

CHAMPAIGN COUNTY BOARD  
**COMMITTEE MINUTES**

---

**ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE SPECIAL COMMITTEE**

**Thursday, February 5, 2009**

**Meeting Room 3, Brookens Administrative Center  
1776 E. Washington St., Urbana**

6:00 p.m.

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Tom Betz, Brendan McGinty

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Steve Moser

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Carol Ammons (County Board Member), Kat Bork (Administrative Secretary), Deb Busey (County Administrator of Finance & HR Management), Amanda Tucker (HR Generalist), C. Pius Weibel (County Board Chair), Barbara Wysocki (County Board Member)

**CALL TO ORDER**

McGinty called the meeting to order at 6:01 p.m.

**ROLL CALL**

Betz and McGinty were present, establishing the presence of a quorum.

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA/ADDENDUM**

**MOTION** by Betz to approve the agenda; seconded by McGinty. **Motion carried.**

**PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

There was no public participation.

**DISCUSSION REGARDING CHAMPAIGN COUNTY ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE**

McGinty reviewed the committee's discussions from last year's meetings. It was decided at that time to leave further development of the administrative structure until after the election and budget preparation. The County Board approved changing the structure from 2 County Administrators to a single County Administrator in October 2008. With the two County Administrators' contracts ending later this year, the committee had expressed a desire to have a new administrative structure in place by August. The committee talked about developing the job descriptions for a single County Administrator, a Director or Deputy Administrator of Facilities, and any other structure under the County Administrator. The committee wanted to have some transition to a new Facilities Director before the end of the current contracts and to have the Facilities Director start by October 1, 2009. At

least three months would be needed to advertise, interview, and fill the position. Another question is what the County will have with other positions down the road, such as the IT Director, HR, and Finance. The committee was going to look at the director-level position to decide what the County will have and set the job description that accompany the position. McGinty asked if this summary was accurate and Betz confirmed this was close to his recollection. Betz recommended submitting the resolution approving the single County Administrator structure that was passed in October to the County Board again to get everyone up to speed on the issue and reaffirm support for the structure. McGinty asked if this committee should bring that recommendation to the Policy, Personnel, & Appointments Committee to go to the full Board in February. Betz agreed and did not think reaffirming the single Administrator structure would be a problem because it was unanimously approved by the County Board in October. McGinty concurred and recommended providing the past Administrative Structure Committee minutes to bring Board members up to speed on the previous discussions. Regarding a Director of Facilities, the committee discussed whether the person should be an engineer, architect, or a facilities manager and McGinty recalled the committee leaned more towards a facilities manager-type person. Betz agreed and noted that employing an architect or engineer was out of the question financially and was not necessary for the position. His problem with developing the position is his ignorance with what skill set is needed. Betz asked what a Facilities Director was supposed to do in relation to supervising the management of County buildings, upkeep, maintenance, and potential expansion. The County will have major facilities issues coming up in the future and changing maintenance issues. McGinty asked for Busey's opinion. Busey thought there was a degree in building management and the County needs someone who could develop a capital improvement plan for all 11 facilities. The initial documentation of this plan may take the expertise of an architect or engineer, but once it is documented the Director of Facilities would need to ensure the plan is adhered to, properly budgeted for, and that maintenance is appropriated in a timely manner. This should all be managed by the Director of Facilities. Betz asked if the building management degree was a graduate degree. Busey confirmed she would check on it and that there was a level of expertise that is not to the level of an architect or engineer. Betz asked if other counties with the facilities manager position employ someone with this type of degree. Busey said it is a desired standard, but the degree is rather new and most counties probably have someone in that type of position who has been there for a long time. The County would look for commensurate experience.

McGinty asked if the County Board endorsed the organizational chart when they affirmed the single Administrator position. Betz said the Board did not and he believed that he and Moser were not prepared to endorse it. Betz wanted to have the skill set and financial impact described. McGinty said he meant to bring the organizational chart back to fill it in. Betz agreed and said some price tag range needs to be included, especially given the financial situation of the County. Busey said that information could be quickly provided. McGinty asked if bringing the organizational chart back could be a goal for the next meeting to start defining the positions and exploring the financial impact of going from 2 Administrators to 1 Administrator and a Director of Facilities. Betz asked if the County had a Director of HR now. Busey answered no and explained the County does have an HR Division. The County Board has named the County Administrator of Finance & HR Management as its Personnel Director, so the HR staff answers to that Administrator. Busey confirmed this structure is working well and she did not believe the County needed a director-level position for HR.

Busey suggested the committee consider separating the IT Division away from the Administrative Services Department and isolating those expenses into a separate department. There is

already an IT Director and an IT staff. The Administrative Services would consist of the County Board and overall County department support, including HR and purchasing. McGinty asked what a similar separate department would be to an IT Department. Busey said that Physical Plant is already a separate department. Physical Plant is considered part of Administrative Services and she thought it really should be a separate department responsible for all the buildings and building maintenance. The IT Director would report to the County Administrator. Busey explained all of the IT expenses are in the Administrative Services budget and she thought it would be a much cleaner accounting of the true IT costs for the County if it is separated from Administrative Services. McGinty agreed because IT is not a revenue-generating department and it would be a way to track the sort of support an organization the size of Champaign County requires. McGinty asked if any other department was in that category. Busey thought that Administrative Services was generally providing direct support services to the County Board and general services to all County departments, such as HR, purchasing, photocopying, phones, etc. from one central place. McGinty has gathered there is some sort of animosity from some departments to Administrative Services and asked for a couple of examples why this exists and if there was a way to alleviate concerns through restructuring. Betz thought it was related to elected officials, not departments. The elected officials see themselves as constitutional officers and they resent any attempt to control or mediate their budgets, personnel policies, or department operations even though the County Board gets the bill whenever there is a problem. The County Board has very little authority over the elected offices other than the purse strings. Betz sees it as dynamic tension that people become invested in. McGinty asked if it would just continue to exist because of the status. Betz indicated that part of it was personality and part of it was structure. Betz said one of the most frustrating things of being on the County Board was having the responsibility but none of the actual authority when it comes to the structure of Champaign County with its appointed and elected officials. Ammons asked if revenue generated by the elected offices came back to the General Corporate Fund. Busey confirmed that all revenues for all General Corporate offices go to the General Corporate Fund. Ammons said it appeared the County Board only has leverage through the budget. Busey agreed with Betz and mentioned that, with the County having two isolated campuses, there is a perception that Administrative Services and its employees get preferential treatment because they are closer to the County Board. Busey did not think this was true, but you cannot stop a perception that chooses to perpetuate itself. Other departments think there are many staff in Administrative Services, but Champaign does not have too many Administrative Services staff by comparison to other counties its size. It is just that there are a lot of services focused in the one department, such as payroll and benefits administration. Administrative Services does not have very many clerical positions and Busey hears from offices that are primarily composed of clerical positions that Administrative Services employees are well paid. This is because it is a different kind of responsibility held by the Administrative Services employees. The perception is not accurate, but it exists that the County gives the County Administrators anything they ask for. McGinty stated the County Board is random enough that they could not play favorites like that.

Weibel entered the meeting at 6:24 p.m.

McGinty asked Tucker about the job descriptions for like positions of a Director of Facilities from comparable counties. Tucker said they pulled descriptions from Sangamon, McLean, and Peoria Counties. McGinty requested for those materials to be provided to the committee before the next meeting to allow the committee to do some legwork to come to the next meeting with some draft position descriptions for the County Administrator and Facilities Director. These positions could be fit

into the organization, including knowing the compensation ranges. McGinty would like the committee to review this information before just seeing it in the next meeting. Busey said it could be sent out with the agenda a next ahead of time. McGinty asked how Betz, as the Policy Committee Chair, would recommend moving forward, for example taking a piece at a time. Betz said the problem is that it is unprecedented. The last time the County Board hired the two Administrators, it was not a logical, methodical process. McGinty asked how the former process could be improved. He suggested the Administrative Structure Committee should put together an organizational chart, position descriptions, and salary ranges to take to the Policy, Personnel, & Appointments Committee. Betz recommended this committee bring the whole package to the Policy Committee and then vet it out in Policy to see if there are slight changes. He wants to be able to present a package that people had enough input into so the County Board feels comfortable voting on an administrative structure resolution.

McGinty questioned if the only thing the County Board should reaffirm was the idea of changing to a single County Administrator. There is a question about whether there would be a search to fill the County Administrator position and how that would be conducted. Betz thought the County Board needed to reaffirm the single Administrator structure with the new Board so it is in agreement. He felt filling the position was a totally separate issue. Weibel and McGinty agreed. McGinty suggested the next task after the reaffirmation would be showing a structure with a single Administrator, a Director of Facilities, and the changes that would occur. He suggested showing how Administrative Services would be restructured, the positions descriptions, and the costs involved. Once the County Board approves that structure, then they could look for who would fill those slots.

Ammons wanted it to be made clear that agreeing to Step 1 of the process is not agreeing to Step 2 or 3. She wanted to reaffirm along the way that the County Board has not promised anyone anything, they are simply working on the structure at this point. Betz said implementation is the third step. McGinty said his only concern was getting there rapidly enough to have enough time to post positions and fill them. Betz said the reaffirmation resolution should be submitted at March cycle of meetings. Ammons suggested a timeline be designed to accompany the reaffirmation resolution.

Weibel asked if it would be worthwhile to look at the Supervisor of Building Maintenance job description because it could be affected. Busey suggested it is an opportune time to review the overall structure of Physical Plant because there are two supervisors: the Supervisor of Building Maintenance and Supervisor of Ground Maintenance, who both answer directly to the County Administrator of Facilities & Procurement. Ammons asked if there are any other departments where the County has two people operating in a similar situation. Busey said their staff are defined differently and mentioned the County Clerk's Office and State's Attorney's Office have more than one supervisor over different areas of responsibility. It is also a structure that the County has morphed into over the years, so it is a good time to review to see if it is the most effective structure.

Betz asked how the Nursing Home Administrator fit into the structure because that person is no longer an appointed position. Busey said the County Board may want to consider that in many other counties' administrative structures the appointed officials are evaluated and report to the County Administrator even if they are hired by the County Board. The Animal Control Director has already been placed underneath the County Administrator. The other positions reporting to the County Administrator would potentially include the Nursing Home Administrator, the EMA Director, and the Planning & Zoning Director. This would take the County Board out of total responsibility for the

annual performance evaluations of appointed officials even though the Board members might still participate in the process. In both Peoria and McLean Counties, the County Administrators are responsible for those duties. Betz raised the issue because the Nursing Home structure with its management contract is odd right now. McGinty interjected that the County Board evaluates the performance for how the management firm is doing. Betz noted the Supervisor of Assessments is a constitutional officer and wondered how other counties address this situation. Busey said the County Board currently has the Supervisor of Assessments evaluated by a performance appraisal team just like the other appointed officials. She thought the Supervisor could refuse to participate in the process. Weibel said there some proposed legislation to modify that somewhat. Betz was raising these issues because the committee needs to think beyond facilities to other areas. Busey asked if the committee wanted the County Board to affirm the responsibilities expected of the County Administrator when it reaffirms the single Administrator structure. The committee agreed. Busey suggested spelling that out in a job description, which was not done in October, to accompany the reaffirmation resolution. Betz thought there were some responsibilities in the resolution. McGinty offered to work with Busey to put together some job descriptions and concepts of how the structure would work for the committee to consider before the next meeting and to be submitted to the Policy Committee and County Board in March. Betz agreed. McGinty said the conversation about how the County would afford a changed structure would have to be held after the structure is developed. Betz said the word "reaffirmation" should be used in the resolution so the County Board recalls that it has been approved before.

The committee discussed when to hold its next meeting and selected February 11, 2009 at 5:00 p.m. as its next meeting.

### **OTHER BUSINESS**

There was no other business.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

Meeting adjourned at 6:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kat Bork  
Administrative Secretary

*Secy's note: The minutes reflect the order of the agenda and may not necessarily reflect the order of business conducted at the meeting.*