



Rock Island County
1504 Third Avenue
Rock Island, IL 61201
(309) 558-3619

Finance and Personnel Minutes
April 9th, 2019

The Finance and Personnel Committee of the Rock Island County Board met at the above date and time in the Conference Room of the Administration Office on the second floor of the County Building, 1504 Third Ave, Rock Island, IL. Chair Luis Moreno called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m. Minutes as follows:

1. Call to order and roll call

Committee members present: A. Normoyle, D. Cremeens, L. Moreno, K. Swanson, S. Noyd, R. Simmer, K. Maranda, D. Johnston

Committee Members absent: None

Others present: D. Hart, A. Van Daele, S. Alberts, J. Snider, R. Brunk, K. Swet

R. Simmer arrived late

2. Public Comments –None at this time

3. Approval of minutes from the March 2019 meeting

Motion to approve: D.Cremeens

2nd A. Normoyle

Voice Vote

Motion carried

4. Reports to Committee

S. Alberts: The Treasurer is gone; she has asked you to read her cover letter. If you have any questions I might be able to answer them.

A. VanDaele: April is also gone. I will be giving a brief summary at committee like she does. I am here if you have any questions.

D. Hart: Security checkpoint is up and running. Hopefully you found it accessible. Most board members have access cards to get in the back. We've had positive responses with employees. I think it's running pretty smooth. We've had a few issues here and there but nothing major. We appreciate everyone's compassion.

L. Moreno: Any issues with people with disabilities?

D. Hart: No. The first day or so we had some confusion as to where to go. We've been working on some signs. We've added some chairs and maybe put a bench there. Other than that it's worked out well.

R. Simmer arrived late

J. Snider: To follow on Captain Hart's statements. Thank you for everything you've done, it's been a pretty seamless transition. There have been some questions from the public about the front entrance not being ADA compliant. It doesn't meet the full technical requirements of ADA

accessibility. The back entrance technically doesn't meet the full requirements but it is more compliant-ish. If we get called on the fact on a complaint, that we address the front entrance then we'd have to use the back entrance; it wouldn't be efficient. To put an ADA entrance in the front, there'd be considerable costs in building a slope. It's a good solution now, due to budget constraints. They can safely allow people in. I reported yesterday about Hope Creek situation and finance issues late last week with the agency cost for nurses. They asked immediate payment or we wouldn't be get agency on site so we had to use the County credit card for a payment last week and one for the next week and that will get us through the month. We had a very productive week with members of Management Professional Associates on staff assessing the facility and staff. We are on track to report next month to GHA, Committee of the Whole and County Board on cost benefit analysis. There are opportunities we've defined; one of them we are working on is upping our approach to receiving clients from Unity Point. We're indicating that we're available 24/7 to receive intakes prior to just a few weeks ago we weren't doing that. We were doing that on a weekly basis. That's the nature of the business. If the hospital wants to send you intakes they want you to be able to do it right away with no delay. I think that's been a weakness.

A. Normoyle: To clarify, they were only taking people in one time a week?

J. Snider: Five days a week, no evening hours.

R. Simmer: No weekends, evening hours.

J. Snider: It's a business that we need to operate like a business. Unity Point wants to work with us. Obviously we're not in the ACO which is the network that allows us to be recognized as a placement service because the star rating isn't high enough. It's been suggested during turn around analysis that if one closed wing could be filled short term Medicare that could generate 2.5 million dollars revenue a year so we're beginning that process this week and in the next couple weeks see what kind of traction we can get with that. That's a positive.

R. Simmer: I was at coffee yesterday morning with (Tony) McCombie and Neal Anderson. I had someone call us out on door on Monday and that they weren't able to get in. They rang the bell numerous times and no one came and checked on them and weren't able to get in. I don't know if it wasn't working...

D. Hart: What we're finding out is that they're pushing the button and if someone isn't there within two seconds they're leaving by the time we walk over. We have a camera there. We're reviewing with IT, or maybe look at installing a Ring doorbell or an intercom that will say we're walking down there. We'll continue to work on that.

5. Public Safety Communication: Sheriff's Office

D. Hart: The Sheriff asked that I come over and start this process this month. In the month of May an IGA; intergovernmental agreement will come to board for approval for a project that we've been working in for the past 18 months with Scott and Rock Island County. It's to upgrade the communication platform. Forever, RI County has struggled with communications. When I went on the air this morning, I live near Hampton and I couldn't hear anything. It's beyond repair. We've been working with Scott Emergency Communications (SEC) and municipalities in Iowa and core agencies in Illinois and Quad Cities. In the month of May you'll see a presentation of the project itself, We're approaching a contract

signing in the month of June with a vendor that will build out a new communication network to support Iowa and Illinois side. It is based on population, the percentage of payment; not only corrections, law enforcement. It will substantially upgrade our communication. It's a win-win. There are areas in this County that there is no communication at all. We have individuals that have to use their personal devices or computers to make communication back to dispatch center. This infrastructure will assist in gaining access to that area. It is an expensive project but we will bring the project to the Committee of the Whole in May, make presentation at County Board and will go to be signed off on. The sheriff is a huge proponent. We had a grievance filed by the FOP for safety and communication. Kathy Swet from the States Attorney office has been working with us in developing the IGA to make sure all municipalities sign off on a similar IGA and it will be a core group of municipalities of 6 on the Illinois side; Moline, East Moline, Silvis, Rock Island, Milan and us. We will have to jointly come up with funding. This is for towers, mobiles, ect. It's a 12 tower buildout

K. Swet: This went through an RFP project this is actual Scott County is paying 60 percent and 40 percent and our own land acquisition cost. They have to buy all their land. The consultants pick the tower side and they have to work based on geography. That is a huge We had a bank robbery last week; the current system was woefully inadequate and they were in pursuit of a bank robber. This is an absolute necessity.

D. Hart: There Of the five, there would be three in a central location. There's a proposed one for Buffalo Iowa for Scott County you'd take advantage of the entire system. At the Committee of the Whole we would give a better idea of location.

D. Cremeens: 911 calls to my area, Rapids City, cell call transfer and it'd have to be transferred back in .

D. Hart: This is about portable mobile communication for law enforcement back and forth to dispatch centers. It's not uncommon to get a call transfer and unfortunately not our ability to regulate.

K. Swanson: For historical context, I want to remind tough decisions about revenue that will support this project. Recall in 2016 Public safety referendum that did not universal support from the board. When that comes back, I would hope we would have a chance to revisit that had that passed, we wouldn't be having any difficult revenue decisions because there would be a funding source. The central piece was to Improve emergency communications.

D. Cremeens: Didn't our sheriff give back \$20,000 to the county last year?

K. Swanson: That's very prudent fiscal budgeting. Largely about capital this is a communications system with roots in the 1970s. We just haven't done anything about it.

R. Simmer: I think we need to address it when we do it not just replacing this line item. That was the biggest problem. We need to be more upfront.

K Swet: I just want to hit on something Mr. Snider mentioned. He talked about certain agencies being different from Hope Creek and Hope Creek being a business. From a legal context what that means is the sheriff's office is an essential function of the County. You have to fund them. You don't have to fund Hope Creek. You have opted to fund Hope Creek. The extent that Funding things that are essential can cause some issues. Just to remind you it is a business but it also is a non-essential function of the County. The sheriff's office and need for officer safety is extremely essential and have potential in huge litigation if an officer was injured in the line of duty because he couldn't call for help or in an accident

and there wasn't radio coverage in areas of the County. Just something to think about and move forward. That is really a key element.

R. Simmer: You're absolutely right. That's something we need to consider. What is really essential? There are a few things that are not of that nature.

K. Swet: I'm not saying Hope Creek doesn't have value. Just to remind you when looking at dollars and cents you have essential function and non-essential functions and you're statutorily mandated to fund your essential functions first.

6. Consider Approval of Post-Issuance Tax Compliance Report

Motion to approve: K. Maranda

2nd K. Swanson

Voice vote

Motion carried

7. Consider Agreement between University of Illinois Extension and Rock Island County

Motion to approve: K. Maranda

2nd K. Swanson

Voice Vote

Motion Carried

8. Consider Transfer of Appropriations

Motion to approve: K. Swanson

2nd A. Normoyle

Voice vote

Motion carried

9. Consider appropriation resolution for funds

Motion to approve: K. Maranda

2nd. K. Swanson, S. Noyd

Voice Vote

Motion carried

10. Consider Claims and TDs.

Motion to approve: R. Simmer

2nd: K. Maranda

Voice Vote

Motion carried

11. Consider Board Member per diem/mileage report

Motion to approve: R. Simmer

2nd: D. Cremeens, K. Swanson

Voice Vote

Motion carried

12. Committee member opportunity for brief comment (no decisions will be made)

K. Swanson: Briefly, I wanted to thank our administrator, Mr. Snider coverage from committee meeting he did mention part of the over \$350,000 in arrears to the employee health benefit fund. This is kind of an outlier. Also a reminder tomorrow is the wellness fair to the QCCA. That's an employee benefit of the health insurance policy.

R. Simmer: I will be at the wellness fair tomorrow as a vendor. I give away adjustments. With Hope Creek I got a call after the paper came out. We've been having to fund this on the backside for years. It's not any surprise it's not any better. Hopefully we can establish better relationships with Unity Point. Unfortunately those have been damaged in the past. I think there's money to be made there. I am looking forward to the report soon.

K. Maranda: Who took Patty's job?

J. Snider: Patty came back.

K. Maranda: I just wondered who took over the billing.

J. Snider: Just a report on the Courthouse. The Plaintiff's against County and PBC filed for a stay with the appellate court and was awarded with a bond \$337,000 due Thursday. We'll know if they did put that bond up. If they did it's anticipated that it'd be several months before it was considered by the appellate court. There'd be no gap between the appellate court decision and a Supreme Court appeal if we won at that level.

D. Johnston: What happens if they win?

J. Snider: From what I understand, the legal minds feel like, technically they're in no man's land in justifying the authority to stop from demolishing it. The board has the authority, PBC; Legally, there is no stand. Landmarks Illinois is a non-for-profit. They want to protect the historical buildings and in the business of raising money. Part of the process is pointing out that this historical building is not being saved. It's gone beyond what we have. Its' taken on a life of its own

D. Johnston: So basically it could be "don't demolish it, but figure out what to do with it? But it will stand there?"

J. Snider: They'd like it to be repurposed but to date, so far, Mr. Lemmon's proposal federal tax credit. There has been no private+ investment. Our argument is the safety aspect of being close to the courthouse. From an economic develop view should the county be in the business of subsidizing private development? Where do you stop with abandoned buildings in this city? There are a lot of historical type buildings that could be saved. This has become a political and media football. It's unfortunate we have to sit and watch it because we have serious financial issues as we know.

R. Brunk: Based on conversations with attorneys and such; this is like no man's land. Everyone is watching this case because it's never been done before; basically its one step at a time. No one, not even the attorneys are sure where this could go depending on a judge's ruling. As far as different private proposals, I've been accused of living in fairy tale land when I talk about risks to the current court facility and the people in that building. About two months ago the Champaign County Courthouse was evacuated because of a bomb threat against a judge. It wasn't a fluke. Whatever the judge received in the mail, the Sheriff's department responded with a dog alerted on vehicle. They called in another dog from another jurisdiction and that dog alerted on the vehicle. I searched for additional information on it,

but the matter is this is Champaign County Illinois. It's the world we live in. That concern is legitimate. The board's long term goal is to eventually consolidate facilities downtown. We've got a piece of property that's been in the County's hands since the 1840s. If we were to give up that property we would give up a huge opportunity to for county tax payers in the long run. It may not happen in the next 2 or 5 years. As far as putting that property back on the tax roll, this board has been accused for years of being short sighted and not looking at the big picture. I still believe we're on the right course.

13. Adjourned