

**THERE IS NO AGENDA FOR THIS  
MEETING**

**IT IS A CONTINUATION OF  
THE MEETING HELD ON  
OCTOBER 25, 2011**

**WILL COUNTY BOARD**  
**FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING**  
**MINUTES**

**October 26, 2011**

Will County Office Building  
County Board Committee Room  
302 North Chicago Street  
Joliet, IL 60432  
10 a.m.

**CALL TO ORDER**

Mr. Kusta called the meeting to order at 9:04 a.m.

**ROLL CALL**

**Present were Members:** Gould, McPhillips, Wilhelmi, Zigrossi and Kusta.

**Absent were Members:** Dralle and Maher.

**Also Present:** Will County Board Members Sharon May, Kathleen Konicki, Bob Howard, Cory Singer, Herbert Brooks and Denise Winfrey. Will County Board Chief of Staff Bruce Friefeld and Will County Board Deputy Chief of Staff Melissa Johannsen.

**Present from State's Attorney's Office:** ASA M. Tatroe.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

Ms. Zigrossi led the committee in the Pledge of Allegiance.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

None.

**OLD BUSINESS**

Mr. Rafac began a review of the proposed 2012 budget and distributed two one-page documents, one comparing the actual corporate fund salaries in the 2011 budget versus the 2012 proposed budget, and another detailing the cross fund report. The county has received \$1.8 million in fees from Waste Management and an additional \$400,000 in host fees. The respective figures from the two different landfill sites cannot be broken out from that figure, however. Although the revenue forecast might be conservative, it does not suggest there is much margin. There were questions regarding the grants related to the Sheriff's department and their affect on salaries and benefits. The combined impact is about \$240,000. Severance

information has been requested. Regarding the Homer Glen line item that included the term "other," the amount of the other items is \$12,000.

Mr. Kusta asked for an explanation of the informational sheet detailing corporate fund salaries.

Mr. Wilhelmi arrived at this juncture.

Mr. Rafac began a review of the informational sheet by explaining it was a list of each department including information on the major salary variances.

Mr. Kusta asked how many interns were working in the Auditor's office.

Mr. Rafac replied the money probably covered more than two.

Mr. Wilhelmi asked if the Sheriff's line item technically was flat.

Mr. Rafac stated the change was \$15,737 from the 2011 adopted budget to the County Executive's proposed budget for 2012.

Mr. Wilhelmi asked if there were going to be new employees at the Adult Detention Facility.

Mr. Rafac replied it was absorbed into other areas. For the past few years, the county has funded a benefit buy out in the line item. It was funded in this year's proposed budget. The step movement effective December 1 or later and the union contracts are not explicitly funded either.

Mr. Wilhelmi asked if they participated in the severance.

Mr. Rafac answered there were at least two with a separation date of September 30, and others also have taken the severance package. The department has participated more this year than last year.

Mr. Wilhelmi asked for some information on furloughs particularly in the Sheriff's department and the Treasurer's department.

Mr. Rafac answered the first year furlough was offered was the only time there was wide-spread participation. Across the county there was approximately \$240,000 in estimated savings. Some people who would like to have extra time away from work have taken a furlough since then. This was adjusted for the people who took the severance plan.

Mr. Wilhelmi asked if the people who took the severance package were replaced with new employees who worked at a lower rate of pay.

Mr. Rafac replied a new Treasurer was elected during that period so the office also has been restructured. The positions now are not necessarily the same ones that were there before.

Mr. Howard asked for a cost analysis for the County Board's employees including the average cost for each employee.

Ms. McPhillips arrived at this juncture.

Mr. Rafac replied that the information was available but the numbers weren't necessarily meaningful. The Circuit Court Clerk and Sunny Hill Nursing Home, for example, have employees who make less money than other county employees. Regarding the County Board, it might be better to remove the board member's salaries from the equation before considering the other salaries. On one of the reports distributed during this process, it looked as if Sunny Hill Nursing Home had more employees. There actually was an increase in part-time employees and a decrease in full-time employees. That allows for better coverage and lead time.

Mr. Howard commented that if the elected officials were removed from the equation, the efficiency of the office could be determined. That number should reflect the efficiency of the office.

Ms. May noted that there will be an increase in the Sheriff's budget because of arbitration. Is that reflected here?

Mr. Rafac replied no.

Ms. May asked for an amount.

Mr. Rafac replied the impact of the three contracts has not been analyzed.

Mr. Kusta stated the County Board's philosophy is the elected officials are given a certain amount of money to run their offices. The individual officials decide how to spend the money, not the County Board. Is it possible to determine the amount?

Mr. Rafac answered yes. The step movement alone in the Corporate Fund is roughly \$2 million to \$2.1 million.

Ms. McPhillips stated there had been a discussion about base salaries including increases.

Mr. Rafac stated this does not cover any kind of adjustment that would be effective after December 1. Adjustments prior to that become part of the base.

Ms. McPhillips commented she was uncomfortable with that situation. Either everyone should have a raise or no one.

Mr. Rafac stated most departments and elected officials did something.

Ms. McPhillips stated employees who did not get raises have been penalized. There should be a policy that is fair to everyone.

Mr. Kusta agreed with Ms. McPhillips. When the County Board finalizes the budget, those dollars should be tracked and brought back to the 2010 funding levels.

Mr. Wilhelmi stated most budgets are the same as last year. I'd like to see all salary lines be 2% above the 2010 budget. If all the salary lines were decreased it only would save about \$800,000. That does not cover the reduction in real estate taxes.

Mr. Kusta noted any possible way to save money would be considered, not just salaries.

Ms. McPhillips stated there had been no discussion of the landfills.

Mr. Rafac stated he had requested additional information regarding the landfills. There has been roughly \$1.8 million in payments from the two landfills and another \$400,000 in corporate host fees. The numbers from each entity could not be broken out. The numbers don't suggest a windfall, however. The detail must be considered on each of the revenue streams so there is a better idea of the estimates. There is also revenue of about \$1.5 million or more that comes into the special fund. But the estimates we received in excess of \$3 million to date are not seen in what has been receipted. Considering what goes into the special fund, and combined with the annual revenues in excess of \$4 million, that is not far off, however.

Ms. Johannsen stated they also should determine if all of the proceeds should go to special funds. Perhaps some of it should go to corporate instead of 285.

Mr. Rafac commented that he believed what was in the special funds did belong in that account. The gas-to-energy was in the special fund. Although \$250,000 was budgeted this year, that is not going to happen. Next year's estimate was \$416,000.

Ms. McPhillips commented that was new revenue.

Mr. Rafac stated of the different components, it belongs there. Everything is categorized in the contract. The gas-to-energy is the one piece that is not. I thought we had said it would go into that fund.

Ms. Johannsen stated there was quite a bit of cash there. That kind of fund balance is not needed.

Mr. Rafac stated that is the only new component.

Mr. Wilhelmi asked for an explanation of what is being funded.

Mr. Rafac replied it funds the Solid Waste Department and outreach for recycling and education.

Ms. McPhillips noted it might also include the inspectors.

Ms. May asked when the agreements last were updated.

Mr. Rafac answered the agreements seemed to be passed for the life of the landfills.

Mr. Friefeld stated the payments increase automatically depending on the amount of waste.

Mr. Rafac indicated the agreements were posted on the landfill's web site.

Mr. Friefeld noted the difference between the two agreements was Prairie View provided a tipping fee as well as a host fee.

### **Association/Affiliation Dues & Subscriptions**

Mr. Rafac stated NACo was about \$9,000. Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning was about \$25,000, but some of the federal highway funding was tied to the involvement in the group. Will County Governmental League was paid about \$23,400 yearly.

Mr. Kusta suggested choosing a benchmark number of perhaps \$1,000. Anything over that figure that is not required should be pulled out of the budget, and each department head or elected official should explain why it should be included in the budget. NACo, for example, is an excellent organization. But if board members attend their meetings or conventions, perhaps there should be some type of report on the proceedings.

Mr. Rafac stated the largest overall entity was West Group, or Thomson Law.

Mr. Gould asked if that was generated by court filing fees.

Mr. Rafac answered it was for the Judges, the Assistant State's Attorneys and the Public Defenders, among others. The county paid for all of those entities so there could be access to the service. There was \$80,000 in the Circuit Court; \$12,000 for the Public Defender; the State's Attorney's fee was \$70,000; and the Sheriff's fee was \$10,000. Not only was that a large cost, the price had increased. There are some costs related to the Health Department and Sunny Hill but most of the other memberships aren't huge.

Mr. Kusta asked how the West Law licenses were distributed.

Mr. Rafac stated the county paid for one license per user. The company does not seem willing to negotiate.

Mr. Gould suggested there should be an attempt at negotiation.

Ms. Tatroe stated everyone in the State's Attorney's office uses it for research and continuing legal education.

Mr. Rafac noted the county spent \$140,000 last year for the Law Library for West Law licenses. Those licenses are available to anyone among the general public who wants to do legal research at the courthouse.

Mr. Wilhelmi wondered if there could be more sharing of access to West Law.

Mr. Kusta noted that might violate the license agreement.

Ms. Tatroe commented there are different kinds of access to West Law. Some sections charge by the minute.

Ms. Konicki asked if all the departments using West Law were considered collectively for a grand total, and the negotiations for the county were based on the total number of licenses for all departments combined.

Mr. Rafac stated they had tried to have that conversation but the attempt was not successful.

Mr. Kusta commented that the agreements should be considered in depth at the committee level.

Mr. Howard stated there are other expenses such as travel associated with dues and subscriptions. Those are the real costs.

Mr. Kusta commented perhaps every department should have a total of \$1,000 and the balance is put in the account so it can be justified.

Ms. McPhillips stated the dues and subscriptions in the 2011 amended budget total \$422,910 and increased to \$475,000. I would like to take it down to the amended budget. Money that truly was necessary probably was transferred because it increased from \$389,000. At least that does not strap West Law. Last year \$449,000 was spent, so it still is below that level.

Mr. Wilhelmi stated he would recommend returning to the 2011 adopted budget minus 10%.

Mr. Palmer stated some funding was tied to the various memberships. Membership in the Will County Governmental League was tied to STP funding, for example. Associations such as NACo provide many resources. Many of the department heads use their webinars or online contacts.

Ms. Zigrossi stated she supported Mr. Kusta's proposed \$1,000 threshold.

Mr. Kusta stated he did not object to the money remaining in the budget. It is important to control it until the spending is justified.

Mr. Rafac stated the combined total of the West Law licenses was more than \$325,000, or half of the total amount. Perhaps every amount over \$2,500 or \$3,000 should be considered.

Ms. Konicki suggested the State's Attorney's office might be at a disadvantage when it negotiated with West Law. Perhaps the county should negotiate for all the West Law licenses held by the combined offices and departments. Additionally, perhaps there should be a basic allowance for board members to fund activities that might be the most advantageous to constituents.

Mr. Kusta asked if the discussion could be continued during the November 1 Finance Committee meeting.

Mr. Rafac asked if Mr. Kusta wanted justification of expenses over \$2,500.

Mr. Kusta replied yes and asked also for an explanation of any ties to particular programs.

Ms. McPhillips asked also if mileage and travel could be rolled back too. Meals, miles and travel increased about \$20,000 over 2010.

Mr. Gould commented that it might be a good idea to keep the memberships but reduce the associated costs.

Ms. Zigrossi asked if there was another vendor providing the same services as West Law.

Ms. Tatroe stated the only competitor was LexisNexis. By law, it is provided at the jail. If there was a change, everyone would have to be trained on LexisNexis.

### **Professional Services**

Mr. Rafac stated the discussion should begin with providers who are on retainer. The Mack contract, the two lobbyists, the grant contract and the CED were the big ticket items that collectively cost more than \$300,000.

Ms. McPhillips asked for an explanation of Will County Legal Assistance and how they handle Orders of Protection and Guardian ad Litem.

Ms. Tatroe replied the court largely appoints a Guardian ad Litem to represent a juvenile, but one also can be appointed to represent an adult involved in a probate case. Research is done, and the bill is paid using county funds. There is staff available to fill out the necessary forms for an Order of Protection.

Mr. Kusta asked if it was an annual fee or was per client.

Ms. Tatroe replied the judges appoint the Guardian ad Litem. Sometimes the fees come from the estate in a probate case.

Mr. Kusta noted Ms. Goodson was going to report on the state legislative consultant during a future meeting.

Mr. Howard commented Smith, Dawson & Andrews had the largest numbers and asked for a description of the company's duties. It would be difficult to discuss cutting a line item for a lobbyist without knowing more about the company's work and the subsequent results.

Ms. May asked for more information about JJC.

Mr. Rafac answered it was a consulting firm used by ICT to help with wiring and other technological issues. Although the bulk of the contract is with ICT, other departments do additional work with them. The main reasons for variances in Other Professional Services relates to \$100,000 of the variance from last year. That is based on the County Clerk's work with elections and some of the associated costs. There also is an increase related to the Supervisor of Assessments. This is a quad year so the county pays for some of the negotiated contracts out of Other Professional Services, so that amount was increased slightly. The amount in the Merit Commission was increased by \$60,000, and that is where the testing is done for correctional officers and deputies. When those people leave, the county does a test. The process starts with hundreds of people, and there are physical, written and psychological tests. When the list is developed, it is used to find replacements for the officers who are leaving. The lists are being exhausted on both the correctional officers and deputy sides. There was not much testing this past year, but a new list must be created. That will be \$60,000.

Mr. Wilhelmi asked about the line item for storage in Other Professional Services under 101-45-411.

Mr. Rafac replied that also was related to the election and involves off-site storage for voting equipment. "Other Professional" is a catch-all for things that don't fit elsewhere.

Mr. Kusta asked about line item 262-42-291.

Mr. Rafac replied that probably is the new foreclosure mediation fund.

Mr. Wilhelmi asked if it was supported by grant funding.

Ms. Johannsen replied it was funded by bank fees.

Mr. Howard asked about Cox Livery Service.

Mr. Rafac answered it is a car service that generally provided transportation to the airports.

Ms. May asked if the United Way funds were matched by employee contributions.

Ms. Johannsen replied it was a match of as much as \$25,000.

Mr. Rafac stated there had not been a contribution this year.

Ms. Konicki noted some of the different branches of government had their own communication specialists. Why does each branch of government need a special apparatus? We have not discussed the question of keeping some of the entities that provide special services on retainer or the possibility of moving to an hourly or contingency program. I think we should look more closely at Mack Communications. If the company was on an hourly schedule the county might use them less.

Mr. Friefeld stated the company was paid hourly but not to exceed \$40,000 a year.

Ms. Johannsen stated the County Executive had two in-house individuals who work on media relations exclusively for that office.

Ms. Konicki asked if that should be. Should we think more as a unit of government than two different branches?

Mr. Wilhelmi noted that there had been a discussion about that issue at the last Finance Committee meeting, and there also was a discussion last year. Perhaps Mr. Palmer and Mr. Friefeld should work together to address this issue during the next budget. I also believe Mr. Mahar should be reduced. I don't see the effectiveness.

Ms. Konicki agreed. Should the county pay a retainer to Mr. Mahar? There might be a contingency approach depending on what they provide that we wouldn't get otherwise.

Mr. Kusta asked if the subject of the consultants was on the agenda for the Finance Committee meeting scheduled for November 1.

Ms. Johannsen stated Ms. Goodson was going to provide information relative to Mr. Mahar. Should media relations be added?

Mr. Kusta replied it could be brought up as a topic to discuss. Perhaps it would be best to send the issue to the Executive Committee and then have it filter down through assignment. It is not solely a finance issue; it is a much broader issue.

Mr. Palmer noted the County Executive's office handled media relations for all of its departments, other than the Health Department.

Ms. McPhillips commented there was an efficiency created with the gasoline in the Highway Department. Is there a transfer in for the revenue? There is an increased expense.

Mr. Rafac replied he did not transfer any payment from the Highway Department or a Special Fund to Corporate for the use of the gasoline. The expense was consolidated. There was no transfer to them previously for other department's use of diesel either. It was just a movement of the expense. The Sheriff's Department uses diesel fuel as well and that was not reimbursed to the Highway Department. I viewed it as more of a levy-related expense as opposed to a true Special Fund expense.

Ms. McPhillips noted it increased by \$500,000.

Mr. Rafac stated the contract was approved in September, and it increased by a little more than \$100,000. There is also about \$100,000 in credit card-related costs for fuel that is not purchased at our distribution sites. When the Highway Department was paying for it, it included diesel throughout the whole county but it was being funded under the levy.

Ms. Johannsen asked who was using a credit card to purchase gasoline.

Mr. Rafac answered it happens county-wide. If Probation needs to go pick up someone, and they go out of town, or if someone is not conveniently located to our filling centers, they will purchase it with a credit card. A large portion of it is related to when we need to leave the community and it is not possible to get fuel from one of the county's filling centers.

Mr. Wilhelmi noted the Highway Department might be a Special Revenue Fund but it is all levy. So it is really moving it.

Ms. McPhillips commented the county is not moving revenue, it is moving expense. But \$500,000 seems like a big expense to shift.

Mr. Rafac stated their levy is held the same. Because of the capital expenditures that have happened during the past couple of years, the county is actually lending them the money. On December 1, we will lend them a little less than \$5 million on a cash flow basis. By shifting this there, we might be able to replenish that a little faster.

Ms. McPhillips noted that increased the burden for Corporate.

Mr. Rafac stated from the beginning most of the burden was Corporate.

Ms. McPhillips asked if the Sheriff was using diesel fuel.

Mr. Rafac replied it was the Sheriff's Department and other departments.

County Engineer Bruce Gould stated the Highway Department logged the use of diesel fuel by other departments. The Highway Department does not charge back any of the Departments. Mr. Rafac and I discussed the issue and determined that because the other departments use it, perhaps it should be included in Corporate. It is not just the county. There is a similar situation with the Sheriff and gasoline. Although the Sheriff uses most of it, there are

other county departments that use it. The maintenance on the tanks is part of the Highway Department's budget, however.

Ms. McPhillips asked which vehicles use diesel fuel.

County Engineer Bruce Gould answered the buses for Sunny Hill Nursing Home and some of the tow trucks.

Ms. McPhillips asked if it could be handled something like the postage for metered mail.

Mr. Wilhelmi asked about Property Services Equipment Maintenance Agreements item 3530 involving printer maintenance. That fund had increased; was there something specific?

Mr. Rafac explained a new Xerox printer was purchased for the ICT Department. This printer has been treated separately from other printers handled by Records Management. There also was three-year software agreement that was paid out of this year's budget, and an internal 9-1-1 system used for tracking telephones. There also are anticipated increases on the New World software agreement. The increase in ICT was \$50,000 for these four items. The County Clerk's collections number increased by \$24,000 and that is consistent with the 2010 election. The Sheriff's number went up across various departments increased collectively by about \$150,000 including maintenance on the OP warrants contract; a contract for about \$100,000 with Johnson Controls for HVAC; and the third item is related to the jail management system.

Mr. Wilhelmi asked about the maintenance costs for New World.

Mr. Rafac replied it was around \$100,000 for the finance system. The jail management system is also New World.

Mr. Wilhelmi asked if New World still was updated.

Mr. Rafac answered yes. There is also annual maintenance.

Ms. Konicki stated she wanted to make sure there was movement to bring the CED's functions in-house. Our interests and the CED's interests aren't necessarily the same.

Mr. Kusta asked Ms. Johannsen to include an item on the CED's contribution.

Mr. Howard asked which line item included the relocation of gas pipelines.

County Engineer Bruce Gould replied if it was part of a particular project on a county highway it is charged toward that project and is part of the construction.

Mr. Gould asked for an explanation of the 18% increase in Workman's Compensation.

Mr. Tidwell explained the bulk of the increase was related to the anticipation of large settlements. A Workman's Compensation claims review recently was held with the defense attorney, the carrier and the department. A single Workman's Compensation claim can take several years to resolve, and there are several significant outstanding claims that seem close to a settlement. When the Workman's Compensation carrier sets the reserves, the county adjusts based on what is anticipated.

Mr. Gould asked if 1575 was the reserve fund.

Mr. Tidwell replied yes. There was a reserve for the current year and a prior year.

Mr. Gould stated \$3.2 million was added last year.

Mr. Rafac noted that decreased from \$3.2 million to \$2 million. The current year claims increased from \$2.7 million to \$3.2 million. The net of the total costs is actually a decline relative to what was adopted last year.

Mr. Gould asked if year-to-date only \$539,000 has been expended. Unless I am reading this incorrectly, there has been a significant carry over for next year.

Mr. Rafac stated the cash balance sheet distributed at the beginning of the meeting shows last year ended with about \$1.7 million in cash. Now there is about \$2.7 million in cash. When I started, the county was doing transfers to Workman's Compensation and Tort Immunity every year. Those have now changed from loans to grants; they are not meant to be repaid. We have tried to build the fund balances in both categories. Last year's large settlement in tort did draw down that balance, and additional funds were transferred to cover that. However we are trying to prevent the need for cash flow loans throughout the year.

Mr. Tidwell noted these numbers are actually lower than the reserves for all of the claims. All of the claims won't settle in a single year, however; that is why there is carry over.

Mr. Rafac stated at the end of September the total in cash in Workman's Compensation was \$2.7 million, or 50% of the annual expenditures. Workman's Compensation has front-loaded costs, meaning the premiums are paid at the beginning of the year. The rest is pay out.

Mr. Gould asked if carrier stepped in after the county paid a certain amount.

Mr. Tidwell answered yes. The county reports monthly to its excess carrier but because each claim has a self-insured retention of \$600,000 just the very large claims kick in there.

Ms. Konicki asked if the county had explored the possibility of no longer being in-house. If the county is not self-insured, then the insurance company would hire an attorney to defend the cases.

Mr. Wilhelmi stated there was a service that handled the claims administration.

Mr. Tidwell stated just the TPA. The county does not pay its own claims. The county hires a third-party administrator. No one would fully insure a county this size.

Mr. Wilhelmi asked about the possibility of reductions in revenue for the Health Department.

Mr. Cicero replied that he had talked to Mr. Rafac and Ms. Johannsen and expected to have some re-worked numbers for them by November 4.

Mr. Wilhelmi stated he preferred not to reduce the Health Department's levy.

Ms. McPhillips noted the Sunny Hill TB Clinic had a starting balance of more than the budget. Could the county levy less if the carry over is more than we are budgeting?

Mr. Rafac answered yes.

Mr. Wilhelmi suggested that money might be used elsewhere in the Health Department.

**ADJOURNMENT**

A motion was made by Ms. McPhillips, second by Mr. Wilhelmi, to adjourn the meeting at 10:43 a.m. All in favor.

MOTION CARRIES.