



**Rock
Island
County**

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

Finance and Personnel Committee

May 14th 2019 8:30 AM

The Finance and Personnel Committee of the Rock Island County Board will meet at the above date and time in the Conference Room of the Administration Office on the second floor of the County Building, 1504 Third Avenue, Rock Island, IL. Minutes as follows:

1. Call to order and roll call

Members present: D. Cremeens, S. Noyd, L. Moreno, D. Johnston,

Members absent: K. Swanson

Others present: J. Snider, C. Przybyla, L. Ewert,

Dr. R. Simmer arrived late at 8:32 AM

2. Public comment- none at this time

3. Approval of the minutes from the April 9th 2019 meeting

Motion to approve: A. Normoyle

2nd: K. Maranda

4. Reports to the Committee

L. Ewert; Friday May 3rd we mailed 62741 tax statements with total tax collectable \$258.6 million dollars. 13 percent stays at County level tax statements. We have new pies on how much money stays at the County level and how much goes to taxing bodies.

First installment is June 5th. First tax distribution is set for June 20th. Stressful times until the first distribution; Trying to balance and keep accounts are able to make it to that first installment.

General Fund is not in real good shape either. At this time we can't afford to carry any balances; We do have a TAW in place. IMRF did have to borrow \$231,000 internally from working cash; Going into next week we have payroll and vouchers. Trying to get enough money to pay out for that.

Hope Creek, as you know, they are in turmoil; currently on the checkbook end -\$6030. We are waiting to get \$15,000 because they owe payroll \$15,000 because they were short making last Friday's payroll. At the end of the month their bonds are due but I was saving some of their available credit to pay those bonds. We're looking forward to that first distribution. I haven't set up a schedule to pay back loans; will look when the first installment comes in simply because I don't want to have to pay it back and then borrow it again. Trying to get money paid to outstanding vendors.

J. Snider: My monthly report was sent out last Friday. If you have questions, let me know. I reported at GHA that the MPA report was sent out 85 pages; very concise a lot of good objective data. The disappointing thing we found out late Friday the representative from MPA had a family medical emergency so we are no able to go to Committee as a Whole to discuss the report; I also have a summary report on top of that ready to go on the MPA report. We may

have to delay until next month's Committee of a Whole if Mr. Gima is available. The primary reason I'm recommending that is the issue is really cash flow. Louisa illustrates it is dire. Most of you read the article; noted in the MPA report it shows short term debt at \$3.8 million. It was reported I said it was 5.3 million. It was not because we came up with 1.4 It was when it came down to the final report with MPA because decided to not include the tax anticipation warrants which is about 1.4 million. The tax anticipation warrants will be served once property taxes come in. The \$3.8 is actually debt that we cannot serve.

L. Moreno: I thought we needed to have action by this month. Louisa, wasn't time of the essence?

L. Ewert: In my opinion yes. In my opinion, I also thought you shouldn't go out for the MPA audit.

S. Noyd: We paid them all this money and there's only one person who can come to us and give us a report? We're right down to the wire and they drop a bomb on us; I understand things happen, but we spent a lot of money on this, they don't have anyone available to give us this report?

J. Snider: The person who was available is unavailable.

S. Noyd: He's the only person in the company?

J. Snider: Yes. I'll take it on me. I felt like it was important the Board has an objective perspective.

L. Moreno: Is there anything we can do; have a special meeting to still have action on it a week from tomorrow?

J. Snider: No. That's just the reality.

S. Noyd: It's just funny there's no one in the entire agency, system who can give us this report?

J. Snider: He's the specialist who does these reports for the firm.

D. Johnston: Did we learn anything that we already didn't know?

J. Snider: Sure. Its 85 pages. You can read into what you want. Several aspects those are critical to dealing with the facts that it's been mismanaged and micromanaged over the years. That's the reality. Its going to take some significant discussions with ASCME to have a possible turn around. We're competing against the private sector. Pension costs, step increases, we have 250 call outs a month. How do you operate 24/7 when someone takes a sick day? And a staff with agency costs. The shortage of nurses and bills in the house that nurses mandated at certain staffing levels. They want to fine nursing homes for not having a certain level of staffing. The most drastic one is the demographic of nurses. Over fifty percent of nurses working today are 55 and over.

S. Noyd: Is that where our costs are going?

J. Snider: Agency primarily is RNs, CNAs and LPNs.

R. Simmer: They're not paid to scale out there anyway.

J. Snider: They're underpaid. We have staffing, overstaffing issues in certain areas. To address those we have to do it contractually. I hear your frustration and I respect it. There's no one more frustrated than I. There's somethings you can't control.

R. Brunk: In Jim and I's conversations one of the things I asked was is there anyone else with that firm who can dive into this information and give us a clear picture, explanation to the depth we need and there is not. We'll work to get this gentleman in here as soon as we can. In the

meantime it gives everyone an opportunity to go through it and highlight areas you have questions on. Submit questions to Jim and maybe he can forward them to the gentleman from MPA and get some answers ahead of the presentation.

5. Consider IL/IA P25 Communication Project Intergovernmental Agreement

Motion to approve; K. Maranda

2nd. A. Normoyle

Voice vote

Motion carried

D. Johnston: Rock Island currently collects all the money for this; what is the cost to Rock Island County

D. Hart: Rock Island's portion is about \$800,000 infrastructure equipment; end user equipment is years 2-10 \$650,000 ongoing maintenance covered in our normal budget. \$55,000 a year annual ongoing radio maintenance; That would supplement that. Our total cost for a ten year project is about 2.7 million. Up front cost would be paid rather quickly within 24-30 month time is about 2 million dollars. There is a cost schedule in the IGA, how it will be paid out; mostly for physical equipment; new portables, mobiles, correctional officers. The other is actual physical cost of population we serve for tower in

A. Normoyle: So it's based on population?

D. Hart: City of Moline will approve it the same night we will. There are six core agencies Us and City of Moline. It already went to committee of the whole.

D. Johnston: Are these two separate agreements?

K. Swet: One with Scott County and one with Illinois entities.

D. Hart: System has to be up and functioning on the IL and Iowa side.

D. Hart: Scott County is buying more radios.

K. Swet: They also have higher infrastructure costs. The bulk

R. Simmer: Have we ever looked further into combining our dispatching services?

K. Swet: Disrespectfully, that's a completely separate system. These are the radios that people use to call 911. That isn't related to what is on the agenda. This doesn't have anything to do with

K. Swet: This system we're building is not dispatching. 911 call centers are not affected by any way.

D. Hart: This doesn't affect 911. We already have a center .We are only buying That has nothing to do with Rock Island County having a separate dispatching center.

K. Swet: The example of the bank robbery all the agencies couldn't talk to one another; this does solve that problem. This doesn't have to do with QCOM or changes. I think there's a misunderstanding in the systems.

6. Consider delinquent tax resolutions

Motion to approve: K. Maranda

2nd: D. Cremeens

Voice vote

Motion carried

7. Request for IMRF benefit protection

J. Snider: These are standard IMRF documents; employee nearing retirement tow short periods of time. IMRF allows employees to purchase time they have not already earned if they make a contribution and the County has to make a contribution. I'm not sure if it has come to the board level before, has to be certified by the clerk. There is a pension cost but not a large one. It's the same person just two different times. We have a past practice where we allowed this.

D. Johnston: I don't remember this coming before the board but I remember people doing this. It was never approved by the board?

J. Snider: I don't know. Obviously there are local governments that don't allow any of this.

D. Johnston: This individual was on a pension plan before he was vested; could he buy that?

J. Snider: This person took FMLA and didn't use their time. Trying to buy back their time. It's not a lot of money. Main concern was what is our practice, or if it's been approved. I felt it was my responsibility you know and board approves.

R. Simmer; Couple concerns; If we're going to start voting for this, there's no past practice just what was done without our approval . Have they met all requirments for retirement?

Already vested and have a few months left.

J. Snider: I can't say for sure its never had board approval. My experience is you do follow past practice; someone signed off on this. My take is we set the precedent. If you want a legal opinion we can get that.

D. Cremeens: I don't think we should have to pay for something we didn't get service for.

A. Normoyle: There are some costs to if you can't keep people. Is it worth \$500. This happened almost 20 years ago. I am more concerned going forward. I have no interest in trying to change that. Is it worth \$300?

J. Snider: I can seek out an opinion from civil. If that's the case you've already set the precedent.

Motion to approve: 3 Yes 4 No

Item tabled for further consideration.

Motion to send to civil for further information

R. Simmer

2nd: A. Normoyle

Motion carried

J. Snider: were able to buy previous years; this is different. Not being lawyer myself, We're trying to deal with the collateral damage of allowing things.

A. Normoyle: How would we move forward putting this to a discussion so in the future we're doing this intentionally?

IMRF that basically were able to buy back time. Yes you have the point that this has occurred. I can't find specifically.. Don is saying approved by the board. That creates another level of practice.

J. Snider: Whoever would say board approved in 2019; we're bound to that. You can say that

R. Simmer: I'd like to send it to legal and we could make them pay that portion. I don't see us being responsible. Why would it be ours to buy back their time?

D. Johnston: It's the contract with IMRF.

J. Snider: Local governments have said no. Past practice weighs heavily on future decisions. My experience local governments sign off on this type of things.

L. Moreno: How soon is this person looking at retiring?

J. Snider: I would have to check that.

We can send go through all the minutes to see if the board has approved it.

D. Cremeens: How much time are we looking at?

L. Moreno: We can withdraw and motion to table this pending language and civil.

8. Motion to approve metal culverts

Motion to approve:

9. Consider transfers of appropriation

Motion to approve K. Maranda

2nd: R. Simmer

10. Consider transfers of appropriations resolution for funds

Motion to approve D. Cremeens

2nd: R. Simmer, S. Noyd

11. Consider claims and TDs

Motion to approve K. Maranda

2nd: S. Noyd

Voice vote

Motion carried

12. Consider board member mileage per diem report

Motion to approve: R. Simmer

2nd: K. Marnada

Voice vote

Motion carried

A. Normoyle: I have a question. Its non-commuting miles that can be claimed. So, the IRS says from my house to here that is a commuting mile so I cannot claim that. If someone went to a meeting here and went to the zoo for another meeting, they'd claim the mileage from here to the zoo? But not the mileage home because that's commuting?

L. Moreno: That's the way I understand it.

D. Johnston: There has always been an argument; this is per diem. What brought it to a head was we had a chairman that was claiming it and was paid a salary. For years people were

charging. I really don't know that you can't do it. From home to here for a meeting like this. That was an argument at the time, years ago.

R. Brunk; Auditor's office looked into it. At one point years ago, standard guidelines to make sure they are aware of.

A. Normoyle; I'd like to understand what the policy is. Or what I am voting for.

D. Cremeens: I've not always claimed it, I claim it now. It was explained to me, I could claim from my home to here.

J. Snider: Coming from a background, I've never seen mileage paid like this before, I have no clue. When they sign off on it, basically they're legally bound. Anything can be made; when you start misappropriating funds, it turns into a bigger issue; it's best to self-police. In my position elected officials are not employees and should not be reimbursed for mileage.

A. Normoyle:

J. Snider: At any time the newspaper could do a FOIA request on our cellphones; could FOIA the data.

D. Simmer: If I am at work and have to come to a meeting, to and from employment. If I go from my employer to Niabi, Loud Thunder. I don't know about those coming from home.

R. Brunk: The states attorney's office looked into at one point some years ago and you might touch base with Ms. Castro if there are some standard guidelines to make sure people are aware of.

A. Normoyle: I'd like to understand the policy and they should be made aware when you join the board. I'm not arguing for or against it, I'd like to understand the policy.

R. Simmer: My accountant told me if I am at work and come to discussion or if I go from my employer ; myself, can't charge to your house.

L. Moreno: We could ask the chair to look into that and I would help, Richard.

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

14. Adjourn

Motion: K. Maranda

2nd: D. Cremeens