

## **MINUTES**

### **SANGAMON COUNTY BOARD**

**SEPTEMBER 12, 2006**

The Sangamon County Board met in Regular Statutory Session on September 12, 2006 in the County Board Chambers. Chairman VanMeter called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. Mr. Montalbano gave the Invocation and Mr. Pace 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. Mrs. Turner and Ms. VanHoos were excused.

#### **CORRESPONDENCE**

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

**MOTION CARRIED**  
**CORRESPONDENCE FILED**

#### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

A motion was made by Mr. Vaughn, seconded by Mr. Bunch, for approval of the Minutes of August 8, 2006. Mr. Vaughn stated that on Page 2 the roll call vote should be amended and changed from 29 Yeas – 0 Nays to 28 Yeas – 0 Nays. A motion was made by Mr. Cahnman to amend Page 16. He stated that in the second to last paragraph the last sentence should read “If this ordinance is passed they won’t be exposed to it in the unincorporated areas of Sangamon County.” There were no objections to the amendments. A motion was made by Mrs. Long, seconded by Mr. Bunch, for approval of the Minutes, as amended. A voice vote was unanimous.

**MOTIONS CARRIED**  
**MINUTES ADOPTED**

#### **RESOLUTION 1**

1. Resolution approving a supplemental engineering agreement for a traffic study on Bradfordton Road.

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

MOTIONS CARRIED  
RESOLUTION ADOPTED

**RESOLUTION 2**

2. 2006-46 – Estate of William Carver and David Carver, 1310, 1320, and 1340 Carver Road, Springfield – Approving a Variance. County Board Member – Sarah Musgrave, District #9.

A motion was made by Mrs. Musgrave, seconded by Mr. Wieland, for the adoption of Resolution 2. 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 2.

MOTIONS CARRIED  
RESOLUTION ADOPTED

**RESOLUTION 3**

3. 2006-47 – Estate of Lorena E. Wagner, 13933 N. Pawnee Road, Pawnee – Granting Variances. County Board Member – Andy Goleman, District #4.

A motion was made by Mr. Goleman, seconded by Ms. Cimarossa, for the adoption of Resolution 3. 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 3.

MOTIONS CARRIED  
RESOLUTION ADOPTED

**RESOLUTION 4**

4. 2006-48 – Darren and Aimee Johnson, 7425 New City Road, Rochester – Granting a Variance. County Board Member – Andy Goleman, District #4.

A motion was made by Mr. Goleman, seconded by Mr. O’Neill, for the adoption of Resolution 4. 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 4.

MOTIONS CARRIED  
RESOLUTION ADOPTED

**RESOLUTION 5**

5. 2006-49 – Michael Sharp, 12515 Cotton Hill Road, Pawnee – Granting a Use Variance. County Board Member – Andy Goleman, District #4.

A motion was made by Mr. Goleman, seconded by Mr. Buecker, for the adoption of Resolution 5. Chairman VanMeter asked the professional staff to give the procedural history of the case.

Susan Poludniak stated that the petitioner is requesting a use variance for a one-man welding shop restricted to a 48' by 50' building. Randy Armstrong stated that the property is on Cotton Hill Road just north of the Village of Pawnee. The petitioner wants to operate a one-man welding shop in an accessory building being constructed on the property. Ms. Poludniak stated that a commercial application of welding is only appropriate in an industrial zoning district and the staff recommends denial. Mr. Armstrong stated that the Zoning Board of Appeals recommends approval. They felt since the welding shop would be a low volume business and is near two agricultural machine sheds where similar work takes place, the use variance would be appropriate.

Michael Sharp, residing at 12515 Cotton Hill Road in Pawnee, addressed the Board. He stated that he has been an iron worker for over 20 years and works in very dangerous conditions everyday. He stated that this would be an opportunity to make a better, safer and more secure living for him and his family. He explained that his son has been diagnosed with scoliosis of the spine and he wants the opportunity to have this business for the income and to be with his son when needed. The water draining from the property would be taken care of from the shop. All material pertaining to the shop business will be kept under a roof and will be kept clean. This will be done for the success of the business. Working hours will need to be from 7:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Anything after those hours will be overtime for meeting deadlines or for emergency situations. He stated that his neighbors, the Lederbrand's, have no time frame or noise limitations for their business and he doesn't know why he should. This shop will also be completely portable meaning the tools will be on the truck and available to fix things anywhere.

Mr. Montalbano asked how close homes are to his property. Mr. Sharp stated that there is one house about 300 feet away and all the other homes are a pretty good distance.

Mrs. Musgrave asked if all the equipment would be stored inside the building. Mr. Sharp explained that he would store what he could inside. All of the steel would have to be stored inside. If someone drops something off it may be outside until it can be put inside.

Mr. Moss asked how close his home is to the shop. Mr. Sharp stated that his home is about 65 feet away. Tom Lederbrand's house, which is the closest, is approximately 285 feet away. The shop will have 8 ½ inches of insulation between two liner panels plus in the future there will be a fence between the shop and the house.

He explained that since his house is close he wouldn't want to keep his family up either, but he just wants the opportunity to work and be there when someone needs something fixed.

Mr. Moore asked Mr. Sharp if it would accommodate most of his needs if his hours were restricted from 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. Mr. Sharp stated that it would accommodate most of them, but if someone comes in such as a truck driver or farmer, he would like to be able to help them whenever needed.

Mr. Goleman stated that the business would be portable so Mr. Sharp could go to the location of where someone breaks down and prevent the noise at his shop. Mr. Sharp stated that he would be able to do that.

Ms. Cimarossa asked if he has sat down with his neighbors the Lederbrand's and tried to work out their obstacles. Mr. Sharp stated that he has tried to approach them to discuss certain issues, but have gotten no response.

Mr. Mendenhall asked if the drainage issues were there before he purchased the property. Mr. Sharp stated that they were but he has leveled off the area so there is not a constant decline. Any water draining from the property would channel down a roadway away from Mr. Lederbrand's shed. The only runoff would be a little 14-foot area.

Mr. Moss asked if the volume of water would have been the same amount hitting the ground whether the building was there or not. Mr. Sharp stated that it would be and there would have been more runoff if he hadn't put in a slope.

Amy Gurloff, attorney for the objectors, addressed the Board. She stated that her address is 1 North Old State Capitol Plaza in Springfield. She explained that the Lederbrand's do understand he is trying to make a living and would withdraw their objection if the use variance could be subject to several conditions. They would like the fact that he will be putting 8 1/2 inches of insulation in the walls and ceiling to be part of the use variance. Since part of the use variance is already in place to keep anything related to the welding shop inside the shop they do not want to add that again. The final restriction they would want would be the hours of operation. There have been several incidents where Mr. Sharp was out working in his shop at 6:00 a.m. on Sundays or late in the evening. Mr. Lederbrand is a farmer and he does get up early and goes to bed early. His home is very close to Mr. Sharp's home and for that reason they propose to limit the hours of operation of the shop from 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. Monday through Saturday and from 12:00 to 5:00 p.m. on Sunday. They would be okay with emergency hours during the planting and harvesting season, since they would probably be his primary clientele, from 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. The time frame for these hours would be September 15<sup>th</sup> through November 1<sup>st</sup> and April 1<sup>st</sup> through May 15<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. Griffin asked how close the property is, that the Lederbrand's farm, from the petitioner's. Ms. Gurloff stated that they farm the land directly to the west. Mr. Griffin asked if they would be willing to accept the same restricted hours during the harvest season. Ms. Gurloff explained that they are not operating a commercial business. The petitioner knew when they moved into the area that farming would be taking place. Now there is a situation where Mr. Sharp wants to operate a commercial business where he will actively seek business.

Mr. Moss asked how close the Lederbrand's machinery shed is from the petitioner's property. Ms. Gurloff stated that she believes it is probably another 200 feet back from the shop. She explained that the Lederbrand's usually do work on their machinery out in the fields.

Ms. Cimarossa asked how these conditions would be enforced if they are included. Randy Armstrong stated that this kind of enforcement would be difficult. You have to rely on people's word in situations like that.

Mr. Mendenhall stated that farming is a commercial business which requires a commercial driver's license and a commercial pesticide applicator's license; everything about it is commercial. He stated that he farms and it would be awfully hard for him to limit his activities in the course of harvesting or planting when he's in a crunch.

Mr. Cahnman asked if there were other instances like when the petitioner was doing work at 6:00 a.m. Ms. Gurloff stated that there have been several other instances. Mr. Cahnman asked why the objector would want restrictions on the petitioner's activity in the morning when he gets up early in the morning. Ms. Gurloff stated that his concern was with Sunday morning because he does not work on Sundays. She stated that her client would probably be okay with it if Mr. Sharp would start earlier and stop earlier.

Mrs. Musgrave asked if Mr. Lederbrand would have no limitations or restrictions when he can work in his shop. Mr. Armstrong stated that he would not have these limitations.

Mr. Moss asked if the work Mr. Sharp was doing outside was part of the construction of the building. Ms. Gurloff stated that she believes he was welding and it was not part of the construction.

Mr. Sharp explained that there are issues and everybody knows if something breaks the people would want it back as soon as possible. This shop would be there to fit everybody's needs. He stated that he knows there will be a problem if he goes out to the shop at 11:00 p.m. and turns a light on and starts working on things. Someone will get a phone call and a policeman will be knocking on the door. There is a limitation on certain things, but it is okay to do others.

Mr. Bunch stated that this sounds like someone wants to do what they want to do and not allow Mr. Sharp to do what he wants to do. He should maybe restrict what he does on Sunday, but otherwise should be given the same consideration as the other people.

Mr. Moore asked Mr. Sharp if he would agree to the insulation, keeping the equipment inside the shop, and restriction of the hours of operation from 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. Monday through Saturday and 12:00 to 5:00 p.m. on Sundays with expanded hours during harvest and planting. Mr. Sharp stated that he would agree to everything but the restricted hours because someone may come to his door and need something done right away and he wouldn't be able to help them. Mr. Moore stated that he is trying to affect a compromise that lets everyone do what they want to do. He added that sometimes you just have to be good neighbors. Mr. Moore asked Mr. Sharp if he was agreeable to these terms. Mr. Sharp stated that he is not.

Mr. Fulgenzi stated that if the shop was insulated and the noise was abated this should suffice for the noise problem on the objector's end.

Mrs. Scaife reminded both parties that they are neighbors and may need each other in the future so they should try to be good neighbors.

Ms. Gurloff stated that the property is already zoned agricultural. When Mr. Sharp moved in he knew there would be farming taking place around his property. Farming is a commercial business; however, the main business is just to farm. The Lederbrands are out there late at night during planting or harvest season only when it is an emergency and they have to fix their machinery. Mr. Sharp wants to operate a commercial welding business where he will advertise and do what he can to have additional people come to use his services. Without any limitations, he could be out there late every night if his business becomes successful. There needs to be some sort of limitation on his hours of operation to stop any potential problems down the road.

Mr. Bunch asked if the objector's would be against having farming equipment welded and worked on late at night. Ms. Gurloff stated they feel those types of emergencies would happen primarily during planting and harvesting season when they would be okay with longer hours.

Mr. Fulgenzi asked if a lot of farmers are out late at night working. Ms. Gurloff explained that in a lot of instances they are large pieces of farm equipment and can be fixed right where they are.

Chairman VanMeter asked for a roll call vote on the motion to adopt Resolution 5. Upon the roll call vote, there were 26 yeas 0 Nays. The resolution written "to grant a use variance" was adopted.

**MOTION CARRIED**  
**RESOLUTION ADOPTED**

## RESOLUTIONS 6 – 12

6. Resolution allowing the Circuit Court to change the breakdown of the fee structure for traffic tickets that require a court appearance.

A motion was made by Ms. Cimarossa, seconded by Mrs. Scaife, for the adoption of Resolution 6. A motion was made by Mr. Bunch, seconded by Mr. Pace, to consolidate Resolutions 6 – 12. Chairman VanMeter asked the Clerk to read Resolutions 7 – 12.

7. Resolution allowing the Circuit Court to decrease the County Law Library fees on civil filings.
8. Resolution allowing the Circuit Court to increase the filing fee on civil filings to support Court Security.
9. Resolution approving the adjustment of the Sheriff's Office budget to allow the purchase of mobile data computers and related equipment.
10. Resolution approving the final plat of Fraase Road Lots-Plat 4.
11. Resolution approving a renewal of the lease agreement with Watts Copy Systems and Sangamon County.
12. Resolution approving the purchase of storage shelving units by the County Clerk's Office.

A voice vote carried on the consolidation. Mr. Cahnman voted nay. Mrs. Long explained that with Resolution 11 there is a savings for the County of about \$18,000 per year.

A motion was made by Mrs. Long, seconded by Mr. Bunch, that the roll call vote for Resolution 1 stand as the roll call vote for Resolutions 6 – 12, as consolidated. A voice vote was unanimous.

MOTIONS CARRIED  
RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED

## WAIVER OF TEN-DAY FILING PERIOD

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

MOTION CARRIED  
TEN-DAY FILING PERIOD WAIVED

**RESOLUTION 13**

13. Resolution amending Section 8.14.040 of Chapter 8.18 of the Sangamon County Code.

A motion was made by Mrs. Long, seconded by Mr. Cahnman, for the adoption of Resolution 13. Mr. Cahnman explained that this amendment, which was approved by the Building and Grounds Committee, would do three things. First, it would impose the ten feet from the main entrance smoking ban imposed on public buildings in un-incorporated Sangamon County on public buildings owned and operated by Sangamon County in incorporated areas such as Springfield. Second, due to an oversight, the smoking ban ordinance adopted last month does not impose any penalty for violations of the ten feet rule in the un-incorporated areas of Sangamon County. The amendment corrects that by imposing a \$50 fine for violations of the ten-foot rule. Third, it corrects some various other errors and typos. There were some areas where it was supposed to be Subsection A and it says Subsection B. The County did adopt a policy restricting smoking from all the entrances in the County Building, but this amendment would impose the ten feet restriction on other buildings the County owns and operates in the City of Springfield. The County should not have one set of rules for private business and one set of rules for themselves. He asked everyone to vote yes on this amendment.

Mrs. Long mentioned that they have been preparing the designated smoking area outside of the County Building for about six months and does not have anything to do with this. The designated area is now on Adams Street and prohibits smoking in front of the building. She assured Mr. Cahnman that they had already been working on this.

Mr. Goleman stressed that he is tired of the grandstanding Mr. Cahnman has taken on a number of issues. This is just another example of where the committee has been working on the issue and has eliminated the problem. This is nothing more than him coming in at the last minute trying to be the hero. There are some technical corrections that need to be done, but they need to go back through the proper procedure, go back to the committee, and have the State's Attorney involved in the process to take care of it.

Mr. Moore echoed Mr. Goleman's comments and stated that he was waiting for yet another press release which prohibited County employees from leaving their trash out or some other monumental activity like that. It seems that Mrs. Long's committee and their activity have overcome all the objections and this will apply to the other buildings the County owns or leases. He stated that he is also pretty tired of this. Mr. Cahnman's record on this Board has been one of finding demons where none exist. He has voted against items which would directly benefit his constituency, such as voting machines and has voted against budgets which have been thought through and would benefit the entire community. He stated that he wished Mr. Cahnman would put out press releases on that. He added that he does appreciate the spirit of what he is trying to do, but thinks it has already been accomplished.

Mr. Vaughn also echoed Mr. Goleman and Mr. Moore's comments. He stated that Mr. Cahnman is using this as a method of getting his name in the paper and before the voters. It is awfully strange that he has never voted in favor of a budget. He recommended that no one vote for this amendment.

Mr. Bunch stated that he is opposed to this because putting people ten feet in front of the building would put them out in the street and he does not want them to get run over. He stated that Mrs. Long and her committee have done an outstanding job designating a place for people to smoke. He stated that they should not worry about the Public Health building because he is sure Mr. Stone will take care of that since he is a very good administrator. He stated that this Resolution is not really needed and he will not support it.

Mr. Pace stated that he is concerned with the dollar amounts being assessed as fines in this Resolution. He asked how those numbers were determined. Jim Grohne, Assistant State's Attorney, stated that those amounts were in the Resolution which was passed last month. The only difference is in the numbering of the sub-paragraphs.

Mr. Cahnman stated that everything he does in Mr. Goleman and Mr. Moore's opinion is grandstanding so he will plead guilty to that. The State's Attorney's Office was involved with this process and did draft the Resolution. He stated that most of this came from them and only a small part came from him. He explained that he did go through the committee process with this and has taken every Resolution he has presented to the Board through the committee process since he was advised to do so by the Chairman. This went through the Building and Grounds Committee and was voted for affirmatively by a majority of that committee and this is why it is before the Board today. He stated that as for Mr. Bunch he would give him a ruler to show that ten feet in front of the County Building would not put you in the street. The restriction that is imposed right now is a lot more than ten feet. This is a very reasonable amendment and makes sense on a number of different grounds.

Mr. Stumpf stated that he can appreciate what he is trying to do, but he is part of the process as he went through committee and did vote no. The State's Attorney said they could change the small technical issues at any time. Mr. Cahnman needs to just give people a chance to breath. He stated that he would vote no again on this.

Mr. Bunch stated that ten feet from the steps would bring you out onto Ninth Street, but ten feet from the front of the building would put you on the steps getting in people's way with a cigarette in your hand. He said he would measure it and apologize if it isn't ten feet from the bottom of the steps to the road.

Ms. Cimarossa stated that they are dealing with another issue here, which is a crowd control issue that security has been trying to deal with for quite a while.

Mr. Goleman stated that there were past Chairmen who went on to the Illinois State Senate. They did so because they were able to get along with people and because they were credible. This Resolution is nothing more than grandstanding and this is the silly season. People need to have credibility and most everyone on this Board does work together for a better Sangamon County. He stated that he hopes in December this grandstanding will be over with from this Board.

Chairman VanMeter asked the Clerk to call the roll on the motion to adopt Resolution 13. Upon the roll call vote, there were 4 Yeas – 22 Nays. Those voting yea were: Mr. Cahnman, Mr. Fulgenzi, Mrs. Long, and Mr. Pace. Resolution 13 was denied.

MOTION CARRIED  
RESOLUTION DENIED

**OLD BUSINESS**

There was no Old Business.

**NEW BUSINESS**

A. Resolutions

There were no new resolutions.

B. Appointments

OEM/911 Task Force Committee

Dennis Wieland, Chair  
Dave Mendenhall, Vice-Chair  
Ted Buecker  
Cathy Scaife  
Rosemarie Long  
Tyrone Pace

Public Health Facilities Planning Committee

Andy Goleman, Chair  
Rosemarie Long, Vice-Chair  
Tim Moore  
Doris Turner  
Bill Moss  
Dr. Jeff Biermann

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

MOTION CARRIED  
APPOINTMENTS ADOPTED

**NEW BUSINESS****C. Order designating Court Holidays**

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

**MOTION CARRIED  
HOLIDAYS APPROVED**

**REPORTS OF COUNTY OFFICIALS, REPORTS OF SPECIAL COMMITTEES,  
REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES**

Jim Stone, Director of Public Health, gave a report on client responses to travel surveys. He explained that the purpose of the survey was to try and get input from members of the public who are utilizing their services. There were three public meetings for people to come and provide input into the construction of the new facility. Division heads were working with their staff to put together space needs to establish what will be needed for a building and land. He explained that with this survey they were trying to determine how people came to one of their facilities, how frequently they came, and from where they were coming. It would also determine how many surveys people were filling out if they were coming for different needs.

He explained that the report shows 22% of the people completed their surveys at the Dirksen office and 78% did so at the Jefferson office with only 2% not willing to share where they were from. Roughly 60% of the people utilizing the services are from the Village of Jerome, Southern View, Leland Grove, Grandview and the City of Springfield and the other remaining 40% are people from outside the City of Springfield or from other incorporated areas or rural areas within the County. Also 92% of the people coming to the facilities either drive or get a ride. This is very important because with the merger of the health departments a lot of discussion was made stressing the importance of the location so that people could walk to the facility. This survey shows only 4% currently are walking to the facilities. A few of those people actually got off the bus and walked to the Jefferson facility because it is a block away from the bus stop. With the new building they will also focus on having drop off right at the front door wherever they might locate within the medically underserved area. This survey also shows 30% of the people actually live north of North Grand which is outside the medically underserved area. This is something the Board of Health and County Board will have to consider as part of this project. Mr. Stone stated that he has met with the Chairman and County Administrator and they have talked about having a joint public health facilities committee to move through this process.

Mrs. Scaife stated that Mr. Stone has showed his professionalism with this report and they appreciate everything he has done. She stated that he is very thorough and this was very interesting.

Chairman VanMeter asked if there is one more public hearing. Mr. Stone stated that they are trying to have one more hearing in the County within the next 30 days.

Mr. Bunch stated that Mr. Stone is an outstanding administrator and the Board can be proud of him.

Bruce Cowans with Maximus addressed the Board to report on the recent cost study done with Sangamon County. The County has asked that they look at four offices for this report. They are the Recorder, Supervisor of Assessments, Juvenile Probation and Court Services, and Information Systems. The method proposed and used for this study was to meet with each department to ask them to define their major services provided. Measurements were collected to show how many people there were assigned to do each of the things they do and the kind of workload measures they have for those activities. Those numbers were given back the departments to look over and make any changes before they used them in the report. Next, they went out to visit five other counties to use as comparable counties. Those five counties were Champaign, Peoria, McLean, Madison and Rock Island. They were looking for counties with comparable population as well as similar expectations of service. By using five counties at a time you develop an average which can be a pretty interesting number. The departments in Sangamon County were very cooperative in providing information. There is a limit to how much you can ask from another County who is not your client.

Mr. Cowans explained the findings of their report. First, they looked at the Recorder's Office. They do fundamentally one thing which is to produce a faithful copy of documents on file for the public to review. There is one software vendor which is a provider to a large majority of the other counties in Illinois and the statutes are pretty much the same. There are miscellaneous duties that each department would do. There really is only one measure to look at for this office and that is how many recordings there are per each full time equivalent employee. What they typically find is somewhere around 5,000 recordings per employees per year. In Sangamon County they are averaging about 3,000 recordings per employee. A review was done on this variation about 6 years ago and it seemed a little low when it was 4,000 recordings per employee, so it has dropped. There was a boom in refinancing and the Board gave some additional positions to the department and now the boom is over. You should now find recorder document filings are falling and the amount of work a worker can do is affected there. If Sangamon County's staffing were as productive as the peer average you could run this office, which now has just over 20 employees, with nine fewer people. He explained that it is not his recommendation they just lay nine people off, but they will have to think about how they would do that, how much they would want, and they would have to think about the timing. That would be a pretty radical change, and the office would not be able to process that immediately. He explained that there are recommendations of how to put together a plan for a change. He recommended they not just give people targets, but also talk to them about how to make that happen.

Mr. Cowans stated that the second office they looked at was the Supervisor of Assessments. Their review was a little above productivity on one thing and a little below on others. Collectively there may be one or two positions more than they might be able to work with. One thing to think about is that the tax process, as it works its way through county government, does not happen in all of the departments at once. If it were possible they could have staff come from one office to help staff in another office. It may just be that each office having staff get their work done they won't need all their people all the time.

The next office they looked at was Juvenile Probation and Court Services. The list of services they provide is quite lengthy. There were two significant findings from this review. First, Sangamon and Cook counties are the only two Illinois counties that run separate juvenile and adult probation departments. Any time you run a department you need a certain number of administrative personnel to run it. They should ask themselves if they have a couple extra positions because they are running two separate departments. Consolidating both departments may be something to explore. This would not cut programs but change the number of administrative staff running the department. The second issue is the size of the detention center. When it was planned case loads were rising every year. Now case loads have been falling and the facility is bigger than what is needed today. In fact, the occupancy rate is below 50%. Experts in detention would argue a little about what the target occupancy rate is for a detention facility. Some would say 80% to 90%. If it were possible to close off part of the facility the County might find they could save money on staff and the cost of operating a bigger facility. For now it seems rather expensive to operate a larger facility.

The last office they looked at was Information Systems. Other departments have nice things to say about the services they receive from this department, which is an important sign things are going well. The staffing level is right about what the peer counties are using. The list of what they do is really long. The only issue would be that they are using a main-frame computer system. All other counties they spoke with are running mid range and are very happy with it. Replacing the main-frame would be big money. They should think about making this change and get them in place so that there is a smooth transition.

Depending on how radical of a change there is for a department, they will need some support to make it happen. The changes will not happen radically overnight. A plan needs to be made to make these changes happen. He recommended they visit some of the other counties and ask them how they get their productivity. Ask them if it is the people they employ, their training, or their technology. If Sangamon County invests a little time they will find some degree of improvement is always possible.

Ms. Cimarossa asked if the totals for the detention programs were from last year. Mr. Cowans stated that they are.

Mr. Cahnman asked for clarification if they should replace the main-frame computer with a mid-frame when it becomes time and asked how much money they would save by doing that. Mr. Cowans explained there is a process called server rationalization, that they didn't do, which would ask how many servers and the kind of capacity planning. Ryan McCrady, County Administrator, stated that their last main-frame was just about \$500,000 and they could probably get a server big enough for this for about \$25,000.

Mr. Moore asked what else was open and obvious by looking at this Recorder's office and other offices that would account for these kinds of numbers and if there was a drop off in revenue over this time frame.

Mr. Cowans stated that there would be some drop off in revenue. Ryan McCrady stated that in FY 2003 the revenue was \$2.2 million and in FY 2004 it was \$1.4 million, but expenses have gone from about \$370,000 in 2002 to about \$531,000 in 2005.

Mr. Cowans stated that wherever you go everyone may say they are busy, but they are just not equally as busy. Mr. Griffin stated that maybe they are talking not necessarily about the speed of work but the efficiency of effort. Mr. Cowans explained that they didn't really evaluate the causes, but simply asked how much work they would expect someone to do. Six years ago this was looked at in more depth for that office, but they cannot use a six year old review to draw any conclusions about what is happening today. The conclusion is that this office is doing about half the work per worker of their peer group.

Mr. Goleman asked Mr. Cowans to remind them what he found six years ago with this study. Mr. Cowans stated that at the time productivity was about 4,000 documents per worker per year. He stated that they did discuss it with the office and asked them why. They said they just didn't want to make any mistakes. If you go and ask the other offices if they care about quality they will say no. At a certain point they need to just pick up the pace.

Chairman VanMeter asked Mr. Cowans if they suggested seeking consulting advice for the Recorder's Office to improve its operations. Mr. Cowans stated that could be done and they do offer that kind of advice. This issue was put before the Board six years ago, but they didn't act on it. If you want to make a change you need to have a plan and ask what you need to do differently, how you are going to do it, who is going to do it, and ask if the employees are trained appropriately.

Mr. Montalbano asked what brought on the possibility of a 45% cut in personnel for the Recorder's office. Mr. Cowans explained that if you did it suddenly they couldn't operate, but if the staff were functioning at the productivity level as other counties they would be operating with 45% less staff. A plan wasn't specifically made to do this, and if the office doesn't want this it would be difficult to implement a change.

Mr. Pace asked if they took into account the turnover lag between the Recorder's offices. Mr. Cowans stated that they did not do that this time. They were just looking at how much it takes to do the job. On the last study they did notice the turnover in Sangamon County seemed a little higher. Mr. Pace asked if there was a back log in the other offices. Mr. Cowans stated that it seems Sangamon County is comparable with the other counties.

Ms. Cimarossa stated that she does not think the gap was as huge six years ago as it is today. The Board really does need to take a serious look at this.

Mr. Cahnman asked if they looked at the salaries paid to the employees in the other counties as compared to this county. Maybe the salaries are so low here that they are not attracting high quality people for these positions which could have an affect on productivity. Mr. Cowans stated that it could cause a turnover. He stated that the compensation classification system they are using for the non-organized positions was designed by his firm, and the feedback he has received has been that it works pretty well. People do quit, and they do not have any access to any exit interview data to know why they quit or why they say they quit. There is not a huge salary range out there for these positions and this is not specifically what they were asked to look at in this study.

Chairman VanMeter clarified to Mr. Cahnman that there is no implication in the report or the study that there is any lack of professionalism on the part of the employees of the Recorder's Office.

Chairman VanMeter asked Mr. Cowans if he is aware of any other jurisdictions that have closed wings of their juvenile facilities due to these same experiences. Mr. Cowans stated that crime rates are down nationally and not just for juveniles but for adults as well. Ryan McCrady stated that he has talked to other counties who are seeing the same change in their juvenile detention population, and based on programs he has seen, effective programs are better tools for reforming juveniles than just incarcerating them in a juvenile detention center. This counties juvenile center wasn't built just to lock people up, but programs were also expanded. These programs seemed to have worked to affect the population in the facilities.

Mr. Moss asked why the State is cutting back on the funding they are giving to the County. Mr. McCrady stated that the staff expenses have actually risen. The State salary reimbursement level in 2002 was \$1.5 million with the total expense being \$2.5 million and in 2005 it was \$1.1 million with \$3.1 million in expenses. The County continues to fund a larger portion of the expenses. Chairman VanMeter stated that there continues to be more and more expense every year with less support from the State.

Mr. Vaughn stated that the salary increases went up for the juvenile department and it was amazing that the County was not involved in the negotiations because the Judges in the State of Illinois determined that. The County has no control over what they are paying these people, but are getting the short end of everything.

Mr. Goleman stated that the Finance Committee did recommend the Board proceed and implement the suggestions of the Maximus study. The target budget, which will follow on the recommendations of Maximus, will be going out tomorrow afternoon by 3:30 p.m.

**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

**ADJOURN**

A motion was made by Mr. Bunch, seconded by Mrs. Long, to adjourn the meeting to October 10, 2006 at 7:00 p.m. A voice vote was unanimous.

MOTION CARRIED  
MEETING ADJOURNED