTS OF COUNTY OFFICIALS, REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES,
REPORTS OF SPECIAL COMMITTEES, COMMITTEE REPORT ON CLAIMS**

A motion was made by Mr. Bunch, seconded by Mr. Montalbano, to place the Committee Report on Claims on file with the County Clerk. A voice vote was unanimous.

MOTION CARRIED
REPORTS FILED

RECESS

A motion was made by Mr. Montalbano, seconded by Mr. Bunch, to recess the meeting to December 10, 2013 at 7:00 p.m. A voice vote was unanimous.

MOTION CARRIED
MEETING RECESSED

JOE AIELLO
SANGAMON COUNTY CLERK