

Minutes of the Justice Committee Meeting

The Justice Committee of the McLean County Board met on Monday, November 6, 2000 at 5:00 p.m. in Room 700 of the McLean County Law and Justice Center, 104 W. Front Street, Bloomington, Illinois.

Members Present: Chairman Sommer, Members **Rodman**, Gordon, Pokomey, Arnold

Members Absent: None

Staff Present: Mr. John Zeunik, County Administrator; Mr. Terry Lindberg, Assistant County Administrator; Ms. Lucretia A. Wood, Administrative Assistant, County Administrator's Office

Department Heads/

Elected Officials

Present: Sheriff Dave Owens; Chief Deputy **Derrick** Love, Sheriff's Department; Mr. Dan Brady, Coroner; Ms. Jane Engblom, Jury Commissioner; Chief Judge Luther Dearborn, 1<sup>st</sup> Judicial Circuit Court; Mr. Will **Scanlon**, Trial Court Administrator, 11<sup>th</sup> Judicial Circuit Court, Ms. Amy Davis, Public Defender; Ms. Shawn Walker, Director, **MetCom**; Ms. Rose **Buchanon**, Operations Manager, **MetCom**; Mr. Charles Reynard, State's Attorney; Ms. **Teena** Griffin, First Assistant State's Attorney; Ms. Cindy Outlaw, Office Manager, State's Attorney Office; Ms. Judy Renner, Assistant State's Attorney, State's Attorney's Office; Ms. Joan Naour, Director, Correctional Health Services

Chairman Sommer called the recessed meeting to order at 5:00 p.m. Chairman Sommer opened the floor to the Committee members who made the motion to reconsider the Committee's previous action tentatively approving the State's Attorney's **FY'2001** budget. Mr. Arnold stated that he seconded the motion to reconsider. Mr. Reynard's second letter prompted the motion to reconsider. In the original discussion, the additional personnel were justified because there is money available to Mr. Reynard for the funding of the requested positions. Mr. Arnold stated that he feels that using the Asset Forfeiture Fund is bad public policy. The positions should not be linked to the Asset Forfeiture Fund. Mr. Arnold stated that he is convinced that there is a clear and present need for the staff.

Mr. Arnold stated that last ~~year~~, he had requested that the Asset Forfeiture be cleared out. Mr. Arnold assumed that what was left in the Fund was a nominal amount. He learned that the amount that was transferred out of the Fund was an Accounts Receivable item for money previously advanced to the Asset Forfeiture Fund by the General Fund.

Mr. Arnold recommended that the Asset **Forfeiture** Fund be cleared out all together and a separate transaction should be done for the staffing needs.

Mr. Charles Reynard, State's Attorney, stated that he appreciates **Mr.** Arnold's perspective and feels that the proposal can support those views. The proposal is to transfer funds to the General Fund, which will cover expenses of drug prosecutions, which are accrued in other offices of County Government. This will free General Fund dollars for staffing needs. There is an appearance of a linkage between the transferring of **Assets Forfeiture** Funds and the staffing positions. To resolve the linkage, the Asset Forfeiture Fund could be transferred to the General Fund on a regular basis versus. once a year. The use of the Asset Forfeiture Funds within the General Fund would then be decided in collaboration between the County Board and the State's Attorney's Office.

Mr. Gordon asked if the Asset Forfeiture Fund would be totally folded into the General Fund. Mr. Reynard replied that the fund balance in the Asset Forfeiture Fund would be transferred into the General Fund. Mr. Gordon asked if the County Board would have the discretion to use the funds as the Board sees fit for drug related services. Mr. Reynard replied that the law requires that the Asset Forfeiture Fund be used for drug prosecution and drug related services. The law requires that Mr. Reynard be responsible for the disbursement of the money in the Asset Forfeiture Fund. This is why Mr. Reynard would need to be involved in the budgeting of any Asset Forfeiture money transferred to the General Fund.

Chairman Sommer asked when the transfer of the Asset Forfeiture Fund to the General Fund could be made. Mr. Reynard stated that the Asset Forfeiture Fund transfer could be completed with the start of Fiscal Year 2001. Mr. Arnold stated that the Asset Forfeiture Fund can be tracked within the General Fund so that the Auditor can track the use of the Asset Forfeiture Fund.

Mr. **Rodman** asked if the transfer is a binding commitment that would compel another State's Attorney in the future to make the transfer. Mr. Reynard replied that he is not certain.

Mr. Gordon asked if the transfer is a positive step from the viewpoint of Administrator's Office and the Finance Committee. Chairman Sommer replied that the State Legislature mandates that the State's Attorney handle the disbursement of the Asset Forfeiture Fund. The County's job is to pay the bills. If the State Legislature had ordered the money into the General Fund to start with, the money in the Asset Forfeiture Fund would not be a problem. Mr. Reynard replied that the State Legislature does not foreclose the Asset Forfeiture Fund being housed within the confines of the General Fund.

Chairman Sommer asked what is the total balance of the Asset Forfeiture Fund.

Mr. Reynard replied that the balance of the Asset Forfeiture Fund as of November 1, 2000 is \$8 **1,724.00**, which should increase with November and December **totals** being added.

Mr. Reynard asked that the requested Revenue Budget be amended from **\$20,000.00** to **\$50,000.00** in Fiscal **Year 2001**. The request is made based **on the** letter from the State Police. The estimate of **\$20,000.00** is very low. The State Police have recommended specific programs and directives, which should increase revenue as high as **\$70,000.00**.

Chairman Sommer stated that he wants to focus on the balance at the end of **FY 2000**. Mr. John Zeunik, County Administrator, stated that there are two issues for the Committee to consider. First, this is an unpredictable source of revenue. If this is done, the fund needs to be treated like the Adult Probation Services Fund and the Juvenile Probation Fee Fund. The Fund balance needs to be secured on a date certain. The Asset Forfeiture Fund balance on that date is all the money from that fund that will be used for the following year.

Mr. **Rodman** noted that the revenue would not show in the General Fund, but the transfer of funds would be seen.

Mr. Zeunik stated that the second issue is that of linkage of the Asset Forfeiture Fund to staffing. The Asset Forfeiture Fund balance will offset the qualified expenses for **FY2001**. The qualified expenses will roll over to FY 2002 to the extent that the Asset Forfeiture Fund is used to fund new future expenses, this will impact the available balance. Mr. **Rodman** stated that the Asset Forfeiture Fund has always been in question. If the Asset Forfeiture **Fund is** transferred into the General Fund and disbursed in collaboration with the State's Attorney, there is more control. Chairman Sommer stated that if the Asset Forfeiture Fund is transferred into the General Fund, the fund transferred becomes a matter to be dealt with in the budgetary requirements. Staffing needs would need to be justified each and every year.

Motion by Arnold/Gordon to dissolve fund balance in the Asset Forfeiture Fund, transfer the fund balance of the Asset Forfeiture into the General Fund at the end of the year, and track the revenue and related expenses of the Asset Forfeiture Fund within the General Fund.

Chairman Sommer **asked if** the total balance including November and December will be transferred at the end of Fiscal Year 2000. Mr. Arnold replied that is correct.

Mr. Gordon asked if implementation is possible. Mr. Zeunik replied that the costs for the additional support staff is **\$59,023.00**. That leaves approximately **\$20,000.00** of revenue

from the Asset Forfeiture Fund that will need to be budgeted in order to have a balanced budget. The transfer will need to be done before the FY 2001 recommended budget is approved. If there is any overage, **the** tax levy could be reduced. Mr. Gordon asked if the remaining **\$20,000.00** could be held for future **needs** in the FY 2002 Budget. Mr. Reynard replied that he thought the money could be held in the General Fund.

Chairman Sommer stated that the County has a balanced budget except for the surplus in the Asset Forfeiture Fund, which is not a part of the General Fund. With the transfer of the Asset Forfeiture Fund balance, the County's General Fund budget is no longer a balanced budget. Mr. **Rodman** requested that a solid number be transferred now **and then** the rest be transferred in the next budget cycle. Mr. **Zeunik** stated that a date certain would need to be picked prior to budget planning.

Motion by Arnold/Gordon to amend the previous motion to dissolve the Asset Forfeiture Fund effective for each **FY** Year on June 30" except for **FY** 2000, which will be done for the FY 2001 budget process.

Mr. Arnold stated that he wants to avoid linkage between the Asset Forfeiture Fund and the additional staffing. Chairman Sommer stated that if the balance above the costs of the staffing should be used for tax abatement and returned to the taxpayers. This could **be** done outside the motion.

Chairman Sommer asked if there is a running total for the Asset Forfeiture Fund and what are the total costs of drug prosecution each year. Mr. Reynard stated that the history of the Asset Forfeiture Fund was included in the November **2, 2000** memo. The total is **\$217, 040.00** inclusive of benefits. After 1991, the Attorney position was fully funded by the Appellate Prosecutor grant. Chairman Sommer asked if we have expenses that are separate from personnel. Mr. Reynard replied that the funds have used correctly and are audit worthy.

Mr. Gordon stated that the overage still has to be budgeted. Mr. Reynard stated that it will be a effort to design a protocol for the use of the overage. There are a number of misdemeanor drug cases that have not been taken into account. These prosecutions expenses can be covered by the Asset Forfeiture Fund.

Motion as amended carried.

Chairman Sommer asked Mr. Reynard to review the requested staffing needs of the State's Attorney's Office as presented at the October **19, 2000** Special Justice Meeting. Mr. Reynard stated that one concern raised by the Committee is that the staffing always remains separate and not be absorbed by the General Fund if the Asset Forfeiture Fund does not have sufficient funds. Mr. Reynard suggested that the staffing needs be

addressed by hiring contract staff. Mr. Zeunik suggested that the Office Support Specialist staff could be considered part-time by creating two positions that are less than 1000 hours to avoid the cost of benefits. These positions would be easier to track because the part-time salary budget is smaller. Mr. Reynard stated if there were two part-time positions, the positions would be tracked under personnel as opposed to contract services. Mr. Reynard stated that he supports either option.

Mr. Gordon asked the costs of the support person. Mr. Zeunik replied that the cost of the Office Support Specialist is approximately **\$25,000.00**. Mr. **Rodman** asked if the part-time positions are the best way to spend the funds or would using temporary staff be better. Mr. Zeunik replied that the position would pay \$12.69 per hour. Depending on the qualifications of the temporary contract staff and the costs for Manpower, **it may** be a wash.

Mr. Pokorney stated that one of the needs for the support staff is for filing. He is concerned that if the positions are added as Full Time positions, they become permanently based. Mr. Pokorney stated his objections to increasing the **FTE's**. If there are funds available for the contract attorney, the positions could be contracted as long as the funds remained available.

Chairman Sommer stated that he doesn't like the idea of using two part-time positions in order to avoid funding benefits.

Mr. Gordon stated that the Committee has expressed a great deal of concern regarding adding personnel in FY 2001 because of the outcome of the PAS Study. He stated that there is a question as to the quality of temporary employees. He asked if there is a way to revisit this.

Substitution motion by **Arnold/Rodman** for a SO **FTE** contract attorney and a 1.0 **FTE** contract Office Support Specialist to be funded by the balance available in the Asset Forfeiture Fund.

Mr. Reynard stated that he has brought staff with him to explain the needs of the staffing. Mr. Reynard stated that the staff is needed to help alleviate a backlog in traffic court. Many of the most experienced attorneys, such as **Teena** Griffin, First Assistant State's Attorney, are being pulled from their regular assignments to help manage the caseload in traffic court. The caseload in traffic is continually increasing and the attorneys are being forced into traffic court more and more frequently.

Mr. Reynard stated that the closed file room needs attention. The Fire Marshall cited the room last year. Adjustments were made, however, the room could still cause future problems. Files are stacked in work areas and in hallways.

Mr. Reynard stated that prosecution could be limited in the future because there is not enough staff to keep up with the demands of the increasing caseload. The Juvenile Neglect and Abuse Attorney's are spending many extra hours on their caseloads. Juvenile Neglect and Abuse cases must be reviewed every six months. Mistakes cannot be mistakes made on these cases.

Mr. Gordon noted with regard to the October 29, 2000 memo the State's Attorney has stated if there is ever a shortage in funds, the County Board would have the right to cut the State's Attorney's budget. He asked where would Mr. Reynard make the cuts. Mr. Reynard replied that the cuts would be based on the situation.

Mr. Gordon asked how traffic cases increase the prosecution caseload. Mr. Reynard replied that traffic tickets are initiated by local police agencies. The State's Attorney's Office has no control over the number of traffic cases that are filed. The Juvenile Abuse hearings are mandated by State Law. Ms. Judy Renner, Juvenile Abuse/Neglect Attorney, State's Attorney's Office, stated that permanency hearings have to be held every 6 months in cases where DCFS has guardianship. In the past, these cases were held every 18 months. There was also a change in Federal and State Law regarding any child who has been in care for 16 out of 22 months, a motion to terminate parental rights is mandated. The number of potential terminations has increased due to the change in the law. Termination hearings are held two days a week now. The Attorneys used to be in court two days out of the week, now, Juvenile and Abuse cases take five days of the week.

Chairman Sommer called for questions.

Motion carried.

There being nothing further to come before the recessed Committee meeting, Chairman Sommer adjourned the recessed meeting at 5:27 p.m.

Chairman Sommer called the Committee meeting to order at 5:28 p.m.

Honorable Luther H. **Dearborn, Chief** Judge of the Eleventh Judicial Circuit, presented a report regarding the need for expansion of the McLean County Jail facility. He stated that one comment in opposition to jail expansion that the Committee is likely to hear is that there are alternatives to the overcrowding of the jail facility that should be explored.

Judge Dearborn stated that Mr. Will Scanlon, Court Administrator, gathered and assembled the bulk of the illustrative and statistical material that was distributed to the

Committee in their packets, and that Mr. Scanlon will be available to answer questions for the Committee.

In reference to the document entitled Analysis of Current Inmate Summary for September 18, 2000, included in the Committee's packet, Judge Dearborn explained that he attended a meeting wherein Mr. Charles Reynard, McLean County State's Attorney, spoke on conditions within the jail, and distributed this document as a part of his presentation. He noted that the document was used to illustrate the conditions on a given day in the McLean County Jail. He stated that, although the analysis represents a narrow view of the jail, it does illustrate, statistically, who was in the jail and why they were there, on that particular day.

Judge Dearborn noted that, on the date in question, there were 256 people in the jail, being placed in three (3) categories: 1) those booked under new charges; 2) sentenced inmates; and 3) other inmates. He explained that the inmates in both the new charges category and the sentenced inmates category are further subcategorized as felony charges or misdemeanor charges.

Judge Dearborn stated that, on the day in question, 60.2% of the total population were incarcerated due to new charges being filed against them. He further stated that 19.1% of the total jail population were Sentenced Inmates and 21% were characterized as Other Inmates.

Judge Dearborn explained that the Other Inmates category consists of offenses such as: probation violations, outstanding warrants being executed, family cases, civil cases, contempt of court cases, and storage.

Judge Dearborn explained that the breakdown of the total jail population for the day in question could further be characterized as 70.3% Felony/Violent Misdemeanor offenders, and 29.7% Non-Violent Felony/Misdemeanor offenders. He remarked that the subcategory of Warrants, under Other Inmates, is of particular interest. On the day in question, 45 individuals or 17.6% of the total population were incarcerated on warrants, with 18 of those individuals incarcerated on parole warrants. Such a distinction refers to persons who have been released from prison and have allegedly committed new offenses or other parole violations. Those individuals are housed in the McLean County Jail until penitentiary personnel arrive to remove them.

Judge Dearborn explained that, when the 18 inmates incarcerated on parole warrants are deducted from the total 45 individuals incarcerated on warrants, there are 27 inmates remaining (10.5% of the total inmate population of 256). Those 27 inmates are incarcerated on warrants for failure to appear. He stated that a failure to appear is an

**offence** wherein an individual is first arrested, has been released on bond, and subsequently fails to appear for the next scheduled court date.

Judge Dearborn remarked that the Committee may hear comments from citizens -that an alternative to jail overcrowding might be to allow more first-time offenders and minor offenders to be released on bond He noted that many detainees **who are** eligible to be released on bond usually are released. He stated that, in reality, the majority of failure to appear detainees are detained because they were initially released on personal recognizance or low cash bonds, and still failed to appear for their next court date. Therefore, the rationale for releasing the lesser offenders on bond to relieve overcrowding in the jail does not sufficiently address the situation, when the number of failure to appear detainees is taken into consideration.

Judge Dearborn stated that **10.5%** of the 256 total jail detainees, held on failure to appear warrants, might seem to be an unusually high number. He noted that the significance of this figure is a compelling argument against having lower bonds set.

Judge Dearborn then presented the **McLean** County Sheriff's Department Jail Statistics as of October **2, 2000**. He noted that statistics are available for the last five (5) full years for three (3) categories: 1) Average Total Jail Count; 2) Average Daily Inmate Jail Population; and 3) Average Daily Work Release Inmates. He noted that the Average Daily Inmate Jail Population is defined differently from the Average Total Jail Count. The Average Daily Inmate Jail Population consists of those people who are in custody except for those who are on work release, people who are held in another county, or those who were released within 24 hours of being booked. The Average Total Jail Count, conversely, includes all the inmates accounted for in the Average Daily Inmate Jail Population, the Average Daily Work Release Inmates and all other inmates present on that day.

Judge Dearborn noted, in reference to the totals given in the Jail Statistics, that these figures encompass an entire year, as opposed to the representative day figures for September **18, 2000**. In comparing the figures for the Average Total Jail Count in 1999, which was 223.5 people, and the Average Daily Inmate Jail Population in 1999, which was 198.3, it will be apparent that there are 34.2 people who are not accounted for within the jail population for the Average Daily Inmate Jail Population. He further noted that 10.2 inmates were not in the jail because they were on work release. He also noted that there were no available statistics as to how many of the inmates were being held in another county. However, that number is not ordinarily large. It is estimated that an average of 20 people are released daily on bond. In conclusion, Judge Dearborn explained that there are a number of people who are arrested, booked and then released on bail.



In another set of statistics, Judge Dearborn cited that there is a **5-year** incremental breakdown, from 1970 through 1995 and 1999, showing the McLean County Population as a whole, the Average Jail Population, and the Number of Filings of Felony, Misdemeanor and Drunk Driving cases. He stated that, in **1985, 3% (79.3)** of the population of the County were jail inmates. In **1990, 3.8%** (116.9) were in custody. In **1995, 4.1%** of the population of the County were jail inmates. In 1999, only 3.6% of the population of the County were jail inmates.

Judge Dearborn then explained the illustrative example of the graphs regarding Case Filings and Jail Population in 1985, 1990, 1995 and 1999. He stated that the graph shows the comparison between the Average Jail Population and the number of Felony, Misdemeanor and Driving Under the Influence (**DUI**) filings. The graph **indicates** that the number of Felony, Misdemeanor and DUI filings have increased significantly from 1985 to 1999.

Judge Dearborn noted that the last statistical data cited in his report presented information regarding counties that are comparable to McLean County with regard to jail **population** and general population. The counties examined in this data are: McLean, Champaign, Kankakee, Macon, Peoria, and Rock Island. He stated that 1990 population figures were used in this comparison, noting that they are now nearly ten (10) years old, although still relatively similar.

Judge Dearborn explained that there is real similarity in terms of the number of filings of felony, misdemeanor and DUI cases during the 1998 calendar year, which was the most comprehensive data available at the time the report was compiled. The numbers of filings for each of the counties examined were in the 4,000 to 5,000 range, and therefore, were comparable.

Judge Dearborn cited the statistics from 1999 for the Average Daily Jail Population. He noted that, in comparing the counties listed with McLean County's average, Kankakee County and Rock Island County were the closest in number. Macon County and Champaign County were somewhat higher and Peoria County was substantially higher. He explained that the most revealing statistics, in terms of illustrating the activity **level in** the jail were the 1998 Court Filing Statistics and the 1999 Average Daily Jail Population statistics.

Judge Dearborn stated that these statistics show that the County Jail is overcrowded due to the growth in this Community. The problem will continue to exist as long as the Community continues to growth.

Judge Dearborn stated that due to the growth in caseloads, another judge in the Circuit' was added. This judge serves part-time in McLean County in the Criminal Division.

Another judge is needed in McLean County. If the Judge is added, additional staff will be needed in the State's Attorney's Office and Public Defender's Office.

Mr. Gordon stated that other factors effect the caseload such as social factors and law mandates. There are some fairly significant differences in the rate of population growth and the rate of case filings. Between 1985 and 1990, the population increased by **5%**, the number of case filings increased by 17% and the jail population 47%. He stated that he is curious about the different rates of increase **in other** Counties as well. Judge Dearborn stated that there are lots of socio-economic reasons that could cause the jail population increase. However, these statistics are not easy to measure. The general trends are that with a population increase, **case filings** increase as well.

Mr. Arnold stated that the Illinois Detention Facilities report states that the incarceration rate has decreased according to the statistics.

-- Mr. Pokomey stated that the **1999 average** daily jail population expressed per capita shows that Rock Island is lower than McLean County. The other Counties are higher. In terms of housing inmates, McLean County could be in a worse position.

Mr. Gordon stated that he would like to look at all of the different perspectives involved in the jail population statistics.

Mr. **Rodman** asked if there were a work release program prior to 1998. Judge Dearborn replied that there was a work release program prior to 1998, however the statistics are not available. Mr. **Rodman** asked if the statistics are ready for 2000. Judge Dearborn stated that he didn't look into the work release statistics for 2000 and did not want to guess.

Mr. **Rodman** asked if the judges were looking into sentence alternatives other than jail time. Judge Dearborn stated that there are many alternatives such as work release, community service, fines, and restitution. However, while a case is pending, these alternatives are not options.

Mr. **Rodman** asked if drug court is an option to decrease the jail population. Judge Dearborn replied that the Circuit Court just completed a study on drug courts. The establishment of drug court would have a minimal impact on the jail population. Mr. **Rodman** stated that recidivism is reduced in places where drug courts have been established. Judge Dearborn stated that the most dramatic reduction of recidivism is during the time the offender is in the program and being monitored. There are not statistics available that show reduced recidivism once the program is completed.

Mr. Will Scanlon, Trial Court Administrator, 1 **1<sup>th</sup>** Judicial Circuit, stated that most models for drug courts operate post-sentence and will not effect pre-sentence jail populations. The recidivism rates are measures while the offender is in the program or immediately following the program.

Mr. Scanlon indicated that 180 Counties were involved in the study. It is unclear whether or not the program is effective because there are no long-term statistics available. Judge Dearborn stated that if drug courts are found successful and become an option for McLean County, resources would have to be devoted. Staff time would be "impacted."

Mr. **Rodman** asked if the study were done by the State. Mr. Scanlon replied that the study was completed **by local** jurisdictions.

Judge Dearborn stated that many of the drug courts in Illinois were established by grants. These grants are no longer available.

~~Mr.~~ **Arnold** asked what would be the costs for establishing a drug court as compared to the costs of building a new jail. Judge Dearborn stated that those would be difficult figures to compare.

Mr. Gordon stated that there is a significant difference in the costs per participant in drug court as opposed to the costs of incarceration per inmate. In the City of St. Louis, job training and job placement was used in conjunction with the drug court.

Chairman Sommer stated that 12.7% of the jail population are drug offenders according to the **LZT** study. Drug court in McLean County may not be all that effective in terms of the total jail population.

Chairman Sommer thanked Judge Dearborn for his report and the statistical data.

Ms. Jane Engblom, Jury Coordinator, presented a request for approval of a Copier Equipment Maintenance Program between McLean County and CDS Office Technologies. Ms. Engblom stated that the request is a renewal of the program.

Motion by **Arnold/Pokorney** to recommend approval of the request of a Copier Equipment Maintenance Program between McLean County and CDS Office Technologies for the Jury Commission. Motion carried.

Sheriff Dave Owens presented the Illinois Department of Corrections report on the Inspection of the McLean County Jail. The jail was cited for instances of jail overcrowding. The detainees are not provided suitable quarters.

Mr. **Rodman** asked what the report refers to in **#3** of the Noncompliance with Illinois County Jail standards. Chief **Derick** Love stated that the requirements of a physical nature refer to toilets, lighting, and beds. Sheriff Owens stated that housing inmates out continues to be a problem. Many facilities do not have extra bed space available.

Mr. Arnold asked if the Illinois Department of Corrections gave the County any **advice as** to how to handle the problems of overcrowding. Sheriff Owens stated that in 1997 the County was encouraged to expand. Chief Love stated that no alternatives were given, Mr. Arnold suggested that the Department of Corrections be contacted to see if the Department recommends any solutions to the overcrowding in the **jail**. Sheriff Owens stated that the **LZT** study has provided a source for alternatives to jail sentences.

Mr. **Rodman** noted that Mr. Michael Velarde, Illinois Department of Corrections, does volunteer to act as a consultant. Mr. **Rodman** asked if **LZT** has contacted him as a part of their study. Mr. John **Maher, LZT**, stated that he does not know if Mr. Velarde has been contacted. LZT does communicate with the Bureau of Investigations on a frequent basis. **LZT** is aware **of the** Bureau of Investigations suggestions. The Bureau hopes that Counties will solve overcrowding problems on their own.

Mr. Pokomey asked if the linear regression analysis used data from 1989 to 1999. Mr. **Maher** stated that he did not create the report. A special consultant, who specializes in linear regression analysis, was hired to analyze the data. Mr. Pokomey stated that the data from 1989-1993 shows large increases. After 1993, the data planes off. The linear regression analysis takes into account the prior years, which would cause false increases. **Mr. Pokomey** suggested that other years be included in the analysis. **Mr. Maher** stated that he could ask the consultant to look at different years.

Mr. Pokomey commented that the report states that the County's incarceration rate is low. He would like to see a comparison to the National Standards. Mr. **Maher** stated that he could get the National Standards.

Mr. **Rodman** stated that he has seen studies, which indicate that when a population increases over 100,000 people, the crime rate tends to be higher than in communities whose populations are under 100,000 people. Mr. **Maher** stated that he has not seen those studies.

Chairman Sommer noted that the report states that policy changes are needed for the police, bonding and the courts and that whether or not a new addition is done, alternatives to incarceration need to be put into effect. Almost one-third of all those housed in the facility were individuals **arrested** for crimes against persons. Many individuals that were book were charged with multiple offenses, the report recommends that only the most serious offenses be charged. Sheriff Owens noted that the report also states that 823 individuals were released within 24 hours, which is significant.

Mr. **Maher** stated that **LZT** wants to supply the Committee with as much information as possible. If the Committee has specific questions, please let Mr. Zeunik or Sheriff Owens know.

Ms. Amy Davis, Public Defender presented a request for two contract attorneys for the Public Defender's Office. The request is not for new positions. Last Thursday, the DUI Attorney resigned. The Attorney **in the** Traffic Division is inexperienced. **If** another new attorney is hired, there would not be anyone with experience handle traffic and DUI cases. The proposal is to split the **DUI** position in two. The contracts are six months **in** length. Two seasoned, local attorneys have agreed to take the position. The salary for the attorneys is based on the annual salary of a full-time position divided in two. This will allow time for the traffic attorney to gain experience.

Motion by **Pokorney/Rodman** to recommend approval of a request to contract for two attorneys for six months in the Public Defender's Office. Motion carried.

Ms. Billie **Larkin**, Director, Children's Advocacy Center presented the Monthly and General Reports for the Children's Advocacy Center. The number of cases is up 61% over 1999.

Ms. Beth **Carlson**, Deputy Coroner, presented the Monthly and General Reports for the month of September. McLean County deaths are down, Out-of-County autopsies are up. Two of the inquests held in September were ruled suicides and one was an accidental motor vehicle death.

Mr. Zeunik presented an update on the Integrated Justice Information System (**IJIS**). The contract amount for time and materials has run out on the current work order. However, due to the implementation problems experienced with this version, TRW has credited the County \$13 **1,000.00**. Chairman Sommer stated that the County will continue to receive credits for two more months.

Mr. John Zeunik presented the recommend budget for FY 2001 for the Coroner's Department. There is a slight change in revenue because of a 9% increase in the costs of copy fees and morgue fees. On the expense side, there is an increase in the Employee Medical line item. Personnel expenses for the Elected Official and Full-time positions have increased. Supply line items show little change. Contractual line items show little change. The most significant increase in the contractual line item is for the costs of the pathologists. The increase is due to the number increase in the of Out-of-County cases being handled. In the Capital Outlay line item, many of the requests were transferred to the Facilities Management in the Public Building Commission budget. The Coroner's Office is requesting a new vehicle.

Mr. Zeunik stated that Ms. **Carlson** is available to answer questions and was involved in the preparation of the budget.

Mr. **Rodman** asked if the County has a lot of cell phone usage. He suggested that the contracts be consolidated. Mr. Zeunik stated that there is not a lot of cell phone usage throughout the County. Among the Departments that use cell phones, nearly all of them have different service agreements. Over time, the County could standardize and use the **same vendor**. However, as the agreements are now, all of the departments are receiving a government discount.

-Ms. **Carlson** stated that the Coroner's Office is using ARCH as a cell phone provider, which is no longer a local company. There is a representative at Cellular One that would like to have the County's business.

Chairman Sommer stated that there are radios that have the abilities to patch into landlines. He asked if the current radio system allows for the patch to the landlines. Mr. Dan Brady, Coroner, replied that the current radio system does not allow for that service.

Motion by Pokomey/Gordon to tentatively approve the Recommend Budget for Fiscal Year 2001 for the Coroner's Department. Motion carried.

Mr. Zeunik presented the Fiscal Year 2001 Recommend Budget for the Children's Advocacy Center. The General Property tax levy is increased to **\$90,532.00** based on the estimated increase in Equalized Assessed Valuation. The other revenue sources are grant sources. The DCFS Grant and the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Grant are projecting considerable increases in 2001. There are increases in the Medical Expense line items and in the Personnel Line items. There are minimal increases in non-personnel line items. The 600 line items are up 1% over **FY'2000**. The 700 line items show a decrease. The total budget is up 11% mostly due to the PAS study and the resulting increase in personnel costs.

Motion by **Pokorney/Rodman** to tentatively approve the Fiscal Year **2001** Recommended Budget for the Children's Advocacy Center. Motion carried.

Mr. Zeunik presented the Fiscal Year 2001 Recommended Budget for MetCom. There is an increase in revenue of 9%. The Revenue is based on the formula defined in the Intergovernmental Agreement between the ETBS, City of Bloomington, Town of Normal, and McLean County for allocating the costs of operating the MetCom Center.

Mr. Zeunik stated that **the proposed** budget for MetCom has been reviewed and approved by the Operations Board, the City Manager of Bloomington and the City Manager of **Normal**. The budget does included additional personnel of 2.5 **FTE Telecommunicator** positions and 1.5 **FTE** non-union Supervisory positions. The need for the positions was discussed in the budget message. There are increases in the 600 line items. The major

focus in the budget is on training. There are significant increases in books, Videos and Publications and under Schooling and Conferences.

Mr. Zeunik stated that there are some additions to the capital line **items** for expenses such as new chairs. A new vehicle is also proposed. The vehicle planned to be **purchased** is used and will be purchased from either the Sheriff Department or the Town of Normal.

Mr. Pokomey questioned Ms. Walker regarding the number of conferences, the length of the conferences and the number of employees that will be sent to each conference.

Ms. Walker reviewed the details of each conference with the Committee. Ms. Walker explained that the conferences are necessary to assure the competencies of the **employees**. Many of the conferences are mandatory for new telecommunicators, other conferences keep the employees aware of new laws and updated technologies.

Mr. Pokomey suggested that the employees write a summary report regarding each conference. The Committee cautioned Ms. Walker on the number of conferences and suggested that in the future the conferences be spread out over a number of years.

Ms. Walker stated that the training in this budget is catch-up. In future years, the training will decrease and some of the training may be able to be done in house.

Chairman Sommer stated that **MetCom** has a 25% turn over rate. He asked how many of the employees that are involved in the training are likely to terminate employment.

Ms. Walker stated that it is likely that many of the employees involved in the training might leave. Unfortunately, training such as CPR, LEADS and Fire Training are required for employees to become certified Telecommunicators.

Motion by **Gordon/Pokorney** to tentatively approve the Fiscal Year 2001 Budget for METCOM. Motion carried.

Chairman Sommer presented the bills, which have been reviewed and recommended for transmittal to the Justice Committee by the County Auditor.

Motion by **Gordon/Pokorney** to recommend payment of the bills as presented by the County Auditor. Motion carried.

Justice Committee Meeting Minutes  
 November 6, 2000  
 Page Sixteen

DATE 11/06/00  
 TIME 13:10:34  
 Justice Committee

FINANCIAL SYSTEM  
 MCLEAN COUNTY BOARD COMMITTEE REPORT  
 AS OF 11/06/2000  
 EXPENDITURE SUMMARY BY FUND

PAGE 1  
 COMREPR  
 AUD2

FUND	FUND TITLE	PENDING TOTAL	PREPAID TOTAL	FUND TOTAL
000 1	GENERAL FUND		\$1,052,891.40	\$1,052,891.40
0129	CHILDREN ADVOCACY CENTER		\$22,467.12	\$22,467.12
0135	TORT JUDGEMENT		\$11,595.13	\$11,595.13
0139	COMM.POLICING DOM.VIOLENC		\$6,479.36	\$6,479.36
0140	CIRCUIT CLERK AUTOMATION		\$1,530.58	\$1,530.58
0141	COURT SECURITY		\$23,276.79	\$23,276.79
0142	COURT DOCUMENT STORAGE		\$ 198.20	\$198.20
0143	CHILD SUPPORT COLLECTION		\$800.56	\$800.56
0146	ADULT PROBATION SERVICES		\$2,648.53	\$2,648.53
0149	VIOLENT CRIME DEFENSE GRT		\$12,218.65	\$12,218.65
0150	DOM.VIOLEN GRANT(SHERIFF)		\$5,505.92	\$5,505.92
0152	ASSET FORFEITURE		\$570.32	\$570.32
0153	DARE PROGRAM FUND		\$300.00	\$300.00
0156	IDPA IV-D PROJECT		\$22,491.66	\$22,491.66
0506	LAW LIBRARY		\$878.79	\$878.79
COMMITTEE REPORT TOTALS		=====	\$1,163,853.01 =====	\$1,163,853.01 =====

There being nothing further to come before the committee at this time, Chairman Sommer adjourned the meeting at 8:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lucretia A. Wood  
 Recording Secretary