

**PROCEEDINGS  
OF THE  
MACON COUNTY BOARD**

**MAY 09, 2013**

**Jay A. Dunn  
Chairman**

**Stephen M. Bean  
Clerk**

The Chairman called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. with the Sheriff and State's Attorney present.

The Roll Call showed all members present with the exception of Mr. Mattingley.

Mrs. Taylor led the members in prayer.

All led in the Pledge of Allegiance.

#### **A. PROCLAMATION**

Mrs. Taylor presented a proclamation recognizing May 6-10, 2013 as Small Business and Entrepreneur Week.

#### **B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE APRIL 11, 2013 MEETING**

##### **MOTION**

Mr. Potts moved, seconded by Mr. Smith to approve the minutes of the April 11, 2013 meeting.

There were no questions or comments from the board floor.

##### **ROLL CALL.**

Ayes: Ashby, Baxter, Bird, Cox, Dawson, Drobisch, Dudley, Dunn, Greenfield, Hogan, Jacobs, Little, Meachum, Minich, Oliver, Potts, Smith, Taylor, Williams, Zimmerman

Nays: (None)

**AYES = 20**

**NAYS = 0**

##### **MOTION CARRIED.**

There were no zoning or subdivisions submitted at the meeting.

#### **C. CORRESPONDENCE**

An e-mail from AT&T U-verse regarding possible programming changes

A letter from Comcast regarding Speed Dial Position Change

A Notice of Application for Permit to Manage Waste from the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency for Advanced Disposal Services Valley View Landfill addressing condition IX.3 of the permit.

A Notice of Application for Permit to Manage Waste from the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency for Advanced Disposal Services Valley View Landfill regarding groundwater monitoring well installation and perimeter landfill gas probe installation and sealing.

A letter from Klingner & Associates P.C. regarding a permit request for renewal of the existing compost permit for the Macon County Composting Facility

Two notices from Ameren Illinois regarding tree trimming that will be done in the Decatur and Maroa areas in the near future.

## **REPORTS**

Sheriff's Report – April 2013

Coroner's Report – March 2013

Treasurer Fund & Investment Report – April 2013

Tax Collector Bank Report – April 2013

Auditor's Report – April 2013

## **MOTION**

Mr. Smith moved, seconded by Mr. Potts to approve the Correspondence and Reports and that they be placed on file by prior roll call vote.

There were no questions or comments from the board floor.

## **MOTION CARRIED.**

### **1. CLAIMS**

## **MOTION**

Mrs. Cox moved, seconded by Mr. Minich to approve the claims that have already been paid by prior roll call vote.

There were no questions or comments from the board floor.

## **MOTION CARRIED.**

### **D. APPOINTMENTS**

2. Resolution G-3872-5-13 – Appointment to the Argenta Sanitary District Board of Trustees

Corwin Bruce White, 580 North St., Argenta, IL 62501  
Term Expires: 1<sup>st</sup> Monday, May 2015

**MOTION**

Mr. Dunn moved, seconded by Mr. Oliver to approve Resolution G-3872-5-13 by prior roll call vote.

There were no questions or comments from the board floor.

**MOTION CARRIED.**

3. Resolution G-3873-5-13 – Re-Appointment to the Macon County Merit Commission

Fred Closen, 6835 W. Rock Springs Rd., Decatur, IL 62521  
Term Expires: May 31, 2019

**MOTION**

Mr. Dunn moved, seconded by Mr. Potts to approve Resolution G-3873-5-13 by prior roll call vote.

There were no questions or comments from the board floor.

**MOTION CARRIED.**

4. Resolution G-3874-5-13 – Re-Appointment and Appointment to the Macon County Board of Review

Joe McGlaughlin, 1372 W. Sunset Ave., Decatur, IL 62522  
Daysa Miller, 707 W. William St., Decatur, IL 62522  
Terms Expire: May 31, 2015

**MOTION**

Mr. Dunn moved, seconded by Mr. Dudley to approve Resolution G-3874-5-13.

**QUESTION:**

Mrs. Little: Mrs. Little asked if it is possible for a person to be appointed to this board and then complete the certification by June 1<sup>st</sup>. She said that used to be the way it was and she wondered if that had been changed, or if that was still in place.

Mike Baggett: Mr. Baggett said he and Josh had an opportunity to discuss this before the meeting began tonight. We do not know when the Department of Revenue gives the

exam for this; but by statute a person has to take the exam, pass the exam and be qualified before they may serve on a Board of Review.

Mrs. Little: Mrs. Little asked if he knows when they changed that.

Mr. Baggett: Mr. Baggett said the statute was amended by Public Act 96122 effective January 1, 2010. He doesn't think they could have someone who isn't currently qualified by the Department of Revenue, ready by June 1<sup>st</sup> of this year.

Mr. Ashby: Mr. Ashby asked if they can take the qualification exam on-line.

Mr. Baggett: Mr. Baggett did not know.

Mrs. Little: Mrs. Little asked that they address these two appointments individually.

Mr. Tanner: Mr. Tanner said the exam has to be given and proctored by Department of Revenue staff, so it can't be taken on-line.

Mr. Ashby: Mr. Ashby asked if it has to be taken in Springfield.

Mr. Tanner: Mr. Tanner said not in Springfield. Any county can host it, but the Department of Revenue comes down and proctors the exam and then grades the exam.

Mr. Ashby: Mr. Ashby asked if it is possible for them to elect one person now and they take the exam before they take office.

Mr. Baggett: Mr. Baggett said if he understood, they wouldn't appoint this person until after the exam?

Mr. Ashby: Mr. Ashby said no. We would appoint this person now, contingent upon them passing the exam.

Mr. Bean: Mr. Bean didn't think they could do that because the names need to be on the certified list.

Mr. Baggett: Mr. Baggett said the person who takes office, in order to serve on the Board of Review has to have passed that exam, and has to be qualified by the Department of Revenue. As to whether they can be appointed and not serve until after the examination, he does not know the statute. The exact language of the statute is that no person may serve on the Board of Review who has not passed an examination prepared and administered by the Department of Revenue to determine his or her competence to hold that office.

Mr. Ashby: Mr. Ashby said his understanding then is that we could assign or pass somebody for the Board of Review and they would later have to pass the test before they have to take office. He asked if that is correct.

Mr. Baggett: Mr. Baggett said he does not have enough information to be able to answer that. He hasn't done case law research. He is not sure there has been a case on this. He hasn't done research on the case law to determine if that issue has ever come up before. He simply knows that the statute does not allow anyone to serve on a Board of Review. He can't answer whether it is permissible for the board to appoint someone, and then that person not be allowed to serve until the qualification is attained.

Mr. Ashby: Mr. Ashby said from his experience in the past, a person has been appointed to the Board of Review and then later passed the test. Unless there is legislation that excepted that, we could vote for somebody to be appointed to the Board of Review and later they pass the test. He asked Mr. Baggett to research that for the board.

Mr. Baggett: Mr. Baggett said he would do that.

Mr. Dunn: Mr. Dunn said in going back to Mrs. Little's question, he is not sure exactly how we can break this resolution up since it covers two appointments.

### **MOTION TO AMEND**

Mrs. Little moved, seconded by Mr. Hogan to amend Resolution G-3874-5-13 so it would state to reappoint Joe McGlaughlin of 1372 W. Sunset, Decatur, IL 62522.

### **ROLL CALL.**

Ayes: Ashby, Bird, Cox, Drobisch, Greenfield, Hogan, Jacobs, Little, Williams, Zimmerman

Nays: Baxter, Dawson, Dudley, Dunn, Meachum, Minich, Oliver, Potts, Smith, Taylor

**AYES = 10**

**NAYS = 10**

### **MOTION FAILED. (TO AMEND RES. G-3874-5-13)**

### **QUESTION:**

Mrs. Little: Mrs. Little said she had a question before they voted. She asked if this resolution dies as it is written, because she knows in zoning certain things cannot be brought up again in the following month, could Mr. McGlaughlin be brought up for reappointment.

Mr. Dunn: Mr. Dunn said if it fails we will have two openings so he assumes it will be brought back until the positions do get filled.

### **ROLL CALL.**

Ayes: Baxter, Dawson, Dudley, Dunn, Meachum, Minich, Oliver, Potts, Smith, Taylor

Nays: Ashby, Bird, Cox, Drobisch, Greenfield, Hogan, Jacobs, Little, Williams, Zimmerman

**AYES = 10**

**NAYS = 10**

**MOTION FAILED. (RES. G-3874-5-13)**

**COMMENT:**

Mr. Dunn: Mr. Dunn said we still have two openings on the Board of Review.

Mr. Oliver: Mr. Oliver asked what this does for the taxpayers as far as the Board of Review's work being done. Does this put the taxpayers...?

Mr. Dunn: Mr. Dunn said Mr. Oliver would have to ask the only board member on the Board of Review. He doesn't think she is here.

Mr. Tanner: Mr. Tanner said as of June 1<sup>st</sup> we won't be able to conduct any Board of Review action. They won't be able to issue any Certificate of Errors. There will be no Board of Review action.

Mr. Hogan: Mr. Hogan asked if we could appoint Joe McGlaughlin tonight.

Mr. Dunn: Mr. Dunn said no; we have already addressed that resolution.

5. Resolution G-3875-5-13 – Appointments to the Macon County Zoning Board of Appeals

Barbara C. Lamont, 121 E. Burgess, Oreana, IL 62554  
Edward H. Leonard, 510 S. Illinois St., Niantic, IL 62551  
Terms Expire: May 31, 2018

**MOTION**

Mr. Dunn moved, seconded by Mr. Williams to approve Resolution G-3875-5-13.

There were no questions or comments from the board floor.

**ROLL CALL.**

Ayes: Ashby, Baxter, Bird, Cox, Dawson, Drobisch, Dudley, Dunn, Greenfield, Hogan, Jacobs, Little, Meachum, Minich, Oliver, Potts, Smith, Taylor, Williams, Zimmerman

Nays: (None)

**AYES = 20**

**NAYS = 0**

**MOTION CARRIED.**

6. Resolution G-3876-5-13 – Appointment to the Hickory Point Fire Protection District

William (Bill) Voorhees, 593 Jacobs Way, Forsyth, IL 62535

Term Expires: 1<sup>st</sup> Monday in May, 2014

**MOTION**

Mr. Dunn moved, seconded by Mr. Williams to approve Resolution G-3876-5-13 by prior roll call vote.

There were no questions or comments from the board floor.

**MOTION CARRIED.**

**E. CONSENT CALENDAR**

7. Resolution G-3877-5-13 – Executing Deeds to convey property on which taxes were delinquent

**MOTION**

Mr. Meachum moved, seconded by Mrs. Dawson to approve Resolution G-3877-5-13 by prior roll call vote.

There were no questions or comments from the board floor.

**MOTION CARRIED.**

**JUSTICE COMMITTEE**

8. Mr. Dunn presented Resolution G-3878-5-13 which is approving an increase in appropriations in the FY2013 Probation Grant Fund for Juvenile Redeploy Illinois Grant.

**MOTION**

Mr. Dunn moved, seconded by Mrs. Cox to approve Resolution G-3878-5-13 by prior roll call vote.

There were no questions or comments from the board floor.

**MOTION CARRIED.**

**EEHW COMMITTEE**

9. Mr. Dudley presented Resolution G-3879-5-13 which is approving an Intergovernmental Agreement during a disaster or extreme emergency between Long Creek Township and the County of Macon.

**MOTION**

Mr. Dudley moved, seconded by Mr. Smith to approve Resolution G-3879-5-13 by prior roll call vote.

There were no questions or comments from the board floor.

**MOTION CARRIED.**

**COMMENT:**

Mr. Dudley: Mr. Dudley did want to say this is being provided free of charge by the Township of Longcreek. He wanted to thank his colleague Mr. Greenfield.

**OPERATIONS AND PERSONNEL COMMITTEE**

10. Mrs. Cox presented Resolution G-3880-5-13 which is approving a health insurance proposal from Gallagher Benefit Services.

**MOTION**

Mrs. Cox moved, seconded by Mrs. Little to approve Resolution G-3880-5-13 by prior roll call vote.

There were no questions or comments from the board floor.

**MOTION CARRIED.**

11. Mrs. Cox presented Resolution G-3881-5-13 which is approving two year Delta Dental Insurance proposal from Gallagher Benefit Services.

**MOTION**

Mrs. Cox moved, seconded by Mr. Potts to approve Resolution G-3881-5-13 by prior roll call vote.

There were no questions or comments from the board floor.

**MOTION CARRIED.**

12. Mrs. Cox presented Resolution G-3882-5-13 which is offering expanded voluntary benefits through employee Flexible Benefits Plan.

**MOTION**

Mrs. Cox moved, seconded by Mrs. Little to approve Resolution G-3882-5-13 by prior roll call vote.

There were no questions or comments from the board floor.

**MOTION CARRIED.**

The Legislative Committee had nothing to submit at the meeting.

**FINANCE COMMITTEE**

13. Mrs. Cox presented Resolution G-3883-5-13 which is approving fee cost studies for County Clerk's Office, Recorder's Office and Sheriff's Department.

**MOTION**

Mrs. Cox moved, seconded by Mr. Williams to approve Resolution G-3883-5-13 by prior roll call vote.

**QUESTION:**

Mr. Hogan: Mr. Hogan asked who is conducting the study.

Mr. Dunn: Mr. Dunn said it is through Bellwether out of Bloomington.

Mr. Meachum: Mr. Meachum asked what the expense is on this.

Mr. Ashby: Mr. Ashby said not to exceed \$18,000.

Mr. Williams: Mr. Williams asked if this is the same group we utilized several years ago.

Mr. Dunn: Mr. Dunn said no that was Maximus.

Mr. Ashby: Mr. Ashby said that cost more than \$100,000.

Mrs. Cox: Mrs. Cox said that was all the offices.

**MOTION CARRIED.**

## **LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE**

Mrs. Little: Mrs. Little said there are several bills we have been monitoring, however the ones that are going to have the biggest impact on Macon County have either been amended amicably or are stuck in General Assembly limbo. We are still watching them because they can still show up. She thinks for the most part we are going to come out not too terribly damaged after this session.

The Negotiations Committee had nothing to submit at the meeting.

## **TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE**

14. Mr. Williams presented Resolution H-1845-5-13 which is appropriating funds for construction expenses on a bridge on CH 25 North of Argenta.

### **MOTION**

Mr. Williams moved, seconded by Mrs. Zimmerman to approve Resolution H-1845-5-13 by prior roll call vote.

There were no questions or comments from the board floor.

### **MOTION CARRIED.**

15. Mr. Williams presented Resolution H-1846-5-13 which is appropriating funds for construction expenses on the CH 30 West Reconstruction Project.

### **MOTION**

Mr. Williams moved, seconded by Mrs. Zimmerman to approve Resolution H-1846-5-13 by prior roll call vote.

### **QUESTION:**

Mrs. Cox: Mrs. Cox asked if this is what is already done on County Road 30.

Mr. Bird: Mr. Bird said it is done.

### **MOTION CARRIED.**

16. Mr. Williams presented Resolution H-1847-5-13 which is appropriating funds for construction expenses for a patching project at Progress City.

### **MOTION**

Mr. Williams moved, seconded by Mrs. Cox to approve Resolution H-1847-5-13 by prior roll call vote.

There were no questions or comments from the board floor.

**MOTION CARRIED.**

17. Mr. Williams presented Resolution H-1848-5-13 which is appropriating funds for the 2013 Annual Guardrail Weed Spraying Contract.

**MOTION**

Mr. Williams moved, seconded by Mr. Smith to approve Resolution H-1848-5-13 by prior roll call vote.

There were no questions or comments from the board floor.

**MOTION CARRIED.**

The Executive Committee had nothing to submit at the meeting.

The Siting, Rules & Ordinance Committee had nothing to submit at the meeting.

The Building Sub-Committee had nothing to submit at the meeting.

There were no citizens' remarks presented at the meeting.

**OFFICEHOLDERS' REMARKS:**

Mr. Dudley: Mr. Dudley wanted to thank the members of the Operation and Personnel Committee and anyone who had anything to do with negotiating the health insurance plan. He thinks they did a heck of job to keep the costs down. He said even when they came back with an offer, they kept fighting and got it negotiated down some more. He just wanted to thank everyone involved in that. They did a great job.

Mr. Meachum: Mr. Meachum said in regard to the proclamation, Millikin as well as small and large businesses in this community are a great asset. What Millikin does to help our businesses is a great asset to this community. He wanted to give them kudos for that.

Mr. Dunn: Mr. Dunn said he would like to make mention about the appointment that failed, to give his reasoning behind the appointment. First, you have to pass the test to be appointed. He asked the State for the list of people who passed the test and there were 129 of them. There was only 1 in Macon County and that was Daysa Miller. There was 1 in Taylorville, 1 in Mahomet, and a couple in Peoria. Most of the rest of them were up north of I 80. Daysa was our Supervisor of Assessments for a number of years. He

thinks she worked in the office before that, but wasn't 100 % sure. Mr. Dunn said when he became chairman we had some things we wanted to take care of that weren't getting taken care of in that office. The Finance Committee was her oversight committee. We asked her to do certain things. There was an issue with real estate that Tim brought to the table and we got that resolved. There were some other issues there. In fact, we froze her salary for a time. She complied with the issues and started getting her raises. She was the clerk for the Board of Review all the time that she was the Supervisor of Assessments. When she retired he appointed Josh Tanner. Josh has got some experience from the Department of Revenue. Mr. Dunn talked to him about some issues there in the office and some things he wanted to see changed. He thought Josh was capable of doing that, but he liked the idea of appointing Daysa to the Board of Review just to be there because of her experience. However, he realizes there are 3 different jobs there. There is the Supervisor of Assessments job and responsibilities. There is the clerk's responsibility, and there is the Board of Review responsibility. Fortunately, these appointments are only 2 years so you have a chance to see what people are doing, and if they are fulfilling their statutory requirements. Mr. Dunn also asked Josh to do a record going back about 8 or 10 years of all the Board of Review decisions so he had a baseline to go from. He could see trends and any red flags that might pop up on what the Board of Review might do this year compared to last year. We have those in place. It took quite a bit of research, but he put together a nice spread sheet on that. He talked to one of the Board of Review members who happened to not get appointed tonight, but he certainly would have talked to both of them about the chairmanship job. Ed Leonard who retired was the chairman so they are going to need a new chairman. He would hope it would be one of the two people that have been there for some time, rather than a new person on the board. That was kind of his reasoning behind that. Daysa Miller is the only person in Macon County at this time that has passed the test. She is also a Democrat and you have to be a Democrat to fill that spot in this particular case. He just wanted to let them know why he put that resolution together. The same resolution will probably be coming back unless he is convinced differently.

Mrs. Little: Mrs. Little said she appreciated his explanation for the appointment and she was only speaking for herself, not the other 9 who voted against it tonight. Her concern is that as Supervisor of Assessments with the quadrennials that have gone through, and things that she has actually set for some of the assessments, those may come before the Board of Review for challenging. Mrs. Little is concerned about how unbiased Daysa Miller will be if someone is challenging an assessment that she actually made. That is her concern. She did not doubt Ms. Miller's qualifications as far certified or her experience in the office at all.

Mr. Ashby: Mr. Ashby said the question here is not whether Daysa is qualified; she is very well qualified to do the job. The question is, are we eliminating other people who have a different point of view. The State's Attorney couldn't answer the question on whether they have to be qualified before being appointed, or they have to be qualified before they take office. He thinks that question needs to be answered before we make a decision on who get the Board of Review seat.

Mr. Tanner: Mr. Tanner said he had one concern and would e-mail Revenue tomorrow. If Mr. McGlaughlin is not reappointed, he doesn't have to take the test because he is a sitting Board of Review member, but if his position is vacated; he is not positive but Mr. McGlaughlin may have to retake the test. He will send off to revenue to get clarification on that. He is exempted from that because he is a sitting member, but if his position was vacated he would be effectively a new member. He will ask Revenue for an opinion on that tomorrow and then get back to all the board members as soon as he gets that.

Mrs. Cox: Mrs. Cox said the term is up June 1<sup>st</sup>.

Mr. Tanner: Mr. Tanner said yes. He also looked up to see when the test is being offered. It is being offered up north tomorrow at 9:00 a.m., and then it is being offered June 10<sup>th</sup> up north as well. They have no postings for the rest of the year. That doesn't mean there won't be any; they just don't have any listed now. He will let them know tomorrow when he hears from Revenue.

Mrs. Cox: Mrs. Cox asked if we can call a Special meeting to appoint Joe McGlaughlin before June 1<sup>st</sup>.

Mr. Dunn: Mr. Dunn said we can always call a special meeting if we follow the rules to do that

There was no old business presented at the meeting.

### **NEW BUSINESS:**

Mr. Dunn: Mr. Dunn said we have a report on the status of the of the high school renovation projects by Mr. Phil Hazenfield.

Mr. Hazenfield: Mr. Hazenfield thanked them for allowing him to come and bring them up to speed on what has been going on with the high school renovation projects here in Decatur. Last October 1<sup>st</sup> he started with the school district and he brought a few people with him tonight to answer any questions he cannot. Keith said to keep it to 37 seconds and he assumed that was per slide, so the next hour and a half.... He said he was going to make this quick. They could go through 20 slides pretty quickly. Basically, we are adding 24,000 square feet to Eisenhower and 43,000 square feet to MacArthur. When we get done there will be 240,000 square feet of floor space at EHS and 234,000 at MHS. The design objects include a WOW factor. When you walk in there you will not believe what you are going to see compared to what it used to look like. It supports student achievement. It is a student-centered design to engage the students. It will enable and facilitate educational excellence and pride of community ownership. In regard to technology the entire building will have complete wireless coverage with high speed data connections. There will be interactive audio/visual presentation systems with promethean boards. They will have audible paging plus text messages to cell phones and flat panel display monitors. So, if they need to send a message if something happens for security purposes or any other reason there will be high quality monitors monitoring the

entire school. The rumors are that EHS is 6 months behind and that is totally false. We are on time for substantial completion by November 30, 2013. There is a rumor we have spent \$100 million on EHS and there is no money left for MHS. Contracts were signed for both. EHS is 55% complete right now. If this rain would quit we would jump up there with all of this site work that we could be doing over the next two months. State of Illinois financial difficulties have impacted our financing. You guys know that you passed and helped the position of the entire county and there are projects going on all over the entire county because of what you did. EHS is getting a swimming pool and MHS is not. Neither one is getting a swimming pool, other than the water main break; we had a pit full of water you could have swam in at EHS, but that is not it. There is a geothermal system. There 300 wells that are 300 feet deep at 10 feet below the earth's crust and it is a constant 55 degrees. There is a continuous loop that runs through the school with 220 heat pumps in all the rooms. There will be individual heat control within each room and since that is 55 degree air there will be air conditioning as well as heat in the schools. This is for both schools by the way. This system will pay for itself within in 7 years. Mr. Hazenfield showed pictures of the progress over the last few months at EHS. He showed photos from January of the steel stud walls put in on the third floor. As of April 1<sup>st</sup> he had photos of the ceiling grid that has been put in showing that the lights are on. We are under substantial completion for the classroom addition to the south by the middle of July or August. On the south exterior they basically took all the walls off and gutted it down to the skeleton. The bricks have been put up and metal panels have been put up. The dark green they see in the photos is waterproofing paint, but it is going to have a new look to it. It will be very complementary to the corner that St. Mary's occupies. That will be a crown jewel of Decatur. Substantial completion will happen as of November 30 and they will move the students in January. They will then start on MHS with substantial completion as of November 30 of next year and move those students in January. Mr. Hazenfield said they would then be done with the project and he could retire again. There are going to be auditorium improvements. They raised the stage up 12 feet so it is a lot more accessible to wheel chairs and other students. Down below the old stage is now going to be the green room. It is a lot more of a gentle slope. The same thing is going to happen at MHS but it didn't start out as steep a slope. Structural steel has been going up and is virtually done. He had pictures of the classroom addition to the south. Mr. Hazenfield has taken 2100 pictures so far. The Information Commons will replace the library and overlooks the administration area and will have reference and media access. There will be a new practice gym at each school with about 6,800 square feet. EHS also contains a wrestling room in between that and the concessions. MHS is not getting a new wrestling room; there is an existing room that will be remodeled into one. They will both basically have the same facilities. At MHS school is still in session and the contractor elected to start in December, Williams Brothers out of Peoria, and they are putting in the five additions. There are two additions on the east side, south of the building. On the north side of the building between the two wings is another classroom addition. There will be a practice gym which is adjacent to the old gym. Right now the walls are all up and they are going to start putting the roof on next week. There was a picture of the geothermal field with all of the stubs waiting to be hooked together in one continuous loop. He had architectural renderings to give a quick look at what it is going to look like, and these are reasonably accurate. There were

pictures of the main entrance and the competition gym. He had photos of what the new auditorium will look like with a lot gentler slope. He showed the Student Commons and said architects get a little mad at him but it is a food court, kind of like a mall. They don't like him to make a comparison to a mall but that is what it will be kind of like. He thinks the students will like it. The servery is on one side and they will go to stations and pick the kind of food they want and go out and eat it just as if they were at a food court. Pictures showed the gym entry and what you will see if you go to watch a basketball game. The concession stands are behind the stage that are in the gym. You will be able to keep an eye on the game while you are buying whatever you buy at the concession stand. BLDD did the renderings on MHS as well. He had a picture that gave a kind of bird's eye view over Grand Avenue of what it is going to look like. The front entrance to MHS will be off of Grand Avenue, finally, after all of these years. The gym at MHS will have a similar look to EHS, and that is the competition gym as opposed to the practice gym. Their auditorium will be very similar to EHS. The Student Commons Servery is very similar in nature and is two-story. The gym entry will be right as you come in next to the gym that they've got utilizing existing terrazzo floor. The Information Commons is part of the new addition on the north side between the two wings; again that is the reference library. He left a card at each of their places. If you go to the website and click on Community Planning High School Renovations, you can see the pictures plus a summery that he has posted from the middle of November, on. Every week they do that. He asked if anyone had questions.

Mr. Ashby: Mr. Ashby said we are very fortunate to have two high schools being renovated and Mr. Hazenfield gave an excellent presentation. His question is that we approved a 1% sales tax to finance this and he would like to see a financial accounting of where that 1% came from and where it is going to.

Mr. Hazenfield: Mr. Hazenfield jokingly asked if he wanted that right now. He said he would have to get back to him on that.

Mr. Ashby: Mr. Ashby asked if he could provide that to Mr. Dunn so he could distribute that to them.

Mr. Hazenfield: Mr. Hazenfield said he could tell him that \$76,300,000 is the overall budget for the high school renovations, and then there are other costs for technology and furnishings in addition to that. \$38,000,000 plus or minus is for EHS and \$34,000,000 is for MHS. He said that is it in a short capsule. They have those numbers and he could get them for Mr. Ashby.

Mr. Ashby: Mr. Ashby asked if he would weigh that off against the amount of 1% we have collected at this point in time.

Mr. Hazenfield: Mr. Hazenfield said he can ask Todd Covault to do that. He is the Business Director. Mr. Hazenfield said he really does not get involved in the funding, but he would be happy to ask him.

Mr. Ashby: Mr. Ashby said he would appreciate if they could get that information out to the board members.

Mr. Dunn: Mr. Dunn said we have a Macon County Highway Department road funding presentation.

Bruce Bird: Mr. Bird said this is the same presentation that the County Engineers Association put together. It is basically a result of the last state Capital Bill where the locals, that is the counties, the townships, and the municipalities weren't even brought to the table for funding. In fact, we weren't even part of the original Capital Bill until the eleventh hour. They saw fit to give us 14% of the total amount of money that was brought up with the Capital Bill. We were lucky enough to get that. We also got 80,000 pound roads instead of the 73,280 and it didn't even come close to covering the cost of that. So, we decided that if IDOT wasn't going to stick up for locals that we were going to do our best to do that the next time there was another Capital Bill. This is a presentation we are going around talking to all of the legislators basically as an educational tool to explain to them where the money comes from. Hopefully we will leave a message with them that the next time there is a Capital Bill that comes up, we will actually get our fair share as opposed to what we have been getting lately. He said the Highway User Funding fee is not equitable and not sustainable. Public Roads in Illinois include local roads and local jurisdictions. There are County Highways, Township Road District Roads and Municipal Streets. Under State jurisdiction you have State Highways, U.S. Highways and Interstate Highways; and then you have the Toll Road system in northern Illinois. He gave them some highway and street facts. There are 140,762 miles of public roads in Illinois. These are all statistics that are compiled by IDOT. They got almost all of their information straight off of the IDOT website. Out of that 140,000, 124,448 miles are local roads that is 88.4% of the centerline mileage. State jurisdiction has 11.4%. Our 88.4% of the centerline miles carries 35.6% of the traffic and the state 11.4 % of the miles carrying 56.5% of the traffic. Toll roads are 295 miles or 0.2% carrying 7.9% of the traffic. The User Fees collected by the state are the funds that are intended to cover the cost of maintaining those roads. There are two sources Motor Fuel Tax which is paid at the pump. This is the flat .19 cents a gallon. It is not the sales tax; the sales tax is 5%. The sales tax at 5% goes into the General Fund. None of that goes to the roads. The only thing that goes to the roads is the flat .19 cents a gallon. So, we get .19 cents a gallon whether that gallon cost .50 cents or \$5.00. It doesn't matter; it is just .19 cents a gallon. That hasn't changed in over 20 years. There is also revenue that comes from motor vehicle revenue paid at the Secretary of State's Office for vehicle registrations, driver's license, and Certificates of Title.

Mr. Williams: Mr. Williams asked if Bruce had any idea of how many gallons of gas are sold in Macon County annually. Has that number gone down, gone up or stayed the same?

Mr. Bird: Mr. Bird said it has gone down. As we go through this he will see with the numbers that it has gone down. The money we get is the flat .19 cents and the revenue matches exactly with the gallons.

Mr. Ashby: Mr. Ashby asked if there has been any legislative move to tie the .19 cents to a percentage of the cost of gas.

Mr. Bird: Mr. Bird said no. At the end of this he would go over something that came out yesterday in fact. The User Related Fees collected by the state are not returned the road and those are the Sales Tax, the 5%. Actually at 5% there is more money that comes in and is collected off of sales tax than there is on the Motor Fuel Tax per gallon. There are also the Automobile Rental and Occupation Tax, Tire User Fee, Vehicle Use Tax which are all related to roads but are not returned to the roads. Those go into the General Fund.

Mr. Williams: Mr. Williams asked what an example of an occupation tax is. He thought that generally the occupation tax was initiated by a municipality.

Mr. Bird: Mr. Bird said yes, but it is collected off of...

Mr. Williams: Mr. Williams said payroll.

Mr. Bird: Mr. Bird said yes.

Mr. Williams: Mr. Williams asked where the state gets involved with that.

Mr. Bird: Mr. Bird said it is not a separate occupation tax. The Automobile Renting and Occupation Tax is a separate one that is collected by the state. That is the name of the tax. It is very, very small. On the first bar chart it shows Highway User/Related Fees Collected. The red bars you see on the graph are MFT revenue. The motor vehicle revenue is in the dark blue. The light blue is the sales tax. Basically starting in 1996 and on, when the price of fuel started going up, the light blue started being a larger and larger portion. If you look at the red bars and blue bars they have pretty much stayed the same; they haven't changed a whole lot, in fact they have gone down some. In the next graph if you just compare the Motor Fuel Tax and the Motor Vehicle Revenue with IDOT & Local Shares, before 2000, 2002 and 2004 the revenue and shares were pretty close. Starting in 2000 and 2002 a larger portion was not returned to the roads. The portion of blue that is sticking above the red is the portion that was collected and didn't come back to the roads and there is a reason behind that. He said you take that same information and include some power graphs in there. The Highway User Fees Returned to Roads, again the dark blue is the Motor Fuel Tax and Motor Vehicle Revenue's combined. You can see the IDOT share and the Local Roads Share is the red line. The revenue is the top graph line that goes across and it has been trending upwards. The IDOT line is trending upwards a little bit flatter. The Local Roads portion is the portion that is the counties and it is not trending upward; it is flat. The first pie chart shows centerline road mileage and the little green portion. The red portion is the local roads at 88.4%. A large portion of the mileage is local roads. As you can tell from the percentages if you compared it to centerline miles that is probably not a real fair comparison. It is not an apples to apples comparison because obviously the interstates carry more traffic; the marked state highways are going to carry more traffic. There is another measurement called the Vehicle Miles Traveled. One vehicle traveling one mile is a vehicle mile. If you have

road that has a lot more traffic on it you are going to have a lot more vehicle miles compared to a road that doesn't have it. If you look at the second pie chart with vehicle miles traveled, local roads are 36%, state are 55.7%, and the toll roads are 8.3%. However, the toll roads have their own source of funding; they don't get Motor Fuel Tax revenue and they don't get federal revenue. All their roads and everything are being built off of the tolls they collect. If you take that information out and you are just comparing the local roads and the state roads, local roads have 88.6% of the road mileage and 11.4% for the state. The Vehicle Miles Traveled is 39.2% to 60.8%. The 39.2% is a very important number as far as we are concerned. Contribution versus Share of Revenue shows Centerline Road Mileage 88.6% for the local and 11.4% for the state. The share of Motor Fuel Tax and Motor Vehicle Revenue returned to the roads, again if you look at the Vehicle Miles Traveled for the state is 60.8% and they get 55.4% of the money back. There is only 5% that is a handling fee or administrative fee. The Vehicle Miles Traveled for the local roads is 39.2% and they only get 22.3% back. That missing 22.3% on the chart is not all administrative fees; that is a missing chunk that never comes back to the roads. Most of that is off of Motor Vehicle Revenue. For example, last year the Department of Natural Resources got an additional fee on your license that helps fund DNR. That is an example of where it is money that is collected by the Secretary of State's Office off of an intended user that is going to be using a road and it doesn't go back to the road; it goes off to DNR and helps fund DNR. That is the biggest chunk of that. In last several years, where he said it started splitting at 2000 that is the biggest difference. They have been increasing fees here and there but basically they have been pulling out of potential road revenue and using it to pay for other things in state government. They haven't taken it from the state side of things when they do that. The state is only down 5%. We are down from 39.2% to 22.4%. Contribution versus Share of Revenue are 2011 numbers. The numbers on this chart are about the same. The share of MFT and Motor Vehicle Fees returned to the roads, we are carrying 39.2% of the traffic and getting back 22.3% of the revenue. That is the part that is not sustainable and not equitable. He said they will do "What If's". What if the local roads had received 39.2% of the Highway User Fees collected by the state in 2011? Answer: The local roads would have received an additional \$250,600,000 in one year. That is a 1 year increase, a 36.6% increase. However, that would have cut into IDOT's share and that is not ideal because you don't want to hurt one system at the benefit of another. What if the revenues had been increased to the local roads so they received 39.2% of Highway User Fees collected by the state in 2011 with no reductions to IDOT's share? Answer: The local roads would have received an additional \$412,100,000 annually which is a 60.2% increase. What if local roads had received 39.2% of Highway User Fees collected by the state since 1980? Answer: This isn't an annual amount; it is a combined amount since the last time that the Motor Fuel Tax was raised up to .19 cents a gallon. The local road would have received an additional \$5,670,000,000. We have missed out on almost \$6,000,000,000 in road money since 1980. That would not be ideal because it would cut into IDOT's share. What if revenues had been increased to local roads so they received 39.2% of Highway User Fees collected by the state since 1980 with no reductions to IDOT's share? Answer: Local roads would have received an additional \$9,320,000,000 since 1980. In effect local roads were donors to the State of Illinois in the amount of \$250,600,000 in highway user fees collected by the state in 2011. Local roads have been

donors to the State of Illinois in the amount of \$5,670,000,000 since 1980. This is neither equitable nor sustainable for local roads. If you keep up with this funding stream, you can't maintain the road system that you've got. Some people have asked what kind of needs we have. Several years ago HR190 of the 92<sup>nd</sup> General Assembly Representatives Hartke and Black commissioned a study because they wanted to know what the costs would be to upgrade all of Illinois' rural highways to accommodate 80,000 pound trucks. Up until this last Capital Bill we had two different weight classes. We had 73,280 pound for all the rural roads and 80,000 pounds for marked truck routes. So, the last Capital Bill we got 14%, 500,000,000 spread over 5 years in exchange we had to take the 80,000 pound truck route. So when that study was done it was estimated it would cost \$60,000,000,000 to upgrade almost 84,000 miles of road. The County Engineers Revenue Committee updated it in 2006. They found that the funding shortfall to maintain and upgrade Illinois' county highways and township road district roads to accommodate 73,280 pound trucks was estimated to be \$770,000,000, per year based on upgrading 5% of the system over a 20 year period. We are not talking about all the money at once because that is unreasonable to expect. That is just to get it up to the old weight limit. The funding shortfall to maintain and upgrade the county highways and township roads to accommodate 80,000 pound trucks was \$2,190,000,000 per year, again based upon 5% a year over a 20 year period. The most recent Capital Program in Illinois was "Illinois Jobs Now" in 2009. There were historic changes from past Capital Programs. There were increased Motor Vehicle Revenue fees, but the entire revenue stream was directed to increase the bonding. So it is not an ongoing revenue stream. It is an ongoing revenue stream but we are going to do it all in bonding. We are going to bond everything and will not have an annual allotment that is going to come out. Basically we are just going to build projects with this; that is the only thing they wanted to do with it. There was \$3,054,000,000 and 86% went to IDOT and \$500,000,000 or 14% went to local roads. That was in 2009 and it was a 5 year bill. We are still waiting on the last \$200,000,000. If we are going to get the last \$200,000,000 the state actually has to bond for it. So, we have to keep going back to the state and requesting and talking to legislators to make sure they bond so we can get the money. If they don't bond, we don't get the money. There was no increase in revenue stream to local roads and no increase in revenue stream to IDOT, and we got the increase to the 80,000 pound load trucks. He said the same information was on a bar chart in the packet. It basically shows the shortfall. He thinks the most important graph on here is the comparison of the purchasing power. The green line at the top, because during this same period of time over the last 10 years we have had a great increase in the cost of our basic materials to build the basics. Those are oil, rock, and concrete. The green line shows the cost increase of the materials that we deal with on a daily basis. If you see the little blue bars that are part of the graph, that is the revenue percentages, and as you can see the last several years they have been negative. The red line that goes down is our purchasing power. As the years have gone by our purchasing power has just flat out nose-dived. One of the things we left with the legislators was that the net effect of the Motor Vehicle and Motor Fuel Tax Highway User Fees revenues returned to local roads could only put contractor's labor, equipment and materials to work on county highways, township road district roads and municipal streets, 4 days in 2012 for every 10 days they were put to work in 2000. We have had our purchasing power cut by 60%. In Conclusion, the

continued return to local roads of such a reduced share of the highway user fee revenue stream collected by the state as compared to the road mileage and amount of traffic the local road system contributes threatens the sustainability of the local road system. It weakens the seamless nature of the overall transportation network, which reduces the safety, effectiveness and efficiency by which it moves people and goods. This continues to erode the economic vitality of the State of Illinois. Those of us nationwide that are involved in local roads, there is a statement we always use that says, every trip either starts or ends on a local road. Nobody lives on an interstate. There are very few people that actually live on a marked state route. When you pull out of your house in the morning you pull out on the road to take off and go to work, you are pulling out on a local road. That local road is the one that is getting screwed out of this deal. Our final message basically with the legislators was, we are not saying this is what we want for revenue or this is what we were really looking for. What we are saying is first step, it needs to be equitable. Whatever kind of funding mechanism you come up with in the future. There is one that was proposed yesterday. We need to get as close as possible to 39% because that is the revenue we are generating. Those vehicle miles traveled the 39.2%, that's revenue. The local roads are generating the amount of revenue. We ought to get as close as possible to that amount back. The state at 61% is getting back 55%. They are actually not doing to terribly bad. The local roads if you talk to any township road commissioner or anybody who has had to deal with the increased cost of materials, and the continued erosion of the funds. The Motor Fuel Tax in the last 4 years, each year the revenue has been down about 4% each year. For each of the last 4 years we have dropped 4% each year. Out of the first 4 months they actually have the records collected for this year, it is down 7%. It is all going in the wrong direction. The seconded double-sided sheet he handed out goes from 2003 - 2013 and shows all the statistics on the basic seal coating, blade mixing, oil prices per gallon, and rock prices per ton. He said a quick comparison from top to bottom. In 2003 we did 46 miles of seal coat, and 8.4 miles blade mixing. Blade mixing is where we come in with our crews and use multiple layers of chip seal, either 5 or 7 layers and squirt everything out like a big layer cake. We get our guys on motor graders out there and they basically stir everything up on the road. They basically make the mix on the road and lay it back out. It is a way for us to beef our roads up and re-profile them. It is real reasonable and very cost effective. You've got to have a couple of good motor grater operators, and we have been lucky to have those. The oil price in 2003 was 0.83 cents per gallon. Rock prices in 2003 were \$12.30 a ton. Fast forward to 2013 and we are doing 21 miles of seal coating. We are not doing any blade mixing miles. The oil price per gallon is \$2.04 and that is a low ball price from someone who came in from St. Louis; everybody else was in the \$2.10 range. Rock prices are \$19.72 a ton. It is tough to do what we gotta do, but we gotta do what we gotta do. The back side with the bar chart is another study done by the County Engineers Association. We took a look at both the county and townships and looked at what is called deferred/suspended mileage. This is saying we don't have the money to do the traditional maintenance we would like to do there; it has either been deferred or in some cases suspended. The last 5 years 45 miles of township road in Macon County has been turned back to rock. That is suspended. They changed the character of the roadway. He said it shows in 2013 that 24,451 miles state wide are in the deferred/suspended mileage category. Five years from now they are talking about 50,987 miles. If you remember

back from the total centerline miles that we looked at, local system it was 124,000 miles. In 2018 almost half the total miles on the local system will be deferred or suspended unless the funding changes.

Mr. Drobisch: Mr. Drobisch said one of the rumors that were going around was, and he didn't know if this affects our local roads, that there were several bond issues that they tried to sell at the state level and they couldn't get them sold because of Illinois' bad track record as far as the amount of debt. He asked if that reverts back to part of our problem locally.

Mr. Bird: Mr. Bird said the bonding for that is part of the money that comes from the Capital Bill. Mr. Drobisch was right; they pulled the offer off the table because the cost of the bonding was going to be too much. That is a portion of the Capital Bill that is left. It will affect any kind of bonding going forward, any kind of construction bonding. There is a small portion of the Illinois Jobs Now (IJN) that we have left. We have been told by IDOT that they are going to bond it and it is going to be taken care of this year so they will not have to mess with it anymore. It will affect anything that goes forward. Keith was asking about any kind of options out there. Mr. Bird said the Transportation for Illinois Coalition just yesterday came out with a proposal and it mirrors what they did in Virginia. The Transportation for Illinois Coalition is contractors, labor, and engineers, everybody that deals with transportation. The County Engineers have a seat at the table. We actually were able to affect some change to get included in the bonding side of stuff, because originally we weren't. He said what they are proposing, and again this is just a proposal it hasn't run through any legislative board or anything, is to completely do away with the Motor Fuel Tax. It is very similar to what they did in Virginia, instead of taxing at the pump they are going to tax it at the producer; basically tax it at the refinery. Local roads supposedly will be given a guarantee of no less than what we are getting in Motor Fuel Tax revenue now, plus another portion of the new revenue they bring up. Again, it is just an initial proposal. It would be a completely different way of paying for roads, and it would be somewhat indexed when they do that. It wouldn't be a flat amount; it would actually be a percentage. But, again if the gallons keep going down, that only affects it if the price keeps going up, if the gallons keep going down you are going to get less and less. One interesting caveat they had in there, they increased the registration for electric vehicles. He was talking with Matt about that earlier. They also had a fee in there for any bicycle for over \$400.00. There was a registration fee they would have to pay. So, he was wondering how many \$399.00 bicycles there are going to be coming forward.

#### **MOTION TO CLOSE SESSION**

Mr. Meachum moved, seconded by Mrs. Little to go into closed session by prior roll call vote.

#### **MOTION CARRIED.**

#### **MOTION TO OPEN SESSION**

Mr. Drobisch moved, seconded by Mr. Meachum to return to open session by prior roll call vote.

**MOTION CARRIED.**

**MOTION TO ADJOURN**

Mr. Smith moved, seconded by Mr. Drobisch to adjourn until Thursday June 13, 2013 at 6:00 p.m.

**MOTION CARRIED**

Meeting adjourned at 7:15 p.m.