

EXECUTIVE BOARD MEETING
STEVE VAN WINKLE, CHAIRMAN – EXECUTIVE BOARD
(Crawford, Delaney, Drury, Hinrichsen, Karr, Phelan, Proehl, Sundell)

Monday, August 15, 2016

5:30 p.m.

AGENDA

1. Call to Order
2. Roll Call
3. Public Input
4. Approval of Minutes of July 18, 2016
5. Executive Director Report
6. Discussion of Strategic Planning Session
7. Discussion of selecting Health Insurance Broker
8. Discussion of selecting Property Casualty Insurance Broker
9. Discussion of hiring a consultant to perform compensation study
10. Discussion of TCRPC and PPUATS Memorandum of Understanding
11. Discussion of renewing Line of Credit with South Side Bank
12. Report on activities of the PLBA
13. Review of August 25, 2016 Commission agenda
14. Other
15. Executive Session
16. Any action as a result of Executive Session
17. Adjournment

EXECUTIVE BOARD MEETING
STEVE VAN WINKLE, CHAIRMAN – EXECUTIVE BOARD
(Crawford, Delaney, Drury, Hinrichsen, Karr, Phelan, Proehl, Sundell)

Monday, July 18, 2016

5:30 p.m.

Minutes

1. Call to Order
Chairman Van Winkle called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.
2. Roll Call
Present: Van Winkle, Crawford, Delaney, Drury, Phelan, Proehl, and Sundell. Absent: Hinrichsen, and Karr.
3. Public Input-none
4. Approval of Minutes of June 20, 2016
Sundell moved to approve the June 20, 2016 minutes and Delaney seconded. Motion carried.
5. Approval of Executive Board- Executive Session minutes
 - June 20, 2016
 - May 16, 2016
 - March 11, 2015
 - March 2, 2015
 - February 23, 2015
 - September 19, 2014
 - September 18, 2014
 - August 28, 2014
 - August 11, 2014
 - Sundell moved to retain the following minutes confidential June 2, 2016, May 16, 2016, March 11, 2015, March 2, 2015, February 23, 2015, and August 17, 2014 and Crawford seconded. Motion carried.
 - Crawford moved to release to public the following minutes September 9, 2014, September 18, 2014, and August 28, 2014 and Sundell seconded. Motion carried.
6. Executive Director Report
 - Miller reported the financial report is positive year to date for June of \$64,362.
 - He also reported that in April of this year TCRPC executed a contract with IDOT for FY15 State Planning Funds. Now with the passing of the state budget, IDOT has erased the \$102,000 liability due to a FY14 Audit funding of IDOT overpayment of indirect funds. Is currently working with auditor to determine how the Commission handles the booking of the \$102,000.
 - IDNR water supply grant of \$32,000 is cancelled and there is \$10,000 left of which they want to be refunded the balance.
 - The SB2966 bill was not considered and not make to the budget. But the state did include over \$6 million in state planning funds in the IDOT budget. The PPUATS Policy Committee will receive \$150,000 for FY16.

- PPUATS Policy has programmed \$37,000 for a component of a regional freight study. This project is sponsored by City of Pekin, Peoria County, and Tazewell County. The original amount was \$250,000. Has asked IDOT OPP for consideration of additional special funding for this study.

7. Discussion and Recommendation Employee Health Insurance Benefit

Proehl moved to get on floor for discussion and Delaney seconded.

- Miller explained the 2 tier plan. Existing employees will pay 10% of coverage and Commission will pay 90%. As for spouse and dependents the Commission will pay 75% while the employee will pay 25%. For new employees it will be 80/20 for employee and 50/50 for spouse and dependents. This will come into effect after August 1st and will be looked at yearly.
- Drury asked what the increase will be yearly. Miller said 10% per year.
- Phelan said it is a good start but a wage study conducted and look at the whole package per employee.
- Crawford asked that if we pass this will this affect not hiring a new employee. Miller said no.
- Delaney said to go along with the proposal.
- Sundell mentioned that we cannot do this all at once. Need to ease into the changes of benefits over 2 to 3 years to meet standards.
- Crawford liked the 2 tier system and said the Commission can maintain employees and over time the variances will go away.
- Van Winkle mentioned that in October 2016 that we will seek proposals for health insurance providers for a dual option plan which offers a low deductible option and high deductible option with a Health Savings Account (HSA). If the employee chooses the high deductible the Commission will make a defined contribution to the HAS in the employee's name.
- Sundell asked when the HAS will start. Miller responded in March 1, 2017.
- Hayward, from staff asked if he could speak. He asked what will the Commission HSA amount is? Will they support the HSA continually? He understands managing the healthcare costs, but there will be harm in the employees take home pay.
Delaney said there is importance in explaining to all employees the HSA benefit.
Van Winkle mentioned that the dependents in the past were the problem and glad we now have a cap on dependent coverage.
A vote was taken with 7 ayes and 1 nay.

8. Discussion of TCRPC and PPUATS Memorandum of Understanding

Miller explained the changes on the MOU.

- Van Winkle had concerns on the staffing section. Would like PPATS Policy and members of Commission on as members.
- Sundell said to leave as is and we can always add to the committee.
- Proehl suggested meeting with Rainson and Van Winkle on their concerns of MOU.
- Phelan asked if Tom Kelso is the spoke person for IDOT?

9. Approval of Resolution 17-02 Transportation Funding

- Sundell moved to approve Resolution 17-02 and Drury seconded. There will be 2 additional documents added to the resolution a pie chart and plan.
- Miller said this will go out to other local areas to present to counties and municipalities for support.
- Mr. Fink thanked the Commission again for the May 2 meeting. He stated the resolution addresses the causes and effects of the road problems in Central Illinois. The only thing

missing is the exact amount that each community can receive. He also explained where the link is for all to review.

Delaney left at 7:00 p.m.

10. Discussion of Draft Strategic Plan Report

Miller was asked to bring back to meeting.

Phelan asked what the high, low, and medium to the forum is? Bring back to next meeting.

11. Report on activities of the PLBA

Hayward explained they are still working on the scope of work with Marshall Plumley of Army Corp of Engineers.

Miller said they are also working with Nature Conservatory and Heartland Water Resources.

12. Review of July 28, 2016 Commission agenda

Sundell suggested moving the presentation up under Public Input on the agenda.

13. Other

Phelan asked Miller about Employees Association for salary range study.

Miller responded it would cost Commission around \$3,000 to \$4,000 to do.

14. Executive Session

15. Any action as a result of Executive Session

16. Adjournment

Proehl moved to adjourn at 7:10 p.m. and Sundell seconded. Motion carried.

Respectively Submitted,

Eric Miller

Executive Director

Recorder and Transcriber: Debbie Ulrich

Tri-County Regional Planning Commission Strategic Planning Session April 28, 2016

Notes Captured on Flip Chart Sheet:

What has worked? What are successes in the past few years?

- EDC restructure
- Outreach to local communities
- Recreational enhancements: bike paths, RI Trail
- Collaboration between counties / cities enhances
- We are back on a good path and restoring our reputation
- We have done a better job prioritizing activities
- We have worked harder to demonstrate our efficiencies (more needs to be done)
- GIS
- Environmental work
- Our overall collaboration on transportation planning and MPO work
- Our IDOT relationship is stronger

What are our challenges and threats?

- The level of non-MPO funding is decreasing
- Loss of staff and retention issues
- Our county membership may be at risk
- Our image is still at risk: loss of identify, loss of reputation
- Legislation & regulations that hurts our area's economy, ability to do business, etc.
- Area 'communities' are not looking into the future enough to identify issues
- As an organization: are we bold enough?
- As an organization: are we too conservative?
- We need to be visionary
- Need to look at our organizational culture
- Are some of these above issues related to funding concerns?

The above issues were grouped into six categories and participants voted on those issues of most concern:

1. Loss of funding (14 votes)
2. Organizational culture: be more bold; visionary; but funding is related (13 votes)
3. Staff issues: attraction, retention, interim director (9 votes)
4. Membership: demonstrating value, communications, potential loss of counties (6 votes)
5. Communities: they need planning (5 votes)
6. Our image and reputation (4 votes)

Based on the voting, further discussions were held to develop ideas that could form solutions to the top concerns / issues:

1. Loss of Funding
 - a. Leverage to staff to identify opportunities for funding projects / activities
 - b. We need more research on issues that are out there locally and nationally which means more staff travel is needed
 - c. Funding discussion must be tied to discussion of communities and reaching out to communities (cities)
 - d. Need to do more grant-mining
 - e. Need to increase billable hours
 - f. Increase membership: got more dues-paying members
 - g. Look at staff management
 - h. Need to keep focused on overhead costs
 - i. Keep focused on key stakeholder relationships (CAT, IDOT)
 - j. Reduce non-ROI expenses
2. Organizational Culture: Being more Bold / Visionary
 - a. We first need to look internally as a commission: need more education and develop cohesion
 - b. Need to prioritize new opportunities
 - c. Need more communities involved and make them aware of our activities / abilities
 - d. Need to identify key future trends and issues that will impact our communities
 - e. All our stakeholders need better awareness of our organization
 - f. Need to survey our members to determine what they want
 - g. Need to focus on our core competencies
 - h. Need to be known as a regional steward
 - i. Considering conducting a listening tour with the commission
 - j. Need more information sessions led by TCRPC
3. Staff Issues
 - a. Need to immediately address the issue of interim director
 - b. Give staff more travel opportunities
 - c. Have rotating graduate student position

- d. Increase staffing to increase revenue
 - e. There is a concern some job functions are not getting done
 - f. Permit staff to give more input
4. Membership: did not have sufficient time to brainstorm, but key issue was being more proactive with counties in demonstrating benefits to counties and communities

Discussion Regarding Partnership with PPUATS

- There is not enough awareness within the commission as to the exact partnership with PPUATS, what PPUATS does, and the history behind the partnership
- Commission needs more background to understand the issues relating to the partnership eg. IDOT
- The partnership seems to still be evolving
- Need to beef up non-MPO planning
- Need to work on being a bit more cooperative
- Need to identify common areas of interest
- Need more trust and transparency

Strategic Planning Implications and Recommendations

The goal of the session was more to identify strategic planning issues, than on developing a strategic plan. Key issues and priorities that stand out include:

- **Overall Positive Session – Successes Still Standout**
 Though the session mostly focused on challenges and threats, the initial discussion and overall tone remained positive, future looking, and a genuine recognition that the TCRPC has played and can continue to play a critical role in the health and vitality of the counties and communities.
 - **Potential Action Items**
 - Leverage the suggestions and issues below to communicate internally and externally the successes and impact of the TCRPC.
 - Consider ways to better promote past and current successes
- **Internal and External Education and Information Needs**
 A common theme in the session was the need for more information. This includes understanding the organization better (mostly due to new members), and understanding stakeholder and community needs. This issue was raised in a number of discussions including funding loss, organizational culture, and the partnership with PPUATS.
 - **Potential Action Items**
 - Commissioner education: given new members, and the nature of the commission structure, there appears to be a need to an overall better understanding of TCRPC by the commission members. The goal would not just be to make commissioners more

engaged and able to provide feedback, but to develop stronger cohesion within the commission.

- Listening Tour: there appears to be strong support to get more feedback from countries and communities and commissioners should be directly involved.
- Stronger Communication with Members: another theme was the ongoing need to directly educate countries on the benefits to membership in the TCRPC. Recommend a strategy be developed to address this concern.
- Information Session: there was wide consensus that the TCRPC can increase its role as a coordinator and supporter of info sessions relating to concerns and issues of countries and communities. This helps support the commission's image as a regional steward.

- **Funding Issues**

Not surprising, there was considerable discussions about funding and the issue was continually linked to other issues such as increasing membership. There are some potential short-term recommendations, and longer-term. But clearly this needs to be a priority.

- **Potential Action Items**
- Short-term: staff should review the issues raised in the funding discussions session and provide direct feedback to the commissioners. Some issues are likely already proactively being managed (overhead costs, reduce non-ROI activities, etc.) and others will need more discussions and development by staff (grant mining, increased membership, etc.)
- Long-term: there are key issues that ultimately need to be addressed including
 - What are new activities that will lead to income that staff can identify that will also align with our core competencies and long-term goals as an organization
 - Funding is also tied to membership discussions. Are there ways to increase membership and demonstrate value to new members, while staying focused on our mission?
- PPUATS Partnership: The TCRPC can't have a full discussion of funding without including a discussion of the partnership with PPUATS as discussed later.

- **County Engagement**

This issue of providing ongoing value to all counties was a recurring theme. It is linked to both education and funding issues above. But if the risk of a county leaving the commission is real, short-term steps may need to be taken.

- **Potential Action Items**
- If the TCRPC conducts any of the educational sessions or listening tours, a priority should be placed on acknowledging that an important goal is to develop stronger support within those countries that under increasing financial pressure, may have their membership at risk.
- As part of celebrating the successes of the TCRPC, consider ways to frame those success directly from the perspective of the county.

- **Staff Issues**

This was the third most voted on issue, and had some good short-term recommendations.

- **Potential Action Items**
- Take action on the interim director status
- Give staff more travel opportunities
- Engage staff more fully on commissioner discussions
- Allow staff to provide more input

- **Partnership with PPUATS**

This discussion came at the end of the session but could have benefited from a longer discussion. The clear issue was a simple lack of awareness by the commissioners of exactly what the partnership is, its history, and current issues. It seemed clear no substantive feedback could be widely provided without more understanding of the relationship.

- **Potential Action Items**
- Hold an educational session with the commissioners to provide the background, structure, goals, and activities under the partnership.
- Help commissioners understand any potential issues associated with the partnership such as financial control and priorities of IDOT.
- Once there is wider understanding of the partnership, have a follow up meeting to discuss the future of the partnership. Are there concerns? Are there changes that could be made that strengthen the relationship? Is the overall structure the ideal structure?



TRI-COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

EST. 1958

Memo

TO: Commissioners
FROM: Eric W. Miller, Executive Director
SUBJECT: Health Insurance broker
Date: August 11, 2016

Background:

Commission staff has requested and received qualifications for an Insurance Broker to represent the Commission for employee health insurance. The Commission provides insurance coverage to employees and dependents. The health insurance broker's main function is to represent the Commission on health insurance issues including soliciting insurance bids, educating employees, and resolving any health insurance related issues that arise.

In 2013, the Commission selected Heiser Insurance, Morton, Illinois to represent the Commission as the employee Health Insurance Broker. The Heiser agency has been sold to Arthur J. Gallagher & Co, Itasca, Illinois. It is my desire to have a local agency representing the Commission for their employee health insurance needs.

The Commission received two responses from the Request for Qualifications (RFQ) for employee health insurance brokers. The Unland Companies Pekin, IL and Kuhl Insurance Morton, IL each submitted responses to our RFQ. Both companies presented excellent credentials. I have interviewed representatives from both firms and have checked references.

I recommend that the Commission select Kuhl Insurance Morton, IL to act as the Commission's employee health insurance broker. The Commission's health insurance contract, currently provided by United Health Care, expires on February 29, 2017.

Action:

Recommend to the Commission to select Kuhl Insurance of Morton, IL as the employee health insurance broker for the Commission.



TRI-COUNTY REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

EST. 1958

Memo

TO: Commissioners
FROM: Eric W. Miller, Executive Director
SUBJECT: Property and Casualty Insurance broker
Date: August 11, 2016

Background:

Commission staff has requested and received qualifications for an Insurance Broker to represent the Commission for general liability insurance. The Commission maintains insurance coverage for the following categories: Professional Liability, Directors & Officers, Umbrella, Crime, Auto, Workers Compensation, and Commercial Package.

In 2010, the Commission selected Heiser Insurance in Morton to represent the Commission as the Property and Casualty Insurance Broker. The Heiser agency has been sold to Arthur J. Gallagher & Co, Itasca, Illinois. It is my desire to have a local agency representing the Commission for their insurance needs.

The Commission received two responses from the Request for Qualifications (RFQ) for property and Casualty insurance brokers. Nixon Insurance, Peoria, IL and Monge, Crouch, and Mahoney of Pekin, IL each submitted responses to our RFQ. Both companies presented excellent credentials. I have interviewed representatives from both firms and have checked references.

I recommend the Commission select Monge, Crouch and Mahoney Inc. to act as the Commission's Property and Casualty Insurance Broker. The Commission's general insurance package currently being provided by Auto-Owners Insurance expires on February 29, 2017.

Action:

Recommend to the Commission to select Monge, Crouch, and Mahoney, Inc. of Pekin, IL as the property and casualty insurance broker for the Commission.