

JOE AIELLO
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



MINUTES

SANGAMON COUNTY BOARD

NOVEMBER 8, 2011

The Sangamon County Board met in Reconvened Adjourned September Session on November 8, 2011 in the County Board Chambers. Chairman VanMeter called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. Mr. Moore gave the Invocation. He asked for a moment of silence in remembrance of County employees Lana Rister, with Information Systems, and Dave Kiliman, former Director of Regional Planning, who passed away recently. Mr. Hall led the Board in the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL

Chairman VanMeter asked the County Clerk to call the roll. There were 26 Present – 3 Absent. Mr. Bunch, Mr. Davsko and Mr. Snell were excused.

Chairman VanMeter recognized Senator Kirk's representative, Brad Cole, who is present tonight.

MINUTES

A motion was made by Mr. Montalbano, seconded by Mr. Smith, for approval of the minutes of October 11, 2011. A voice vote was unanimous.

MOTION CARRIED
MINUTES ADOPTED

CORRESPONDENCE

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

RESOLUTION 1

- 1. Resolution authorizing the execution of the Illinois Public Works Mutual Aid Network Agreement.

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

MOTION CARRIED
RESOLUTION ADOPTED

RESOLUTION 2

- 2. 2011-36 – Don W. Herron, 6435 Wesley Chapel Road, Chatham – Granting a Conditional Permitted Use and Variance. County Board Member – Harry “Tom” Fraase, Jr., District #1.

A motion was made by Mr. Fraase, seconded by Mr. Moore, to place Resolution 2 on the floor. 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 for the adoption of Resolution 2.

MOTIONS CARRIED
RESOLUTION ADOPTED

RESOLUTION 3

- 3. 2011-44 – Charles Young, POA for Mary Ann Young, 63 Robb Street, Glenarm – Granting a Variance. County Board Member – Don Stephens, Jr., District #5.

A motion was made by Mr. Stephens, seconded by Mr. Goleman, to place Resolution 3 on the floor. 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 for the adoption of Resolution 3.

MOTIONS CARRIED
RESOLUTION ADOPTED

RESOLUTION 4

- 4. 2011-46 – Philemon Southwick, in the 8500 block of N. Pawnee Road, Pawnee – Granting Variances. County Board Member – Don Stephens, Jr., District #5.

A motion was made by Mr. Stephens, seconded by Mrs. Musgrave, to place Resolution 4 on the floor. 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 for the adoption of Resolution 4.

MOTIONS CARRIED
RESOLUTION ADOPTED

RESOLUTION 5

5. 2011-47 – Richard W. Smith, Jr., 626 S. Livingston, Springfield – Denying a Variance. County Board Member – Rose Ruzic, District #19.

A motion was made by Mrs. Ruzic, seconded by Mr. Boyster, to place Resolution 5 on the floor. 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 for the adoption of Resolution 5 which is written "to deny a variance".

MOTIONS CARRIED

RESOLUTION ADOPTED

RESOLUTION 6

6. 2011-48 – Chris Manion, 9596 Clarksville Road, Rochester – Denying a Rezoning. County Board Member – David Mendenhall, District #3.

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

Molly Berns, professional staff, stated that the petitioner is requesting a rezoning from R-1 single family residence district, to RM-4 manufactured home district, to allow for a manufactured home. Norm Sims, professional staff, stated that the Planning Commission recommends denial of the requested RM-4 zoning. In 2008 the staff recommended approval of this request because there were unique circumstances in that the owner did not place the new manufactured home in place of the old one within the six month time frame. At that time it was considered a reasonable amount of time and an acceptable request; however, the request was denied by the County Board and precedent was set for the subject parcels. It has been approximately three years since the original request, and a spot of RM-4 zoning is not seen as appropriate since a single family residence could be placed on the vacant property. Molly Berns stated that the Zoning Board of Appeals concurs with the staff report and recommends denial of the rezoning.

Christopher Manion, residing at 20 Willow Hill Drive, Sherman, addressed the Board. He explained that his mother and stepfather wish to place a manufactured home on this property. This would be an income savings measure. His mother is chronically ill and his stepfather works two jobs. They want to do this so they can free up their income for medical expenses. He stated that he is able to offer the property to them for the mobile home. His parents would pay taxes on the mobile home and he would continue to pay the taxes on the property. This would help with maintenance on the property. He does have a pole barn on the property that he stores things in. This would allow him to secure goods in there. At the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting, they stated they were against having a manufactured home on the property because a stick built home could easily be placed on this property. He thinks that is true, but he believes there are a lot of older homes and there are homes in need of repair currently in this area. It is probably not a financially viable option to place a brand new home in this particular area.

There are currently two manufactured homes within ¼ mile of the property. One of which is a double-wide on a concrete foundation. The other is a single framed home with skirting on it. He does have pictures if anyone would like to look at them. Mr. Manion yielded the rest of his time to speak to his stepfather, since he will be the one actually occupying the property.

Francis Langloss, residing at 2120 S. Noble Ave., Springfield, IL 62704, addressed the Board. He explained that he now lives in between Outer Park Drive and Cherry Road. He does keep up with that property and always has. By moving out there he would keep up with that property and would also give the area a face lift. They also want to get caught up with their medical bills. He plans to put a lot of trees around there to upgrade it. He would also like to join the fire department out there, since his wife is ill, to help everyone else.

Mr. Moore asked Mr. Manion if the pictures he passed around are of his property or of the property nearby. Mr. Manion stated they are of his property and the neighboring properties. The one with the blue building on the property is his manufactured pole building. He is currently on three lots there, and his building sits on one lot by itself. He took the picture so they could clarify that the lot is being kept up and is being maintained. They did plant trees this past year and had some trees cut down because they were falling down on the property.

Mr. Fulgenzi asked if they would be able to put the manufactured home on a foundation. Mr. Manion stated that it was discussed at the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting and his stepfather did address the issue. He stated that he did offer to remove the mobile home if his parents would ever leave. He was told that is something he could not legally swear to. His stepfather did say at the meeting that he would put it on a permanent foundation. Mr. Manion stated he does not have a problem with removing the home if something happens. If not, he would most likely sell the property.

Mr. Mendenhall asked what his proximity is to the fertilizer plant that has a bunch of bulk fertilizer tanks and to the fuel distribution company that has a lot of diesel fuel and gasoline tanks. Mr. Manion stated he does not know exactly how many feet. The gas company is across the road, and the fertilizer plant is down the road on Clarksville Road. There is a home that sits directly behind his property that is in the same proximity where their home would be placed. He does not see how that would be a problem. Mr. Mendenhall asked if it could affect their well if there is a problem at either one of those places. Mr. Manion stated that becomes true with contamination of any water source or system, no matter where you live. It could be problematic. He stated that this is not close to a river, but he is close to one in Sherman.

Mr. Manion gave his rebuttal. He stated that there are two other manufactured homes within the distance of this property. When he purchased it on October 3, 2006, he was told by Countrywide that this was zoned for a manufactured home. Currently the zoning is for a manufactured building that you can run a small business out of, and he was told it is also zoned to have two homes placed on the property. They only want to put one home on the property. There is currently a well and septic already on the property. The septic has already been tested and has passed the testing for the actual phase of the tank and lateral system. The well has not been tested because there is no electricity on the property. They plan to pump the well completely down.

He explained that his aunt just paid \$4,000 to have a well put in about two miles down from there, and her water tested badly. They were told they would have to use black light. He stated he told that to his parents, and they are willing to do this if they need to.

Mr. Moore asked the Board to recall that their policy has been to move away from RM-4 zoning being spotted around the County, especially in rural areas. They are trying to get away from spot zoning. They do not necessarily object to a stick built home in this kind of an environment, but he does have an objection to a manufactured home in this location. If you go back and look at the testimony in the staff recommendation that is what you will find. They have changed their rules in the last five years to sunset some of these provisions so they can move on to more stringent housing in the rural areas.

Mr. Smith asked the professional staff if they recollect at the Zoning Board of Appeals that there was an agreement to put this on a permanent foundation. Mrs. Berns stated that is not her recollection. She believes it was discussed, but at that particular meeting she does not recall the petitioner stating he would put it on a permanent foundation. She does not recall it without going back and specifically checking the testimony. Mr. Smith stated that he did not recall that either. He asked if the fact that they would put a manufactured home on a permanent foundation change their view of this case. Mr. Sims stated that he does not believe it would change the Planning Commission's professional recommendation on the basis that the testimony tonight is that there are two other manufactured homes within a quarter mile. It starts to look at the question of whether this adds to a trend. A quarter mile is not really that close, but it does establish a trend in the area that would set the precedent for more mobile homes in this area. Mr. Moore agreed with Mr. Sims.

Mr. Smith asked if the discussion about placing these on permanent foundations has changed their view on the permanency of the structure and real estate taxes for the structure. Mr. Moore stated that it was only discussed hypothetically. Legal counsel weighed in and said they could not guarantee anything except what has to be in front of them in writing tonight. They talked about it, but there was no promise made on either side of the transaction.

Mr. Smith asked the professional staff if it would be a different request than what they are addressing this evening if the petitioner came back with the idea of putting a permanent foundation under a pre-manufactured home. Mrs. Berns stated that it is possible, but she could not definitively say what the professional staff's opinion would be without actually seeing the request. The gentleman's testimony is that there are two manufactured homes within a quarter of a mile. That may be the case on those further out in the country versus in the small community of Berry proper. They would have to look at that compared to the other trend, and she could not predict what the answer would be. Mr. Moore stated that they could certainly re-petition for that. That was not in the original petition, nor was it entertained by the Zoning Board of Appeals. That is why it is not before you tonight.

Mr. Smith recalled in past cases there were some differences in how they viewed it when someone put a permanent foundation under a structure versus a mobile home not on a permanent foundation. He did not think they brought that up in the Zoning Board of Appeals, but he wanted to clarify those differences and recollections.

Mr. Fulgenzi stated that he also did not remember that discussion during the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting, but he does remember other cases in which they talked about putting them on a permanent foundation.

Mr. Stumpf asked for clarification if this would still be classified RM-4 if it were on a permanent foundation. Mrs. Berns stated that it would.

Chairman VanMeter asked for a voice vote on the adoption of Resolution 6. A voice vote was unanimous for the adoption of Resolution 6, which was written to “deny a rezoning”.

MOTION CARRIED
RESOLUTION ADOPTED

RESOLUTION 7

7. 2011-49 – Steven P. Churchill & Keith Churchill, 340 Belmont, Springfield – Denying a Rezoning and granting a Use Variance. County Board Member – John Fulgenzi, District #17.

A motion was made by Mr. Fulgenzi, seconded by Mr. Mendenhall, to place Resolution 7 on the floor. A motion was made by Mr. Moore to waive the reading of the professional staff’s report. There were no objections.

A motion was made by Mr. Moore, seconded by Mr. O’Neill, to amend Resolution 7. Mr. Moore stated that line 6 on page 7-2 should be deleted and replaced with the following language: “pole barn to be used for storage of construction equipment limited to inside storage only.” He explained that there was needed clarification from the original petition for the pole barn for inside storage. They wanted to make that abundantly clear in the variance.

Mr. Smith stated that Mr. Moore’s explanation was for inside storage, and that is already in the petition. It seemed like the change related to the pole barn being for storage of construction materials. Molly Berns, professional staff, explained that there was a lot of discussion, and the testimony and evidence presented at the hearing was that the petitioners were going to demolish the existing house and build a pole barn to store their construction equipment with inside storage only. That is what was presumed by the discussion. When the actual motion was made by the Zoning Board of Appeals, they failed to put the restriction for the use for the construction company. This simply clarifies that the use is for the construction company’s equipment storage inside the pole barn to be constructed. Mr. Smith stated he does not know if that is necessary for this. He has had objections to these issues in the past. The issue is that they are constructing a pole barn and that they can store their things on the inside only. He thinks that should be sufficient. They should let them store what they want there. He does not see any need for this additional clarification.

Chairman VanMeter asked for a roll call vote on the amendment of Resolution 7. Upon the roll call vote, there were 15 Yeas – 10 Nays. Those voting nay were: Mr. Boyster, Mrs. Douglas Williams, Mr. Forsyth, Mr. Fulgenzi, Mr. Preckwinkle, Mrs. Ruzic, Mr. Schweska, Mr. Smith, Mr. Stumpf and Mr. Tjelmeland.

A voice vote was unanimous for the adoption of Resolution 7, as amended.

MOTIONS CARRIED
RESOLUTION ADOPTED

RESOLUTION 8

8. 2011-50 – Don & Connie Goodenow, #1 Holland, Cantrall – Denying a Rezoning and granting a Use Variance. County Board Member – Mike Sullivan, District #11.

A motion was made by Mr. Sullivan, seconded by Mr. Forsyth, to place Resolution 8 on the floor. 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 for the adoption of Resolution 8.

MOTIONS CARRIED
RESOLUTION ADOPTED

RESOLUTION 9

9. Resolution approving contracts for 2012 employee benefits.

A motion was made by Mrs. Fulgenzi, seconded by Mr. Tjelmeland, to place Resolution 9 on the floor. A voice vote was unanimous for the adoption of Resolution 9.

MOTION CARRIED
RESOLUTION ADOPTED

RESOLUTION 10

10. Resolution approving the Sangamon County Annual Budget and Appropriation Ordinance for the Fiscal Year December 1, 2011 through November 30, 2012.

A motion was made by Mr. Goleman, seconded by Mrs. Ruzic, to place Resolution 10 on the floor.

Mr. Goleman addressed the Board regarding the budget. He stated that most people understand they are probably in the worst economic times since The Great Depression. They have been hearing that news for about the last three years. It is a very difficult time now. There are folks in this county who are trying to scrape by, make a living and balance their checkbooks. He stated that they also have to do the same here in Sangamon County. He thinks they have continued to show they have been able to do that. This budget does honor their organized labor contractual obligations. It is about 3.3% down overall from last year, and is about a \$95 million budget. There are some positions that have been eliminated through attrition. At least ten of those positions, currently in the budget, have been eliminated through attrition. He thanked the Auditor's office staff and County Administrator Brian McFadden for all the hard work they have done. He also thanked the department heads and elected officials for working together to get by this year.

It is their hope, at some point, that this economy will begin to turn around and make a lot of their jobs easier. Until that happens, they have to make some tough decisions. At the same time, he thinks people understand that in Sangamon County, they do their very best to balance their budgets and live within their means. That continues to be their motto and continues to be the case here tonight.

Brian McFadden, County Administrator, addressed the Board. He gave a slide show presentation of the budget. Fiscal Year 2012 starts the beginning of next month. He explained key points to the General Fund revenue. They have five major revenue groups that the county primarily relies on to fund. There are state tax distributions, property taxes, fines and fees, and state reimbursement grants. Taxes are flat, and they had the same situation last year. They have had flat general fund tax revenue for almost three fiscal years. Fiscal Year 2012, overall for state tax distribution numbers, was \$11.9 million total. That was not just for sales tax, but was also for income tax, use tax, inheritance tax and personal property replacement tax. In FY2008 those items brought in over \$15 million, so they are down pretty significantly from what they have previously seen. Fines and fees are probably the second largest revenue item the county has overall. This year they are flat, and that is actually good news. Last year they saw approximately a \$400,000 reduction in fines and fees. So, in this case, flat is better. The total revenue items are around \$15 million.

The county receives about \$1.9 million per year in state reimbursements. The bulk of that is from Court Services salary reimbursements, which is about \$1.4 million total. There is a little over \$200,000 that goes to the State's Attorney's office for salary reimbursements. The County Clerk also receives reimbursements for election judges. They are seeing a \$66,000 reduction this year, which actually is better news than they have seen in the past. Last year they were looking at a \$217,000 reduction, and in FY10 it was \$850,000. At least the numbers are moving in the right direction. This will have an impact on the Court Services budget, which they will talk about in a little bit.

As you know, the county is tax capped for property taxes. They are looking at a little less than a \$1,000,000 in new property tax revenue, although they will not actually receive that amount of money. That is what they could potentially max out at. You will see that numbers in the revenue history for general funds have risen pretty consistently and steadily in past years. It kind of tops out at FY08 & FY09; in some cases it levels out, and in others it dramatically drops. You will see they have two numbers for FY09 because that is really when the bottom fell out for the county and other local governments. They made adjustments mid-year on both the revenue and expenditure sides. Again, this is regarding general fund only.

With revenue history for all funds it is very hard to make apples to apples comparisons from fiscal year to fiscal year. You see a big spike in FY10 because they issued bonds that year, which drove that number up. There are just dramatic changes from year to year with stimulus funds and bond proceeds, which can artificially inflate or deflate a number.

When you combine the income and sales tax you see about a \$133,000 drop overall. Sales tax is up \$17,000, which is two tenths of a percent increase. Income tax is down \$150,000, which is a 5% reduction. The income tax is a per capita tax. The numbers were readjusted with the census. While Sangamon County grew, the unincorporated areas, that the per capita figures come from, actually shrunk in comparison to the rest of the county. Their income tax distribution is a smaller amount compared to the rest of the state. The county has a policy to budget actual tax revenue from two years prior. That kind of went out the window the last couple years because the number was going down. It was totally unrealistic to go back and grab a number from two years ago when they knew the numbers were dropping. There is still a little bit of that situation because of the changes in income tax and inheritance tax.

The amount of property tax is \$26.4 million for FY12. This number is a little more consistent than what you would see with sales and income tax. The majority of the \$26.4 million levy, about 54% or \$14.2 million, goes into the general fund for general fund purposes. A little under \$5 million goes into pensions, which is about 18% of the levy. A little over \$3 million goes to the Highway Department, which is 12%. Public Health is \$1.6 million, which is 6%, and the liability insurance fund is \$1.5 million, which is just under 6% as well. It is so hard to plan what you are going to get in revenue from year to year. You will see in 2009 there was a 4.1% CPI, which basically caps your levy growth. The next year they had .10%, which was \$23,000. Last year it was 2.7%, and for 2012 it is 1.5%. He stated he thinks they all know the impact the tax caps have had on the county's ability to raise revenue.

The property tax rate is directly tied into the levy and the CPI. You can see the drop that occurred in FY06 when the county eliminated revenue from the Public Building Commission. It has held pretty steady ever since with some minor bumps from year to year depending on what the CPI is for the tax caps. From FY06 the overall property tax rate has been reduced by 12%, so obviously it is going in the right direction. The number for FY12 will actually go down a little bit once the County Clerk makes his adjustments to everyone's rates based upon when the Board of Review finishes their work.

The fines money has been in the range of \$14.2 to \$14.3 million for the last four fiscal years. They feel they know how that is going to perform.

The biggest drivers for the general fund expenditures are payroll and benefits. They provided a 2% COLA for union and non-union employees. That equates to \$450,000 for the general fund. For the all funds it is about \$700,000 to \$750,000. The general fund payroll is a little over \$21 million. They did the 2% COLA, which is what they use for the wage scale for non-unions. They also built in a 2% hiring lag into this budget. The hiring lag they have used for a couple years now has been a pretty effective tool in managing the budget. They implemented a 30-day waiting period to fill vacancies. It worked for FY2011, so they will try it again in 2012. It makes the margins very tight for everybody, but the departments have all cooperated very well.

The next biggest item, by far, is the contractual line item. Commodities and contractals are flat. They brought that amount over to what it was in FY2011. In FY2011 they reduced those two lines by almost \$300,000, so flat is sometimes good news. The commodities line in the general fund is \$6.8 million, and the contractual line is \$1.5 million.

The Coroner's budget is back to normal. As you know, last year the Board slashed that budget in half in an effort to deal with some performance issues and exert some authority over the department. Now the budget is back to the normal full amount of \$530,000.

Pensions are another large item in the budget. They increased about \$288,000. They saw a uniform rate increase of about 10% across the board. The losses in the market have put IMRF in the situation where their funds have dropped; therefore, everyone else has had to contribute more to make that up. As the market does better, that amount will lessen some. They are on a three year smoothing plan, and are hoping the most dramatic increases in the plan are behind them. It will be going up every year.

Chairman VanMeter asked at what level the IMRF pensions are funded. Mr. McFadden explained that they are in the 80% range. Terry Viar, Deputy Auditor, stated that they are over 80%. Mr. McFadden stated they are well funded. IMRF works a lot different than a self-funded pension plan. When the county gets the bill every year, they have to pay it. There is no putting off a payment for a year like you have seen with the state, and there is no assuming investment returns will be at 10% percent so you can put less in. IMRF does the math and assumptions, and they are pretty good at it. Chairman VanMeter stated that they have been presenting some pretty stiff bills lately because of the market, and they've had to pay them.

Mr. McFadden stated that the health insurance costs for both the employees and county remain essentially flat. It is completely flat for the employees, and there is a very slight increase for the county's health insurance cost. This is good management of the fund by the Board of Managers. They have been able to use some of the fund balances built up to keep the premiums in check. It is pretty unheard of for the premium costs not to increase from year to year while the costs are going up. He believes they go up about 15% each year.

The overall expenses match the overall revenue increased in the general fund of \$817,000, which is a little bit less than 2%. For perspective, last year the general fund budget went up \$850,000, which is around 2%.

There are a lot of things that drive numbers on the expense and revenue sides. The overall general funds are down about 3½% at almost \$3 ½ million.

The headcount history shows they have reduced the county's headcount by 91 positions, which is a little over 11% over the past four years. If you go back five years, it has gone down by 96 positions, which is over 12%. There is a definite trend here in reduction. The payroll costs are a large component of the general fund and an area you have to look at for reductions. The year to year reduction on the general fund is two, with the overall reduction of ten positions across all funds. There was also a reduction of positions in Community Resources and Public Health.

There is a detailed list in the resolution, department by department, to show where the actual reductions occurred. They do have some departments that are using their vacant positions to meet the 2% cap on the salary increase. The Sheriff's office primarily has 13 vacancies that they are going to leave unfilled throughout the fiscal year as part of their effort to live within that 2% cap. Public Health has five and Highway has two positions. There are also eight or nine positions mixed amongst other departments.

Terry Viar, Deputy Auditor, addressed the Board regarding the self-insured health insurance fund. This year the Health Insurance Board of Managers has agreed not to raise the premiums for the employees. The county's share of that premium went up slightly because they pick up the additional amount based on the PTELL contributions. It went up by 2.7%. The health insurance expense was basically flat at about \$70,000. The Board of Managers has worked very hard to make this fund very healthy, and they are attempting to put away a fund balance for the county. In the next year or two they should see some real savings in that fund. The Board of Managers is trying to make the insurance program as reasonable as possible for the employees and the county.

Paul Palazzolo, Auditor, addressed the Board to discuss the workman's compensation expenses. His office has been working hard to keep expenses low and address those issues. There are two components to workman's compensation expenses. There are the premium expenses and claims expenses. Sangamon County works with the Illinois Public Risk Fund, which helps to administer their workman's comp issues and expenses. The estimated FY2012 is slightly higher than FY2011. The annual premium has a basis from the three previous years of claims expenses. There was a spike in 2005, and that is when they decided to reach out to a medical management case firm to help address their workman's compensation issues. They used Medical Management Consulting Services in Springfield to follow up with injured employees once they have experienced an injury and help them get back to work as safely and quickly as possible. They were relatively successful in that regard. The claims expenses decreased until 2009 when they experienced another spike. At that point, the County Board working with the Auditor's office decided to establish a Workman's Compensation Safety Committee. It is made up of employees and County Board members who work hard to address issues and learn how to prevent an injury from occurring again. With some effort and work, the number of claims has been steadily decreasing. With the committee, formed at the end of 2010, and with employees and supervisors, they have reduced the number of claims by half in the first year of the committee's existence. They have had the lowest number of claims in a ten-year period. Hopefully, combined with their case management services and the safety committee, the insurance premiums and claims expenses will decrease as much as possible as they approach FY2013 and 2014.

Mr. McFadden stated that the pension rates went up about 10%. The employees are capped at 4.5%. The county's pension costs have gone up by \$2 million, which is 68% between FY2005 and this budget. This is definitely a driver on the expense side, and is something they do not have a lot of control over, other than it is driven a lot by their headcount. Most benefit numbers such as health, dental and life insurance mirror and follow their payroll numbers.

They have added the county debt chart this year, per the request of the Finance Committee. It gives a snapshot of the county's debt situation as of the end of this month. They have broken it down into two charts. The top chart shows the general obligation bonds and debt certificates they issued two years ago. That has seen a reduction. They made a principal payment this year which took this down from \$12.9 million in outstanding principal to \$12.72 million, which is a \$250,000 reduction. That number will continue to drop. The second chart reflects the non-bond debt. These are things you see coming across committee agendas. That number has dropped as well. In FY2012 you will see several items disappear from the county's debt service schedule. The New World Integrated Criminal Justice System has been paid off.

They were paying about \$450,000 per year for that. They paid off about \$30,000 in annual debt for some Highway department tractors. They also paid off \$105,000 for one of the vehicle purchase programs, which primarily benefits the Sheriff's office. The primary things they will be paying this fiscal year will be the new election machines, purchased by the County Clerk's office, at about \$144,000 in debt service in FY2012. They will continue to pay off the Animal Control facility, which is \$46,000 per year. They have one more vehicle purchase program that will be in its third year of payments. That will disappear in FY2013.

Even though times are tough and the budgets and margins are tight, they do try to pay attention to their capital assets and infrastructure needs. They are in initial discussions to start the vehicle replacement program with the Sheriff's office. They have not done that for two years now, and the fleet is aging and the mileage is going up. They have a general guideline of about 90,000 miles and three years of life in the vehicle before they start to offload it. That does help with resale. The Highway department continues their equipment purchase program for new snow plows. The Coroner's office is going to be doing some updating of their technology, which they had not been using in the past. They will also be looking at improvements to the Animal Control facility and Public Health department. They will be looking at some new equipment for the consolidated fleet maintenance facility at the Highway department. They are also hopefully going to initiate their video arraignment project in 2012 to help improve safety in the building and help bring down some of the costs of prisoner transport in the Sheriff's office. There is much more they can be doing in this building and others, so they will try to prioritize this and do what they feel is essential and important.

Chairman VanMeter asked if they are beginning to see some payback from the energy management expenditures. Mr. McFadden stated that they are, but they want to be cautious with this budget. They do not want to go in and make assumptions of what the natural gas, water and sewer usage will be. They have seen some dramatic decreases in their natural gas bills. It has almost cut it in half. They continue to follow through with that program, and they are now about 80% of the way through. They hope to finish that up this fiscal year. They will not actually look at capturing those savings until FY2013. There is some pretty intensive testing and measuring of the equipment that they have to do. A large part of the energy savings they are going to achieve has been guaranteed by Ameresco, the contractor.

The Sheriff's department did experience a slight increase in their budget this year to reflect the demand on medical costs, primarily in the jail. There are also overtime needs and fuel issues they need to address. There are also a couple of contracts that expire at the end of the next fiscal year that they will begin negotiating soon.

Court Services has always been a challenge. The state has cut its reimbursement to the county. This has been a consistent story for several years now, and they talked about it in Finance. A large portion of this department's budget was paid through the state through salary reimbursement. That is not the case anymore. They have entered into some negotiations and discussions, and they are producing some information for the union to follow through with the negotiations. That budget is complicated by the state's reduction in its payroll reimbursement and the fact that they do not know what the pay increases will be for union employees until the CPI comes to them in December. There is a couple of unknowns there that they will probably be working on through this month, and into December, to get resolved.

It has historically been a cycle where they have to add about \$100,000 or more during an election year to the County's budget because of increased costs for election judges, printing and so on. Through the precinct reduction that Joe spearheaded and this Board approved, they got that number down to \$18,000. The numbers went down because the printing went down, and the polling places went down along with a number of other things.

The liability insurance fund continues to struggle financially with its fund balance. They are taking a number of measures to the State's Attorney's office to deal with some litigation issues. That fund, going forward into this fiscal year, is going to get a lot of attention.

Mr. McFadden concluded his presentation and offered to address any questions.

Mr. Boyster commended the staff for the excellent job they have done on this. When you come here at 7:00 a.m. Brian is here, and when you come here at 7:00 p.m. he is here. He asked if this budget includes any solid lay-offs at this point. Mr. McFadden stated that it does not at this point. The ten vacant positions they talked about were through attrition. Mr. Boyster asked what their remedy is with not filling these positions. He asked if this is going to affect services provided to the community and how they would remedy this. Mr. McFadden stated that he does not think they are looking at any major service reductions like they have seen in the past. Most departments have been able to handle the reductions and continue to deliver their services. They have had to eliminate some of the programs in the Sheriff's office and Court Services. It is their hope to bring those back at some point, but they do not think the trends they have seen are going to change that. They are going to continue pursuing consolidation and automation. They have consolidated departments and services and moved the Zoning department. They are also going to drive more things towards the Web. They approved additional funding for the GIS last year to put more documents on the Web. All of the departments are looking at doing this to try and cut down on the foot traffic in the building. If fewer people come through here, through attrition, they may not need as much security or as many clerks.

Mr. Boyster asked how many lay-offs with Court Services they would be talking about if they did lay-offs. Mr. McFadden stated that he really does not know at this point in time. There will be two primary short falls. One is the \$66,000 they talked about, and the other is whatever the gap is between the 2% and the CPI plus one. There is more than one way to address these things. In other departments they have used vacant positions to do that. He knows the Court Services department does have a couple vacant positions they will probably factor in to solve the problem. Right now he just does not know. Mr. Boyster asked if their contract says it is the CPI plus one. Mr. McFadden stated that he thinks it is, or it is the CPI plus ½. Mr. Boyster asked if they are contractually obligated to meet that. Mr. McFadden confirmed that they are. They will have discussions, and if the discussions don't work they will pay whatever the contract says. But what happened in the past is that they needed to have a smaller group to get a larger raise. They do not know what the exact numbers are, but they know they have an issue and they have to address it. Mr. Boyster thanked Mr. McFadden for everything he does.

Mr. Goleman addressed some of Mr. Boyster's concerns. He explained that they all take this job very seriously. He reiterated that they are dealing with the most difficult economic times they have dealt with since The Great Depression.

They all care about their employees and they do a great job for them. They are very concerned about them, but they believe this budget addresses those concerns. They have done the very best they can possibly do to avoid lay-offs, when other entities are cutting right and left. They do that by working together with organized labor and their employees to maintain those positions as best as they possibly can. The easy thing to do, like their neighbors do across the street, is to raise taxes. They cannot do unless they go to the voters. When over 75% of the voters in Sangamon County, in 1995, decided tax caps were best for this county, they told us we would have to live within our means. He is glad so many people are here tonight to hear this budget presentation. It is a good educational process so people understand what they are dealing with and that it is not an easy thing. He stated that they all understood this when they decided to run for this office. He understands the dilemma those folks in the back of the room are in. They have gone down to the State Capitol to lobby for this. He encouraged them to continue going there to lobby that leadership to see if they can get some more secured funding. They cannot continue, and it is unsustainable for them, to make up for the revenue shortfalls the State of Illinois cuts from them. It is not easy, and they all have to make decisions and do the best they possibly can. He understands it is a tough thing, but the county has to live within their means. That is the hand they have been dealt, and that is what they are going to continue to do.

Chairman VanMeter stated that they really don't see where this ends. If you had asked him three years ago, he would not have believed they would still be in the position they find themselves in. Frankly, they still do not see an end to it. Even when it does turn up, and it will turn up again because America is not flat on its back forever, their first responsibility would be to restore the balance sheet they have slowly eroded to maintain services as they have been. He would not even guess when this could be. Next year looks like it is going to be the same.

Mr. Moore thanked all of the directors and elected officials. Without working together, they would not get here. They do ask a lot every year, and they have always stepped up and gotten the job done. Chairman VanMeter stated that they are very fortunate to have a superb staff throughout the county that put their shoulders to the wheel and kept this county functioning through very difficult circumstances.

Chairman VanMeter asked for a roll call vote on the adoption of Resolution 10. Upon the roll call vote, there were 23 Yeas – 2 Nays. Mr. Boyster and Mr. Schweska voted no. Mr. Boyster stated that he respectfully understand their position and is in agreement with Mr. Goleman's comments, but he cannot vote on this, in good conscience, with the unknown variables of Court Services.

MOTIONS CARRIED
RESOLUTION ADOPTED

RESOLUTION 11

11. Resolution approving amendments to the Fiscal Year 2011 Sangamon County Budget.

A motion was made by Mr. Goleman, seconded by Mr. Montalbano and Mr. Schweska, to place Resolution 11 on the floor. Mr. Goleman explained that traditionally, at the end of the fiscal year, they switch some funds around when they have some deficiencies, and this is what they have done. A voice vote was unanimous for the adoption of Resolution 11.

MOTION CARRIED
RESOLUTION ADOPTED

RESOLUTION 12

12. Resolution approving Tax Levies for Fiscal Year from December 1, 2011 through November 30, 2012.

A motion was made by Mr. Goleman, seconded by Ms. Dillman, to place Resolution 12 on the floor. A motion was made by Mr. Goleman, seconded by Mr. Montalbano and Mr. Schweska to table Resolution 12. Mr. Goleman explained that ordinarily they do the levy at the December meeting. A voice vote was unanimous to table Resolution 12.

MOTIONS CARRIED
RESOLUTION TABLED

WAIVER OF TEN-DAY FILING PERIOD

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

MOTION CARRIED
TEN-DAY FILING PERIOD WAIVED

RESOLUTION 13

13. Resolution designating the office of the State's Attorney's Appellate Prosecutor as the County's Agent to process appellate court cases.

A motion was made by Mr. O'Neill, seconded by Ms. Dillman, to place Resolution 13 on the floor. A voice vote carried for the adoption of Resolution 13. Mr. Krell voted present.

MOTION CARRIED
RESOLUTION ADOPTED

OLD BUSINESS

There was no old business.

NEW BUSINESS

A. Resolutions

There were no new resolutions.

B. Appointments

The nominations for appointment at the December meeting were submitted.

C. Ratification of the Sheriff's Civilian Bargaining Unit Collective Bargaining Agreement.

A motion was made by Mr. Sullivan, seconded by Mr. Boyster, to ratify the Sheriff's Civilian Bargaining Unit Collective Bargaining Agreement. A voice vote was unanimous.

MOTION CARRIED
AGREEMENT RATIFIED

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

A motion was made by Mr. Schweska, seconded by Mr. Montalbano, 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 Mr. Montalbano, seconded by Mr. Boyster, to recess the meeting to December 13, 2011 at 7:00 p.m. A voice vote was unanimous.

MOTION CARRIED
MEETING RECESSED