

Call to Order

- The meeting was called to order by Creswell at 6:00 p.m.

Introductions

- Introductions were made:
 - McLean County Board Representatives Metsker and Soeldner were present. County staff Dreyer was present.
 - Extension Council Representatives Creswell, Schumacher and Sommer were present. Extension staff Clore, Lewis-Sibley, Halihan and Estes were present.

Review/Approve March 12, 2020 Meeting Minutes

- Soeldner motioned to approve the April 23, 2020 minutes as presented, Sommer seconded; all approved, motion carried.

Discussion of Extension Fiscal Reports & Review of FY22 (CB tax year 2021) Levy Request for Extension

- Lewis-Sibley shared her screen with a PowerPoint presentation. Items included were:
 - Extension Funding Streams
 - Federal
 - Smith-Lever Funds
 - Federal SNAP-Ed Contracts – SNAP funding is handled through the state office, so our SNAP salaries and expenses are not reflected in our local budget.
 - State
 - General Revenue Funds
 - County Board Match
 - Local
 - County Board Levies
 - County Board Levy Process
 - McLean Historical Levy Requests (FY13 – FY22)
 - FY22 Levy Discrepancy - Reduction of levy amount from \$375,000 to \$300,000
 - Metsker commented that the finance committee agreed that the \$300,000 was a more appropriate amount than the \$375,000.
 - Lewis-Sibley noted that the minutes of the finance committee stated otherwise. Based on the minutes, the \$375,000 that the Extension Board voted on was never proposed to the County Board or the finance committee.
 - Based on the Extension law, the finance committee cannot reduce the levy. That can only be done at the full County Board level.
 - In the past, Bill Wasson communicated with Extension by sending a letter to the Extension Council of the disposition of the levy. To date, no letter has been received showing a reduction in funds.
 - Dryer noted that she believes the error was a matter of timing and that the tax levy is based on the county calendar year vs. the Extension fiscal year. Lewis-Sibley offered to meet with the county administrative staff to get a better understanding of the fiscal year discrepancy and Extension Law.
 - Soeldner wanted to clarify that the six Extension Board members voted to approve the \$375,000, and then that amount was supposed to be presented to the full County Board. Then, at that time a reduction can be discussed and approved. Lewis-Sibley agreed that this statement was true.

McLean County Board Representatives	
<i>Catherine Metsker</i>	P
<i>Jim Soeldner</i>	P
<i>Gerald Thompson</i>	P
Extension Council Representatives	
<i>Tom Creswell</i>	P
<i>Julie Schumacher</i>	P
<i>Mike Sommer</i>	P
McLean County Administrative Staff	
<i>Cathy Dreyer</i>	P
<i>Camille Rodrigues</i>	A
McLean County Extension Staff	
<i>Bobbie Lewis Sibley</i>	P
<i>Sara Halihan</i>	P
<i>Erin Estes</i>	P
<i>Harry Clore</i>	P

- Dryer noted that this reduction was a mistake and not done intentionally.
- Metsker stated that the \$300,000 that was approved by the finance committee had already been approved by the full County Board.
- Lewis-Sibley noted that no notice was given to Extension about the reduction of funds.
- Income and Expense Reports for FY20 final and FY21 year to date
 - Soeldner asked why McLean County funds/expenses were a larger amount than the other two counties. Lewis-Sibley replied that it is based on the size of the county, programs and staff. The current distribution is Livingston 20%, McLean 60% and Woodford 20%.
 - Metsker asked to compare the income/expense report with last year's budget to see the actual difference in program cost. Bobbie noted that information was provided to the County Board. Metsker noted again that the \$300,000 was already approved and final.
- FY22 Draft Budget
- 2019 Unit Audit – Presented by Harry Clore, Associate Director of Budget and Finance for Illinois Extension
 - Clore discussed that the 2019 Unit 12 Audit took a deep-dive into the finances in Livingston, McLean and Woodford counties. The audit committee consisted of three Extension Business Office staff and one Regional Office staff person.
 - They looked over purchasing card transactions, checking accounts, overall purchasing and fiscal processes used by the local staff.
 - With all of the university fiscal policy, the audit committee is tasked with making sure the units are all in order.
 - In Unit 12's review, there was nothing found out of the ordinary. Throughout the state, credit card use tends to be the number one finding. Although there were a few discrepancies, there was no major findings.
 - It was discovered that there was a little more in their checking account than was allowed, but it was resolved quickly and did not cause concern.
 - Thompson asked about this checking account overage. Clore explained that it was the in/out account and they set levels that units are allowed to hold in there based on the size of their unit. In this case, it was about \$2,000 over the allowable amount. This account tends to fluctuate a lot based on donations, that end up being transferred to their campus account.
- Addressing Carryover
 - Only 60% of the carryover is McLean counties.
 - Lewis-Sibley talked about the need for job growth in our counties.
 - In the recent Educator review process, it was apparent that an additional Publicity and Promotions Specialist was needed to help with the online presence in response to COVID-19.
 - In addition, the Consumer Economics Educator has developed the local program to a point where a Program Coordinator is needed to assist with the program needs.
- Extension: Return on Investment, including the state Economic and Functional Impact Report
- FY23 levy request proposal of \$425,000.
- Question & Answer
 - Soeldner asked if Extension was eligible to receive any Cares Act or American Recovery Act money.
 - Clore responded:
 - The majority of the Cares money went directly to the saliva testing on campus. The only Extension area that received funds from this was the 4-H Memorial Camp that lost revenue due to cancellation of their camps.
 - The American Recovery Act money went to the state and local governments. Harry is hopeful that some of that money went toward the \$4 billion in unpaid debts. County Board match for Extension is part of that state backlog of debts due.

- Metsker would like to investigate and review the outcomes of the additional costs associated with not doing planned programming vs. the shift to online programming that was able to be done during COVID. This can not be seen on the budget. How much increased and in what areas? If Extension is asking for more money next year, these discrepancies need to be discussed.
 - Funding proposals to the County Board start soon.
 - \$300,000 allocated to Extension starts getting paid out May to November.
 - Equipment costs that have been mentioned... where are the cost details? Gardens and meal distribution programs were discussed in the slideshow, but no cost details are listed in any of the paperwork displayed. Metsker requested a more detailed report, including materials and supplies.
- Thompson sees that programming was happening throughout the year but would like to be more informed of individual programs taking place.
 - Lewis-Sibley explained that Impact Reports and Quarterly Reports are sent out to the County Board members as they are published. She would like to see County Board members attend some of the programming as well and will encourage staff to let board members know of their programming.
- Thompson mentioned that campus tends to set the criteria about how much carryover can be held in each unit. Although 18 months is a great goal to have, he has to look out for the taxpayer money. He has trouble giving more money to an organization that has so much sitting, when some taxpayers can't pay their bills.
 - Metsker agreed with Thompson about the carryover amount. She would like to see the cost of each program.
 - Clore noted that with any agency's expenses, personnel and benefit payouts are the majority of their budgets. Carryover is used to operate in a "days to zero" scenario. How many days of surplus are needed to survive?
 - Extension funding is based on receiving those funding streams described earlier. The risk is that the state money could possibly go away, and Extension would have to let a lot of staff go. The university has many staff that have notice to rights, which gives them full pay for one year after employment.
 - In addition, the unit has \$280,000 in leases, with four buildings in three counties.
 - For example, last year \$10 million in county board match was reduced by half. That means in Unit 12, there is \$500,000 reduction.
 - The funding from campus was reduced by 5%, with a reduction every year going forward.
- Thompson, as a farmer, understands the ebb and flow of revenue and expenses. He is out talking to taxpayers often and he is grateful Extension can help those people directly.
- Metsker discussed adding staff and that is not just a one-year commitment from the County Board, that is a cost that is continuous.
 - Clore responded stating that the way to spend down the carryover money is to get more buildings or more staff, both of which are a commitment.
- Lewis-Sibley briefly talked about the COVID response of staff working from home. Although it's not for every position, Extension is working on a plan to do some hybrid positions, which may lead to smaller spaces being rented. This decrease in future lease costs will offset the staff increase and hopefully eliminate the need for a levy increase.
 - Thompson was appreciative of the fact that Extension was looking at new ways to work.
 - Metsker thought there should be a discussion about the improvement of the Unity lease to negotiate better terms, since so much money was put into the building with the renovation.

**McLean County Extension Board Meeting
March 16, 2020 Meeting Minutes 6-7:30 p.m.
via Zoom**

- Soeldner thought the group was meeting today to discuss another reduction in the levy, but with increased programming and activities, they will need time to talk to members of the County Board and administrators before voting for a levy proposal.
 - Metsker agreed and asked that on future agendas for the vote to be identified specifically on the agenda. For the next meeting and to vote for the proposed levy amount, the County Board members would like to see:
 - Staff cost and paid benefits, including long-term costs
 - Special program costs
 - Sommer asked what other entities come to the board with levy requests and if those entities are required to provide line item details of their budget.
 - County Board members noted the board of health (Health Department), Show Bus and veteran's administration all request funds and provide detailed line item expenses.
- Lewis-Sibley will check in about scheduling a meeting in April to follow up and finish the levy request for the year.
- Metsker asked if Schumacher or Creswell had any other comments for the County Board members before adjourning.
 - Creswell is very supportive of Extension and their programming. He discussed the program additions and how beneficial those will be to our communities.
 - He wondered what the County Board would consider an acceptable carryover amount.
 - Schumacher agreed with Creswell about being supportive of all Extension programs. She discussed how she hopes that funding is available so that Extension can continue (as well as expand) so that these programs can be available for her kids and future generations.

Adjourn

- Thompson motioned to adjourn. All in favor. Meeting adjourned at 7:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Erin Estes