



MINUTES

Adams County Board FINANCE COMMITTEE

Monday, February 12, 2024 at 6:00PM

Adams County Board Room

507 Vermont Street, Quincy, IL. 62301

2nd Floor

Meeting Convened at 6:00PM on February 12, 2024.

Members Present: Bret Austin, Travis Cooley, Tim Finlay, Brad Poulter, Brent Fischer

Members Absent: None

Others in Attendance: Ryan Niekamp, F. Bryden Cory, Todd Nelson, Chris Pratt, Anthony Foster, Marvin Kerkhoff

A motion to approve the minutes as written by Brent Fischer and seconded by Tim Finlay. The minutes were approved unanimously as printed.

Resolution Number 2024-02-001-007 to Amend the previous allocation amounts of the American Rescue Plan Act for the improvements, and or replacements of community restrooms in various Villages in Adams County, IL was moved Travis, seconded by Mr. Poulter.

Resolution Number 2024-02-001-008 to Adopt the Adams County Housing Plan (G.R.O.W.) and Providing Funding Allocations was moved by Mr. Finlay, seconded by Mr. Fischer. Mr. Austin stated that he had received some questions regarding this plan. Treasurer Cory provided a synopsis of where the County currently sat with ARPA. The Treasurer stated that he has been using a mixed investment policy with a variety of funds. The current total amount of ARPA funds available is \$3,440,191 and this includes unspent money and interest amounts. Treasurer Cory stated that the interest earned does not legally abide by the ARPA fund guidelines and it can be used for whatever reason the Board sees fit. Mr. Austin stated that the County had cost over runs, but also projects that closed out and will be less than allocated and when it is all totaled it, it's about \$253,000 over the base of when the County started, but with the interest rates coming back, and projects coming back in lower, the County is about \$250,000 over which is not allocated. Mr. Finlay asked if the over and under netted each other out. Mr. Austin stated that they did. Mr. Austin stated that there are two pending projects: Housing and EIFS. Mr. Fischer asked if Mr. Austin's numbers included the mold remediation and the Youth Home project. Mr. Austin stated yes it did so there is around a \$250,000 unallocated. Mr. Finlay asked if there is any projection of what the EIFS will cost. Mr. Austin went over some already spend numbers on the EIFS and reminded that Mr. Bellis stated last month, the contractor would honor their original price. Mr. Fischer asked how many contracts that is anticipated to negotiate this year. Mr. Austin stated two, he believed. Mr. Fischer asked if the County was all clear and up to date with CIRMA. Mr. Austin stated yes, and in fact, the County had just seen three reimbursements from a few years prior. Mr. Austin stated that if you look at the GROW plan, the one million dollars will more than likely be spent over about a two-year period so there will be interest still to be add. Mr. Austin discussed the GROW program with the Finance members and stated that it had been sent out a couple of times most recently the past Friday and that that he only had a few questions. Mr. Austin stated that he

was asked what the cap would be, and it is \$100,000. Mr. Cooley asked if someone was building a residential property they would still be eligible for \$25,000 but the consignment would be under the actual owner of the property. Mr. Austin confirmed that to be correct and that with the GROW plan, the County would be handling the actually owner its self. Mr. Finlay spoke about the housing study's certain market need for approximately \$150,000 to \$200,000 homes and wondered if there should be some sort of bottom put on this program to ensure the plan incentives the area of growth that is needed and then asked if the program was designed for tiny homes. Mr. Austin stated, subjectively, no. Mr. Fischer asked what kind of restrictions could be placed on the money with there being no zoning in the County. Mr. Austin stated correct, there is no zoning in the County but there are pieces of the program that would be applicable towards Mr. Fischer's concern. Mr. Fischer asked how the inspector would work and how do does this program address what their cost would be. Mr. Austin stated that their cost would be buried in the cost of the program – Mr. Austin further stated that he does not want too many hoops, and no one applies for the loan. Mr. Fischer stated that if he applies for a loan, he is responsible to pay for all the costs associated with getting that loan (i.e., appraisal, etc.). Mr. Austin stated that perhaps under "financials" we put the developer / owner is responsible for any fees associated with program certification. Mr. Austin stated that the GROW program also includes a paragraph about the prohibition of challenging the properties EAV for a period of five years. Mr. Austin stated that anything that the committee approves, must go before the full County Board as well. Mr. Kerkhoff asked if it is possible to sweeten this program up and look at property tax abatement. Mr. Austin stated that the Board could not as the Board does not have the jurisdictional power to do so. Mr. Kerkhoff asked then about sales tax. Mr. Austin stated that the Board could look at that in certain taxing areas and there are permits to apply for such incentives along with a clause in the program language that requires the applicant to disclose all other incentives / programs their development is taking a part of to hopefully stop double dipping. Mr. Finlay asked about the claw back period and wanted to make sure that it is included in the program. Mr. Austin stated yes and read some piece out of the program but provided the thought that it could be tightened up. Mr. Finlay suggested stated adding "per rata per year into the agreed project timeline". The committee agreed with this change. Mr. Finlay asked if the Board had a security position on the property, and Mr. Austin stated yes. Mr. Finlay asked about the review fund committee and at one point, it was discussed how that would be made up. Mr. Austin said what about no county board members on this committee? Mr. Austin reminded that when the Board did the non-for-profit funding, there was no one on the County Board on that deciding board – Mr. Austin wants to make sure there is no politics in play with this money. Mr. Cooley stated that he agreed it would be best if there were no County Board members as long as the Board puts together a solid framework. Mr. Finlay stated that he was not sure if he felt comfortable with that as the Board is the one who is responsible. Mr. Finlay stated that he would support Mr. Austin's logic and let's try it, and if it does not work, then the Board can change it. Mr. Austin stated that he does not want to be anywhere near the deciding piece, or vetting part of the applications. Mr. Finlay wanted to come back around, that some of what we will see will be confidential and sees that as problematic since the Board is a public board. Mr. Austin stated that he is correct, the Board will want to be sure everything that needs to be confidential (i.e., financials, etc.), needs to remain confidential. Mr. Finlay would like to make sure the County Board has a say who is on the committee that decides the committee. Mr. Austin stated that the GROW committee will include five representatives selected by the Great River Economic Development Foundation and approved by the Adams County Board Chairman. Mr. Fischer asked if there were terms on this committee. Mr. Austin stated that it would just be until the program ends in two years. Mr. Finlay stated that what the Committee was doing now is adjusting the number of members from six to five taking out the County Board representative. Mr. Finlay asked if under the scoring criteria, the language could be re-worded to finalized and approved by the committee. Mr. Austin asked Mr. Finlay and Mr. Fischer if the discussion that was just had addressed their questions. Both gentlemen stated yes. Mr. Austin asked Mr. Cooley if his question was addressed. Mr. Cooley agreed that it was addressed. Mr. Finlay asked if these details would be subject to an audit review. Mr. Austin stated

yes, and in fact, two times – the County’s audit and ARPA audit review. Mr. Austin asked if there were any other questions. Mr. Cooley asked a question regarding the compliance piece regarding the codes and requirements within the property’s location and provided an example of a single-family dwelling. Mr. Austin stated that first if it’s built inside a municipal boundary, there will be some sort of zoning, and there is also a State Building Code and in the County it is default the State’s minimum coverage for building code. Mr. Cooley asked if there has to be an annual inspection, how would that happen? Mr. Austin stated that the County would hire a certified home inspector. Mr. Fischer stated that, that could be an incentive to build incorporated than non-incorporated. Mr. Finlay asked about bullet point number two under “Financials” and Mr. Austin responded with a clarification of the bullet point that it goes by the project’s budget. Mr. Finlay asked if a mobile home would comply with the program? Mr. Austin stated that technically yes. Mr. Cooley stated that he did not like that. Mr. Austin asked what the exclusion would be as if you say mobile home, manufactured home, etc.? Mr. Cooley stated that the program does say that it has to be “constructed” so it is actually covered. Mr. Austin stated how about “a number of units constructed”. Mr. Austin stated that he is going to write a note down and look at some different wording. Mr. Finlay did agree with Mr. Cooley’s point about “constructed”. Mr. Cooley stated that he believes a lot of people will want to go after this money - \$20,000 is a lot of money. Mr. Austin stated that he believed they would get a lot of people would apply – he just wants to see qualify applicants. Mr. Austin stated that he would do a red-line copy of the proposal to the committee so everyone can look over it prior to the meeting. Mr. Austin also asked the committee to help answer some questions at the Board Meeting as there is a lot of good insight on the Finance committee for this program. Mr. Fischer stated that there are three different layers that this Board has in this program so that helps; however, asked if there needed to be language about how to remove a member. Mr. Austin stated that he understands the question and perhaps. The ARPA / GROW plan was

The committee entertained an Additional Fund Appropriation from Tony Grootens – Sheriff – in the Amount of \$250,000 to Revenue Account Number 001-303-4220 – Revenue Federal Inmate Housing – for a Revised Budget Amount of \$250,000 and \$50,000 to Expense Account Number 001-303-5713 – Other Expenses – for a Revised Budget Amount of \$50,000 asked read by the Clerk, Mr. Niekamp. Moved to approved by Mr. Fischer and seconded by Mr. Finlay. Mr. Austin provide a quick recap of appropriation. Mr. Fischer stated that the per diem rate of \$80 per day is a high amount and higher than what he ever had. Mr. Fischer asked how much the Sheriff can spend without Board Approval. Mr. Austin thought that it was perhaps around \$15,000, but asked the Clerk to look up the amount. The appropriation was approved unanimously.

The committee entertained an Additional Fund Appropriation from Todd Nelson – Chief Public Defender – in the Amount of \$148,000 to Revenue Account Number 412-411-4105 – Earnings Public Defender – for a Revised Budget Amount of \$148,000 and \$148,000 to Expense Account Number 412-411-5713 – All Expenses – for a Revised Budget Amount of \$148,000 as read by the Clerk, Mr. Niekamp. Moved by Mr. Finlay, seconded by Mr. Poulter. Mr. Chris Pratt provided a recap of what the money should be used for - salaries for public defenders. Mr. Fischer asked if the state would stop providing the money down the road. Mr. Pratt stated it’s possible, but how the statute is written so it does not sunset. Mr. Pratt stated that the Public Defender’s Office will is already very short so the objective for this money would be aid in salaries of the current attorneys, along with assisting with attracting new lawyers. Mr. Austin stated that there will be multiple vacant positions very soon with the Chief Public Defender leaving and Mr. Pratt could perhaps leave later this year depending on the outcome of his election in Hancock County. Mr. Pratt noted that the staff that the Office currently has is second to none and work very hard. Mr. Fischer asked that if this was to be approved, would this keep some of the current staff? Mr. Pratt stated that he has had preliminary talks and for some of the attorneys there are bigger issues at play, but this would

immediately put the office on a more competitive field. Mr. Fischer asked if the office could put a temporarily incentive out there? Mr. Austin stated hypothetically they could, but he would not suggest that as it has to be pulled away at some point. Mr. Pratt stated that it's a start but if we can at least keep the applicants interest in the hiring ad, it's a start. Mr. Finlay asked if this is a starting point to get where we need to be, or will there need to be more steps in the future? Mr. Pratt stated that this is the request for this year and if it will be enough? Mr. Pratt stated he could not know that now – he stated that he continues to be aggressive in recruitment. Mr. Pratt is now not trying to have the best office, but just to have an office. Mr. Finlay asked how the \$148,000 figured came about. Mr. Pratt stated that is a formula based off population. Mr. Finlay stated he wanted to make sure they had enough money. The committee approved the appropriation unanimously.

Mr. Austin stated that he is noticing not all of the health insurance premium reimbursements are not being made to the County checking and has asked that they be made and remain coming in as requested.

The Committee reviewed a credit card application request for Amy Carothers and approved her request with a credit limit of \$2,500. The motion was made by Mr. Finlay and seconded by Mr. Poulter. The request was approved unanimously.

Clerk Niekamp noted that with Mr. Nelson leaving and Mr. Pratt taking over the Public Defender's Office in the interim, he will need a county issues credit card. Mr. Niekamp recommended a credit limit of \$2,500. Mr. Austin agreed and asked to make sure Mr. Nelson's card is shut off. Mr. Niekamp confirmed it would be. A motion to approve Mr. Pratt's request was made by Mr. Finlay, and seconded by Mr. Poulter, the committee approved the request unanimously.

A motion by Mr. Finlay was made at 7:42PM to adjourn. This was seconded by Mr. Poulter. The committee unanimously accepted to adjourn.