

## **MINUTES**

### **SANGAMON COUNTY BOARD**

**NOVEMBER 14, 2006**

The Sangamon County Board met in Reconvened Adjourned September Session on November 14, 2006 in the County Board Chambers. Chairman VanMeter called the meeting to order at 7:05 p.m. Mr. Montalbano gave the Invocation and Zach Bailey led the Board in the Pledge of Allegiance.

#### **ROLL CALL**

Chairman VanMeter asked the Clerk to call the roll. There were 27 Present – 2 Absent. Mr. Pace and Mr. Stumpf were excused.

#### **PROCLAMATIONS**

Mrs. Turner presented a Proclamation to Sam Cahnman in recognition of his service on the County Board. Mr. Cahnman accepted the Proclamation. He expressed how much he has enjoyed his four years of service on the County Board and that he has learned a lot from the process and from the other members. He stated that he cherishes the friendships and personal relationships he has established with fellow members on both sides of the aisle and with the County Board staff including Ryan, Lou, Charlie and Elaine. He stated that he will remember everyone at the end of his term with fond memories of working together for the public good.

Mr. Goleman presented a Proclamation to Dan Vaughn in recognition of his service on the County Board. Mr. Vaughn accepted the Proclamation. He stated that he cannot believe what all has happened during his 16 years of service on the County Board. He stated that he has met a lot of people and this is really a fine bunch of people to work with and he has never had a bad meeting. He wished the Board continued success.

Mrs. Long presented a proclamation to Dick Bond in recognition of his service on the County Board. Mr. Bond accepted the Proclamation. He stated that he has enjoyed working with everyone on this Board and it has been his pleasure serving his constituents of District #11. He stated that his successor, Mike Sullivan, is a great guy and they will love him.

This is a wonderful County Board and everyone works together on both sides of the aisle. He stated that he will be moving to Arizona to enjoy his retirement.

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

A motion was made by Mrs. Long, seconded by Mrs. Turner, for approval of the Minutes of October 10, 2006. A voice vote was unanimous.

MOTION CARRIED  
MINUTES ADOPTED

### **CORRESPONDENCE**

- A. Illinois Department of Transportation Motor Fuel Tax Allotment and Transactions for September, 2006.

A motion was made by Mrs. Turner, seconded by Mrs. Long, to place the Correspondence on file with the County Clerk. A voice vote was unanimous.

MOTION CARRIED  
CORRESPONDENCE FILED

### **RESOLUTION 1**

1. Resolution appropriating Motor Fuel Tax funds for the annual maintenance of County highways.

A motion was made by Mr. Montalbano, seconded by Ms. Cimarossa, for the adoption of Resolution 1. Upon a roll call vote, there were 26 Yeas – 0 Nays.

MOTION CARRIED  
RESOLUTION ADOPTED

### **RESOLUTIONS 2 – 4**

2. Resolution appropriating Motor Fuel Tax funds for the agreements with Hanson Professional Services, Inc. for MacArthur Boulevard.

A motion was made by Mr. Snell, seconded by Ms. VanHoos, for the adoption of Resolution 2. A motion was made by Mr. Bunch, seconded by Mr. O'Neill, to consolidate Resolutions 2 – 4. Chairman VanMeter asked the Clerk to read Resolutions 3 and 4.

3. Resolution approving a federal aid participation agreement for preliminary engineering for the Sangamon Valley Trail.

4. Resolution approving an altered speed zone on Oak Crest Road in Clear Lake Township.

A voice vote was unanimous on the consolidation. A motion was made by Mr. Goleman, seconded by Mrs. Scaife, that the roll call vote for Resolution 1 stand as the roll call vote for Resolutions 2 – 4, as consolidated. A voice vote was unanimous.

MOTIONS CARRIED  
RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED

### **RESOLUTION 5**

5. 2006-45 – Edwin F. Pearson, 6500-6900 Blocks of PEC Road, Springfield – Denying a Rezoning. County Board Member – Tom Fraase, District #1.

A motion was made by Mr. Vaughn to withdraw Resolution 5. Without objection, Resolution 5 is withdrawn.

MOTION CARRIED  
RESOLUTION WITHDRAWN

### **RESOLUTION 6**

6. 2006-54 – The Landers Children Family, LLC, 13487 BAB Road, Auburn – Denying a Rezoning. County Board Member – Sam Snell, District #6.

A motion was made by Mr. Snell, seconded by Mr. Mendenhall, for the adoption of Resolution 6. Chairman VanMeter asked the professional staff to give the procedural history of the case.

Susan Poludniak, professional staff, stated that the petitioner is requesting a rezoning from “A” agriculture to “R-1” single family residence and has amended his petition to request only a variance to allow the lot depth to exceed 2 ½ times the lot width for two parcels. Randy Armstrong, professional staff, stated that the parcel totals 5 acres. The petitioner originally wanted to divide the property into four lots, but now is asking the request be amended to permit two lots, each of which would have 160’ of road frontage.

Ms. Poludniak stated that the LESA score of 146, which is acceptable for non-agricultural development, therefore; the staff recommends approval of the zoning change from agriculture to single family residences. The staff recommends denial of the original variance request which would have created adjacent flag lots. However, the staff recommends approval of the amended variance request to allow two lots in which the length exceeds 2 ½ times the width. Mr. Armstrong stated that the Zoning Board of Appeals concurs with the original staff report and recommends denial of the request that included three flag lots.

Todd Chance, residing at 214 W. Monroe in Auburn, addressed the Board. He stated that the Landers amended their request to two parcels instead of four and the new request requires rezoning. The lot would be divided down the middle with 160 feet of frontage on each lot. There is an existing mobile home there currently. If the request is granted, they would build one single-family cedar log home on the front of the property, one single-family cedar log home on the south replacing the existing mobile home, and one cedar log home would be built on the north side of the property. All they are really requesting is for zoning to go from "A" to "R-1" and to be divided down the middle. They are not proposing to put a flag lot there or are not building to the back of the property.

Randy Segatto, Attorney representing Robert and Rosalie Brackebusch, who own the property directly north and west of the petitioner's property, addressed the Board. He stated that he believes agricultural is appropriate for its current use and it's not needed to go to "R-1". He stated that he does not believe the petitioners have met their burdens. With respect to the lot variances, they have to show there is an economic hardship. They just bought this five acre tract on October 16<sup>th</sup>, so obviously there is a market there. They have never shown any evidence the plight is unique to the property, so the variances, even under the proposed amendments, should not be granted.

Mark Warnsee, Attorney representing Suzanne and Mitchell Warnsee, who own property along the entire southern boundary of the proposed property, addressed the Board. The Zoning Board did not recommend the variances and without the variances it does not seem the zoning change is necessary. It should be taken as a whole package and not split up into two different things. He stated that there were concerns about the use of his client's property as a horse pasture. The original petition was four houses right along the horse pasture and now they are trying to change that. This amendment may not be properly before the Board at this point, but that would be for the Board to decide.

Mr. Cahnman asked if they would still object if the amendment is adopted. Mr. Segatto stated they still do not believe the petitioners have met their burden to show a unique disadvantage to the owner.

Chairman VanMeter asked if any member wanted to make a motion for the proposed amendment. There were no motions made to amend. The proposal dies due to lack of a member wishing to make an amendment.

Billie Landers, residing at 13481 BAB Road in Auburn, addressed the Board. She explained that they paid more for the land than what it is worth. The proposed location for the home on the north is where a home already was. Right now it is abandoned and is sitting in a pile of rubble and they want to take the rubble away and rebuild and put a nice log cabin there. The ground on the north side is surrounded by trees and they want to remove the existing mobile home on the north side and replace it with a nice home. There are no mobile homes up and down that road so it would be a benefit for the property itself to have a nice log cabin sitting there. They want to divide it into two because there are a lot of woods to the north and it would bring in no income.

Mr. Segatto stated that the petitioner's have not met their standards for a variation. The LESA score was 146 which is just barely under the 150 magic point for changing it. It is zoned agriculture and they could remove the mobile home and build the log cabin they want.

Mr. Cahnman asked for clarification if they could build a home on the property as it is now. Randy Armstrong, professional staff, stated that they would have to first remove the existing mobile home and could only have one house per parcel.

Mr. Goleman asked if a super majority of the Board voting in the affirmative would be required for this to pass. Mr. Armstrong explained that it would require at least 22 votes to approve any variance on it without going back for re-publication.

Chairman VanMeter asked for a roll call vote on the motion to adopt Resolution 6. Upon the roll call vote, there were 26 Yeas – 0 Nays. Resolution 6 written “to deny a rezoning” was adopted and the rezoning is denied.

MOTION CARRIED  
RESOLUTION ADOPTED

### **RESOLUTION 7**

7. 2006-55 – Nicholas Drum, 9617 Buckhart Road, Rochester – Granting a Variance. County Board Member – David Mendenahll, District #3.

A motion was made by Mr. Mendenhall, seconded by Mr. Tjelmeland, for the adoption of Resolution 7. A motion was made by Mr. Moore to waive the reading of the professional staff's report. There were no objections. A voice vote was unanimous on the motion to adopt Resolution 7.

MOTIONS CARRIED  
RESOLUTION ADOPTED

### **RESOLUTIONS 8 - 10**

8. Resolution approving a contract for professional services with Bansal Occupational Solutions, LLC and the Sheriff's Office.

A motion was made by Mr. Buecker, seconded by Mr. Stephens, for the adoption of Resolution 8. A motion was made by Mr. Bunch, seconded by Mr. Moss, to consolidate Resolutions 8 – 10. Chairman VanMeter asked the Clerk to read Resolutions 9 and 10.

9. Resolution approving budget transfers and amendments for various County departments.

10. Resolution approving the final plat of Pickrell Acres Minor Subdivision.

A voice vote was unanimous on the consolidation of Resolutions 8 – 10. A motion was made by Mr. Goleman, seconded by Mr. Wieland, that the roll call vote for Resolution 1 stand as the roll call vote for Resolutions 8 – 10, as consolidated. A voice vote was unanimous.

MOTIONS CARRIED  
RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED

### **RESOLUTION 11**

11. Resolution amending Section 5.04.390 of the Sangamon County Alcoholic Beverages Ordinance.

A motion was made by Mr. Fraase to withdraw Resolution 11. There were no objections.

MOTION CARRIED  
RESOLUTION WITHDRAWN

### **RESOLUTION 12**

12. Resolution approving the annual Budget and Appropriation Ordinance for the Fiscal Year December 1, 2006 through November 30, 2007.

A motion was made by Mr. Goleman, seconded by Mrs. Turner, for the adoption of Resolution 12.

Ryan McCrady, County Administrator, gave a presentation on the FY2007 Budget. He explained that with budget changes there will be a decrease of about \$7.1 million from FY2006. The FY2006 Budget was about \$98.4 million and the FY2007 Budget will be about \$91.2 million. There are several reasons for the budget reduction. One reason is because the County Complex debt was paid off on October 30<sup>th</sup> after about a 20 year commitment to the taxpayers of Sangamon County. However, there is still money to operate and maintain the building including the Adult Detention Center in the back. The tax levy for the next fiscal year will be 12% less than what it is this fiscal year. There will be no additional revenues added on.

Another change is how the Juvenile Detention Center is being funded. This has been about an 18 month process working with the Judges, John Vargas and the rest of the staff in the department to look at the population there and how it is being funded. There was a significant decrease in funding from the State of Illinois. Typically the County has had to contribute additional money from the County General Fund to operate the Juvenile Detention Center. With this fiscal year that contribution will go down by about \$544,000.

After working with that department for about 18 months they have found the population was not what they thought it was going to be and State funding has decreased dramatically from about \$1.5 million down to about \$1 million. They have found the most effective way to reform a juvenile is not to put them into a juvenile detention center, but to use programs which will allow them to interact in the community, go to school, and teach them life skills to operate and sustain themselves in this society. To do that they could not afford to operate the programs and run both wings of the juvenile center so they vacated one wing of the juvenile center and pushed resources towards the programs to be able to afford to do what is most effective in helping reform the juveniles. Mr. McCrady stated that he and Charlie Stratton were not the only people involved in this process. It also included the Juvenile Detention staff, Judges, Court Services Committee, Finance Committee and County Board Chairman. The good news is that even though the staff was reduced by 13 positions and was done purely through attrition and re-organization and without layoffs, the State has not cut off funding for next year.

Another change in the budget has to do with the Recorder of Deeds Office. Maximus came in and did an efficiency study in the Fall of this year. The Finance Committee made a motion to craft the target budget with the recommendation they reduce staff funding in the Recorder's Office. The Finance Committee would like to work to achieve an average efficiency level of that of peer counties in the State of Illinois. They do not want to lay off staff and this won't happen over night. The Finance Committee has asked to speak with the Recorder on a quarterly basis to talk about the progress towards meeting those efficiency goals. The money that was reduced was set aside in a separate reserve line item and as the efficiency in that department is monitored the Finance Committee can forward resolutions to the County Board to add additional funding to that office to fund the operations. This won't happen December 1<sup>st</sup> and will probably take more than a year. Over the next year they will meet and decide on a plan of action.

Another positive change in this year's budget is a decrease in the worker's compensation expenses of about \$300,000 which is about 9.91 %. There has been a lot of extra effort by the Auditor's Office to monitor the worker's compensation situation. They did work with the County worker's compensation insurance company to get a grant to hire a medical case management person to monitor worker's compensation cases where people have time off from work. This means they would work with a person to coordinate their doctor's appointments, checkups, physical therapy and whatever they need. They basically work as an advocate for the injured employee. This helps get the employee services faster and get them well and back to work quicker. It also saves the County, insurance companies, and taxpayers money.

Also, savings from the Voluntary Severance Plan helped to have a decrease in worker's compensation. There were 35 employees who took advantage in the severance plan and the payroll is lower, therefore, it is natural to say the worker's compensation would be lower. It didn't just impact personnel line items because there is trickle down savings throughout the County budget because of that.

Another major change in the budget has to do with the Help America Vote Act. The County is now using a state-of-the-art voting system. On last year's budget there was \$2 million of spending authority for the purchase of the machines. About 94% of the cost of that system was funded through state and federal grants. There was a lot of hard work by Joe Aiello and Stacey Kern and their staff. They no longer need to have the \$2 million in the budget since the system is purchased now. Its operation was successful and it worked pretty well and people are starting to understand the technology.

Another item contributed to this budget is the successful Voluntary Severance Plan. The County has held the line on their IMRF pension contributions because payroll and staffing was lower. This is another trickle down savings from the plan. From 2003 to 2004 there was a 10% increase in the pension fund contribution and from 2004 to 2005 there was a 24% increase. This is important because the money contributed to the pension fund is part of the County's aggregate tax levy for tax cap purposes. There was also a decrease in county staffing by 28 full-time equivalent employees due to the Voluntary Severance Plan. There were 48 employees added from the City Health Department due to the merger of the health departments, but the total County staffing only went up 20 full-time equivalents.

Another highlight of the budget is the improved performance of the self-funded health insurance plan. There will only be a .71% budget increase for the next fiscal year. The plan is fully funded to 125% of the expected claims and there will be no increase in employee premiums with the same coverage. The Board of Managers composed of County employees and County Board members deserves the credit for this achievement. They have to make tough decisions about employee health insurance. The fund balance in the self-funded health insurance plan is about \$3.7 million.

The next fiscal year the Integrated Criminal Justice System will also be implemented. The Dispatch and Criminal Records Systems become functional in mid December 2006 with the full system implementation including field based reporting will be implemented by November 30, 2007. The annual expenses are estimated at \$1 million and are a net of a \$750,000 COPSMORE grant for the initial implementation.

On the tax levy, the total dollars levied for 2006 payable 2007 will decrease by about \$2.3 million from last year, or about 9.46%. The tax rate will be .6963 representing a 12.1% decrease from the previous year. The Truth in Taxation hearing will be on November 28<sup>th</sup> at 5:00 p.m., so if anyone has questions they can attend that hearing. The adoption of the tax levy is scheduled for the December County Board meeting.

Mr. McCrady thanked the elected officials and department heads for their cooperation. He also thanked Dave Conner from the Auditor's Office and Mark Crawford from the Treasurer's Office for their many hours of assistance and thanked the County Board for their support through this process. Mr. McCrady stated that it makes it a lot easier when everyone works together on this. He asked for any questions from the Board.

Mr. Cahnman stated that he read some memos from the Recorder stating reasons why she thought the study on her office was flawed and he wanted to know if Maximus had been given those memos. Mr. McCrady stated that he has not seen the memos. The people from Maximus said they are willing to provide travel receipts, vouchers, meal receipts and gas mileage logs to prove they were there and did do the study. Mr. McCrady stated that he is not sure how else to prove they were there and did their work. They were written a check for their services. Mr. Cahnman explained that he does not think she was disputing they did their work, but she is saying the amount of documents recorded per employee is not correct because a lot of her employees do not do recordings. Mr. McCrady stated that it all depends on how you look at things. Maximus looked at what it takes to process each documents. Mr. Cahnman stated that he thought they would be willing to show the memos to Maximus. After looking at the memos, Mr. McCrady stated that they appear to be the items submitted with the budget requests and to the Finance Committee and Maximus has seen them. Mr. Cahnman asked if they have commented on them. Mr. McCrady stated that they were at the Finance Committee meeting and still stood by the numbers they had from their report.

Mr. Cahnman asked where the money taken from the Recorder's Office is in the budget. Mr. McCrady stated that it is in Finance Miscellaneous under Fund 001-Department 008, and is shown on Page 7 of the Budget Resolution. Dave Conner stated that the account is 559.150 Cost Savings Contingency. Mr. Cahnman asked if the Recorder's budget was cut by \$245,000. Mr. McCrady stated that yes it was moved into that line item and could only be moved back by the Finance Committee and County Board. Mr. Cahnman asked if the County Board could appropriate it if she needs some of that money later on in the year. Mr. McCrady stated that they could.

Mr. Cahnman asked why the corporate fund went up by \$2,550,268. Mr. McCrady explained that it has to go up because the money levied to operate and maintain the building was in a separate levied fund and was inside the counties aggregate tax levy.

Mr. Snell thanked Ryan for his great presentation and thanked Mr. Goleman for his work on the Finance Committee.

A motion was made by Mr. Goleman, seconded by Ms. Cimarossa, to amend Resolution 12. Mr. Goleman stated that Fund 001-Department 024 for the County Clerk should be amended to change the total appropriation to \$397,268 because of a computer error. A voice vote was unanimous.

A motion was made by Mr. Cahnman, seconded by Mrs. Turner, that the Recorder be able to address the County Board. A voice vote carried. Upon the voice vote, the Recorder was given the opportunity to address the Board.

Mary Ann Lamm, Recorder, addressed the Board. She stated that she has been around for 30 years in this office and her staff and some customers are present with her tonight. She explained that they do a lot more than record deeds as expressed in this efficient study.

She stated that had she known an efficiency study was going to take place and had she been informed in June that this went to her Committee, to the Finance Committee, and to the County Board and had she known what they were going to do with her office or against her office, she would have stood up and hollered. The cart has come before the horse. The Board received copies of exactly what her staff does and what their duties are. This office is run efficiently and they are dedicated public servants. The Board is doing a disservice to their constituents and to hers. She stated that she and staff are proud to serve the people of Sangamon County and they do work hard to get their jobs done. She stressed that she has fantastic customers and they are served and treated well. She stated that if the Board votes to cut her staff then they are doing the wrong thing and they will have to pay. She stated she wants to talk to those people who said they need to see how efficient her office runs. They don't need to go to Peoria, Rock Island, or McLean County, they should just come to her and she will open her doors any time. They should see what is going on here in Sangamon County and not what is going on in other counties. She asked the Board to put the money back in the budget for the Recorder's Office and to inform her when these studies take place to let her know what is so inefficient about her office. Those people out there deserve the services they continue to give. She stated that if there has to be cut backs then she as the office holder of the Recorder's Office, and her employees should be the ones to look at that. She thanked the Board for their time and asked anyone interested to contact her so she can show them what they do in the Office of the Recorder because it is much more than stamping a document.

Mr. VanMeter asked Mr. McCrady to answer a few questions since the Recorder suggested the hiring of Maximus was done in secret without any notice to her or the public. He asked if the meeting notices regarding hiring an outside consultant were posted as required by law. Mr. McCrady stated that they were. Mr. VanMeter asked if meetings which the Board met to hire a consultant to study the various areas of the County were posted by law. Mr. McCrady stated that they were. Mr. VanMeter asked if the meetings were conducted in public as required by law and adequate notice was given to the public. Mr. McCrady stated that they were. Mr. VanMeter asked if the Recorder was informed of the fact her office would be included in the study. Mr. McCrady stated that she was. Mr. VanMeter asked if all the other departments were informed they would be part of the study. Mr. McCrady stated that they were. Mr. VanMeter asked if the study consultants met with the Recorder as part of the study. Mr. McCrady stated that they did meet in the County Board Conference Room. Mr. VanMeter asked if various members of the Board have met with the Recorder prior to the public notice of the study to discuss the results and review her thoughts with respect to the findings of the consultants. Mr. McCrady stated that they did. Mr. VanMeter asked if the Committee met with the Recorder subsequent to the publication of the study to discuss the results. Mr. McCrady stated that they did. Mr. VanMeter asked if various Board members have offered to meet further with the Recorder to find ways to implement the recommendations. Mr. McCrady stated that they have.

Mr. VanMeter asked the Board members to raise their hands if they are familiar with the operations of the Recorder's Office. All members raised their hands.

Mr. Cahnman asked if it is correct that the Recorder's Office takes in more revenue and recording fees than it actually costs to run the office. Mr. McCrady stated that is correct. It probably brings in more than twice as much revenue as it spends and that is the nature of the general fund operation of the County government. The County has a general fund composed of various departments and the way County government is designed by law is that the general fund is support fund for all the funds of County government. There are also departments that don't bring any revenue in. If the amount of revenue is a benchmark for the number of employees they should have, then Tom Cavanagh should have about 500 employees because he brings in more revenue than anybody. The unique thing about county general departments is that they don't get billed for the expenses of running their office.

Ms. Cimarossa asked if there will be a line item still set aside if needed by the Recorder's Office. Mr. McCrady stated that there would be. Mr. VanMeter asked if there is any reason any employee should be laid off on December 1<sup>st</sup> if this is adopted. Mr. McCrady stated no there is not. Mr. VanMeter stated that he deeply regrets to the deeply hard working employees of that department who have been frightened in any way into thinking their regular paycheck has been threatened by the Board's proposal. There is every reason to believe that by working together they can manage this adjustment to the department so they will be able to maintain the job they have or move to another comparable position in County government.

Mr. Goleman stated that it is sad commentary that members of the Recorder's Office have been used and have been provided with false information. The only thing that is constant in life is change and some people can adapt to change and some can't. The Board has a responsibility as a governmental body and have a judiciary duty to make sure operations run in an efficient matter and that they get the most for the taxpayers which is what they are going to do. For the Recorder to suggest she wasn't aware of this is totally inaccurate because she has been aware of this. He stated that he personally sat down and talked with her about this. She is implying things because she has a D behind her name. The silly season is over and the Election is over with. The Finance Committee is made up of both political parties. In a bi-partisan effort the Board has crafted this budget and worked together on it. He stated that there have been some people who have called and he would be glad to talk to anyone at anytime.

He stated that he and Mrs. Long, Chairman of the Finance Committee, sent out a letter on November 1<sup>st</sup>, to the employees of the Recorder's Office explaining the action taken by the County Board. Mr. Goleman read the letter explaining the facts of the situation to the Recorder's Office employees and asked that the letter be placed on file for the record. Without objection the Chairman ordered that the letter be placed on file as a permanent record.

Chairman VanMeter asked for a roll call vote on the motion to adopt Resolution 12.

Mr. Cahnman explained that he is voting yes because the budget does reduce the property tax levy, but is disturbed by the drastic 53% cut in the Recorder's budget when the highest other department cut was 9.5% and some went up by 12% to 13%. He stated that he is also voting yes because the money is set aside in another line item in the budget and the Board will be appropriate funds to the Recorder if needed. He stated that he hopes the Board and Recorder will work together to bring up the efficiency level in a reasonable matter and not in an unreasonable and drastic way.

Mrs. Turner explained that she is voting yes as well, but she does this with a lot of thought and research and after many conversations with the Recorder, Finance Chair, and Chairman to ensure that the Recorder's Office will be able to function in a sufficient manner to serve the public. She stated that she does consider Mary Ann Lamm one of her mentors as a Democratic office holder and would never do anything to cast a vote to cause harm to the office. This is something they are doing for a number of good reasons and they have taken all of the steps needed to ensure it will serve not only the employees of the Recorder's Office but the County as a whole.

Upon the roll call vote, there were 26 Yeas – 0 Nays.

MOTIONS CARRIED  
RESOLUTION ADOPTED

### **INTEGRATED CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM PRESENTATION**

Without objection, Mr. VanMeter stated they would proceed slightly out of regular order because the Sheriff is present to give a presentation which is critical to the future of law enforcement services in the community. Mr. VanMeter stated that the issue being discussed is going to come to the public's attention before the Board meets again. A large group of Board members have been working on this for a long time. It is important that everyone be supplied with this background information.

Neil Williamson, Sheriff, addressed the Board. He explained that they are in the process of implementing a computer integrated system because of the work of the Chairman and County Board. On December 11<sup>th</sup> the first phase will go into effect with the new dispatch. The end result will be that the deputies out on the street will be submitting reports electronically from the field instead of driving all the way into the County Building to do these reports and it will enable them to patrol one to two hours per day extra. He stated that it will take them into the 21<sup>st</sup> Century. Mr. Williamson stated that Ryan McCrady would give a slide presentation on this program and would introduce key people who are involved in this.

Mr. McCrady explained that back in 2000 Maximus did an Operational Study showing an integrated system would be more efficient and information would be more accurate. It would also enable quicker adjudication of cases. It is about getting decisions made faster and more efficiently.

In 2002 they received a COPSMORE Grant in the amount of \$750,000 which allows officer to spend more time in the field and allows reports to be electronically moved through the justice system. With their current technology they have a mainframe computer which is lacking storage. There are delays in retrieving information and the estimated lifespan ends December 31, 2006. The replacement needs to take place now because the efficiency of getting people out to respond to the needs of the public would be difficult.

Some of the integrated system components include updated dispatch software, new mobile computers, integrated criminal data, wireless environment, records management, corrections management, and field reporting.

Some of the new updates will include NWS mobile client software, in-car mapping and Cad viewer, crash report drawing tool, laptop virus protection, full integration with other agencies and County, state-of-the-art mobile records management, field reporting, and expedited jail booking.

The timeline for this project will be as follows: mobile design locked by November 3, 2006; MDC installation and training in November, 2006; go-live CAD, MDC by December 11, 2006; go-live RMS by December 12, 2006; intergovernmental agreement due by December 31, 2006; Corrections in the 2<sup>nd</sup> quarter of 2007; field-based reporting in the 3<sup>rd</sup> quarter of 2007; begin agency RMS implementation in the 4<sup>th</sup> quarter of 2007; begin Phase II in the 4<sup>th</sup> quarter of 2007.

Mr. McCrady recognized and introduced some key people involved in this project. They are: Paula Tolbert, Jim Gasparin, Dave Matrisch, Sgt. Joe Raft, Deputy Mike Long, Deputy Scott Butterfield, Detective Mark Garst, Deputy Stacey Buecker, Deputy Craig All. It has been great to have the deputies involved to look at the system and give their input. They have volunteered a lot of their time with this. From 911/Dispatch is Terry Oger, Ken Davis, Matt Broche, Mallorie Teubner, Gordon Fritz, and Don Kupferschmid, project manager. Everyone has been working very hard to get this done and it will be a super project.

Mr. VanMeter stated that as many hours as they have put in it will get worse before the December 11<sup>th</sup> implementation day. He stressed to everyone that it is mission critical this transition is made around the middle of December because the system the entire community is dependent on is so outdated.

Ms. Cimarossa stated that this is an awesome project and asked how they will integrate the City, Fire and all other departments. Mr. McCrady stated that the City has been involved in this process and are well aware of where this is going. They are looking at their resources to figure out how they want to integrate with this system.

The system was designed to be easily interfaced with other types of systems. They may decide to buy under this system or go with their own system. Mr. VanMeter explained that this system has been developed to be user friendly and responsive to all of the users in the community.

Mr. Bunch asked if they discussed this with the City and informed them they would have to go ahead with it whether they were going to be involved or not. Mr. McCrady stated that the City has been involved with this since 2001. Mr. VanMeter stated that the City is also going with this basic system.

Mr. Cahnman asked if the City has the funds to participate in this. Mr. McCrady stated that he does not have any knowledge of the City's funding situation, but they have been very well advised the County is moving forward on December 11<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Cahnman asked if this system would have any impact on the ability to pin-point the location of a 911 caller who is calling from a cellular phone. Mallory Teubner stated that it would give them the ability to locate a cellular caller by their latitude and longitude. She stated that they are currently unable to plot them with the technology they are using.

Ms. Cimarossa asked if all the rural agencies would be using this also. Mr. McCrady stated that they have met with rural agencies and have put together a monthly newsletter to keep people apprised on the status of the project. Communication has been pretty good with everyone involved. The rural agencies have upgraded a lot of their computers already.

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

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

**MOTION CARRIED**  
**TEN-DAY FILING PERIOD WAIVED**

### **RESOLUTIONS 13 – 16**

13. Resolution amending Section 5.04.390 of the Sangamon County Alcoholic Beverages Ordinance.

A motion was made by Mr. Fraase, seconded by Mr. O'Neill, for the adoption of Resolution 13. A motion was made by Mr. Bunch, seconded by Mr. Vaughn, to consolidate Resolutions 13 – 16. Chairman VanMeter asked the Clerk to read Resolutions 14 – 16.

14. Resolution amending Section 5.30.020 of Chapter 5.30 of the Sangamon County Administrative Hearing Officer Ordinance.

15. Resolution approving the five-year update to the County's Solid Waste Plan.
16. Resolution approving an amendment to the original Comprehensive Fire Protection Plan.

A voice vote carried on the motion to consolidate Resolutions 13 – 16. Mr. Cahnman voted nay. A motion was made by Mr. Wieland, seconded by Mr. Griffin, to amend Resolution 15. In the third paragraph the word “it” should be changed to “its”. A voice vote was unanimous on the amendment. A motion was made by Mr. Goleman, seconded by Mr. Stephens, that the roll call vote for Resolution 1 stand as the roll call vote Resolutions 13 – 16, as consolidated and amended. A voice vote was unanimous.

MOTIONS CARRIED  
RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED

### **OLD BUSINESS**

There was no Old Business.

### **NEW BUSINESS**

#### A. Resolutions

There were no new resolutions.

#### B. Appointments

John O'Neill to the OEM/911 Task Force Committee

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

MOTION CARRIED  
APPOINTMENTS ADOPTED

#### C. Ratification of the Sangamon County Highway Department Collective Bargaining Agreement.

A motion was made by Mr. Griffin, seconded by Mr. Bunch, for ratification of the agreement. Mr. Griffin praised the good work of the Road and Bridge and Collective Bargaining Committees as well as the professional attitude brought forward by the County Engineer. This is probably the first time they have walked in, exchanged proposals, had one meeting, and ended up with a very good contract that was favorable to both sides. He recommended approval by the Board.

Mr. Bunch agreed there has been a big change in the professional staff and with the employees there.

MOTION CARRIED  
AGREEMENT RATIFIED

**COMMITTEE REPORT ON CLAIMS**

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

MOTION CARRIED  
REPORT FILED

**RECESS**

A motion was made by Mr. Cahnman, seconded by Mrs. Long, to recess the meeting to December 12, 2006 at 7:00 p.m. A voice vote was unanimous.

MOTION CARRIED  
MEETING RECESSED