

LEGISLATIVE AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
McHenry County Government Center – Administration Building
667 Ware Road
Woodstock IL 60098

MINUTES OF THURSDAY APRIL 14, 2011

Chairman Heisler called the meeting to order at 8:32 a.m. The following Committee members were present: James Heisler, Chairman; Ersel Schuster; Kathleen Bergan Schmidt; and Pete Merkel; Nick Provenzano and Marc Munaretto. John Jung, Jr. was absent. Also in attendance: Peter Austin, County Administrator; Adam Lehman, Assistant to the County Administrator; Kathie Schultz, County Clerk; Nicole Gattusa and Brittney Venetucci, GIS; Jamie Rein and Tom Carroll, States Attorney; Donna Kurtz, Mary McCann and Paula Yensen, County Board Members; interested public and the press.

| | |
|-------------------------|-----------------|
| James Heisler, Chairman | |
| John Jung, Jr. | Pete Merkel |
| Marc Munaretto | Nick Provenzano |
| Kathleen Bergan Schmidt | Ersel Schuster |

MINUTES

Committee members reviewed the committee minutes from March 10, 2011. A typographical error was noted. Ms. Schuster made a motion, seconded by Mr. Provenzano to recommend approval of the minutes as amended. The motion carried with all members present voting aye on a voice vote.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

PRESENTATION

None

OLD BUSINESS

Federal Legislative Update: Mr. Trent Lehman, from The Ferguson Group, the County's Federal Legislative Group, joined committee members via teleconference to provide a Federal Legislative Update to the committee members. Committee members were informed there has been a lot of big talk from Washington on how to pay for the 2011 Federal Legislative budget. There have been many continuing resolutions passed in order to avoid a government shutdown. The latest resolution expires at midnight on Friday. The final measure reduces the budget by \$40 billion dollars from the 2010 levels. Committee members were informed that there are still some programs available to fight for. They are unsure how much funding will be put into the grant programs. Some of the Republicans will vote against the budget as they are saying not enough cuts have been made and some of the Democrats feel the cuts have been too deep. The budget won't pass by a simple majority for either party. The Senate will be more reasonable but they will be looking to bigger budget battles in the future.

They will now move forward to funding for fiscal year 2012. The budget brought forward by the Republicans includes a savings of \$6.2 trillion dollars over the next 10 years. Obama's proposed budget includes a \$4 trillion dollar cut to the budget over the next 12 years. The budgets rely on cuts to programs and increased revenues. Both parties fight to lower the deficit and have plans on how best to achieve this goal. Committee members were informed they continue to fight for funding for the local governments. Mr. Austin stated that when we have another meeting, we will need to discuss how local Federal bureaucrats find funding for their local agencies. He stated that they need to think about this issue for discussion in the coming months. Committee members questioned what the proposed budget for the WIB is as previously they had discussed zeroing out this budget. Committee members were informed that if what is on the table is signed by the President, they WIB will see a 10% reduction in funding for this fiscal year. Based on discussions, all programs still have a possibility for additional budget cuts. Committee members were informed that they will continue to make sure the counties still have resources to fight for funding for some of the local programs. Committee members thanked Mr. Lehman for the update.

Discussion of re-districting questions for the Committee of the Whole: Committee members entered discussion on redistricting options for the County Board. When the committee last met, they spoke about what the software can do. Representatives from GIS have joined the committee members to help with the mapping discussion for redistricting of the County Board. They will help to form questions that will be brought to the Committee of the Whole meeting next Tuesday at 6:00p.m. Ms. Gattuso and Ms. Venetucci joined committee members to provide information on how changes can be made to spread equal numbers among the map. The map shows the

deviations based on the information entered. The software allows the numbers to be narrowed down based on the population numbers. The map currently shows that the most growth can be seen in Huntley, Wonder Lake, and Lakemoor. The population numbers shows that District 5 had a lot of growth. The maps can be manipulated to show the population by census blocks, this is the boundaries as defined by the census and population count. In FY2000 the census reported a population of 260,000. In FY2010 the population grew to 308,000. By looking at the map the committee members can see the county is moving out from its urban boundaries to the west. The Eastern portion of the county is where the largest growth was seen. Committee members were informed that one of the first decisions they will have to make is how many County Board districts they want. Autbound Redistricting Software in conjunction with the County's GIS system will be used for this process. This is the same software that is being used by the State of Illinois. This software can determine the percentage of deviation from the ideal population for each district. A map was reviewed that included equal population numbers. The software can provide a wide variety of reports to assist in the redistricting process. There will be three types of reports reviewed the first being a core constituency map where the numbers will remain unchanged for each district, a compactness map that will measure how smooth the boundaries are and a majority/minority population map. Committee members were informed that the Legislative Committee is charged with giving direction on where to start the discussion at the COW meeting. A time outline will be provided that will outline the amount of time it will take to get a balanced map with minimal deviations. Time will vary depending on the considerations the County Board wants to take. Mr. Carroll reminded committee members that the law requires that they first discuss the number of county board members that are going to be in existence. They need to decide the size of the board and the geographic and political boundaries. Ms. Schmidt stated she would like to see at least 20 single member districts. She stated that this would allow for easier constituent representation without making any drastic changes to the board. This would result in some savings for the County as well. Mr. Munaretto stated that he feels this would increase the number of the population that each county board member would be responsible for and stated that he was not in favor of single member districts. Ms. Schultz stated that there would be an unintended consequence if changed to single member districts. She stated that notification would be required that would increase the expense and workload within her department. Committee members stated that if they were going to consider a reduction to the County Board they have to take into consideration the committee structure. It was stated that if you look at the time and duties of each county board member, if the board is changed to single member districts, it would require more committee meeting assignments and the workload for each County Board member would increase. It was stated that this would also result in the increase for support staff as staff needs would naturally increase with the increase of the population. It was stated that if the board was decreased to 20 members, some of the board members would have to pick up the slack in their areas. The number of county board members will have an impact on how the county board does its job. Committee members stated that they may have to increase the pay for the county board members because of the increased duties. The committee members stated that the County Board Members need to be aware of the consequences some of the changes may have. Ms. Schuster stated that in District 6 it is very difficult to handle because of the size of the District. She stated, even with this issue she would like to see the district to remain as is. She stated that the County Board, as it currently is, brings a good collection of expertise to the table. If you reduce the number of board members she stated the duties become more of the responsibility for administration to run. She believes there should only be changes to the boundaries to address the changes to the census numbers. Mr. Heisler stated in the past there were only 3 districts with 8 members for each district and this was changed to 6 districts during one redistricting event. Ms. Kurtz requested that during the redistricting they take an entire community. She stated it is very difficult to represent a half of a community. She stated it is important to look for ways for the County Board members to be the most optimal to the voters. She stated it is important that when they are drawing lines to address population changes, you need to try to include a whole city into a district to prevent municipal fracturing. Mr. Merkel stated in the southeastern portion of the County there are high density areas where you will see municipalities split up. He stated that if you create 9 or 10 two member districts they may be able to move the areas together based on municipal issues. He stated that if you change the districts to identifiable communities you would then be able to decide the number of county board members versus the number of districts. Mr. Munaretto stated that everyone needs to be sensitive to municipal fracturing, but, this isn't the only reason to look at these numbers. He stated he should be a fan for single member districts as it would be easier for him to get voted in since the members of the district know him. He feels that the current structure has worked well for the county board and therefore feels the structure should remain as is. Mr. Provenzano agreed. Four members for each districts provides for good representation. This structure allows for input at municipal meetings and with 24 members you get representation of all districts in each of the committee meetings. Mr. Heisler believes the current structure works well and agreed that the only change needed would be to the boundaries for each district. Ms. Schmidt stated she still believes 18-20 single smaller districts are what are needed. She stated that there should

be no more than two members for each district. She stated that smaller more compact districts would make it easier to reach the population. Districts one and two are fairly compact making their districts easier to reach the constituents. If they are in a large district, it is very difficult to reach the constituents. Mr. Merkel stated that he is in favor of additional districts in order to address the municipal fracturing issue. He stated that overall if the number of county board members were reduced it would streamline the committees and provide more flexibility to adjust the map. Ms. Schuster stated she would like to make her decision on what the map would look like when using different scenarios. The map will show how specific changes based will change the boundaries. Committee members were reminded that there is a specific path that needs to be taken to make these changes. The first thing they need to do is to decide how many county board members there should be, the second is the number of districts and the last decision is to make changes to the maps. It was stated that this committee is tasked with creating the consensus for the County Board and currently 4 out of the six members of this committee has recommended the structure remain the same though there are 24 members of the board who have very different ideas of what should be done. Mr. Heisler stated that various scenarios need to be created and mapped in order for the members to make an informed decision. He stated that he makes better decisions when he can "see" what is being proposed. Committee members were reminded that the COW is only a one hour meeting and they will need to get a lot of work completed in a very short time. Committee members agreed that additional discussion is needed with direction from the whole County Board before a consensus and decision can be made. The Assistant State's Attorney again reminded committee members that the first decision that needs to be made is the number of the County Board Members, then how many districts will there be. If the County Board members are voted for by district the population for each district must be equal. Committee members questioned if the size of the board can be increased once it is decreased. They were informed that this could be done by referendum only. Committee members were reminded that if they change the number of the districts, this would necessitate the need to change the board rules too. There would be additional consequences of these changes as well. It was stated that it is important to try not to split the precinct lines and align these with the district lines as much as possible. Ms. Schultz stated the sometimes the precinct lines will not line up with the district lines. She stated once the map is developed the precincts will change. They will try to follow the voting districts as much as possible. Committee members were reminded that Representative Franks, along with a couple other representatives will be holding a redistricting meeting at Marengo High School at 10:00a.m. if interested in attending.

Committee members reviewed the State Legislative tracking list as updated by Mr. Lehmann.

The Governor's budget included the proposed consolidation of the ROE's (Regional Office of Education). The Superintendent of Schools is against this proposal.

Mr. Annarella had previously discussed the proposal to cut 6% for payments to institutions. There has been no change to this bill and it still stands in its current form.

The Governor has proposed cuts in the probation fees paid to the Counties. He is proposing to fund 80% of the previous cost share.

There are a number of bills that have been referred to the rules committee. Most of these occurred in the House, where they will remain. Twelve (12) bills have passed one House and have been forwarded to the other House. Mr. Lehmann provided an update on where the current bills stand. House Bill 156 sets forth the notice requirements to inform the State Representative and State Senator of a proposal to erect a tower in their districts. This Bill passed the House and is in the Assignments Committee of the Senate.

House Bill 1869 has been re-referred to the Rules Committee. This is the bill that amends the Notice By Publication Act. It provides that notwithstanding any other law, if a statute requires a unit of local government or school district to publish a public notice in a newspaper then, at its discretion, the unit of government may satisfy this requirement by publishing this notice on its own website. This is currently stuck in the rules committee because there is some negotiation to not advertise all assessment notices. The issue is that some entities have a good website for this posting requirement and others do not. That disparity is the issue. This was introduced to cut expenses for some counties.

Senate Bill 91 is the Bill from Senator Althoff that Amends the Fox Waterway Agency Act. This was previously referred to as the Fox Waterway Fee. This modifies the wording of what describes a waterway. This bill is expected to be considered in 2012.

LEGISLATIVE AND INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

April 14, 2011

Page 4

Committee members stated that there were two bills not reflected in the list that should be included. Those were HB 173 and SB 1926. The bills include ways to consolidate government. This could result in more costs to some units of local governments. It is important to continue to review these two bills as they seem to be building steam in Springfield and may be on the floor of the Senate within two days. Mr. Austin stated that a report came out yesterday on government consolidation and where this should be done. It was stated that some counties do not need to have townships, for example, Cook County. Other counties do need townships. House Bill 173 has been wrapped into Senate Bill 1926 (the bill that eliminates townships).

Mr. Lehman stated that it is important that they start to gather ideas to progress with for local agencies, including the Fox Waterway Agency, Cell Tower Regulation and "purchase local". Committee members stated that wind towers should be included in this list as well.

NEW BUSINESS

None

EXECUTIVE SESSION: None.

REPORTS TO COMMITTEE: None.

ADJOURNMENT:

Noting no further business, Ms. Schmidt made a motion, seconded by Mr. Provenzano to adjourn the meeting at 10:37 a.m.

* * * * *

RECOMMENDED FOR BOARD/COMMITTEE ACTION:

:ksf