



Office of the President

Lanetta Haynes Turner

Chief of Staff

118 N Clark St, Suite 1018 | Chicago, Illinois 60602 | (312) 603-2845

TONI PRECKWINKLE

PRESIDENT

Cook County Board
of Commissioners

TARA STAMPS
1st District

DENNIS DEER
2nd District

BILL LOWRY
3rd District

STANLEY MOORE
4th District

MONICA GORDON
5th District

DONNA MILLER
6th District

ALMA E. ANAYA
7th District

ANTHONY QUEZADA
8th District

MAGGIE TREVOR
9th District

BRIDGET GAINER
10th District

JOHN P. DALEY
11th District

BRIDGET DEGNEN
12th District

JOSINA MORITA
13th District

SCOTT R. BRITTON
14th District

KEVIN B. MORRISON
15th District

FRANK AGUILAR
16th District

SEAN M. MORRISON
17th District

To: Honorable John P. Daley, *Chairman, Finance Committee*

From: Lanetta Haynes Turner, *Chief of Staff*
Office of the President

CC: Kanako Ishida Musselwhite, *Budget Director*
Department of Budget & Management Services

Date: November 1, 2023

Re: Request for Information from FY2024 Budget Hearing

The following information is provided in response to questions posed at our department's budget hearing held on October 24, 2023.

BOF: Request ID# 1010-01

Commissioner Gainer asked: Compared to other jurisdictions of similar size, how has Cook County performed in terms of recovering money from the class action opioid settlement - where does Cook County rank in comparison to all municipalities and counties that opted into the litigation?

Response:

The Illinois Opioid Allocation Agreement ("Agreement"), was entered into by and among the following Parties: (i) the People of the State of Illinois by Kwame Raoul, the Attorney General of the State of Illinois (the "Attorney General"); and (ii) Cook County, DuPage County, Kane County, Lake County, Madison County, McHenry County, St. Clair County, Will County, and Winnebago County (the "Original Participating Local Governments" or "Original-PLGs"). The Agreement negotiated by the Parties, allocates the funds Illinois receives through the various opioid settlements, as well as any future settlements, to counties and municipalities throughout the state.

To resolve various claims and encourage settlement, the Parties agreed to allow other local Illinois governmental units to join this Agreement in the future and to ensure the fair apportionment of all sums collected from any Opioid Defendant, by way of judgment or settlement to best serve the People of the State of Illinois.

Pursuant to the Illinois Opioid Allocation Agreement, the distributions of settlements or other recoveries is as follows:

Any sums collected related to Opioid Litigation by the Attorney General from any Opioid Defendant by way of judgment or settlement in a National Multistate Opioid Settlement shall be distributed as follows to ensure, among other things, that 70% of all such judgment or settlement proceeds are used to support specified opioid remediation or abatement programs:

- *Twenty percent (20.0%) shall be distributed to the State of Illinois, at least one-quarter (1/4th) of which shall be used to support opioid remediation programs included in the list of Approved Abatement Programs provided in the Settlement Agreement.*
- *Fifteen percent (15%) shall be distributed into the Local Government Recovery Fund (“LG Recovery Fund”) and shall be allocated in accordance with the percentages set forth in the Municipalities and Townships Allocation Table to (1) municipalities and townships who are Participating Local Governments (“PLGs”) and who have filed a lawsuit against an Opioid Defendant by September 1, 2020, and (2) municipalities who are PLGs with a population of at least 30,000 according to the 2019 United States Census Population Estimate whether or not they have filed a lawsuit against an Opioid Defendant. Any amount remaining in the LG Recovery Fund following this distribution shall be allocated among counties who are PLGs in accordance with the percentages set forth in the Counties Allocation Table.*
- *In addition to any amounts remaining following the allocation, Ten percent (10%) shall be distributed into the LG Recovery Fund to be allocated among counties who are PLGs in accordance with the procedures set forth in Counties Allocation Table. Counties who receive an allocation from this portion of the LG Recovery Fund are obligated to use such distributions to support opioid remediation programs in their community through uses included in the list of Approved Abatement Programs provided in the Agreement Each LG receiving an allocation from this portion of the LG Recovery Fund shall track and quarterly report to the Attorney General all monies spent to support opioid remediation programs.*
- *Fifty-Five Percent (55%) shall be distributed into the Illinois Remediation Fund. A Remediation Fund Advisory Board shall be appointed to provide nonbinding recommendations regarding the administration and distribution of the Illinois Remediation Fund. The Remediation Fund Advisory Board, when making recommendations, will seek to ensure an equitable allocation of resources to all parts of the state, taking into consideration population as well as other factors relevant to opioid abatement, including rates of Opioid Use Disorder, Overdose Deaths, and amounts of opioids shipped into each region as measured in Morphine Milligram Equivalents. All funds disbursed from the Remediation Fund shall go to support uses included in the list of Approved Abatement Programs. In addition, funds disbursed from the Remediation Fund shall go to support abatement uses that provide services in each of the seven regions identified in the Agreement with the allocation of resources being equitable across regions, taking into consideration population as well as other factors relevant to opioid abatement, including rates of Opioid Use Disorder, Overdose Deaths, and amounts of opioids shipped into each region as measured in Morphine Milligram Equivalents. The Attorney General or his delegate shall appoint the members of the Remediation Fund Advisory Board at his sole discretion, provided that at least one half (1/2) of the voting members of the Advisory Board shall be representatives of the PLGs as determined by the PLGs.*

Any sums collected related to Opioid Litigation by a PLG from any Opioid Defendant by way of judgment or settlement shall be turned over to the Attorney General for distribution pursuant to this Agreement.

*The percentages allocated by municipality and county can be found **Attachment A**.*

BOA: Request ID# 1010-02

Regarding Animal Control, the department budget was reduced by 1.5 FTE from FY23. Commissioner Anaya asked what position(s), if any, were added (new titles elsewhere?) as a result of losing 1.5 FTE.

Response:

Animal and Rabies Control added a new position/title, Business Manager III for FY24.

Per the SEIU 73 Contract 2020-2024, in cases of promotion, employees in the department shall have first preference. The Business Manager III, SEIU 73, position is a higher Grade/Salary than our existing union titles and would therefore present an opportunity for internal promotion within ARC.

BOF: Request ID# 1010-03

Commissioner Anaya asked: Of the \$130M budgeted in the Equity Fund, how much has been spent to date?

Response:

Cook County allocated \$74M for the Equity Fund in FY2023. As of October 26, 2023, the County has spent \$7.8M of the \$74M allocation:

- JAC Violence Prevention Grant \$675K*
- JAC Returning Resident Grant \$4.4M*
- Expanded Home Buyer Direct program \$709K*
- Expanded Homebuyer Program Aging Inventory \$246K*
- Transforming Places \$1.8M*

BHR: Request ID# 1010-04

Commissioner Anaya asked: Explain the reduction of 1 hearing officer in BHR's Labor Relations department budget.

Response:

In 2023, the Hearing Officer position was reclassified, and the funding was used to cover a senior hearing officer position. However, both positions (Hearing Officer and Sr. Hearing Officer) will be placed in the 2024 budget and the change will be made during the budget amendment period.

BED: Request ID# 1010-05

Commissioner Anaya asked: Is there a mechanism to provide reports for each district on the impact of the property tax incentives, the progress of those projects and how much is received by the County? (It was noted by X. Flores that the Assessor's Office has this info and X. Flores will converse with them).

Response:

The Bureau administers a subset of the Cook County Assessor's Real Estate Tax Incentive Program. We can provide data that we collect from the applicants for the anticipated impacts in property taxes, job numbers (including construction jobs) and project development cost (Purchase Value and Construction Cost). This data is provided annually to Commissioners and is attached. For future reporting and impact assessment, we can work with the Assessor to explore opportunities to collect this data through annual certifications.

DHRE: Request ID# 1010-06

Commissioner Anaya asked: The numbers on the reports from the Department of Human Rights & Ethics do not reflect the number of complaints/reports - what are we missing? Commissioner Anaya asked if there is something we are not doing internally or if there are mechanisms for outreach to encourage residents to reach out to the County and report violations? How does the reporting reflect what is happening on the ground concerning stakeholders, and how is the department working with stakeholders on the ground? Commissioner Anaya is asking if there is a comparison to what the State is reporting, given the State's statistics conveying half of their complaints are from Cook County – there is a disconnect of what the State is reporting versus what the County is reporting.

Response:

Per section 42-34(9) of the Human Rights Ordinance, the Commission is required to file a quarterly report noting the case resolved and filed within that time frame. Going forward, the report will include the total number of cases pending before the Commission, broken down by complaint type. Additionally, the Commission's annual report details the total number of cases and more enforcement about our enforcement areas.

We regularly connect with about 30 community organizations located throughout Cook County and with a variety of services and expertise. For Equity Fund Recommendations 2.2 and 2.11, we have close partnerships with Arise Chicago, CAFHA, Shriver, and several other labor and housing-focused community organizations (who refer and file complaints with the Commission). We have developed new relationships with the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Illinois Housing Redevelopment Authority, and TransUnion. We have increased the number of materials available in three additional languages and increased the number of informational materials to aid in navigating the Commission, its many protections, and explain the distinctions between the protections provided by the Commission in comparison to its sister agencies. We are aware that we still have significant outreach work to do, but we have done significantly more in the previous two years than in the five years prior to that.

Commissioner Anaya noted that the State's statistics report that half of their complaints are from Cook County. There are a few reason for this: [1] our jurisdiction overlaps with Chicago and Illinois, so individuals oftentimes have the opportunity to file their complaint with a jurisdiction that has a longer timeframe for complaint acceptance (1 year instead of 180 days) or a possibility of a larger fine/settlement; [2] both Illinois and Chicago have significantly larger staff (investigators and outreach staff) and they have greater name recognition, [3] it is possible that this data includes complaints filed with the Illinois Department of Labor, which would include complaints related to protections not within the Commission's scope, including wage theft.

Staff have made efforts to develop memoranda of understanding with the State and other sister agencies over the previous year, whereby they refer complaints within our jurisdiction to us. This effort is ongoing. Currently, we refer some complaints to sister agencies when the matter is outside of our geographical and subject matter jurisdiction.

Additionally, it is important to note that none of our peer agencies also includes the agency of the Board of Ethics. This has specific implications on our outreach capabilities, as our outreach coordinator is also responsible for Ethics in-person and virtual training for 3,600+ staff members per year and development of reports and informational materials.

Lastly, we intend to share more materials with Commissioners that can be shared with their constituents. We appreciate all feedback and are always available to meet to discuss proposed strategies or specific concerns at any time.

BOF: Request ID# 1010-07

Commissioner Miller asked: What percentage of contracts with zero MWDBE goals are due to the lack of MWDBE vendors? Budget book states 85% in the Contract Compliance Performance Measures table; the latest percentage is being requested.

Response:

The latest percentage remains at 85%.

DHRE: Request ID# 1010-08

Commissioner Britton asked: Has there been an increase in hate crimes in the County? Are we tracking hate crimes internally? Are we sharing the information with other organizations or police departments?

Response:

Hate crimes are not within the Commission's scope, as they are a criminal matter. The Cook County Sheriff's Office receives and investigates hate crimes and can provide more information. We receive inquiries from the public regarding allegations of hate crimes and provide referrals to the appropriate law enforcement authority.

We recognize the public is not always aware of which agency to contact when they experience a hate crime, or what conduct amounts to the legal definition of a hate crime. To that end, we are collaborating with the State's Attorney's office to educate the public about the distinctions between hate crimes and discrimination-based protected classes included in the County's Human Rights Ordinance, along with providing resources on where to seek assistance based on what they are experiencing.

BAM: Request ID# 1010-09

Commissioner Degnen asked: Is the \$1M value of a total capital project still an appropriate threshold for BAM to send to labor unions to evaluate whether in house trade labor or JOC labor (vendors) should be used, in light of the inflationary effects on capital project costs? How is this number set and is it during CBA negotiations? Are tinsmith's positions being added?

Response:

Confirming subcontracting (including JOC Program review) is governed by Section 13.7 of the COUPE CBA. Section 13.7 is below:

Section 13.7 Sub-Contracting: The County shall provide the Union with notice of any Request for Proposal or Invitation for Bid for the performance of bargaining unit with an estimated budget of \$200,000.00 or less. If after said evaluation period, the County nevertheless determines to subcontract the work, such sub-contracting shall, at all times, be in compliance with State and Federal Statutes and the Parties' Project Labor Agreement (if applicable), and not be used to undermine the Bargaining Unit. The Coalition agrees to reduce the notice requirement in the parties' PLA from fourteen (14) days to seven (7) days.

A technical amendment will be issued that reclassifies an existing title to tinsmith.

BOF: Request ID# 1010-10

Commissioner Trevor asked: What are the Contingencies and Special Purpose amounts shown on page A-29 (Bureau-wide Distribution by Appropriation Classification table for BOA) and the appropriation transfer we see on page A-34 in Volume 2 of the Executive Recommendation (E1011's Distribution by Appropriation Classification)? An explanation is requested.

Response:

Bureau of Administration budgets \$2.3M credits in Account 580419 – Appropriation Transfer in FY2024. Following credits have been budgeted in FY2024:

- *A total of \$413,810 for the Office of the Chief Administrative Officer (Department 1011) for printshop reimbursements from countywide agencies and salary reimbursement from DOTD for time spent for various DOTD projects including Invest in Cook program.*
- *A total of \$628k for the Department of Environment & Sustainability (Department 1161) for grant reimbursements and SPF reimbursement.*
- *A total of \$600K for the Medical Examiner's Office (Department 1259) for credits from their Special Purpose Fund Medical Examiner Fee to reimburse operating expenditures.*
- *A total of \$650K for the Department of Emergency Management and Regional Security (Department 1265) for reimbursements from Emergency Management Performance Grant and Urban Area Security Initiative Grant.*

The large increase in credit compared to FY2023 appropriation is driven by the credit within the Medical Examiner's Office.

BHR: Request ID# 1010-11

Commissioner Gainer asked: When it comes to the Deloitte contract and investments in technology or personnel in BHR, how do we evaluate if these investments paid off?

Response:

The Bureau of Human Resources tracks the outcomes of our partnership with Deloitte. Each workstream has specific deliverables and expected outcomes which provide benefit to Cook County. The Recruiting and Hiring Operations in conjunction with process changes yielded a reduction in HR's time to fill metric and promoted transparency to hiring departments on the hiring process. This work also yielded over 400 hires in one year, which was an increase over the previous few years.

The Organizational Design and Job Architecture workstream has resulted in a system to ensure alignment of job titles and functions to the labor market, as well as a framework for job titling and leveling which provides consistency, standardization, and transparency to current employees to aid in retention. This new framework provides the basis for the creation of new titles and job descriptions and will allow HR to streamline the job description process once implemented.

The Compensation Services workstream has resulted in an updated non-union corporate pay schedule that is aligned to the relevant market, establishes uniformity in grade increases, and increases the earning potential of County employees. This work impacts all County elected offices and supports both recruiting and retention.

The Marketing and Branding workstream has resulted in increased brand awareness with Cook County career opportunities, provided the tools necessary to execute marketing campaigns to target highly desirable candidates, and increased our digital marketing presence.

In addition to our work with Deloitte, our team continues to work with the Bureau of Technology on Taleo enhancements which will also benefit offices Countywide. The enhancements will automate the hiring and onboarding processes, eliminating the need for manual processing and workarounds which extend the hiring timeline. The resulting reduced time to fill metric and the increased satisfaction of candidates and hiring managers will be the markers of success.

JAC Request ID# 1010-12

Commissioner Gordon asked: Could the JAC provide a list of community-based organizations that received County funding in FY23, and how much was allocated to each of them?

Response:

The JAC has created “Commissioner Kits” with information about various initiatives and community investments. As part of those kits, each district has been provided a breakdown of FY2022 county investments as well as ARPA Gun Violence Prevention and Reduction Grant Awards. The SharePoint may be accessed [here](#).

Request ID# 1010-13

Commissioner Degnen asked: Why did we allow the No Place to Stay contract and list to expire without bringing a new RFQ/RFP?

Response:

The contracts have not expired. Only the qualified provider list. The initial plan was to re-draft the terms of an RFQ incorporating lessons learned from PFA implementation. Due to the unexpected and uncertain delay in PFA implementation due to the litigation, until recently we were unable to return to RFQ drafting. Since the qualified provider list has expired, we are unable to create new contracts with current providers, nor new providers. However, we are empowered under the RFQ and the contracts approved by the board last year to renew the existing contracts. (Under the RFQ the list is active for two.

Request ID# 1010-14

Commissioner Degnen asked: Why the delay to extend the No Place to Stay contract between March 2023 and November 2023 and how long is the renewal period being brought to the Board in November?

Response:

The current contracts have a performance period of December 1, 2022 – November 30, 2022. There has been no delay in extending contracts. We will be requesting approval to exercise the contracts’ renewal options at the November board meeting. There are two (2) one-year renewal options we have the ability to exercise for each of the current providers.

Request ID# 1010-15

Commissioner Degnen asked: How does the No Place to Stay contract renewal tie into the list of providers? Are the providers all the same on this renewal?

Response:

The JAC currently holds contracts with six NPTS providers. All providers were selected from a list of qualified providers, reached through a formal RFQ process. There will be no new housing providers contracted with NPTS until the next RFQ process.

Request ID# 1010-16

Commissioner Degnen asked: Is it the JAC's sole responsibility to ensure 100% of the No Place to Stay (NPTS) clients have a place to stay, or are there other County programs?

If these clients cannot access No Place to Stay beds, do they go back to jail?

Response:

No one in the County is responsible for ensuring 100% of NPTS individuals have a place to stay. The CCSO is responsible for identifying who in their custody has no place to stay and may benefit from placement in one of the NPTS provider beds. The CCSO began this program understanding that remaining in Cook County Jail was not a suitable outcome for individuals who had technically been ordered to pre-trial release (on EM). The CCSO's contracts for NPTS were sunseting in 2020, with no stated plans to continue programming. At this point, the JAC assumed responsibility for the procurement and management of provider contracts to ensure individuals who were NPTS did not remain, nor return to jail during the pandemic. Since then, the JAC has been working in close collaboration with the CCSO, CCH, and OPD to maintain this housing option for individuals that could benefit from it.

To our knowledge, there are no other county programs that provide housing explicitly for NPTS individuals impacted by the criminal justice system at the pre-trial stage although ad hoc arrangements have been made for NPTS individuals outside of our program. Other housing initiatives, such as HACC or others, may serve justice-impacted individuals.

Individuals assigned to electronic monitoring under the Sheriff must first go through the intake/enrollment with the Sheriff's office before being released from Cook County Jail. Individuals are in custody during that time. If it is determined that an individual does not have a suitable place to be released to on electronic monitoring, they remain in custody until an alternative housing option can be identified. This could be a different family member, friend, or a shelter bed through the NPTS program.

However, under the Pretrial Fairness Act, judges are now required to re-evaluate conditions of release if an individual is unable to meet them within 48 hours. For this reason, we expected a significant change in the NPTS population under the PFA and planned the NPTS RFQ timeline with this in mind.

Request ID# 1010-17

Commissioner Degnen asked: What internal policies determine whether someone is put on EM and becomes NPTS? Is that decision largely up to the judge that decides whether to release the defendant on EM or not, especially in light of the PFA?

The decision to order a person to EM is up to the judge, but the policies that govern whether a location is eligible for EM is at the discretion of the Cook County Sheriff's Office. The policy referenced in the letter around utilities, for example, is a well-intentioned policy that aims to ensure an individual is not being released to a residence where they and/or their host may be "squatting". However, this policy may also have unintended consequences for individuals who are housing insecure, couch surfing or who have a non-traditional living arrangement. These policies govern who is ultimately designated as NPTS, therefore cannot be placed on EM and must rely on providers like the ones we contract with; we believe periodic review of those policies would be useful.

Request ID# 1010-18

Commissioner Gainer requested a list of vacancies.

| Bureau | Row Labels | F24 funded vacancies |
|--------|--|----------------------|
| OUP | 1002-Human Rights And Ethics (Office) | 5 |
| OUP | 1007-Revenue (Office) | 15 |
| OUP | 1008-Risk Management (Office) | 4 |
| OUP | 1009-Enterprise Technology (Office) | 57 |
| OUP | 1010-Office of the President (Office) | 18 |
| OUP | 1011-Office of Chief Admin Officer (Office) | 23 |
| OUP | 1013-Planning and Development (Office) | 12 |
| OUP | 1014-Budget and Management Services (Office) | 8 |
| OUP | 1020-County Comptroller (Office) | 23 |
| OUP | 1021-Office of the Chief Financial Officer (Office) | 7 |
| OUP | 1022-Contract Compliance (Office) | 16 |
| OUP | 1026-Administrative Hearing Board (Office) | 3 |
| OUP | 1027-Office of Economic Development (Office) | 21 |
| OUP | 1030-Chief Procurement Officer (Office) | 23 |
| OUP | 1031-Office of Asset Management (Office) | 23 |
| OUP | 1032-Department of Human Resources (Office) | 43 |
| OUP | 1033-Department of Labor Relations (Office) | 6 |
| OUP | 1070-County Auditor (Office) | 12 |
| OUP | 1160-Building and Zoning (Office) | 3 |
| OUP | 1161-Department of Environment and Sustainability (Office) | 16 |
| OUP | 1170-Zoning Board of Appeals (Office) | 0 |
| OUP | 1200-Department of Facilities Management (Office) | 43 |
| OUP | 1205-Justice Advisory Council (Office) | 9 |
| OUP | 1259-Medical Examiner (Office) | 16.5 |
| OUP | 1265-Cook County Department of Emergency Management & Regional Security (Office) | 23 |
| OUP | 1500-Department of Transportation And Highways (Office) | 113 |
| OUP | 1510-Cook County Animal and Rabies Control (Office) | 5 |
| OUP | 1530-Cook County Law Library (Office) | 2 |

ATTACHMENT A

State of Illinois Qualifying Municipality Allocation Percentages

Illinois Opioid Allocation Agreement

| Qualifying Subdivision | Distributors Exhibit G Percentage |
|-------------------------------|--|
| Addison Village | 0.1789163143% |
| Algonquin Village | 0.1102023571% |
| Anna Citv | 0.0351784549% |
| Arlington Heights Village | 0.2647476580% |
| Aurora City | 1.1285112946% |
| Bartlett Village | 0.1012637420% |
| Bedford Park Village | 0.0908134228% |
| Belleville City | 0.2800912041% |
| Bellwood Village | 0.0636018022% |
| Bensenville Village | 0.0698164453% |
| Benton City | 0.0648747331 % |
| Berkeley Village | 0.0152507249% |
| Berwyn City | 0.2349799824% |
| Bloomington Citv | 0.4210280112% |
| Bolingbrook Village | 0.3965448276% |
| Bridgeview Village | 0.0500143261 % |
| Broadview Village | 0.0576947589% |
| Buffalo Grove Village | 0.2068406914% |
| Burbank City | 0.0690685990% |
| Calumet City | 0.0970812870% |
| Carbondale City | 0.1954958522% |
| Carol Stream Village | 0.1407965379% |
| Carpentersville Village | 0.1363950647% |
| Champaign City | 0.4052254107% |
| Chicago City | 15.6332843102% |

| | |
|-----------------------|----------------|
| Chicago Heights City | 0.1217857439% |
| Chicago Ridge Village | 0.0524909103% |
| Cicero Town | 0.2786347507% |
| Countryside City | 0.0301223625% |
| Crystal Lake City | 0.3158354713% |
| Danville City | 0.2559565285% |
| Decatur City | 0.4645929351 % |
| Dekalb City | 0.1798256279% |
| Des Plaines City | 0.2324422843% |
| Dolton Village | 0.0603302846% |

| | |
|--------------------------|----------------|
| Downers Grove Village | 0.3224473331 % |
| Elgin City | 0.5305768766% |
| Elk Grove Village | 0.1757993182% |
| Elmhurst City | 0.2577623917% |
| Evanston City | 0.2696457560% |
| Evergreen Park Village | 0.0597799426% |
| Forest Park Village | 0.0453425079% |
| Franklin Park Village | 0.0785284649% |
| Galesburg City | 0.1473738962% |
| Glendale Heights Village | 0.0836866697% |
| Glenview Village | 0.1572220054% |
| Granite City | 0.4907786518% |
| Gurnee Village | 0.2256865903% |
| Hanover Park Village | 0.1439424898% |
| Harrisburg City | 0.1363861795% |
| Harvey City | 0.0542520318% |
| Harwood Heights Village | 0.0264961580% |
| Herrin City | 0.1579067080% |
| Hillside Village | 0.0587648633% |
| Hodgkins Village | 0.0232613539% |

| | |
|--------------------------|---------------|
| Hoffman Estates Village | 0.1751755942% |
| Joliet City | 0.8239848961% |
| Kankakee City | 0.3012693137% |
| La Grange Park Village | 0.0306665705% |
| Lombard Village | 0.2672806655% |
| Lyons Townshio | 0.0242947899% |
| Lyons Village | 0.0362495516% |
| Marion City | 0.3397669146% |
| Maywood Village | 0.0867531057% |
| McCook Village | 0.0198186268% |
| Melrose Park Village | 0.1186181878% |
| Merrionette Park Village | 0.0076009169% |
| Metropolis City | 0.0947332002% |
| Moline City | 0.2352551083% |
| Mount Prospect Village | 0.1704792853% |
| Mundelein Village | 0.1639685886% |
| Naperville City | 0.7685669619% |
| Normal Town | 0.2474856274% |
| North Riverside Village | 0.0551815063% |
| Northbrook Village | 0.1427173226% |
| Northlake City | 0.0381023667% |
| Oak Lawn Village | 0.1589709041% |
| Oak Park Village | 0.2093093375% |
| Orland Park Village | 0.1051852784% |
| Oswego Village | 0.1197866160% |
| Palatine Village | 0.2160969641% |
| Palos Heights City | 0.0290094105% |
| Palos Hills City | 0.0251753281% |
| Park Ridge City | 0.1116349061% |
| Pekin City | 0.3387071386% |
| Peoria City | 1.0471081247% |
| Plainfield Village | 0.1401767830% |

| | |
|-----------------------|---------------|
| Posen Village | 0.0146759373% |
| Princeton City | 0.2434249044% |
| Quincy City | 0.2800247680% |
| River Forest Village | 0.0488586169% |
| River Grove Village | 0.0284407118% |
| Riverside Village | 0.0269914748% |
| Rock Island City | 0.2048536960% |
| Rockford Citv | 1.8636718830% |
| Romeoville Village | 0.2124235372% |
| Schaumburg Village | 0.2968023515% |
| Schiller Park Village | 0.0601957886% |
| Sesser Citv | 0.0116834244% |
| Skokie Village | 0.1964801264% |
| Springfield City | 0.9971442684% |
| St. Charles Citv | 0.2062203953% |
| Stone Park Village | 0.0241358032% |
| Streamwood Village | 0.0878171213% |
| Streator City | 0.1400665973% |
| Summit Village | 0.0312780717% |
| Tinlev Park Village | 0.1419492253% |
| Urbana City | 0.2112740522% |
| Waukegan City | 0.4111769252% |
| West Frankfort City | 0.1255886605% |
| Wheaton City | 0.2463124635% |
| Wheeling Village | 0.1229353643% |
| Woodridge Village | 0.1148193756% |

State of Illinois Counties Only Allocation Percentages

Illinois Opioid Allocation Agreement

| Qualifying Subdivision | Counties Only Percentage |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Adams County | 0.5325627744% |
| Alexander County | 0.0431846002% |
| Bond County | 0.1313618076% |
| Boone County | 0.3993006496% |
| Brown County | 0.045543663 1% |
| Bureau County | 0.2675493675% |
| Calhoun County | 0.0374496996% |
| Carroll County | 0.1059047501% |
| Cass County | 0.0902574340% |
| Champaign County | 1.5953670185% |
| Christian County | 0.2717469407% |
| Clark County | 0.1346384837% |
| Clay County | 0.1009205688% |
| Clinton County | 0.2710071787% |
| Coles County | 0.3899340741 % |
| Cook County | 39.7070170529% |
| Crawford County | 0.1502157232% |
| Cumberland County | 0.0765804365% |
| De Witt County | 0.1343763530% |
| Dekalb County | 0.7648068692% |
| Douglas County | 0.1396209979% |
| Dupage County | 6.9961301825% |
| Edgar County | 0.1369536821% |
| Edwards County | 0.0557876634% |
| Effingham County | 0.2745921107% |
| Fayette County | 0.1730292191% |
| Ford County | 0.1050766592% |

| | |
|------------------|---------------|
| Franklin County | 0.3753293914% |
| Fulton County | 0.2857420449% |
| Gallatin County | 0.0461748227% |
| Greene County | 0.1120932638% |
| Grundy County | 0.4447604831% |
| Hamilton County | 0.0586888564% |
| Hancock County | 0.1237654700% |
| Hardin County | 0.0525232340% |
| Henderson County | 0.0468231560% |

| | |
|-------------------|----------------|
| Henry County | 0.3631064984% |
| Iroquois County | 0.23400463 86% |
| Jackson County | 0.4766842676% |
| Jasoer County | 0.0729264789% |
| Jefferson County | 0.3076865268% |
| Jersey County | 0.2029662011 % |
| Jo Daviess County | 0.1594100240% |
| Johnson County | 0.0934835787% |
| Kane County | 3.7592516293% |
| Kankakee County | 0.8907176656% |
| Kendall County | 0.9152447008% |
| Knox County | 0.4095413266% |
| Lake County | 5.432300633 1% |
| Lasalle County | 1.0382633595% |
| Lawrence County | 0.1362169504% |
| Lee County | 0.2713491451% |
| Livingston County | 0.3277646387% |
| Logan County | 0.2230314720% |
| Macon County | 0.8339920017% |
| Macouoin County | 0.3637461000% |
| Madison County | 2.5601663484% |
| Marion County | 0.3444624326% |

| | |
|-------------------|---------------|
| Marshall County | 0.0878603767% |
| Mason County | 0.1123492816% |
| Massac County | 0.1236043365% |
| McDonough County | 0.2216295193% |
| McHenry County | 2.3995936239% |
| McLean County | 1.3208345544% |
| Menard County | 0.0917783576% |
| Mercer County | 0.1144419910% |
| Monroe County | 0.2714501969% |
| Montgomery County | 0.2342865810% |
| Morgan County | 0.2708645052% |
| Moultrie County | 0.1003140855% |
| Ogle County | 0.3811415242% |
| Peoria County | 1.5640744904% |
| Perry County | 0.1751336763% |
| Piatt County | 0.1214359333% |
| Pike County | 0.1155220743% |
| Pope County | 0.0347091515% |
| Pulaski County | 0.0404416607% |

| | |
|--------------------|----------------|
| Putnam County | 0.0452090528% |
| Randolph County | 0.2879823727% |
| Richland County | 0.1208518975% |
| Rock Island County | 1.0782047657% |
| Saline County | 0.2659477915% |
| Sangamon County | 1.5850818631 % |
| Schuyler County | 0.0485294910% |
| Scott County | 0.0349810216% |
| Shelby County | 0.1586806535% |
| St Clair County | 2.1366773448% |
| Stark County | 0.0381570939% |
| Stephenson County | 0.3550412743% |

| | |
|-------------------|---------------|
| Tazewell County | 1.1033013785% |
| Union County | 0.1447352927% |
| Vermilion County | 0.6907560341% |
| Wabash County | 0.0923901750% |
| Warren County | 0.1239679440% |
| Washington County | 0.1076671021% |
| Wayne County | 0.1225391595% |
| White County | 0.1115911540% |
| Whiteside County | 0.4275606484% |
| Will County | 5.3461509816% |
| Williamson County | 0.6715468751% |
| Winnebago County | 2.7201669312% |
| Woodford County | 0.3076824807% |