

**ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES COMMITTEE  
SPECIAL MEETING  
October 12, 2004**

The Administrative Services Committee of the DeKalb County Board met Tuesday, October 12, 2004 at 6:30 p.m. at the DeKalb County Government Administration Building Conference Room East. Chairperson Sue Leifheit called the meeting to order. Mr. Stephen Faivre, Mr. Jeff Metzger, Mr. Dennis Sands, Mr. Roger Steimel, Ms. Ruth Anne Tobias, Mr. Frank Van Buer, Mr. Joseph Wiegand and Mr. John A. Wilson were present. Also present were Ms. Marlene Allen, Ms. Joan Berkes-Hanson, Mr. Ray Bockman, Mr. Ken Campbell, Ms. Eileen Dubin, Ms. Julia Fauci, Ms. Julia Fullerton, Ms. Karen Grush, Mr. Gary Hanson, Deputy Sheriff Kevin Hickey, Deputy John Holiday, Mr. Ken Johnson, Ms. Pat LaVigne, Mr. Steven Kuhn, Mr. Paul Miller, Mr. Greg Millburg, Mr. Robert Rosemier, Sheriff Roger Scott, Mr. Steven Slack, Ms. Margaret Whitwell.

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

**Mr. Faivre moved, seconded by Mr. Wilson to approve the agenda.  
Motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.**

**FY 2005 BUDGET:**

Chairperson Leifheit called on Mr. Hanson who was absent from last week's meeting to answer a few lingering questions. He distributed a revenue budget sheet (and is attached to these minutes as Appendage #1) to review and noted the corrections in the 6 Months Actual column. There was a posting error between 3311 and 3321. The Total Revenue of \$11,062,100 didn't change based on historical trends and things he sees changing. Mr. Wiegand asked about sales tax revenues and if the 6 months included Christmas retail season. Mr. Hanson stated that he uses other sources and that this is cash actuals and there is always a 2 to 3 month lag from the state for getting funds. Mr. Wiegand asked if the county should be at the 9 month actual which would include the Christmas retail. Mr. Hanson agreed and reported that more stores will be added which would produce some major sources of revenue.

***Mr. Faivre moved to take the motion from last week off the table and Mr. Steimel seconded to reopen the motion. The motion from last week read "To restore all of the appeals as presented and to balance the budget by bringing back the G.I.S. Fee Increase up to \$14.00 and the Law Library Fee Increase back up to \$13.00. Motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.***

Chairman Leifheit asked about the money earmarked for parking lots and instead using the capital monies to pay for the salaries. Mr. Hanson explained that the budget has two different types of capital (Operating Capital and Major Capital/One Time/Long Useful Life). Operating Capital are things departments use each year i.e. computers, filing cabinet, desks, chairs, etc. and is in the operating budget and operating revenues are to pay for them. Asset Replacement Fund isn't a new fund but a new fund name which used to be part of the Special Projects. Because the county is getting more of those type of funds and Mr. Hanson feels they are a long term threat to the county finances so he lifted that part out. The Major Capital uses one time revenue sources. An example is the Special Projects Fund which gets it's money from General Fund balance. Another type of Capital Fund results from the Bond Proceeds Fund. Interest earned on it is about \$280,000. Once used, it will be gone and that is why it has been looked at to pay for a new parking lot. The money was not given for new positions because the money would not be there the next year to fund the position plus there wouldn't be any money to build a parking lot in the future.

Mr. Sands asked Mr. Hanson, "What if we only could charge a fee that could be justified?" Mr. Hanson stated that the county could justify the entire \$11.00 increase (\$14.00 total fee). There is no profit built into the fee and by law the county can only raise the fee to the amount that will cover the cost and must be verifiable.

Mr. Van Buer stated that the issue is, who is it being charged to? He said he heard that it is being charged to those who record documents. But the cost that were generated to come up with the fee includes all the costs of GIS providing services to all departments in the county, and all citizens in the county and so it's not really a fee. Mr. Hanson stated it was a fee, maybe not a user fee, but a fee that relates to the type of service being provided. He asked Ms. Berkes-Hanson to expand on this position.

She stated that after talking with several different people, she concluded that it was a reasonable fee to apply to recorded documents. She explained that G.I.S. is a map and database that talk to each other. The County's G.I.S. does not contain a line, nor a data element that is not necessary for a county department. There has never been anything created for anything that is not used internally. However, this information is of interest or value to others. The information exists to fill the county's need but is of interest to any outside user. When a user finds a use for that database, they will be charged for it just as G.I.S. charges outside agencies such as the engineering firm for the Town of Cortland. What causes G.I.S. map to change is most often, the recording of the document. The recording of a document prompts work on G.I.S.

Mr. Wiegand asked to hear more about the possibility of a future jail referendum. He asked if the county was not in that plan looking at a substantial expansion of parking spaces within that funded mechanism. Also, he wanted to hear about the Economic Opportunity Fund. He stated that he feels we are on a time frame to aggressively pursue the expanse of a 100<sup>th</sup> year footprint. Mr. Hanson stated that if the referendum comes up again and referendum passes we could use the money to build parking lots which are needed today. He stated that it is an option but is not on an immediate horizon.

Mr. Hanson also stated that the Opportunity Fund (\$825,000 a year) is another funding option. He stated that when looking at this money you look at what's coming on the horizon and then decide if you want to use the funds now but then possibly precluding some other options later. Opportunity means investment and feels strongly that cash in reserve creates opportunity. He feels that a small fee increase is worth leaving opportunities out there for what might come up. Some might be worth millions of dollars and he doesn't want to take away that chance at this point.

Mr. Wiegand asked when the agreement with the City of DeKalb expired. Mr. Hanson reported that 30 years remain for Walmart, Lowes, OfficeMax and 40 years left for Kohls, Best Buy, and somewhere between those years for Michael's, Old Navy and the westside stores. Mr. Wiegand stated that these funds won't be here in the future but it is a long way off. Mr. Hanson stated that as he looks ahead, he feels that there are some costs out there that are going to be harder to respond to than the current issue here. The continual increase in jail prisoners without a jail and the county will have to do something with these people which will be a large expenditure. Also, juvenile detention is another area of concern. Changes in judiciary could end up sending them back to residential treatment facilities resulting in astronomical costs per child. He feels that revenue is needed for when the big spike expenditures come that can't be controlled. He wouldn't consider the expenses this year of the personnel costs as a spike. The alternative of this fee increase is a better, safer way from our financial position to address that need.

Mr. Wiegand asked if the Economic Opportunity Fund could be capitalized so that the county could have a substantial fund with which to make a large capital investment that might deal with some of the foreseen issues. Mr. Bockman stated we are nowhere near our borrowing power. Mr. Wiegand asked if we could borrow \$12-15 million (projected jail referendum) off the Economic Opportunity Fund Revenues alone. Mr. Hanson stated that you would need 125% of whatever revenues but it would have a debt payment of somewhere around \$1 million per year. The cornerstone of the referendum however, was that it had a tremendous amount of operating expenses in it and would not have the bonding capacity to pay the operating expenses and pay off the debt on the building.

Mr. Metzger used the Review of Budget Appeals handout (and is attached to these minutes as Appendage #2) to ask what the consequences would be if D,E,F & G were cut. Mr. Hanson stated that fairness was the basis of the appeals for D & E. The Health Department (F) has been called upon from Terrorism to West Nile Virus and funds are needed to do it. Planning Department (G) working with growth, development and planning with their expertise warrants this re-organization. He feels that the county will be better, and more responsible if they are done.

Mr. Metzger asked Mr. Miller what he would be better able to do with the additional \$30,000 a year. He stated the reason of fairness of his staff with demands that have been going on for years and should be rectified. Staffing is an issue. The office needs people out and people in the office. If someone is out sick, they are in trouble. There are more and more demands being put on planning services, questions being asked all 8 hours of everyday for staff involvement. He stated, that the Regional Planning Commission had begun to pay off with small communities who are being approached daily with growth and

struggles to deal with them.

Mr. Van Buer stated he was concerned about the motion on the table and that it is being tied to activities that are very high priorities and we've tied it to a revenue device. He liked the explanation and is a fan of G.I.S. but he has a difficult time with a fee that identifies a particular group of people to pay for a service that everyone enjoys. He blames himself for not raising questions earlier. He doesn't like it that it now comes down to the 11<sup>th</sup> hour and to have positions that are very important not be funded. He stated that they never really looked collectively at the budget and feels the process is fragmented. He stated he knows that he can go through the book and all the committee meetings but he doesn't and most of people don't go to all of the meetings. He stated that maybe not this year but they have to have a way that the priorities get taken care of first. He stated that if the Legislature suggests a way to get revenue, we don't have to do it. He added, that if the Legislature makes a mistake why should we make a mistake.

Chairman Leifheit said that G.I.S. has been funded by real estate taxes. We have the opportunity to fund G.I.S. with a fee, but we are not reducing the real estate taxes. She stated that she did not like the way the Legislature acted and will vote no. Mr. Faivre stated that she brought up a good point that the increase and the fee is not offsetting the tax but the strategy of the board needs to be communicated to the staff ahead of the presentation of the budget. He stated that as Frank said, he doesn't have time to know all the nuances of what happens in each of the departments and it's not fair to now go and take this or that out. If we separate them we must find something other than the fee increase to take out of the budget in order to fund these items that we are asking to put back in. Ms. Leifheit stated that we are not lowering property taxes when we are increasing the fee. Mr. Bockman stated that we are increasing services. He stated that the county should feel good it is getting 2 policemen, 1 prosecuting attorney, and 1 defense attorney without a property tax increase vs. feeling bad that GIS is going to be funded with a fee.

Mr. Wiegand said that if this motion fails he would make a motion to consider funding all of the appeals with the economic opportunity fund for the next fiscal year.

The Chair called for a vote, first re-stating the motion.

**Mr. Steve Faivre moved, seconded by Ms. Tobias to restore all of the appeals as presented and to balance the budget by bringing back the GIS Fee Increase from \$3.00 to \$14.00 and the Law Library Fee Increase back up from \$10.00 to \$13.00. Motion carried by a roll call vote of 5 votes yes and 4 votes no. Faivre Y, Metzger N, Sands Y, Steimel Y, Tobias Y, Van Buer N, Wilson Y, Wiegand N Leifheit N.**

**Mr. Faivre moved to send the budget to the full county board, seconded by Ms. Tobias. Motion carried by a voice vote of 5 votes yes, and 4 votes no. Faivre Y, Metzger N, Sands Y, Steimel Y, Tobias Y, Van Buer N, Wilson Y, Wiegand N Leifheit N.**

Mr. Wiegand stated he would be offering an amendment that will be the language he alluded to as a substitute for how this might be funded at the county board meeting.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. Wilson praised the foresight of the county administrator's to sell the county farm to have revenues giving the county many services. He wondered where the county would be without the sales tax income. Many agreed that this budget wasn't simple. Chairman Leifheit suggested that a special meeting after the budget recommendations are distributed to fully examine where and how things are funded. Mr. Van Buer stated that perhaps a new subcommittee could be formed. Mr. Bockman and Mr. Hanson said they would help getting something started. Mr. Wiegand thanked everyone for their time and thanked the Chair for her leadership.

**Mr. Faivre moved, seconded by Mr. Wiegand to adjourn at 7:50 pm.  
Motion carried unanimously by a voice vote.**

Respectfully submitted,

---

Sue Leifheit, Chairman

---

Lisa K. Sanderson  
Finance Secretary