

WHEREAS, in the opinion of the County Auditor, the public interests required that the Lake County Council, should be called to meet in special session at this time, for the purpose of considering Budgets for Year 2017, a written notice was sent to each member of the Council, and proper advertisement made, and all other acts performed in accordance with the laws governing such matters.

And now in obedience to such call, come Ted Bilski, President, David Hamm, Elsie Franklin, Jamal Washington, Daniel Dernulc, Christine Cid, and Eldon Strong, County Councilpersons, together with Ray Szarmach, County Council Attorney.

OPEN: County Council Recommendations, Discussions and Actions

Dante said that the bottom line is exactly where we left off in the last budget session. He said that he took all of the re-organizations were taken out.

Bilski asked if in fact, we decide to give pay raises to elected officials, as well as rank-in-file members, looking into the department for a re-org, and he used the Assessor's office as an example. He said that the County Assessor made reductions within his existing budget, put in a pay raise for himself, and an across the board pay raise for his employees. Bilski suggested that the Council excludes that, and after speaking with Dante, we've looked at where we're going to be, in the long term plan. He said those who have been paying attention to the salary schedule, that's something we want to implement, worst case scenario, we review, and we do mid-year pay raises, like we did this year, if in fact, if we don't have the revenue to do it January 1st. We can build it into the budget, but we don't have to award it.

He said, the elected officials, that's different. That raise would have to be passed prior to January 1st, so if there has been a re-org, and we decide to give, for example, Mr. Prince a 5% pay raise, that would come out of the re-org that was done.

Dernulc said, that makes sense.

Bilski said he thinks that's where the conversation is going to have to start.

Dernulc said, in his mind, they are not going to get (2) raises, if you will.

Bilski said, correct. If you have a re-org in your department, and he used Mr. Prince, as an example, he has done a re-org, he has given his people pay raises, just like when we gave mid-year pay raises last time. We excluded everyone covered by a CBA, anyone that had step increases, and the Dispatchers, who had received a pay raise. Bilski said, so in the event that we approve the re-org, and the increase, then in March or April of 2017, we decide we are able to implement the salary schedule, or give a pay raise, those people that got it during the re-org would be excluded from that additional percent, that raise. Bilski said, that would be my suggestion.

He said they also discussed some kind of attrition plan to help pay for that, so possibly having a finance committee meeting, we can implement a hiring freeze, like we did before. That would yield Line 2 revenue, which is one way to go, but that discussion would take place during the finance committee meeting.

Dante said, we have to be frank, in terms of all of these plans, there is no way we are going to get it in place by October, there's no way, so we start establishing committees, to look at how many are out there, and start looking at the funding, and you have to start implementing, and really acknowledge that there is no way, shape, or form that you are going to form an across the board salary increase with all of these different structures out there. Dante said, if you don't mind me asking for some kind of pass on that, there is no way you are going to get done by October.

Bilski said, it doesn't seem feasible.

Dante said if we approve these schedules, you can put them on-line next year, you can make them retro-active, if you want, you can displace them until June 30, 2019, so you can(inaudible)

Washington asked, are we talking about giving raises to elected officials, and are you suggesting that we pass if off, before I go to my next statement?

Dante said, indeed, elected officials salary schedule should be one of the schedules being considered, by the team. It's like 15 right now, that I know. They would be 1 of 15. How, and where, and when would be disposed of, or recommended by the team, and then of course, back to the County Council. It wouldn't be done by October.

Washington said I do not have a problem with giving raises for the elected officials, I mean, I don't necessarily care for a raise for myself, but again, it's for everyone who goes to work everyday, and do a job, and some people asked, I think one was \$10,000 dollars raise, one was \$8,000, one was 6,000, so

there is no equity. What I was going to propose is that we give equity, across the board, just a flat rate. Now in terms of the Assessor, I haven't talked to him, but Hamm has. The municipality, Assessors, Townships, they were asking for pretty much the same raise as Mr. Prince has asked for.

Washington said, that's something that needs to be cleaned up.

Washington said to his colleague, I don't have a problem with giving raises, I do have a problem as far as them being all over the board. I think that's something that Bilski has been working on for a long time, of getting consistency, and Dante was saying he doesn't think it will be done in time. Washington said he likes the effort of different elected officials, trying to find it in their budget, but some found more than enough to compensate, so Washington said, let's get equity.

Bilski said he wants to make sure that he isn't missing any of County Elected, that we're talking about. Bilski said, the Assessor's Office, the Treasurer's Office, The Auditor's Office, the Clerk's Office, and the Recorder's Office. Have I missed one?

He was told that he missed the Surveyor, and the Commissioners.

Cid asked did they provide re-orgs, are all of them re-orgs, or did some just put in a raise?

Dante said we have 3 different varieties, originally, Jerome came in with a re-org.

Bilski said that's where I was leaning with this because I'm going to make a motion.

The Assessor's Office has a re-org right? Hamm said yes.

Bilski asked, does the Treasurer?

Dante said, they've proposed one, and they were all over the board, then I shut it down, because it was all over the board. Everyday it was changed.

Bilski asked, did the Auditor submit a re-org?

Dante said, yes, sort of...

Cid said, sort of? I think that needs to be clarified first, where are we at?

Dante said, right, that's why(inaudible)

Bilski asked, did the Clerk submit one?

Dante said, no.

Cid said he didn't request a 3%?

Dante said, no re-org.

Bilski asked did the Surveyor?

Dante said, no.

Bilski asked, Commissioners?

Dante said no.

Bilski said, and the Council? No.

Washington said, so when there is a re-org, that means they found the money themselves? When it's not a re-org, they just said "hey, just give me a raise", so I can get a clearer understanding, is that what we're talking about?

Dante said some used other pay, some used other line items.

Bilski said, with that said, excluding the Township Assessors, at this point in time, because we are going to amalgamate groups, and I spoke to Hamm about utilizing them and using the Township Assessors in an amalgamated group. We don't deal with the Trustees, and all that, just the elected officials. Bilski said, if, in fact, we were prepared today to discuss a 5% increase for the County elected officials, in the 7 offices, I just spoke of. Bilski asked Dante, what does that come in at?

Dante said you are in the 20's somewhere.

Hamm said Mr. Prince will be here shortly. Hamm wanted to point out that he deals with the Assessor's Office, he doesn't deal with the others. He has submitted a re-org, and it doesn't affect the bottom line, it doesn't increase his bottom line one bit. He wanted to point out that the Township Assessors have asked for increases, one for example, has asked for an increase, and after Mr. Prince submitted his budget, which was a bottom line of zero, they asked for another \$8,000 dollars.

Bilski asked, is there anyone here even considering doing that?

Cid asked, considering doing what?

Bilski said, \$8,000 dollars, plus the other increases for the Township Assessors?

Hamm said their total would have been about a \$12,000 dollars increase, and those individuals are asking for a \$12,000 dollars increase because they sent in an amended version, without reducing their bottom line, just take it out of the general fund. Hamm said, Mr. Prince is a little different, he is the one who has said, "I have found the money, in my budget, and it cost us nothing.

Strong said, he found the money by eliminating positions.

Hamm said, yes.

Strong said, okay, and if those positions come back a year from now, or a few years from now, they are right back to where they were at.

Franklin interjected, "he said no".

Bilski said here is what my suggestion is, that we can address that, one on one, but putting this out there, the County elected officials, this is regardless of the re-org, regardless of the Township Assessors, regardless of anything. How do you feel about 5%, and I would like to open that up for discussion. I am talking about, not for the Township. It's for the Assessor, Treasurer, Auditor, Clerk, Recorder, Surveyor, and Commissioners. Just this group, a 5%? What do you feel about giving them a 5% based on the rank in file getting 3%, and a potential 3% in 2017, if the money is there in mid-year?

Cid said, "I feel that we should balance our budget, before we consider any increases for the elected officials, and I believe that they should receive the same thing that employees receives, 3%. If I were to consider, I would recommend the same thing. I realize that they received that portion of this year's, the elected officials didn't, but because lawfully they couldn't receive it, so, regardless if it's a re-org, and they found it in your own budget, believe me, everyone would do that, everyone could do that, I think, if we told them to go find it in your budget, they would find as much money as they could, so that's my opinion.

Hamm said, if that motion were on the floor, I would be supporting it. Probably more..

Cid asked, you are not counting your votes before you make it, is that what you're doing, because you should make the motion...

Bilski said, I asked for an opinion.

Dernulc said, that's not what he's saying.

Cid said, if you are planning on taking action.....

Bilski said, my question was, out of eliminating the other entities of government, and if you look at the pay raises that were handed outside, to give, and start the debate at 5%, for those positions, what's your opinion?

Cid said I think we need a legal opinion because if you are counting your votes now, and then you find out you have your support, then you make your motion, I don't think that's (inaudible).

Bilski said okay then, I will make a motion, for the purpose of a discussion.

Dernulc said, all you're doing is, asking an opinion.

Attorney Szarmach said when you are in budget discussions like that, you do not need to make a motion, to have a discussion on an item. If you want to bring it up, you can bring it up, and discuss it without making a motion. Usually the budget sessions, your motion comes at the end of a lot of discussion, when it's been thoroughly discussed, but until that Second Reading, you can change anything.

Hamm said that was my opinion, if the motion were on the floor, that I would support, maybe I shouldn't have worded it that way. It caused some confusion, and I didn't mean to cause confusion.

Bilski said, I wasn't "cherry picking" votes. I don't even know if 5% is the accurate amount. Hamm said, I don't either, and it may need to be more, because we just gave mid-year raises to our employees, of 3%, I don't know what we're going to do for our employees for next year.

Bilski said, they could see, up to 6% in the fiscal year 2017.

Franklin said, she has always felt that the elected officials, in Lake County have never been properly compensated. You have a Treasurer making \$50 something, and you have other areas, with smaller municipalities, and their staff make more money than anything that happens in Lake County. The other thing is most of the staff here, their secretaries make way more money than the Council does. They are making like \$30,000, all the way up to \$40 something, Secretaries, and they don't even have the kind of load that our secretaries have, because they have 9 people to take care of, but they get less money, and I

think that's unfair, because most of the other offices that have secretaries, those people make way more money than our secretaries do, so the elected officials, here in Lake County, have always, since I've been on this Council, have not had but one raise, in 10 years time. In 10 years time, they have had one raise. So, for the elected officials, we've always said no, just try to find some money for the staff, and I am all for our staff having raises because they go above and beyond the call of duty. Most of them are doing jobs that 2 people should be doing, instead, it's one person taking on all of that responsibility. Our office secretary takes care of all of us. When I came here one of our staff was making \$19,000 dollars a year. Nobody ever took time to look at all of this work that she does. I feel they did it because it was the Council office, but I don't think that our staff should be treated in that manner, because of the fact that they are in the Council office. They do a lot of work. When I came here Dante was grossly under paid, not making the money that he should have been making for his expertise. She said she couldn't believe that this man was making that kind of money, and our secretaries were making little to nothing, so for that reason, I think we should seriously take a look at doing these raises, across the board.

Bilski said I think that everybody realizes that there is a lot of work by our staff, the personnel here, but the question on the floor is should the elected officials, and the disparity between a Treasurer, of Lake County, and it's entity, at \$50 something thousand, and the Treasurer of Highland, Munster, all in excess of \$100,000, and you are talking about making the cost of living and adjustment for them that they haven't seen in a few years, that's what the debate is about.

Washington said I want to make sure that we are clear, in terms of what we're trying to do. I think we are all professionals, and we can conduct this in a professional manner, without attacking personally, without screaming, or making allegations, with that being said, we have a Sheriff's Department who went over his budget, millions of dollars, we are actually fighting to try to bring that in, and from my understanding, just to start a discussion. Washington said, the way things go, you get an idea, then after the idea you get a planning stage, the ideas are raised, the planning stage is, how do we get this to happen. The President said, well, why don't we look at 5%, so the discussion came up about 5%, now with that being said, I believe, and I said this from day one. Equity, we have to be fair across the board, there's a lot of elected officials, at least everyone I know, we're available 24/7. Our budget consumes millions of dollars, so when we're talking about having equity, and the disparity of the pay difference from one county to another, is crazy, so if we're talking about just giving a total of \$23,000 dollars, and remember \$23,000 dollars to bring equity, I don't have a problem with that. I know some people say, "you don't need a raise". Actually, this person is in charge of millions. You go to other companies, CEO's, when it's over millions, they are getting compensated. I'm not saying we should make money to be compensated. Washington said this is my opinion, and right now, this is something that he would love to consider. I am not saying that people should get \$10,000 dollars raises, but for some reason, when people negotiate, they start off extremely high, and say, "hey, all I really wanted was \$2,000", but when you do that, the newspaper writes about it, and people see it, then it's an uproar. Washington said, again, I think, for equity, I think it's fair that we should consider giving a raise, employees that received raises, I think twice now, we are trying to bring some kind of equity to them. Washington said, as far as I know, we haven't received raises in a while, I can't go back and give the definite answer, but I think it has been a while. Have equity, across the board, that's very important to me.

Dernulc said that he thinks Elsie brings up a good point, he said he thinks our staff, and all staff in this county needs to get at least cost of living increases to keep up. As it relates to elected officials, I've been on record in the past, that I am not in favor of elected officials getting, we are there to serve, not to be served. When you run for this office, you know what you're getting, and it is just a typical thing for me to do it. He said the argument could be that, well, in other counties, they make more, that's a decision that their taxpayers and constituents have to deal with. He said he hopes, from his District, not even so much...Dernulc said he personally don't think that there is a need. When he was on the Council in Highland, and even now. He said he has always asked that the elected officials be left out.

Strong asked, would he like to have a pay raise for himself? Absolutely. He took a pay cut coming here from the Trustee's Office, however, he said he sees, and he uses the term, "smoking mirror government". We have too much separation here, by too many jobs, that are similar jobs, that have too much difference in pay. We need to make the playing field level. We need to understand where we're at, we don't know what each position is worth, and we've got our human resource person still working on something like that. We need to straighten everything out, before we start giving out raises that are kind of all over the board. The pay is all over the place, and it makes no sense to me. We need to balance our budget first, and then we need to move forward from there, but I think all of the secretaries should be paid the same amount, everything should be evened out. We got to get rid of the "smoking mirrors" in Lake County Government, so we can see the "picture" much more clearly. We've got to level the playing field. Do I want a raise, absolutely, but we've got too much work to do, I think, before we get to that point.

Bilski said the intent on this is when we have a Finance Committee meeting, to have some things to start off the discussion, that has been brought in front of this Council, and everybody has a right to speak, on behalf, so a 5% increase for the County Elected Officials, in those offices that I just mentioned, seems to be a starting off point to bring back to the Finance Committee, to make sure that we have the money in, and in respect to what Councilman Strong said, I am in agreement. We look at figuring out a way, through attrition plans, through hiring freezes, for a 3% across the board pay raise, with respect to what Councilman Strong said we develop a tier system, so those making under \$50,000, and for the purpose of

discussion, I'm saying \$50,000 dollars. This is not.... Personnel that are making below a certain amount, would make the full 3%, those in the middle, would maybe make 2.5%, and those in excess would make 2%, so that would be broken down, as we discussed earlier for that rank-in-file, not covered by mandated raises, re-org raises, or negotiated raises, through Collective Bargaining Agreements. They would all be excluded. Bilski said, the importance of discussing this now, is because this is something, like Dante said, we won't have the tiered system, salary schedule in place to act on it. It doesn't seem feasible to have it done this year, maybe by June, maybe not sooner, but it will give us time to plan for it. We would like to give a 3% pay raise, for those that are well below, working poor, as Councilwoman Franklin said. Bilski said his thought coming back to the Council is, he thinks the consensus is, to look at a percentage increase, in the ballpark of 5%, for the elected officials, for County Government, and a 3% scheduled, from 3 to zero, for a certain dollar figure, within those non-recommended, and then I am going to add the third for debate, is in the Assessor's Office, who are asking for raises. They are meeting today, and some of the conversations, I had, I asked them to contact their Chairman, but I would say based on that, they would be granted a pay raise, not to exceed 3%, would be my suggestion to bring back to the Finance Committee, that would be something that if they are in that same (inaudible) that they are in, that they wouldn't be entitled to the same increase, like was said here as a Clerk Treasurer, or Recorder, or whatever, so that's kind of my second part of my first question.

Cid asked, did you just say that in the re-org for the Assessor, since he has, in the re-org, besides the 3% the Council is, then Cid asked, did we ever act on the 3% overall?

Bilski said, for 2017 we did?

Dante said, yes, sure. Not for the officials, but the one that you just passed.

Bilski said, right, but for the raises granted in 2016, is budgeted for 2017, but not a new pay raise.

Cid said, we have not put in a 3% for 2017?

Dante said, not an additional one, the current one just moved forward.

Bilski said, that would have been 6%. We did not do that.

Cid said, 3% for this year, we didn't carry that 3% over for 2017, we have not done that?

Bilski said we did that.

Dante said, yes, sure we did.

Cid said, so, as of now, that 3% carries over into 2017

Dante said, correct.

Cid asked, are you saying you want to give an additional 3% on top of that?

Bilski said, we budget... we're talking non-elected officials, mid-year, is what I said. Mid-year, as we have to come up with an attrition program, anywhere up to 3%, based on a slide-rule, so would discuss, if someone is making excess of a certain amount of money, they might only receive a 2% pay raise for 2017. This would be mid-year for non-elected officials, someone under \$50,000 dollars would get the full 3%, and that's based on where we are mid-year, and based on whether or not we are able to implement our permanent salary schedule at that time. If we can't, and it's not feasible until the following year, in June of 2018, then, yes.

Cid said, I feel like we're all over the place. Cid said, and the re-org, like the Assessor's re-org, he put in for raises, or pay increases for some of his employees.

Bilski said we are not talking about recognizing that. We've already talked about the re-org, and the consensus was, we would just do something outside, because there was too much, and the second part of the question was a 5%, for the county base, for the rank and file, not a re-org, for the rank and file, an appropriate percentage increase, based on their current earnings, and the Assessor's, the Township Assessors, a 3%, and that's kind of what it came back at, for some additional discussion. Bilski said I am not looking for votes, I am just kind of eliminating the re-org, and the questions, and concerns about, like Strong said, they would be concerned that they would need more bodies, Franklin said they guarantee it, we we've all been guaranteed that they are never going to need more bodies, and it seems like 3 years from now, they will be back, so if we just look at keeping the people status quo, and I did add one little thing in there, to get to the rank in file pay raise next year, we can look at savings on Line 2 by implementing a hiring freeze on those vacant positions that they have. We have done that before, and we're very successful and raised, well over a million dollars on line 2 on freezes that we got on Line 2.

Cid asked, why did we eliminate it? Cid said right now you are talking about employees, not elected officials?

Bilski said, I threw in elected officials in, and 3%, just Township Elected Officials at 3%.

Cid said, Township Elected Officials at 3%, along with employees, perhaps, a range, depending on their salaries, up to 3%, and elected officials, 5%?

Bilski answered, yes.

Cid said, I think, but I don't know what those numbers are, but I think we need to balance the budget. Cid asked, how can we talk about giving extra, when we don't know if we're balanced?

Bilski said, I was looking at what Dante, going back to what you just handed us, and on page 19, where are we at? Are we \$2 million dollars?

Cid said this is to throw, what we were just talking about, into a "bucket", to decide whether or not we can afford to do it. This is one of the first years, that we are sitting here, at this point in time, not ten million dollars negative, and what are we going to cut. I see \$2 million dollars reserved right now, what all are we going to throw in there, then Dante spends his time saying, you are not \$5 million dollars in the red, Council, and you'd better take something out. Then we will say, "well, there goes the 5%, there goes the 3%, there goes this". Bilski said, but I think we've got to get there somehow, and that's all I am trying to arise, is how do we get there guys. I am not trying to say, I'm giving all of this money. We have a lot of things that we need to throw in there, and I just wanted to go down the line to see what everybody thought of those ideas. Bilski said I have to conduct a meeting with Dante, and the Finance Committee, to come up with a Plan, to come back to you guys, before the end of budget session, I just need a little direction, as well, on what the consensus is, and how you feel about this. I don't want to waste time.

Hamm said, I understand completely, and Cid's question is valid, because of the growth quotient, and the unfrozen tax levy, we are used to doing exactly what he said, we are used to cutting, and oddly enough, we have a reserve, because of the unfrozen tax levy, so I know what Chris is saying, on being fiscally responsible, she knows what she is doing, but this is odd, because we are not digging ourselves out of a hole.

Cid said we also don't have to take the maximum levy.

Bilski asked, has there ever been a City and Town out there in government, who has not taken their maximum levy?

Attorney Szarmach answered, yes, and they paid dearly..... Lake Station.

Bilski asked, what happened to them?

Attorney Szarmach said, if you don't take your maximum levy, the next year, you get the growth quotient, not on what the maximum should have been, but what you've actually taken. Each year you're losing, if you didn't take your 3%, you are losing 3% each year, on what you didn't take.

The other one that did it was Beverly Shores in Porter County, and you can't, it just doesn't make any sense to me.

Franklin said, the one thing that this Council has done, is not taken raises when we had 2%, or 3%. We did do something for the staff. Franklin said, she thinks that what we're doing is just discussing among ourselves, and it's a good discussion, because then, we all know where we are, and how we look at things. Franklin said, she does remember, Councilwoman Cid, and herself, always advocated raises for the employees, we have always done that, so Franklin said that she doesn't think at this juncture, that she won't change her stance. She said, she thinks the staff needs a raise, the only problem that she has, as it relates to the staff is, the disparity in pay. It's just not equitable. Like jobs are not the same, and she thinks that somewhere along the line, we need to set precedence, where people that come in new, instead of, and it may sound like micro-managing, and that is not the intent for me, but she has a problem that 2 people have the same job title, and 1 person is getting paid \$10,000 dollars more than the other, to do the very same thing. She thinks that is something that she likes for this Council to take a look at.

Attorney Szarmach said, even if you are not going to spend your maximum levy, you can put that extra money into a rainy day fund, which we have, Insurance. He said when we had \$15 million in the reserve funds, every year, we used to use that partially, for TAW's, so you wouldn't have the interest you had to pay on the TAW, that saved another few hundred thousand dollars. So you could slowly, over the next 10 years, easily create a Rainy Day fund of \$20 million dollars, which is gaining, and earning interest. So, there is a lot you, but make sure that you do pass the budget with the maximum levy.

Attorney Szarmach said, another thing is, you still have to, as far as I know, pass a budget with excess, to do an appeal, and you may want to, you never know what Indianapolis is going to hand you, you may need to do a new Court, and you need to have that excess levy, that excess budget to proceed with expenses for a new Court, for example.

Washington said I think we're missing the bigger picture, we have been talking about the Sheriff going over his budget, millions, millions of dollars. The Sheriff gets a budget imposed by the State, no one is saying

anything about that. So right now, to me, there is nothing wrong, and everyone has their own opinion, and this is my opinion, I believe, for equity purposes, there is no reason that anybody can tell me, that elected officials should not get a raise, even though, elected officials should be the hardest working person in their department, as the CEO. Most elected officials work 24/7. I know I do, I receive calls at 1am, but like someone said, we knew what we signed up for, and that is true. The raise that I agree with, something like 5%, I don't know, it was just thrown out there. I agree with it. I'm trying to be fair.

Bilski said to Mr. Prince that the Council decided, let's just take the re-orgs, and everything else, out of the picture, and the County Officials, would receive a 5% pay raise, a 3% breakdown, and the Township Assessors, a 3% raise, then when we look at the rank and file, through our projected sliding scale, or if we need to, just to implement, because it's not prepared, and ready to implement, a flat pay raise, for them, based on that 3% breakdown.

Dernulc said as it relates to elected officials, I just have a philosophical difference in raises, I just do.

Bilski said, so you are strongly against pay raises for elected officials, got cha.

Dernulc said, absolutely.

Strong said, again, I would like to see a raise, I would like to see our employees get a raise, but I think we have so much work that needs to be done, that needs to be fixed, at our level, before we can get a clearer picture, and give these raises. I talked individually, with all of the council members, the thing that really sticks in my "craw" is the County 102 Fund, the gas tax fund. I think we really need to get those employees out of that gas tax fund, and get them paid by the general fund. \$5 million dollars a year, on the gas tax, going to salaries, and benefits, can we do that in one year? Strong said, absolutely not, but maybe we can \$3,\$4,\$5 hundred thousand dollars a year, and maybe get those people out of there, and use this money for what it's meant, for bridges and roads. We need to get a clearer picture, of where we're at, and we have to have the playing field level, so we can see it. Am I okay with 3%? I probably will be Mr. President, but at the same time,

Bilski said it's a starting point, I am throwing some fillers out there, and how we can address this at budget time, and I'm trying to get something to work with here. Briefly, I agree with a lot of things you said, but I am going to be in opposition on the MVH funding. I believe that was established there to not just do bridges and roads, but to provide snowplowing, salting, and all the manpower requirements for unincorporated county, that now all to be put on the tax rolls that all taxpayers pay for something that they don't get.

Strong said, my issue is that a majority of it being used for salary and benefits, it's not even a 50/50.

Hamm said with regards to the maximum tax levy, as many days as you and I have spent in Indianapolis trying to get that tax levy unfrozen, I will not agree to not taking our maximum tax levy.

Bilski said, well you can't. This is why I ask the question because we have to have discussion, and I think it's important.

Hamm said, the Assessor is here, and he has done something completely different than a lot of the other elected officials, which is a re-org that cost us nothing.

Bilski thanked Jerome for coming in, and informed him that the Council looked at his budget proposal, and realized that he was the only one, out of the entire group, that submitted a re-org. So we can not take action, not knowing that it's going to be equitable to all elected officials, which started the conversation of looking at a percentage to take care of the rank and file, take it back to the Finance committee, and that's why we were not able to approve your budget, "as submitted" because of those reasons. There were a lot of differences of opinion, on how it should be addressed.

Mr. Prince said, he totally respects the process, and whatever you decide, he will be okay with it. He said, fundamentally, he thinks the Council understands his approach, and rationale behind it, and he thinks it's important to point out that it doesn't cost an additional dime, which is important. He said he respects the Council' job tremendously.

One thing that he would be concerned about are the raises that he provided for the employees, largely, because it was done within the budget, and we keep saying that we want to provide extra incentive, or extra money for employees, he found an avenue to do it, I returned positions to the Council, which translates to insurance dollars, for you guys, but the reality of it is, I did so, to provide raises to those people, an excess of 3%.

Mr. Prince said it's been my approach since day one, and it's always going to be approached, to that end. He said, and this isn't a threat, but if he can't give them the raises like that, he would have to reconsider the positions that he sent back also, which ultimately is not a savings for them.

Bilski said we have considered not accepting your budget, "as submitted", looking at flat pay raises, due to the salary schedule changes that we're looking at doing, and a progressive scale from zero to 30 years of service, with built in pay raises. So the fact that you want to give an excess of that, not every department

can, and that creates, and what we're trying to achieve in a job description, and equal pay. We are trying to correct the problem of people having the same job title, and not making the same amount. We have to make sure that the pay fits the job description, equally, across the board, and that's kind of the consensus for all of us. If you are a clerk in a certain department, you make the same as the clerk in the other department. That's what we're trying to achieve.

Mr. Prince said he respects that, and he thinks that makes sense, but it's not a "one size fit all", as you know, in the Assessor's office, it's even more so true. This is the only office where certifications are required, and these people are actually going to school.

Bilski said, in an amalgamated group, wouldn't you say that they are not doing any less work than Hobart Township, or in Ross Township the person who is doing the Level II assessment. Your people are doing more training, and more work than them, or do we need to keep them in an amalgamated group with the same pay?

Prince said, I think so. To be clear, his people do everything in there, and he isn't sure what the other Assessor's require their people to do. One of the things they've been able to do, within 20 months, is train multiple people on multiple jobs, because you have a little budget, you have a little staff, and it's a ton of work that continues to increase every day, but the achievement of the certification is very relevant, and the more higher you go, the more relevant. Level III requires a series of 5 classes, that are the equivalent of a semester's worth of information that they have to cram in a week, and successfully pass the test, in order to, and there are 5 of them like that.

Hamm said, not only are the certifications correct, but the other thing is he is the only one who came in with a zero....

Bilski said, beautiful job, I wish every other official had done the same thing.

Cid said he has increases in other areas.

Prince said, she is absolutely right. That increase isn't something that I created. That increase is because, as you all know, one of the biggest issues right now, are big box appeals, and that's just the business model. Everyone wants to reduce their taxes. Most retailers have kind of grouped up, and they are going after it aggressively. In order for us to defend our valuations, you have to have an appraisal.

He said, previously, the Commissioners were picking that up. Early this year, John Dull said, the Commissioners can not do it, they will not, they are not going to, and he asked if I would consider increasing my general fund budget by \$900,000 dollars. I did it, right off to bat, but once we look at it, and start looking at the request, we don't need \$900,000 dollars. That's what they needed the first year all of it started, but we've been able to taper it down. We are winning some of the appeals

Bilski asked was that on fund 337?

Prince said, no that's completely different. 337, we're asking for an increase in the levy. For general fund, we are asking for an increase of about \$500,000 dollars submitted for that, and it's for the purposes of paying for appraisals, as well as the expert defender of all appeals that they hire at the State Tax Board level.

Hamm said, what the Commissioners used to pay for on these appeals, Jerome is paying for them.

Bilski asked Dante how do we put \$500,000 dollars for this reassessment, and we need to reduce the Commissioner's general fund by \$500,000 dollars.

Dante said it's not in the general fund Commissioners, and the reassessment levy basically has to go up by \$500,000. That's essentially it, you are looking for a \$500,000 increase in that levy

Cid said she would like to see the numbers, how much we're spending in legal fees, and how many appeals we have won, and that dollar amount. That's what I want to see.

Cid said, as far as Level I, Level II, Level III, the cost for them to go to school, we pay for that. It's not their costs, we're paying for that. We're paying the continuing education for them that the State is demanding. The State used to pick it up, they haven't in a long time. Cid said also, once they receive those levels, they are receiving a stipend. They're receiving \$1,000, or \$500 dollars for having that Level.

Bilski said we what we talked about was the half a million dollars that was paid out of the Commissioners. There was a comment, and Ray, you questioned, there were losses in Riverboat, appeals, and maybe...

Attorney Szarmach asked about the Riverboat appeals, because he didn't know how they turned out. Prince said, to not move really far into it, there is a portion of it that he can candidly speak to, and a portion that's not completely accurate.

He said, some facts, as it relates to Riverboat appeals, before his administration, the majestic, that appeal was 10 years, and when he came in, they were able to re-visit it, and put it to rest. He said they stopped the "bleed", they stopped the attorney' fees, and all of the interest that was accumulating. He said to the point, if you let those things linger, they absolutely will accumulate, but from the perspective of the county, he believes that we came out okay. He said there was another settlement, because it's all relevant, in terms of appeals, where we absolutely came out okay, and that was one of the things that I first reported to you, when I took office, because of that one, we were able to return about \$3 million dollars to Lake County, as a whole. The general fund received about \$1 million of that. There have been successes in filing appeals. The alternative is to just "roll over", and give them what they want, and you don't have to take my word for it, just talk to the Cities and Town, and learn what the impact of it, you guys know, I'm sure they've called you. We are working with Cities and Towns, and we're doing our best to defend appeals, and back to the \$500,000 dollar increase, Prince said, he wasn't sure where he was get it from, all he knows is that he needs it. Commissioners aren't going to be able to pay for it anymore. If it's in the Reassessment levy, that's fine, as long as we have the means to operate, in fact, it's not even a request, it's the LAW. It's the law that the County defends these appeals, you can't go get the money from Cities and Towns, we tried that before, also, but it is the law, we're simply asking for the resources to adhere to the law.

Dante said the Assessor asked for a levy of \$2.3 million. The levy on your sheet is approximately \$1.8, so it should be \$500,000 dollars.

Hamm made the motion, seconded by Washington to increase the Reassessment tax levy by \$500,000 dollars.

Mr. Prince said that the Assessor's Office is not short, the fund will be short at the end of the Reassessment, and to be completely forthright, the fund was already in place before he became Assessor. He has just done the responsible thing, and stopped the bleeding to make sure that the fund is solvent at the end, as it hasn't been, when he was a County Councilperson, and before then.

Franklin said, a lot of false information gets out into the public, and it gets into the media, and people react to not the facts, but what they read, and they think if they read it in the paper, it's "gospel", which isn't always the truth, and she is glad that Prince spoke to that. She said we really do need to get the facts. That's why all of that craziness is in the paper is because people say things, and they don't really know what they are talking about.

The majority voted "Yes". Motion carried 7-0.

Bilski said to the County Assessor, just so you are aware, we are not prepared the pay raises, your particular salary is something that is not going to take action until a few meetings from now. He asked Prince are there any other issues in your budget that have not been approved, that you would like to address, at this point?

Mr. Prince said, not particularly, there is a slight little housekeeping, that he will provide the information to Ajaz, that the other Assessors would like to dictate the line items.

Bilski said right now, with the exception of the pay raise for yourself, and your rank and file employees, you are done.

Prince said, yes sir, and whatever decision the Council makes, as it relates to the pay, I completely respect.

Bilski said we can put done, with the exception of pay raises, for the Assessors.

Bilski asked about the Clerk's Office. He said there has been no request for increases, changes in the budget, so the only thing that would be addressed would be, if we take action on the Clerk's pay, and their rank and file members pay. Bilski asked are there any other increases in the budget?

Dante said, always part-time. Bilski said, so he is looking for increases in his Part-Time?

What is he asking for in his part-time?

Cid said, another \$120,000 dollars. We are going to need the Clerk to come here and discuss the need for the \$120,000 dollars in part-time.

Cid made the motion, seconded by Washington to approve for the Treasurer, an increase in line item 43190 – Other Professional Service by \$15,000.

The majority voted "Yes". Motion to approve carried 7-0.

Bilski said the Surveyor is asking for \$100,000 cap improvement. Bilski said he understands the need for it, and that's going to be.

Dante said, he didn't request it, and Cum Cap is locked now.

Bilski said we need to have him here, so he can discuss and explain the importance of where we're going to get that \$100,000 from, so we don't leave him hanging.

Cid said the Coroner wants 4 new position, but the Coroner will need the Contract for the Pathologist, and it's about \$50,000, maybe we can get the funding first, out of Public Safety, and moving it over to general fund.

She said she is trying to schedule a budget committee meeting for Monday, and she will have recommendations.

Bilski said the Pathologist is \$168,000, split between the Public Safety, and general fund right?

Christine said it's more like almost \$400 thousand.

Dante said she is asking for \$167,000, and there is \$115,000 in Public Safety, so the difference is around \$50,000 dollars.

Cid said give her \$50,000 in the general fund, or Public Safety?

Dante said it will be safe in the general fund.

Cid made the motion, seconded by Hamm to increase the Coroner's Public Safety line item 43120 – Medical & Hospital Services by \$50,000.00.

The majority voted "Yes". Motion carried 7-0.

Washington made the motion, seconded by Cid to increase Part-Time line by \$15,000 dollars for Veterans Services. The majority voted "Yes". Motion carried 7-0.

Bilski told Ned, from the Planning Department that his re-org was thrown out the window. Ned said that he did eliminate a position called, Building Official. He said he gave some of those responsibilities to Steve, and he created another position to replace the one that was vacated called, Assistant Building Commissioner, so that he could help, and he reduced that salary, to spread that money around the rest of the office in the form of a 3% raise. He said it will cost county general nothing. He said his budget would be reduced because they lost a couple of employees to retirement, who've been replaced, but their longevity will be deducted, it will be slightly less, but it will not be any more.

Bilski said, you have to be aware that if, in fact, that this Body was to accept your re-org and salary increases, any salary percentage increase voted on for the other county government entities, you would be excluded from, based on the pay raise you're giving yourself.

Ned said, so you are telling me that if you would give 2% to the County employees for 2017, we would be excluded for that?

Bilski asked, did you exceed 2% in your pay raise? Ned said, absolutely.

Bilski said, then yes.

Ned asked why would we be excluded, and everyone else ...

Bilski said, because you already got your pay raises, you decided to do it within yourself.

Bilski said I am not guaranteeing you there is a pay raise, so we are not taking any action on your re-org.

Ned said what made this thing go awry was when you gave the 3% end of the year pay raise for the employees in the County because when I filed the re-org, originally, that was before there was any discussion of a pay raise for County employees, then you gave the 3% raise.

Bilski said I am not going to argue with you there, we talked last year, that we would be working consistently in giving a mid-year pay raise, so that's a little unfair. We told you in 2015, going into 2016 at every meeting, we talked about budget cycle, we said we were going to do everything possible to give a pay raise.

Bilski asked, you're not concerned about your re-org, if we're considering a mid-year pay raise?

Ned said, I will bring it back next year, at some point. That's only fair. I've redistributed the job positions in the office, and if you don't want to consider it, I think it's unfair to give everybody else a percentage increase, going into 2017...

Bilski said, well is it unfair that you can increase, and give yourself a percentage increase, when no one else can?

Ned said, so you are telling me that no other office in this county government center can reorganize their office? Is that what you're saying?

Bilski said, no I'm not, I am just saying worst-case scenario. Dan is the Chairman of that Committee.

Ned thanked the Council for the mid-year increases for the employees.

Ned said if I say throw it out, and leave the budget the way it is, and then we get a raise in 2017, what says that I can't bring it back next year, and do it again?

Bilski said, nothing. Ned said then just leave it, throw it out.

Cid said we have said that we want to look at a salary schedule, and if we keep allowing departments to re-org, then... our goal was to have a salary schedule, based on longevity with the County, if we keep allowing these re-orgs, then we are just unbalancing the salaries again. Either we give across the board, or we allow re-orgs, or we vote through with our salary schedule. We haven't voted on anything, but that's the purpose of not allowing re-orgs, is to move forward with the salary schedule.

Ned said whatever you decide to do, we will work with you, I don't have an issue with that at all.

Bilski asked, have we taken action in everything address in the Commissioners, department 2900 budget?

Dante said there are 3 steps to take. We are not transferring the appropriation to pay for current medical bills, as of January 1, 2017, and accrued, old bills that you are going to inherit, after January 2017.

Dante said, first you have to get the "seed" money into place.

Bilski asked, how much is that?

Larry Blanchard and the Commissioners said \$800,000 dollars in the general fund.

Dernulc made the motion, seconded by Washington to make appropriation for \$800,000 dollars in the Commissioners budget, general fund 001, for Jail Medical & Hospital, line item, 43120, effective January 1, 2017.

The majority voted "Yes". Motion carried 7-0.

Dante said, step 2, is the Jail budget, department 3100, you will be eliminating or reducing to zero, line item 43120, that will be removed by \$524,000 dollars. You are removing and eliminating...

Bilski said, remember, you are talking about 2017 right now, not right this minute.

Washington made the motion, seconded by Hamm to remove \$524,000 from Jail budget, 001-43120, Medical & Hospital.

Cid asked is that the only thing, is the medical bills that the Sheriff pays out of that line item?

Dante said, yes. That's where he centers those payments. Unfortunately you will hear next month, he also has some pharmacy, but we will (inaudible), but that's for 2017.

The majority voted "Yes". Motion carried 7-0.

Dante said, step 3, now we go all the way back to a brand new fund. This is your reserve account. You will need an appropriation for \$800,000 in 43120, that's the first step. It's Fund 414, Jail Inmate Medical & Hospital Reserve Fund). You will see the main regular bills, the normal bills coming across at \$800,000 dollars, which you just appropriated seed money in the general fund.

Cid said, you are going to give the Commissioners \$800,000 dollars out of the general fund, for medical, and you are going to give another \$800,000?

Dante said no, that's the seed, this is a reserve account, and it needs a source.

Cid said, so you are saying you take from the general fund, and feed this account?

Dante said, that's correct. That's how we feed reserve accounts. It's the same \$800,000. One is a source, one is a payment. It needs money from someplace.

Dante said the motion should be to approve in department 2900, line item 43120, \$800,000 in fund 414.

Washington made the motion, seconded by Strong for Fund 414, Department 2900, line 43120, an appropriation of \$800,000 dollars.

The majority voted "Yes". Motion carried 7-0.

Dante said, they need an appropriation to isolate prior bills that he is going to inherit when he takes over in 2017, so these are prior year bills as well.

Washington made the motion, seconded by Hamm, in Fund 414, Department 2900, line item 43121, an appropriation of \$200,000 for prior year medical bills.

Cid asked, is this the same \$200,000 dollars that we gave this year? The answer was yes.
Cid said, there is a line item in the Sheriff's budget also for prior years.

Hamm said we stopped that.

Dante said we stopped it.

Hamm said this will be for bills from 2014, 2015, 2016, anything that's old?

Dante said, some.

The majority voted "Yes". Motion carried 7-0.

**Hamm made the motion, seconded by Washington to approve for Department 4070, Div IV:
\$5,000 increase for the Court Administrator
\$5,000 increase for the Court Administrator Assistant
\$5,000 increase for the Secretary
\$2,500 increase for the Court Reporter.
No new positions.**

The majority voted "Yes". Motion carried 7-0.

**Cid made the motion, seconded by Strong to approve for Fairgrounds, Department 2920, an increase in line item 43630, Maintenance & Service Contracts by \$2,000.
The majority voted "Yes". Dernelc was "absent". Motion carried 6-yes, 1-absent.**

**Cid made the motion, seconded by Washington to approve for the Coroner, 4 new Investigators.
The majority voted "Yes". Motion carried 7-0.**

Bilski asked, for Co-Op, when they existed in another location, who cleaned it, who snow plowed it, and who maintained it? The money should be there right?

Blanchard said, no, it's not in their budget. We are going to have to put it in ours.

Blanchard said, I think that was included in their rent.

Bilski said that needs to be figured out, but right now, if we sent housekeeping over there, it really shouldn't be an increase to us, unless we will need to hire additional bodies. Bilski said to Blanchard, if you think we need to hire additional housekeeper here, or additional part-time housekeepers to send there, because plowing the lot, we're plowing our lot anyway.

Blanchard said, no it's not plowing the lot, that's garbage, and a few other items.

Bilski said we will have to get a dumpster.

Blanchard said, probably, and pay a little extra for the year.

Blanchard suggested bumping maintenance & service by \$10,000.

Strong made the motion, seconded by Hamm to increase Maintenance & Service, line 001-3030-43630 by \$10,000.

Bilski said no one is being hired, just an increase because they didn't have in the line item before. (This is for the Co-Op)

The majority voted "Yes". Cid was "absent". Motion carried 6-yes, 1-absent.

**Cid made the motion, seconded by Washington to approve, in Department 4002, Public Defenders, the 3 Public Defenders Commissioners@ \$35,540 each.
The majority voted "Yes". Motion carried 7-0.**

Cid made the motion, seconded by Hamm to increase for Department 4002, Public Defender, line item in the general fund, 43190, by \$350,000. The majority voted "Yes". Motion carried 7-0.

Bilski asked Dante in Department 3950 – Juvenile Court, IV-D, they wanted to make some switches, and asked Dante if those changes were made?

Dante said no, because there is some shifting of money, from the 297 Fund, into the general fund, and that's why it stopped. It wasn't net neutral. They are swapping out positions on the User Fee Fund, to the general fund, with costs to the general fund. He said they are shifting between a lower priced position in Fund 297, to a higher priced position in the general fund. They want to remove a \$27,000 dollars position, and create a \$36,000 dollars position. That's a difference of \$9,000 dollars.

Cid asked, is it because the other fund can't support it?

Dante said I have no idea. No new positions, but they want higher priced positions in the general fund.

Bilski said they also had some title changes.

Cid said they wanted to take the Office Manager out of Fund 297, move it to Secretary in the general fund @ \$29,174, she said that's what she seems to be looking at.

Dante said, they want to move it to Office Manager, lateral, to the general fund. Dante said, they made an error, and gave us the wrong thing, and we punched it in. there has been a revision to their requested budget, and he has the revision in front of him. They are taking an Office Manager out of Fund 297, and putting it to the general fund at the full \$36,000, and they are taking a \$27,000 out of the general fund, and putting it in Fund 297, and you don't have that request in front of you because we caught it.

Dante said this is swapping a position increase into the general fund.

Bilski said, I am not prepared to do that.

Bilski said for the Sheriff's Department, we've already taken care of the 5% raises for the Sheriff's Police, through CBA, outside the raises for the non-bargaining, non-Police personnel; we've taken the medical out.

They want to reduce the Petroleum line item, to Overtime, just transfer within the budget.

Dante said he thinks that's it for them.

Bilski said that Economic Development was looking for Part-Time increase, department 6100.

Cid said they want \$22,000 in Part-Time, then asked, are the Commissioner's okay with that? Because it was the Commissioners who gave them the money to help them remain solvent. Bilski said because we had discussed a long time ago about eliminating the whole department itself, Economic Development, and contracting it out.

Washington said, that was for them to get a Consultant, and when that was exhausted, it was over. The Commissioners are not funding Economic Development.

Dante said they are also asking for a salary transfer from Fund 170, because somebody can't be paid a certain amount, and \$5,000 has to come off of his or her salary, to the general fund.

Cid said that wasn't discussed.

Washington said we did discuss that, and he would like to make a motion.

Washington made the motion, seconded by Hamm to approve for Economic Development, Department 6100, in the general fund, Supplemental Pay, 41390 @ \$5,000.00.

Dante said this is over from the Fund 170.

Dernulc asked, is the Supplemental Pay...

Bilski said it's part of his salary.

Dante said he is going to paid from 2 places.

Dernulc said, but we call it Supplemental Pay, but it's not Supplemental Pay.

Bilski said, it's part of their total salary, like a grant writer who gets paid out of 4 different funds to get their total salary. It's not a pay raise.

Cid said, she remembers this came up because we had someone here who was employed, and won an election, and had to leave her position, because we said we were not going to split the salaries to conform to allow to go against the Hatch Act. So now, that person left this job, and now we're talking about doing this again, which I am not going to approve it. I am not going to approve to They have to make a tough decision. I am not going to approve moving part of the Deputy Director's salary into the general fund.... I remember we did this, and someone had to leave their job, and now we are going backwards.

Bilski said I was Chairman of that Committee, at that time, and we were in a very difficult time, what he did was, when he got with the then Director, and finance people over there, and he removed them completely from the general fund, they were, in the beginning paid out of the general fund, when Bilski was in such a financial crunch, consulting with Dante, and Milan, Bilski took everybody out of the general fund, and said figure out how to pay for this department. Discussions came in that were going to eliminate Economic Development, figure out how to contract this out, apply for these Grants, outside of government completely, it didn't seem feasible. The intent, when I did that was to reduce the budget in the general fund, not to eliminate anyone from having a right to exercise their constitutional right to run for office. That was strictly an economic move, on my part, and that's why I don't think it was fair. That wasn't my intention to stop someone from having the ability to run, my intention was fiscal, why I had to do that, and those positions were all paid out of the general fund, at one time.

Dante then said, if you need anything else, go to the Commissioners for help.

Bilski said that's how that all transpired.

Dernulc said, to make sure, if the person is making \$30,000 dollars, they have this fund that we're taking it out of, they are still going to be making \$30,000 dollars, it's not going to be extra.

Bilski said, \$25,000 out of one, \$5,000, out of the other. No increases.

Franklin asked, are we going to take a look at giving them additional staff.

Washington said yes, he is going to make that motion next.

Franklin said, she knows that they need it. She said this is Federal money, and there is a requirement that they have a check and balance. That's why they are asking for that person to be brought back. They need to have 2 of them in Finance.

Bilski said we need to take a strong look at this department, and see what we're gaining out of it. Bilski said he has no problem on this, but... we have a motion and a second on the floor.

The majority voted "Yes". Cid voted "No". Motion carried 6-yes, 1-no.

Washington made the motion, seconded by Franklin to approve for Economic Development, Department 6100, to create Part-time, line item 41190 @ \$22,000 in General Fund 001. The majority voted "Yes". Strong and Bilski voted "No". Motion carried 5-yes, 2-no.

Dernulc made the motion to add the Vector Control Director @ \$42,000 dollars in Department 5130, Health Department, Fund 296

Dante said he didn't request it.

Attorney Szarmach said, you want to add a position that wasn't advertised?

Dernulc said yes.

Dante said he is over his request.

Bilski said he has to apply for it next year.

Dernulc said if you look at line item 41194, there is a new job available, but it doesn't have an appropriation to it, in Fund 296.

Dante said he didn't request it.

Bilski said we are going to have to talk to him.

Dernulc removed his motion at this time.

Dante said, you can create the position, but there is going to be no appropriation, come January, so he will have to get on the agenda for January for the appropriation.

Bilski said, according to Attorney Szarmach, we can go ahead with 6 votes, because it's not going to affect the bottom line, advertised. The vacant position was advertised, we would just have to reduce something in here for the total amount out of the Tobacco Settlement.

Bilski said we advertised the position, it says new job.

Dante said it's just an anomaly.

Bilski said, so the 41194 is not an advertisement for a new job?

Dante said no it's zero, so what you're going to do is create the position, and the position will be there, but there will be no funding, or no appropriation, and come January, he has to get on the January agenda. Bilski said, and reduce a line item?

Dante said, no, just ask for an additional.

Bilski said we will talk to him about it.

Dante said he has plenty of cash.

Dante said with regard to Data, he had \$300 something thousand dollars for Lawson, and he put it into Cum Cap, then somewhere in his general fund, or his Riverboat Fund, he has another \$300 something thousand laying in there for something else, and Dante said he can't recall what it is.

Cid said yes, that was for the Lawson.

Bilski said, no, an addition, there is something else.

Christine said he advertised in different places, \$363,000 has been requested for replacement of the loss of the financial system.

Bilski said he was going to do it all out of one, or give us the option to take the \$360,000, and pick out of different accounts, or do it all out of one.

Cid said so we can remove \$363,000 from the Riverboat, that's where he advertised, and we should probably ask him.

Dante said, he is at the Original in 196, and he is at the Original in the general fund

Bilski said, so he is going for it in two places, so \$396,000 in Riverboat, and \$396,000 in general fund, so he doesn't need \$800,000 dollars does he?

Cid said, no, we need to call him up here.

Bilski asked so where do we want it to come out of?

Dante said, we can only take it out of the general fund, you are done in Cum Cap, and you are done in Riverboat. He told me just this morning he has another \$300 something thousand dollar request that he needs. About \$700 something, or \$800 something thousand dollars, yes.

Bilski said, so the next request can't come out of Riverboat, that's done, if he needs another \$396,000 dollars, it needs to come out of general fund.

Dante said, that's correct.

Bilski asked is that a motion?

Cid said, no, not until I speak with Mark.

Bilski said, we need to find out does he need \$800,000, or just \$396,000.

Dante said, and he said yes.

Bilski said he said he said yes, he needs \$800,000 dollars.

Bilski said contact him please.

Cid made the motion, seconded by Franklin to approve for Department 3200, Animal Control \$20,000 increase to Part-Time, line item 41190. The majority voted "Yes". Washington was "absent". Motion carried 6-yes, 1-absent.

Bilski asked Mark does he need \$396,000 or does he need \$800,000?

Mark said there are multiple needs within this request. First, the \$363,000 is for the replacement, for upgrade for software and hardware wise of your financial system.

Bilski said that amount was taken care of in Cum Cap. That's done.

Mark said, if you look at my letter, I have additional increases for different needs in other line items, that's the other part of the \$800,000. The reason being is we have every year, increases for software and hardware, and what I do is request that percentage that I'm aware that's coming through, so I don't have to show up here in the middle of the year saying I'm short, we didn't get the money.

Bilski asked, how much do you need for that?

Mark said, in my first request for general fund, for Other Professional Services, I need a total of \$111,550, that's an increase in the general fund, Professional Services. Then in general fund, in telephone, because our communication costs are going to go up next year, an additional \$43,200, then in general fund, I requested in Other Services & Charges, an additional \$77,963 because we are taking on the support of the Juvenile Courts record system that is provided through an internet.

This popped up a couple of years ago, where they signed a Contract, and nobody knew what was going on. Then the vendor showed up and said he needed \$77,000 dollars to support, for you to access your records, so I got involved. The decision was made that it would be split in thirds, out of Cum Cap. They requested Cum Cap money in Juvenile, Clerk, and Probation, for the last 2 years, so I met with those 3 departments, this year, and said lower your Cum Cap request by that \$20 something thousand dollars, I will combine it and put it in a request in my budget so that we get out of the Cum Cap business of supporting this thing, and we get it into the software support, within Data Processing, and they agreed to do that, so although this is an increase in my budget, it lowers their Cum Cap request this year by \$20,000 each.

Mark said the Clerk was paying a third, Juvenile IV-D was paying a third, and Prosecutor was paying a third. These are the records that were damaged in that flood 3 years ago. That's how all of this came about.

Mark said, that's it for general fund.

Bilski asked to add up \$111,550, plus \$43,200, plus \$77,963. Dernulc said, it equals \$232,713. Mark said, that's what I requested in general fund.

Franklin made the motion, seconded by Cid to approve \$232,713 in the general fund for Data Processing, Department 3600. The majority voted "Yes". Washington was "absent". Motion carried 6-yes, 1-absent.

Mark said to ignore his gambling and admission tax request because you took care of it in general fund.

He said in Reassessment Fund he is asking for an increase of \$98,427 because the Reassessment software cost \$98,000 more than the old reassessment software.

Bilski asked does that come out of Prince' budget?

Mark said it comes out of reassessment, but it's put into his budget.

Dante said that's already in.

Bilski said with regard to the Jail, Department 3100, Dante has a good suggestion of separating Jail OR, from Jail OT, (per Budget Committee), including PERF & FICA, in the sum of \$300,000.

Dante said, the total amount that he needs more is \$300,000. I haven't figured out how much will be, you always want to know what OR is.

Cid said we've been having discussions of just make them come back as they have to do, so we can ask why.

Bilski said to Dante, you and I have had this...he asked Dante over the last couple of years, how much have we done in Fed Overtime? It seems like enough is never enough.

Cid said, that's true. The more you give them, the more they want..
Bilski said, it seems like it never goes away.

Cid said, right now, they have \$520,000 for 2016, and she suggested taking \$100,000, and put it in OTR, you can still separate that amount.

Bilski said, you suggested the amount was \$300,000, for both, and to separate it. Bilski said I am prepared, I will make that motion.

Dante said we want to identify OR, to signify that there is a whole bunch of OR, and what is this OR.

Bilski asked, so to make the appropriation, and to separate them?

Bilski asked Dante would it help if he makes the motion to go ahead separating Jail OR from the OT, that includes PERF & FICA?

Dante said, and increase it by \$300,000. Dante said I will look at the proportion between the two.

Bilski made the motion to separate Jail OR from OT, which includes PERF & FICA, and increase it by \$300,000.

Motion dies for lack of a second.

Hamm said I will make that motion, for purposes of discussion.

Hamm made the motion, for the purposes of discussion

Attorney Szarmach said, you can discuss it without a motion.

Bilski said, I thought because it's a workshop that I could make a motion, but Attorney Szarmach, you said I can't.

Cid said clarify Dante's request to increase the Sheriff's Overtime from \$520,000, add that \$300,000, so he is requesting to increase overtime to \$820,000. That's his request.

Bilski said, right, and separate, it's not done there, separating Jail OR from OT.

Dante said he is going to be creating a Jail OR in there of that \$300,000 in there.

Dante said I am going to be creating an OR in there, they will both have \$300,000

Bilski said, so we are right where we need to be, and I don't mind, but there still is not going to be enough, unless the software, and the changes... Bilski said the reductions in the Jail, it's not working. The money goes up, and the hours, and the overtime in the Jail go up, and the prisoners are not going down enough. This is just going to tell us what we're paying.

Franklin said that's because of the Judges.

Bilski said, some of them. The Cities and Town Judges, some of them are probably the biggest culprits, but I think keeping in line the Dante needs to maintain the books, and I think he gives us a better handle on it, from the fiscal standpoint, regardless of your political standpoint on the Sheriff. This is about budgetary standpoints, and I think it gives Dante control, at for a way for us to look at this and segregate it. Bilski said there is a motion, and a second, and Dante...

Cid said, your notes Dante said this includes PERF and FICA, so you are..

Dante said I might only put in \$250,000, and the rest in PERF and FICA, but you are going to need a healthy bump in Jail OT, no question about it, and I will separate between OR and OT, and we will start creating 2 line items so you can see what OR really costs, it's mostly OR.

Commissioner Repay came into the courtroom.

Dante said, the software as if OR was a big surprise to everyone, where does it come from, how are they accumulating this, and where is it being applied, when they were moving around up in laundry, or to the hospital? That's what the software will tell you. Then you should take that software and see, indeed the manpower on the floor is for the DOJ.

Hamm said, but we have not received a report yet.

Dante said ask for it, then asked Blanchard, "have you started it"?

Blanchard said no.

Dante said it's sitting there collecting dust. He said he mentioned this to the Committee that they should start moving forward on this so I don't have to keep coming to you guys, and saying \$250,000, I think.

Bilski asked Blanchard, how do we get there?

Blanchard said, Jail Oversight.

Bilski asked, how do we get that done?

Dante said OT is for the software.

Commissioner Repay said he believes that Dante is talking about the payroll software, the recording of the event that had already taken place, in other words, the allocation of people in their different pods, right? Their workplaces, Repay said that's the problem, it's management, it's not anything else but management of the operations of the Jail, there are individuals, and you would probably find it from they report, because you would see particular individuals, or not singling them out as people, but whatever numbers, you would see them. There are obviously individuals that make more OR/OT, or whatever it is, than others, and Repay said, I'm not so sure that it's not based on something less than optimum operations of the Jail. Repay said, I mean mis-management, that's what I mean.

Bilski said I would like to throw these things into the "bucket", we are not finalizing the budget, if this is something that you don't want, we can back that out. We may have to back some things out. We are not voting on approving this as the final budget today.

Dernulc asked is there a way that it could be put in a Rainy Day account?

Bilski said it has to be separated in this, and the key here is separating the Jail OR from the OT.

Strong made the motion, seconded by Cid to separate Jail OT from Jail OR, and to increase by \$300,000, including PERF and FICA.

(This is Jail, Department 3100, general fund 001)

Dante said I will make it a 60/40 split. OR is the biggest of the group. Dante said you are doing 2 things here. You are separating and identifying, and you are adding more to the budget. He is coming.

The majority voted "Yes". Washington was "absent". Motion carried 6-yes, 1-absent.

Dante said we just found out in a meeting that they are applying pharmacy, and actually shooting some of these expenses, this year, into the services line item. We need to extract that which is coming before you in an additional appropriation, and their health care & lab supplies, they are short. So we found another problem.

Cid made the motion, seconded by Hamm to increase the Health Care & Lab Supplies, line item 42250, in Jail, Department 3100, general fund, by \$200,000.

Hamm asked, what happens next year? Does that stay with the Jail, or is that going to the Commissioners too?

Dante said no, this is pharmacy. Pharmacy is staying with the Jail.

The majority voted "Yes". Washington was "absent". Motion carried 6-yes, 1-absent.

Dernulc made the motion, seconded by Hamm to increase the Food line item for Jail, Department 3100, in the general fund by \$140,000.

The majority voted "Yes". Washington was "absent". Motion carried 6-yes, 1-absent.

Dernulc made the motion, seconded by Hamm to cancel the Budget Workshop scheduled for 9-12-16, at 10:00 a.m., and re-convene on Thursday, September 15, 2016 @ 4:00 P.M.

The majority voted "Yes". Washington was "absent". Motion carried 6-yes, 1-absent.

The next 2017 Budget Workshop will be held on Thursday, September 15, 2016 @ 4:00 P.M.

There being no further business to come before the Council, it was moved and seconded that the Council does now adjourn, to meet again as required by law.

President, Lake County Council

ATTEST:

John Petalas,
Lake County Auditor

