

LIVINGSTON COUNTY BOARD
FINANCE COMMITTEE
MINUTES OF MAY 8th, 2013

Committee Chair Tim Shafer called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. in the committee meeting room within the Livingston County Historic Courthouse.

Present: Shafer, Bullard, Campbell, Cohlman (left at 7:00 p.m.), Runyon, Vietti,

Absent:

Also Present: Tom Blakeman, Seth Uphoff, Randy Yedinak, Alina Hartley, June Slagel,
Linda Daniels

Shafer requested that agenda be re-ordered to switch items a and b. Shafer then called for any additional changes to the agenda with none being requested. *Motion by Runyon, second by Vietti to approve the agenda as presented.* **MOTION CARRIED WITH ALL AYES.**

The Committee reviewed the minutes of the April 3, 2013 meeting. *Motion by Runyon, second Campbell to approve the minutes of the April 3, 2013 meeting as presented.* **MOTION CARRIED WITH ALL AYES.**

Contract Counsel – William Bertram – Tom Blakeman stated that he was contacted on April 24th by States Attorney Seth Uphoff who requested he meet with various individuals in an attempt to work out an agreement in regards to the Bertram contract. Blakeman reported that Uphoff's concern was more about the contract arrangement, which appears to be worked out between the parties using a sample from McLean County. Blakeman stated that the other concern related to the requested increase from \$47,428 to \$58,500. Blakeman stated that it appeared that an agreement had been reached at \$57,500, but stalled when the discussion turned to the amount of reimbursement for payments made year to date. Blakeman reported that after the contract was not approved in April, Judge Bauknecht entered a court order requiring bookkeeping to pay an additional \$11,329.76 for a total of \$30,300 to Bertram, based on his hourly rate of \$100, from December 1st through April 16th. Blakeman stated that it was discovered that additional payments had been made to Bertram for the past several years. Blakeman stated that as an example for FY 2012 Bertram's contract was for \$47,428.92, however, he received a total of \$57,007.75. Blakeman stated that he was told that the contract covered one day in court, but there sometimes was a need for an extra day for which Bertram was compensated at a rate of \$100 per hour. Blakeman stated that there was an attempt to cap the amount paid, but that was not acceptable to Bertram or the judges. Blakeman stated that they did offer a contract for six days per month, but would not agree to a flat amount. Blakeman stated that the amount of the reimbursement is also in question with Bertram requesting \$7,114, compared to his calculation of \$10,744.

Runyon stated that based on these numbers the county would be better off hiring a full time public defender, which he would be in favor of pursuing. Linda Daniels reported that she spent time researching how other counties handle the assistant public defenders. Daniels stated that some have contracts, some have part time staff and some have full time staff. Daniels stated that for those that had contracts the contracts did not specify a time, but were for however long the job takes. Daniels stated that in McLean County they have two full time public defenders who handle the same types of cases as Bertram; they get paid an annual salary of 50,212 and 52,473.

Discussion took place. Committee members were not in favor of a flexible amount. Some Committee members felt that a full time staff member could be hired for less. It was felt that as the Public Defender, Randy Morgan, should be making the recommendation on whether or not to hire someone full time. Further discussion took place. Consensus of the Committee was to insist on a set cap of \$57,500 annually, an amount certain for the next two years with a 60 day cancellation clause. It was noted that cases such as sexually dangerous petitions, sexually violent petitions and post convictions would not be included in the cap as they are not cases generally handled by the Public Defenders office.

Discover Livingston County Brochure – Hartley stated that she had received a request for the board to once again fund the Discover Livingston County brochure. Hartley stated that the board has funded this effort for the last two years. Hartley stated that the first year additional funds were allocated to the GLCEDC to cover the cost of the project. The second year the GLCEDC was asked to pay for the project out of the original \$500,000 grant, which they did, however they sent a letter to the board office stating that they do not wish to use those funds for this purpose going forward. Hartley noted that at one time supporting this effort was one of the board’s annual goals. Discussion took place. Consensus of the Committee was to deny the request.

Regional Office of Education Intergovernmental Agreement – Hartley stated that as part of the States effort to reduce the number of Regional Offices of Education they requested that boards of regions voluntarily consolidate. Hartley stated that it is being proposed that we add Logan County to what was formally comprised of DeWitt, Livingston and McLean. Hartley stated that this will reduce Livingston County’s allocation from 17% to 12%. Hartley noted that the change will not go into effect until July 1, 2015. *Motion by Vietti, second by Campbell to recommend approval of the joint resolution and intergovernmental agreement for the Regional Office of Education.*

MOTION CARRIED ON VOICE VOTE.

University of Illinois Extension Agreement – Hartley stated that this agreement covers the levy that was previously approved as part of the FY 2013 budget. Hartley stated that this agreement does not generally require board action, but since the chairman is out of the country, there will need to be approval to authorize vice-chairman Borngasser to sign in his absence. *Motion by Vietti, second by Runyon to recommend approval of the University of Illinois Extension Agreement.* **MOTION CARRIED WITH ALL AYES.**

2014 Budget & Levy – Slagel reviewed the proposed budget calendar with the Committee. *Motion by Vietti, second by Runyon to approve the FY 2014 Budget Calendar.* **MOTION CARRIED WITH ALL AYES.**

Slagel then reviewed the proposed budget guidelines with the Committee. It is requested that departments remain at the same level as last year or lower where possible. Discussion took place regarding the levies and the percentage of funds in reserves. Slagel stated that the funds that are hurting are corporate, IMRF, health, veterans and social security. Those funds with high reserves could be reduced in order to increase the levy of others. It was noted that the CPI increase used for this year is 1.7 and the new construction will range from 1-2%, which will result in a maximum levy increase of 2.7-3.7% (although it is recommended that the maximum be requested) based on PTELL. *Motion by Vietti, second by Runyon to approve the budget guidelines.* **MOTION CARRIED WITH ALL AYES.**

Approval of Bills – The Committee reviewed the bills submitted. *Motion by Vietti, second by Campbell to approve the bills.* **MOTION CARRIED WITH ALL AYES.**

Motion by Vietti, second by Campbell to adjourn. **MOTION CARRIED WITH ALL AYES.** Meeting adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

Alina Hartley
Administrative Resource Specialist