

FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING
September 30, 2019 5:15 P.M.

MEMBERS PRESENT

John Jackson
Tim Dudley
Laura Zimmerman
Kevin Greenfield
Debra Kraft
Greg Mattingley
Jim Gresham

MEMBERS ABSENT

COUNTY PERSONNEL PRESENT

Carol Reed Auditor
Judge Webber
Ed Yoder, Treasurer
Rocki Wilkerson, Workforce Investments
Rick Bright
Sgt. Matt Reynolds, Animal Control
Lisa Wallace, Auditor's Office
Mike Baggett, State's Attorney's Office
Jay Scott, State's Attorney
Alysia Crist, State's Attorney's Office
Pat Berter, Probation
Adam Walter, Sheriff's Dept Chief Deputy
Helena Buckner, County Board member
Patty Cox, County Board Member
Tracy Sumpter, County Board Office

CALL TO ORDER

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

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM PRIOR MEETING

Ms. Zimmerman made a motion to approve minutes of the 9/16/19 Budget Hearing Meeting, seconded by Ms. Kraft, and the motion carried 7-0.

CLAIMS

Motion to approve the report of the finance claims made by Ms. Kraft, seconded by Ms. Zimmerman, and the motion carried 7-0.

REPORTS

Audit Sub Committee – No report

Auditor –

Ms. Reed explained that she would be presenting the Auditor's budget along with a few of the miscellaneous ones like retirement and SS and then will come back and finish up with the levy and the rest after everyone else has done their changes.

The Auditor's budget for next year has two pieces to it; the HR and the Auditor. The Auditor budget changes are pretty much just salary increases with a net increase of \$2,355. The HR budget has the savings in it. It has a positive \$3,951 from the prior year. That was done by taking the health insurance for the HR person out. 60% of that salary comes from the insurance fund, so the entire health insurance premium was put in that fund. That was the way cuts were able to be made to the general fund. The net between the Auditor & the Auditor HR is down (or to the positive) about \$1,600. There is very little change in anything else.

Retirement Fund – this has a \$1.7 million balance. There have not been any changes made to the levy. The expenses will go up next year since the IMRF rates are going up. The regular rate, on most people, is 8.29% that the employer pays. Next year, it is going up to 10.07%. That is about a 1.78% increase. The SLEP & ECO go up about 3% and 13%. There will be a little increase in those, but we will keep the levy the same because we have plenty of fund balance to cover it.

Mr. Greenfield asked about the audit and the pensions and if it is correct that we are not 100% funded. Ms. Reed explained that no, IMRF is not 100% funded, but it is like in the 90's. They tell us the rate for next year. The reason it went up is because their investment on returns for last year were down. Not as much got funded through interest and earnings. That caused the rates to go up a little bit. They vary. They've been going down for the last 3 years. 8.29% is about as low as it has been in forever. Chairman Greenfield commented on how lucky we are to have IMRF because they are one of the best. Ms. Reed agreed.

The budget for the retirement fund for next year shows a deficit of \$106,000, but that is very capable of being taken care of by the fund balance.

SS – The tax levy is being reduced by \$100,000. It has a fund balance of \$884,000 and the rate never changes. It's 7.65%. We can estimate that one a little better. So, for next year, we estimated losing or having a negative of \$154,000 which is easily covered by the fund balance too. The only thing we have to watch there is that the taxes come in around July and October and we just have to get through the whole year before we get more tax revenue to pay them.

Insurance & Self-Insurance – We are going to be in a new pool with the Illinois Counties Risk Management Trust for next year. Our insurance rates for our liability insurance should stay pretty steady for next year. Ms. Reed said she has estimated that to be about the same. The levy is being reduced by about \$200,000. The fund balance is about \$900,000. We do pay some workers comp claims and employment stuff out of this but there is still plenty in there to handle what we have had to handle this year. With the insurances being about the same, Ms. Reed said she does not anticipate any problems with that. The fund 13, the Self-Insurance is a derivative of the insurance liability fund. It gets funded from the insurance fund and that is what we use to pay our claims. If someone has a fender bender, we pay it out of there. We do have a couple of temporary disability that come out of there. Things like that shouldn't amount to a whole lot.

Capital Lease – This is a fund of about \$100,000 set aside for people to buy copiers so they don't have to pay the rates that a copier company would charge for buying on time. This allows departments to borrow from this fund at a very minimal interest rate. There are only a couple of people using it. \$20,000 has been set aside for people to do that next year. It has been available for 10 years.

Capital Vehicle Fund – Fund 18 – That has \$200,000 set aside for offices to buy vehicles or large capital items if they need to. Currently, there is not anyone using it. \$200,000 has been set aside (restricted) and it is available if they need to purchase vehicles. That will continue on unless a reason to end it comes up. Ms. Kraft asked why it wasn't being used. Ms. Reed

explained that many of the vehicles are handed down and the Sheriff has their own program. The Coroner got one. There hasn't been a need.

Wind Energy – Fund 19 - This is the license fees for the windmills. That has a fund balance of \$2.7 million. It has ended but is still getting interest. It is still in a separate fund. There has been some talk of ending that fund eventually. Generally, when the audit is done, it is a part of the general fund because it is general monies. That is the fund that the general fund borrows from when it needs cash. It still has about \$2.7 million in it. The only thing budgeted for for next year is the interest.

Decatur Public Building Commission Lease Fund-Fund 42 - We levy what we need and only what we need to pay for the building lease for that fund. The next year's levy includes the Decatur Public Building Commission Lease for \$5,410,000. We rent garage space in this building at \$4,320; we pay a portion of the Health Department Lease at \$18,073; services for the Tyler Technologies Project in the Circuit Clerk's office at \$557,000. The amount of money we need for next year will be \$5,990,000. We get rental income from Andy Manar's office and CASA which amounts to \$6,000 & \$11,000. Taking that away from what we need, it leaves us with \$5,973,470 for the levy. This is about \$157,000 more than the prior year. The only other expenses that come out of there are the license & maintenance fees for the Circuit Clerk. From some of the surplus funds, we pay some license and maintenance fees for the Auditor's Office at \$28,000. That comes from excess funds that have been returned to us and is not a part of the levy.

Public Defender Fund – this is new – starting in August, they started receiving \$10.85 a month, but according to the Statutes, it needs to be in its own automation fund. They now have an automation fund. The plan is for \$200 to come into that. It is part of the Public Defender portion of the budget, but hadn't been included previously and it just needed to be included.

Funds from prior years that are not included this year include:

Fund 99 – Economic Development – Marketing Branding Fund. This was a pass-through from the Buffett Foundation. We passed through quarterly money to the EDC. That ended last month.

Fund 97 & 98 – Criminal Justice Grant Agency Fund and an Alternative County Outreach Grant Agency. Those are both funded by the Howard Buffett Foundation. They were 3 and 5 year programs and have ended.

Mr. Dudley made a motion to approve the Auditor's FY20 budget proposal for placement on Display, seconded by Ms. Kraft , and the motion carried 7-0.

States Attorney – FY20 Budget Presentation

Mr. Baggett explained that he had made the requested move from the General Fund to the Judgement Fund out of the personnel expenses for a total of \$71,600 out of salary and an additional \$29,400 out of the Health Insurance. Those have been moved over to the Judgement Fund for a total of \$100,000 less out of the General Fund and being charged to the Judgment Fund. There are no other changes from the previous budget presentation.

Mr. Dudley made a motion to approve the State's Attorney's FY20 budget proposal for placement on Display, seconded by Ms. Kraft , and the motion carried 7-0.

Mr. Baggett moved on to the Judgment Fund. The proposal is to increase the levy in the Judgment Fund to \$675,000. That does have over a \$1 million fund balance. It is being increased not just to accommodate the transfer the expenses from the general fund, but also because of the status the County has as a self-insured entity right now. The additional outside legal costs that are a result of the fact that our first \$100,000 of any legal claim against the County has to be paid by the County as opposed to being paid by the insurer. We have seen an increase in outside counsel fees dramatically this year. As a result of that, we are anticipating seeing that continuing forward and as long as we are self-insured. In line with that, there is an increase in the personnel expenses as well as the health insurance. The contractual services where we pay outside counsel on the complex litigation cases are also being increased by \$75,000. Payment of Judgments is being maintained at \$400,000. We don't know when or if a judgment will be entered against the county and if so, for what amount. We are insured. We have an excess carrier after the first \$100,000 that would kick in. But, in the event that we have a significant judgment or a multitude of claims arising against the county, this is where those would be paid from.

State's Attorney's Automation Fund – This is similar to the Public Defender's automation fund. The State's Attorney's Office has had an automation fund statutorily for a number of years, but it is a non-appropriated fund based on past practice of the Board. The State's Attorney has monies coming in through fines and fees. How much will be collected is not known, but what is gotten is restricted to being spent on computer software and the like.

State's Attorney's Sex Offender Investigation Fund – Again, under certain types of sexual violence cases, there is a fee that can be assessed against offenders. Those come with restricted use with respect to sex offense cases. It is not known how much will come in, but this fund is in place for the restricted balance.

Grant Funds –

092-400 Child 1st Center (C1C) – Lower revenue coming in from the Circuit Clerk fees is projected, but again, until a year or two into the new Statute with respect to the court fees, it is not known exactly how dramatically it will impact what is being brought in. Some defendants are still being sentenced under the old law because they committed their crimes earlier than July of this year. That will continue for some time to come. Less money than last year is being projected, but it honestly cannot be known how much it will be affected. Expenses in the personnel line have been dropped to try to make this as much of a money in / money out budget as possible.

092-401 – Violent Crimes & Victims Assistance Grant for Child 1st Center

This is money in / money out. The state's fiscal year started July 1. This is dollars we can count on and dollars that there is a contract as to how to spend.

092-402 DCFS Grant

This C1C contract began July 1 of this year and will run through June 30 of next year. It is money in / money out. There is a contract that governs how the money is spent.

092-404 VOCA Grant for \$253, 000. This contract began July 1 of this year and expires June 30 of next year. There are contractual obligations.

092-405 Teen Court – This is the relationship with Millikin University where certain fees are brought in through Statutes on criminal cases. The contract with Millikin only obligates that they be paid what is received during the previous year. If the budgeted \$18,000 is not brought in, they don't get \$18,000. They only get what is collected. There is a fund balance in the line that they can request additional funds from if enough fees are not collected to pay for the program.

092-410 DUI Grant

This number has firmed up since the previous budget presentation. Official notification from the Department of Transportation has been received. There was a slight cut of about \$5,500 from last year. That is appropriated amongst two employees; one attorney and one support staff for salary, fringes and health insurance. This is as much as a money in / money out budget as possible.

092-415 Adult Redeploy – This contract runs on the state fiscal year beginning July 1 of this year. This is contractually obligated.

092-435 Elder Victims Crime Unit

It is anticipated that this will be zeroed out and all of the money will be spent by the end of this fiscal year so next year, it will be defunct.

092-440 Mental Health Board Grant – Confirmation has been received. This grant began on the Mental Health Board's fiscal year beginning July 1. This pays part of a salary for one attorney.

092-450 Violent Crimes Victims Assistance Grant from the Attorney General. This began July 1. The number is solid and it pays part of the salary of the Victim Witness Coordinator

092-460 Opioid Prosecution Grant.

This is the last year for this grant. The grantor agreed to having additional staff moved into it to assist in alleviating some of the pressure on the general fund. This was done even prior to moving things from general to judgment. There are now one plus a partial attorneys being paid out of this grant as well as a full time support person and the fringes for two of the full time employees.

Mr. Dudley made a motion to approve the State's Attorney's FY20 budget proposal for placement on Display, seconded by Ms. Kraft , and the motion carried 7-0.

Circuit Clerk

Ms. Reed explained that after the Circuit Clerk's presentation last month, it was discovered that what was left in some of the fund balances would not support what she had put in there for next year. The general fund, 001, 050, & 051 are fine.

On the Circuit Clerk Automation, she had projected \$107,000 for a loss and the fund balance that was in there would not support that. She revised it by taking some of the \$80,000 from the EDP line leaving that at \$60,000. There were a few other things she rearranged to get to where she needed to be. That one now shows a \$6,000 loss. Between funds 050, 051, 052, & 053, she made changes. They are all in the automation fund, document storage fund, restricted cash and clerk's op & admin. It's all the same numbers, but some had to be put into other funds just to make sure there was enough fund balance to cover everything. There really is no change, it is just a matter of how it is spread out.

Motion to approve forwarding the amended Circuit Clerk FY20 budget to Display made by Mr. Greenfield, seconded by Mr. Mattingley, and the motion carried 7-0.

Circuit Court

Judge Webber explained that he had previously suggested that the board consider a 2 % raise for his staff at a cost of \$8,000 spread throughout the year. The clerks would get a step increase on their anniversary date. These are scattered throughout the year.

An adjustment has been made to the revenue expense line for mortgage mediation at the suggestion of the Auditor, Ms. Reed. That is a self-sustaining program from the mortgage mediation fees.

Other than that, the budget proposal is the same as was presented previously.

Motion to approve forwarding the amended Circuit Court FY20 budget to include proposed raises for staff to Display made by Mr. Greenfield seconded by Mr. Mattingley, and the motion carried 7-0.

Auditor – General Revenue accounts

Ms. Reed explained that the general accounts are kept separately with everyone giving their best estimate of what fees to expect for the next year. The revenues for next year are projected to be about \$564,000 more than this year, mainly from state income tax which has trended higher than previously. Sales Tax is flat. The sheriff may have one or two less municipalities that they are doing things for. Overall, the general revenue is expected to be about \$564,000 more which is good, but it is mainly just because of the state income tax and personal property tax being a little higher. We don't know if that will continue or not.

Mr. Gresham asked about the \$70,000 increase in the Circuit Clerk Juvenile fees. Mr. Baggett wondered if it might have something to do with collecting for the new Statute. He said he was not sure if it would be referencing the juvenile delinquency cases and was not sure if juvenile abuse and neglect cases have any type of fees assessed. Ms. Reed said she would find out. It is either something new or an increase in something.

001-020 General Accounts – This is the one that is a general fund item, but is where the general items go through. Audit fees are there. It didn't change. Health Insurance runs through here.

For next year, the proposal is to save general fund monies by converting the dental insurance to a voluntary plan. Currently, it is the same as the health insurance which is 75% paid by county and 25% paid by employees. The savings to the county would be approximately \$210,000.

If our health insurance, Blue Cross / Blue Shield, goes up 4% to 5%, we're hurting to come up with it. That is the reason for proposing making the dental insurance a voluntary program.

Many companies also have a spousal surcharge on the health insurance. In other words, if the spouse has a job elsewhere that provides insurance and you don't want to take it for whatever reason, you can still stay on ours, but it will cost \$200 a month more. If the spouse is retired or not working, they can be on ours and it is fine. Dr. Zimmerman commented that at Millikin, spouses cannot be on the insurance at all. She asked if people could be forced to pay the \$200 if they can't go on it. Ms. Reed said no, there has to be an option to have insurance elsewhere. It is encouraging spouses that have options to take it. If they don't, it's fine, but it will cost them an extra \$200 a month. Those two items are built into this budget. We were looking to save \$500,000 to \$600,000. There were some other changes in benefit structure that could have and were considered, but felt these two were the best to get started on. Then, we will deal with the insurance rates next year. July 1 is the anniversary date for our insurance. The two just mentioned will take effect January 1st. Any changes in the Blue Cross / Blue Shield medical insurance will probably not take place until next July. The Sheriff's contract is open again in April. That clause was left open. So, the potential is there to have some other changes, but we have to do a little more work on those. We are trying to bring our benefits in line with what others are doing. They are still good benefits. We just have to do what we have to to save money.

Mr. Gresham asked about the network support line going from zero. Ms. Reed said they have a network support person for this building now which was not in prior budgets. That is his salary. It used to be under network expense (EDP) which has now been reduced. There are still a few network EDP things like the website, etc, but the bulk of it is his new salary which has been moved to network support. He is in house where we used to pay out of house.

Motion to approve forwarding the Auditor's FY20 budget to Display made by Mr. Gresham seconded by Mr. Mattingley, and the motion carried 7-0.

Ms. Reed explained the levies.

The Judgment Fund was raised as explained by Mr. Baggett previously

The SS & Insurance funds were lowered by a little bit. Those cover the increase in the Judgment Fund

There is a small increase in Highway, Highway Matching, & Special Bridge which were included in the budgets when approved earlier.

The Building Lease fund, as discussed earlier, had a small increase of \$157,000 or 2.7%

Taking into account the overall changes, the ins & outs, excluding the Building Commission which we levy exactly what we need, our levy has increased by .22% which is \$38,000 for the year. Ms. Reed said it has been held at break even as much as possible. Really, the only ones that have increased are the Judgment Fund and the three Highway Funds a little bit.

Motion to approve the proposed levies and placing the FY20 budget on Display made by Mr. Mattingley, seconded by Mr. Gresham, and the motion carried 7-0.

Board of Review – No Report

Supervisor of Assessments – No Report

GIS – No Report

Treasurer-

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

Mr. Dudley made a motion to approve forwarding the resolution on to the full county board consent calendar, seconded by Ms. Kraft and the motion carried 7-0.

NEW BUSINESS –

Sheriff's Department

Macon County Board Resolution Approving an Agreement between the Macon County Sheriff's Office and the Illinois Department of Transportation Sustained Traffic Enforcement Program (STEP) Grant Budget FY19

Chief Deputy Walter explained that the Illinois Department of Transportation has issued a grant to the Sheriff's Office for the FY20 to combat impaired and distractive driving through use of directed additional enforcement patrols provided through funding from IDOT during holiday periods. This resolution is to amend the Sheriff's Office 2019 budget to show an increase of revenue in the amount of \$4254.92 and increase expenses by \$4254.92. That money is earmarked through the grant to be used in November, 2019. If it is not used during that time, that money will be lost.

Ms. Kraft made a motion to approve forwarding the resolution on to the Full Board with recommendation to approve, seconded by Mr. Mattingley, and the motion carried 7-0.

Probation

Macon County Board Resolution Amending the Probation's FY19 Budget

Mr. Berter explained that unfortunately, because of overages with detention, he has to come and ask for more money. This would cover the quarter which is \$61,385. There have been over 50 days this year when there were more than 5 individuals in Peoria County at any given

time. Currently, there are 7 individuals in Peoria County. Six of those individuals are in there for gun charges. A couple of weeks ago, two Probation Officers were conducting searches and found handguns on two juveniles. There is currently only \$28,000 in the juvenile detention line and because of the overages and not knowing what is going to happen between now and the end of this fiscal year, that money needs to be there. Again, this is the only line item that is not controllable by Mr. Berter.

Ms. Kraft made a motion to approve forwarding the resolution on to the full board with recommendation to approve, seconded by Mr. Mattingley, and the motion carried 7-0.

Animal Control

Macon County Board Resolution Requesting Approval of Fees to be Charged by Macon County Animal Control

Sgt. Reynolds explained that this is a fee for entities without a contract with the Macon County Animal Control. He said he would like to add an after hours dispatch fee of \$25 per warden call to jurisdictions that do not hold an Animal Control contract. During the current budget process, a new line item entitled radio fees in the amount of \$25,000 was added. He said they are trying to collect some revenue when wardens are dispatched to areas that do not have a contract to fund that fee. That would be going into a revenue line item under warden fees.

Ms. Kraft made a motion to approve forwarding the resolution on to the full board with recommendation to approve, seconded by Dr. Zimmerman, and the motion carried 7-0.

County Board

Macon County Board Resolution Regarding a Land Parcel Acquired and Owned by the Decatur Public Building Commission for the Benefit and Use of the County

Chairman Greenfield explained that this gives the Building Commission permission to give that property back to the Howard Buffett Foundation.

Chairman Greenfield made a motion to approve forwarding the resolution on to the full board with recommendation to approve, seconded by Mr. Mattingley, and the motion carried 6-1 with Dr. Zimmerman voting nay.

Macon County Board Ordinance Prohibiting Cannabis Business Establishments

Chairman Greenfield explained that this will give the County the option to opt out of the cannabis that the state passed last spring. He said his plan is to, at the October meeting, go through the regular business and then just before the end of the meeting, present this ordinance and bring it up for public discussion to let the public have whatever time they need to (with time limitations on their conversations) speak in favor or against. County Board members will have their opportunity to discuss their pros and cons on the subject. And then, at the end of that period of time, take a vote on it.

Mr. Mattingley said he had a question that maybe Mr. Baggett or Mr. Scott could answer. If the County were to adopt this, would it prohibit Forsyth or Mt. Zion from going ahead and doing exactly what the County has asked to prohibit.

Mr. Baggett said no. Mr. Mattingley commented that they could still end up putting these into those two communities. Mr. Baggett said yes, and it would not just be Forsyth or Mt. Zion. It could be Warrensburg, Oreana, Maroa, Macon, Blue Mound – any of the incorporated areas of Macon County have the ability to exercise their own authority under the Statute. This would only apply to the unincorporated Macon County.

Dr. Zimmerman said that the county could put a tax, if they have these businesses, on that though. We do have that ability. Mr. Jackson said he was wondering about that. He said he didn't think there were guidelines on it yet; on the taxing ability of the County. Dr. Zimmerman said the County can put up to a 3.75% tax on any municipality that has one of these dispensaries in the county. Mr. Baggett said the municipality that has the permitted sale within their municipality can impose a tax under their municipal scheme. We can also impose a county tax on any cannabis that is sold or grown in that municipality despite the fact that we may have opted out with respect to the unincorporated areas of the county.

Chairman Greenfield said the County currently had three and it is now down to two liquor licenses where the County has control over the liquor license. At one time, there was talk of putting places in like smoke areas for these type of things. Areas like that, the county does have jurisdiction over them because we do issue the liquor license for those.

Chair Jackson asked if there is any defined percent revenue yet. Dr. Zimmerman said yes, a certain percent goes to the state and a certain percent of that comes back to each community regardless of whether you opt in or opt out. There are different funds that it has to go to.

Mr. Dudley said that in just the last 5 minutes there have been two questions that nobody really knew the answer to. Well, we did in a general state, but as board members, we really did not know the exact answer and we still don't know the exact answer. He said he thought it would be irresponsible to vote on this at this point without the answers. He said he did not know why it is not going through EEHW. This is health and welfare. He said it doesn't matter how he feels about marijuana one way or the other, but it is irresponsible to take this to a vote tonight without a discussion. There are too many unanswered questions. He said they would be doing the public and the board a disservice if they vote on it tonight.

Mr. Dudley made a motion to table the resolution.

Chairman Greenfield said it could be tabled but he would entertain a motion that it be put on the full county board meeting agenda and let the full county board . . . Chair Jackson said he agreed with that. Mr. Dudley said he disagreed because in the past, this has always been done at EEHW. Always, these things have been done in committee. Chairman Greenfield said they have never had this. Mr. Dudley said he was speaking of other resolutions, not just pot. There has been windfarms, sales tax, expansion of the landfill, all kinds of things. Chairman Greenfield said it could have gone through Justice, SRO, Finance. He said he checked with the State's Attorney before he did it. Mr. Dudley said that's fine, but this stuff has always been

discussed in sub-committee. Mr. Greenfield said this is something that needs to be discussed with the full county board. Mr. Dudley said it needs to be discussed. Period and he didn't know how it could be voted on tonight without discussing it. Mr. Greenfield said that all they're doing is forwarding it on to the full county board. The County Board needs to be the one to have the debate. Dr. Zimmerman said there needs to be a study session on it; not put a resolution on the agenda that has never been discussed. It's 10 pages long. Mr. Dudley said he had never seen it before he got there to this meeting tonight. It wasn't emailed or anything. Dr. Zimmerman said she thought they need a study session. Chairman Greenfield said he would get it out to all of the board members now and they'd have until the county board meeting to look at it. Mr. Dudley asked what the hurry was. Mr. Greenfield asked what the point was for any of it. Mr. Dudley said the reason is because the definition of an issue is something that half the people agree with and half disagree with. If it's 80/20 or 70/30, it's a pretty easy decision, but this is going to be an issue because you've got half the people out there that are for it and half that are against it. He said they are basically not really letting the people that are for it speak here. He said they are making the decision for them and that is pretty irresponsible of the County Board. Chairman Greenfield said he totally disagreed. Why vote on it at EEHW and not everywhere else. Mr. Dudley said discussion – you have to let the public come in and discuss it. We've always done it that way in the past. We took on the expansion of the landfill there, the 1% sales tax for the schools, the windfarms – all of these issues and they were all discussed in EEHW. The public had plenty of notice and plenty of time to come and get it done. He said he thought they were not giving them enough notice. He said he did not think the board members have had enough discussion. He said he did not feel comfortable voting on it. He said he did not expect Mr. Greenfield to feel the same way about it because he just didn't think he'd feel that way. He said he just didn't feel like Mr. Greenfield liked to hear what everybody else has to say sometimes. Mr. Greenfield said he thought that was totally unfair. Mr. Dudley said he did not think it was unfair at all. Mr. Greenfield said he thought it was a good idea to bring it up in a full county board meeting. Mr. Dudley said he did not think so and they'd just have to agree to disagree. Mr. Greenfield continued saying that he thought all the board members should be there to hear all the input that is said about it. Chair Jackson said that if it goes to EEHW, it will go to the full board. He asked if it could be run back through Finance again too. Chairman Greenfield agreed and said they could run it through every committee and they might as well run it through Justice, SRO, EEHW & Finance because it affects all of them. Mr. Dudley asked why they wouldn't want to do that. Chairman Greenfield said that's what he just said. If we run it through one, we're going to run it through all. Mr. Dudley asked why they wouldn't want to. Mr. Greenfield said he didn't have a problem with that. Mr. Dudley said they must agree then.

Chairman Greenfield made a motion to send it through all the committees. Mr. Jackson suggested they vote on the motion that's already out there. Mr. Baggett said they can't vote until there is a second. The first motion is to table. A second is needed. Mr. Mattingley seconded. Chair Jackson clarified saying there is a motion and a second to table, to move it to EEHW and then on to Finance. The motion carried 7-0.

Chairman Greenfield said they also have a motion to send it on to Justice, SRO, . . . Chair Jackson said if there's a motion, a second is needed. Mr. Greenfield said he was making the motion to send it to EEHW, Justice, SRO, and back to Finance. Chair Jackson asked for a

second. There was no second. Mr. Dudley clarified that it would then go to EEHW on October 24, back to Finance, and then to the full county board.

Citizen Remarks – None

OLD BUSINESS-

CLOSED SESSION None needed

NEXT MEETING – November 4, 2019

ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn made by Ms. Kraft, seconded by Dr. Zimmerman, the motion carried 7-0, and the meeting adjourned at 6:10 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Tracy Sumpter & Jeannie Durham, County Board Office