



CITY OF CHICAGO

COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET AND GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS  
CITY COUNCIL  
CITY HALL-ROOM 200  
121 NORTH LASALLE STREET  
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60602

ALDERMAN JASON C. ERVIN  
CHAIRMAN

PHONE: 312-744-3166  
FACSIMILE: 312-744-9009

COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET AND GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS  
MONTHLY RULE 45 REPORT  
DECEMBER 2024

---

Pursuant to Rule 45 of the City Council Rules of Order, the Committee on the Budget and Government Operations (CBGO) submits the following Monthly Rule 45 Report for DECEMBER 2024 Meeting.

**Date, Time & Location of Meeting:** On December 10, 2024 at 12:00 P.M., the Committee on the Budget and Government Operations held a Meeting in City Hall, Council Chamber, 121 N. LaSalle Street, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor.

**Attendance:** The following members were present: Chairman Ervin (28), Lee (11), LaSpata (1), Dowell (3), Robinson (4), Yancy (5), Mitchell (7), Harris (8), Ramirez (12), Quinn (13), Lopez (15), Moore (17), O’Shea (19), Mosely (21), Rodriguez (22), Burnett (27), Taliaferro (29), Cardona (31), Conway (34), Ramirez-Rosa (35), Villegas (36), Sposato (38), Nugent (39), Vasquez (40), Napolitano (41), Reilly (42), Knudsen (43), Martin (47), Hadden (49) and Silverstein (50)

The following members attended virtually: Mosely (21), Scott (24), Sigcho-Lopez (25), Rodriguez-Sanchez (33) and Mitts (37)

The following non-members attended: Beale (9) and Hoppenworth (48)

Internal witnesses present: **Chief Financial Officer:** Jill Jaworski; **Office of Budget & Management (OBM):** Budget Director Annette Guzman and Managing Deputy Director Kevin Murphy; **Department of Law:** Chief Assistant Corporation Counsel Redeatu Kassa and Senior Assistant Corporation Counsel Rey Phillips Santos; **Office of Inspector General:** Deborah Witzburg and Representatives from: **City Clerk's Office, Department of Water Management, Chicago Police Department, Community Commission on Public Safety & Accountability and Department of Environment**

**The Committee on the Budget and Government Operations addressed the following items:**

- **Approval of the Monthly Rule 45 Report of October 2024**
- 1. **Amendment of various provisions of the Municipal Code regarding technical and scriveners' corrections (2025 Municipal Code Corrections Ordinance). (O2024-0013675).**
- 2. **A series of proposed corrections and revisions to the 2025 Budget Recommendations (and text portion).**
- 3. **Adoption of the Annual Appropriation Ordinance for 2025. (O2024-0013682).**
- 4. **Amendment of various provisions of the Municipal Code regarding organization and functions of City government (2025 Management Ordinance). (SO2024-0013673).**
- 5. **Expenditure of portion of the Motor Fuel Tax funds allocated to the City of Chicago for 2024. (O2024-0013676).**
- 6. **Intergovernmental Agreement with Chicago Transit Authority and Cook County for the allocation of Motor Fuel Tax. (O2024-0013677).**
- 7. **Amendment of Regulations Governing Administration of Classification Plan and Employee Benefits for Classified Positions set forth in the Annual Appropriation Ordinance (Salary Resolution) regarding salary schedules, automobile allowance, holidays, vacations and sick leave. (R2024-0013678).**
- 8. **Amendment of Municipal Code Chapters 2-8, 2-32 and 2-53 by modifying various sections regarding City Council notification of fiscal year annual appropriations and amendments including reporting requirements by Comptroller and City Council Office of Financial Analysis (O2024-0014257)**
- 9. **Redevelopment Agreement with Outwest Gallery and Cafe to provide neighborhood opportunity funds for property improvements at 5249 W Chicago Ave (O2024-0013060)**
- 10. **Transfer of funds within 1<sup>st</sup> Ward Wage Allowance/Aldermanic Expense Account for Year 2024. (O2024-0014103)**

- 11. Transfer of funds within Committee on Pedestrian and Traffic Safety for Year 2024.  
(O2024-0014243)**
- 12. Transfer of funds within 4<sup>th</sup> Ward Wage Allowance/Aldermanic Expense Account  
for Year 2024.  
(O2024-0013926)**
- 13. Transfer of funds within 10<sup>th</sup> Ward Wage Allowance/Aldermanic Expense Account  
for Year 2024.  
(O2024-0013960)**
- 14. Transfer of funds within 13<sup>th</sup> Ward Wage Allowance/Aldermanic Expense Account  
for Year 2024.  
(O2024-0014229)**
- 15. Transfer of funds within 14<sup>th</sup> Ward Wage Allowance/Aldermanic Expense Account  
for Year 2024.  
(O2024-0014241)**
- 16. Transfer of funds withing 22<sup>nd</sup> Ward Wage Allowance/Aldermanic Expense  
Account for Year 2024.  
(SO2024-0013380)**
- 17. Transfer of funds within 23<sup>rd</sup> Ward Wage Allowance/Aldermanic Expense Account  
for Year 2024.  
(O2024-0014092)**
- 18. Transfer of funds within Office of the Vice Mayor for Year 2024.  
(O2024-0014227)**
- 19. Transfer of funds within 34<sup>th</sup> Ward Wage Allowance/Aldermanic Expense Account  
for Year 2024.  
(O2024-0014011)**
- 20. Transfer of funds within Committee on Immigrant and Refugee Rights for Year  
2024.  
(O2024-0013858)**
- 21. Transfer of funds within 40<sup>th</sup> Ward Wage Allowance/Aldermanic Expense Account  
for Year 2024.  
(O2024-0013923)**
- 22. Transfer of funds within 45<sup>th</sup> Ward Wage Allowance/Aldermanic Expense Account  
for Year 2024.  
(O2024-0014143)**

**23. Transfer of funds within 48<sup>th</sup> Ward Wage Allowance/Aldermanic Expense Account for Year 2024.  
(O2024-0013922)**

**24. Transfer of Funds within Committee on Environmental Protection and Energy for Year 2024.  
(O2024-0013601)**

**25. Transfer of funds within 49<sup>th</sup> Ward Aldermanic Expense Account for Year 2024  
(O2024-0013600)**

Chairman bid the Body Good Afternoon, took roll call and acknowledged a quorum was present. He next recognized Members participating via Rule 59, which was so Moved by Vice Chair Lee, hearing no objections, the Aldermen were duly added to the roll. He next open the floor for public commentary. The following people were recognized:

Andrian Alexander  
Jessica Jackson  
Zoey Leigh  
Cecilia Butler  
James McCoy  
George Blakemore  
Carolyn Ruff  
Dr. Wallace “Gator” Bradley  
Brenda Ward

The public comments concluded, and the Chairman next called to address Items 10 through 25 of the Agenda, which was a series of fund transfer ordinances. He acknowledged Items 10, 11, 12, 15, 16, 17, 20, 21, 24 and 25 were substitute ordinances for Wards 1, 4, 14, 22, 23, 40 and 49, the Committee on Pedestrian and Traffic Safety, the Committee on Immigrant and Refugee Rights and Committee on Environmental Protection and Energy, then called for a motion to accept the substitute ordinances, which Alderman Hadden Motioned to Adopt. Chairman called for a voice vote, recognized all Ayes and no Nays, and the substitutes were duly adopted.

Chairman next acknowledged 16 transfers of funds were before the Body, which had been forwarded via electronic submission to the Members. He called for a Motion to Pass for Wards 1, 4, 10, 13, 14, 22, 23, 34, 40, 45, 48, 49, Committee on Pedestrian and Traffic Safety, Office of the Vice Mayor, Committee on Immigrant and Refugee Rights and Committee on Environmental Protection and Energy transfers. Alderman Dowell so Moved, and Chairman called a voice vote signifying all in favor say Ayes, any opposed. Hearing no Nays, the Chairman recognized the Do Pass recommendation would be reported out at the next City Council, Wednesday, December 11, 2024 Meeting.

The Chairman next addressed the Monthly Rule 45 Report of October 2024, which was sent to all Members. He then offered, if there weren't any questions, could he get a Motion to approve (adopt), so moved by Alderman LaSpata. The Chair called a voice vote, all Ayes and no Nays were recorded, the Report adopted and would be placed on file.

Chairman then called Item #1, an Amendment of Municipal Code Titles 2, 9, 14, 16, 17 and 18 for the 2025 Municipal Code Corrections Ordinance, acknowledged there was a substitute for the ordinance, queried if there was a motion to accept the substitute. So Moved by Alderman LaSpata, followed by voice vote with Chair asking all in favor to say Aye, opposed Nay, and recorded unanimous Ayes. The substitute was then before the Body, Rey Phillips Santos, Law Department, identified to answer questions, and the floor was opened to the Members. There were no calls for questions and the Chair asked for a Motion to Pass. Alderman Mosley Motioned to Pass followed by Chair calling a voice vote, all Ayes and no Nays were recorded, and Chair acknowledged a Do Pass recommendation would be reported at the City Council, December 11<sup>th</sup> Meeting.

Item #2 was next called for consideration, a direct introduction of a series of text corrections and revisions to the Recommendations, Item #3—the original Annual Appropriation Ordinance for 2025. The Chairman solicited a Motion to apply the text portion to the 2025 Budget Recommendations to the Annual Appropriation Ordinance before hearing from Budget Director Guzman. So Moved by Vice Mayor Burnett. The Chairman, hearing no objections, so ordered and acknowledged an adoption of the proposed Annual Appropriation Ordinance for 2025 as recommended was before the Body for the Office of Budget & Management to explain. The Chair paused to acknowledge Alderman Sawyer, who was visiting the Chambers, thanked him for joining us. There was a brief exchange, then Chairman next recognized Budget Director Guzman to provide a brief explanation of the Budget content and then opened the floor to questions.

The Director thanked the Chair and began with a conveyance that before the Committee and Membership Body is a consideration of the 2025 Budget. She recollected previous briefings, then clarified that new revenue to fill the gap equaled \$256 Million, while additional cuts of \$90 Million would reach a balanced budget, and conveyed some management ordinances, which Assistant Corporation Council Senior Rey would review and that she would go over the budget gap portion, explaining that the way that the budget \$346 Million gap would be closed, the \$300 Million—the original gap, removal of liquor tax of \$10 Million, loss of telecommunications tax increase due to a change in state law of \$23 Million and restoration of consent decree positions and additional costs related to implementation of speed camera enforcement throughout the city is another \$12.7 Million that is being filled through \$256 Million of new revenue including the PPLT increase, a P tax increase to the base levy, parking tax increase to the rate for parking garages and valet services, the extension and expansion of the congestion surcharge within the downtown driving zones, an increase to the streaming and cable tv services and an increase in bag tax. Additionally, reforecasting of enforcement revenue of \$11 Million, parking enforcement increases of \$8 Million and an additional amnesty program for public way of \$2.5 Million, this is

also closed through \$90 Million of additional budget cuts within 2FM of \$3 Million of cuts to debt service due to recent issuance of bonds. So, a reduction of our debt service, a full sweep of 2026 allocations for ARPA and this full sweep of ARPA for the guaranteed basic income program and small business sweep and so that gets us to a balanced budget. And so there are two substantive technical amendments that I briefed Alders on previously. The first relates to the loss of the telecommunications tax increase of \$40 Million gap, \$12.5 Million to the corporate fund and \$27.5 Million to the emergency communications fund. The resolution is to shift about \$10.3 Million of cost to the corporate fund from the public safety office, which is temporary in nature as we work with the General Assembly to restore the language in the telecom bill that's needed and then to shift another \$16.7 Million of eligible technical technology costs to our capital bond. The second very substantive technical amendment is the restoration of the consent decree positions within the police department. This is 162 positions within constitutional policing, community policing, professional consenting as well as a couple of other divisions. The 162 positions are at a value of \$11.6 Million that is being mitigated by increases in our enforcement revenue. And with that I will turn it back to the Chairman for any questions.

The Chair then called for the committee to stand at ease for about 5 minutes. Thereafter conveying changes to the Amendment and copies reflecting such changes were electronically sent to the Committee Membership and Body, physical copies in process of printing, observed tally of Alders opting for printouts. The Chairman then duly reconvened, recapped to bring all up to speed, addressing Item #1: the Municipal Code Corrections Ordinance, made the correction that he previously stated there was a substitute for the item but there is no such substitute. The Chair then called a re-vote on Item #1 as it was initially introduced. He then queried if there were any questions on the item. Alderman Beale was then recognized and queried if Item #1 was the one in which there was a change over the law department and authority in the Management Ordinance? Chairman clarified that was in fact the Management Ordinance, a separate ordinance. Alderman Beale thanked the Chairman and concluded his comments. Chairman Ervin continued, asking for any other questions on the Code Corrections Ordinance. Hearing no such questions, on a Do Pass Motion by Alderman Lopez, the Chairman took a voice vote, recorded all Ayes, no Nays, the Motion passed and would be reported out at the next regular City Council on December 11<sup>th</sup>.

The Chairman next address Item #4, the 2025 Management Ordinance, further clarifying that this was the item being referenced (by Alderman Beale). It is an amendment of various provisions of the municipal code regarding organizations and functions of city government, restating 2025 Management Ordinance, then acknowledged that for this item we have a substitute and queried for a Motion to accept the substitute, which was so moved by Alderman Vasquez. Chairman lobbied a voice vote calling for all in favor to signify by saying Aye, then any opposed? Hearing all Ayes and no Naves, the Motion passed, and the Chair declared the substitute was before the Body, acknowledged members from OBM, Finance, Law and other departments were present to address any questions on the Management Ordinance and acknowledged Alderman Beale for questions. Alderman Beale conferred that he was looking at language he believed to have been corrected where the Law Department was looking to have jurisdiction or authority over all city departments, including the OIG's office and seven of the management ordinances having

thorough conversations the Inspector General had grave concerns the Law Department would have authority and be able to give directions to them when it came down to it, investigations on who could be investigated and things of that nature throughout the entire city. And so, I raised that question, and it looks like that part was stricken. Budget Director Guzman responded that the language was not stricken rather more language had been added in to clarify the intent, and the original intent of the ordinance change. Alderman Beale interjected, so the intent now is to make where we clarified and I just need on the record that the Law Department does not have any jurisdiction over the Inspector General's Office. The Chairman then asserted, I wouldn't say that the Law Department has jurisdiction over the city in its entirety, I interpret that to the point you're making, then referencing the text read, Corporation Counsel is authorized to enter into and execute contracts related to and necessary for the conducting of law business of the city, not investigations. So, I'd say the Corporation Council does have overall jurisdiction over all departments, but not to the extent that you're raising where they can direct investigations. Alderman Beale then responded, well I appreciate that Mr. Chairman but you're not a lawyer and I would like to hear from the Law Department. Chairman recommended Law could simply respond "ditto". Redeatu Kassa, Chief Assistant Corporation Counsel from the city's law department engaged response to Alderman Beale, directed Alderman Beale's attention to Page 7 of the substitute ordinance, Subsection G, last sentence, which is added, will address the concern you just raised. In that last sentence we added the language which says that nothing in this Subsection G shall be construed to alter or limit the powers and duties of the Office of Inspector General. So that has been clarified. It is clear this amendment has no intent at all to infringe upon the powers and the duties of any other city departments. Alderman Beale thanked the Chairman, reiterated he just wanted the content on the record. Chairman acknowledged, then next called upon Alderman Vasquez.

Alderman Vasquez queried Chairman if the Body could hear from the Inspector General, referencing that there were conversations around the language, so the Inspector General's disposition could be discerned by her for the Members. Chairman, not recognizing Inspector General Witzburg presence in chambers, responded that was not necessary. Alderman Vasquez acknowledged she was in chambers and Chairman apologized for the oversight then recognized Inspector General to speak to the matter. Inspector General Witzburg greeted the Body and clarified that the expansion of the powers of the Corporation Counsel is not to alter or limit the powers and duties of the Inspector General, thanked the Chairman, who next queried if there were any other questions.

Alderman Lopez was next recognized and stated, going back to the Inspector General, then asked her was she satisfied with the language provided in the current substitute. The Inspector General responded yes, adding that the clarifications in the Management Ordinance will not interfere with the independence of the office. And further, that the independence of the Inspector General's Office is critical to its function and I appreciate the Law Department's cooperation in clarifying that it will not use this provision to interfere with that independence in any way. Alderman Lopez then asked, can they use this provision to interfere? The Inspector General responded that she believes the clarification suffices and that the Law Department while fulfilling its duty to

prosecute the law business of the city will not interfere with the office. Alderman Lopez reiterated, does this change give them the ability to interfere, whereby the Inspector General restated I don't believe so as drafted, as it has been corrected, I believe, protects the independence of the office. Then added, if there are further concerns of how that is implemented, you will hear about it from me. But I believe the correction in the Management Ordinance is sufficient to protect the independence of the office from any interference under this new language. Alderman Lopez thanked Inspector General and concluded his comments. Chairman then queried if there were any other questions. Hearing none, asked if he could get a Motion To Pass. Alderman Lopez was again recognized, apologized for the late submission and offered attention to a different portion of the Management Ordinance, specifically Page 28, Article 6, mid-year reporting and annual budget process, referenced Section 8 states as follows: "This Article VI of this ordinance shall take effect only upon the happening of both of the following: (i) passage and approval of this ordinance, and (ii) passage of both the fiscal year 2025 Annual Appropriation Ordinance and fiscal year 2025 Revenue Ordinance by midnight on December 13, 2024." He then posed the question, I would like to know with so much effort by members of this Body to try to bring transparency, why are we putting this kind of boot on the necks of Aldermen who want to have collaborative discussions with the Collaborator-In-Chief's administration for the next years moving forward? Chairman responded that might be a question you may want to ask the Collaborator-In-Chief. Alderman Lopez offered for the Chairman to call a recess, get the mayor in chambers and he would be happy to. Chairman conveyed that he could not answer and no one in the chambers could answer your question. Alderman Lopez then asked, who drafted the substitute ordinance, which Chairman responded, Corporation Counsel. Alderman Lopez continued, so then if I can have Corporation Counsel explain the need for such language injected into this document that clearly deals with trying to create mechanisms for oversight and accountability, its not even quarterly, its midyear, why the necessary language included in this item from the Corporation Counsel. Chairman looked to Corporation Counsel to respond. Good afternoon, Rey Phillips Santos on behalf of Chicago's Department of Law responded, we were asked to place that, Alderman Lopez interrupted, by who? Rey Phillips continued that putting that in there was a policy decision. Alderman Lopez again injected, by who, and you can go ahead, by who, to which Rey Phillips responded that he was not going to say in this public forum at this time. Alderman Lopez stated, I'm sorry, so the Corporation Counsel, which drafted this single substitute is refusing to answer a question from the Body? Is that your answer? Rey Phillips continued, that is not what I'm saying, to which Alderman Lopez again demanded him to answer the question and Rey Phillips maintained that he was not going to answer this particular question in a public forum at this time. Chairman then conveyed that the question had been asked and answered, continuing that the Corporation Counsel has stated that he will not answer that question, so what do you want to do? Alderman Lopez responded that this was not privileged information. You are Corporation Counsel for the city of Chicago, which is us as well. Second, so, if we ask the question of who put this in, it should not be a secret of who directed it and if that's what the case is, then I make a Motion to strike this on its face, striking Section 8 in its entirety. The Chairman responded, okay. Rey Phillip attempt to respond to Alderman Lopez who interrupted and said there's a Motion sir, calling for a Motion to lay it on the table. The Chairman conveyed to the Body that the Motion to Table is nondebtable. We will take a roll call on the



Motion to Table on Alderman Lopez Motion to Strike, then called the roll. The resulting vote was 12 to 19 and the Motion to Table was recorded as fails. Alderman Burnett than asked the Chairman to explain what the motion was really about. Chairman responded that the motion was to strike Section 8 of Article VI from the Ordinance and then queried for questions. Chairman Dowell asked if she could hear from the Law Department what that affect would be, if any. Rey Phillips Santos on behalf of the City of Chicago's Department of Law responded, if I heard correctly, Alderman Dowell your question is what effect striking Article 6, Section 8 of the Ordinance will have if this, or if the Management Ordinance were to pass, it would have the same effective date as the rest of the Ordinance.

Alderman Hadden was next recognized by the Chair, who conveyed for the record, that before we vote on this, I will just say for the Law Department and to the Administration to know I actually do think that Section 8 is completely unnecessary and added an acknowledgement that she moved to lay her colleague's Motion on the Table but it was just to make another amendment and requested a roll call vote and in persistence, reiterated it was wholly unnecessary and frankly not in good faith for the Administration to request that this be added knowing that so many of us having been working very hard on this and I appreciate my colleagues who moved to get these amendments put into the Management Ordinance, so I would like a roll call on this Motion.

The Chairman next acknowledged Alderman Moore who conveyed that he was misreading content and requested revising his vote. The Chairman responded that the vote was already recorded, further clarifying that the only vote taken was on the Motion to Table thus far on this matter, so we're going to Move to a vote on the removal after everyone has spoken, then queried if there were any other questions on Alderman Lopez's Motion. Hearing none, Chairman placed the Motion to a vote calling on all Members in favor signify by saying Aye. Any opposed? Acknowledging there were no Nays, Chairman ask the Member's, if there's nobody opposed, what do we need a roll call vote for? There was agreement and the Chairman proclaimed Motion Passes and further declared that Section 8 of Article 6 is stricken and will have no impact on this, as confirmed by the Law Department. The Chairman next inquired if there were any other questions on the Management Ordinance. With no other queries observed Chairman called for a Motion to Move to Pass, so Moved by Alderman Hadden. Chairman then took a voice vote calling for all in favor to signify by saying Aye. Any opposed? All Ayes, no Nays was recorded, Item #4 passed and would be reported out at City Council, December 11<sup>th</sup> Meeting.

The Chairman next returned the Agenda to address Item #2, a direct transmittal, acknowledged the Body originally accepted one amendment, and introduced a second amendment and instructed both Item #2 and Item #3 would be considered together, as a series of proposed corrections and revisions to those record recommendations together with the text portion, further stating that before we place these items for consideration and hear from Budget Director Guzman, can we get a Motion to apply the text portions of the recommended 2025 Budget Recommendations to the Annual Appropriation Ordinance? So Moved by Alderman Burnett. Called a voice vote to the Body for all in favor to signify by saying Aye. Any opposed? All Ayes

and No Nays were recorded. The Chair proclaimed the combined Item #2 and Item #3 was before the Body and acknowledged Budget Director Guzman.

The Budget Director confirmed that before the Body was Item #2—the text portion which is the Budget Resolution for the 2025 Budget Year, and Item #3—the amendments to the Appropriation Ordinance. She acknowledged there were two changes which were made in the Item that came before you [the Body] earlier this morning, removing additional funding to the Housing Committee and the Police & Fire Committee. Chairman then queried if there were any questions on the amendments. Alderman Conway was acknowledged and asked were there any other changes besides those two. The Budget Director responded, changes removing \$80,000 from those two committees. Alderman Conway stated \$50,000 and \$31,000, then repeated, are there any other changes from the previous amendment to this Amendment. The Budget Director conveyed, so the \$80,000 removal balance through turnover. Alderman Conway interjected is that a no. Director Guzman replied no, its balance through turnover. Yeah, so there is a decrease in turnover to balance, the \$80,000. Alderman Conway continued, okay, so, but other than that, no other changes. The Director responded with no other changes sir. Alderman Conway thanked the Director and concluded his comments. The Chairman next acknowledged Alderman Reilly, and that he would be followed by Alderman LaSpata.

Alderman Reilly conveyed having a few other areas in the Appropriation Amendments he had questions about asserting he honestly didn't know were in here. I see the Office of Budget & Management is seeking to add an assistant budget director in charge of data analytics, is that correct? The Director replied yes. Alderman Reilly next asked, what's that person suppose to be doing for us? Director Guzman responded, our data analytics division runs all data performance workforce management analyses, develops all the dashboards presented on our budget website, as well as data that goes on our open data portal, works on a number of analytical items for the city and will also be working on the new mid-year reports that we do, as well as the analyses being asked of the Office of Budget & Management to perform. Alderman Reilly continued with, so for example, the data request that I sent you, that person would work on that. The Budget Director responded, and that you received, yes. Alderman Reilly asserted that we could have used that person this year, then addressed the Chairman conveying he had one other question related to the City Treasurer's budget here. Continuing, I think a number of us stumbled onto this as we were reviewing other errors in this Ordinance and it was a surprise to many of us that out of the city's water fund, which is an enterprise fund, a security detail is being paid for in the Treasurer's Office and I understand it's slated to receive a pay increase under this Amendment. At what point in time did the Treasurer's Office receive a security detail paid for by the Water Department. Was that in last year's budget? Is that when it started? Pondering, I don't know if this is a question for the Budget Department, Chairman. Budget Director Guzman responded, I'd have to go back and see when that detail was first placed in her office, but this is not a change from year over year. Alderman Reilly continued, so this was already being paid for out of the enterprise fund, which for those folks listening at home, an enterprise fund is only supposed to be spent on water related issues, so this must have been added last year. At what point do we have a conversation about increasing the Treasurer's allocation for this security specialist who's paid for

with our water fund? The Budget Director replied, it's actually a change to a part-time position. She has switched her detail from full-time to part-time. Alderman Reilly acknowledged with, I see, and so I see its budgeted hourly. Does that mean there are multiple members on that team? Director Guzman responded, two members. Alderman Reilly repeated, two members, then thanked the Director, thanked the Chairman and concluded his comments.

Chairman next acknowledged Alderman LaSpata, who conveyed two clarifying questions on Page 40 of the Substitute Ordinance under the Payment of Bonds from \$156.7 Million to \$143.5 Million. Can you please help me to understand that change? Chairman then called on the CFO to respond. The CFO identified herself, Jill Jaworski, CFO, then responded, we sold refunding bonds last week, general obligation and sales tax securitization corporation bonds that this Body authorized us to do about six weeks or so ago and that sale was very successful, and we were able to, through the sale of those bonds, lower our debt service for next year so that a \$13 Million and some change in savings that we have in fiscal 2025 and that's what is reflected in the budget. Alderman LaSpata responded, alright, very, very helpful to understand. The Alderman went on to raise a question regarding Page 16, Office of Public Safety Administration for professional services for information technology maintenance, striking \$4.1 Million and adding \$14.4 Million. Can someone speak about that change? The page number was clarified per the Chairman, then Budget Director replied with, so as part of the technical amendments that I mentioned earlier today, when the state law changed last month, that took out our language in the telecom bill, our revenues for the Emergency Communications Fund, as well as a portion of that, which comes into the Corporate Fund, was reduced because of the change at the state level. \$12.5 Million in the Corporate Fund and \$27.5 Million in the Emergency Communication Fund. And so, the increase you see in OPSA is a shift of, and this is in your briefing deck as well, \$10.3 Million from the Emergency Communication Fund for various contracts into the Corporate Fund, which we consider to be a one-time shift as we work with our state legislators to get that language back into the state bill. And we shifted \$16.7 Million off the Emergency Communications Fund into our bonds because they're eligible technological costs. Alderman LaSpata confirmed, got it! He thanked the Director, thanked the Chairman and concluded his remarks.

Chairman Ervin next recognized Alderman Lopez, who expressed his disdain by stating that having to go through 78 pages of amendments with barely two hours' notice was incredibly disrespectful to this Body even if it's allowable its not right. Second, on Page 24 of the amendments under BACP, there is a \$250,000 increase for delegate agencies. What is that increase for? Budget Director Guzman responded the increase is for funding to support a driver resource center as part of the Management Ordinance that was also just passed out of this Body. Alderman Lopez repeated,, driver resource center, to which the Director conveyed it was TNP Driver Resource Center. Alderman Lopez then referenced the next page, specifically Animal Care & Control. We are losing two certified veterinary technicians and augmenting them with veterinary assistants. Is there a reason we're going from certified to veterinary assistants? Budget Director Guzman replied, this was a change that was requested by Animal Care & Control based on the ability to hire more quickly for this position. Alderman Lopez then queried if someone

was available from Animal Care & Control to address what impact this would have? The Director responded no one was available from ACC. Alderman Lopez next stated that, further in, even though it says Page 1 again, there's a \$200,000 increase in violence prevention programming, where is that going to? The Director clarified the funding to which Alderman Lopez referred was CDBG, which he confirmed. Budget Director Guzman replied, so these were changes that were made with Public Health and DFSS as it relates to their grant funding from the federal government under HUD, and this aligns with their multi-year delegate agency contracts that are funded through this particular grant. Alderman Lopez then asked if this was related to the following page's \$200,000 in reduced mental health clinic funding? Budget Director Guzman replied yes, adding, so the CDBG fund covers a number of delegate agency contracts across a number of departments, and this is rebalancing to actually align with their existing delegate agency contracts. Alderman Lopez then asked if there were other rebalancing amendments in here, to which Budget Director Guzman replied yes, there's rebalancing within DFSS as it relates to their agreements as well with Senior Services. Alderman Lopez continued his commentary while the Director was looking for additional instances, asking do these rebalances impact service delivery or are they just being classified in different manners but still providing the same service? The Budget Director replied, service delivery is not impacted, it is rebalancing to align with actual delegate agency contracts that are multi-year in nature. Alderman Lopez then conveyed that even though it is not in this, are we on the hook for \$175 Million from CPS again for this year for nonteacher personnel. The Director clarified the amount was what they owed to us. Alderman Lopez next queried, for 2025 we're paying that again. Director Guzman reiterated that the \$175 Million is the amount that CPS owes to the City of Chicago in payment of their portion of MABF. Alderman Lopez then asked, which we pay in advance and then get reimbursed. The Director replied, we pay in advance and then get reimbursed. Alderman Lopez questioned, we pay in advance then get reimbursed and we're still waiting for that reimbursement? The Director replied yes, and they'll be paying. Alderman Lopez continued, and we have the same arrangement for 2025 scheduled to which the Director replied, correct. Alderman Lopez acknowledged, okay, then went on with, lastly, I know we started this meeting late because of pages 5 and 6, which were the committee budget increases, thank you for taking them out. The other question I have regards the position of Vice Mayor, the fact that that is a \$432,000 non-statutory position, why is that so high? Budget Director Guzman conveyed that is the same amount as was in the 2024 Budget. Alderman Lopez continued, there are matters with regard to funding a position that has no statutory function other than being a placeholder in the unfortunate event of an opening on the fifth floor. Why is that level of staffing required, which almost would be equivalent to the third largest committee if it actually had some sort of responsibilities attached to it. The Budget Director responded, the Vice Mayor does step into the stead of the Mayor in many occasions and attend events as well as other meetings on behalf of the City. Alderman Lopez then asked, so the duplicity of having photographers both for the Vice Mayor and the Mayor, drivers for the Mayor, Vice Mayor and all of that, that isn't a government efficiency that we thought we could work on? Budget Director Guzman responded, I think on many occasions there is need to be in the community and to provide information to those who both live in the City of Chicago as well as do business in the City of Chicago. Both the Mayor serves that role and the Vice Mayor in his stead as well. Alderman Lopez thanked the Chairman

and concluded his comments and Chairman Ervin called for any other questions from the Body. Alderman Villegas was recognized.

Alderman Villegas then asked Budget Director, as it relates to the \$175 Million from CPS given the new law goes into effect January 2025, what are we doing to make sure we decouple ourselves from that whole process? The Budget Director thanked the Alderman for the question and responded, so, there are a couple of things that we are doing. One is through the Department of Law. We're working to have this state statute that requires the City to be the payer or contribute to the fund changed, because we know that we have employees from two different employers in that fund, and so that is a big thing we're looking to get out of Springfield, to have that one word changed from city to employer. And secondly, we're continually working with the Board of Education to identify those areas of entanglement and help them think through the ways in which they can begin to continually disentangle from the City's financial support, you know they have their proposals on the table, I think we have to look at those as a city and understand what we can and cannot do. And I think that will come before this Council as well. Alderman Villegas queried, so right now one of the items for the Spring agenda for the City will be to clarify the statute and make that correction. The Director responded, correct. Alderman Villegas thanked the Chairman and concluded his comments. The Chairman again lobbied additional questions from Alders for the first round of questionings prior to returning the floor to Alderman Reilly for the second round. Seeing none, Chairman opened the floor for second round of questions and acknowledged Alderman Reilly.

Alderman Reilly conveyed it wasn't his intent to speak to the Vice Mayor's appropriation but since it was brought up and since there were some conversations around the duties of that quote unquote office, having served as the City's Vice Mayor under Mayor Emanuel, I can tell you I happily executed those duties with a staff budget of exactly \$0, didn't have a driver, a photographer, any kind of staff, any of that kind of stuff, you know, all of these special trips to the ward and all these sorts of things that are mentioned in the Vice Mayor's duties, that's superfluous and frankly voluntary. If you look at the definition of the position, that position is only relevant in the horrible occurrence of something being visited upon our Mayor, whether its an illness or worse yet, death. Otherwise, it is simply a symbolic title and there are no duties to be performed, certainly not \$400,000 worth. And so to hear the Office of Budget & Management defending those expenditures after trying to look us straight in the eye and saying they found every cost efficiency they could in this budget, I find that laughable and dishonest and I mean no disrespect to my colleague Alderman Burnett, who I have a lot of respect for and I like as a friend but we're trying to balance a budget here and you all are about to ask the taxpayers to pony up a whole lot more money, yet here we are. We are catching these extra staffers for some of the Mayor's good buddies, who serve as chairmen, that you snuck in here. And then thankfully, some of our colleagues caught, and that you had to go and remove. You know we learned that the Water Department is paying for security details. Now, you know, God knows what else is buried in here but to tell us that, I'm sorry, a ceremonial office like Vice Mayor requires staff and photographers, and drivers and these sorts of things is nonsense. So, let's be honest with the taxpayers and enough of this. He then thanked the Chairman and concluded his

remarks. The Chairman thanked Alderman Reilly, queried if there were any additional questions on the Item, hearing none, asked for a Motion. Alderman LaSpata Motioned for a Move to Pass on a roll call vote. Chairman took a roll call vote, the Motion passed 17 to 16 (Annual Appropriation Ordinance and Text Portion) to be reported out at the City Council, December 11<sup>th</sup> Meeting.

The Chairman next called Item #5 to be addressed, which was an Ordinance for the Expenditure of the Portion of the Motor Fuel Tax Funds allocated to the City of Chicago for 2025 and identified Annette Guzman, Office of Budget & Management, available to answer any questions committee members may have on the Motor Fuel Tax Allocation Ordinance. The Chairman, seeing none, acknowledged that Alderman Dowell called for a Motion to Pass. The Chairman called a voice vote, recorded all Ayes and no Nays. The Chairman acknowledged this matter will be reported out at the City Council, December 11<sup>th</sup> Meeting.

The Chairman next called Item #6 to be addressed, which was an Intergovernmental Agreement with Chicago Transit Authority and Cook County for the allocation of Motor Fuel Tax. Again, identified Annette Guzman from the Department of Budget & Management can answer any questions the Members may have. Any questions? The Chairman recognized Alderman Villegas. Alderman Villegas asked if the Budget Director was going to make a presentation on this? Director Guzman then offered, first, it's the annual IGA we enter into with the City, Cook County and the Chicago Transit Authority to allocate \$3 Million from our Motor Fuel Tax Revenue to the CTA. Alderman Villegas then asked, is that by stature or ordinance? How's that? Director Guzman conveyed, it's pursuant to the authority of this Body to provide a portion of the motor fuel tax to CTA. Alderman Villegas then asked, and what's the requirement, what is that money to be, then Director Guzman clarified the funding was according to state stature. Alderman Villegas acknowledged the correction and went on to ask, does it also explain what that money needs to be use for? The Director responded yes, and conveyed it's just for transportation purposes, subject to the purposes set forth in the Regional Transportation Authority Act that is state stature. Alderman Villegas then queried, are they required at some point to talk about the appropriation? How they are going to spend that money or is it just a blank check. Director Guzman replied, this Body would have the authority to ask them exactly how they used that money over the past year, but it is regulated by state stature. Alderman Villegas acknowledged the content, thanked the Director and Chairman. The Chairman next called for any other questions on MFT, then acknowledge Alderman Vasquez.

Alderman Vasquez first made clarification if the commentary was about CTA as far as what they would do with the funds, that's what my colleague was asking about, correct? Just want to remind folks that we do have quarterly meetings with Dorval Carter and the Transportation Committee thanks to legislation that was passed. Feel free to ask him the next time he gets on the microphone, said thanks, and his commentary was concluded. The Chairman next ask if there were any other questions, seeing there were none, recognized Alderman Mitchell's Motion to Pass. Chairman took a voice vote asking all in favor to signify by saying Aye, surveyed for any

opposed. The Motion passed and will be reported out at City Council, Wednesday, December 11<sup>th</sup> Meeting.

The Chairman next addressed Item #7, an Amendment of Regulations Governing Administration of Classification Plan and Employee Benefits for Classified Positions set forth in the Annual Appropriation Ordinance regarding salary schedules, automobile allowance, holidays, vacations and sick leave, recognized Annette Guzman from OBM available to answer any questions on the Salary Resolution. Director Guzman conveyed Managing Deputy Commissioner Kevin Murphy would respond to questions raised regarding the Salary Resolution. First Deputy Murphy then advised that changes to the Resolution do a couple of things. One is, under authorized leaves of absence, conforms language to the various bereavement leave acts passed by state law: the Family Bereavement Act, the Child Bereavement Act, the Extended Bereavement Act. It also codifies the current city policy regarding bereavement leave for city employees. And then under Section 2, updates Schedule A, which is a listing that DHR provides to assigned titles to pay schedules. It is an annual update as they do that work throughout the year. And then, Section 3 is an update to all the pay schedules based on the collective bargaining agreements and pay schedules that exist for city employees. The Chairman thanked Managing Deputy Murphy, then next acknowledged Alderman Reilly for questions.

Alderman Reilly started by making clarity on the commentary asking, so this particular ordinance we'd be voting on includes the new salary schedules A/K/A salary adjustments, or no, just the titles. The Chairman called upon the Budget Director to respond. Director Guzman replied yes, that is correct. The annual reconciliation work that DHR does to add titles to schedules as well as the update to all the salary schedules based on collective bargaining agreements that are in place. Alderman Reilly then asked, and are only related to collective bargaining agreements. So, this is only for non-management Union employees, or is it for all employees? Managing Deputy Director responded, it's inclusive of all pay schedules. Alderman Reilly then queried, so not just the Unions, correct? And the Managing Deputy replied, correct. Alderman Reilly thanked him for the response. The Chairman then solicited the floor for any additional questions. Seeing none, called for a Motion to Pass, then acknowledged Alderman LaSpata's Motion to Pass and called for a voice vote, asking all in favor to signify by saying Aye. Any opposed? Chairman acknowledged all Ayes, and no Nos, recorded the Motion passed and will be reported out at tomorrow's City Council, December 11<sup>th</sup> Meeting.

Before concluding the meeting, the Chairman acknowledged all parties contributing to the 2024 Budget Hearings, including Vice Chair Lee, Members and Colleagues, Expert Department Speakers and all other participating auxiliary teams for its successful completion.

The Committee on the Budget and Government Operations having no further business, on Motion made by Alderman Michelle Harris for adjournment, Chair recorded a voice vote of all Ayes and no Nays, and duly adjourned the meeting.

*(A video recording of the full meetings with committee members, internal and external experts, as well as any/all public speaking content can be reviewed on the Chicago City Clerk website under Committee Meeting Web Stream Archive dated December 10, 2024.)*

Respectfully submitted by:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'J. Ervin', written over a horizontal line.

Jason C. Ervin, Chairman  
Committee on the Budget and Government Operations