

# DON GRAY

SANGAMON COUNTY CLERK

SANGAMON COUNTY COMPLEX  
200 SOUTH NINTH STREET – ROOM 101  
SPRINGFIELD, ILLINOIS 62701  
TELEPHONE: 217-753-6700/FACSIMILE: 217-535-3233  
WEBSITE: [www.sangamoncountyclerk.com](http://www.sangamoncountyclerk.com)



## MINUTES

### SANGAMON COUNTY BOARD

NOVEMBER 14, 2017

The Sangamon County Board met in Reconvened Adjourned September Session on November 14, 2017 in the County Board Chambers. Chairman Van Meter called the meeting to order at 7:05 p.m. Ms. Sheehan gave the Invocation and Mr. Fraase led the County Board in the Pledge of Allegiance. Chairman Van Meter and the County Board acknowledged all of the Veterans in the room.

## ROLL CALL

Chairman Van Meter asked County Clerk Gray to call the roll. There were 26 Present – 3 Absent. Mr. Forsyth, Mr. O'Neill, and Mr. Thomas were excused.

## MINUTES

A motion was made by Ms. Sheehan, seconded by Mr. Bunch, for approval of the Minutes of October 10, 2017. A voice vote was unanimous.

MOTION CARRIED  
MINUTES ADOPTED

## CORRESPONDENCE

A motion was made by Mr. Bunch, seconded by Ms. Sheehan, to place correspondence on file with the County Clerk. A voice vote was unanimous.

## RESOLUTION 1

1. Resolution allocating motor fuel tax funds for the maintenance of County highways.

A motion was made by Mr. Fraase, seconded by Mrs. Fulgenzi, to place Resolution 1 on the floor. Upon a roll call vote, there were 25 Yeas – 0 Nays for the adoption of Resolution 1.

MOTION CARRIED  
RESOLUTION ADOPTED

**RESOLUTION 2**

2. 2017-044 – James and Sandra Farris, 7563 New City Road, Rochester – Granting a Variance. County Board Member – Jeff Thomas, District #4.

A motion was made by Mr. Ratts, seconded by Mrs. Deppe, to place Resolution 2 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 2.

MOTIONS CARRIED  
RESOLUTION ADOPTED

**RESOLUTION 3**

3. 2017-045 – Dennis Branner, 2727 S. Pasfield Street, Springfield – Denying a Rezoning and granting a Use Variance. County Board Member – Clyde Bunch, District #21.

A motion was made by Mr. Bunch, seconded by Mrs. Small, to place Resolution 3 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 3.

MOTIONS CARRIED  
RESOLUTION ADOPTED

**RESOLUTION 4**

4. 2017-046 – Victoria Nwaobasi, 3220 Stanton Street, Springfield – Granting a Variance. County Board Member – Joel Tjelmeland, Jr., District #14.

A motion was made by Mr. Tjelmeland, seconded by Mrs. Ruzic, to place Resolution 4 on the floor. Chairman Van Meter asked the professional staff to give the procedural history of the case. Trustin Harrison, professional staff, stated the petitioner is requesting a variance to allow for multiple uses in a mall setting. Steve Keenan, professional staff, stated the staff recommends approval. The building is a large vacant commercial space (approximately 40,000 square feet) formerly used as a bowling alley. The previous use and large size make it difficult to repurpose without some zoning relief. The building was closed for approximately three years prior to its purchase by the current owner. This constitutes a hardship since the property’s owners had some difficulty attracting a single client for the property, despite its B-2 zoning along an arterial roadway with high traffic counts.

Mr. Harrison stated the Zoning Board of Appeals concurred with the staff recommendations.

Victoria Nwaobasi, petitioner, addressed the County Board. She stated she is a real estate developer and has been in the business for over 20 years. The building in question was a bowling alley with about 44,800 square feet. Her understanding is the building has been vacant for five years. The purpose of her purchasing it is that she has a Plan A and Plan B. Her Plan A is to renovate and look for a single tenant, which the previous owners have tried and were not able to find one. Her Plan B is to renovate and divide it into smaller spaces for a shopping center that she can rent out to retail tenants who would use as retail space for different kinds of businesses.

Carolyn Cooper, residing at 3219 Sherman Street in Springfield, addressed the County Board. She is an objector to the petition. Her street backs up to the bowling alley. She was invited to the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting because she has interest in this. As she looked at the plans on the website there was a proposal for what the bowling alley would look like if it had 15 tenants. That is where her concern comes in. Everybody wants Ms. Nwaobasi to be successful and would like that to be an additional asset to their neighborhood. But as a direct neighbor who will be affected by the back side of it if they put six or eight exit doors by what she calls an alley. It is an easement that is behind the bowling alley. She showed pictures of what it looks like back there. It made her think about what it would mean to her and her property value. She may have to pay to put up a new fence to protect herself from what could possibly become a big traffic issue. The architect at the last meeting didn't have a lot of specific answers to some of the questions. The existing fence there would be taken down, and she thinks it would be a big traffic issue and an issue of safety and security for her personally.

Mr. DelGiorno asked Ms. Cooper how long she has lived at that address on Sherman Street. Ms. Cooper stated she has lived there for four years. The bowling alley was still in business then. It has not actually been vacant for five years. Mr. DelGiorno asked if it was right before it closed. Ms. Cooper explained that she had no idea the bowling alley was going to close. It had never been announced. Mr. DelGiorno asked if there is also a strip mall across the street at Stanford and Stevenson. Ms. Cooper stated there is, and it is enough distance that you don't even notice it. The bowling alley is 12 feet.

Ms. Nwaobasi gave her rebuttal. She reiterated that there is a shopping strip across the street. The old fence will be taken down, but they will replace it with another fence. Also, the exit doors will be emergency exit doors. They will not be doors customers will have access to. They will be just for the staff in case of an emergency, so they will rarely be used.

Mr. Preckwinkle asked the professional staff if emergency doors are the same as receiving doors. Trustin Harrison, professional staff, stated he can try to answer that as best he can because that is more of a building code type of question. It really would not affect the zoning portion. In most cases it would be dependent on the occupancy load. As long as they have through traffic they will be required to have one emergency exit. Mr. Preckwinkle asked Ms. Nwaobasi if she intends for them to be receiving doors or just fire doors. Ms. Nwaobasi stated they would just be fire doors.

Ms. Cooper gave her rebuttal. She stated it is a perfect question whether the doors would be receiving doors or doors people would put trash out of. If you look at the floor plan, where else would the merchant put their trash? They don't usually put their inventory in or put their trash out through where customers are coming in. She knows Ms. Nwaobasi is developing it, but that would not ensure a future owner would have the same intentions. She thinks that is a fair and reasonable question for people living right next to it. She loves the existing fence because it is covered with vines that actually block their view. She is going to spend \$1,000 to build her own fence to create the view that she wants. These are her own personal and financial questions and she doesn't expect that to influence decisions that have already been made. She wanted to come here and talk about it because she thinks it's appropriate for anyone who pays taxes, owns their house, and loves their property, neighborhood and their city. She has the right to bring these things up and have you think about that too.

Chairman Van Meter asked Ms. Cooper if she has met Ms. Nwaobasi yet. Ms. Cooper stated she has not. She's anxious to do that, and she's sure she is a very nice lady. Chairman Van Meter suggested that sometimes those conversations can be very helpful.

Mrs. Small stated the business had always been there and had the garbage out there. The fence was not rod iron in the picture. Ms. Cooper explained that the picture of the rod iron fence is of her fence. The grassy part that is maintained is the part of the easement that she had maintained. Behind the bowling alley, where there is mud and trash, is where nobody ever goes. When the bowling alley had it they would trim trees down there maybe once a year. It is an access for CWLP. There is a power pole that you can see right in the middle of what she calls an alley. Cars don't drive down there and people rarely walk there, but it is there for maintenance of utilities and things like that. There could be the potential for those exit doors to be used for emergencies or where people take the trash out. She can foresee there being a lot more traffic and people back there.

Chairman Van Meter asked for a roll call vote. Upon the roll call vote, there were 25 Yeas – 0 Nays.

MOTION CARRIED  
RESOLUTION ADOPTED

### **RESOLUTION 5**

5. 2017-047 – Text Amendment to the Sangamon County Zoning Ordinance regarding Chapter 17.06.060-Exceptions from Applicability and adding Chapter 17.37-Solar Energy Systems.

A motion was made by Mr. Mendenhall, seconded by Mr. Stumpf, 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. 2017-048 – Beverly Buck, 11124 Green Ridge Lane, Dawson – Denying a Variance. County Board Member – David Mendenhall, District #3.

A motion was made by Mr. Mendenhall, seconded by Mrs. Williams, to place Resolution 6 on the floor. Chairman Van Meter asked the professional staff to give the procedural history of the case.

Trustin Harrison, professional staff, stated the petitioner is requesting a variance to allow the side yard setback to be zero feet instead of the required 15 feet side yard setback on a corner lot. Steven Keenan, professional staff, stated the staff recommends denial. The property has a detached garage that was added to over time. In 2007 the central garage was the only structure. By 2011 two carports had been added, one of which was approximately zero feet from the corner side lot line. No building permits were obtained. It appears a new roof was constructed over the combined garage/carports sometime between 2011 and 2015. The standards for variation are not met. Mr. Harrison stated the Zoning Board of Appeals concurs with staff recommendation to deny the requested variance. The addition has now been completed without any permits.

Beverly Buck, petitioner, addressed the County Board. She sincerely apologized because they had no idea they needed building permits for zoning. She grew up in the country and they never needed them as she grew up. They did build it seven years ago. Right now they have a neighborhood feud going on and this is how this all started and was brought up. They want to comply and do what they need to comply. At this point her and her husband cannot tear down what they have there now by themselves because they are disabled, so they will have to hire someone. They would need to save up \$1,000 or more, and they are asking for time because she does not know what else to do. She had asked Trustin what would happen if she paid the \$250 and didn't get the variance. She was told she shouldn't worry and she would get the variance, so she paid the money. That is a lot of money to her. At this point with the variance being denied, she wishes they had not paid it and just waited for them to come out and tear it down. Now she is out money and she doesn't even get the variance. It's the same as other people who paid the same money as she did and they got their variance. It just doesn't seem fair. Chairman Van Meter explained that it is not the case that you pay your money and you get your variance. You pay your money, go through the process, and sometimes you get the variance and sometimes you don't. It depends on the particular situation involved in your petition. He thanked her for speaking.

Mr. Mendenhall asked if they are planning to move some time in the near future. Mrs. Buck stated she is. She is hoping to retire in the next 4 ½ years. She is almost 62 years old. They plan to leave the state when she does retire. Mr. Mendenhall stated her testimony at ZBA was that under these carports they had some older cars. Mrs. Buck stated that they do have a couple classic cars. Without the carports they would sit out there and rust. They have money tied up in them, but don't have the money to restore them. Her husband is disabled and she is carrying the load. They have a lot of stuff in these garages and carports. They only started enclosing it in because the same neighbors who are complaining about it right now, after seven years, were stealing from them.

They had to find a way to close it off so they would not steal. Mr. Mendenhall asked if they are going to market those cars and get rid of them. Mrs. Buck stated they are going to try this winter since her husband can no longer work on them. She does not want to lose money. Mr. Mendenhall asked if it would decrease the amount of space they need if they sold the cars. They would then be able to take down one of the carports. Mrs. Buck stated they have a pickup truck that will only fit in the one carport they are talking about.

Chairman Van Meter asked for a roll call vote on the adoption of Resolution 6. Upon the roll call vote, there were 18 Yeas – 6 Nays. Resolution 6 written to deny a variance was adopted. Those voting nay were: Mr. Bunch, Mr. DelGiorno, Mrs. Douglas Williams, Mr. Preckwinkle, Mrs. Ruzic, and Ms. Sheehan.

MOTIONS CARRIED  
RESOLUTION ADOPTED

### **RESOLUTION 7**

7. 2017-050 – Elizabeth Vala et.al, 4309 Yankee Town Road, Pleasant Plains – Granting Variances. County Board Member – Craig Hall, District #7.

A motion was made by Mr. Hall, seconded by Mrs. Scaife, to place Resolution 7 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 7.

MOTIONS CARRIED  
RESOLUTION ADOPTED

### **RESOLUTION 8**

8. 2017-051 – Elizabeth Vala et.al, 14981 Walbaum Road, Pleasant Plains – Granting Variances. County Board Member – Craig Hall, District #7.

A motion was made by Mr. Hall, seconded by Mrs. Hills, to place Resolution 8 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 8.

MOTIONS CARRIED  
RESOLUTION ADOPTED

### **RESOLUTIONS 9 - 14**

9. Resolution amending Section 5.04 of the Sangamon County Liquor Code.

A motion was made by Mrs. Hills, seconded by Mr. Fraase, to place Resolution 9 on the floor.

A motion was made by Mr. Bunch, seconded by Mr. Smith, to consolidate Resolutions 9 – 14. Chairman Van Meter asked County Clerk Gray to read Resolutions 10 – 14.

10. Resolution amending the FY2017 Sangamon County Budget.
11. Resolution approving the final plat of Parkwood Acres Minor Subdivision.
12. Resolution approving the Sangamon County Annual Budget and Appropriation for the Fiscal Year December 1, 2017 through November 30, 2018.
13. Resolution amending Chapter 6.04, 5.28, 5.24, 5.20 and 15.05 of the Sangamon County Code regarding the Public Health fee schedule.
14. Resolution approving a maintenance agreement contract with Jano Technologies, Inc. and the Circuit Clerk.

A voice vote was unanimous on the consolidation. A motion was made by Mr. Preckwinkle, seconded by Ms. Sheehan & Mr. Bunch that the roll call vote for Resolution 1 stands as the roll call vote for Resolutions 9 – 14, as consolidated. A voice vote was unanimous. Mr. Preckwinkle stated within those resolutions was the county budget for next year. It was a fantastic effort by Brian McFadden, his team, and the County Auditor and his staff. They worked with every department head and elected official to come up with another conservative budget that still accomplishes some major goals including some one-time capital improvements, a rural transportation system, and a lot of economic development. Mr. McFadden has prepared a handout to present to the County Board.

County Administrator Brian McFadden addressed the County Board and gave a presentation on the budget. The resolution they are voting on this year is different and is much thicker than what they have seen before. They have included the fee schedule this year. Usually the standard procedure is to adopt the changes they are making in the fee schedule of that particular year. The decision this year was to just re-adopt the entire fee schedule including any potential changes. That makes up the bulk of the resolution they are looking at. The rest should look familiar to them. They should all have a handout in front of them that follows the format similar to what they've had before.

They are looking pretty good with the FY2017 budget as of this date, but things can change. Personnel and fringe benefit costs are coming in under budget. Commodities and contractual services are their big cost centers and are all coming under. OEM is a little over budget because of some retirement payouts. By and far, across the board, most departments are hitting their target budgets and are going to be below that. It looks like they are going to hit their goal for FY2017.

For FY2018 the All Funds is up to \$108.5 million, which is an increase of \$5.9 million and a 5.7% increase. That number can be misleading, compared with the types of budgets they've had in the past. Of that \$5.9 million, it's important to point out that \$5 million of that is one-time capital expenditure grant related funding. The grant money is coming in to cover those costs. There is also a change in how they are budgeting highway projects. That is about \$1.9 million of that \$5 million.

When you subtract out most of that capital spending, the grant spending is about \$900,000, which is about a 1% increase in what they have done in prior years. The General Fund is up by 2.7% at \$49.6 million. It's up \$1.3 million from FY2017. Revenue from All Funds is at \$108,570,557. This includes: Property Taxes +4%, Other Taxes -1.1%, Fines & Fees +1.7%, Transfers +1.5%, Grants +8.50%, Health Insurance +.008%, State Reimbursements -3%, Interest -.90%, Licenses & Permits 0.00%, and other miscellaneous items.

County Administrator McFadden explained they used to have a policy where they would go back two fiscal years and grab the actual revenue from that year and budget it for the year they are in. They can no longer follow that policy because if they went back two years they would be grabbing a number that is significantly higher than what they are actually getting. That would not be very good budgeting. This just gives them a snap shot of sales tax, income tax, personal property tax, use tax and video gaming revenue. If you go back and look at FY2015 for personal property tax they are \$1.3 to \$1.4 million below what they were just two years ago in those revenue items. Use tax is a different story. Use tax is the tax/privilege you pay to use items in the State of Illinois that were purchased outside the state, which is primarily over the Internet. That number has been growing slightly each year. The video gaming number is up as well. It will probably plateau some time, as soon as the market has saturated. Also, the annexations by the City are pulling Lake Clubs and places with video gaming in the City of Springfield. They will lose that revenue in its entirety.

Property tax is always something that generates some discussion. This year's property tax revenue is \$31.5 million, which is a little over a \$1 million increase from the prior year, and is a 4% increase in revenue. The good news is the EAV grew because of the quadrennial reassessment last year, so they are drawing from a larger pool of equalized assessed valuation. That is driving the rate down. The CPI rate fluctuates all over the board. That CPI rates are their main driver for new revenue for property tax. They have averaged about \$730,000 in increases in property tax revenue every year. Looking back at the property tax six years ago, it was at about \$700,000 as well. It's about a 2% increase each year. With the property tax rate, which is what impacts the property tax bill they all pay, the projected rate is less than a 1% increase in the rate itself. He guarantees that will not be the rate once the County Clerk does the extension. They are a little bit below their average from what they have seen in the past. Their property tax rate is now lower than it was 28 years ago. In FY1990 the rate was .817%, which is 8% more than what it is now. It's 4.7% lower than it was 17 years ago as well. It's 5% lower than in FY2005. So historically their rates are much lower than they has been over time.

The expenses for All Funds, which includes the payroll and fringe benefits, is up by 3.4%, contractual services is up by 14.4%, transfers are down by .1%, health insurance is up by .8%, debt service is up by 18.42%, and commodities are down by 1.4%. Most of the increase in payroll in All Funds is being driven by the fact this budget projects that SMART comes on line. That's an \$880,000 increase in SMART spending with an additional hire of about 22 drivers. There were also an additional two positions created in the Child Advocacy Commission. Overtime is up by 5%. It is down by 35% in Public Health, and down 27% in Buildings & Grounds. It is up 13% in the Sheriff's Department, which is being driven primarily by a 30% increase in overtime for Corrections. That is based upon a historical trend in the last three or four years.

Pension costs are up slightly. For All Funds it is up about 1%. The pension funding for the General Fund is down by 1%. Rates are up 3% for regular IMRF, and for SLEP it is flat. That means their pension costs are in line with where they need to be. Actual IMRF spending in the Sheriff's Office is down \$132,000. SMART is also pushing up the pension costs. Health insurance premiums will be flat again for the employees and the County. For three of the last four years, premiums for health insurance have not gone up. The worker's compensation premium is going down. That will save the County about \$60,000. Debt service is up slightly. There is no new debt or borrowing in this budget. Overall debt principle is \$19 million. They are capped at \$114 million by state law, so they are nowhere near the max they could be by state law. Contractual spending is up significantly, but that is being driven by the workforce grants, SMART hires, and Public Health grants. Commodities are pretty much what they have been in prior years.

Headcount has been going down as far back as FY2007. This year they will see an increase in headcount. This will include 20 new positions in SMART, 2 new positions in the Child Advocacy Commission, and 1 new position in Court Services. All 23 positions are being funded through grants. If the grants go away, then the positions go away. There is no general revenue at risk there. The 23 new positions are being offset by positions being eliminated. The Sheriff's Office is eliminating 3 positions and Public Health is eliminating 1, so that washes out at 19 new positions. There will be no layoffs at all in the budget.

Expenses by department from FY2017 to FY2018 were as follows: SMART expenses increased by \$880,194 at 198.8%. Capital increased by \$732,652 at 95.4%. Child Advocacy Center increased by \$184,253 at 38.6%. The State's Attorney expenses increased by \$120,647 at 34.2%. The Highway Department increased by \$1,910,287 at 22.4%. WIA increased by \$487,060 at 20.6%. Elections increased by \$77,560 at 6.5%. ETSB/911 increased by \$97,069 at 4.1%. The Economic Development Corp. increased by \$200,000 since there was nothing budgeted for FY2017. Regional Planning decreased expenses by \$90,379 at -6.6%.

There has been some questions about how they have been able to obtain the \$500,000 in funding for the EDC. Over the years they have been achieving a lot of efficiencies through a number of different ways. Whenever they do that, some of those savings are used to prop up that year's fiscal budget. Some are set aside for future needs, including something like the EDC. They achieved that \$500,000 by redirecting some existing resources, primarily the \$45,000 they currently give to the Q5 effort. They have seen some TIF's that have been eliminated, which has generated some additional revenues for the County, and they have dedicated that to economic development purposes. They paid off some debt as well. A portion of that is going to help the budget, and a portion is going to help some of these special expenses. This all racks up to about \$3.3 million in savings over the last five or six years that they have achieved a number of different ways. A portion of that has been dedicated, over a period of time, to fund this EDC effort.

The County budget is made up of a large number of funds. There are in excess of 50 funds. There are 30 of the funds that represent the actual working funds of the County that equal about \$105 to \$108 million. They have given them all a grade.

About 95% of their funds are in good fiscal condition. There is about 1% getting a grade of an F because of the situation with the negative Fund Balance. They need to work towards fixing that. The others have a negative Fund Balance, but are not dropping. The majority of their funds are in strong fiscal shape and continue to be.

Some of the FY2018 budget pressures are: continued stagnation in the growth of property value in Sangamon County, continued stagnation in the pace of new construction in Sangamon County, continued stagnation in population growth in Sangamon County, stagnant sales and income tax revenue, potential freeze for our largest revenue source, which is property taxes, fine and fee revenue is essentially flat, and annexations of commercial properties in unincorporated Sangamon County by the City of Springfield.

County Administrator McFadden concluded his presentation with some of the FY2018 budget positives. There is a solid foundation in their largest cost centers which include payroll, pensions, and health care. The FY2018 budget allows them to continue to follow the county's long-standing principles including: a balanced budget, live within their means, pay their bills on time, financially sound pensions, financially sound employee healthcare, limited debt, operate within the constraints of tax caps, maintain reasonable reserves, streamline service through consolidation, reduce costs through automation, and maintain a property tax rate that is still lower than it was 25 years ago.

He thanked Andy Goleman and his staff for all their hard work. He also thanked all the departments for working well with the County Board through this process. Lastly, he thanked the Finance Committee and Chairman Preckwinkle for their guidance.

Chairman Van Meter stated they could just fix the negative balance funds easily by just passing a motion through the Board to transfer money from one fund to another and wipe away the negative balance. He asked why they don't do that. Mr. McFadden explained it would not be a good idea. The primary funds that have a negative fund balance is the Juvenile Detention Center. A lot of that results from the fact the funding for that particular service was funded by the State and is now funded primarily by the County. That has put pressure on that fund. If they put money in that fund or the Public Health fund, they will have to take from other funds to do that. That puts pressure on those other funds. The General Fund does do a transfer, for instance, into the Juvenile Detention Fund every year. The goal is to lower that transfer each year, which they have been doing. They lowered and eliminated the transfer into the Public Health Fund from the General Fund. Both of those major funds are slowly crawling out of a negative position. It is not something that is going to happen overnight. It's something that will require discipline, and both those departments understand that.

Chairman Van Meter stated that we don't set the property tax rate. We ask for an amount of money in the levy that funds the budget they are adopting tonight. The County Clerk's Office takes the levy, compares it to the property tax values, and then sets the rate to give them the levy they requested. It's set by mathematics in the County Clerk's Office. He asked Mr. McFadden what he thought the levy would be next year, if he had to guess.

Mr. McFadden stated traditionally when they go through this process and adopt a budget, it includes an amount for the revenue coming from property taxes. They estimate that, and when they adopt the levy itself next month they will estimate the same number. That's based upon factors that they don't know, so they make an estimate of what the growth in the EAV is going to be and what the growth in new construction is going to be. All those things will be finalized in April in the spring. They make their best estimate, but generally miss the mark. It gets culled back an average of about 1%. Based upon past practice, the fact that their projected rate is going to grow by 9/10 of a percent, it would be either at or below the rate it was at the prior year. That has happened, most recently, two years ago. Chairman Van Meter re-emphasized the best guess is the tax rate is going to be flat to maybe slightly down. Mr. McFadden stated that is correct.

Annette Fulgenzi stated that Brian mentioned the fees being generated by the fee increase are not going to be obligated in this budget since they don't do that for a year. She asked if those funds would remain with those departments because they passed them saying that is what they need to provide the services. Mr. McFadden stated that is correct. He explained the policy is with any fee they increase, they do not budget it the year they increase it. They give it a year's activity because otherwise it would be just a guess. One of the smart policies this Board has adopted is to make decisions based upon historical data and not just their best guess on what is going to happen with the economy in the next year. You can get yourself into a lot of trouble doing that. Chairman Van Meter explained the reason they do this is because there are other governments in this city that say "we raised that fee and that is going to bring in a billion dollars, so let's just spend that." But then it doesn't bring in the billion dollars. The County doesn't do that. They wait to see what it is going to bring in and then start spending it after.

Mr. Hall asked if they have been in negotiations with the City of Springfield and other government bodies regarding the EDC. He asked how that is going. Mr. McFadden stated he doesn't know if he would call it negotiations, but more of a dialogue. It's uncertain how it's going to finish. They have spoken with Aldermen and the Mayor. They have gone through the report with them and explained what the County will do tonight by making an annual commitment of \$500,000 to fund the EDC and to cede their economic development authority, or at least to have it operate under one entity which would be this Regional EDC. The City is in their budget process now and don't really get started until after the first of the year. Once they get into that process, they will have a better idea where the City will be at on this. They have been successful in getting the private sector on board. He thinks eventually The Chamber of Commerce and Q5 leadership and their members will be on board. The main foundation for this left undecided will be the City.

#### **WAIVER OF TEN-DAY FILING PERIOD**

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

MOTION CARRIED

TEN-DAY FILING PERIOD WAIVED

**RESOLUTIONS 15 - 18**

- 15. Resolution authorizing the execution of a contract with Encore Unlimited, LLC for comprehensive medical case management services.

A motion was made by Mr. Krell, seconded by Mr. Ratts, to place Resolution 15 on the floor. A motion was made by Mr. Bunch, seconded by Mr. Smith, to consolidate Resolutions 15 – 18. Chairman Van Meter asked County Clerk Gray to read Resolutions 16 – 18.

- 16. Resolution approving the renewal of the County’s worker compensation insurance policy with the Illinois Public Risk Fund for 2018.
- 17. Resolution amending the Springfield/Sangamon County Enterprise Zone.
- 18. Resolution approving and authorizing the execution of an Intergovernmental Agreement between the Village of Rochester, Rochester Public Library District, Rochester Fire Protection District, Lincoln Land Community College District #526, Sangamon County Water Reclamation District, Rochester Township, and County of Sangamon for the Rochester Tax Increment Financing District.

A voice vote was unanimous on the consolidation. A motion was made by Mr. Preckwinkle, seconded by Ms. Sheehan & Mr. Bunch, to amend Resolution 17. Mr. Preckwinkle explained they have a technical amendment to Resolution 17 by substituting an improved legal description of the property in question. A voice vote carried on the amendment. A motion was made by Mr. Preckwinkle, seconded by Mr. Tjelmeland that the roll call vote for Resolution 1 stands as the roll call vote for Resolutions 15 – 18, as consolidated and amended. A voice vote carried. Annette Fulgenzi voted Present on Resolution 17.

MOTIONS CARRIED  
RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED

**OLD BUSINESS**

There was no old business.

**NEW BUSINESS**

Mr. DelGiorno commented that many of them noticed the AFSCME protestors standing outside the building. They are there on behalf of the workers in the Court Services Department who are the probation officers and juvenile court staff that work on the third floor and not at the Juvenile Center predominantly. He wanted to bring this to their attention because he knows a lot of them have not been involved or heard a lot about the contract negotiations that have been going on, and because of the hybrid nature that Court Services seems to be since it’s required by the state and under the purview of their Circuit Court judges.

There has been a multiple-year period where the Court Services employees have been without a contract. He understands it was being negotiated by the Attorney General's Office and then kind of punted to the County to negotiate it. It is his understanding they are going to mediation tomorrow. Someone can correct him if he has misstated something. He was asked tonight by Twyla Moore, who is the President of their Court Services Local here in the building, to allow her to explain why they have been protesting and what their position is. She believed they were under the five-day rule for sign up. They amended the rule quite a while ago to be only 24 hours. Assistant State's Attorney Dwayne Gab explained that there was a motion to ask for the privilege to speak, and they would need to ask if there is an objection to that. Chairman Van Meter asked if there were any objections. Mr. Smith objected.

Mr. Gab explained it would now require a majority vote of the County Board to approve the point of privilege. He welcomed the group to sign up for their standard policy for speaking as any other group would. Chairman Van Meter asked for a roll call vote on the motion. Upon the roll call vote, there were 3 Yeas – 22 Nays. The motion failed. Those voting yes were: Mr. DelGiorno, Mrs. Douglas Williams, and Mrs. Small.

MOTION CARRIED

MOTION FAILED

A. Resolutions

There were no new resolutions.

B. Appointments

Appointment of Henry "Patt" Patterson to the Sangamon County Building Code Board of Appeals for a term expiring November, 2018.

Appointment of John Hearn to the Sangamon County Building Code Board of Appeals for a term expiring November, 2018.

Appointment of Declan Binninger to the Sangamon County Building Code Board of Appeals for a term expiring November, 2018.

Appointment of Tony Smarjesse to the Sangamon County Building Code Board of Appeals for a term expiring November, 2018.

Appointment of Keith Moore to the Sangamon County Building Code Board of Appeals for a term expiring November, 2018.

Appointment of Herbert Cole to the Mechanicsburg-Buffalo Water Commission for a term expiring November, 2023.

Appointment of John Pruitt to the Sangamon County Water Reclamation District for a term expiring May, 2020.

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

MOTION CARRIED  
APPOINTMENTS ADOPTED

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

A motion was made by Ms. Sheehan, seconded by Mr. Bunch, to place the reports on file with the County Clerk. A voice vote was unanimous.

MOTION CARRIED  
REPORTS FILED

**RECESS**

A motion was made by Ms. Sheehan, seconded by Mr. Bunch, to recess the meeting to December 12, 2017 at 7:00 p.m. A voice vote was unanimous.

MOTION CARRIED  
MEETING RECESSED

***Don Gray***  
***Sangamon County Clerk***