

**FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING**  
**Special Meeting – Budget Hearing #3**  
**September 9, 2013**  
**5:15 P.M.**

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

Keith Ashby, Chairman  
Jay Dunn, Vice Chair  
Kevin Greenfield  
Linda Little  
Patty Cox (came in @ 5:19 p.m.)  
Tim Dudley (came in @ 5:19 p.m.)

**COUNTY PERSONNEL PRESENT**

Amy Stockwell, Auditor  
Deb Garrett, Environmental Management  
Ed Yoder, Treasurer  
Lori Long, Probation  
Robyn McCoy, Workforce  
Josh Tanner, S of A  
Jeannie Durham, County Board Office

**MEMBERS ABSENT**

Susanna Zimmerman

**CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 5:15 p.m. by Chair Keith Ashby at the Macon County Office Building.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Motion to approve minutes of the prior meeting on 9/3/13 was made by Jay Dunn, seconded by Kevin Greenfield, and motion carried 4-0.

*Tim Dudley & Patty Cox arrived.*

**Budget Proposals**

**Environmental Management**

Deb Garrett explained that in the 4000 revenue line items, the only thing that was different was the \$2,000 coming in for the electronics recycling IEPA grant and it will be going out of sundry. There are no raises included until the contract has been renegotiated.

The only change in the 7000 line items was in line 7110, maintenance equipment. There is an additional \$4,000 put in and taking \$1,000 out of 7200, \$2,000 out of 7250, and \$1,000 out of 7550. For the next fiscal year, additional funds have been added into the maintenance equipment line item because several of the recycling boxes need maintenance @ approximately of \$800 each.

In the 8000 line items, the 8200 line item has been deleted and the money has been dispersed into 8020 & 8025 because we are going to need to replace two computers and 8060.

The Enforcement Grant does not ever reflect what we get in that line item because that is IEPA FY. Back to 2006, it has been the same amount, \$46,265 coming in from the IEPA for the Enforcement Grant. There has been some shifting around in the various line items to accommodate our expenditures a little better. No other changes. Linda Little asked if these numbers are half way through our fiscal year. Deb confirmed. Linda expressed concern as to

whether we really would get \$46,000. Deb said the amount has been committed to. Linda asked if the \$46,000 has been committed to through June 30 of next year. Deb confirmed and said that since this was done in June, there is already more money in this account.

Keith asked what the need to increase the training budget was. Deb said that Laurie is current with HAZWOPER, but she needs to re-up it and she is going to be going to construction and demolition training because we believe there are new policies. Keith asked if that would be this year or next year. Deb said next year.

The 4000 numbers, the Fund Balance, do not show much change. The Disposal Fees have not quite reached the \$6,300 as is typical for the hauler's licensing. We may not get even up to \$4,000 next year because there have been various hauling companies that have been bought out by Advanced Disposal. They bought quite a few new trucks that are much bigger, so we are licensing fewer trucks.

Jay asked if new computers were going to be bought from line 8020 under the Enforcement Grant. Deb said Laurie wanted to increase supplies, even though it was only at 66%, but Deb would have to check on it. Tim Dudley asked about line 8060, vehicle expense. Deb said that Laurie's Escape was going to need tires and some maintenance. Jay said he noticed that there have been 81 trucks licensed to date coming to \$6,000 which is pretty close. Deb agreed.

Motion was made to pass the budget on to the full board for approval by Kevin Greenfield, seconded by Linda Little but stated that she did want an explanation for the increase in supplies, and motion carried 6-0.

### **Treasurer**

Ed Yoder explained that line in 5495, for the Supervisor of Collection, the balance of the salary has been moved from automation to general. The extra help line, 5695, shows \$12,300 moved from automation to general. The overtime, 5707, has been increased from \$500 to \$800. Line 7115, telephone, increased from \$2400 to \$2,650. Legal Advertisement, line 7140, increased from \$3,500 to \$5,500 based on last year's expenditures due to delinquent parcels. We really won't know that number until right before the tax sale in November. The postage line, 7150, has been increased from \$31,000 to \$35,000 to reflect the increase in postage as well as the number of certified delinquent notices. Line 7230, copy machine, went from \$480 to \$560 for contract maintenance.

The automation fund line 4260 receipts have been reduced to reflect the actual income that the Collector side receives on the Treasurer's Office. The tax sale license, line 7190, is increased because it depends on how many numbers of parcels. That is how we are billed. I am requesting a line, 7355, be added regarding the Guardian Ad Litem which has always been \$600. The equipment line, 9040, has been increased. I've added a request for a currency counter @ \$4,000. That \$15,500 all comes out of automation. Last year, on the Collector's side of the Treasurer's Office, we collected just from interest on penalties on late payments on property taxes \$471,205.30. As of Sept 5, 2013, we collected \$72,028.84. That number will increase dramatically by the end of November. Those two numbers added together is \$543,034.14 that the Collector's side of the Treasurer's Office turned over to general revenue.

Tim Dudley asked about the equipment line that has been increased to \$15,500. Last year's budget was \$4,400. You said the currency counter was \$4,000. That is \$8,400, so where is the other \$7K going? Ed explained that some computers were bought last year and this year's equipment that is to be replaced is different. Tim said there is \$7,000 difference between the \$15,000 being requested and the \$4,400 and the \$4,000 for the currency counter. So where is the \$7K going? Ed said the currency counter is a standalone expense. Ed said there is other equipment that is going to be replaced such as the 5 new computers. On the automation side, it leaves a balance of \$5,530.

Linda Little questioned line 4260. In this year's budget, you are expecting \$40,000 and you've got \$2,400 in at the halfway mark. Are you really going to get the \$37,000 in before December 1<sup>st</sup>? Ed said it's a big unknown, but it is realistic. Keith asked what was realized from last year's sale. Ed said slightly over \$38,000 for the year.

Linda asked for an explanation of 7355. Ed said that it is for the attorney to represent people that are under 21. The Guardian Ad Litem gets paid \$600 every year. That is a separate line item that is being added. Linda asked where it came from before. Ed said wherever there was money left over.

Amy said that the full cost of the copier is listed and questioned whether Ed had considered leasing from the fund. If you leased it from the fund, the least payment would be approximately \$100 per month rather than the capital cost of \$5,500. The county would pay the \$5,500, but it wouldn't be in automation. It would be \$100 per month approximately at current interest rates. Ed said that he is mindful of the fact that if we order two copiers, we may get a better price, but this is the best price per copier at this point. Linda asked if, when that purchase comes up, it has to come back to this committee. Keith confirmed. Jay asked if all 4 of the items could come under the lease from the fund program. Amy said they had not been doing computers because the life cycle is so short. We don't have unlimited funds there. Jay said then just the copier. Amy explained that with the fund being managed so tightly, if the capital cost could be put in 16, the county is still buying it. Any price negotiated would be invisible to the vender. We would just be paying for it out of 16 and budgeting it out of 16. Keith asked if that would go for the bill counter. Amy asked what the life expectancy would be on it. Ed said 4 years, but he expected more because he would use it much less than a bank would. Amy said that is consistent with a copier, so yes. Jay said Ed is still projecting, at the end of the year, \$5,500 left over in automation. Amy said yes, but in looking at the fund balance pages to fund 66, you see that because of the board's decision to use up fund balances in 2011, he actually ended last year with a negative fund balance. This is not allowed. He has to make up that deficit. It looks like he will make that up by the end of this year and will be at zero at the end of 2013. Jay said that it is still pretty tight. Amy agreed but said that if those 2 items were shifted from capital to 16, then you have more room to move things around. That would take \$9,000 out. Jay asked if that was a 3 year payback. Amy said it's flexible, but 3 year is typical and it has to be the same or less than the expected life cycle of the equipment.

Motion was made to pass the budget on to the full board for approval by Linda Little, seconded by Patty Cox, and motion carried 6-0.

## **Probation**

Lori Long distributed and explained that the report shows statistical information on the amount of community based supervision that takes place provided by the probation officers, the number of court reports that are produced, the number of community service hours that are completed by offenders through this department and through not for profits, the percentage of youth that are supervised and how Macon County compares to other counties of similar population. When looking at the numbers, especially in comparison to other counties, last year we were in the top of the counties on average active caseload, intakes, bond reports, and PSI's. The trend is continuing into this year. Your officers produce a lot of work and provide community based supervision for a large number of offenders which can help reduce the number of people who are incarcerated in the jail.

The average daily population of juvenile detainees spreadsheet shows trends across years and months. This is the biggest wildcard in our budget. This year we were plugging right along through March, but in June, we had a bubble of juvenile offenders who were co-defendants that were incarcerated at the same time. As they move through their court hearings, you see them drop off because they went to the Department of Juvenile Justice or they were released on probation. Over the course of this year, it would have been very difficult to predict so we do the best we can with trending.

Judge Webber and Judge Flanel preliminarily approved additional probation fees as revenue in the Reimbursement from Probation line.

Lines 4317, Mental Health Grant is received from the Mental Health Board to help offset the majority of costs for juvenile sex offender evaluations and community based treatment. The next three lines are the State Reimbursement that is gotten from the Administrative Office. Last week, we got an informal communication from our field representative that every county jurisdiction was going to receive a minimum additional 5% in allocations for FY14. Depending on how their formula works out, we may get more than 5%. That boils down to an additional \$37,655 over what we received this fiscal year. Linda Little asked if the mental health expenses are in line with the grant that is received. Lori said it is administrative, but Denny Crowley has indicated that as we go year to year and if we have more kids that need evaluations and treatment than the \$15,000, he is very willing to be approached. He has been very supportive.

Line 5001-5465 are the Probation Manager, Probation Supervisors and support staff. All but the six managers are covered by the collective bargaining agreement. Lines 5325 and 5465 are FOP members and their salary increases and wage schedule are determined by the agreement. That includes a 3% increase and longevity moves. Line 5001, the Chief Probation Officer and the 4 supervisors and line 5040, the Administrative Assistant lines have a 3% increase factored in to try to keep things equal with the staff that are supervised. Jay asked if Lori had any supervisors leave in the last year. She said yes. Jay asked if there were problems replacing them. Lori said yes because while there are extremely capable people who are probation officers and would be wonderful supervisor have very candidly said they couldn't see how taking a cut in pay was the right thing to do. Jay said he thought some salary adjustments were made. Lori said yes, two years ago. Those adjustments really corrected a disparity between the line staff and middle manager salaries. We had 6 or 7 people who had been with the department as long or less time than some of the supervisors, but were making more money. We rectified that wrong. Jay said that was between the line staff and the middle managers and

asked if there were still issues between the middle managers and supervisors. Lori said they would have a problem if they did not provide managers with the supervisors with increases. Lori said she looked at the seniority and wage schedule and within six months, three probation officers would be making as much or a little more than their supervisor. That imbalance would start fairly quickly. Jay said he did not want to get back to the problems they had before when we couldn't get people to step up to take those supervisory positions. Rather not have to go out and find someone to bring in that was not familiar with the system. Lori said she was very fortunate with the last supervisor as she had worked for the Department when she was fresh out of college. She had gone to the state. She had all kinds of experience and was interested in getting back to more direct service. For the past 4 to 4 ½ years, it has been difficult. Linda said her only problem was about raises for non-union. She said she understood the point and has understood it for 20 years, but she has a problem with it. The only saving grace is that your department is not currently in negotiations with anyone in the office. Lori said they have another year on their contract and negotiations would probably start next spring. Linda said the others she has had the issue with are currently under negotiations. Kevin asked why it mattered. Linda said because of the concern of when there is an open contract, to go ahead and set raises for non-union employees in that office. You are setting precedence for your negotiations. With this one, we are not setting precedence for her negotiations because they are in the middle of the contract. She already knows they are getting 3%. Kevin said he agreed, but what we do for one, we need to do for all. Linda agreed and said she's not standing very firmly on either side. Kevin said that it is obvious there is a problem and we have a lot of non-union people who are not getting a raise, so, we as a finance committee need to address that. These in kind raises for supervisors are making it where the supervisors are making more than the people that are in charge like Lori or the Sheriff. Until we find a solution to this problem, it is going to continue to happen. Keith said the emphasis this year was not to put a raise of 3% in there because of it would become what they expect. That was the emphasis of the letter that was sent out. If we say union guys get 3%, then they will negotiate for 5% knowing they will get the 3%. How we deal with the supervisors is that they should make more than the people they supervise. That is not always the case. We've failed to reign that in. Now, how do we reign that in without going over the budget is a big problem. Kevin said they either need to live by the sword or die by the sword. As of now, we've told everyone no. Linda said that the people that have been told no are the people that are currently in open negotiations. Kevin said that is irrelevant. Linda said she could argue that either way. Kevin said that Judge Webber's assistant is not in negotiations. Linda said no, but the clericals in his budget are. Jay said that they threw the Judge's out because it had 2.1% in it. The main strategy is to keep the raises out until negotiations start. We have received their first offer and its well above the 3% mark. Jay said he couldn't see where it matters so much at this point since we have their first offer, but he said he always likes to keep all raises out until the first offer comes in. That tells them this is their bottom mark, but they've well exceeded that in their first offer. Negotiations are this week. Kevin asked if Jay anticipated the contract being settled. Jay said he anticipated settling it. There was a misunderstanding on the letter that was sent out. Kevin said that as of now, they've sent every budget that had an increase in it back. Jay said he didn't have a problem with it because it can be rectified pretty easily once the agreement is signed. Keith said that if the agreement is signed at 3%, then the supervisors would get 3% too. Jay said that would be up to each department as to what they ask for and this committee as far as what they want to give them. We've had cases where the Health Department gave 28% increases in 7 years and the union people in this office got 10% in 7 years. That is something you need to ask every department

as they come through. Linda said the Health Department is a different beast with their own levy and our authority is different than general funding budgets. Linda said that in going back to this one, this department is currently not in negotiations and they already know what their union is getting this year and that makes it different. I'm not sure we want to base the supervisors in Dept A and figure their increases based on a contract negotiation in a totally different department. Jay said he doesn't think it will affect us as far the negotiating committee goes at this point. Linda said that as far as negotiations that you are in now, all they have to do is pull up the FOP contract and say, you've already got this contract with 3% in it. They don't even have to go outside the union salaries. Jay said yes, they can say FOP got this and the Sheriff deputies got that, but it's also based on qualifications and education. That doesn't go very far with negotiations. I know we had a problem in Probation a couple of years ago and we sat down and rectified it. We had several supervisor positions coming open and we couldn't get the people we had here to do it. We changed the salary structure and it seems like it is working. I'd hate to see that start happening again. The Sheriff deal that Keith is bringing up is a different problem. That is mainly with the Lieutenants and we are going to be working on that agreement as soon as we settle the deputies. Kevin asked if it was the same problem we have here. Jay said no. Jay said the in kind percentage that is just dealing with the salary increase is different. So if the union gets 3%, the command gets 3%. But that was not necessarily the case. It is a different situation than this. Jay said that since he has been on the board, if the supervisor is non-union, the people have gotten about the same thing the unions got within that department. Sometimes they got more. Sometimes the departments take that money and put it in a lump and then divide it out depending on how each person gets graded as far as performance. We did that with the Public Defender last year. This year, his budget got thrown out because he had 3% in there, but we forgot to question him on whether he was doing the same thing he did last year where he put it all in a pool. That's a good question to ask these departments. I kind of like that mythology where they take that and pro rate it depending on the employees. Kevin agreed.

Motion was made to table the budget until they see what happens and what is going to be done with everybody else by Kevin Greenfield. He said that with all due respect to Lori, he could not vote on the budget with the increase in it unless we're going to do it for everybody else. The motion was seconded by Patty Cox, and motion carried 6-0.

### **Workforce Investment**

Robyn McCoy presented a year in review report and explained that it contains numbers of customers visiting the work net center over the past 5 year. There were over 150,000 jobseekers coming through the doors. It also shows the grants and revenue that they have received. They total \$4,000,000. There is a snapshot of the training program their customers are enrolled in. There are several hundred customers enrolled in various training programs at various training institutions. Nursing is a big funding pool with manufacturing, welding, business, accounting, engineering technology, etc... making up the rest. There is a listing of expenditures by provider. It shows \$189,000 to OJT various companies, and reimbursement of wages for new employees that are hired, tuition, fees & books totaling \$464,000. \$115,000 was spent on youth providers, both in school and out of school. \$40,000 has been paid out for youth work experience. \$26,000 has been paid through the Veterans Work Experience Grant where they worked at the DNR parks. \$61,000 has been paid to the Decatur Schools Internship Program. \$330,000 has been paid in wages to the Summer Youth Program through the Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity for approximately 180 kids. The

performance measures that are negotiated with the Department of Labor include youth measures, adult economically disadvantaged measures and dislocated worker measures. The adults and dislocated workers are tracked by who enters employment, how long they stay in that particular job and the earnings are calculated at the end of the year. Youth are checked on whether they are getting their degree or certification. They are also checked for literacy and numeracy gains. One of the reasons they are in the program is because they are at risk and are not reading and doing math at the level they should be at. Exits are tracked by earnings. The return on investments shows they received \$285,000 for adults and those who exited earned wages of \$604,000. Comparing the wages earned to what was received, there was a 211% return on that investment. We received \$882,000 for dislocated workers and those that completed the program and entered employment earned \$2,317,000 in wages which is about a 262% return on that investment.

Robyn's budget shows each department being a separate grant. There is a cash account that gets all the cash and then there is a set of books within each department that is revenue and expenses.

The summary page explained the revenue for the various grants. The allocation for program year 2013 which began July 1 is \$1.1 million. \$120,000 was carried forward from program year 2012. \$234,000 was also carried forward in the dislocated worker specific grant that was received specifically for those dislocated from CAT, GND, ADM, & StarTek. The trade grant is for Hostess employees. There is about \$23,000 now which should be spent by Sept 30 and another \$8,000 to \$10,000 in trade dollars is expected. Special grants are the ones that are applied for competitively. The National Emergency Grant OJT has \$288,500 to spend and it will cover about 20 OJT's. This program covered about 60 OJT's a year ago and \$600,000 was spent. The Logistics Grant is brand new and we just received notification that we received \$58,000. The plan is to put a training program together coupled with some work based learning with local employers for the skillsets needed for the ADM inland port. Richland plans to have a program ready to enroll individuals in February. The Central Region Advanced Manufacturing Grant is a 2 year grant that we receive \$960,000. It is a regional grant that Macon County is the recipient for. There are 29 counties, 6 workforce areas and 5 community colleges. 88 individuals will be trained in advanced manufacturing and certified production technicians, welding, CNC and industrial maintenance across the entire region. It is a demonstration grant and will be evaluated by an outside evaluator from California. The Put Illinois to Work program has carried forward dollars of \$14,000 from previous years that have not been spent yet. A Community Development Block Grant with the City of Decatur is in the budget but there is not a contract yet.

Expenditures show 9 full time staff. Currently there are 8, but two staff resigned and the Employment Specialist will be replaced in October for the OJT grant. It is unclear whether they will be kept on past June 30 as it depends on what grants come in. \$590,992 is being projected for wage and fringe for 9 people. This is reduced by \$59,000 from last year and includes a 3% increase for all staff. The last increase was in December, 2009. All 8 current employees have more than 10 years of service. In FY11, it was \$744,000 in wage in fringe and in FY12, it was \$622,000.

Facility expenses increased to \$107,000 which is an increase of \$16,500 because of the anticipated move. There are a lot of unknowns with the costs involved with that.

The \$2 million is what we plan to spend on vocational training, on the job training, work experience, contracts, etc...

There is a MOU between 9 community partners. They are the Department of Employment Security, Department of Rehab, Decatur Housing Authority, Richland Community College, Adult Education, the Senior Program, DMCO. We negotiate the expenses and they contribute a portion which is required by the Workforce Investment Act law. Anybody who receives any kind of federal or state money for employment training must be a partner with our center so we share some of those costs. It is very minimal.

Department 38 is the Put Illinois to Work Grant. \$14,000 is being proposed as carried forward in revenue.

Department 45 is not a grant that is received any longer.

Department 46 is the Rapid Response Grant for CAT, GND, etc... and \$141,000 in revenue is anticipated. There is no staff, wage or fringe in this grant. The expenses are in vocational training, on the job training and supportive services. Child Care, line 7540, covers child care and transportation for anybody that we enroll and we want to make sure they stay in. If they are struggling in paying for child care or gas money for back and forth to school, we have dollars to help them out.

Department 47 is the Trade Grant. It has one event, three Hostess employees, attached to it and we do not anticipate much money there. One just finished the CDL and we may be entering into an OJT with him to get him employed.

Department 50, Administration, comes from the allocated grant and has an anticipated revenue of \$115,000. The cost for wage, fringe, facility, etc... are listed there. All salaries are allocated to grants that benefit from the staff services. Some grants do not allow us to charge salaries to so other grants offset.

Department 51, Adult Economically Disadvantaged, has an anticipated revenue of \$124,697. Wage, fringe, training & support are included.

Department 52, Youth Economically Disadvantaged, expects \$122,428 revenue. This is the grant we received a cut in.

Kevin Greenfield stated that he did not think the committee needed to hear all the details about each of Robyn's grants. Linda Little said she supported that opinion. It is pretty much what goes in – goes out.

Robyn explained that Departments 25 & 27 are the new grants.

Motion was made to pass the budget on to the full board as presented for approval by Linda Little and seconded by Tim Dudley. Kevin Greenfield questioned how they could pass this through when they didn't anybody else. Linda Little said she could pass this through because it is not general fund revenue. She said she felt that this committee's responsibility is . . .

Kevin said then all we're concerned about is general fund. Linda said she thought that that is where the committee has the most leverage. Her grants are stellar. She has been recognized for the way she handles them. Kevin said he was not arguing that point at all. He said Robyn does a great job and it shows in the money she brings in. Tim Dudley said they also cut from 10 to 9 employees and they have assumed extra job duties. Linda said her focus is general fund. She said she believes that is what the county is responsible for. We set levies. We don't



even set her levy so to dictate how she can spend her money when the state is obviously quite stellarly approving of how she spends her money. I don't feel qualified to do that, so I am comfortable with the 3% raise for this department. Kevin said then we pick and choose. Linda said no, you can vote no. I made the motion to approve the budget. I can be outnumbered and it won't be the first time. Kevin said he is unclear how Robyn's employees are different than Lori's. Linda said she was not clear on how state employees are different than county employees. She told Kevin to vote it down. She didn't care if she was the only "aye" vote on this. Robyn said that they are all non-union and they have not gotten a raise since December, 2009. The wages are set by the grants that are received. If there are cuts, there are layoffs. The motion failed 4-2 with Linda Little & Tim Dudley voting aye and Kevin Greenfield, Patty Cox, Jay Dunn & Keith Ashby voting nay.

Linda Little asked if they were going to approve the budget without the 3% or just not approve it at all. Jay asked how the others have been done. Linda said the committee had approved them with the understanding that they would take the 3% out. Jay said he was fine with that. Keith asked what they would do with that 3% if there's a grant that includes the 3%. Linda said all you can do is tell her she can't give raises. Jay said he felt it would be taken care of by the time it is put on display. Before, we've made a motion to accept the raises as presented before. We do that prior to the display budget.

Motion was made to pass the budget without the raises on to the full board for approval by Kevin Greenfield, seconded by Patty Cox, and motion carried 4-2 with Linda Little and Tim Dudley voting nay.

Keith stated that they have a fundamental flaw. We can't tell one department they get a 3% raise and tell everybody else that they cannot. Linda said she does not view Workforce Investments as a typical department. Tim agreed with Ms. Little in that it is a whole different situation. Linda said she respects the opposing view, but she is just not on it. Keith said he agreed, but that the average guy does not know that Workforce Investment is a different animal and he is going to resent us giving a raise to some but not others. Linda said she understood and has been resented before. Keith said that they are between a rock and a hard place.

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

None

#### **OLD BUSINESS**

None

#### **NEW BUSINESS**

None

#### **CLOSED SESSION**

None

#### **NEXT MEETING**

Budget Hearing #4 - Wednesday, September 18, 2013 @ 5:15 p.m.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

Motion to adjourn made by Kevin Greenfield, seconded by Jay Dunn, motion carried 6-0, and meeting adjourned at 6:25 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Jeannie Durham  
Macon County Board Office