



# Board of Commissioners of Cook County

118 North Clark Street  
Chicago, IL

## Legislation Details (With Text)

---

<b>File #:</b>	15-5173	<b>Version:</b>	1	<b>Name:</b>	PROPOSED TRANSFER OF FUNDS
<b>Type:</b>	Transfer of Funds	<b>Status:</b>		<b>Status:</b>	Approved
<b>File created:</b>	8/26/2015	<b>In control:</b>		<b>In control:</b>	Board of Commissioners
<b>On agenda:</b>	9/9/2015	<b>Final action:</b>		<b>Final action:</b>	9/9/2015
<b>Title:</b>	PROPOSED TRANSFER OF FUNDS				

Department: Office of the State's Attorney

Request: requesting approval by the Board of Commissioners to transfer \$215,000.00 from and to the accounts listed below.

Reason: This transfer of funds, which represents less than one-quarter of one percent of our 2015 budget, should be sufficient to fulfill our obligations for the remainder of the fiscal year for three accounts with projected shortages. These accounts are: 250-217 Transportation for Specific Activities, where we have seen higher than anticipated costs for bringing in witnesses from out of state and extraditing prisoners from other jurisdictions; 250-232 Boarding and Lodging of Witnesses, primarily due to the cost of relocating and protecting witnesses who are threatened; and 250-268 Court Reporting Services, where expenditures for court transcripts have been slightly higher than projected.

From Account(s): 250-441, \$40,000.00; 250-445, \$175,000.00.

To Account(s): 250-217, \$90,000.00; 250-232, \$75,000.00; 250-268, \$50,000.00.

Total Amount of Transfer: \$215,000.00

On what date did it become apparent that the receiving account would require an infusion of funds in order to meet current obligations? What was the balance in the account on that date, and what was the balance 30 days prior to that date?

On 8/1, Account 217 had a balance of approximately \$25,000; on July 1st the balance was approximately \$105,000.

On 7/1, Account 232 had a balance of approximately \$13,000; on June 1st the balance was approximately \$65,000.

On 8/1, Account 268 had a balance of approximately \$200,000; on July 1st the balance was approximately \$415,000.

How was the account used for the source of transferred funds identified? List any other accounts that were also considered (but not used) as the source of the transferred funds.

These were the accounts, based on current year to date spending and known obligations, which were projected as most likely to have remaining balances at year end.

Identify any projects, purchases, programs, contracts, or other obligations that will be deferred, delayed, or canceled as a result of the reduction in available spending authority that will result in the account that funds are transferred from.

None.

If the answer to the above question is "none" then please explain why this account was originally budgeted in a manner that caused an unobligated surplus to develop at this point in the fiscal year.

Although spending fluctuates from year to year in many accounts, our original budget requests were based on our best projections at that time.

**Sponsors:**

**Indexes:** (inactive) ANITA ALVAREZ, Cook County State's Attorney, (inactive) RAYMOND BALCARCEL, Chief Financial Officer, State's Attorney's Office

**Code sections:**

**Attachments:**

Date	Ver.	Action By	Action	Result
9/9/2015	1	Board of Commissioners	approve	Pass

**PROPOSED TRANSFER OF FUNDS**

**Department:** Office of the State's Attorney

**Request:** requesting approval by the Board of Commissioners to transfer \$215,000.00 from and to the accounts listed below.

**Reason:** This transfer of funds, which represents less than one-quarter of one percent of our 2015 budget, should be sufficient to fulfill our obligations for the remainder of the fiscal year for three accounts with projected shortages. These accounts are: 250-217 Transportation for Specific Activities, where we have seen higher than anticipated costs for bringing in witnesses from out of state and extraditing prisoners from other jurisdictions; 250-232 Boarding and Lodging of Witnesses, primarily due to the cost of relocating and protecting witnesses who are threatened; and 250-268 Court Reporting Services, where expenditures for court transcripts have been slightly higher than projected.

**From Account(s):** 250-441, \$40,000.00; 250-445, \$175,000.00.

**To Account(s):** 250-217, \$90,000.00; 250-232, \$75,000.00; 250-268, \$50,000.00.

**Total Amount of Transfer:** \$215,000.00

**On what date did it become apparent that the receiving account would require an infusion of funds in order to meet current obligations? What was the balance in the account on that date, and what was the balance 30 days prior to that date?**

On 8/1, Account 217 had a balance of approximately \$25,000; on July 1<sup>st</sup> the balance was approximately \$105,000.

On 7/1, Account 232 had a balance of approximately \$13,000; on June 1<sup>st</sup> the balance was approximately \$65,000.

On 8/1, Account 268 had a balance of approximately \$200,000; on July 1<sup>st</sup> the balance was approximately \$415,000.

**How was the account used for the source of transferred funds identified? List any other accounts that were also considered (but not used) as the source of the transferred funds.**

These were the accounts, based on current year to date spending and known obligations, which were projected as most likely to have remaining balances at year end.

**Identify any projects, purchases, programs, contracts, or other obligations that will be deferred, delayed, or canceled as a result of the reduction in available spending authority that will result in the account that funds are transferred from.**

None.

**If the answer to the above question is “none” then please explain why this account was originally budgeted in a manner that caused an unobligated surplus to develop at this point in the fiscal year.**

Although spending fluctuates from year to year in many accounts, our original budget requests were based on our best projections at that time.