

CHAMPAIGN COUNTY BOARD COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE MINUTES

Finance/Policy, Personnel, & Appointments/Justice & Social Services

Tuesday, March 8, 2011

Lyle Shields Meeting Room, Brookens Administrative Center

1776 E. Washington St., Urbana, Illinois

MEMBERS PRESENT: Christopher Alix, Carol Ammons, Jan Anderson, Ron Bensyl, Astrid Berkson, Thomas Betz, Lloyd Carter, Lorraine Cowart, Stephanie Holderfield, Stan James, Alan Kurtz, Ralph Langenheim, Brendan McGinty, Diane Michaels, Alan Nudo, Steve O'Connor, Patti Petrie, James Quisenberry, Michael Richards, Giraldo Rosales, Larry Sapp, Jonathan Schroeder, C. Pius Weibel

MEMBERS ABSENT: John Jay, Brad Jones, Steve Moser

OTHERS PRESENT: Kat Bork (Administrative Assistant), Deb Busey (County Administrator), John Farney (County Clerk's Office), Joseph Gordon (Court Services Director), John Hall (Planning & Zoning Director), Roger Holland (Court Administrator), Lt. Greg Mills (Sheriff's Office), Susan Monte (RPC County Planner), Alan Reinhart (Facilities Director), Randall Rosenbaum (Public Defender), Dan Welch (Treasurer)

CALL TO ORDER

Weibel called the meeting to order at 6:03 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Bork called the roll. Alix, Ammons, Anderson, Bensyl, Berkson, Betz, Carter, Cowart, Holderfield, James, Kurtz, Langenheim, McGinty, Michaels, Nudo, O'Connor, Petrie, Quisenberry, Richards, Rosales, Sapp, Schroeder, and Weibel were present at the time of roll call, establishing the presence of a quorum. Weibel announced the Jay was absent due to illness and Moser was out of town.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION by Rosales to approve the Committee of the Whole minutes of February 15, 2011; seconded by Anderson.

Weibel announced a correction to the last page of the February 15th minutes was presented to the Board on the lilac page at their desks. Petrie said she asked for data from the

Nursing Home consultant at the February 15th meeting. Weibel said this vote was about whether the minutes were accurate or not.

Motion carried with unanimous support.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA/ADDENDA

MOTION by Rosales to approve the agenda; seconded by James. **Motion carried with unanimous support.**

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Mark Thompson spoke about property rights. He wanted individual owners to decide what they would do on their property not the County Board.

Weibel closed public participation after verifying no one else wished to speak.

COMMUNICATIONS

There were no communications.

JUSTICE & SOCIAL SERVICES

Department Reporting Presentations

Court Services

Joseph Gordon distributed a handout comparing three months of Court Services' case activity (both juveniles and adults) in November 2010, December 2010, and January 2011. He described how the juvenile court is active and seeing more females in the system. The most active age group for juvenile cases is the 14-15 year olds. Programming has to be adjusted to address these issues. The numbers are remaining fairly consistent with typically 150 juveniles under court orders over a 12-month period.

Gordon explained that the adult division has seen an active number of intakes in this quarter. The adult division is also experiencing a fair number of females in the criminal justice system. The largest adult age group involved in criminal cases is the 21-30 year olds. Gordon offered to answer any questions from Board members.

Betz inquired if the Court Services Department kept statistics with racial breakdowns. Gordon answered that they did. Typically, the breakdown is about 50/50 between Caucasians and African-Americans on the criminal side. On the juvenile side, approximately 60-65% of offenders are African-Americans. Rosales asked if those racial stats were available online. Gordon verified the monthly reports with those statistics are on the website. Busey added that the Court Services Annual Report is on file in the Administrative Services Department. Any Board member who wants to see it can do so by visiting the department.

Betz wanted to see a breakdown on racial statistics on juveniles given station adjustments and those that go on into the Juvenile Detention Center. Gordon said the formal station adjustments are handled by police departments, not Court Services, so those numbers are not tracked by his department. There is an active station adjustment system in Champaign County and Court Services coordinates with local police departments. Betz asked Gordon to obtain those statistics from the police departments. Gordon offered to report back next month.

Petrie asked if Gordon had any breakdown measuring the effectiveness of probation. She further asked if any juveniles on probation were repeat offenders. Gordon stated the department does not track juveniles after 3 years. It is not unusual for a juvenile to have repeated probationary periods.

Betz questioned how public schools funnel into the juvenile criminal system. Gordon responded that the school resource officers and police departments compile reports. The officers almost always do a formal station adjustment and that could be the end of the matter. The juvenile could be referred to an agency that reports back to the police department. It is not uncommon for a juvenile to have another station adjustment a few months later. The intention is to keep minor offenses out of the criminal justice system. Betz asked how minor offenses are classified if they are treated differently for different groups. He thought programs need to address this perception. Gordon was not aware that was a perception. A minor is not brought to the Juvenile Detention Center unless it is a domestic incident and the minor needs to go into respite care. Court Services has a scoring instrument to review and score juveniles. It takes a certain score for a juvenile to be detained. Even if the situation involves a felony, a juvenile may not be detained. Generally speaking, a misdemeanor offender is not detained.

Public Defender

Randall Rosenbaum distributed a comparison of the number of Public Defender staff and caseloads between Champaign County and McLean County. He spoke about the Public Defender's Office and the challenges they face. The Public Defender is appointed by the judiciary and Rosenbaum has occupied the position for 13 years. The judiciary decides how many Assistant Public Defenders he is allowed and County Board sets his budget. Public Defenders represent those who cannot afford attorneys in criminal cases. Cases are assigned to attorneys out of arraignment court and monthly status meetings are held. The vast majority of cases are resolved by plea bargains with the State's Attorney's Office. Assistant Public Defenders are very active in court. They represent people at the trial level only. The office has 13 attorneys and 3 support staff. They rely heavily on interns. The office is personnel heavy without a lot of commodities, so making budget cuts is challenging. Rosenbaum emphasized that his staff does a good job and hopes the budget looks better over the next several years. He hoped this Board would help his office with more resources.

Sapp exited the meeting at 6:37 p.m.

Petrie said the Public Defender's November 2010 report was listed on the agenda but it was not accessible on the website. Rosenbaum said the report contained corrected data and that

his secretary would resend it tomorrow. Petrie asked why the County Board has only received monthly report thru November 2010 when it is March 2011. Rosenbaum said his office submitted the December 2010 report yesterday. Petrie commented on the steady increasing trend for juvenile delinquency cases. Rosenbaum answered that he has no control over the number of filings. This statistic may reflect something in the community and society. The increase in cases has affected the functioning of his office.

Ammons wanted to understand why the State's Attorney's Office and Public Defender's Office, which are both funded by the County, are not equitable. Rosenbaum explained that the State's Attorney's Office has more attorneys because it handles civil matters for the County Board as well as prosecuting all criminal cases, including those with clients represented by private attorney. The Public Defender's Office only represents criminal cases for eligible defendants. Rosenbaum would never expect to have the same number of attorneys as the State's Attorney's Office. Ammons knows the Public Defender's Office does the best job it can and spoke about seeing Public Defender clients waiting in the Courthouse halls. She remarked the County Board has a responsibility to retain the Public Defender's attorneys and increase the number of attorneys in that office. Rosenbaum responded that there are few complaints about the way his attorneys do their jobs. The complaints he hears are mostly about clients having difficulty in finding time to meet with an attorney. Attorneys are frequently in court and their available time might not easily correlate with the clients' availability. Rosenbaum continued to answer questions about the functions of his office.

Holderfield asked if the office kept statistics on the cases involving university students. Rosenbaum stated his office does not keep those types of statistics. The Public Defender's Office will represent students charged with felonies who cannot afford an attorney. The University of Illinois students pay fees for the UI's own legal staff to represent students charged with misdemeanors. Betz remarked that he keeps statistics on the use of UI Student Legal Services since 1978 for misdemeanors and other cases on his website. University students are the single lowest risk population for misdemeanors or felonies in Champaign County. Students are more likely to be victims of crimes rather than criminals.

Monthly Reports

MOTION by Ammons to receive and place on file the Animal Control January 2011, Head Start February 2011, Probation & Court Services January 2011, and Public Defender November 2010 monthly reports; seconded by Quisenberry.

Sapp returned to the meeting at 6:50 p.m.

Petrie requested that Richards ask the Head Start staff why the decision was made to eliminate expenditures by major categories. She thought it would be helpful for the County Board to see the expenditures by major categories. Richards said those categories will be broken down in the budget and he would inquire further with Head Start.

Nudo exited the meeting at 6:51 p.m.

Michaels and Cowart attended the Head Start meeting and they talked about how the expenditures were listed. She thought Head Start staff would be working on simplifying this information.

Alix do not think the County Board could receive and place on file the Public Defender November 2010 report because it has not been delivered. He asked if Ammons would withdraw that report from her motion as a friendly amendment. Ammons thought the Public Defender's presentation earlier in the meeting was the report. Richards described the difference between the monthly reports and the quarterly report presentation made by the Public Defender.

Nudo returned to the meeting and Betz exited at 6:52 p.m.

Busey said the November 2010 report will be online tomorrow. Weibel stated the Board did not have to see the report to receive and place it on file. Ammons wanted to receive and place on file all the monthly reports.

MOTION by Alix to exclude the Public Defender November 2010 report because it had not been received; seconded by Michaels.

The Board discussed the motion.

Motion failed to remove the Public Defender report from the original motion.

Motion carried to receive and place on file the monthly reports.

Other Business

There was no other business.

Chair's Report

There was no Chair's report.

ENVIRONMENT & LAND USE

Direction to Zoning Administrator Regarding Proposed Zoning Ordinance Text Amendments

Request to Amend the Champaign County Zoning Ordinance to Implement Land Resource Management Plan Policies 4.1.5, 4.1.7, and 4.1.9

Betz returned to the meeting at 6:58 p.m.

MOTION by Anderson for a preliminary recommendation to amend the Champaign County Zoning Ordinance to implement Land Resource Management Plan Policies 4.1.5, 4.1.7, and 4.1.9; seconded by Rosales.

Hall wanted to be clear on what motion was made. The materials in the agenda packet give three alternative policies. He asked which policy was the being moved and the staff needs guidance on Policy 4.1.9, which was mislabeled as 4.1.7 in the packet. The current ordinance includes an exemption for 35-acre or greater lots. There is no limit on those lots. Policy 4.1.9 is intended to let the County Board reaffirm that 35-acre minimum, increase it, or shrink it. Hall said he needed some number from the Board for 4.1.9.

Kurtz wanted the 4.1.5 compromise on Page 82 to be selected. He felt this was a compromise reached with the Farm Bureau. He asked if any Board member wanted to change the 35-acre minimum exemption on 4.1.9.

Ammons asked Hall to give her the layman's definition of what the difference is in changing the exemption from 35 to 38 acres. Hall explained it would require a person to buy more acreage to build a home and claim it as agriculture. From a land use perspective, this means there will be slightly fewer lots, if the exemption is increased to 38 acres. He thought the Board's concern should be whether allowing 35-acre lots to be created with no limit would result in too many non-farm homes in the rural areas. He described the practical impact of the lot size on a mortgage and continued to answer Ammons's questions about the amendments.

Kurtz announced that Brad Uken from the Farm Bureau called him before this meeting and restated the Farm Bureau's position that they wanted 80 acres in this policy.

Ammons and Quisenberry exited the meeting at 7:10 p.m.

Holderfield asked if the farming community as a whole was exempt from this ordinance and Hall verified that was true. The only thing in the new Zoning Ordinance that applies to farmers is the setback from the street. Holderfield gave a hypothetical situation wherein a non-farmer purchases a 35-acre lot from a farmer and would probably have to utilize agriculture commercial lending versus the conventional FHA/Freddie Mac financing. This lot would be more restrictive to the average buyer who wants to buy land to hunt or build a home.

Weibel exited the meeting at 7:12 p.m.

Hall thought that was relevant to the purchase of 35-acre tracts. The current Zoning Ordinance does not limit the number of 35-acre tracts that can be created. He pointed out that the amendment for 4.1.5 plugs the mortgage lot loophole in the existing ordinance. The current ordinance does not say that a lot created for mortgage purposes counts as one of these lots. The amendment makes it very clear that a lot created for mortgage purposes counts as either 1 or 2 lots that can be created.

Ammons returned to the meeting at 7:13 p.m.

The Board discussed the alternatives that had been presented.

Weibel returned to the meeting at 7:14 p.m.

MOTION by Alix to defer this item because it is a technical amendment and he was not comfortable regarding the possible unintended consequences. He wanted the County staff and relevant stakeholders to be satisfied that they understand the implications of the amendment. The motion was seconded by McGinty

The Board discussed whether or not to defer this item. Langenheim requested a roll call vote.

Ammons exited the meeting at 7:23 p.m.

Alix remarked that the Farm Bureau was still clarifying its position on this amendment as of 2 hours ago. The reason he was requesting a deferment was because the stakeholders do not seem to have sorted this issue out for themselves.

Schroeder asked when the item would be addressed and what Alix would like staff to further define. Alix said the deferment was to the next Committee of the Whole meeting with ELUC and he would speak to staff to clarify his concerns that have recently arisen based on stakeholders' comments. He encouraged other members to do the same. Kurtz stated the staff is open to any Board member who wants to discuss the issue and the Board has been at this for months. McGinty noted that Brad Uken called Kurtz privately after the Democratic Caucus and the information was not shared at caucus. He has seen these interest groups change their mind and wanted solidification before moving forward. Schroeder said he would like to hear from the Farm Bureau Board itself, not a small committee.

Ammons and Sapp returned to the meeting at 7:27 p.m.

Langenheim called the question.

Motion carried to defer with a vote of 13 to 9. Alix, Bensyl, Holderfield, James, McGinty, Michaels, Nudo, O'Connor, Petrie, Richards, Sapp, Schroeder, and Weibel voted in favor of the motion. Ammons, Anderson, Berkson, Betz, Carter, Cowart, Kurtz, Langenheim, and Rosales voted against the motion.

James exited the meeting at 7:33 p.m.

Kurtz encouraged the County Board members to contact staff with any questions in order to complete this item next month. Bensyl said one of the problems is that things change or are only disclosed at the meetings. One Board member should not drive the decisions of this Board and Kurtz agreed.

Request to Amend the Champaign County Zoning Ordinance to Implement Land Resource Management Plan Policies 4.1.6 and 4.3.1-4.3.4

MOTION by Holderfield to proceed with the amendment process including staff's recommendation to substitute the word "availability" where it occurs with regard to public services; seconded by Rosales.

Hall explained a change was made on Page 88 to reduce the proposed finding regarding public services and gets rid of “adequacy” and only talks about “availability”. The adequacy and safety of roads was retained because IDOT has clear, published guidelines that are easy to apply in a general way for road adequacy.

Motion carried.

Request to Amend the Champaign County Zoning Ordinance to Implement Land Resource Management Plan Objective 4.4 by adding a Special Use Permit for the RRO

MOTION by Anderson to proceed with the amendment process; seconded by Langenheim.

Hall explained they decided to separate the special use permit from the special use permit standard conditions.

James returned to the meeting at 7:35 p.m.

Alix asked if any RRO would require a special use permit on the basis of the State’s Attorney’s opinion. Hall said an RRO is relevant to a specific plan by its very nature. They would never suggest the County condition any other rezoning on a plan.

Motion carried with unanimous support.

Request to Amend the Champaign County Zoning Ordinance to Implement Land Resource Management Plan Objective 4.4 by Adding Standard Conditions for the Special Use Permit for the RRO

MOTION by Ammons to proceed with the amendment process; seconded by Anderson.

Hall explained this amendment proposes the seven conditions discussed at the study session. The County Board is telling the subsequent dividers this is what the County Board expects as minimum conditions. There is nothing like this is the current ordinance, regarding when a new street or other access to lots should be proposed. Support for any of the seven conditions would be a big improvement over the existing situation.

Petrie convened a conversation she had with Professor Reynolds about the Zoning Ordinance. She did not think the RRO section of the ordinance was in a user-friendly format. She would approve the seven criteria with the hope that the work program, previously approved by the County Board, would be adjusted to include the creation of a procedural flowchart for anyone considering an RRO.

Motion carried.

Other Business

Request for Letter of Support for Senate Bill 2195

Hall explained that Senate Bill 2195 proposes to amend existing legislation to allow for a process by which certain counties could adopt storm water management fees. Champaign County is in a class of counties not even discussed in this bill until Page 116. Champaign County is subject to the Illinois General NPDES Permit No. ILR40. The process allowed by this change would be very complicated and would involve a degree of cooperation with municipalities that has never been seen. Hall did not think this was necessary in Champaign County right now and was more suitable for counties like Kankakee County. The bill completely exempts farmland and drainage districts.

MOTION by Nudo to defer; seconded by James.

Berkson asked why the County Board was discussing this legislation. Hall responded that the County Board Chair was contacted by a person who wrote the legislation to have the Board consider it. The Board discussed the deferment versus what information is known about the legislation.

Motion carried to defer.

Michaels exited the meeting at 7:49 p.m.

POLICY, PERSONNEL, & APPOINTMENTS

Appointments/Reappointments

Forest Preserve District Board

MOTION by Weibel to appoint Robert "Robin" Hall to the Champaign County Forest Preserve District Board for a term from March 18, 2011 to June 30, 2014 to fill the vacancy caused by Christopher White resignation; seconded by Anderson.

Weibel listed Robin Hall's qualifications for the appointment, including having been head of the Champaign Park District for over 30 years. He has also worked with the Extension Office and has a consulting business to help other park districts develop their programs. Petrie asked Weibel if there were any other applicants for the position. Weibel confirmed the nominee was the only applicant. If there were any other applicants, then they would be listed on the agenda.

Motion carried with unanimous support.

Kurtz exited the meeting at 7:50 p.m.

Rural Transit Advisory Group

MOTION by Weibel to appoint Elaine Fowler Palencia to the Champaign County Rural Transit Advisory Group for a term from March 18, 2011 to November 30, 2012; seconded by Betz.

Weibel stated the group was looking for someone familiar with the needs of handicapped residents in the County. Palencia has a handicapped family member and is familiar with the obstacles that population faces.

Motion carried with unanimous support.

Wrisk Drainage District

MOTION by Weibel to appoint Dennis Riggs to the Wrisk Drainage District for a term from March 18, 2011 to August 31, 2013; seconded by Schroeder. **Motion carried with unanimous support.**

Kurtz returned to the meeting at 7:52 p.m.

County Administrator
Vacant Positions Listing

The vacant positions listing was provided for information only. Busey asked if the Board could address the Sheriff's item before the County Administrator's items because Lt. Mills had been present for quite some time to address any questions on the Sheriff's behalf. There was no objection from the Board.

Recommendation for Award of Contract for Vending Services Pursuant to RFP 2011-003

Busey announced the recommendation was to award the vending services contract to Pepsi.

MOTION by Langenheim to award the vending services contract to Pepsi; seconded by Rosales.

In answer to Nudo's question, Busey confirmed the County has the option to audit Pepsi's report. Anderson inquired about the missing commission figure on Page 12. Busey was still working with legal counsel on this contract. The final version of the contract will be presented at the County Board meeting. Betz asked what portion of this revenue is used for employee recognition. Busey stated the General Corporate Fund vending revenue is about \$18,000/year. About \$4,000/year is budgeted for the Employee Recognition Event to come directly from these proceeds.

Motion carried with unanimous support.

Recommendation for Award of Contract for Employee Health Insurance & Related Benefits Broker/Consultant Services pursuant to RFQ 2011-004

Busey stated the RFQ for Employee Health Insurance & Related Benefits Broker/Consultant Services was released and nine responses were received. The evaluation team shortlisted four firms after a review. The interviews for these firms are scheduled for tomorrow. She asked the Board to allow the recommendation for award of contract to be taken directly to the March 17th County Board meeting. The work will be completed in time for the County Board meeting, but all the meetings could not be scheduled in time for tonight's meeting.

MOTION by Kurtz to send the award of contract recommendation directly to the March 17th County Board meeting; seconded by Alix.

Ammons asked if the Board would see the four finalists or only the firm selected for the contract. Busey answered the firm that is selected will be presented to the Board. There are two County Board members on the selection team, as well as an employee representative from each of the three major employee groups, the County Administrator, and the Insurance Specialist.

Bensyl said he needed to abstain from the vote because of his employer submitted a proposal for this RFQ.

Petrie said it would be helpful for the rest of the Board to know who the four finalists were and asked about the contract's term. Busey said it would likely be a two-year contract with reopeners available for a third and fourth year, subject to County Board approval. The contract only ties the County to the broker who will negotiate the insurance rates. In response to other questions, Busey listed the evaluation team members as Berkson, Sapp, John Farney (AFSCME), Elizabeth Murphy (non-bargaining employees), Brian Mennega (FOP), Debbie Chow, and Busey. The four shortlisted firms are Gallagher Benefit Services, Wells Fargo, CIBC of Illinois, and Barham Benefit Group.

Motion carried with Bensyl abstaining.

Job Content Evaluation Committee Recommendation for Classification of Deputy Director of EMA

Busey stated the Job Content Evaluation Committee has reviewed the proposed new position. The committee's recommendation was that the position be classified in Grade Range I and titled Deputy Director for EMA.

MOTION by Alix to forward the recommendation to Finance to establish and classify the Deputy Director for EMA in Grade Range I; seconded by Carter.

Michaels asked where the salary would come from in the budget. Busey responded that a clerical position was eliminated in EMA and that salary will cover the new position's salary. Petrie asked if there was a place on the County's website where one can read the description of

the grade ranges. Busey replied that the information was available on the website as the FY2011 salary ranges. Ammons asked if EMA's budget will cover the position's salary, be it between the minimum and midpoint of the salary range. Busey answered yes, because the new salary will primarily be covered by the savings generated by eliminating the clerical position. Alix thought the eliminated clerical position was paid less than the new position. Busey said the individual who occupied the clerical position was paid \$40,000, which is the low end of the salary range for the Deputy Director for EMA. Alix asked if EMA had the money available in its budget to cover any new salary costs over \$40,000 and Busey confirmed EMA did have that money.

Motion carried with unanimous support.

Sheriff

Request for Letter of Opposition to House Bill 1293 – Sheriff's Mortgage Foreclosure Sale Revenue

MOTION by Weibel for the County Board Chair to send letters of opposition to House Bill 1293 – Sheriff's Mortgage Foreclosure Sale Revenue; seconded by Richards.

Lt. Mills was asked by Sheriff Walsh to present information about the bill and the reasons why he opposes it. The current bill is similar to House Bill 5055, which was made into law last year. The current procedure is for the Sheriff's Office to process foreclosure sales until completion. The Sheriff's Office receives revenue for these services, amounting to \$127,800 in FY2009 and \$130,000 in FY2010. This represents half of the Sheriff's fees revenue.

Michaels returned to the meeting at 7:53 p.m.

Mills stated the proposed House Bill 1293 would remove the Sheriff's responsibility and transfer it to a private entity, who would also receive the revenue. The Sheriff's Office acts an independent and unbiased representative of the court in handling the foreclosure sale process. The Sheriff's Office is not allowed to bid and the process is accessible to the public. This could be lost as the bill transfers the process to a private entity. One reason given to support this bill is a claim that the Sheriff's Office unnecessarily delays the sales. The reality is that the foreclosure sales are held every second and fourth Friday when the appropriate paperwork is received. The Sheriff was urging the County Board to oppose this bill.

Richards commented that the foreclosure system does not need to be made any easier. He viewed the Sheriff's involvement as a check on banks that needs to be continued. Weibel asked where the revenue comes from and Mills answered that the current fee of \$600 was statutorily required to be paid by the person who purchases the property, usually a bank. Betz noted some banks have sold loans in foreclosure situations so many times that discovering the actual parties at a later date is problematic. The current process is open to the public, unlike the banking industry. Berkson remarked that the sales are court ordered and a matter for law enforcement. She did not support any more privatization of law enforcement activities.

Weibel explained, for the benefit of new Board members, that a letter of opposition would be sent to the legislators for areas of Champaign County, as well as the Senate majority and minority leaders. Betz asked the Chair to also send the letter to Representative Lou Lang.

Holderfield concurred with the Sheriff's recommendation to oppose the bill as someone who has participated in numerous foreclosure sales. Keeping the process with the Sheriff's Office will help maintain a fair and open foreclosure process. Many of the problems with foreclosure process stems from the asset management company, not the Sheriff's Office.

Motion carried with unanimous support.

County Clerk

Monthly Fees Report – February 2011

MOTION by Betz to receive and place on file the County Clerk's monthly fess report for February 2011; seconded by Richards. **Motion carried with unanimous support.**

Other Business

There was no other business.

Chair's Report

Recommended Rules Change for Alignment of Committee of the Whole Meetings

Ammons wanted to entertain a motion to accept the proposed rules changes. Busey stated the proposal could not be voted on tonight because the County Board Rules require that any rules changes be presented to the County Board at least 14 days in advance. The Board could vote on this issue in April. The item was on the agenda for discussion.

James thought adding a meeting would increase the expenditure for County Board per diems and would require more staff time to be spent on meetings. He preferred the previous committee structure before the change to Committee of the Whole. He was uncertain if he could support the proposed changes because they would increase the travel pay and per diems made to County Board members. If the Board has money available to increase its reimbursement, then they should look at giving the money to those who work for the Board.

The Board members discussed the pros and cons of changing the meeting structure. Berkson asked how much more another monthly meeting would cost. Busey said the meetings costs about \$1,800 to reimburse the Board members when all attend. Rosales noted the per diems for a third meeting alone would cost an additional \$14,580 per year, not including the expense of Board member mileage reimbursement or staff time. Ammons reminded the Board that Champaign County has one of the lowest paid county boards and they voted to not increase their per diem rate when they increased the per diems of other boards. The Board continued to discuss the meeting structure. Busey stated the County Board Rules changes are proposed by Board members. If a member wants to propose a rules change and needs help, then she is happy

to provide assistance. She advised the Board to be aware any proposal has to be in all the Board members' hands 14 days before it can be considered. This proposal will be on April 12th Committee of the Whole agenda. Petrie asked if a matrix comparison of various meetings structure could be prepared. Ammons said she would will follow-up with Busey.

Cowart exited the meeting at 8:44 p.m.

Designation of Items to be Placed on County Board Consent Agenda

Agenda items 9.A.1-3 & B.2 were designated for the consent agenda.

FINANCE

Budget Amendments & Transfers

Budget Amendment #11-00016

MOTION by Kurtz to recommend to the County Board approval of Budget Amendment #11-00016 from Fund 105 Capital Asset Replacement Fund – Department 042 Coroner for increased appropriations of \$6,500 for the Automobiles, Vehicles line with no increased revenue; seconded by Rosales. **Motion carried with unanimous support.**

State's Attorney

Request Approval of Application for and, if Awarded, Acceptance of Violent Crime Victims Assistance Grant

MOTION by Langenheim to approve the application for and, if awarded, acceptance of Violent Crime Victims Assistance Grant; seconded by James. **Motion carried with unanimous support.**

Petrie exited the meeting at 8:48 p.m.

Treasurer

Monthly Report

The Treasurer distributed his report and the Board applauded Welch for staying thru the long meeting. Welch announced the General Corporate Fund has not had to borrow from other funds so far. He thanked Petrie for coming to visit his office and invited the other members to come learn more about the Treasurer's Office.

MOTION by Kurtz to receive and place on file the Treasurer's February 2011 report; seconded by Alix. **Motion carried with unanimous support.**

Auditor

Purchases Not Following Purchasing Policy

No list of purchases was provided because the Auditor was not present. Alix asked if the list would be available online. McGinty said the Auditor should provide it at the full Board meeting

Monthly Report – February 2011

MOTION by Langenheim to receive and place on file the Auditor's February 2011 monthly report; seconded by Berkson. **Motion carried with unanimous support.**

County Administrator

General Corporate Fund FY2011 Revenue/Expenditure Projection Report

Busey stated the GCF is doing well, although it is still early in the fiscal year. The sales taxes and income taxes are coming in at a stable rate. At this point, the GCF is projected to end the year above budget by 2%. This report gains greater credibility by May or June. The GCF expenditures budget is being underspent in just about every area except Purchase Documents Stamps, which correlates to increased revenue on the first page. The projection is the budget will be underspent by \$760,000. The GCF could end the fiscal at its fund balance goal even with the outstanding loan to the Nursing Home.

General Corporate Fund Budget Change Report

Busey commented this report has not changed since last month.
Petrie and Cowart returned to the meeting at 8:52 p.m.

Harris & Harris Monthly Collections Report

Busey announced the collections report is looking quite good with the GCF receiving \$46,617 year-to-date. James asked if these collections were from the older outstanding accounts. Busey explained there is \$20 million owed to the County in back fines and fees ordered by the courts system. Ammons asked if all the fees collected go the GCF. Busey said no, the report shows the total collections and the portion of the total amount that goes to GCF. These collections are distributed to various agencies and police departments. A total of \$250,000 has been collected in three months for all agencies on Champaign County cases. Of that amount, \$46,617 went to the GCF and the balance goes to other agencies or funds. Ammons asked if this was unbudgeted revenue. Busey said this revenue was built into the operating budget as part of the projected GCF revenue. It is expected to take Harris & Harris at least three years to collect the outstanding fees and fines.

Michaels inquired about the situation with revenue from the State of Illinois. Busey answered that the state is starting to catch up on the income tax payments and sales tax revenue is looking good.

Busey answered Alix's questions about the County's history with Harris & Harris, including how selecting and engaging the firm was a decision made by the State's Attorney. Nudo noted the end user pays a fee to the firm, so the County has no expenses for the collections. James recalled that the State's Attorney assigned an employee to collect the fees and fines. Busey confirmed that one of the responsibilities of a Paralegal position in the State's Attorney's Office is to work on current collections. The collections sent to Harris & Harris have typically been unpaid for at least 60 to 90 days. James asked for a running total each year in order to see what amount has been collected versus what was outstanding. Busey agreed to provide that information.

MOTION by Holderfield to receive and place on file the County Administrator's reports and the Harris & Harris report; seconded by James. **Motion carried with unanimous support.**

Recommendation for Approval of Creation and Classification for New Position – Deputy Director for EMA

MOTION by Alix to approve the establishment of the Deputy Director for EMA position classified in Grade Range I, effective April 1, 2011; seconded by Anderson. **Motion carried with unanimous support.**

Resolution Establishing FY2011 Salary Increase for Non-Bargaining Employees

A revised resolution was distributed to the County Board.

MOTION by Langenheim to approve the revised Resolution Establishing FY2011 Salary Increase for Non-Bargaining Employees; seconded by Berkson.

Alix inquired about the impact for exempt employees, whose salary increase will not be permanent. Busey hoped the salary planning for next year will make the 2.5% increases permanent by adding it to these employees' base salary. A recommendation for salary administration for non-bargaining employees in FY2012 will be presented to the Board in May.

Schroeder exited the meeting at 8:59 p.m.

Motion carried with unanimous support.

Other Business

Weibel reminded the Board that the County Board will have its photo taken at 6:30 before the March County Board meeting.

Chair's Report

There was no Chair's report.

Designation of Items to be Placed on County Board Consent Agenda

Agenda items 10.A.1, B.1, & E.4-5 were designated for the consent agenda.

CLOSED SESSION MINUTES

Approval of Closed Session Minutes – February 15, 2011

MOTION by Holderfield to approve the Committee of the Whole minutes of February 15, 2011; seconded by Ammons. **Motion carried with unanimous support.**

Semi-Annual Review of Closed Session Minutes

MOTION by Weibel or all closed session minutes to remain closed; seconded by Alix.

Weibel explained that he and David DeThorne are looking at ways to review the closed session minutes. Ammons said she would vote against the motion because the Board has been talking for a long time about placing some parameters on how long the minutes remain closed.

Motion carried.

ADJOURN

The meeting was adjourned the meeting at 9:02 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kat Bork
Administrative Assistant

Secy's note: The minutes reflect the order of the agenda and may not necessarily reflect the order of business conducted at the meeting.