



**Public Health**  
Prevent. Promote. Protect.

**Macon County**  
Health Department

## **Macon County Health Department Board of Health Meeting Minutes**

Monday, September 15th, 2025 – 6:00 p.m.  
Main Conference Room - Macon County Health Department  
1221 E. Condit St., Decatur, IL 62521



**Public Health**  
Prevent. Promote. Protect.

**Macon County**  
Health Department

Meeting called to order at 6:00 p.m.

### **Attendance**

- Mark Scranton, President – present
- Jeff Entler, Vice President – present
- Jan Hack – present
- Cody Parks – present
- Debbie Hill – absent
- Dr. Bret Jerger – present
- Dr. Venkat Minnaganti – absent
- Dr. Jeff Smith – absent
- Deborah Pulliam – present

### **Health Department Staff in Attendance**

- Lindsey Munsterman, Public Health Administrator
- Laura Zuber, Accounting Director
- Scott Parks, Director of Human Resources
- Amber Balfour, Administrative Assistant
- Jerry Brown, Director of Environmental Health and Emergency Preparedness

### **Other Attendance:**

### **Consent Calendar**

- *Cody Parks made a motion to approve the consent agenda, properly seconded by Deborah Pulliam. Voice vote: all in favor; motion carried.*

### **Public Comment**

- Lindsey stated there is no public comment.

### **Employee Recognition**

- Mark congratulated and thanked Sarah Stoutenborough on 10 years of service, Rebecca Stewart on 8 years of service, Ireta Lincoln on 5 years of service, Dr. Kim on 4 years of service and Kailey Smith on 1 year of service.

### **Old Business**

Mark Scranton recommended that BOH Secretary take on Treasurer duties as well for the time being. Deborah is happy and willing to take on both BOH positions at this time-she just asks for guidance along the way. Lindsey explained how a previous treasurer handled the position.

## **New Business**

Mark shared that Cody Parks had a bit of an emergency to take care of, so he wanted to jump to the discussion and action regarding CFY26 Budget first. Mark thanked Laura and Lindsey for the time and effort they put into the budget. Laura is proposing a budget of \$7,666,433.77 for FY2026 which is an increase of \$257,794.23 from FY2025. Revenue increase is because of the potential increase in tax revenue due to property taxes being predicted to increase. Mark requested Laura touch on the SIPA funds. Laura shared that we received funding from a SIPA grant in 2024 and the grant is to improve Illinois Public Health. We were given \$350,000 and have until the end of FY 2027 to spend the entire amount. She explained that we would like to give a one-time Christmas/Holiday bonus, so we're proposing a bonus of \$1200 per employee. Mark shared that our goal was to get everyone \$1000 take home bonus after taxes and that the one-time bonus would be given around the first of December for the holiday shopping season. Mark explained that we may have some residual money leftover that could possibly go toward something next year. Laura shared that we have a remaining balance of \$256,000 in SIPA funds right now before this one-time bonus. We also have a \$10,000 line item for a motivational speaker to come in and talk with our staff as part of staff morale also. Laura explained that we are proposing to spend \$148,043.13. She also explained that she doesn't have any revenue listed on the budget proposal for the SIPA grant because we've already received the funds and they're sitting in our Health Fund Balance. Lindsey shared that she's spoken with a couple of people regarding public/keynote speaking to come onsite for motivational speaking. Mark shared that Bruce and Kevin are both great guys and would both be great to have. Lindsey shared that she's spoken with Bruce and plans to reach out to Kevin in the near future. She stated that in 2026 we plan to bring in more motivational speakers possibly beyond Bruce and Kevin and we've budgeted for those speakers. Mark shared that he wanted to bring that discussion up because it was a big topic during the finance committee meeting. Mark asked if Laura had anything more to add to which Laura shared that the budget for equipment expenses is up 102% due to, we have a couple of grants allowing us to upgrade some computer equipment this coming year. Overall, we have \$41,046.16 in excess that we are looking to spend but couldn't really find anywhere to put it within the budget. If that money doesn't get spent, it will be moved to our health fund balance. Laura shared that she, Lindsey and Scott have been working to try and organize departments better to get positions filled and salaries paid the way they need to be. Lindsey shared that the salary increase is 4% merit increase based on performance, which is different than the .81% that is shown on the budget proposal summary. This is due to decreasing the staff needs. She explained that we are now at a point that we know what staff we need for the programs we have and offer. Mark shared that he thinks we're (finance committee) happy with how the budget came together, despite the increases. Mark Scranton *made a motion to approve the CFY2026 budget as presented; Jeff Entler seconded; all in favor; motion carried.*

Mark congratulated and thanked the following for their service; Sarah Stoutenborough-10 years, Rebecca Stewart-8 years, Ireta Lincoln-5 years, Dr. Kim-4 years and Kailey Smith-1 year.

Mark moved forward to the discussion regarding the BOH Treasurer and expressed that we needed to have the position filled, but we also have board positions filled and he's more concerned about filling board positions rather than the treasurer, so he suggested that in the meantime, our BOH Secretary take on the role of Treasurer as well. Deborah Pulliam offered to move into the Treasurer position instead if that would help. Mark thanked her but explained that there would still be a hole to fill. Deborah stated she was happy to do both, as long as she had some guidance along the way. Lindsey shared that she would be looking over the bills that are always in the board packet. She explained that the previous treasurer would review and ask questions anytime she wasn't sure what a charge/service was. Mark shared that when he first became a board member, he would question everything until he became familiar with the charges/services that were within the expenditure reports in the board packet. Deborah accepted to take on BOH Treasurer for the time being. Laura shared that Amber has scanned in all invoices so the BOH and auditors can request invoices at any time, and they can be emailed right to them.

Scott shared that our focus continues to be recruitment on open positions. Our open positions moved from 8 down to 7 with the hiring of an Environmental Health Specialist who started today in Jerry's division. So,

we stand at 7 open positions. He shared that we had 3 separations from employment in August-a HealthWorks Lead Agency Case Manager, a WIC Competent Professional Authority and an Environmental Health Specialist, with no issues with unemployment since they were all voluntary resignations. We extended an offer in August to an Environmental Health Specialist who started today. He shared that each month he likes to calculate turnover calculations with August being a very miniscule turnover rate of 3.84%. Scott also shared that we had a part time Dental Assistant position open that we were able to fill in about a weeks' time and we have extended an offer to a Non-RN Better Birth Outcomes Navigator who is considering the position, so our open positions could drop to 6 this week.

Lindsey shared that we are just continuing to go through policies with the BOH to end up with a fully accrued personnel manual. The personnel records policy is simply just stating that employees do have access to their personnel file by law. They can access it by putting the request in writing to Scott. This policy just outlines what is kept in a personnel file as well as how an employee can access their personnel file. *Dr. Jerger motioned to approve the personnel records policy changes as presented; Mark seconded; all in favor; motion carried.*

Lindsey shared that the expectations of privacy/workplace searches policy is already a policy within the personnel manual, and it states that we do not assume liability for damaged, lost or theft by other parties to personal property. It also states that we have the right at any time without advanced notice to search their desk, office, cubicle, station. This obviously isn't something that we do without intent or reason to need to do so-we want to respect employee privacy, but the policy outlines that we have the right to do so, if we had a reason. This policy also states that we do have video surveillance and makes employees aware that is located throughout the building except private areas like restrooms. *Deborah motioned to approve the expectations of privacy/workplace searches policy changes as presented, Dr Jerger seconded; all in favor; motion carried.*

Lindsey proposed to remove the staff and division meetings policy from the personnel manual. Supervisors are already meeting with their division staff regularly. We also meet as an all staff. Lindsey feels the policy is unnecessary and we should remove it and continue status quo as we're currently doing. *Jeff motioned to approve the staff and division meeting policy removal as presented; Mark seconded; all in favor; motion carried.*

Lindsey shared FMLA is federal law, so we must follow that and provide FMLA to any eligible employee. An eligible employee is someone who has worked for their employer for at least 12 months, and/or have at least 1,250 hours of service with the employer during the 12 months before their FMLA leave starts. She shared that Scott is very well versed in FMLA and has had quite a few employees qualify/apply for it and be approved. This policy just states that we are in compliance with federal law, and we do provide FMLA in 12 weeks to all eligible employees. She also shared that the policy states that if there are any questions, concerns or disputes with the policy, employees are directed to contact Scott. *Mark motioned to approve the FMLA policy changes as presented, Jan seconded; all in favor; motion carried*

Lindsey shared that this is again a policy that we already have-employees are given 1 paid personal leave day at the end of their 6-month probationary period measured from their anniversary date, another given at their 12 month anniversary, and 2 days given on their anniversary date annually after their first year. Employees are allowed to carry over 1 personal day every year for a total of 3 each year. She shared that employees simply request to use a personal day with their supervisor-no reason or information needs to be given and their supervisor will approve assuming there are no extreme situations or staffing situations are going on. She also explained that employees are allowed to take their personal time in quarter hour increments. Mark questioned if the flexibility of employees taking their time in quarter hour increments was something that had to be required by law or if it was something MCHD sets. Scott responded that personal leave is more of an internal accommodation. The state laws that are on the books, currently the pay leave for all workers act falls more into a general PTO. Personal leave for non-medical reasons is generally seen as an internal accommodation offered by the employer to the employee. Mark shared his concern regarding the quarter hour increments stating that if you ask for the time off, you ask for the time

off. Jeff questioned how often an employee asks for time off in smaller increments. Lindsey shared that it happens somewhat frequently, but it doesn't cause problems. Laura shared that our time system is able to track the personal time in 15-minute time increments. Mark shared that he is concerned about how this impacts the departments, creating interruptions, etc. Lindsey shared again that this doesn't cause any issues and allows the employee to be more flexible and division directors have the ability to deny time off if there are staffing issues. She also shared that it doesn't cause an issue with time tracking-if an employee with 7 hours of personal leave requests to use 15 minutes of it, the time tracking software just shows that they have 6.75 hours left to use. Mark asked how much notice is required to be given by the employee. Lindsey shared that it's situational-and varies from one person to the next. Mark shared that the policy stating "in advance" is very vague. Lindsey stated that this wasn't feedback that she gets from her leadership staff that staff are taking advantage of it and if a staff member is requesting time off for the same day, they're very aware that it may not be approved. Deborah shared that it was the same in their office, basically if the staff is there, then last minute time off is usually approved. Mark stated that if it's working, there's no problem, he just wanted to share his personal experience. Lindsey also shared that we do have to have the different types of leave separated out to some extent because we're an IMRF employer and sick time left at the time of retirement converts into service credits with IMRF. *Deborah motioned to approve the personal leave policy changes as presented; Mark Seconded; all in favor; motion carried.*

Lindsey stated that this is a federal requirement, and this policy is just stating we're going to comply with state and federal laws governing leaves for military service and reserve training. She shared that there was an update that Scott brought to our attention that took place on August 11, 2025, so we are also stating that we are going to follow the Standing Military Leave Act amendment. Scott shared that the amendment provides paid leave for service members who will be participating in any kind of Honor Guard activity as well. Macon County has a standing Honor Guard that is primarily made up of retired service men and women so most of the time it's covered by Macon County Honor Guard, but active personnel could be invited to take part in Honor Guard as well. *Mark motioned to approve the military leave policy changes as presented; Jeff seconded; all in favor; motion carried*

Jerry shared regarding a resolution with a septic system issue. As of June 25<sup>th</sup>, we had some issues/complaints with a homeowner who was taking their damaged septic and pumping it into a storm drain. After partnering with them, as of August 27<sup>th</sup>, the homeowner has a brand-new septic system and the only thing being discharged into the storm drain is fresh water. Lindsey shared that we were just a couple steps away from having to contact the State's Attorney to take legal action, so we're very happy to see this issue resolved cordially between the homeowner and the person being affected. She shared that going to the attorney only puts the homeowner back further from the goal, which is resolving the issue, so we're always trying to take a very friendly and customer service type approach. Thankfully Jerry was there to resolve the entire situation and was there to help explain the situation and keep everyone levelheaded. Mark shared that he ran into the homeowner who was being affected by the faulty septic system, and he was very happy to have the issue finally resolved. Jerry went on to share that we have 608 active food establishments. He shared that over the last 3 years, we've only lost a small amount of business-and generally a new food establishment with move into the space because it's already made for food service. Out of the 608 active food establishments, we have 108 establishments that are non-profit. Those non-profits include schools, churches, facilities like our hospitals and we currently do not charge them a permit fee. Jeff asked why we don't charge non-profits a permit fee to which Jerry responded that he's just been told that we don't charge them the permit fee. Now that he's director, he just wanted to look into it and get a list for everyone. Bret asked where other counties were with charging non-profit the permit fee. Jerry explained that some counties charge them full price, some who charge nothing and others who charge a pro-rated fee. Jerry shared the difference between the 3 categories within food establishments, who/what businesses fit into each category and what the permit cost for each category is. He shared that we as we approach renewal season, we are looking at a revenue of \$206,650. The 108 non-profit establishments would bring in an additional \$51,800 in revenue if they had to pay full price for a permit, which is a big jump in revenue. He went on to share that we have 188 temporary permits that we inspect one time per calendar, typically paying \$75/permit-but out of the 188 temp permits, we have 64 that are classified as

non-profit, so we aren't charging them which is about \$4800 in lost revenue. Jerry questioned if we should continue not charging our non-profit establishments, or if we should make some changes and require those non-profits pay a fee. Mark shared that he believes everyone should contribute something and pay some sort of fee, but should it be based on volume, like square footage of their facility, size of their kitchen, number of people served. A large hospital is different than a small church and it doesn't seem fair to charge them the same permit price. Jerry expressed that he would encourage some of the smaller non-profits to not renew their permit, but to apply for a temporary permit when they have an event. Jeff questioned when the last time we changed the fees was-Jerry responded that they've not been changed since he started 7 years ago. He also shared that we are the 2<sup>nd</sup> highest county when it comes to fees being charged. Jerry shared that Decatur Public Schools and Decatur Park District are the big chunk of nonprofit facilities that we service. Mark questioned how much push back he thought we would get if we chose to start charging nonprofit facilities. Jeff asked how much the permits were again, Jerry explained Cat 1 is \$600, Cat 2 is \$400, and Cat 3 is \$200 and temporary permits are \$75.00 per event. Mark asked how many dollars we are leaving behind by not charging these facilities to which Jerry responded \$51,800 plus the \$4,800 for temp permits, which equals \$56,600 total. Mark is concerned how this will affect some of the smaller churches, Good Samaritan, Water Street Mission, etc. and questioned if we could have a hardship exemption form. Jerry shared that he thought other facilities would be upset when they got wind of the exemption form. Deborah asked if we were one of the only counties that don't charge nonprofit, to which Jerry responded, no other counties also don't charge, but there are a few that do. Jeff mentioned that he'd like to know exactly what each county is doing so we have a basis to go from. Mark asked what category some places were like Water Street Mission. Jerry shared that they would be considered a category 1 due to the clientele that is being served. Lindsey shared that we could table the discussion if the board wanted to know exactly what each county is doing. Mark asked if we would be out of the norm by charging nonprofits to which Jerry explained that charging full price would probably be out of the norm and he just wanted to provide the BOH with as much information as possible. Mark confirmed that each facility within school districts and the park district had their own licenses. Mark shared that his recommendation is to define what nonprofit is/isn't and suggested that we charge nonprofits 50% of what our for profits pay. *Mark made a motion to charge non-profit establishments 50% of the food license fee; Jeff seconded; all in favor; motion carried.*

### **Closed Session:**

No Closed Session

### **Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 7:04 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Amber Balfour  
MCHD Administrative Assistant

President: \_\_\_\_\_

Secretary: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: 10/21/25

