

**FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING**  
**Special Meeting – Budget Hearing #2**  
**August 16, 2021 @ 5:15 P.M.**

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

Kevin Greenfield  
Linda Little  
Greg Mattingley  
Jim Gresham  
Helena Buckner  
Ryan Kreke  
Marcy Rood

**COUNTY PERSONNEL PRESENT**

Nathan Pierce, Historical  
Sherry Doty, Circuit Clerk  
Carol Reed, Auditor  
Scott Rueter, State’s Attorney  
Mike Baggett, State’s Attorney’s Office  
Debra Kraft, County Board member  
Greg Collins, Veterans Assistance  
Jeannie Durham, County Board Office

**MEMBERS ABSENT** None

**CALL TO ORDER**

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

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Motion to approve minutes of prior 8/9/21 finance committee budget hearing #1 was made by Ms. Little, seconded by Mr. Mattingley and the motion carried 7-0.

**Budget Proposals**

***Veterans Assistance***

Mr. Collins explained that he had spoken with his President who is not present tonight, but that he had told him that with inflation being at about 5 ½%, he should ask for the highest raise Mr. Collins felt comfortable with. Mr. Collins explained that he had put 5% on the form.

The Office Manager position salary was moved up to \$45,000 because the State of Illinois starts their VSO positions at \$58,000 per year. He has been contacted by them already and Mr. Collins said he does not want to lose him. This is a minimal amount.

The Emergency Assistance line was decreased because a lot less was used this year, but the amount will be moved to the transportation line to help support the new van that was just purchased.

Chairman Greenfield asked which salary line was Mr. Collins’. Mr. Collins said it is the one that is for \$70,992. It was at \$67,612. That is a 5% raise. He said he had spoken to some people in the private industry and most of their management is getting between 5% and 7%.

Mr. Gresham asked if a lot of the expenses are end loaded because it looks like the first six months, 50% of the year, and only 33% was spent. He asked if heavier expenses come at the end of the year. Mr. Collins explained that they will have \$44,000 van expense come out all at once at the end of this year. Also, when the moratorium for all the evictions start, they will get slammed for emergency assistance money. Also, at the end of the year, stipends are given out

to their president and others. Ms. Reed explained that the Help for Heroes line has \$75,000 budgeted, but that much is never spent.

Ms. Rood asked when Mr. Collins' last raise was and how much. Mr. Collins explained that he just took over as superintendent in March of last year. He said he never got that raise. He had been making close to \$44,000 a year for the previous 16 years.

Mr. Greenfield asked if Mr. Collins received a stipend. He said he does not. Mr. Greenfield commented that he didn't know of anybody getting a 5% to 6% raise. The most being given is probably 3% due to the Deputies contract. Mr. Collins said he had told his president that the raise would be up to the County Board, but the president had encouraged him to go for as much as he could. He said they obviously think he is worth it. Mr. Greenfield said he wouldn't say he's not worth it, but he would also argue that the deputies are worth more than what they got too. Unfortunately, the County does not have the money to pay them more. Mr. Collins explained that he is still within his levy by far. In the past they've always been very frugal about raises and he respects that.

Ms. Little agreed that Mr. Collins is worth it, but she is concerned with setting a precedent this early in the budget cycle and ongoing negotiations. However, she realizes that he does have his own levy and he is within his own levy.

Mr. Gresham commented that he also had been shocked a little too, but on the other hand, looking at years and years of service with minimal increases, he applauds Mr. Collins for what he is doing in a small office doing a big job.

Ms. Little made a motion to approve the proposed budget with the understanding that next year he would not be getting a 5% increase and forward on for display, seconded by Mr. Gresham and the motion carried 6-1 with Chairman Greenfield voting nay.

### ***Historical Society - Budget Presentation***

Mr. Pierce explained that the budget is pretty much the same as last year and does not change from year to year. They get the two tax levy installments that are pretty much set. He said he would probably get a raise next month, but that money comes out of their other funds anyway. Once the tax levy funds are used up, the difference is picked up on all extra expenses by them.

Chairman Greenfield asked what percentage he anticipated the raise to be. Mr. Pierce said he did not know. The board meets every other month and it will be discussed next month. It will be up to his president and board. In the past, it has usually been \$1,000 to \$1,500 a year. Given the circumstances of the last year and a half, there may be a small bonus.

Mr. Greenfield said he had spoken with some of the board members and asked if they have to pay to be on the board. Mr. Pierce said no. According to the by-laws, they should be a paying member, but they do not make them pay. He said that by the time you become a member and put time in, it costs to be on about any board. Membership dues are \$25 minimum.

Ms. Rood said that some departments had provided accomplishments for the year and wondered about anything Mr. Pierce might like to talk about. Mr. Pierce explained that they had recently done a couple of new exhibits; high flyer kites which were manufactured in Decatur and they redid a sports exhibit, restoration work on a log home, blacksmith shop, & is currently trying to

raise money to put a shelter over the courthouse which is the oldest building in Macon County where Lincoln did 5 trials. Old Log buildings are not meant to be exposed to long term weather and most likely when it was brought to that location and rebuilt, the logs were not treated. He said he had called places across the country and with issues around the way it was rebuilt, there is nobody that runs historic state sites or anything with log homes that have run into the same problems. So, the only realistic advice he had gotten would be to put a shelter over the top of it. You'd still be able to go into it and see it. It won't be as aesthetically pleasing, but if it is laying on a pile on the ground, it is not either. This is the alternative, so it is what it is. That is money being raised separately. He said he hopes to approach the Community Foundation this week for help. Ms. Rood asked if Mr. Pierce does the grant writing. Mr. Pierce confirmed, saying he is the only one there, so he is Director, Curator, Secretary, Accountant and toilet cleaner. He said he'd like to do more fund raising, but only has so much time in a day.

Mr. Kreke made a motion to approve the proposed budget and forward on for display, seconded by Ms. Rood and the motion carried 7-0.

### ***State's Attorney's Office***

Mr. Rueter pointed out that, new this year, they have a union contract with support staff, and the negotiated raise is 2 ½ % . The attorneys did not get a raise last year.

Mr. Baggett began with the general fund budget, noting that lines 4281 and 4548 reflect the same revenue. The error occurred due to changes in the Auditor's software and will be corrected. The State's Attorney's office does not do mental health evaluations as indicated there.

As seen in the FY21 budget at the halfway mark, the actual received was approximately at 50% in the deferred prosecution fees. Therefore, the budget for Fy22 reflects the assumption that next year's revenue will generally match this years.

The state salary reimbursement line is for the State's Attorney's salary. That is the amount provided by the Department of Revenue for the State's portion of the State's Attorney's salary for State FY22.

Line 4552, the Appellate Prosecution is held over. It is a former line item, but the State, unfortunately, killed that grant money beginning in this fiscal year. It is still holding over from prior budgets, but it is not anticipated that the state will reinstituting that grant money to pay for part of a drug attorney salary. It continues to be zeroed out.

Line 4545 is the fees from collections. It reflects a significant decrease in anticipated revenue form this year based on exceptionally lackluster revenue this year. It was hopeful that more money would be received through the collections program that come into the Circuit Clerk's office, but that has not materialized. Mr. Baggett explained that he did not want to be overly optimistic. Those projected revenues have been lowered to \$6,000 for next year based on the accrued at the halfway mark with the hope for a lot more.

Line 4556, Victim Impact Panel, is being lowered slightly from last year's budgeted revenue anticipation with the hope that more will come in. The VIP panel is something that is ordered in DUI cases for defendants to complete as part of their supervision or probation conditions.

They have to attend a panel where they hear presentations and the other side of the story from victims of DUI incidents to get a more thorough understanding of why a DUI is such a serious crime. Recently, a new online VIP program has been instituted so it is not being offered in the courthouse. This is a reaction to both COVID as well as trying to make the process more efficient. They come in and pay the fee and then are given the information for logging into the website. They log in and do it on their own time. That should make the process a lot easier for everyone involved.

Cellular phone sales – this is where the State’s Attorney purchases new phones based on the new release. This happens in the fall of each year. Once the new phones are received, the old ones, which are normally kept for about a year so as much can be gotten from them by selling them on the open market. This has been the process for about 4 to 6 years and typically more in revenue is brought in from the sale of the phones to 3<sup>rd</sup> party sellers than what the cost of the purchase of new phones purchased under a corporate government program that gives a substantial discount.

The anticipation is that in total, revenues will be decreased by approximately \$15,000 over last year. Most of that is due to collections.

Expenses –

The Elected Official line has been moved down to the bottom of the list instead of the top. That reflects the 2 ½% raise the State adopted for its state FY22 budget and was also adopted by the County Board at last week’s meeting.

5000 lines – accounts for payroll for the State’s Attorney, Assistant State’s Attorneys, Investigators and support staff. The investigators and all of the support staff are members of collective bargaining units and they have active contracts. The Investigators contract calls for a \$1,000 increase for each of the two investigators. The support staff contract calls for a 2 ½% increase in salary in County FY22. The State’s Attorney also received a 2 ½ % increase in the State FY22 budget. Based on the support staff contractual raise as well as the State’s Attorney’s appropriated amount, the budget reflects a 2 ½% increase in salary for Assistant State’s Attorneys to make that an equitable increase. As previously noted by Mr. Rueter, there was a flat dollar amount increase given to most of the support staff, but none of the attorneys received raises during FY21. The support staff line also reflects the addition of a full time IT support person who is yet to be hired, but is desperately needed. It also reflects some slight reallocations of some salaries based on attrition and reassignments in the last year.

Overall, an expected increase in expenses of just over \$95,000.

The health insurance line reflects the addition of two full time employees to the general fund staff.

Non personnel expenses – the phone line shows a slight increase based on the fact that it appears that FY21 budget may not be sufficient to meet the telephone expenses.

Postage remains the same as last year.

IT services shows an increase. Mr. Baggett reminded the committee that they are looking to hire a full time IT person for this year and for as long as needed. Services are also contracted with an IT contractor, someone who handles the most complicated IT tasks such as server

installs, firewall maintenance, virus protection and any catastrophic events that may occur to the hardware or software. The contractor does not work on a day to day basis for the State's Attorney's office and is not available during the work day. This is an after hours contract. The amount for FY22 is increased over this fiscal year based on what has been spent to date. It is hoped that a lot of the expenses that have been incurred can be avoided in the future based on having brought in this new contractor this year and addressing a lot of the areas where the office had fallen behind in IT services. In terms of the budget, the hope is to bring in an IT person who can handle the day to day stuff such as setting up new computers, email maintenance, etc... Right now, Mr. Baggett said he handles most of this maintenance and it prevents him from doing the things he is being paid to do. The hope is to find someone who can do that. They are not looking for someone at top market rates to be able to handle that type of work. There is a contractor who handles that on a case by case basis. The hope is to hire the IT person to maintain the dual structure to keep costs as low as possible.

Ms. Little asked if the person they hope to hire is included in the salary line. Mr. Baggett confirmed.

Mr. Mattingley asked if this would be specifically support staff. Mr. Baggett confirmed. Mr. Baggett asked if there is additional support staff beyond that IT person, other than the \$6,000 or \$7,000 to the contractual and the 2 ½% increases, is the entire rest of the difference allotted for the IT person. Mr. Baggett explained that there is \$45,000 allotted for the IT person. The additional amount there is the 2 ½% increase and about a \$12,000 difference that is attributable to some reallocations done between moving some employees between the judgement fund and the general fund and just moving them around.

The Law Library line is being decreased a little. There is a contract with West Law and the specific dollar amount is known. What was budgeted last year might be just a little more than what is required by the end of this fiscal year.

The office is in the process of negotiating with CDS to lease 4 new copiers. The copy machine expense line reflects the downgrade on two of the six copiers as well as a same to same transition on the upgrade in the sense that 2015 & 2017 units are being replaced with 2021 units. They are comparable in terms of capacity. A formal quote has not yet been received, but it looks like it should be kept to around \$4,300 next year in terms of copier expenses. That does include all maintenance, which is an invaluable service.

Appellate Services is at \$28,000 versus \$24,000 last year. Mr. Baggett explained that there was an error in last year's budget where he did ask for the \$24,000, but the contract was for \$28,000. He said he should have asked for \$28,000. He knew it was going to be \$28,000. They spent \$28,000 at the beginning of the year. The line for this year is being increased to \$28,000 to make it correct.

Line 7290, Investigations is being left the same. At the halfway mark, more than what would be anticipated has been spent, but those investigation expenses are a moving target as to when they occur. It is being left the same and if it is not sufficient, they should be able to find other monies when & if needed.

Court Costs & Appeals line was lowered by a little over \$1,800 just to reflect what has been spent at the halfway mark. That is also a moving target and you never know exactly what you're going to need. That tends to pay for things like evaluations when necessary as well as some witness expenses when they come up. Court costs would be transcripts when they have to be paid for.

The office supply line was left the same. Less than half was spent at the halfway mark this year, but that expense can't really be scheduled. The office tries to tap the automation fund for these types of expenses before tapping the general fund.

The Equipment line has been substantially increased over last year's budget. Part of that is in line with the wish list submitted to the ARP sub-committee in terms of what they might be able to do with the federal COVID money. These are expenses that are necessary to build up some of the tech infra structure. \$10,000 is probably not close to what will actually be needed. It was lowered last year to next to nothing and now they can see that with the need to purchase multiple computers and other hardware that was not anticipated. This number is lower than what is actually necessary. As an update, the State's Attorney's office's backup server, a 2008 machine crashed a couple of months ago. The office is currently working off of one server, a 2017 machine. In the event of a server crash, the office would be in a significant amount of pain. Access to all of the case files maintained electronically, the database used to do that is maintained exclusively on the server. There are backups. If they could get a server going, they could pull from the backup. As long as it would take to do that, they would be without historical records of all files and they would not know where they are located. It would be very difficult in that amount of time. It is a 2017 machine. It is not the oldest machine; it is not the newest machine.

After the submission of this budget, a quote was received from Striglos for the purchase of a new server. The quote came in at just over \$22,000. If the office would be able to upgrade over to this new server, the current 2017 server could be used as a backup and some degree of information safety would be in place. You always want to have at least one level of redundancy which is not had currently. If the new server could be purchased, that would be allowed. The request is for \$10,000. As stated, that is a much lower number than is necessary, but it is what has been submitted.

Chair Greenfield asked Mr. Baggett what he felt would be the correct number. Mr. Baggett said, given the quote from Striglos of \$22,000, that \$10,000 does reflect what was being hoped to be the server cost based on conversations with the IT contractor. There are other expenses built into that \$10,000, but if that \$10,000 figure were \$20,000, Mr. Baggett said he thought they could accomplish what they need to do. They do have other funds, like the automation fund, that can be tapped for computer hardware & equipment. So, all of it does not need to come from the general fund, but given the current standing in the county, now may be the best and possibly only time to ask. Increasing the figure from \$10,000 to \$20,000 would be sufficient.

Moving on to the Judgment Fund budget, the revenue line reflects the tax levy of \$775,000. That is a carry over from last year. That is a placeholder amount. Ms. Reed picks that number before the Display Budget based on the anticipated revenues and other lines will be and what the Judgement Fund will need.

Under Salaries, the State's Attorney's line reflects the 2 ½% increase as well as some movement based on attrition as well as movement between allocations and funding sources from the General Fund and the Judgment Fund. The support staff is not quite 2 ½% over, but does reflect the 2 ½% increase after considering the movement between the General Fund and the Judgment Fund. The total increase comes to about \$28,000 in salaries through the Judgment Fund.

Group Health Insurance shows no change due to having the same number of full time employees. There is a slight increase in SS and a slight decrease in the IMRF based on the instructions from the committee.

Contractual services was lowered slightly to \$300,000. There is not a lot of confidence in the year to date figure being accurate. Mr. Baggett said he reviews every bill that comes through the State's Attorney's Office before sending it over to the Auditor for payment. He said that number just doesn't seem right. Last year, just over \$322,000 was spent in outside counsel expenses. The office does contract out, in complex litigation, most of the cases where inmates have sued the county on behalf of the jail or families have sued the county on behalf of inmates in the jail. When that happens, these cases are typically extremely complex. There are several of them that are 5 to 6 years old and still in the Discovery phase. The County used to be insured through a private insurer who would pick the lawyer for us and we would use that lawyer. The insurance company would pay for that lawyer. Since we have become self-insured, we now have an obligation to account for the attorneys, the outside counsels, retention rates. We have a good working relationship with our current counsel. They've done very good work for us over the years. We do have approximately 20 pending complex litigation claims against the county right now. Several of them have significantly high liability exposure if we have an adverse judgment. We are self insured up to the first \$100,000. Beyond that first \$100,000, we have a policy with an excess carrier, but the contract with the excess carrier expects us to pay any judgment or final amount up front and then be reimbursed by that excess carrier. On a case by case basis, we can try to sweet talk them and get them to pay it up front when we don't have the money on hand. We do have a plan for the possibility that they can force the contract and say, it's a \$20 million judgement and you need to pay all \$20 million and then you will be reimbursed. Mr. Baggett said he was throwing out big numbers for fear factor more than anything else, but that is how the current situation of being self insured works. We are on the hook for the first \$100,000 in every single case. That includes the attorneys' fees. Up until we hit the \$100,000 mark, it comes directly out of the Judgment Fund and that is what is being budgeted for.

Line 8275 is the payment of Judgements. Work comp claims and settlements are paid out of this. Sometimes complex litigation claims are settled where it is paid out of this line. The \$300,000, if not used, goes into the fund balance which we try to build from year to year so that when and if a big one hits, we will be ready for it. Payment of Judgments as well as the levy amount figures are put in as placeholders and Ms. Reed will adjust if necessary.

Chairman Greenfield asked if there is a cap on the judgement fund. Mr. Baggett said no.

Automation Fund – An increase in revenue there has been estimated because at the halfway mark this year, it began exceeding the revenue marker. Whether that will hold is unknown, but it is there and is real, so the assumption is that it will continue. The State's Attorney's office

gets \$2 in each criminal case that they prosecute. That money comes either from the defendant or the defendant's bond. When we move to a no cash bond system in 2023, this might take a hit. But for FY22, the anticipation is for an increase in revenue.

On the expenditures line, it can be noted that it is a substantially larger number than the fees anticipated to be brought in. That is based on using Ms. Reed's fund balance numbers. We know that there is more money from prior years in the automation fund. This allows, if we appropriate it now, to spend the automation fund before tapping the general fund.

Beginning in County FY22, the C1C will be its own entity and will no longer be considered a part of the State's Attorney's Office and will not be budgeted for within the grant funds. The C1C is a statutory entity created by state law, answerable to its own advisory board and budgeted for by the County Board. If the County were to adopt a referendum, it can tax and have its own levy.

Mr. Rueter explained that they had made a decision to let the C1C Director submit her own budget.

Teen Court budget shows that the revenues are substantially exceeding what was anticipated in FY21. An increase is being shown in the FY22 revenue lines. The Teen Court program is contracted out to Millikin University. We have a contract with them that says that any statutory fees that the State's Attorney's Office receives for Teen Court go to Millikin at the end of the fiscal year minus the expenses the State's Attorney's Office incurs for providing them telephones, travel expenses and a copy machine in their office. Once those expenses are subtracted, they get everything else. If it does not meet the expected revenue, they don't get that dollar amount. They get whatever is actually received. Teen Court does have a fund balance and upon the request of Millikin University, if their expenses exceed what is provided them in fees, they can tap into that fund balance and the State's Attorney's Office makes a case by case decision on that. This is, more than anything else, money in / money out.

Adult Redeploy is a contract with the State of Illinois that is entering the 10<sup>th</sup> or 11<sup>th</sup> year. It is also money in / money out and reflects the State FY22 contract that went into effect July 1st.

The contract with the Mental Health Board to provide money toward the payment of part of a salary of one of the Assistant State's Attorneys. Confirmation has been received from the Mental Health Board of what their Board has appropriated for that grant next year. This is money in / money out. It only pays for salary. All of that attorney's fringes are paid out of the general fund or judgement fund.

The Violent Crimes and Victims Assistance Act grant is a contract with the Illinois Attorney General. The contract has already been received and is in force got State FY22 in the amount of \$29,000. It goes to pay part of a salary. The majority of the salary of the Victim Witness Coordinator and the fringes come out of the general fund.

Mr. Mattingley asked about the Court's IT person and if he works specifically for the courts because he was under the understanding that he worked some for the Public Defender's and other offices and they get assessed a percentage or some amount. He asked if that was an option for the State's Attorney's office. Mr. Baggett said he has been informed that the Court's



IT Administrator works for the Courts and the Public Defender's Office as an arm of the courts and that is the end of his job description. That was not meant with a negative implication. That is just the understanding, desire and plan when that position was created and funded. It is not made available to the State's Attorney. He is helpful when he can be, but we are not a priority because we do not employ him. There are multiple systems through the Circuit Clerk's office that the IT Administrator is in charge of in terms of licensing agreements, access, etc... The State's Attorney's Office does pay a portion for those programs, but pays no portion of his salary and they cannot expect him to work for the office. They do appreciate the assistance that he is able to provide. He cannot be relied upon because he already has more to do than he can reasonably handle already. Mr. Rueter said it also has to do with how, years ago, the decision was made to provide computer access to the court system. He explained that they are actually more tied in with the Sheriff and the Sheriff's server than they are with the Court's server. That came from the law enforcement point of view. The contractual person the office is currently using is actually one of the Sheriff's full time employees. That is why that person is not available to them during working hours. It also cuts the cost of having an outside contractual IT person. That also explains the need to have an in house support staff person to further reduce that obligation as well. He said he is paying an attorney, Mr. Baggett, to do computer IT work.

Mr. Baggett commented that the Board had approved the creation of a County Administrator last week. This is something, the possibility of moving forth with a project like that, he has talked with various people over the years about. It will be someone that has a 50,000 foot view of all county operations and something he said he would want to talk to that person about is the consolidation of IT services county wide because what we currently have works, but it is not the most efficient process that we could have.

Ms. Kraft asked how many investigators they have in their office. Mr. Baggett said they have 2. They used to have 4. There had been a couple of investigators employed through some Buffett Foundation grants. Those grants have terminated. It does reflect that even before the Buffett Foundation was kind enough to provide funding for two investigator positions, there were previously 3 investigators, one of whom served as the IT person and did a good job at the IT stuff. Not just as a result of the grants running out and having to downsize, the office has downsized from what they used to have before ever having any outside money helping out. Those guys are kept very busy.

Chairman Greenfield said that in line 9040, there is \$10,000 but you said \$20,000 is really what you need. Mr. Baggett agreed that he feels that \$20,000 should be sufficient in that line. He said he would use all of that and then find some in other places because he does not want to be greedy. The \$20,000 would definitely be a lot better than the \$10,000. Mr. Greenfield said that they would, without question, get the \$20,000 and they might as well put it in there now. Mr. Baggett agreed that if it is not done now, he may have to come back sometime in the middle of the year or even at the beginning of the year because the server situation has already been boiling for a couple of months and it is not going to wait. Mr. Gresham commented that it might be considered insurance because of the bad things that could happen if it went down. Mr. Baggett said he could not imagine the nightmare if the server were to suddenly go down. The office would not be able to function for at least 2 weeks minimum.

Ms. Little made a motion to approve the proposed budget as presented, seconded by Mr. Kreke.

Mr. Mattingley made a motion to amend the budget with the change of the equipment line 001-090-9040 from \$10,000 to \$20,000, seconded by Mr. Kreke and the motion carried 7-0.

The motion to approve the proposed budget as amended, with recommendation to forward to Display, carried 7-0.

### ***Circuit Clerk -Budget Presentation***

Ms. Doty explained that COVID had hit her office hard. It will trickle down to everybody else sooner or later. The office is now down by 10 people after someone quit last week. She won't be replaced for a while. The work will be done by Ms. Doty & the Deputy Circuit Clerk.

The general fund has been increased by \$160,000 which will keep the 26 people in the office keeping the office above water and mandates in line.

Three people have been put back into document storage. They are non-supervisors because Ms. Doty said she has learned that supervisors are not to be taken out of document storage unless they are sitting there doing the work per State Statute.

Also, per State Statute, you are not to put anybody in Automation unless they are sitting there doing the work. The only person that does the work on automation is Mr. Bellah, IT.

The server is going out. Ms. Doty said she would hate to see the courts crash. That is \$60,000. She said they had put that on the wish list for the ARP funds.

Ms. Doty said she had to take people out of Document Storage and Automation to build them back up due to the fact that that money will be needed for what it is supposed to be doing, which is not payroll. Automation is for automation. There are 3 supervisors in Document Storage. Everybody else had to be put into the general fund. The fees are completely down, but on the good side, Ms. Doty said she had received an email that they are trying to work out grants for the Clerk's offices. It is a mess with new laws, COVID, people not wanting to work for what she is able to pay. She said she didn't think she'd even be able to hire anybody.

The grant is still the same.

Legal Advertising went down to \$1,000. This is for juvenile cases. That is a touch and go situation.

Office Supplies are taken out of other things before hitting the general fund.

The only thing coming out of the general fund is payroll, which is sky high. That is only for the Chief Deputy and the 3 supervisors that are left after one quit to go to the Public Defender's office.

Jury is the same. Mr. Baggett helped with the parking last year, but the jury is now \$4,800 because jury is back in full demand every month. Everything else on jury is the same.

Going back to the general fund, \$20,000 is for raises in the contract. Supervisors do not get raises. They know that. They haven't had a raise for about 4 years.

Automation – that is what has to be built back up for the server. The quote for that is \$65,000. If that server goes down, we won't have court; we won't have records until it is gotten back up. The server is 7 years old which is at the maximum. Per the IT manager, Mr. Bellah, it could probably be extended to next year, but that would be it. The reason it hasn't been replaced is that if they went with Tyler, it would be on the cloud. In speaking with others, they say the cloud is scary. That is where they get hacked.

Mr. Bellah's salary is coming out of Automation. The courts have to ok that. That is the only person coming out of that line. The \$60,000 for IT services is for the server.

Chairman Greenfield asked about the general fund and supervisor raises. He asked how many supervisors there are. Ms. Doty said the Chief Deputy plus 3.

Document Storage is supposed to be used for storing documents. That means anything that is sent to archive. There is around 9,000 expungements that need to be sent over. That quote is \$45,000. That has to be saved up. Once in archives, nobody can look at those tapes. She said they have a new machine and they are splicing and dicing, but that is on their own time. That cost \$5,000 and is worth every penny.

Restricted Cash had a supervisor coming out of it. She said she is not getting anything in that. Restricted Cash is what Mr. Baggett, we signed a contract so that he could use it to hire a good attorney – Ms. Doty said she had given him \$25,000 out of that. As you know, as he said, he hasn't reached that mark. He reached \$6,000 / \$9,000 maybe last year when we were up in collections. That is what is used in Restricted Cash. Ms. Doty said she is not getting anything in that. Every once in a while there might be a straggler, but not very much. It has to be remembered, that they cannot hold wages on somebody if they have a hardship. That is how that money is generated. It goes to Idrop. Idrop is where it has gone to collections. They found out they work for the State of Illinois, so the State of Illinois started pounding them to get money out of them. Well, if it is 7 years old, they stop. If they get laid off, it stopped. Now, since it is hardships, everybody has a hardship nowadays. That is why the State's Attorney's fees are down too on that. There is also the lottery winnings. That we still get. That is probably where the State's Attorney is getting a little of their money.

Clerks Ops – this is a little higher. Bills just got sent out for child support maintenance. The hope is to build this back up so some money can be flipped.

E Citations - this is in & out. The only thing paid out of it is for digi-tickets. There has been one contact with one entity, Maroa, that they didn't have enough money. This office pays part and they are supposed to pay part. They didn't have enough money, so they are building back up to get enough money coming back in. Ms. Doty said she would be coming back in, that will be a resolution because nothing comes out of that except for digi-tickets. It did go down a little bit, \$300, because they had gotten rid of Tyler.

Jury payments is also in & out. This is just for paying the jurors.

Training and Travel has been taken out.

One reason the fees are down is due to civil assessments and CTAAAs which are civil assessments is how Springfield came up with the word assessment saying a filing fee can be charged. In six months time, from January 1<sup>st</sup> to June 30<sup>th</sup>, \$82,760 was waived by the courts. That is money that would have stayed right here. That is just for the first six months.

Criminal is over \$150,000 that was waived. That is for hardships. The Supreme Court is now saying they are trying to get grant money for the office. Ms. Doty said she has not heard from them yet, but they are working on it. They will probably do it for DuPage and Cook Counties before they do it for Macon. We are low man on the totem poles.

Chairman Greenfield stated that he is surprised that Ms. Doty is not asking for more. He said he had had a conversation with Ms. Durbin before she retired and they thought it might be \$250,000. He commended Ms. Doty for being where she is. Ms. Doty said she has one heck of a Chief Deputy that works her tail off. Mr. Greenfield said he had no problem with the budget except that he felt the supervisors should be given a raise. He asked when the last time they had gotten a raise was. Ms. Doty said 2017 or 2018, about 4 years ago. A bonus had been given with leftover funds, but that was not added to base pay. Ms. Doty said that the raises are 2 ½% per contract and she could readjust.

Ms. Little made a motion to approve the proposed budget and forward on for display, seconded by Mr. Mattingley.

Ms. Little made a motion to amend the budget to include the 2 ½% raises for the supervisors. Ms. Doty will, prior to display, will inform the Auditor what the 2 ½% for her four supervisor positions, what that new number will be so that it can be included in the display budget, seconded by Mr. Gresham. The motion carried 6-0 with Mr. Kreke being present.

The original motion, as amended, carried 6-0 with Mr. Kreke being present.

**CITIZEN REMARKS – PUBLIC COMMENT** - None

**OLD BUSINESS** - None

**NEW BUSINESS** - None

**CLOSED SESSION** - None

**NEXT MEETING** -

Regular Finance Committee meeting - 8/30/2021

Budget Hearing #3 – Tuesday, 9/7/2021

(Environmental Mgmt, Recorder, Probation, Treasurer, Workforce Investments)

Mr. Mattingley & Ms. Little reported that they would not be present for the 9/7 meeting.

**ADJOURNMENT** - Motion to adjourn made by Ms. Little, seconded by Mr. Gresham, and the meeting adjourned at 6:30 p.m.

*Minutes submitted by Jeannie Durham, Macon County Board Office*