

**PROCEEDINGS
OF THE
MACON COUNTY BOARD**

OCTOBER 14, 2021

**Kevin Greenfield
Chairman**

**Josh Tanner
Clerk**

The Chairman called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. with Chief Deputy Sheriff, Kristopher Thompson and the State's Attorney present.

The Roll Call showed all members present with the exception of Mrs. Dawson and Mr. Drobisch

Mrs. Taylor led the members in prayer.

All led in the Pledge of Allegiance.

A. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 09, 2021 MEETING

MOTION

Mrs. Little moved, seconded by Mr. Entler to approve the minutes of the September 09, 2021 meeting.

There were no questions or comments from the board floor.

ROLL CALL.

Ayes: Buckner, Coleman, Comer, Edwards, Entler, Greenfield, Gresham, Hogan, Holman, Horve, Kraft, Kreke, Larner, Little, Mattingley, Noland, Oliver, Rood, Taylor

Nays: (None)

AYES = 19

NAYS = 0

MOTION CARRIED.

ZONING / SUBDIVISIONS

1. Mrs. Little presented Resolution Z-1237-10-21 which is regarding Case S-01-09-21, a petition submitted by Dennis & Tonya Brooks requesting a Special Use Permit for the operation of a sharpening business in (R-1) Single Family Residential Zoning on property commonly known as 2914 S. Danny Drive, Decatur, IL 62521 in South Wheatland Township. After hearing the evidence, the Zoning Board of Appeals voted to recommend approval of the subject petition to the County Board with 5 stipulations. The EEHW Committee met and reviewed the petition and recommended the County Board approve the petition subject to the 5 stipulations recommended by the Zoning Board of Appeals.

MOTION

Mrs. Little moved, seconded by Mrs. Kraft to approve Resolution Z-1237-10-21 by prior roll call vote.

There were no questions or comments from the board floor.

MOTION CARRIED.

B. CORRESPONDENCE

A thank you note from the Macon County Health Department Team to the Macon County Board for being included in the Covid-19 premium pay.

A new release from Canadian National Railway regarding receipt of notice of termination of KCS merger agreement.

A news release from Canadian National Railway detailing their Strategic Plan.

A letter from CN – Canadian National Railway regarding available grant funding for the greening up of public spaces in communities along CN rail lines.

An e-mail from Ameren Illinois notifying of future tree trimming in the area.

REPORTS

Sheriff’s Report – September 2021

Treasurer’s Fund Report – September 2021

Collector’s Report – September 2021

Coroner’s Report – August 2021

Public Defender’s Report – September 2021

Auditor’s Report – August 2021

MOTION

Mrs. Little moved, seconded by Mr. Mattingley to approve the Correspondence and Reports by prior roll call vote.

There were no questions or comments from the board floor.

MOTION CARRIED.

2. CLAIMS

MOTION

Mrs. Little moved, seconded by Mr. Gresham to approve the Claims by prior roll call vote.

There were no questions or comments from the board floor.

MOTION CARRIED.

C. APPOINTMENTS

3. Mr. Greenfield presented Resolution G-5316-10-21 which is approving appointments to Long Creek and Oakley Townships Union Drainage District #1 & #2.

David Corman, 10414 Sefton Rd., Lovington, IL 61937
Term Expires: 1st Tuesday in September, 2024

MOTION

Mr. Greenfield moved, seconded by Mr. Hogan to approve Resolution G-5316-10-21 by prior roll call vote.

There were no questions or comments from the board floor.

MOTION CARRIED.

D. CONSENT CALENDAR

4. Mr. Greenfield presented the Consent Calendar which includes Resolution G-5317-10-21 regarding executing deeds to convey property on which taxes were delinquent.

MOTION

Mr. Greenfield moved, seconded by Mr. Hogan to approve the Consent Calendar by prior roll call vote.

There were no questions or comments from the board floor.

MOTION CARRIED.

JUSTICE COMMITTEE

5. Mr. Mattingley presented Resolution G-5318-10-21 which is approving permission to dispose of surplus equipment stored in the Law Enforcement Center.

MOTION

Mr. Mattingley moved, seconded by Mrs. Kraft to approve Resolution G-5318-10-21 by prior roll call vote.

There were no questions or comments from the board floor.

MOTION CARRIED.

6. Mr. Mattingley presented Resolution G-5319-10-21 which is increasing IT Services line in the Circuit Clerk E-Citation fund for fiscal year 2021.

MOTION

Mr. Mattingley moved, seconded by Mrs. Kraft to approve Resolution G-5319-10-21 by prior roll call vote.

There were no questions or comments from the board floor.

MOTION CARRIED.

EEHW COMMITTEE

7. Mrs. Little presented Resolution G-5320-10-21 which is approving the Macon County Environmental Management Department vehicle purchase from the host fee account.

MOTION

Mrs. Little moved, seconded by Mr. Edwards to approve Resolution G-5320-10-21 by prior roll call vote.

There were no questions or comments from the board floor.

MOTION CARRIED.

COMMENT:

Mr. Greenfield: Mr. Greenfield said they are going to temporarily skip Operations and Personnel and would do it last.

The Legislative Committee had nothing to submit at the meeting.

FINANCE COMMITTEE - (Resolutions were presented in reverse order)

8. Mrs. Kraft presented Resolution G-5323-10-21 which is approving an amendment to the Decatur Macon County Enterprise Zone Intergovernmental Agreement entered into December 1, 2014.

MOTION

Mrs. Kraft moved, seconded by Mr. Edwards to approve Resolution G-5323-10-21 by prior roll call vote.

There were no questions or comments from the board floor.

MOTION CARRIED.

9. Mrs. Kraft presented Resolution G-5322-10-21 which is approving a renewal and amendment to the contractual agreement for providing healthcare services to the inmates of the Macon County jail.

MOTION

Mrs. Kraft moved, seconded by Mr. Hogan to approve Resolution G-5322-10-21 by prior roll call vote.

There were no questions or comments from the board floor.

MOTION CARRIED.

The Negotiations Committee had nothing to submit at the meeting.

The Transportation Committee had nothing to submit at the meeting.

The Executive Committee had nothing to submit at the meeting.

The Siting, Rules & Ordinance Sub-Committee had nothing to submit at the meeting.

The Building Sub-Committee had nothing to submit at the meeting.

There were no officeholder remarks presented at the meeting.

CITIZENS' REMARKS:

Mr. Greenfield: Mr. Greenfield said he would like to keep it to 5 or 6 people if possible. The issue at hand, which is probably why most of them were at the meeting, is whether they cut the board to 15 or stay at 21. He asked if there was anyone present that was in favor of cutting the board, and there was no response. He said if there were people present that would like for the number to stay at 21, he hoped they had chosen 4 or 5 from their organization to speak. He didn't want to get redundant. Mr. Greenfield said if they felt like they needed to be heard then the board wanted to listen to them. Their time is limited to 5 minutes.

Jacob Hamm: Mr. Hamm said he is a resident of Decatur. He is concerned about some of the proposed maps being supported by some members of the Macon County Republican Party. Two out of the proposed maps would eliminate 6 out of 21 seats, or

about 28% of the seats in total. The decline for Macon County's population from 2010 to 2020 was about 6%. The way the maps are drawn is also concerning. Only one district that is proposed on one of the maps is a plurality of African American residents, not voting age residents. This is just one of the many ways that voters of color can be disenfranchised from the democratic process, and is a blatant violation of voting protections. He asked if the county wanted to send the message that certain voters and districts are more important than others. He asked if they still want to be known as a county with lower voter participation, particularly at the local level. In order for Decatur and Macon County to come back, they need to have a vibrant democracy. The bipartisan map proposed by Republican County Clerk Josh Tanner and supported by the Macon County Democratic Party is a fairer and more compact map. The bipartisan map will insure voters of color's voices are heard and not take away representation from Macon County residents. Macon County over the past decade has seen a growth in African American residents from 16.3% to 18.3%. The map should represent the demographics of Macon county.

Michael G. Diggs: Mr. Diggs is the Vice-President of the NAACP, Decatur branch. The NAACP does not agree with the changes that are put forth for the districts. They would like to see it remain the same, as stated by the young man before him that gave all the numbers and details. To reduce the number would reduce the voting ability of African Americans and most people in the city and the county. Mr. Diggs said right now everything is pretty good. They would like to see it remain that way. Any changes are going to reduce, again, people's ability to voice themselves. NAACP supports everybody voting, everybody, minorities, majorities; everybody needs to get out and vote. They want to make sure it stays that way from now until. Again, he said the NAACP does not support the change to the fewer districts.

Steven Christian: Mr. Christian said he felt disenfranchised by this Republican proposed voting things. It shrinks the districts in the neighborhoods he grew up in and in the neighborhood he lives in right now. They may think the crime and poverty in Decatur is bad now, but if they take away people's ability to vote, have themselves heard, and have themselves represented in government that is how they get things like January 6th. As wrong as it was, they felt like they had not been heard. That their voices didn't matter. They are choosing to disenfranchise and to remove people's access to get to vote. That is only going to increase poverty. It is only going to increase violence. It is only going to increase the fact that people are disenfranchised. The NAACP is against this. He would be one white person signing his name to the petition to have a lawsuit filed against the party if they do this, because this is wrong. There is no reason to reduce the amount of people on this board by that dramatic of an amount when they have only lost 6%. And to reduce the likelihood of people of color and different ethnicities being elected by rezoning those districts. That is sickening and shows people are scared of change. It is going to happen whether they are on the board or are replaced. Because, honestly if they go ahead and do this, then they are just going to have people running as Republicans. Mr. Christian said he would run under a Republican platform just to get up here and undermine everything they do if they are going to change it to where there are no Democrats that can get elected. He asked them to think about what they are doing.

Think about why it is right to take away people's ability to go vote. He asked why that is right and why do they need to reduce the number of people on the board, then only to give the remaining people a raise because that is in the plans also. It is just sickening greed and fear of a change in demographics, and they need to get over it.

Shawn Schollenbruch: Mr. Schollenbruch said he agrees with most of the comments and opinions of most of the citizens that have come to the meeting. He said he has a little bit of a different view on a couple of things. First off, when it comes to representation and civic engagement and the processes in this county, just because they have a population decrease does not necessarily mean that a representation decrease is appropriate or necessary. He feels quite the contrary would be a better way to go, wherever possible they could increase the number of seats in their representative government in various areas of the county including the county board, possibly city council and other areas. Mr. Schollenbruch said in addition to bringing more voices into the decision making process and not having that centralized in fewer and fewer hands, it brings a diversity of opinion, more room for compromise, and more room for innovation and brainstorming among the policymakers. He said most importantly it would instill a higher degree of faith in the civic leaders, among the members of the community. They could see the level of concern on this issue that has come up. He thinks it is something that should be registered and some attention should be paid to it. Perhaps they could take a little time, push this back, meet with some other constituents. Just to voice their concerns more than anything else. Another concern about this and one of the reasons for the redistricting proposal is cost related. Mr. Schollenbruch said he honestly feels like, proportionally to the rest of the county's expenses, this is manageable. He also feels that some of the current county board expenses could probably be looked at and adjusted to offset whatever perceived potential cost issues might be coming up. Mr. Schollenbruch said it is also important to say that once in a while it is important to remember that the person in the other party does not necessarily have some kind of nefarious ulterior motives in what they are doing. They may actually have a perspective and a different reason why they are trying to make moves that the board members might be in conflict with personally. He said he has to remember that these are his neighbors. He said he has known quite a few of them. He has known Jim Gresham his whole life. He trusts him as a person. Mr. Gresham is not there to screw anyone over, instead he is there because he is thinking about something that needs to be done or needs to be considered, and maybe not have anything done with it. Mr. Schollenbruch highly recommends they take some time and consider everybody's concerns. He recommended they stick with Tanner's map because it's one of the best ways to put a bipartisan effort forward at a time he thinks they could really use it here and the rest of the country as well. Let's have a good example if possible.

Aldophis Cooper: Mr. Cooper said he is new to this that is going on today. He said he had one question. What is the reason for the change? That is his question. What is the reason for the change?

Reed Sutman: Mr. Sutman said he didn't prepare a speech which handicaps him, but he just found out about this yesterday, the day before. The Herald & Review article was posted on the 12th and today is the 14th. The Democratic Party maybe didn't get this out

to the public like they should have. The Republican Party maybe didn't get this out to the public like they should have. The public has had two days to think about this, give their feedback, study up on what this means, and get an understanding of what the new balance on the board will be. He thinks everybody there knows that this redistricting plan will give the Republicans the majority on the county board. He didn't think that was in dispute at all. Mr. Sutman thinks this should be tabled. He honestly thinks they should keep the 21 seats that were proposed by Josh Tanner, a Republican. He said out of respect he would not comment on the concerning behavior he saw in the Republican caucus that day. Mr. Sutman asked them to vote with their conscience, not with their hope for power and party.

Will Wetzel: Mr. Wetzel said since 1980 this community has lost about 24% of its population. The City of Decatur has been 26%. If they look around at all of the other local boards, how many of them have shrunk facing absolute population loss, and almost none of them have. The Decatur City Council hasn't. Small towns haven't lost seats. To all of sudden come up, when they have been facing this issue of population loss for 40 years, which is 4 years longer than he has been alive, and to suddenly come up out of nowhere and say that this is when we have to do it does not make sense. They need representation. Everyone in this community needs representation. They stand at a crossroads in this country now, either they move forward together, or they continue to drift apart. They have the opportunity to preserve disparate voices. They have the opportunity to preserve democracy on the local level and stand up and show they are all local leaders who value everyone in our county.

OPERATIONS AND PERSONNEL COMMITTEE

10. Mrs. Kraft presented Resolution G-5321-10-21 which is addressing Reapportionment following the 2020 Census.

MOTION

Mrs. Kraft moved to approve Resolution G-5321-10-21.

MOTION TO TABLE

Mr. Coleman moved to table Resolution G-5321-10-21. He said he did so under the reasoning that they had not had any form of a public hearing on this situation.

Mr. Rueter: Mr. Rueter said he was slightly out of order because there had to be a second before it was a valid motion to do anything with. He said there was a little timing issue. He was not disputing Mr. Coleman's right to make the motion. He certainly could do that, but they needed a second to the motion first.

Mrs. Lerner seconded the motion to approve Resolution G-5321-10-21.

MOTION TO TABLE

Mr. Coleman moved, seconded by Mr. Holman to table Resolution G-5321-10-21. He motioned to table under the reason that they had not had any form of public hearing under this plan in any capacity. This is an incredibly sensitive issue they only do every ten years. He thinks they need to have a lot more public input than the 5 or 6 individuals that have spoken to this issue here. Especially when they have done this within a calendar week of passing this issue. He said that within the last several hours they have introduced the map they are going to be voting on now. He was delayed in getting all the information he needed about that to really look into the detailed numbers of that situation. So, he could guarantee the public hasn't had the time to digest and internalize what's going to be going on with the result of what this is going to be.

ROLL CALL.

Ayes: Buckner, Coleman, Edwards, Holman, Oliver, Rood, Taylor

Nays: Comer, Entler, Greenfield, Gresham, Hogan, Horve, Kraft, Kreke, Larner, Little, Mattingley, Noland

AYES = 7

NAYS = 12

MOTION FAILED. (TO TABLE RESOLUTION G-5321-10-21)

COMMENT:

Mr. Rueter: Mr. Rueter said the way their office drafted the motion, there are several things the board needs to consider and adopt in terms of the resolution and in terms of redistricting. One of the things is they have to indicate how many total members and how many districts there will be. They have to indicate how many members from each district and the annual salary of each member and the annual salary of the chair. He said they also laid it out, since there were several maps proposed at the Operations Committee, if they look at page 2 of 3 there are blanks that need to be filled in for what the board desires. They have the recommendation from O&P which is for 15 members, 5 districts, and 3 members in each district and that Exhibit B be adopted. The annual salary be the amount of \$2,500 and the annual salary for the chair be \$5,000. Those things were the recommendations of O&P. He said what they tried to do, knowing there would be some discussion here was to leave that open for the board to decide what items to plug into the actual resolution. Mr. Rueter said once that is decided then that is what they should vote on, whatever is put forward. He said they will need someone to make a motion to adopt and lay out what things go in there. Mr. Rueter said he understands there is a new map that has been identified in some places as R2 that is under consideration as well. It is not one that went through O&P in terms of one of the exhibits that was allowed. He suggested to be consistent for everyone to refer to R2 as Exhibit E, E as in Edward which is the next one they have not utilized. They have A,B,C,and D. If the board's pleasure is to adopt R2 as a board, then everyone should label it as Exhibit E and refer to it as such. That should keep it clean for the record. Mr. Rueter said there has

been various discussions about whether there needs to be a motion to amend or not. It is not necessarily a motion to amend, but what they would need is a motion which proposes in the 6 vacant blanks in the subsection on page 2, what goes in lines 1, 2, 3, 4, 6 and 7. They need someone to state that as their proposal as a motion to fill those blanks in with those figures. He said if that makes sense. He asked if anyone had questions about that.

Mr. Edwards: Mr. Edwards said he needed a point of clarification. He was trying to determine which map was which. He said what he was really looking for was which one is Josh Tanner's map.

Mr. Rueter: Mr. Rueter asked if Mr. Tanner could tell them which maps were which in the packets. Discussion followed by multiple members on the maps in the packet and which ones were which exhibit.

Mr. Tanner: Mr. Tanner said they might be better off to refer to the colored copies that all of the board members have.

Mr. Rueter: Mr. Rueter said Exhibit A would be the one that is simply titled Macon County Board 2022 with no attendant letter. That is the one Mr. Tanner created, and it is a seven district map. The next one as Exhibit B would be the one titled Macon County Board 2022 R.

Mr. Oliver: Mr. Oliver asked if that was the one proposed this afternoon.

Mr. Rueter: Mr. Rueter said this is the one was that was promoted by the O & P Committee. It is labeled R and is Exhibit B. The other one that has been given to them is Macon County Board 2022 R2 and it would be labeled as Exhibit E.

Mr. Edwards: Mr. Edwards asked if the map labeled R2 was the one just given today.

Mr. Rueter: Mr. Rueter said that is correct.

Mr. Edwards: Mr. Edwards asked if the other ones in-between are the previous ones that were given at O & P, which would be...

Mr. Rueter: Mr. Rueter asked if they had a copy of the one referred to in the resolution as Exhibit C.

Mr. Tanner: Mr. Tanner said there is not a colored copy of that one. He said some of the O & P members may have a copy.

Mr. Rueter: Mr. Rueter said Exhibit D is simply a spread sheet. It is not a map.

Mr. Oliver: Mr. Oliver said the last addition to this proposal is so new and unprepared for presentation to this body. He didn't think they were ready to discuss it in full with everybody having an explanation of what the question is all about. He thinks Mr.

Coleman's motion to delay a vote on this was in order, but just out of order as to what has happened tonight. Mr. Oliver said they have not had an ideal opportunity to even look at this and express any kind of feeling about it. All that has happened is that the maps were taken and numbers were shot in and out of certain areas of this county and of its districts in order to try and balance it and make it come out as such without any input from anyone except those people that devised the map. Mr. Oliver does not think it is a fair and equitable presentation to this county, to these districts and to the voters of this county.

MOTION

Mr. Coleman moved, seconded by Mr. Holman to adopt Exhibit C and fill in the blanks in this resolution with the following numbers: For #1 The county board shall consist of 21 members; #2 The county board shall be divided into 7 districts; #3 That each district shall elect 3 members; #4 That the proposed plan attached hereto as Exhibit C is adopted; #5 There is nothing to fill in on this one; #6 That said annual salary shall be in the amount of \$2,000; and #7 That the chair of the county board shall receive additional compensation in the amount of \$14,000.

ROLL CALL.

Ayes: Buckner, Coleman, Edwards, Holman, Oliver, Rood, Taylor

Nays: Comer, Entler, Greenfield, Gresham, Hogan, Horve, Kraft, Kreke, Larner, Little, Mattingley, Noland

AYES = 7

NAYS = 12

MOTION FAILED.

COMMENT:

Mr. Rueter: Mr. Rueter said they still need a motion to fill in the numbers in some way.

MOTION

Mr. Noland moved, seconded by Mrs. Larner to fill in the numbers as: 15 members, 5 districts, 3 members from each district, proposed Exhibit E, the amount would be \$2500.00, and the additional compensation for the chair would be \$5,000.

QUESTIONS:

Mr. Coleman: Mr. Coleman asked who drew this map. He would like to know all the names and individuals involved in the production of Exhibit E and the map they are currently voting on.

Mr. Tanner: Mr. Tanner said he received the map from the Republican Party which would be Mr. Pillsbury and Mr. Stocks was involved in drafting the technical aspects of it.

Mr. Coleman: Mr. Coleman asked when it was drafted.

Mr. Tanner: Mr. Tanner said he didn't know when it was drawn. He received it that day.

Mr. Coleman: Mr. Coleman asked where it was drawn. He asked if it was drawn in someone's home, in a county office, or in the Republican party office.

Mr. Tanner: Mr. Tanner said he did not know.

Mr. Coleman: Mr. Coleman asked what software was used to prepare this map.

Mr. Tanner: Mr. Tanner said he did not know that either.

Mr. Coleman: Mr. Coleman asked if they know what and /or whose computer was used to draw this.

Mr. Tanner: Mr. Tanner said no.

Mr. Coleman: Mr. Coleman asked if any county resources were used to draw this map.

Mr. Tanner: Mr. Tanner said originally he provided to both the Democrat Party and the Republican Party statistical data about the precincts consolidations. Later on he also provided census data with regard to the racial makeup of each of the precincts. All of that information came from the census bureau. He collected it and disbursed it to both parties, so they received that data from him. He said the color maps for the board were produced by him as well, but he was just filling in the blanks that were given to him.

Mr. Coleman: Mr. Coleman asked if race or ethnicity of Macon County voters was taken into consideration as they were drawing those lines.

Mr. Tanner: Mr. Tanner asked if he meant in regard to Exhibit E. Mr. Coleman affirmed. Mr. Tanner said he did not know.

Mr. Coleman: Mr. Coleman asked if the chair or anyone else could speak to those questions.

Mr. Greenfield: Mr. Greenfield asked if he said based on race.

Mr. Coleman: Mr. Coleman said yes; and asked if race and ethnicity of Macon County citizens was taken into consideration when drawing these lines.

Mr. Greenfield: Mr. Greenfield said on the R2, the one that Mr. Coleman has designated to him that there was not a designated black district, and that is why it was changed to be a designated black district.

Mr. Coleman: Mr. Coleman said R2 in the plan was what they were doing at that time. Somewhat factually inaccurate, but yes. In what specific ways was race taken into consideration when drawing this map?

Mr. Greenfield: Mr. Greenfield said he was afraid he could not answer that.

Mr. Coleman: Mr. Coleman said so clearly that wasn't taken into consideration even though there is both a state and federal voting rights act that mandates that there be certain racial requirements for districts there.

Mr. Greenfield: Mr. Greenfield said it may have very well been taken into consideration, he was just not aware of what the consideration was.

Mr. Coleman: Mr. Coleman asked who gave the legal advice to not consider race or didn't provide the legal advice that that's not a key component that needs to be taken into consideration when drawing maps, they are proposing as a county board.

Mr. Greenfield: Mr. Greenfield said that Mr. Stocks is an attorney so...

Mr. Coleman: Mr. Coleman asked if the State's Attorney believes that this map complies with the state and federal voting rights act.

Mr. Rueter: Mr. Rueter said he did not have an opinion as to that because #1 he was not involved in the drawing of the map, and #2 that is not his position to make. His position is to represent the county board in any legal action.

Mr. Coleman: Mr. Coleman said those were all things that could be taken into strong consideration if they were to have public hearings about this. To figure out the true flesh of what is going on here in that sense. Not having a minority/majority district is a straight violation of the voting rights act, and under this plan they are proposing there is not a majority/minority district. The maximum is 46% and that is not voting age population; that is general population. So, that doesn't meet the qualifications of a majority/minority district. He asked Mr. Rueter if that does or does not meet it.

Mr. Rueter: Mr. Rueter said it is not his position give an opinion that.

Mr. Greenfield: Mr. Greenfield said if Mr. Coleman chose to bring a lawsuit, the courts can work it out.

Mr. Coleman: Mr. Coleman said he appreciated that. He said he was speaking with his State's Attorney who represents him and this body. He asked if county taxpayers would

be on the hook for the cost of defending this map in state and federal court if they were sued.

Mr. Greenfield: Mr. Greenfield said the county was going to be defended. He said he did not understand the question.

Mr. Coleman: Mr. Coleman asked who would be footing the bill if they have to represent themselves in court to defend the fact that they have passed maps that are in violation, or believe to be violation of the voting rights act. Who will be paying for that? Is it taxpayers?

Mr. Greenfield: Mr. Greenfield said if he chooses to sue the county...

Mr. Coleman: Mr. Coleman said if anybody, the state government the federal government or any African-American or minority that is disenfranchised under this plan.

Mr. Greenfield: Mr. Greenfield said it would be defended by the taxpayers.

Mr. Coleman: Mr. Coleman asked what percentage of African-Americans are living in the current district that is being proposed under this, District #1.

Mr. Tanner: Mr. Tanner said on the sheet that was provided, County Board 2022 R2, County Board District 1 is, according to the census bureau... He asked if Mr. Coleman needed the total population or the percentage

Mr. Coleman: Mr. Coleman said he needed the percentage of African-Americans that live in District #1.

Mr. Tanner: Mr. Tanner said under the proposed R2 it is 0.458%, so 45.8%.

Mr. Coleman: Mr. Coleman asked if that would constitute a majority.

Mr. Tanner: Mr. Tanner said he didn't know.

Mr. Coleman: Mr. Coleman said it is just sheer numbers. Anything under 50% would not be a majority district, which is outlined in the voter rights act. They already had a voter rights protected minority district established that three of their members of color were representing at the meeting. So, to alter this is a violation of the voting rights act, to dilute that and craft that down from what it currently is. He asked if they thought this map proposal dilutes the African-American political viability. That is another concern because that is another way it violates the voting rights act, by reducing the number of elected officials and increasing the number of constituents in an overall district makeup is a dilution of minority viability. He said that question is for any Republican on the board and/or the State's Attorney who represents the board in this public meeting.

Mr. Rueter: Mr. Rueter said his job is to be the legal counsel, not to provide personnel opinions about what he might believe. That is left to the board members.

Mr. Coleman: Mr. Coleman said he appreciated it and was not asking for his personal opinion. He was asking for Mr. Rueter's opinion as the board's legal counsel and State's Attorney who's representing and providing factual analysis of the board as they go forward.

Mr. Rueter: Mr. Rueter said again, if they are talking about lawsuits, then he didn't want to comment on pending lawsuits.

Mr. Coleman: Mr. Coleman said he wanted to request a copy of all e-mail correspondence between Chairman Greenfield, Clerk Tanner and any county official, or employee, and person, group or entity discussing this map proposal. He said he could file a FOIA request if necessary unless it's a transparency, those copies should just be provided to all members of the board and the media as well, just for transparency reasons. He asked if it was true that they have lost 6 % to 7% population over these last 10 years, yet they are responding with a lowering of the county board by 28%.

Mr. Greenfield: Mr. Greenfield said it is true that they have lost population over the last 30 years. Mr. Coleman said he was not disputing that fact. Mr. Greenfield said at that point in time they were still at 21 board members. He said this is something that Chairman Dunn showed interest in doing as well.

Mr. Coleman: Mr. Coleman said he understood that and Mr. Dunn is not a member of this body anymore. So, he didn't honestly think that his opinion matters in this situation here. Other than that, a citizen of Macon County that could come and voice their opinion and/or their favorability of going down to 15 if they were to have a public hearing about this that would allow the public to voice their concerns more than 5 minutes and a limitation of more than 5 people in that same sense.

Mrs. Little: Mrs. Little said she finds it very out of order to be having regular discussion during this, but she had to say, this is her third re-map. This is the third time proposals have been put forth to reduce the number of board members. This is the third time they have not changed any salaries. This is not new; it is just finally coming this far. And this is how far it is and they need to vote on it.

Mr. Coleman: Mr. Coleman asked if it is true that they are reducing the county board by 28%, but also simultaneously giving the members a 25% pay increase under this current proposal they are getting ready to vote on.

Mr. Greenfield: Mr. Greenfield said he didn't figure out the percentages of it. He asked what the question is on it.

Mr. Coleman: Mr. Coleman said it is just a significant fact that they are decreasing the number on the county board by 28%, but in that same sense giving themselves a 25%,

20% pay increase and building from \$2,000 to \$2,500. He said especially because they argued that in one fashion or another the cost effectiveness and saving costs is why they were looking to reduce the number from such a drastic thing.

Mr. Greenfield: Mr. Greenfield said if Mr. Coleman wanted to make a motion to cut the board's salary he would be more than happy to second it because he voted to cut his salary.

Mr. Coleman: Mr. Coleman said he would make a motion to keep the same pay. He didn't think they needed to be increasing any pay at all, if anything they need to be doing more work and advocating on behalf of the people not paying themselves more money, but then lowering the number of people that can advocate and voice their opinion to this board.

Mr. Greenfield: Mr. Greenfield said he would have to make a motion to amend the resolution.

Mr. Rueter: Mr. Rueter said there is a motion to amend the resolution on the floor.

Mr. Oliver: Mr. Oliver asked what that motion is.

Mr. Rueter: Mr. Rueter suggested they title it a motion to amend, but it is really a motion to fill in the blanks. The motion that was made by Mr. Noland and seconded by Mrs. Lerner was that the county board should consist of 15 members. They would be divided into 5 districts and each district shall elect 3 members. That Exhibit E, the R2 map be adopted. The annual salary shall be in the amount of \$2,500. The chair shall receive a compensation in the amount of \$5,000. That is the current motion to fill in those blanks that way.

Mr. Coleman: Mr. Coleman said he assumed it would go unanswered, like the majority of the ones he had already put forward. He asked if the map put forward has a majority/minority district that is over 50% that would make it a majority.

Mr. Greenfield: Mr. Greenfield said according to Mr. Tanner, no.

Mr. Coleman: Mr. Coleman said, so it is a minority/minority district, not a majority/minority that is required under the voting rights act. He said the other violation... He asked if this could harm the minority political viability by decreasing the number of elected officials and increasing the number of people that have to be represented, that make up that district. He said obviously African-Americans didn't just magically get another 5% to 10% with the adoption of this plan or proposal of this plan. Just by sheer numbers and logic it is a reduction in their viability as a minority which is also a violation of the voting rights act. So if they pass this resolution they are still in violation of the voting rights act in two different fashions. Question, whether he would get an answer or not.

Mr. Greenfield: Mr. Greenfield asked if that was his argument.

Mr. Coleman: Mr. Coleman said it was his question.

Mr. Greenfield: Mr. Greenfield said he doesn't believe it does.

Mr. Coleman: Mr. Coleman said then they are still very, very liable to be sued by either the state, federal government or any individual in this county that is a minority and is disenfranchised by this plan.

Mr. Oliver: Mr. Oliver said he was looking at the Exhibit E and to the left side of it which would be the western side of Macon County, there is a tremendous amount of territory. It also goes into the middle of the county. There is 6 that go from the bottom end of the county on the south side, clear to north side which is into another county. He said that is called a district. That is ridiculous. Mr. Oliver said he knows farmland doesn't vote. So, they had to go into the middle of the county to try and get the numbers right. He said it doesn't make sense except for the fact that someone is trying to garner a specific amount of votes, not necessarily territory, but of votes to make it balance out so they could go down to 5 county board districts. In the meantime, it is disenfranchising a bunch of people in the middle of the county. He said when they go straight up the line like that, a little bit to the left side and then go back into the middle of town to help carry that particular facet out. Mr. Oliver said it is not prefatory to even present. He thinks to vote on this is asinine, and everybody that thinks this is a fair and equitable thing to do tonight should take another look in the mirror.

Mr. Holman: Mr. Holman said he was approached by a county officer in late June about this exact proposal of reducing the board. They asked what his opinion of it was. He thought from a cost saving measure from the get-go that sounds good but he would want to take a stronger look at the situation. He said obviously there are some issues with restricting voter accessibility. Mr. Holman said if they have been working on this since sometime in June, and he didn't know what their official start date was on it, but if they approached him with it at that point then they have had this for 3 to 4 months. The first he saw of any of the maps or any of the changes was on the 7th of October when he attended the O & P meeting. He said now they have Exhibit E which is being thrown out here, and it is the first time anybody has seen it in this room today. Mr. Holman said he sees a problem trying to rush this thing through. Obviously the board is not getting a clear purview of this entire map and what it's impact is going to be, and obviously the public doesn't know. So, from that perspective he says they need to do something to make sure they get this out to the public and get their input, and the board members are educated on what's going on so they can make a vote that is really going to count.

Ms. Buckner: Ms. Buckner said regardless of what has happened in the past with things that have not changed within 10, 20, 30 years, this still is not a fair and equitable map.

Mr. Edwards: Mr. Edwards said that if the present motion does not pass, he will be presenting a motion afterwards for Mr. Tanner's map.

Mrs. Taylor: Mrs. Taylor said she totally does not agree with this map, Exhibit E. She thinks it is wrong.

Mr. Coleman: Mr. Coleman said he wanted to acknowledge that all 4 of the African-American members of this caucus that are present, 3 of which are from District #2 which is being toyed with, the voting rights of African-Americans in that sense are being toyed with there, have all expressed extreme displeasure and concern with what they are doing as a board and a party. He appreciates the candor they have had at the meeting. He felt they had kept it rather civil in that sense because it could have gotten out of hand. He just wanted to reiterate the fact that this is a map that leads them up to legal liability so why they would do that as a county board, he just simply did not understand what logical sense that serves, if anything it just shows political gamesmanship and power grabbing. This proposal is clearly going to threaten the viability of an African-American trying to get on the board, but really any Democrat, with how wide and base these maps are.

ROLL CALL.

Ayes: Comer, Entler, Greenfield, Gresham, Hogan, Holman, Horve, Kraft, Kreke, Lerner, Little, Mattingley, Noland

Nays: Buckner, Coleman, Edwards, Oliver, Rood, Taylor

AYES = 13

NAYS = 6

MOTION CARRIED.

OFFICEHOLDER REMARKS:

Mr. Oliver: Mr. Oliver said that in the explanation that was given a while ago, from Pleasant View Township clear up to Austin Township and back into the middle of town, those three people are going to be real busy trying to cover everything from the middle of town to the outside edges of town and across to the Niantic District. They won't be compatible anywhere at all. That is what he is trying to figure out, what have we got here? What kind of mix-up will they have? Has that been thought out? He doesn't think this has been clearly thought out to produce something that is equitable to everybody in this county, or to most people in this county anyway. It's too big a spread.

There was no old business presented at the meeting.

There was no new business presented at the meeting.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mrs. Little moved, seconded by Mr. Hogan to adjourn until Wednesday, November 10, 2021 at 6:00 p.m.

MOTION CARRIED.

Meeting adjourned at 7:05 p.m.