

**FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING**  
**July 1, 2013**  
**5:15 P.M.**

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

Keith Ashby, Chair  
Jay Dunn, Vice Chair  
Tim Dudley  
Kevin Greenfield  
Patty Cox  
Linda Little  
Susanna Zimmerman

**MEMBERS ABSENT**

**COUNTY PERSONNEL PRESENT**

Amy Stockwell, Auditor  
Ed Yoder, Treasurer's Office  
Lori Long, Probation  
Mike Baggett, Asst. State's Attorney  
Bruce Bird, Highway Dept  
Sheree Zalanka, Health Dept  
Josh Tanner, Bd of Review, SofA, GIS  
Jon Butts, Sheriff's Dept  
Rodney Forbes, Public Defender's Office  
Robyn McCoy, Workforce Investments  
Jeannie Durham, County Board Office

**CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order by Chair Keith Ashby at the Macon County Office Building.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Motion to approve minutes of prior open meeting on 6/3/13 was made by Jay Dunn, seconded by Patty Cox, and motion carried 7-0.

**CLAIMS**

Motion to approve the claims as presented made by Patty Cox, seconded by Jay Dunn, and motion carried 7-0.

Chair Ashby stated that if the committee did not object, he would move the Transportation Department forward to this point in the agenda because Bruce Bird had other obligations he needed to attend.

***Transportation Department***

***Macon County Board Resolution Appropriating Funds for Engineering Expenses on the Washington Street Bridge Replacement Project over Lake Fork Creek***

Bruce Bird explained that this is done and the amount is \$1198.42. Jay Dunn asked if there was a scrivener's error as (1) says Forty Two Cents and (2) says Forty One Cents. Tim Dudley agreed. Bruce verified that it should be Forty Two Cents on both. Keith Ashby requested that the scrivener's error be corrected.

Linda Little made a motion, seconded by Susanna Zimmerman to approve passing the corrected resolution on to the full board with recommendation for approval and motion carried 7-0

Keith Ashby asked Bruce to attach the cover page of the contract to the resolution before sending it on to the board. Bruce stated that there really is not a title page. He asked what type of information the board is looking for. The cover page does not give any information on location, cost, or anything. Keith asked if the contract had been reviewed and approved by

counsel. Bruce stated that it has been approved by the Transportation Committee. Keith asked if the Macon County State's Attorney had reviewed and approved. Bruce said that it is not a typical procedure to send highway contracts to the State's Attorney's Office. Mike Baggett stated that he had not seen it, but Bruce is correct that the State's Attorney's Office does not normally review transportation contracts between the State Department of Transportation and the County. That has not been past practice. Jay Dunn asked how thick the contract is. Bruce stated that the typical construction booklet has all of the special provisions and everything including the prevailing wage information, the responsible bidder's form from the county and from IDOT. Technically, because of the references in the contract, the set of plans, the IDOT Standards Specs & the Supplemental Specs that come out every year, as well as the 100+ page contract are all part of the contract. Anything that gets put into one of these booklets gets reviewed by IDOT before it is put out for bid. Everything that is written in the contract is standardized from contract to contract. I can provide any kind of information the committee wants, but I need a better idea of exactly what it is you're looking for. Keith stated that most of the contract is boilerplate. Are you saying that the Resolution contains the meat of the contract? Bruce said that there is a contract bond, but even on the bond, the contract itself does not say how much the contract is for. The contract bond does, but neither one really gives a description of the work that is being done. I can pull out specific sheets if I know what it is you are looking for. Keith asked Mike if he was comfortable with that. Mike stated that it is not really about his comfort level. We have a situation here where the Department of Transportation controls the process. As to whether or not the money is going to be appropriated or designated for the County's use. If the County Board elects to contract under those guidelines, then we follow DOT to the line. As far as the specifics of the contracts, there is a procedure in place, but this is state procurement – State funds being funneled through the County. I am as comfortable as I can be, given the fact that we are not going to have any power in controlling the terms of the state contract. Kevin Greenfield asked if DOT writes the contract. Bruce said no, we put it together, they review it. We do occasionally have some projects where we will do in a year where it is all county highway or all local funds, but we put them all together just like any other project we are going to send off to the state with the exact same set of specifications. As far as we are concerned, it is no different than when we put out a set of plans that go out to a contractor. The contractors we deal with pretty much expect that. It is a standard procedure from this county to the next county and that is what they expect when they are bidding on something. Jay Dunn stated that Bruce has started adding more information in his resolutions so that now we know that this is appropriated for engineering expense to Clark Dietz, Inc. We hadn't been putting that into the resolution, but now we're getting a little more information. I think it would be nice if someone were looking back through this, they could know some detail other than just a bridge replacement, but I don't want 150 pages either. Maybe there is some way to give a general idea of what the work is without being too specific. It would be nice to know who we are paying the money to plus a general idea of what they are doing. Keith said we have a scrivener's error anyway, so it has to be rewritten anyway. I would like to tentatively approve this with the Bruce and Jay Dunn getting together on the rewrite. Bruce asked if he'd like that for all of the resolutions before they go to the board. Keith confirmed.

Linda Little made a motion, seconded by Jay Dunn, motion carried 7-0.

*Macon County Board Resolution Appropriating Funds for Construction Expenses on the Ocean Trail Road Bridge Replacement Project*

Bruce explained that this is a bridge replacement on Ocean Trail just west of Prairie View Road and on the east side of Long Creek. The project has been let and awarded to Schmidt Construction. We are just waiting on the beams to show up before they get out there. It is a Township bridge road project so 80% of the cost is paid for with Township Bridge monies from the State, 10% is the Township and 10% is the County per Statute. Amy asked for clarification. Bruce said, with TBP funds, we let the project. Based upon what the letting is, we bill the State for 80% of the costs and they front that money to us. So we already have those checks deposited. That is why it is written that we are fronting 100% of the cost because we have already got the money for it. Bruce asked if Amy wanted the resolution written differently. Amy said no, but that her test of a resolution is whether someone who is not talking to you or us can read it and understand what is going on. Bruce said he would make those changes.

Jay Dunn made a motion, seconded by Susanna Zimmerman to approve passing the revised resolution on to the full board with recommendation for approval and motion carried 7-0

#### **Macon County Board Resolution Appropriating Funds for Construction Expenses on the 2013 Coordinated Microsurfacing Project**

Bruce explained that this is an intergovernmental agreement between the County and the City where we would cooperatively go together and bid this work. As part of the agreement, the City was going to be the lead unless the City was not going to participate that year and then we would become the lead. Well, they are not participating this year, so we became the lead. This is a cooperative project between the County, Long Creek Township and Hickory Point Township. There are various roads and streets in the townships. Our stretch is CH32 from Macon west to IL Rt 48. Some of the roads we've already done with this microsurfacing process include Lost Bridge Road and Baltimore Avenue. It is a nice process for extending the life of the pavement for a relatively low cost. It looks like it's been resurfaced, but it hasn't been. It lasts 2 to 3 times longer than a chip seal.

Jay Dunn made a motion, seconded by Linda Little to approve passing the resolution on to the full board with recommendation for approval and motion carried 7-0

#### ***Macon County Board Resolution Awarding the Purchase of One 2013/2014 Tandem Axle Dump Truck***

Bruce explained that the lowest bidder was J X Peterbilt out of Bloomington at a total of \$163,918.61. Keith asked if this purchase is to replace existing equipment. Bruce confirmed. Keith asked what would be done with the existing equipment. Bruce said standard procedure is to offer it for sale to local governments first on a sealed bid basis. If it does not go to local governments, then we will offer it locally to any bidder on a sealed bid basis. If nobody takes it at that point, we dispose of it in a manner that the county will be reimbursed the best. Keith asked how old the equipment being disposed of is. Bruce said it is a 15 year old truck. Kevin Greenfield asked why the truck was not bought under IDOT. Bruce said they have had a lot of issues lately with electrical problems and a lot of issues with early corrosion – so much so that we've had to take trucks in to a local shop and have them repainted. I have spent a lot of time talking with some of the other counties to see how they handled it. They basically said, and it was backed up by what they were getting out of their fleets, that the State Bid Specs that the State puts together are rather thin. You can get a better truck if you put your own specs

together. Kevin asked the price of an IDOT truck. Bruce stated that it depends on what you get on it like the bed package and everything else. Kevin asked if Bruce had from IDOT what it would cost if this truck were bought from them. Bruce said no, because we did our own specs. This is the first time we are trying to do our own specs. We want a truck that is going to last. The one we are getting rid of is 15 years old. We want a truck that will last for 15 years. Just ballpark, you are probably talking \$12,000 to \$15,000 less than this. We specked out a lot of aluminum on the bed, the spreader so we wouldn't have to deal with the corrosion issues. They don't have that on their bid. We specked out the electrical cables that they would actually be in conduit and armor instead of just zip tied up on the frame. The biggest problems we've had lately with those trucks lately are the electrical problems. They are not designed and built to withstand the typical wintertime storms we put them through. Kevin asked if he was saying that IDOT trucks don't go through the same winters we go through. Bruce said they have the same problems we do. Other counties that spec out their own specs don't have the same problems that IDOT and that we've had. We need the trucks more than anything else and we really need to be able to count on them. The trucks don't go down in those other counties. Kevin asked what counties and how many counties. He said he knew of very few people that don't buy from IDOT. Bruce said that their trucks are dirt cheap and there's a reason why they are dirt cheap. Kevin said they are dirt cheap because they buy so many. Bruce said that yes, they spec them out, but they also spec them out very poorly. Bruce said he has talked to Champaign, McLean, Sangamon, and Tazwell counties. These are counties that are comparable in size to us. A lot of counties will still use the IDOT specs because it is handy. They don't have to put anything together and write it down and think about it. Kevin said and they are cheaper. Bruce said yes, they are cheaper, but they break down when you need them. Kevin said there is a warranty anyway right? Bruce said the warranty on the proposed truck is a 5 year while the state bid warranty is for 12 months.

Patty Cox made a motion, seconded by Linda Little to approve passing the resolution on to the full board with recommendation for approval and motion carried 6-1 with Kevin Greenfield voting no.

*Macon County Board Resolution Increasing Appropriations in the Matching Fund FY13 Budget for Country Club Road*

Bruce explained that this is for an increase in the budget for funds that are available. When the project was started, all the costs were in the last FY. The project was partially completed and the costs need to be brought into the current FY. Keith asked if the fund balance would be positive at the end of the year. Bruce said yes. As of 2 weeks ago it was just under \$667,000. We got a check from the State that has not yet been credited for \$104,000. The first half of the levy is \$220,000. We are also waiting on another reimbursement from IDOT off the CH30 project that should come in the middle of August for \$425,000. September is another \$220,000. The total amount, including those balances is \$1.6 million. Keith said that the balance should be about \$700,000 at the end of the year. Bruce confirmed and said he had talked with Amy and that he has been watching the balance on that for the past 9 months just because of the cash flow of those two large projects.

Linda Little made a motion, seconded by Susanna Zimmerman to approve passing the resolution on to the full board with recommendation for approval and motion carried 7-0

## **REPORTS**

### ***Audit Sub-Committee***

Amy Stockwell reported that the Audit Sub Committee had a meeting and went over the management letter which will be going out to departments with suggestions for improvement. We also talked about grant policy. You will be looking at a draft of that shortly.

### ***Auditor***

#### ***Macon County Board Resolution Approving Contract for Employee Assistance Plan Services with Chestnut Global Partners***

Amy explained that last year a complete RFP process was done. The assessment of the group reviewing the proposals was unanimous to select Chestnut. We've now had a year under the new contract and have been increasingly happy. Chestnut is being an integral part of our bonus program and providing training to our employees. We just had a very successful customer service training put on by EAP and received a lot of good conversations about that. This continues the contract for another year under the current terms. Keith asked about the \$27 per employee per year cost and whether it was based on the amount of people we have right now or how? Amy stated that we are holding it the same because we do not distinguish between full and part time because we have a number of part time employees who are here all the time. We can look at that if our number of employees falls. The contract also includes additional charges for this training. We are still in the included training, but we anticipate purchasing additional services. Keith said @ \$150 / hour, how many hours are you anticipating in the next year? Amy said all of the wellness classes are full so we will need all of them. I think that makes about 10 – 15 hours. They only charge for the time for the class. It is a very good deal.

Patty Cox made a motion, seconded by Linda Little to approve passing the resolution on to the full board with recommendation for approval and motion carried 7-0.

#### **Macon County Board Resolution Approving Renewal of Contract with Call One Inc. for Professional Services for Long Distance and Local Phone Service**

Amy explained that when we purchased our own phone equipment, we still purchase trunk lines from AT&T and we have to purchase local and long distance service. Call One is a bulk resaler of AT&T services. We have been with them since 2010 and have been extremely happy with their service. They offer good trouble shooting, excellent billing, and great rates. I am pleased to present this recommendation to continue to them. Keith asked if this was a savings. Amy said it is a savings over the 3 years of \$18,000 over the prices offered by AT&T.

Patty Cox made a motion, seconded by Jay Dunn to approve passing the resolution on to the full board with recommendation for approval and motion carried 7-0.

Amy stated that most, but not all, of the budget forms went out on Friday as per the schedule so the budget process begins.

### ***Board of Review***

Josh Tanner reported that they are starting to get the 2012 casework from PTAB. He talked to them last week. They are still way behind. So far this year, 213 complaints filed. At the high, we've been at 1,200 and usually no less than 700 so either there are a lot to show up or this is going to be a very low year. The assessments are going down and that generally fixes a lot of the problem. A lot of the complaints are triggered by someone purchasing a foreclosed home. They know if they paid less than it is assessed for, it's an easy win. They bring their closing statement in. They bring in some pictures of the inside of the home to show it was in bad shape and we put it on a watch list. Then, when it gets brought back up to the neighborhood standards, it gets reassessed in their quadrennial year.

Tate & Lyle negotiations have begun. The State's Attorney will be in contact with them this week to move that along. Keith asked when completion is anticipated. Josh said they would like to complete them for 2013 which gives them about 60 days. They are under the gun to come to a conclusion on that. Mike Baggett added that the Decatur Public Schools has successfully intervened in the case and they are now a party to the action. Any negotiations now have to be signed off by three parties. That is also a potential effect on the timeline as to when this might come to a close. Keith asked if the park district is participating in this. Mike said not that he is aware of. Josh explained that the Park District did not intervene. Intervening is like an official becoming a party to. All of the Districts, except the City of Decatur, agreed to participate with the cost of the appraisal. In that respect, they participated, but they are not an intervener. Only the school district is an intervener. An intervener means they have a standing on their own and they get to make a decision. Although, ultimately the Board of Review gets to make the final decision, the school district is part of the process now.

### ***Supervisor of Assessments***

Josh Tanner reported that they are almost finished at Long Creek. They are just working out some of the commercial property. All the pictures and measures have been done and the rest should be complete in the next 30 days.

Josh stated that a local appraiser had sent communication and he could explain. What happens is that you have appraisers come in that need to access documents in the Supervisor of Assessment's office. Several years ago, the office asked for some increased barriers to keep people from just being able to come in and mill around the office. The safety committee came up, walked through, and determined that the problem needed correction. Then there was a front desk counter built and more video and audio was installed. At that time, the staff was directed to take requests for the paperwork, go get the paperwork and bring them what they need. The lobby area was expanded to include several desks, computers and work space to accommodate visitors to look through what they need and flag pages they need copies of. The staff makes the copies and brings them to the visitor. Also, since then, all of this has been put online, so there really is not a need to come into the office, but some habits die hard and some people still like to see the paper. The policy is that we do not let anyone behind the counter. Of course, most people do not have ill will, but there have been a few people in the past and so it was addressed. Since then this has been the standing policy. When I came into office, I asked them to uniformly apply that. I'm sure that in the past if you've had long standing relationships with people, some exceptions were made, but when I came into office, I asked them to uniformly apply it so we were treating everyone the same. Keith Ashby asked if there

had been any other complaints, beside this one. Josh answered not to his knowledge. He said he has talked to some of the other appraisers about the services we offer. The books that are mentioned in the letter are not actually something we are required to do. That is just something that was started in the past and it is basically a way of cherry picking the stuff that most people are interested in, putting it into a book and organizing it. Most of them have been pretty happy with the service we provide. A lot of them are beginning to transition to where they do most of the work from their office. You can search through our records pretty easily electronically so a lot of them don't really even need to see the paper anymore. This year, we are adding a couple of services to make that search capability a little more functional, but so far they've been pretty happy with it. Tim Dudley verified that these are public records. Josh confirmed. Tim asked that since they are public records if they should be moved to a place where they could be accessible. Josh said that they are organized by category for the books. We put all the sales of mobile homes in book, etc.. Then, if they just want to see the green sheets themselves, then they are organized by Section, Township, Range, etc... So, normally, what happens is, someone, and it's usually an appraiser, who has a subject property in a neighborhood will come up to the front desk and say, for example, they need Section 43 in Decatur Township and the staff will go back and get the whole folder, bring it to the front so they can look through it and flag the things they need photocopies of. Some of them have gotten to the point where they don't even need copies. Tim said then your people go back and get the information that they request. So, they do have access to it? Josh confirmed. They have access to the paper. The only reason I mention the internet is because we are trying to make it a little more accessible 24/7. But, yes they can come and they are still able to get all of those records. It's just, in the past, they used to walk all the way to the back and get them and now we've just asked them to just tell us what you need, we'll go get it for you and you can look at it or have us copy it for you. Tim said, "That's good enough for me". There were no further questions.

### ***GIS***

Josh Tanner reported that the enhancements made to the webpage a couple of months ago have gone through and everyone is relatively happy with that. It gets a lot of traffic that increases every year. Every time you add something, people call and want to know if it can do this or that. So, next year, on the docket, people would like to see year over year how the rates are increasing. The public is becoming a little more cognizant of the levy rate gain that a lot of districts like to play and the newspaper and they are actually looking that up to see what that means. Currently, they can see every district that your bill pays to and the amount that was paid to it. We will be adding that next year.

### ***Treasurer***

*Macon County Board Resolution to Execute Deeds to Convey Property on which Taxes were Delinquent*

Jay Dunn asked what kind of marketing the tax buyers, like Mr. Meyer, do on the properties that end up on the tax roll, especially some that end up there year after year. Ed explained that every year in Sept, there is a trustee deed sale. This year's is on 9/11. These properties listed on this resolution tonight were actually on that deed sale last year. The school district bought a couple of properties on Wood Street. Usually, out of all those things, he'll sell maybe 45 – 50 a year. Otherwise, it just stays in limbo as trustee deed property and just sits there. A lot of

them are in not very good areas and houses are not going to be built on them. Some are vacant lots and if there is a house on it, it gets condemned and torn down eventually. Keith Ashby asked how someone goes about getting a list of the delinquent properties. Ed stated that he could get a Trustee Deed property list, but would not have a delinquent list until this Fall when they get ready for the delinquent sale. There will be a booklet come out for the one on September 11<sup>th</sup>. Ed said he gets it around the middle of July from Joseph E. Meyer for Macon County and it will be in his office. It lists all the properties that will be offered for sale in September. That sale is held at the Civic Center. Keith asked what the price of the book was. Ed said it is usually around \$12.

Motion to approve moving resolution on to the consent calendar was made by Tim Dudley, seconded by Linda Little and motion carried 7-0.

### **CITIZEN REMARKS – PUBLIC COMMENT**

None

### **OLD BUSINESS**

None

### **NEW BUSINESS**

*Macon County Board Resolution Setting the Salary for the Office of Sheriff of Macon County 2014-2018*

Jay Dunn said he would be bringing similar resolutions for the Treasurer and County Clerk shortly, but this one is for the Sheriff. He explained that he wanted to keep them separate. This one is unique because duties have been added to the Sheriff's office over the last few years. That salary should be looked at. There is a spreadsheet showing salaries from some of the different counties and also for some of the internal salaries within the office. There are 9 employees under him that make more money than the Sheriff.

Jay Dunn made a motion to approve. Kevin Greenfield asked Jay when the resolution needed to be approved. Jay said, by Statute, 180 days prior to the election which is in November of 2014. Some of the counties have been moving them up two years ahead of time. I didn't get it to you that fast, but wanted to get them taken care of and I wanted to keep them separate even though we've grouped them together before. I would rather keep all the offices separate so that each office can be evaluated on its own as far as how many duties each officeholder has. Keith asked if there was a list of increased duties to justify the raise being over 6%. Amy said there is job description attached which was prepared by the Sheriff. It includes the three big things. They are the Emergency Management which includes the Terrorism Taskforce, Business Continuity Plan and the work with FEMA; Macon County Animal Control and Care Center; and Federal Prison Detention. Keith asked if Amy felt this would justify the increase of over 6%. Amy confirmed. The motion was seconded by Tim Dudley to approve passing the resolution on to the full board with recommendation for approval and the motion failed 4-3 with Linda Little, Kevin Greenfield, Patty Cox & Susanna Zimmerman voting no and Keith Ashby, Jay Dunn, & Tim Dudley voting yes. Linda Little explained that the only reason she is voting no now is that she wants more time to consider granting an 11% increase. She said she agreed with not lumping them all together. She said she was not comfortable voting for this tonight.



*Macon County Board Resolution Authorizing the Execution and Delivery of an Amendment to Loan Agreement and Other Documents in Connection with an Amendment of the Economic Development Revenue Refunding Bonds (Decatur Family YMCA Project), Series 2011 of the County of Macon, Illinois and Providing for Related Matters*

Mike Baggett said Sam Witsman, Bond Counsel, was present to answer questions. Mr. Witsman explained that his firm has acted as Bond Counsel in the past on issues when the County has assisted the YMCA with. In 2011, there was a bond issue done with the county's assistance to refund even prior bonds. What we are asking for tonight – Hickory Point Bank owns 100% of the bonds. The Y is committed to making the payments. There is no obligation to the county. They have negotiated a rate change so that the Y can have the option of a 5 year fixed rate @ 2.25% in order to effectuate that, we need to amend the loan agreement that is between the County and the Y that was then assigned to Hickory Point Bank. This is a brief resolution amending the definition of the 5 year fixed rate option to allow the Y to elect that 2.25%. There are a couple of other companion changes that need to be made in the loan agreement in connection, but that is the primary reason. Keith Ashby asked if this is a decrease in the rate. Mr. Witsman introduced Chris Funk from Hickory Point Bank who was nodding his head yes to confirm that this is a decrease in the rate. Right now it is in a variable rate mode which is based on a percentage of prime rate, but the answer is yes, if the Y selects the 2.25%, it will be a lower interest rate. Keith asked what happens at the end of 5 years. At the end of the 5 years, it goes back to what is the current definition of the 5 year fixed rate which is based on the Federal Home Loan Bank. The formula based on the Federal Home Loan Bank rate multiplied by a percentage of what the bank pays taxes on. That is the same definition that is there now. The only thing we are doing is that for the next 5 years, we are taking it out of that formula and fixing it at 2.25%. Keith asked if the interest was being loaded on the rear end. Sam said no. The definition of the 5 year fixed rate in the resolution, part B says after July 16, 2018. That is the same definition that they are in right now. If we were not making this amendment, if they wanted to go to the 5 year fixed rate at any given time, it is the same formula as they are in now. The only thing we are doing is that for the next 5 years, it is taking it out of that formula and fixing it at 2.25% which today is a lower interest rate. Linda Little asked what the anticipated payoff on these bonds was. Sam said they were originally 20 year. He thought 2021. Tim said that by the time these 5 years are up, there are only 3 more years to deal with. Mr. Witsman & Mr. Funk clarified that it is actually 2031. It was 20 years from when they were done in 2011. There were four 5 year adjustable rate periods.

Linda Little made a motion to approve passing the resolution on to the full Board with recommendation to approve. Jay Dunn stated that the County had done this for the Y back in 2011 and then we've done something similar with Millikin and he thought it had been decided that the County would start charging. He said they had talked with both Millikin and the Y about using the CIEDA program, but in both cases, earlier on they had both already started the process of redoing the bonds and did not feel it would be in their best interest to change course. I know in Millikin's case, they came back and we did charge them a fee for the efforts in the Auditor's office, the State's Attorney office and just for going through this process. I've looked at the emails and know the State's Attorney's office has been involved. I don't know what the fee was in Millikin's case and what it should be in this case, but we should treat everyone the same. Since Millikin came through when wanting to redo their bonds, this should be the same with the Y. Keith asked Amy if she had determined what the charge should be based on what we had done with Millikin. Amy said \$8,000. Chris Funk with Hickory Point Bank stated that

it is the County's option if they want to charge the Y a fee, but the bank looks at this as a simple rate modification just like we would do with a commercial mortgage loan or an equipment loan where a customer would say, hey, the interest rates have fallen since you made us a loan so can you help us out. We're just trying to help the YMCA and as part of that, we are not charging any fee. Mr. Witsman has significantly reduced the fee that he would typically charge to do one of these. We've really tried to minimize the out of pocket expense. For what it's worth, for Hickory Point Bank's vote, I'd be disappointed if we charged the YMCA a fee to do this because the amount of work to modify these definitions and do this resolution is substantially less for all of us. That would be the bank's recommendation. Linda Little stated that she thought that when Millikin did this, they were actually redoing the bonds. Mr. Witsman stated that they were involved in the Millikin bond issue and it was a refunding of prior debt. It was a significant dollar amount in the multi-millions. In the Y's situation in 2011, we end up with a thick stack of documents and multiple resolutions. There's a lot of work that goes into it. In this situation, we have 6 or 7 pages as opposed to 600 or 700. We have worked very efficiently with Mike. Speaking on behalf of the Y, which I have not been asked to do, that number would be very far out of the norm of what we see in the marketplace. Kevin Greenfield asked that if there was a fee, it be waived. Mike Baggett stated that the resolution, as drafted, does not include fees. The motion was seconded by Kevin Greenfield. Keith stated that he would suggest that the members study a fee schedule for these types of things so it can be applied uniformly. The question of how many of these we have was asked. Amy said Millikin & the Y recently, but there are also the housing bonds which are kind of a different circumstance and each one is slightly different. We are not talking about a huge volume. The motion carried 6-0 with Patty Cox voting as present. She stated her reason is that she is employed by Hickory Point Bank. Keith asked Amy to set up a fee schedule that would be fair.

### **Workforce Investment Solutions**

#### *Macon County Board Resolution Approving Amendment for Workforce Investment Solutions FY13 Budget – Trade Adjustment Assistance Grant*

Robyn McCoy explained that this is actually a modification. The first grant was about \$800 and we recently had an event. The Hostess Company was approved recently as a trade event and we have a couple of people now going through training and we have now increased our grant by \$18,050 and I anticipate increasing it again in September because we've got a couple more people wanting to go to school. We need to get this in to the State, prior to June 30 FY end date. They've amended our grant by increasing it by \$18,050 for the period of January, 2012 thru September 30, 2013.

Linda Little made a motion, seconded by Kevin Greenfield to approve passing the resolution on to the full board with recommendation for approval and motion carried 7-0

#### *Macon County Board Resolution Approving Amendment for Workforce Investment Solutions FY13 Budget – Rapid Response On-the-Job Training Grant*

Robyn explained that the State received dollars from the Department of Labor and asked the local Workforce areas to apply for these dollars. I applied for the on-the-job training grant. It is for incentives to go to employers who hire dislocated workers. I am able to reimburse, based on company size, at 50%, 75% & 90%. This is similar to last year's grant and is in the amount of

\$288,500. The expense amounts cover part of Robyn's salary, the fiscal assistant, and employment specialist wages and most of the dollars are in the on-the-job training line. \$225,000 for on-the-job training and \$5,000 for supportive services for those individuals.

Patty Cox made a motion, seconded by Kevin Greenfield to approve passing the resolution on to the full board with recommendation for approval and motion carried 7-0

*Macon County Board Resolution Approving a Budget Amendment Workforce Investment Solutions FY13 Budget - Regional Workforce Innovation Grant*

Robyn explained that this resolution has not been approved by the O&P committee. It was pushed out in the last week by the Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity because of the end of their fiscal year on June 30. The State received some Workforce Innovation grant dollars from the Department of Labor. They released a request for proposals and we were to work as a region to train individuals in the manufacturing sector. I pulled together a rather large region, from Quincy to Danville. There are six local Workforce areas involved. Twelve Community Colleges, Economic Development entities, etc... working to serve individuals. We were the recipients of \$960,025. This is for the entire region, but Macon County is the grant recipient for these dollars. There are dollars for part of my wage, fiscal assistant wages, case manager wages in this area. We will be hiring a project manager. There is \$100,000 budgeted for this. This person is required to be from the private sector and have manufacturing background experience. We will be hiring someone on a contractual basis. The training is for tuition, fees, & books, on-the-job training and internships. We will be working very closely with the community colleges in all areas. Each local workforce will have some staff assigned to them. There are some other expenditures I will have to contract out with other entities. Supportive services are \$42,000 and supplies are \$1,500 to purchase a laptop for that project manager. This grant is for the period of June 1, 2013 thru May 31, 2015. The State has hired an evaluator who is coming from California. There were 5 grants awarded across the State of Illinois and we were the recipients of one. We will be working very closely with the state's evaluator as we move forward with the project. The budget actually states \$1,528,000. There is \$568,000 of leveraged resources and that comes from community colleges, Workforce areas and employers who have committed to host an intern or an on-the-job training and the leverage resource would be, perhaps a supervisor overseeing one of our customers at that worksite. So, it is not actually dollars, but is in kind resources that we will be keeping track of throughout the length of the grant. Amy asked how much will fall into FY13. Robyn said they would like for us to have all customers enrolled by May or next year, so even though the grant ends in May, 2015, we will be tracking those individuals for another year. I anticipate the bulk of the expenses to be between Aug, 2013 and June 30, 2014. Since there is only 5 to 6 months in this particular year, we can make that adjustment as we will have to make the adjustment of 092 as well. Robyn asked how Amy would like that done and Amy said she would prefer it for the board meeting. Robyn said she would revise each resolution so it fits within the County FY.

Patty Cox made a motion, seconded by Kevin Greenfield to approve passing the revised resolution on to the full board with recommendation for approval and motion carried 7-0

Kevin Greenfield complimented on the great job. Robyn stated that dollars are not just allocated anymore like it used to be. Everything is now coming out competitively and you just

have to get on the bandwagon and apply or you'll get left behind. Robyn said that she sees this as our future.

### **Health Department**

#### *Macon County Board Resolution Approving Increase in Appropriations for Phase II Building Improvements*

Sheree Zalanka reported that the improvements include drainage work, parking lot resurfacing, and interior improvements. Work in these three areas has not been updated nor maintained since the initial building in 1991. That's 22 years. The total is \$190,000 for the expenses. Also is included revenue of \$32,000. A Rebate for the roofing project that was completed last year has been received. More rebates are anticipated as they are continuing to apply for them.

Linda Little made a motion, seconded by Patty Cox to approve passing the resolution on to the full board with recommendation for approval and motion carried 7-0

#### *Macon County Board Resolution Approving Increase in Appropriations in the FY13 Health Fund Budget for Administrative Clerical Support*

Sheree explained that when Julie Aubert took over as Administrator, the Assistant Administrator / HR position was not replaced. Since then the payroll clerk has taken over a lot of those duties, but additional help is now needed. A part time, high level, clerical support worker @ approximately 28 hours a week who will work with FMLA, payroll, general admin backup etc... is being proposed. This will cost approximately \$9,000 this FY and approximately \$18,000 / year in the future.

Linda Little made a motion, seconded by Patty Cox to approve passing the resolution on to the full board with recommendation for approval and motion carried 7-0

#### *Macon County Board Resolution Approving Increase in Appropriations in the FY13 Health fund Budget for Mother and Infant Home Visiting Program Evaluation (MIHOPE) Project*

Sheree explained this is a research project which was designed to evaluate the MIECHV home visiting program that is currently in place. We have received \$15,000 this year and will receive an additional \$3,500 in September and another \$3,500 in January, 2015 for a total of \$22,000. This is a wash of revenue and expenses.

Patty Cox made a motion, seconded by Tim Dudley to approve passing the resolution on to the full board with recommendation for approval and motion carried 7-0

### **Sheriff's Department**

#### *Macon County Board Resolution Approving Increase in Appropriations in FY2013 Sheriff Budget for German Shepherd Dog*

Lt. Butts explained that the Sheriff's Office has received funds from the HGB Foundation for a 2 year old German Shepherd dog which will help improve response times for potential bomb threats within the county and will be able to patrol the local government buildings and schools as needed. The duties of the dog will be assigned to the Court Security Office and the County Office Buildings. The dog should be ready by mid August. The first school will be scheduled

for Sept, 2013. The received funds will be \$13,154 for the purchase, the Explosive Detection Course, 3 weeks housing for a student during the course and equipment. Letters of interest were accepted thru last Friday and the officer was selected who would be the canine handler for this dog. The dog will go home with him and he has been instructed that this dog is not a pet. We have had recent bomb threats in both the Court House and the County Office Building. We looked at several dogs before making a choice and we feel this dog will be very beneficial to the department. Keith asked what account the monthly upkeep would be taken out of. Lt. Butts replied that it would be comparable to the canines the department already has, but this dog will not need the training that the current dogs have because this is a single purpose dog for explosive detection only. The Sheriff has confirmed that the addition of this dog will not cause the budget to be out of line.

Kevin Greenfield asked that since we will have a bomb dog, will we have a bomb squad. Lt. Butts explained that he is the County Bomb Person due to the fact that he has been to training. Protocol is that if there is a suspicious package or situation, the U of I has a bomb squad put together by the U of I, Urbana and Champaign Police Departments. Since they are 30 – 35 minutes from Decatur, we use their bomb squad. Kevin asked if there is a bomb threat, do you wait for them to bring the dog through or just go ahead. No, the protocol for our dog is to go through this building and the Court House daily and if he detects something suspicious, we would then call the bomb squad.

Linda Little made a motion, seconded by Susanna Zimmerman to approve passing the resolution on to the full board with recommendation for approval and motion carried 7-0

#### **CLOSED SESSION**

None

#### **NEXT MEETING**

Monday, July 29, 2013 @ 5:15 p.m.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

Motion to adjourn made by Jay Dunn, seconded by Susanna Zimmerman, motion carried 7-0, and meeting adjourned at 6:30 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Jeannie Durham  
Macon County Board Office