

VANDEBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL
MINUTES
JANUARY 3, 2001

The Vanderburgh County Council met in session the 3rd day of January, 2001 in room 301 of the Civic Center Complex. The meeting was called to order at 3:35 p.m. by Vanderburgh County Auditor, Suzanne Crouch.

Suzanne Crouch: Good afternoon. This is the Vanderburgh County Council meeting, January 3rd, 2001. Could the Sheriff open the meeting, please?

(Sheriff Brad Ellsworth opened the meeting)

Suzanne Crouch: Thank you. Secretary, could you take the roll call?

COUNCILMEMBER	PRESENT	ABSENT
Councilmember Tornatta	X	
Councilmember Sutton	X	
Councilmember Wortman	X	
Councilmember Bassemier	X	
Councilmember Hoy	X	
Councilmember Raben	X	
Councilmember Winnecke	X	

Suzanne Crouch: Please join us in the Pledge of Allegiance.

(Pledge of Allegiance was given)

ELECTION OF PRESIDENT

Suzanne Crouch: Thank you. The Chair will now entertain motions for presidency of the Vanderburgh County Council.

Councilmember Winnecke: Madam Auditor, I nominate Ed Bassemier.

Suzanne Crouch: Is there a second?

Councilmember Raben: I'll second.

Suzanne Crouch: Thank you. Are there any further nominations? May I have a motion to close the nominations, please?

Councilmember Hoy: So moved.

Councilmember Raben: Second.

Suzanne Crouch: Thank you. Secretary, could you take the roll please?

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Suzanne Crouch: Congratulations.

Councilmember Bassemier: Thank you.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

President Bassemier: Thank you all for your vote of confidence. Before we get started I'd like to have Mr. Wortman come up here a minute, please? On behalf of the Councilmembers we'd like to give you this plaque for a job well done last year as President and keeping us in line and telling us your war stories about Darmstadt. I present you with this plaque. Thank you very much.

Councilmember Wortman: I appreciate that.

Councilmember Sutton: The best part of it all, Curt, you've gotten a little bit closer to me now.

Councilmember Raben: In the rest of the world we hang those on walls, that's not fire wood.

President Bassemier: And one more thing. I'd like to introduce and welcome a new member to our County Council. He's a very good campaigner, very tough. With his business background I know he'll be an asset to our County Council and I welcome you, sir, and the rest of us.

Councilmember Tornatta: Thank you, Ed.

Councilmember Winnecke: We can really get some competitive bids on tires now.

Councilmember Raben: Troy has already seen it and he don't want it either.

ELECTION OF VICE PRESIDENT

President Bassemier: Okay, we'll start with number five, the election of the Vice President. The Chair will entertain nominations for Vice President. Can I – somebody want to...

Councilmember Wortman: Mr. Chairman, I would like to nominate Lloyd Winnecke.

Councilmember Raben: I'll second that nomination.

President Bassemier: Do I have any other nominations?

Councilmember Hoy: Move they be closed.

Councilmember Raben: And I'll second.

President Bassemier: Okay, can we have a roll call vote, please?

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Could I get back to you on this? Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

President Bassemier: I am going to confuse you for a while, aren't I?

Teri Lukeman: Uh-huh, I think so.

APPOINTMENT OF COUNTY COUNCIL ATTORNEY

President Bassemier: Now number six, appointment of our County Council Attorney. Also need a motion there, who is going to represent us as the County Council Attorney. Do I have a nomination?

Councilmember Wortman: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to nominate Jeff Ahlers as the County Council Attorney.

Councilmember Raben: I'll second that motion.

President Bassemier: Any other nominations?

Councilmember Raben: I'll move to close.

Councilmember Hoy: Second.

President Bassemier: Okay, can we have a roll call vote, please?

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

<p>APPROVAL OF MINUTES DECEMBER 6, 2000</p>
--

President Bassemier: I'd like now to have a motion to approve our minutes of the December 6th, 2000 meeting.

Councilmember Wortman: So moved, Mr. Chairman.

President Bassemier: Okay, do I have a second?

Councilmember Sutton: Second.

President Bassemier: Okay, everybody in favor, would you raise your right hand on that?

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

<p>APPOINTMENT OF PERSONNEL CHAIRMAN AND FINANCE CHAIRMAN</p>
--

President Bassemier: Okay, this is my appointment to the Personnel Chairman and Finance Chairman. The Chairman appoints Mr. Raben as our Finance Chairman and Mr. Winnecke our Personnel Chairman. Congratulations.

Councilmember Wortman: Excuse me. Mr. Chairman?

President Bassemier: Yes?

Councilmember Wortman: I think it's more appropriate now that we've got Mr. Hoy and you on continued membership of four more years?

President Bassemier: That's okay. Alright, moving right along, we'll get into the appropriations and I'm going to turn it over now to our Finance Chairman, Mr. Raben.

APPROPRIATION ORDINANCE

PROSECUTOR/STOP DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

Councilmember Raben: Okay, thank you, Mr. President, and congratulations once again. Okay, first on the agenda is Prosecutor/Stop Domestic Violence, account 1085-3994 Matching Grants \$7,030. I'll move approval.

Councilmember Sutton: Second.

President Bassemier: Any discussion? Troy, you're new. Are you okay with that?

Councilmember Tornatta: We're okay with that.

President Bassemier: I know you've attended a lot of these meetings before. So can we have a roll call vote, please? We've had a motion and a second.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

PROSECUTOR/STOP DOMESTIC VIOLENCE		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1085-3994	Matching Grants	7,030.00	7,030.00
Total		7,030.00	7,030.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

COUNTY ASSESSOR

President Bassemier: Okay, letter B or County Assessor. Now, I understand this takes five votes. Is that correct?

Jeff Ahlers: To increase the Salary Ordinance.

President Bassemier: Okay, Mr. Raben, would you continue?

Councilmember Raben: I will certainly do that. Next is County Assessor 1090-1120-1090 Chief Deputy \$350. I'll move approval.

Councilmember Hoy: Second.

President Bassemier: Roll call vote. I'm sorry, any discussion on that?

Councilmember Wortman: Yeah, I'd like to. The only problem I've got with this is the Assessor, County Assessor is a unlimited term where a lot of them are not and that's why I've got a problem. I'm afraid down the road we're going to get the salary above the Assessor here, and that's why I've got a problem with that.

President Bassemier: Okay. I see we do have the Assessor out there. Would you want to come forward? Please state your name and your department, please, for the record.

Cheryl Musgrave: Cheryl Musgrave, County Assessor. I would understand your concern, Mr. Wortman, if the salary of this office was subject to step increases, but it is not. It is tied to the officeholder's salary and only gets raised by the percentage that Council votes every year. So, for example, this year my salary will go up four percent and hers would go up four percent. No step increases. Hers will never outpace mine. Thank you.

President Bassemier: Anybody else?

Councilmember Sutton: Now before you get away, Cheryl, I didn't have the benefit of the discussion that we had last week so maybe you might be repeating some of the things that you've already discussed related to this, and how did we find ourselves in this situation here? Kind of take me back and help me to understand why there is a disparity here.

Cheryl Musgrave: I have no explanation for the disparity, Mr. Sutton, and I was not able to attend the December 18th meeting so there is nothing to repeat for you. I've asked for this disparity to be corrected, I believe, in each of the past budgets that I've ever submitted to Council and they've come in the flurry of budgets at budget time and I think it's just been overlooked every time. And this is a matter of importance to my deputy that she be treated the same way and it is at her request and at mine that this disparity be corrected.

Councilmember Sutton: I guess, you know, I've sat through several budget hearings over the last several years. I guess I don't exactly recall this particular request. It may have slipped by me, that's very possible, but I guess when we go back and we redo the salary ordinance each year at the end of the year, I guess I just don't recall this particular one coming up as one that was out of line. I know we make a lot of corrections throughout the course of each year and even at budget time. I guess, I don't recall this one. I don't know about the other Councilmen...maybe I am the only one. Is this something that we've discussed before?

Councilmember Raben: I think we had discussed this back during budget session or maybe we didn't. I don't -- I am not sure --

Cheryl Musgrave: It was in my budget book and in the paperwork that I submit, but when the amounts that were recommended were read out on the Council floor, it was never

included.

Councilmember Raben: Yeah, we cut this request at budget, but I don't think this request is probably out of line. And again, this position would never outpace the Assessor's Office. They are unclassified. They never receive the longevity step increases and it does get it in line with other Chief Deputies throughout the building. You know, \$350 is probably a small price to pay if it makes this employee a better employee. You know, if it keeps them happier at their daily work, so...

Councilmember Sutton: Well, I guess it am just trying to get an understanding, you know, if the others are here and this person is here, how did that occur? You know, I guess that's maybe what I am trying to get understanding.

Cheryl Musgrave: And I have no explanation for you. It was an anomaly I noticed myself and have sought to correct. And if I didn't bring it to your attention enough in, you know, bold enough letters, I apologize for not having done so. But it has existed and I've made requests but I am making a special effort now to bring it to your attention.

Councilmember Tornatta: Do we have to worry about this bringing the pay higher than the County Assessor's? I mean, is that going to be a – is that a conflict?

Cheryl Musgrave: No.

Councilmember Tornatta: I mean, because I have heard that before from other people about just the pay and the county level as opposed to – or the township, I would say, the township level as opposed to the Chief Deputy.

Cheryl Musgrave: I am a county employee and so is she, not township.

Councilmember Tornatta: I understand, but I am talking about the Assessors in the township. Are they going to –

Cheryl Musgrave: This is only her job that we're talking about. No one else's.

President Bassemier: Okay, we have a motion and a second. Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes, it passes five to two.

COUNTY ASSESSOR		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1090-1120-1090	Chief Deputy	350.00	350.00
Total		350.00	350.00

(Motion carried 5-2/Councilmembers Tornatta and Wortman opposed)

CIRCUIT COURT

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Mr. Chairman, next is Circuit Court 1360-1240-1360 \$3,060; 1360-1390-1360 Bailiff \$0; 1360-1900 FICA will be adjusted; 1360-1910 will actually need to be adjusted; 1360-1920 \$0; 1360-3944 \$25,000; 1360-3860 \$13,000. I'll move approval.

Councilmember Hoy: Second.

President Bassemier: Second. Any discussion?

Councilmember Sutton: That first line, I am sorry, I didn't catch the very first line.

Councilmember Raben: \$3,060. And I don't know if anybody has got any discussion on the motion made on the Bailiff or not. I'd certainly entertain discussion.

Councilmember Wortman: Did you set that in at zero, Mr. Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Suzanne Crouch: Excuse me, Mr. Raben. Do you have a number, an adjustment for the (inaudible) as long as you put something in there.

Councilmember Raben: No, I do not. Sandie, do you have an adjustment on that figure? Because there will be some adjustment. I'll tell you what, we can zero those out and make an adjustment for the Probation difference in salary later –

Sandie Deig: Probation Officer?

Councilmember Raben: Yeah. There will be some adjustments to both FICA and PERF for the salary increase.

Sandie Deig: The Probation Officer, though, that was a mistake or error made in the salary ordinance during budget time. It was incorrectly backed out of his regular salary so that is what he is entitled to for the whole year.

Councilmember Raben: I understand that, but there will be an adjustment made to his FICA and PERF as well, correct?

Sandie Deig: Yes.

Councilmember Raben: And we would not necessarily need to make that adjustment today, so if I may, I'd like to reopen my motion.

President Bassemier: Who seconded it?

Councilmember Hoy: I did.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Mr. President, what I would like my motion to read is, items

1360-1900 FICA \$0; and 1360-1910 PERF \$0, with the understanding that we will next month have to make an adjustment for the additional Probation Officer's salary. So is everybody clear on that?

Councilmember Wortman: Insurance, you're going to leave that as it is?

Councilmember Raben: In what?

Councilmember Hoy: Insurance.

Councilmember Raben: Insurance, I set in at zero.

Councilmember Wortman: Did you?

Councilmember Raben: Is everybody clear on the motion? Let me go back over it once again: 1360-1240-1360 Probation Officer \$3,060; 1360-1390-1360 \$0; 1360-1900 \$0; 1360-1910 \$0; 1360-1920 \$0; 1360-3944 \$25,000; 1360-3860 \$13,000.

Councilmember Hoy: I'll second.

President Bassemier: Discussion?

Councilmember Wortman: Yeah, now that Bailiff, that is a new person, I think that's correct, isn't it, Mrs. Deig? That's a new person there submitted by the Circuit Court. Yeah, okay.

President Bassemier: And you set that in at zero?

Councilmember Sutton: That Special Reporter –

Councilmember Wortman: The Bailiff?

Councilmember Sutton: Well, no, well, I am moving to discuss Reporter. I mean, the salary there just seems – that's an actual allocation or for that particular function but not a person?

Councilmember Raben: That line actually would be separate. I mean, that's people that actually do the work for it. So that's like an Extra Help line, per se.

Councilmember Winnecke: Why don't you ask the Judge to come up?

Councilmember Raben: Did anybody have any questions of the Judge on this motion?

President Bassemier: Yeah, I got a question. Why do you want to set that Bailiff in at zero?

Councilmember Raben: It's a new person.

President Bassemier: Please state your name, your honor, and department.

Carl Heldt: Carl Heldt, Circuit Court. I would just point out that it is a new position but we're giving up a part-time, we're giving you back \$14,000 of part-time Bailiff money which, we need a Bailiff. So that's why I am asking for it, to give the part-time back for a full-time Bailiff. By the way, we tried 45 jury – I was low – we tried 45 jury trials last year and it will probably go up this year which is far more than any other Circuit Court in the state and our Bailiffs probably handle five times as much jury work as the Bailiffs in Superior Courts.

Councilmember Wortman: Mr. Chairman? Judge Heldt, that would be possibly just an additional \$10,000 with that returned. Is that about –

Carl Heldt: What's that?

Councilmember Wortman: Like if you got \$24,000 down here and you say \$14,000, so about \$10,000 difference.

Carl Heldt: Yeah, plus the Insurance and such. Let me make a suggestion. I don't know if we can cut deals right here in the meeting. If you'll give me that second half of that Bailiff, I'll take care of the computer hookups overs at AAPS & DAPS because I think I can handle that if you can handle the Bailiff and I don't have to supplement the Bailiff's salary to get her to full time. I can handle the computer access over there which would just about be a wash for you all; if you are agreeing to hook up the computers, I'll take care of that. How's that?

Councilmember Winnecke: Could you repeat that? I'm sorry.

Carl Heldt: I think you've allocated \$13,000, haven't you, for the computers?

Councilmember Winnecke: Correct.

Carl Heldt: Which, that letter I wrote to you, most of that is going to be an annual deal. Let me do that. If you'll give me the Bailiff, I'll do that out of the user's fees.

President Bassemier: We have a motion and a second. Do you want to change that and help Mr. Heldt out here?

Councilmember Raben: I'll tell you, I would rather at this point, rather than set it back in, I mean, I have a hard problem day one adding employees. I'd rather have a little time to think about it. I mean, I would entertain at this time deferring it as opposed to setting it in at zero.

President Bassemier: Do you agree to that, to defer that?

Councilmember Hoy: I'll agree.

President Bassemier: Would you make your motion over, Mr. Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Well let's...

Jeff Ahlers: Would it be cleaner just to rescind the motion because you're going to affect about three or four line items there, aren't you? If you're going to do that?

Councilmember Raben: Okay, I'll move that the original motion be withdrawn.

Councilmember Hoy: I'll withdraw my second.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, now I will make a new motion: 1360-1240-1360 \$3,060; 1360-1390-1360 be deferred until our February meeting; 1360-1900; 1360-1910; and 1360-1920 will also be deferred until our February meeting; 1360-3944 Special Reporter \$25,000; 1360-3860 Contractual Computer \$13,000.

Councilmember Hoy: Second.

President Bassemier: Do I have a second on that? Mr. Hoy seconded it. Open for discussion.

Councilmember Wortman: Mr. Chairman, how will that affect the \$13,000 then on the Repeal then, that request?

Councilmember Raben: Well, that Repeal for \$13,000 was to offset the Contractual Computer anyway. So we're still going to accept that Repeal. But, Mr. Chairman, if I might,

—

President Bassemier: You might want to defer –

Councilmember Raben: I might ask our Counsel, although I am comfortable with making this motion if it's okay with everybody else, we're not actually taking final action in deferring a matter at this meeting when, in fact, we do need to take final action. So, we typically do not defer or have not in the past deferred during these meetings. During Personnel & Finance, in fact, we do but not –

President Bassemier: There is another deal on the table, so I see no problem –

Councilmember Raben: – which was my original motion, but if you're comfortable with this, I'm comfortable with it.

Jeff Ahlers: Well, you can defer it. The only thing I had suggested – you don't have to do this, it's whatever you want to make your motion. I didn't know if, with the Judge's suggestion, whether or not you were going to package the Contractual Computer or your motion is to go ahead and take that now versus with the rest of it. That's up to you, but...your motion is perfectly fine, however you all want to handle it, that's fine. I mean, if you want to defer it and –

President Bassemier: Defer that one, too, the whole thing?

Councilmember Raben: No, I've set in the last two figures. The motion needs to remain that way.

President Bassemier: Special Reporter \$25,000 and Contractual Computer, the \$13,000, that's the end? Is that what you're –

Councilmember Raben: Right and we may have to repeal that \$13,000 if something changes next month. So let's vote on it as it is.

Councilmember Winnecke: Mr. President?

President Bassemier: Mr. Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Just a quick comment in the area of playing devil's advocate. I think one of the things that we need to look at in this body is the efficiency of how we allow officeholders to perform their tasks and although I think most of us are against from the first meeting out creating, adding this body, I think the Judge has come to us in good faith. Offering a half position for a full position, I mean, he's willing to work with us. I think one of the things we need to look at going forward is this whole allocation of human resources. As we get farther down the road with the jail issue we need to look at where our human resources are allocated in each of the areas that affect the judicial system: the courts, the Sheriff's Department, the Clerk's Office. All the stuff that has big ticket item written all over it, we don't want to hear it. But I think it speaks to the efficiency of government and in this case, I think we have some momentum now in keeping the jail population down and I think we ought to approve the Judge's request today.

Councilmember Sutton: Well, and I think with that said, I mean, it's been some time back ago that I indicated that I think it's important for us to look at the broader scope of the picture and I think the Judge is in the best position to be able to tell us what the needs are in his area. But, I guess as has been the case with so many other decisions that have been made, with every decision that is made, it affects other areas in some way or another. And my hope has been that we could come up with an idea of what the overall impact is going to be rather than piecemealing it together. I mean, this position probably is needed and I really feel like that the request that he's making is a legitimate request but my concern is that I'm only really putting a Band-Aid on something that is much greater in terms of the problem and I really feel like if I could get a good handle on what all of our commitments are going to be and all the departments that are going to be affected concerning this jail issue, then I think I'd feel a lot more comfortable in moving forward and

it's not based upon what's going on in Circuit Court, but it's all the offices that are affected by this jail situation.

Councilmember Hoy: Mr. President? I would concur with what Councilman Sutton has said and that really was some of the thinking behind the purpose of me sending the memo to all of you as well as to the Commissioners and that is, I know we're going to have to build a jail and I think all of us know that, but we've also, and with the Court's help, have fine tuned the system and reduced the population. The jail study caused us to look at a whole system and I still think we need to look at it systematically and as a system. So I concur on that. The second thing is, I seconded Mr. Raben's motion or all three of them or four, whatever we had, because I am uncomfortable voting new positions in the January meeting when we do not have the figures from the state of Indiana as to where we stand financially. We don't know. And I would rather wait until the February meeting when we do know and I do not think that one month is going to do injury to the system. But if we see in a month, then if this looks appropriate, then we next month can go ahead. But I do think that the parties that worked on the jail study need to return to the table. And my last point is one I've made many times and that is, I continue to speak for that segment of our population that doesn't have any money because that's who is in the jail. I'm not saying they're innocent, I am just saying they can't go bail and they can't do this and they can't hire the best lawyers, and I think I have to continue my, going with my convictions on that issue because I think the last segment of prejudice in our society, not that we've done away with all prejudices, because we haven't, racially or any other way. But we currently are now in a period of time when we pick on the poor. And I don't want to see us do that.

Councilmember Tornatta: Judge, can you get by a month? I know you – we've talked about it and I think you've been doing your best to get by as a lot of the county officials have in some areas. Can you get by a month and let us talk about this?

Carl Heldt: I'd like to point out, I don't think you were here, Mr. Tornatta or Mr. Sutton or Mr. Raben, I don't think, I may be mistaken, at your Finance meeting when I made my pitch. But I passed out a statistical sheet to all the Council persons that were here. Our caseload has doubled in the last ten years and we've got along with one and a half Bailiffs for the last ten years. That's what I am saying. Our caseload has doubled, so I think it makes a lot of sense that we need more Bailiffs than we had when it was half of what it is today. Because we are a very trial intensive court because we do a lot of criminal work and so that's, that's the justification I think there is for raising a part-time Bailiff to a full-time Bailiff and so just so you all know, because you weren't here.

Councilmember Sutton: Well, Judge, I don't disagree necessarily. I recognize that there likely is a need but I would like for us – it may be more than one person that you actually need. I'd like to know that if that's the case, you know, rather than you having to keep coming back and keep coming back. I'd like to know what my total hit is going to be on the situation and by evaluating the whole judicial system, I think we can get a firm understanding of just the severity of the pressure that's placed on this system.

Carl Heldt: I don't disagree with that at all as long as while we're doing all this studying, we don't drown in our work and not be able to have the 45 trials a year because we don't have – I mean, Bailiffs, you know, on a trial day they start at 7:30 in the morning and sometimes go until 10 or 11 at night. And I've got one Bailiff and one part-time Bailiff. So, I mean, it's – yeah, sure. That's fine, I'll come back in a month if you like. We do need to also defer the Repeal because the Repeal was the part-time Bailiff money that I was giving back to you all.

(Inaudible – microphone not turned on)

Carl Heldt: Just defer it because I'd like for you to take it back next month.

Councilmember Wortman: Judge Heldt, if I recall, I think you mentioned you handle more cases than anybody in the county and the state of Indiana and maybe –

Carl Heldt: We do more jury trials by far than any other Circuit Court in the state. It's just a jury trial intensive court and that's when Bailiffs come in. Bailiffs handle jurors and that's why we need two.

President Bassemier: Thank you, your honor. Okay, we've got a motion and a second and if this is okay, roll call vote.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: No.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: I am going to vote no and the reason, I want to give this reason, I think – I don't need to study it – he needs this manpower and if we voted today, I would vote yes for him but I am going to vote no since we're going to defer it. We are going to defer it.

CIRCUIT COURT		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1360-1240-1360	Probation Officer	3,060.00	3,060.00
1360-1390-1360	Bailiff	24,109.00	DEFERRED
1360-1900	FICA	2,078.00	DEFERRED
1360-1910	PERF	1,562.00	DEFERRED
1360-1920	Insurance	6,000.00	DEFERRED
1360-3944	Special Reporter	25,000.00	25,000.00
1360-3860	Contractual Computer	13,000.00	13,000.00
Total		74,809.00	41,060.00

(Motion carried 5-2/Councilmembers Winnecke and Bassemier opposed)

President Bassemier: And that appropriation amounted to \$41,060. Mr. Raben, do you want to take – did you want to do the other one on Circuit Court?

Councilmember Raben: The Supplemental Adult Probation? We can.

CIRCUIT COURT SUPPLEMENTAL ADULT PROBATION

Councilmember Raben: 2600-1450-2600 \$31,399; 2600-1900 FICA \$2,402; 2600-1910 PERF \$1,805; and 2600-1920 Insurance \$6,000, for a total request of \$41,606. I will move approval.

President Bassemier: Need a second.

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

Councilmember Raben: I would like to – I, Mr. President, if I could back up. I have a little caveat to add to my motion. I'd like to amend my motion if the co-maker will accept the amendment. Would you amend – I want to amend that last motion –

Councilmember Wortman: And I'll accept his amendment – motion.

Councilmember Raben: Mr. President, the motion stands as read with this addition. In the past we have always threw in this disclaimer that if the fees or the well ever dries up that's funding this position, and this is a new position, if it ever dries up, the position is gone and the employee needs to be made aware of that, that the General Fund is not going to pick up this salary if, again, if the well dries up on these funds.

President Bassemier: Of course, unless it's voted on.

Councilmember Raben: Right.

Councilmember Wortman: And I second that along with his amended motion.

Councilmember Hoy: Mr. Raben, I'm assuming you're putting that in the same category as we have grants and things like that. Okay, thank you.

President Bassemier: We have a motion and a second. Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

CIRCUIT CT. SUPP. ADULT PROBATION		REQUESTED	APPROVED
2600-1450-2600	Probation Officer	31,399.00	31,399.00
2600-1900	FICA	2,402.00	2,402.00
2600-1910	PERF	1,805.00	1,805.00
2600-1920	Insurance	6,000.00	6,000.00
Total		41,606.00	41,606.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

SUPERIOR COURT

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Superior Court 1370-1570-1370 Riding Bailiff \$6,221; 1370-1900 FICA \$527; 1370-1910 PERF \$327, for a total of \$7,075. I'll move approval.

Councilmember Hoy: Second.

President Bassemier: Second from Mr. Hoy. Any discussion? No discussion, roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

SUPERIOR COURT		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1370-1570-1370	Riding Bailiff	6,221.00	6,221.00
1370-1900	FICA	527.00	527.00

1370-1910	PERF	327.00	327.00
Total		7,075.00	7,075.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

COUNTY COUNCIL (Two requests)

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Mr. President, I am going to take both of these together. County Council 1480-1971 Accrued Payments \$50,000; 1480-1900 FICA \$3,025 –

President Bassemier: 825?

Councilmember Raben: \$3,825; 1480-1910 PERF \$1,033; 1480-1911 Sheriff’s Retirement \$2,535. Next is 1480-1220-1480 Secretary \$14,633; 1480-1900 FICA \$1,120; 1480-1910 PERF \$769, and I’ll move approval.

President Bassemier: Do I have a second?

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: Any discussion? Okay, roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes. Both of those passed. I am kind of glad it did because that second one would have took five votes. Okay, I just wanted to point that out to everybody.

COUNTY COUNCIL		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1480-1971	Accrued Payments	50,000.00	50,000.00
1480-1900	FICA	3,825.00	3,825.00
1480-1910	PERF	1,033.00	1,033.00

1480-1911	Sheriff's Retirement	2,535.00	2,535.00
Total		57,393.00	57,393.00

COUNTY COUNCIL		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1480-1220-1480	Secretary	14,633.00	14,633.00
1480-1900	FICA	1,120.00	1,120.00
1480-1910	PERF	769.00	769.00
Total		16,522.00	16,522.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

GENERAL FUND REPEAL REQUEST

CIRCUIT COURT

Councilmember Raben: Alright, next we have the repeal for Circuit Court which is 1360-1970-1360, at this time that request has been withdrawn. So I'll move approval on that.

Jeff Ahlers: Excuse me. Are you going to – to be consistent, just defer it or are you just going to zero it?

Councilmember Raben: I was going to withdraw it because I am still not comfortable with deferring at this meeting, but I'll amend my motion to read deferred.

Jeff Ahlers: You can do whatever you want, I just didn't know if you were packaging them all together or not. I didn't mean to – procedurally, it's fine to do it however you like.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, I'll move that this repeal be deferred.

President Bassemier: Got a second?

Councilmember Hoy: Second.

President Bassemier: Mr. Hoy. Any discussion? No discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: That would have been, I mean, the way we did that, that's the proper way because the request was contingent upon the full-time position being approved. So –

Councilmember Raben: I would have interpreted originally this request was to compensate for the computer for \$13,000 but I guess the Judge states that it's – it was out there to be offered as a deal, but it was my original understanding that it offset the \$13,000 computer request, but I am trying to be agreeable with everybody. It's a new year.

Councilmember Sutton: It's a good way to start out the year. Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

CIRCUIT COURT		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1360-1970-1360	Part-time Bailiff	13,000.00	DEFERRED
Total		13,000.00	DEFERRED

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

TRANSFER REQUESTS

**PROSECUTOR
PUBLIC DEFENDER COMMISSION**

Councilmember Raben: Okay, then we have two transfers. Prosecutor, I'll move approval of the transfers as they are listed and Public Defender as they are listed. And I'll make that in the form of a motion.

Councilmember Winnecke: Second.

President Bassemier: Any discussion? No discussion, roll call vote.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Are those lines going to go away that he's transferring out of? Sandie?

Sandie Deig: Pardon me?

Councilmember Sutton: Just one question. The question is on that Prosecutor's transfer, the two positions that are being lined out of into this one line, are those positions going to go away, those line items will actually go away?

Sandie Deig: Yes, they will.

Councilmember Sutton: Now –

President Bassemier: They will go, yeah, delete.

Councilmember Sutton: Does that have an effect upon the salary ordinance in any way or fashion?

President Bassemier: Yes, we'll have to vote on that. We're going to vote on it here in a minute.

Councilmember Sutton: Okay, alright.

President Bassemier: And that's a yes over there?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

PROSECUTOR		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1080-1080-1080	Deputy	29,711.00	29,711.00
1080-1250-1080	Part-time Deputy	24,510.00	24,510.00
To: 1080-1140-1080	Deputy	54,221.00	54,221.00

PUBLIC DEFENDER COMMISSION		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1303-3946	Pauper Appeals	25,000.00	25,000.00
1303-1790-1303	Investigative	25,000.00	25,000.00
1303-1800-1303	Investigative	25,000.00	25,000.00
To: 1303-1801-1303	Public Defender/Appeals	42,757.00	42,757.00
1303-3482	Investigative/Cont. Svcs.	32,243.00	32,243.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

AMENDMENTS TO SALARY ORDINANCE

President Bassemier: Number twelve, the amendments to the Salary Ordinance.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, we've got four items today. Superior Court, set line 1370-1570 Riding Bailiff in as the appropriation previously adopted. County Council, set line 1480-1971 Accrued Payments in as previously adopted; also line 1480-1220 Secretary as the appropriation was previously adopted; Circuit Court Supplemental Adult Probation, set in line 2600-1450 Probation Officer as previously adopted; and again, with the total salary

to be paid by user's fees and that the position will be eliminated should those user fees no longer be available. Prosecutor, set salary line 1080-1140 Deputy in as previously adopted and Public Defender Commission, set line 1303-1801 Public Defender/Appeals and line 1303-3482 Investigative/Contractual Service in as the transfer previously adopted. Then we also have one that I need to add for the County Assessor to set line 1090-1120 in as previously adopted. And that's it and I make that in the form of a motion.

President Bassemier: Need a second.

Councilmember Winnecke: Second.

President Bassemier: I'm sorry, there's one more?

Councilmember Raben: Okay, let me see if I have, in fact, overlooked one. Okay, I certainly did. Circuit Court 1360-1240 Probation Officer in as previously adopted.

President Bassemier: We've got a motion. Need a second.

Councilmember Winnecke: Second.

President Bassemier: Discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

OLD BUSINESS

DISCUSSION REGARDING JAIL

President Bassemier: Number thirteen, Old Business. Any Old Business?

Councilmember Raben: Mr. President, I might, I see a new Commissioner out in the stands

and I would like to make a point. I didn't know how long she had planned to stay, but Catherine Fanello is out in the stands and I did want to make a statement.

President Bassemier: We've got our new Recorder out there, too.

Councilmember Raben: Oh, okay. That's right. Congratulations to you, Betty, too. Watching the news last night there was a comment made that there was going to be some action take place within the next two to three weeks on the county jail and I wanted to bring this to your attention that I don't know what any future plans you may have, but I would advise that you not make any decisions prior to discussing it with this body because, ultimately, we do have the final say on funds.

Councilmember Hoy: Mr. President? Yes, I have a comment also. This is not towards the Commissioners, it's towards the media and I was watching Channel 14 last night and they had an entirely incorrect report on who holds the purse strings in this county and I called them and they did not issue a retraction, but I had to do a piece of education with them on who sets the budget, when and all of that kind of thing, and I think we've gotten better coverage out of the two persons who are here, much better. But I wanted to point that out. I think the public needs to know that we have checks and balances. This is not aimed at the Commissioners, not aimed at anybody. It's just aimed at reality and we have some really, really tough decisions ahead of us. We all know that and we need all the help we can get on having accurate information emanating in the media. Thank you.

Councilmember Raben: And again, Mr. President, I'd like to add that, you know, once again, I would hope that there's not a deal out there that's been made or a proposal that's been accepted that we're not a part of from the beginning because, once again, the whole jail issue hinges around what this body will or will not fund, so...

President Bassemier: Okay, we'll give her a chance to defend herself.

Councilmember Raben: This isn't an assault on her.

President Bassemier: Oh, I know it wasn't, I was just kidding.

Councilmember Raben: Again, when I hear on the ten o'clock news last night that something is going to happen within the next two to three weeks, in the back of my mind, somebody is coming to a conclusion that's not been before the body that is going to fund whatever that conclusion is.

Councilmember Sutton: But, Jim, with all due respect, I know Catherine is getting ready to speak, though, all due respects with our good friends from the media here, we can't take everything that we hear from the media and take that as the gospel truth as –

(Inaudible – Councilmember Raben and Sutton both speaking at once)

Councilmember Sutton: – give me a chance to speak. What a person may have accurately reflected or said or even implied, so I think maybe the more appropriate course of action maybe for this body would be to make sure that either a representative or someone here on this Council is very much involved in the whole process regarding any decisions related to the jail and I don't think any decisions, at least from my standpoint, have been made that commit this body or this county to any particular course of action. No funds have been expended and I think when we look at the Commissioner's role as opposed to the Council's role, obviously, there is a difference there, but I think it's a good opportunity for us here at the beginning of the year to at least encourage that the two of us would work together and maybe not make assumptions based upon anything that we have read or heard that's not directly attributable to anyone that may have been implied to.

Councilmember Hoy: Mr. Bassemier? May I follow that?

President Bassemier: Mr. Hoy.

Councilmember Hoy: And that is, I want Commissioner Fanello to know my remarks were not aimed at the Commissioners as I said a while ago. I thought I made that very clear. But I watched Channel 14 at six o'clock. They did not have you or Commissioner Mosby or Commissioner Mourdock speak at all. They spoke for you. I called them and I said you've got it wrong. And I had to explain to them, to the head of their department, that the budget is set in August by this body and go through that whole thing. I am reflecting upon exactly what you're saying and that is, I think that kind of reporting is dismal. I did not see the newscast that Mr. Raben saw. I would have been disturbed, too, because had I heard what he heard, I suppose. But what I heard was simply newscasters not being accurate. Thank you.

President Bassemier: Thank you, Mr. Hoy. I want to welcome you to your first County Council meeting, Ms. Fanello. And would you please state your name and job status?

Catherine Fanello: Catherine Fanello, County Commissioner. And I did come today just to say that I do look forward to working with each and every one of you and particularly on the jail issue and thank you, Councilman Sutton, for your remarks. But, no decisions have been made. We are not at any point where we could even entertain proposals. What I would like to see us do is move into a planning phase and that is currently what we're working on. I think you heard last night that we have entertained the motion to move to a different bond counsel. We also are talking to PMSI about what their involvement might be in the next stage, but we are a long way away from even knowing what figures might be. So you will be informed of every, you know, step of the way. But last night was the first step in moving to a new bond counsel and over the next week, and I even spoke with Sheriff Ellsworth today and I spoke with Richard last night, we're going to be deciding what our next step is in moving into the planning phase. But we're a long way off from even knowing any firm figures or even making any solid decisions. But we're more than willing to work with every one of you. We want to work with every one of you. I'm looking forward to it. This is a decision that affects every single person in Vanderburgh County, so –

President Bassemier: And the same here.

Catherine Fanello: So I want to get through it very easy and nice. Thank you.

President Bassemier: Well, thank you for – has anybody else got anything? Mr. Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: I wasn't watching the news, I was watching football.

Catherine Fanello: But they did get parts of the report wrong on Channel 14.

President Bassemier: Thank you very much and I believe everything Susan Taylor prints, though. You can take that to the bank.

Catherine Fanello: Well now, don't tell her that.

Councilmember Sutton: Mr. President is getting in good on the first meeting, isn't he?

President Bassemier: Do you see her writing?

Catherine Fanello: So if you all ever have any questions, you know, I am going to make sure that I make every effort to get in touch with each and every one of you.

President Bassemier: And the same here if there's anything. We all need to work together and if you've got any questions, then we'll be glad to help you and vice versa.

Catherine Fanello: And you may want to maybe entertain the idea of making one person the point person in communicating about this issue. It might be difficult to get in touch with each and every one of you every day as this issue goes along and maybe you might want to designate somebody to be kind of a liaison between that issue.

President Bassemier: Thank you very much. We'll be looking forward to working with you. Thanks for coming.

Catherine Fanello: Thank you.

Councilmember Hoy: My only comment, Commissioner, is that if we're looking at 30 to 45 million dollars, I would strongly suggest that all of us be contacted. I am trying to say that as kindly as I can but, you know. I realize we may need a liaison person.

Catherine Fanello: Well, and I am not saying that each and every one of you shouldn't be contacted, but I think it would be quite difficult to be on the phone with seven of you every day if something –

Councilmember Hoy: No, we're not asking for that.

Catherine Fanello: But I am just suggesting that, you know, maybe one person be the point person that comes to all of you and maybe gives information or whatever.

Councilmember Hoy: We may want to do that. I spent, personally spent, a lot of hours of my life, which I was happy to do and I am paid to do, on the juvenile section of that and so I have a very strong interest in that section as you know. You already know that.

Catherine Fanello: I do know that but I am not suggesting that everyone not be contacted, but I am suggesting you make it as efficient as possible.

Councilmember Hoy: And we're not trying to be unfair to you since you're here by yourself.

Catherine Fanello: Yeah sure. But, oh David did want me to say he could not be here.

Councilmember Hoy: We would do the same thing if the other two were here.

Catherine Fanello: Yeah right. He could not be here today. He is at the fire house but he did want me to express that he is looking forward to working with every one of you.

President Bassemier: Thank you, Catherine. We're running pretty well on schedule. Anyone else – oh, I am sorry.

Councilmember Sutton: (Inaudible – microphone not turned on) I don't have my mike on. We haven't made our appointments to our different boards and committees as of yet, but later on in the meeting I know we will. But there are two appointments on the jail overcrowding – what was the jail overcrowding assessment committee and I just wanted to make this available to you just as kind of a reference.

President Bassemier: Thank you. Anybody else out there like to say something since we've got the meeting opened? Sheriff?

SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT - REDUCTION OF CHIEF DEPUTIES' SALARIES

Brad Ellsworth: This is probably a perfect opportunity since we're all talking about forthrightness and honesty and communication. For two years – I'm Brad Ellsworth, County Sheriff – for two years I've tried to be forthright and honest with this board and I would request the same of you. So if anybody has anything they want to tell me that involves my office now, any actions you're about to take, please feel free. I've been a policeman for almost 20 years now. When I look at a crowd and I see eyes going down and to the left and Adam's apples about to jump out of your mouth, something is up. So anybody got anything they want to tell me?

Councilmember Wortman: Not right now, but I'll be thinking of something.

President Bassemier: I like you, Sheriff.

Brad Ellsworth: I like you too, Ed, but I've been tipped...there is nothing going on with my office or any of my deputies' salaries today?

Councilmember Hoy: I really have no clue as to what you're talking about.

President Bassemier: Yeah, I don't either, sir.

Brad Ellsworth: Okay, so I can rest assured that there is no Council action going to occur with any of my deputies' salaries at today's meeting or –

Councilmember Hoy: No.

Councilmember Winnecke: Well, I'll speak up. I think that's not right. And as far as I know, this was a, as I understand it, there are two salary corrections.

President Bassemier: Right, there is a –

Councilmember Winnecke: Two, based on actions of the previous County Commission, based on, as I understand it, based on two people that were previously assigned to the Community Corrections facility. As I understand it, they were given a one-time salary increase for a short period of time to go do that job for that period of time and their salary would revert back to whatever it was prior to that. That's the way I understand it. I understand that's part of our Salary Ordinance amendment.

President Bassemier: Is that correct?

Councilmember Winnecke: I assume that's what you're referring to.

Brad Ellsworth: You all tell me. I heard about this about a half hour ago that my two Chief Deputies were getting their salaries cut back by \$8,000 at today's meeting. It's not on the agenda, nobody came down and told me. We've got, supposedly have a liaison. Ed, you're my liaison, when was I going to find out about this? When was I going to tell my two Chief Deputies that their salary was cut \$8,000 on the next check?

Councilmember Hoy: We didn't cut anything.

Brad Ellsworth: Okay, is it not going to happen or is it going to happen?

Councilmember Hoy: Did we?

President Bassemier: No. It's got to be voted on.

Councilmember Raben: Let's be fair. Let's be honest here.

Brad Ellsworth: Yeah, let's be honest because everybody –

(Inaudible – several speaking at once)

Councilmember Raben: What Sheriff Ellsworth is referring to is under New Business. The next item is amendment to the Salary Ordinance.

President Bassemier: That's exactly right, number –

Councilmember Raben: And those adjustments – I started to look through the pages here, but he's referring to two adjustments in this book, so where, I don't know where they're at. I've just started to look since he brought this up.

President Bassemier: I'll be honest with you, I guess that's my fault. I thought that was

common knowledge because that was in the minutes. Sandie, you –

Sandie Deig: I think somebody was telling me it was supposed to have been done at budget time. But it's more than it would have been because now we have a Major. So it would be 8% over what a Major made. But I just received this two hours ago.

Brad Ellsworth: I would like the minutes. I guess you all can produce that where it was said. You know, I remember a meeting and, Mr. Wortman, you were there, and Sandie, you were there and former Councilman Betty Knight-Smith was there, where I laid out a plan. In fact, I came up here with a great big table of organization. The old one that had the 35 job descriptions, the new one had 15. I told the plan, I told you about my intentions and somebody call me a liar if I'm not telling the truth, but I'll show you and I've got enough witnesses where I was going to reduce one of my Chief Deputies as soon as the Captains retired, but a Chief Deputy was going to be reduced to the rank of Major. I spelled all of that out for one, two, three people in this room, I told you the plan, and now I understand that for some reason, nobody – and, like I said, I want to see some minutes about this agreed reduction because I've never been a party to any kind of agreed reduction. I'm the one that came up with the plan to cut it and came to you all and showed you, trying to sell you, because again, it's hard to get with seven people thinking that that's (inaudible). This is all going to occur with the retirements January 15th.

President Bassemier: I tell you what, here's what I heard and I apologize, Sheriff. And I don't mind even deferring it if we can. But I was under the understanding that if we gave you that Major out there at the SAFE House that you wouldn't need these two out there any more on the salary. You would reduce their salary. That's not correct?

Brad Ellsworth: If you understood that, then somebody other than myself – here's the way I explained it several times. Under Sheriff Hamner, he was given two Chief Deputies through the department and those were line item Chief Deputies. What I said when the county came to me and asked me to bail them out in Community Corrections, which this board said thank you, you've done a great job. No more stipends, everybody is in line with the salary. We do the Teamster's contract and what did the county say? The Teamster's said they didn't want anybody's salary reduced, they'd want them to catch up. So my employees are less important than the Teamster employees? I don't think so. But that's off the subject. What I am saying is what my plan was. Nobody said a word about how I was going to do this. Out of running my office in good faith and making – I now have three major areas, I have a jail structure that I have to run, I've got a Community Corrections complex, and I've got operations: road patrol, detective, all that. What made more sense to me instead of having two Chief Deputies and then a Major who were all doing like jobs, why not have three across the board to make that table of organization look like it made more sense where people with like duties were making like pay. Instead of trying to ask for a third Chief Deputy and raise that person up, what I decided to do was ask to reduce and ask one of my Chief Deputies, which is not an easy thing to do to take an \$8,000 reduction in pay, but I thought that was more palatable to the county to ask a Chief Deputy to step down, have one Sheriff, one Chief, then three Majors that have like duties and like responsibilities all the while eliminating three Captains positions and Steve Woodall, who, I came up again in front of you and told you – it was the simplest way to solve this and now I hear that you, with no knowledge to me, the officeholder, you're reducing two Chief Deputies salaries by \$8,000 and it was never agreed upon in any meeting.

Councilmember Raben: Sheriff, can I borrow you one second?

Brad Ellsworth: You can borrow me. I'm here for two more years.

Councilmember Raben: – look here at the book.

(Inaudible – several speaking at once)

Councilmember Hoy: Mr. President, I'd like to call for about a five or ten minute recess

while we straighten this out, if you don't mind. Would you call for that please?

President Bassemier: Yeah, can we entertain a motion here to take a recess here?

Councilmember Hoy: I make that motion to take a brief recess.

Councilmember Winnecke: Second.

President Bassemier: Got a second. Okay.

(Meeting recessed for five minutes)

President Bassemier: We're back to order.

Councilmember Hoy: You can end it, I think, by executive order. You can end the recess by calling us back to order.

President Bassemier: Okay, call back to order.

Brad Ellsworth: Do I stand back up there?

Councilmember Raben: No, I need to find the page again.

Councilmember Hoy: Page 29.

APPROVAL OF AMENDED 2001 SALARY ORDINANCE
--

Councilmember Raben: Pending clarification as to what the original motion was, yeah, I found it, what the original motion was way back when, when the additional salary was given, it's reasonable to defer this matter until next month. So under New Business, okay, which is A, approval of 2001 amended Salary Ordinance, I would move that we accept the amended 2001 Salary Ordinance with the exclusion of two lines in the Sheriff's Department, and this would be page 3 of 29 Chief Deputy, and we can put a name with that, that's T. Wallace. And then turn to page 5 of 29, Chief Deputy E. Williams. Those two items be excluded from this amendment at this time and there may be other amendments that take place as we find any further corrections or errors.

Councilmember Sutton: Second.

Councilmember Raben: We may have further amendments to make in February but right now I am moving that we amend the Salary Ordinance book as presented with those two exclusions for today, with the understanding that there could be further amendments that take place in February.

Suzanne Crouch: Will the salary be in before the next meeting, because we have to have something –

Councilmember Raben: With the existing salary in place until our next meeting in February.

Councilmember Sutton: Second.

President Bassemier: Any discussion? Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Raben: I probably completely lost you, Royce.

Councilmember Sutton: No, just one clarification. Now you said with the existing salary as presented in the book. Now does that, with those two that we are referring to, does that put them at the 2000 figure or the –

Councilmember Winnecke: It keeps this salary, correct?

Councilmember Raben: Well, I never thought of it. You're saying does it go back to the old figure or the figure as in the book?

Councilmember Sutton: Well, the figure in the book is lower. I mean, the 2001 figure, should I say.

Jeff Ahlers: It'd go to the one that's in the budget that was passed, right?

Councilmember Raben: Okay, so in the budget.

Councilmember Sutton: So the one we approved actually in September.

Councilmember Raben: In September, right.

Councilmember Sutton: I just wanted to make sure we're clear on that.

Councilmember Raben: So we're finalizing every other line, basically, in here outside of those two, with the understanding that there could be further corrections for errors or that we typically do routinely throughout the year, find errors in salaries.

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: This salary, we corrected these things for years and years and years, always had to do this. So I don't think it's out of character here to do this on that. So with that understand them two items and then whatever was adopted at the budget session, right? Okay, so I'll vote yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

APPOINTMENT OF LIAISONS

President Bassemier: County Council liaison appointments¹. These are my appointments. As you will see, there's really no changes from last year except Troy is taking Betty Knight-Smith's spot and Phil Hoy will be getting the Public Defender. Instead of reading all of these names out, I'd like to have these – you all have the handouts – I'd like to incorporate these into the minutes. Could I have a motion for approval of that?

Councilmember Winnecke: So moved.

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: Could you all show approval by just raising your right hand?

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

APPOINTMENT OF PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE
--

President Bassemier: Appointment of Personnel Administration Committee². You also have – that's the Job Study – you also have a handout on that. I'd like to also have that incorporated into the minutes without reading them. Do I have a motion and a second on that?

Councilmember Wortman: So moved.

Councilmember Hoy: Second.

President Bassemier: (Inaudible – microphone not turned on) raise your right hand.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

APPOINTMENT TO THE ABC BOARD

President Bassemier: Letter D, the appointment to the ABC Board. That has to be voted on and I would like to appoint Frank Daugul to that. Do I have a motion?

Councilmember Hoy: So moved.

Councilmember Raben: I'll second.

President Bassemier: Let's take a roll call vote on that please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

¹ Copy of 2001 County Council Liaison Appointments included for permanent record.

² Copy of 2001 Personnel Administration Committee appointments included for permanent record.

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

OTHER COUNTY COUNCIL APPOINTMENTS
--

President Bassemier: Going to letter E, the other County Council appointments. I am going to read these off and then have a motion and a second. We just did Frank Daugul. Curt Wortman, Area Plan Commission, I left the other Area Plan Commission open; Paul Farmer, Board of Review; Peggy Pfister, Board of Review; William Vieth, Building Authority Board of Trustees; Marion Deig, Burdette Park Advisory Board; Michael Jordan, Burdette Park Advisory Board; Ed Bassemier/Bill Meisler as my designee, Central Dispatch; Gloria Altman, Convention & Visitors Bureau Board; Jeff Guier, Convention & Visitors Bureau Board; Sandie Deig, Data Processing Board; Joe Harrison, Sr., Economic Development Commission; Albert Umbach, Jr., Economic Development Commission Vanderburgh County; Lloyd Winnecke, EUTS Policy Committee; Sandra Shauntee, Human Relations Board; Jim Raben, Jail Overcrowding Assessment Committee; Royce Sutton, also Jail Overcrowding Assessment Committee; Samuel Clifford, Library Board of Trustees; Ted DeVries, Library Board of Trustees; Bob Musgrave, Museum Board; Phil Bruner, Pigeon Creek Greenway Passage Advisory Committee; Phil Hoy, Pigeon Creek Greenway Passage Advisory Committee. I am taking, Ed Bassemier, Solid Waste Board; John Koehler, Southwestern Indiana Mental Health Board; Gene Koch, Southwestern Indiana Mental Health Board; Robert Dillow, Vanderburgh County Redevelopment Authority; and John Stoll, Vanderburgh County Redevelopment Authority. I'd like to have that in the form of a motion.

Councilmember Winnecke: So moved.

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: Some of these names I read off, of course, I see that they're already there. I mean, their dates, they still have a year or two, but I read them all off anyway. It wasn't highlighted or anything, I forgot to do that. So, any discussion on that? Roll call vote on that, please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

APPROVAL OF 2001 COUNTY COUNCIL MEETING DATES
--

President Bassemier: We're going to number F, the approval of the 2001 County Council meeting dates³. Do we all have them? Everybody have a –? I'd like to have a motion to approve these and also be incorporated into the minutes.

Councilmember Winnecke: So moved.

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: No discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Did you catch your breath yet, Teri?

Teri Lukeman: Almost.

Councilmember Sutton: Okay. Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

³ Copy of County Council 2001 meeting dates included for permanent record.

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

FILING DATES FOR FEBRUARY 2001 MEETING

President Bassemier: The February 2001 meeting filing dates. I'm going to ask Sandie to send out a memo and they should all be in by January 12th. Do I have a motion and a second on that?

Councilmember Winnecke: So moved.

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: Any discussion on that? Okay, roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

COUNTY COUNCIL GUIDELINES

President Bassemier: H, County Council guidelines. I'd like to have a motion to defer this until the February meeting. We have some more things to discuss on that. Can I have a motion to defer that?

Councilmember Hoy: So moved.

Councilmember Winnecke: Second.

President Bassemier: Any discussion? Roll call vote on that.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

PROPOSED COUNTY ABANDONED VEHICLE ORDINANCE
--

President Bassemier: The proposed county abandoned vehicle ordinance, I am going to ask that be deferred. I understand that wasn't advertised and I'd like to have that deferred.

Councilmember Hoy: So moved.

Councilmember Sutton: Second.

President Bassemier: We need a roll call vote on that, too.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

President Bassemier: Can I have a motion to adjourn?

Councilmember Winnecke: So moved.

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

(Meeting adjourned at 4:55 p.m.)

VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL

President Ed Bassemier

Vice President Lloyd Winnecke

Councilmember James Raben

Councilmember Phil Hoy

Councilmember Curt Wortman

Councilmember Royce Sutton

Councilmember Troy Tornatta

**VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL
MINUTES
FEBRUARY 7, 2001**

The Vanderburgh County Council met in session the 7th day of February, 2001 in room 301 of the Civic Center Complex. The meeting was called to order at 3:35 p.m. by County Council President Ed Bassemier.

(Sheriff Brad Ellsworth opened the meeting)

President Bassemier: Thank you, sir. I'd like to welcome everyone to the February 7th, 2001 County Council meeting. Could I have an attendance roll call please?

COUNCILMEMBER	PRESENT	ABSENT
Councilmember Tornatta	X	
Councilmember Sutton	X	
Councilmember Wortman	X	
Councilmember Hoy	X	
Councilmember Raben	X	
Councilmember Winnecke	X	
President Bassemier	X	

President Bassemier: Would everyone stand for the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag please?

(Pledge of Allegiance was given)

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES
JANUARY 3RD, 2001**

President Bassemier: We need approval of the minutes from January 3rd, 2001.

Councilmember Sutton: So moved.

Councilmember Winnecke: Second.

President Bassemier: Everybody in favor, raise their right hand. Opposed? Thank you.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

COIT RESOLUTION

President Bassemier: Okay, going into number five, Appropriation Ordinance –

Councilmember Raben: Mr. President, before we begin the appropriations, last Wednesday we were asked – it was asked of us by the Commissioners to pass a resolution or a letter showing support for an increase in COIT so we need to determine today what we want to do there, but I might ask one of the Commissioners – I am looking here. Is Catherine or David in the room?

President Bassemier: Anybody from the Commissioner's Office? I just saw her. She was here. Okay...

Councilmember Raben: Sandie, would you care to go next door and ask one of them to come over? I think it would be nice in case anybody's got any questions or comments

about it. I know it did pass two to one Monday night at their meeting.

President Bassemier: Hi, Commissioner. Would you please state your name and title?

David Mosby: David Mosby, County Commissioner.

Councilmember Raben: David, I understand that your body – matter of fact, we just discussed this – passed the COIT resolution by two to one Monday. But we were asked to pass a resolution or a letter of support here today. I was just giving you the opportunity, did you want to speak towards it?

David Mosby: I can. I don't know if you got a copy of the bill and I didn't bring mine with me. I think it's 1726 or something like that, House Bill. What it is, it's a bill that – and I talked to Dennis Avery as late as last week. I had went to Indy with Sheriff Ellsworth and we talked and we talked on the phone. It's a bill to let the county have the option to raise up to .25% on the local option income tax to fund the jail facility. It cannot be used for anything else and the way Dennis has wrote the bill, the city will not receive part of the .25 as they normally do with local option income tax receiving a portion of that. This portion is dedicated just towards building a facility. If I understand Dennis right, I think it's also in the bill that the city will not even have to vote on it. The way they've written the bill, the City Council will not have to take action on it. So what he has asked us for as Commissioners and Council is a letter supporting the resolution asking for the funding mechanism and from what I understand this afternoon, as far as Dennis is concerned, if we're not all on the same page, he'll withdraw the bill tomorrow. And it has not, from what I understand as late as this afternoon, been totally withdrawn yet. He's got it on hold, but he has not withdrew it, so there is still a chance for a hearing in the House Ways and Means next week.

President Bassemier: Anybody got any questions for Mr. Mosby? Suzanne?

Suzanne Crouch: Commissioner Mosby, I just received this information that was put on our desks. Are you familiar with this sheet? Can I ask a couple of questions about it?

David Mosby: I seen it this afternoon. You can ask me. I'll try to answer them, but if not, I'll defer to the other Commissioner.

Suzanne Crouch: Alright. Looking at this, this is the project size summary sheet, it's a single sheet, that you have given us different amounts that the issue of the bond could be for.

David Mosby: Funding on twenty, thirty, forty and fifty million? Okay.

Suzanne Crouch: And then on the years to pay it off, it's using all of that new COIT, is that correct, to pay it off over the term? I think for a 20 million dollar project it's saying seven years; and then for a 30 million, eight; 40 million, ten; and 50, thirteen? That would be the amount of years it would take to pay off that if we used that .25 additional –

David Mosby: To pay off total debt service. The number goes up a little bit when you add in the issuance of bonds and everything. So it's not really 20 million, I think it'd be like 22 or something.

Suzanne Crouch: Is there anywhere in this other information we've been provided, any kind of projections on if you did it over this period of time, how much interest that would save the county in terms of bond interest?

David Mosby: Now that I am going to defer because I have not talked to Crowe Chizek about this. Catherine is in here. I'll let her speak to this. If you have any other questions about the House Bill, I mean, I'd be glad to answer them. If not, I am going to defer this to her.

Councilmember Raben: Yeah, I think that's probably a very good question, actually.

President Bassemier: Would you like to come up please?

Jeff Ahlers: Mr. Mosby, if you have a copy of that, could you make one available to me? I've not seen it.

David Mosby: Yeah, I've got two copies I believe over there and I'll have Tammy run one and get it to all of you if you want to look at the House Bill. I'm not sure I've got the latest copy because Dennis had went back in and altered some of that so that the city would not have to vote it. Normally, the City Council is the voting body on the LIT because they encumber, I think, 76% or something. But in this case, the way I understand it from Dennis is they will not have to vote because .25 is dedicated to the county for the jail facility only. It's also stated in the bill that once the jail facility is paid off, the .25 comes back off and if somebody would want to use it for something else, they would have to go back through the House and Senate to get it reinstated. But I'll get a copy out of my desk and I'll give it to Tammy to have all of you a copy.

President Bassemier: Thank you, Mr. Mosby. Miss Fanello? Please, for the record, state your name and your title and, Mr. Raben, would you go ahead and direct the question again?

Catherine Fanello: Catherine Fanello, County Commissioner. Do you want me to answer your question first?

Suzanne Crouch: Please.

Catherine Fanello: What he did, if you've got this packet right here which I think I gave to you. He ran numbers on a 50 million dollar issue based on funding it three different ways, but he did not do those for each of the 20, 30 and 40. I can get those if you wanted it, but he did it on a 50 million comparison.

Suzanne Crouch: I was curious, Commissioner Fanello, if the amount of interest we save going this route would justify the additional tax increase and I did some rough numbers and I don't see where we do.

Catherine Fanello: I guess we probably – and these are preliminary numbers from him and just to initiate discussion. So, I mean, I don't really have a firm opinion on them because, I mean, he's ran the numbers for us to look at so we can certainly talk about them. If we just take in comparison on the 50 million issue, if you go to page four, that's if we fund it with all property taxes and the amount of interest we would pay would be 52 – let's just say 53 million to round it off. If you go to, let's see, page nine, if we funded it with the county option income tax only, and that's to pay it off, I think, on a 50 million, it's thirteen years, the interest was 20, but rounded off, let's say 25 million. Okay, so you can see there's a big difference right there. If we go to page twelve, that's if we funded with a combination of county option and property taxes and the interest on that would be roughly 52.4 million dollars. So, I mean, he can run debt service schedules like this on the other size issues. He just took one size, so you can see there is a difference in the interest there. And I can just kind of tell you what he told me the other day and this was based preliminary, I mean, he hasn't done an in depth study yet, so this was just to initiate discussion, but he did send me an e-mail because I asked him if we could, you know, possibly pay it from just our existing budget and not have to raise taxes at all. And in his opinion at this point, he didn't think that we could. We could if we cut everybody's budget by four million dollars. If we cut the county's budget in total by four million, we could pay the debt service. But to him, he felt like we probably couldn't find enough areas to cut that much out of the budget and for 25 years. That was his preliminary opinion at this point.

Councilmember Raben: What did he base that upon?

Catherine Fanello: I guess he based it on, he does have like financial statements for the past few years and he's got copies of the budgets and stuff, so I guess he's just whatever they do when they get in there. He's taking and running the numbers and that was his

opinion. For us to hold the budget for 25 years, he thought that would be kind of burdensome on us to do that.

Suzanne Crouch: Commissioner Fanello, if we could make payment without increasing COIT, is that something that you would be in favor of doing?

Catherine Fanello: Oh, if we could, and if they took a look at maybe a more in depth study of our numbers, I would be real in favor of it, but I would want them to take a look at that since they are the financial advisors. They could give us a good firm opinion on that. But I certainly would be in favor of that.

Councilmember Raben: For everyone's benefit, I think one important thing to look at is, with increasing the COIT, and I've seen the figure fly a few times as recent as this morning, that the additional COIT that this House Bill would entail amounts to roughly 7.6 million dollars a year annually. And with that, it does save some interest, but based on ten years, you're going to take 76 million dollars out of the pocketbooks of the taxpayers. If you use the thirteen year figure, you're going to take 98.8 million dollars, so 99 million dollars out of the billfolds of the taxpayers. So the amount of money you're going to take in an effort to pay a bond off early would never offset the difference in paying the extra interest.

Councilmember Sutton: Are we not just looking at options? We aren't making a decision here today, are we?

Councilmember Raben: No.

Catherine Fanello: This is just for preliminary discussion only and I certainly, I think we should probably ask them to make a comparison for us based on an assumption like that.

Councilmember Raben: During your meeting Monday, you had mentioned that the county was somewhat financially strapped.

Catherine Fanello: He felt like we didn't have the leeway to take it out of our current (inaudible) and I think I prefaced that with that was preliminary discussion only with him. But he didn't feel like we had the cash surplus or the leeway to do that, but he certainly would be willing to take a more firm look at it. But that was just based on a preliminary look at it.

Councilmember Raben: Okay. I don't know, Mr. President, but we need to address this issue of whether or not to pass a letter or not as to whether or not we support any additional COIT. But let me ask everybody to turn to their financial sheet that they would have just received today and, at the same time, if I could, would you care to pass these out?

Teri Lukeman: Sure.

Councilmember Raben: I had asked the Auditor's Office to do a ten-year projection based on revenues and expenditures, okay. First, let's look at...

Catherine Fanello: May I have a copy of...

Councilmember Raben: I can give her one. If we first look at our finance sheet, you'll see today that we have an unappropriated balance of just under 5.8 million dollars. That's a very healthy unappropriated balance. And along with it is also the other balances for the other, whether it be set asides or other accounts, the sheets that were just passed around are a ten year projection, okay, and these sheets that were run by the Auditor are very conservative, okay. They're based on a six percent annual increase in expenditures and revenues and, correct me if I am wrong, but our revenues average about seven and a half, correct?

Suzanne Crouch: Our miscellaneous revenues over the past ten years have averaged out

annually at 7.75% and our expenditures over the past ten years have averaged out at 4.38%, so these numbers are very conservative. I raised expenditures to a 6% level knowing that there would be additional operating costs for the jail. We also put our revenues in at 6%, trying to be very conservative. There's two scenarios: one is at 6% and one is at 5.75%. We feel those are very conservative.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, and if you look over at the fourth column and this is what I am going to ask you to do today – and again, I am very comfortable with this. I know the Auditor is quite comfortable with this. But it would be my opinion that today we could set aside or instruct the Auditor to set aside 2.7 million dollars, which we would set aside annually to use to pay towards construction of a new jail. And what, you might ask, what does 2.7 arrive at? That would roughly cover a 35 to 40 million dollar bond issue. And honestly, that's as much as I am comfortable with. We know, –

Councilmember Sutton: Go ahead, finish what you were saying.

Councilmember Raben: We're quite comfortable with that amount. If you look at the projections again, one is extremely conservative, one is not quite as conservative. But after year 2010, you'll see that we're still floating that bond payment and we still have a very healthy balance. I don't know if the Auditor has got anything to add to this, but again, I can't stress enough that we can do this with ease based on expenditures and revenues, we can float this ourselves and not increase anything.

Catherine Fanello: May I just make a suggestion? That you before you decide on something like this that we do have them take an in depth look and give us an opinion on that? I really, I am more familiar with the city's finances than I am the county's and I always know we had a policy over there about how much cash surplus we kept on hand in cash of emergencies or anything. I'm really not sure what your policy is, but I really do suggest we, since our former Commissioners did hire Crowe Chizek to give us some good financial advice, that we let them take a look at this and just issue us an opinion on it.

Councilmember Sutton: Well, I think, also too, I think this is very helpful information in taking this and stretching that out over a ten year period, but I think something that would also be very helpful with this, I mean, if we're looking at projections and what we anticipate our expenditures and what we anticipate our balance, or beginning balances being, I think if we could see what it has been, say, over the last five years to give us an idea of how those weigh and how those stack up because as each year (inaudible) as we know, our expenditures are not the same every year. We have a variety of different things that may come about and as we look at our unappropriated balance, I mean, we can look at our unappropriated balance this year, very healthy unappropriated balance, I mean, as far as I can remember I've never recalled my years here on the Council, and I guess it's been about nine and a half, that we've ever had an unappropriated balance that's that healthy, and so for us to assume that it will be like that every year might be a little generous for us to assume that it will be that healthy for ten years running, going forward. And then as well, I think when I've looked at and when I think about our unappropriated balance, it's probably ranged over the last probably five years, anywhere from probably about 1.8 to somewhere in the neighborhood of about, last year I think we had somewhere around close to four was our unappropriated balance, so this year we consider it more of an anomaly that we would have that much of an unappropriated balance and given that we've got some major things that are really, we're still here in February, we're still very early and there's probably some things that we're going to confront that we already know about that will eat into that unappropriated balance. I guess as we try to extrapolate this out, it does make it a little difficult to be able to kind of do that because, like I said, just different issues that we face each and every year, so I guess what I am trying to say in a nutshell, is that I think this is something that we need to look at. It provides another avenue as an option for us, but I think when we talk long term, I don't think there is any one here on this Council that's qualified to really speak and look at where we're going to be ten years from now. I mean, we can guestimate that out, but there's just way in the world you can say for sure this is where we're going to be. But this is good helpful information.

Catherine Fanello: May I add to that? Like Royce said, we do have a couple of other big issues on the table right now. We're all familiar with the Old Courthouse situation so we're going to have to come up with a long term plan on that and then also we may be dealing with a convention hotel at some point in time. I don't know if any of you have received a letter from the Convention & Visitor's Bureau, but they would really like the city and county to get involved and us maybe coming up with a plan to boost our convention business and that would, you know the problems we're having with the Radisson right now, so we've got a couple of big issues on the table and I would hate to see us make a rash decision and commit to one big project at this time when we've got so many other things to take into consideration.

President Bassemier: Thank you, Ms. Fanello, but I tell you what, Suzanne has been running these numbers for us for several years and she is pretty well on target and I know she's took into account other projects when she came up with these numbers, and so I'd just like to say that if Suzanne feels real comfortable with this, I do too. So, Suzanne, did you want to say anything?

Suzanne Crouch: And certainly these are projections based upon the past ten year history. So I agree with Commissioner Fanello. I'd like to talk to Crowe Chizek and go over some of our finances with us, but I think Councilmember Raben just wanted to demonstrate that there is another option that maybe we don't have to support a tax increase at this particular point in time.

Councilmember Hoy: Mr. President?

President Bassemier: I'm sorry. Mr. Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: I recall a few years ago when we had about 4.5 million that we brought over into the new year and in one of the first meetings of that year we voted three million out of that for Burkhardt Road.

President Bassemier: I knew you were going to say that.

Councilmember Hoy: Yeah, because I was against the project, you know that. But we survived that very well, financially. I wouldn't be afraid of, frankly, with this kind of balance, I wouldn't be afraid of tucking away three million towards the jail of this 5.7 because we also have \$610,519 in Riverboat and in CCD almost a million and a half. Those three total \$7,881,000 and some change. That's my first comment. My second comment, I'm real uncomfortable with a COIT tax from the standpoint from which I usually speak, which I know I am County Council-At-Large, but there are people outside of the poverty pockets of this city who don't make a lot of money and this is a working person's tax, the COIT is. The only way I could support a resolution, and I wouldn't mind supporting a resolution, is also at the same time saying that we don't have to use this tax. I mean, all we would be asking the legislature is to have permission to levy it. I really don't want to levy it, I'll be honest with you. I'd do anything to keep from levying that tax. When I see figures like this, this looks good to me, but that's the only way I could support levying that tax, or sending an overture to the legislature is to say well, okay, you give us permission for some home rule here, that doesn't mean we have to use it and secondly, I don't want to use it. So those are some of my feelings but the other thing is, I guess my third point is, if we do lock ourselves in to an annual payment as a Council, then we'll have to work hard on the budget which we have. I'm just very pleasantly pleased and amazed at the financial picture we find ourselves in today. I did not expect it to be this high, frankly, because we, if you remember after budget time we bought the automobiles for the Sheriff and a whole laundry list of things toward the end of the year and I was quite worried we weren't going to end up with any money in the bank at all. Thank you.

President Bassemier: Thank you, Mr. Hoy. I know how you feel. The last several years we've never raised taxes and I know we don't want to start now whether it be a property tax or COIT tax, so thank you, Mr. Hoy.

Councilmember Raben: And again, when you look at these projections, we're averaging 4.8 in expenditures and 7.5 in revenues. Both these figures are extremely conservative. I'm quite comfortable with it and –

Catherine Fanello: May I ask a question? I guess, what kind of surplus are you leaving yourselves in case of an emergency that we just –

Councilmember Raben: Three million dollars in unappropriated.

Councilmember Sutton: Are you talking about annually? Three million?

Councilmember Raben: This year, we will be allowing ourselves three –

Catherine Fanello: What about the next ten years?

Councilmember Sutton: What this is based on is, you know, a ten year projection. I guess that's the point I was trying to make is it would be nice if we had this amount every year, but it's highly likely that –

Councilmember Raben: Well, the trend is going that we will and that's what these figures state –

Catherine Fanello: And but –

Councilmember Raben: – they're based on ten years' history, okay. You mentioned five, these are based on ten.

Councilmember Tornatta: Can we keep the option open? It's up to .25 so, I mean, if we kept the option open, like Phil said, it's not necessarily anything we have to use but we could keep the option open if we had to. If we were in a position where we found ourselves in a bind, then it's open. We don't want to use it and, I mean, that's my thought. I don't want to use it. It's never fun to raise taxes but on the other side of it, I'd rather have it there if we got in a bind. But we don't have to use it, it's just an option.

Catherine Fanello: And I am just going to really stress again, I really think we need to let Crowe Chizek give an opinion on this.

Councilmember Hoy: The bind that we're in –

President Bassemier: Mr. Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: That alright, I'm not in a hurry.

President Bassemier: I'm going to let our Counselor talk on a couple of these issues. Go ahead.

Councilmember Hoy: I'm just concerned that we watch the timetable and that is if we're going to overture the legislature, then we probably have to overture them pretty soon to get this legislation passed because its in process and it's kind of sitting on hold so it would seem to me that we may want to make a decision yea or nay today because our next meeting is in March and their session ends – when does it end, end of April?

(Inaudible – several speaking at once.)

Councilmember Sutton: I guess if you can recall last time that we were looking for a unified local support of an increase in like the Innkeeper's Tax, there was a possibility that that was going to fail because there didn't appear to be a cohesive effort here locally. Ultimately it did pass but I think I like the idea of at least having it as an option and if at all possible do what we can to make sure that is the last option that we explore. But if we close the door or if we don't move in some direction, we will not get an opportunity to come

back to use that as an opportunity for us because it's going to – if you're going to withdraw the bill, then try to bring the bill back later, it's just not going to happen.

Councilmember Tornatta: I'd just like to make a motion.

President Bassemier: I'm going to have our Counsel speak on this, whether we can do this or not today on either one of these issues (inaudible – microphone not turned on)

Councilmember Raben: There's no problem on this.

Councilmember Tornatta: Yeah, you should be able to vote and make a motion on giving our favor to this or not.

Jeff Ahlers: One of the concerns I had that I just wanted to bring up, and obviously I can only make recommendations and obviously representing the entire Council, the concern is and I know that we're getting a copy of the Bill, is that it wasn't on the agenda and in terms of looking at it as to before you endorse a bill, I mean, has everybody read it? Do they know what's in there, what the ramifications are and we've got the second issue of my concern of exactly what it is it depends on what this body wants to do. I mean, anybody here is obviously free to send a letter to Representative Avery to express your views. I have concerns about whether or not without advertising it or looking into the bill itself about making some sort of resolution or anything formally today to endorse legislation without it being put on the agenda.

Suzanne Crouch: I believe the Commissioners voted for a resolution Monday night. It wasn't advertised.

Councilmember Raben: Jeff, we're not – you can vote on a resolution without advertising. We can pass a resolution or letter of support.

Jeff Ahlers: Well, and in terms of whether or not legally you can do it, I am just saying, I don't know, has everybody read the bill, is I am just pointing out as to whether or not you want to look at it. In terms of how you're wording it, are you truly endorsing it or are you saying we're in favor of it moving forward through the process. You don't know what the final product is going to be legislatively. But, I mean, that's up to you.

Councilmember Tornatta: Representative Avery has introduced it as clearly an option and then it's up to us to decide whether we want to execute the option to do that. But he's brought it at least to me as purely an option just to say there are other ways to skin a cat.

Jeff Ahlers: Well, one of the questions in terms of the bill, and that's why I wanted to take a look at it is, does it eventually come back to this body or does it go to the Income Tax Council to determine whether or not it goes into effect?

Councilmember Raben: Mr. President, I am going to make a motion that we move to authorize the Auditor to earmark 2.7 million dollars as set aside for future Jail bond payments.

Councilmember Hoy: And I'll second that motion. With the current balance we have, right, Mr. Raben?

Councilmember Raben: That's correct.

Suzanne Crouch: And what we might want to do is go ahead and file an appropriation for next month although in checking with the State Board of Tax Commissioners and the State Board of Accounts, we can earmark that money within the General Fund, so it's whatever your pleasure is.

President Bassemier: We've got a motion and a second and, Mr. Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: What you're going to do then is like the Riverboat, listing a separate column then, keeping it separate so everybody understands that. Okay, I am comfortable with that. Thank you.

President Bassemier: Yeah, I am too. Anybody else? Mr. Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Why do we need to do this today?

(Inaudible – several speaking at once.)

Councilmember Sutton: I am not saying I am opposed to it but, I guess, one, we don't even know what type of facility, the cost of the facility, we know obviously we're going to have a facility, but why is it imperative that we need to do this right now?

Councilmember Hoy: Mr. President, my reason for seconding it is real simple and that is we have a good surplus here and I think it's incumbent upon us to manage the money well. The jail, the new jail will not be built by the end of this year and we will have then some money ahead set aside and that three million leaves us plenty of operational for the rest of the year. I feel real comfortable with that and I think it also sends a signal to anybody who needs to get the signal that we're going to be fiscally responsible as a body. We've been very fiscally responsible in the past and we're going to continue to do that and we're trying to make an effort, I am, speaking for myself, to avoid a new tax if at all possible.

Catherine Fanello: May I ask a question? I'm still going to get, do you guys want me to get an expert opinion? Is that something that you –

Councilmember Hoy: Sure.

President Bassemier: That's no problem.

Catherine Fanello: And will you be –

President Bassemier: I feel like we have one, too.

Catherine Fanello: Well, we have our opinion, but it can be –

Suzanne Crouch: Certainly I am all in favor of speaking to Crowe Chizek.

Catherine Fanello: I am just saying they have worked on numerous –

Councilmember Sutton: I guess that's what I, I mean, we just got this put on our desks when we arrived here today. And I guess I'd like to be able to look at what our options and how we would work those out. The 2.7 might be just fine, but I'd like to know all of the three options before we start voting to set money aside for something and I don't want to see us have to increase anything, tax-wise, but also I'd like for us to even consider and factor in that we also have some other major projects coming down the pipe. So just so that we can have enough information rather than just coming here with something that you set on our desks today and vote on it. I'm not saying that this is not a good proposal, I am just saying that we need to see all the information before we move forward.

Councilmember Hoy: Mr. President, my response to my esteemed colleague is that y'all felt real comfortable with three million for Burkhardt Road. I don't know why y'all don't feel comfortable with 2.7 out of 5.7 because that year we only had about 4.4 or 4.5. That's my first point and maybe my only point. I just feel real comfortable with it and I think it shows good planning.

President Bassemier: I agree with you, Mr. Hoy. I think it's wonderful that we've got this much money in our unappropriated balance and this 2.7 million dollars is – if we don't have to raise property taxes or the COIT tax, I think we're sending a good message out there. I do have a motion and I do have a second.

Councilmember Sutton: Now are you saying not raise property taxes, now you are saying 2.7 as this sheet presents it over ten years or are you saying 2.7 this year? Is that what the motion is? What is the motion?

Councilmember Raben: This year.

Councilmember Sutton: Okay.

Suzanne Crouch: Because quite honestly, you don't know if it's going to be 2.7, that's just for point of illustration.

President Bassemier: (Inaudible – microphone not turned on)

Councilmember Raben: But I don't want to send a false signal, either. I don't want to earmark 2.7 today and someone sign a contract for 60 million dollars. I mean, the point with 2.7 is this will fund a 35 - 40 million dollar jail and that's what we can afford. That's what this county can afford without raising –

Councilmember Sutton: Well it would be nice if it cost less than that.

Councilmember Raben: That's exactly right. It would be very nice. But I am telling them that this is what we can afford. We're not looking at 50 or 60 million dollars.

Catherine Fanello: With all due respect, a 40 million dollar size issue manual debt service is going to be approximately 3.7 million.

Councilmember Raben: Over how many years?

Catherine Fanello: That's going to be, I guess, over a 25 year period.

Suzanne Crouch: What would be the interest on that?

Catherine Fanello: He did not give me the debt service schedule for that. I can get that if you want. That's why I am saying, I wish you would just – if we could just maybe take a week just to get them some more information and let them run us some more firm numbers and let them work with Suzanne on some projections or something and that way you could really make an informed decision.

Councilmember Raben: I'll address that with my next motion, okay? Let's vote on this and I'll make a further motion.

President Bassemier: Any more discussion? Can I have a roll call vote please?

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: I think I've said no. Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Is that a yes or a no?

Councilmember Sutton: Well, that was a yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

Teri Lukeman: Excuse me, I need to change the tape.

(Tape changed)

Councilmember Raben: I would also move that we instruct the Auditor to research the budget process and advise the Council on setting aside additional monies at budget time in the future years, and secondly, I would also like to authorize the Auditor to meet with Crowe Chizek and go over these numbers and the possibility of funding the jail with these existing revenues. So that's my motion.

Councilmember Winnecke: Second.

President Bassemier: I have a second. Okay. Any discussion on that?

Councilmember Sutton: Yeah, one question for the Auditor. At the – when I'm looking at this sheet that lists our funds, this Council and the Commissioners had set aside the Riverboat dollars in three different ways: Economic Development, Welfare to Work and the other was Infrastructure, three different uses on that, and I guess I am looking at that total unappropriated balance at \$610,000 when it began at 1.5. Is some of that – where did – what's kind of going on there because I thought we were really working with about 1.5 in each year and I know we didn't have an appropriation, normally we have an appropriation at the beginning of the year to make sure that is fully funded? Was that something that was needed to be – needs to take place here?

Suzanne Crouch: At the top, when the Council put in place the Riverboat and set the Riverboat revenues aside, you all were very conservative, that's one of the reasons we're in such good financial condition and if you recall, what you did was, we don't want to ever spend more than what we're taking in, so you always budgeted 1.5 million at budget time and then at the beginning of the year we show the 2000 revenues at the top of that column, that's the 2.1 million. What is left over then is what's available to you to appropriate in whatever of those line items you see fit.

Councilmember Sutton: Well, I guess I thought we were working with the 1.5, actually for the unappropriated balance. That's what – roughly we had 500,000 for each of the segments, each of the three areas. Do you know what I am talking about? Are you following me?

Councilmember Raben: (Inaudible – microphone not turned on) It shows the 1.5 million dollars.

Councilmember Sutton: No, but then if you look at the unappropriated balance, look down at the very bottom. We're down to \$610,000 so that's really what we have available.

Councilmember Raben: (Inaudible – microphone not turned on)

Suzanne Crouch: That's above and beyond that \$500,000 in each of the line items.

Councilmember Sutton: Okay, so our balance, just to make sure I am correct would be what, the –

Suzanne Crouch: The \$610,00 is what's available to Council to appropriate in each of those additional line items that already have \$500,000 in them.

Councilmember Sutton: Okay, so you're saying that essentially that if we divide those in three you'd have somewhere in the neighborhood of seven, something like that for each one, is essentially what you're –

Suzanne Crouch: I'm not sure that you really have to divide it by three. In the past –

Councilmember Sutton: Yeah, I'm just basing it on what had been done before.

Suzanne Crouch: Right.

Councilmember Wortman: I'd like to remind the Council, I've been over here for years and I don't want to lose our conservative ways now. I'd just like to remind everybody of that.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Mr. President, there is a motion and a second on the floor.

President Bassemier: Motion and a second, any discussion?

Councilmember Sutton: We can be a subjective term.

President Bassemier: Do you want to raise your right hand on this, everybody in favor?

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

Catherine Fanello: Suzanne, if you want, we can get in touch with Mike Clater, who is with Crowe Chizek, and get him on a conference call or something and see if he can tell us what he needs to do some further analysis.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, and I would like to continue on the subject of COIT. Typically this body does not make negative motions, so although I intend to vote against it, I am going to make a motion that we send the signal now that at this time we are not interested in raising the COIT and that's my motion.

Councilmember Sutton: Well, Jim, what about Phil's recommendation? Not sending it as a this is what we'll do, but as an option. Not something that we have to use, but something that would be available to us.

Councilmember Raben: I've got a motion on the floor that needs a second.

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: Any discussion?

Councilmember Sutton: Yeah, just as I was saying, Phil's recommendation that it come as an option that we may explore but if at all possible do everything to avoid using or increasing that tax amount.

President Bassemier: If it's defeated I'm sure we can bring that back up.

Councilmember Sutton: Well, I mean, you're speaking in the negative. We haven't taken

a vote.

Councilmember Raben: Well, in not doing this, you're sending them a signal that it's okay to go ahead and try to pass the bill.

Councilmember Tornatta: But there's no advantage to that. There's no advantage to passing the bill if we don't use it. It's strictly an option.

Councilmember Raben: Okay.

Councilmember Tornatta: And that's all, I think, that Royce is getting at. It's just one option if all our other options would subside in some way, that would be an option to use in our favor.

Councilmember Hoy: It keeps the door open.

Councilmember Tornatta: Exactly. And you're going to have the Representative's help.

Councilmember Hoy: As I said earlier, I am extremely reluctant to open this door simply because of what it does to people who are depending on weekly paychecks. They're going to feel it the most keenly and the low income folks are going to feel it most keenly as well. So I do have problems with even keeping the door open, but I think we might want to keep our options open just in case.

Councilmember Sutton: And I would think that this Council, we're going to do everything possible to – I mean, if that were available to us, that we would do everything possible to avoid even the prospects of using that, but given that there are so many unknowns right now about the scope of the project and other issues that are coming before this Council, just the prospects of that bill being voted down, it will no longer be a possibility for us in that particular case. So that's merely the point I am trying to make.

Councilmember Hoy: Mr. President, my other reason for having extremely ambivalent feelings is, I did participate in the juvenile section of the PMSI study and I read the whole study, and their recommendation for all three facilities is well under 50 million and I think we ought to stay well under 50 million. That doesn't include land. I also feel that we own some land that we can probably use. I mean, I can't imagine that we'd want to build a jail out in Darmstadt, Mr. Wortman, or even nearby and try to transport prisoners. So we don't make a judgement on the placement, but by making statements about the amount of money, that will make a statement about how much we feel we should spend on acquiring land, which could be very expensive.

President Bassemier: Okay, I have a motion and a second. Any more discussion? Who seconded? Mr. Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yeah, the price of land just went up in Darmstadt.

President Bassemier: I figured it did. Please take a roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Now, before we continue this vote, it was a positive motion to send the resolution forward in support of COIT. We don't make negative motions here, so you two just voted against what –

Councilmember Sutton: No. As I understood the motion was that –

President Bassemier: Could you read the motion back?

Councilmember Raben: Again, as I stated prior to making the motion that we typically don't make negative motions so –

Councilmember Tornatta: Typically –

Councilmember Sutton: Let's restate the motion.

Councilmember Raben: And I made it very clear that I intended to vote against this – okay, let me restate the motion. The motion again...

Suzanne Crouch: Who was the seconder?

(Inaudible – several speaking at once)

Councilmember Raben: Okay, the motion is to pass a resolution in support of increasing COIT. That's the motion.

Councilmember Tornatta: That's not the motion that..

Councilmember Sutton: That's not maybe as I understood it. But the motion –

Councilmember Raben: I am making the motion and as I said before, I do not intend to vote for this motion but to get it on the floor. And we do not make negative motions, that's what –

Councilmember Sutton: What I am saying is, would you want to give some consideration to Phil's proposal in wording that it's not something that will kick in, that it's an option for us?

Councilmember Raben: No, my motion remains as it is.

Jeff Ahlers: I'd suggest you get a second and then just start the voting again, to this motion.

President Bassemier: I want to hear the motion again.

Councilmember Raben: I make a motion to approve, okay, to approve a resolution in support of increasing COIT. Okay, if you want to see the COIT increase, you vote yea. If you don't, you vote nay.

Councilmember Tornatta: If you want to see the option available for COIT to increase, that's how it should read.

Councilmember Raben: That's not the motion. The motion is whether –

(Inaudible – several speaking at once)

Councilmember Raben: – move forward or we don't.

Jeff Ahlers: Are you making the motion again? Do we need to get a new second and we're starting the vote again? Is that what we're doing? I want to make sure procedurally we know what we're doing here. Is that – we just need to get a second to what Jim said. Is there a second?

Councilmember Raben: Again, I'll withdraw my original two motions. Will the seconder follow?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Councilmember Tornatta: Hold on a second. Real quick, Mr. President, I wanted to give this motion back about 30 minutes ago and, I mean, I can give this motion real quick, no offense, but, I mean, I was trying to give this motion about 30 minutes ago and we deferred that and then Mr. Raben made a motion. Is that –

President Bassemier: That would be out of order, sir. Mr. Raben has got a motion on the floor.

Councilmember Tornatta: Okay.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, and again, this is a positive motion. I have no intent of voting in favor for this motion. I want that on record before I make the motion. I move that this body pass a letter of support to increase the COIT tax. That's the motion. Again, if you're against it, vote nay; if you're for it, vote yea.

Councilmember Wortman: I second it.

President Bassemier: Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: I am going to abstain.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Either way it doesn't agree with me. I don't like either, yeah I don't...I'll abstain.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: No.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: No. It's defeated.

(Motion fails 0-5/Councilmembers Wortman, Hoy, Raben, Winnecke and Bassemier opposed. Councilmembers Tornatta and Sutton abstained from voting)

Councilmember Hoy: Mr. President, a question. And, Mr. Ahlers, it seems to me it's legal for another motion to be put on the floor then that might state this differently? Am I correct or incorrect?

President Bassemier: Can we do that, sir?

Jeff Ahlers: Well, I mean, I guess it's whatever the President wants to recognize in terms of making motions.

Councilmember Hoy: Then I'll yield the floor to Mr. Tornatta.

Councilmember Tornatta: Thank you. I'd like to make a motion that we are in favor of considering the legislation, which I believe is Bill #01762 as an option for us to utilize down the road if needed.

Councilmember Sutton: Second.

President Bassemier: I have a second. Any discussion?

Councilmember Hoy: Would you clarify the motion?

President Bassemier: Do you want to repeat it, sir?

Councilmember Tornatta: I will repeat it. I motion that we use as an option the House Bill – I'm sorry, I motion that we give favor to the House Bill #01762 that gives us the option to use this bill at said time if we decide to use it.

President Bassemier: Do you understand it, sir? Mr. Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: I think so.

President Bassemier: Do I have a second? Royce, did you second that?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

President Bassemier: And I am going to allow this motion to be fair to everybody, all parties. Any more discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: If I understand the motion that we're just asking for permission that we might possibly do this, I'll vote it a qualified yes so that we can overture the legislature even though I have a lot of questions about it. That's a yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: No.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: No. That's defeated.

(Motion fails 3-4/Councilmembers Wortman, Raben, Winnecke & Bassemier opposed)

Councilmember Sutton: When are we going to get on the agenda? We haven't even started the agenda yet. When are we actually going to get on the agenda, Mr. President?

President Bassemier: Right now. I think these were two important issues and were kind of discussed at Monday night's Commissioner meeting. We needed to get this out of the way as we talked about it. It's pending up there; we needed to give them an answer so today we have given them an answer upstate.

ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATION & REPEAL REQUESTS

SHERIFF

President Bassemier: Okay, going on with number five, Appropriation Ordinance. Would the Sheriff please step forward, state your name and your business for the record? Finance Chairman, Mr. Raben, would you go ahead and make your motion?

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Mr. President, I'll move approval of 1050-1130-0002 for the amount of \$50.

Councilmember Hoy: Second.

President Bassemier: Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

SHERIFF		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1050-1130-0002	Captain/Change to Major	50.00	50.00
Total		50.00	50.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

President Bassemier: Sheriff, you don't have to, for the record, though, give your name. I like to hear your name.

Brad Ellsworth: My date of birth?

President Bassemier: Name.

Brad Ellsworth: Brad Ellsworth.

President Bassemier: Now your date of birth.

PROSECUTOR

Councilmember Raben: Next is the Prosecutor's Office and I'll move we set all requests in at zero.

Councilmember Winnecke: Second.

President Bassemier: Okay, we've got a motion and a second to deny it. Any discussion? I know Mr. —

Stan Levco: I'm Stan Levco, Prosecutor's Office.

President Bassemier: Okay, do you have anything to say?

Stan Levco: No.

President Bassemier: Okay. You know, I talked with Mr. Levco at our advisory board meeting for Community Corrections and Mr. Levco indicated to me that he probably will need these employees in the future, but you would be happy if you could get a part-time employee. Is that...

Stan Levco: That's not precisely, but that's generally correct.

President Bassemier: For right now, you'd be happy with a part-time?

Stan Levco: Under the circumstances, given that this is in the middle of the year, I think that's not unreasonable. If this were, if it were at a different time, I would.

Councilmember Sutton: What would be the precise wording of that?

President Bassemier: I have a motion. Mr. Raben, would you want to rescind that?

Councilmember Winnecke: I have a question. All due respect to the Prosecutor, based on his very candid response last week, I don't think that he's shown that he needs these bodies yet or a half a body.

President Bassemier: Want to address that?

Stan Levco: Yes. I think your question was, do I see any difference in January than I do in December and the answer is no, but I think in December I needed more help.

Councilmember Tornatta: Mr. President, my only thought was like I said last time, maybe in talking to Mr. Levco that there is a need for a part-time trial lawyer and I think that's kind of where he's going with this. It's not necessarily just to have somebody else on staff, just to have them on staff, this would be a trial lawyer, somebody that had some experience in trial prosecutions or any kind of experience to warrant them to be successful in this position. So that's the only thing I'm looking at. And, in fact, if you'll – I don't know if anybody's got it, but on page 17 of the budget, it is listed as a Part-time Deputy, and that Deputy is listed at \$24,510 and that's something to look at instead of \$33,161, the \$24,510 and then with the benefits. I mean, that's another way to go about that.

President Bassemier: Thank you, Mr. Tornatta. Any more discussion? Jim, do you want to keep it as is? Your motion?

Councilmember Sutton: Mr. President? Last month, Stan, you had two part-time positions. You combined those two part-time?

Stan Levco: Right.

Councilmember Sutton: So you don't have – you combined them into a full-time, so you don't have that part-time position any longer?

Stan Levco: Well, I have four part-time people now. In December, I had six.

Councilmember Sutton: But you lost, what you have now, how many part-timers do you have now?

Stan Levco: Four.

Councilmember Sutton: And you had?

Stan Levco: Six.

President Bassemier: Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Real quickly, I need to just –

Councilmember Raben: The motion is to set them in at zero. So if you're against it, you vote –

Councilmember Tornatta: Well, is that against anything or could there be a motion later to bring in a part-time spot? Or does this kill it?

Councilmember Raben: You've got to vote on this motion first.

Councilmember Tornatta: Okay.

Councilmember Hoy: Mr. President, a point of order, just so Mr. Tornatta knows and I am not trying to treat you like the freshman, but you're new. If we vote anything down, it takes a two-thirds vote to reopen it in that meeting, which means five votes. So if you wanted to reopen, our policy has been to reopen a vote, you need five votes. I think that's correct, is it not?

Councilmember Raben: That's correct. Or to save time you could, technically, ask me if

I would amend my motion, which I'll tell you I won't. But you save going through the vote again.

Councilmember Tornatta: Well, that's what I was going after, but I guess that answered my question. Set it in at zero, yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: This is to set it in at zero, right? Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: I am going to vote no. I think he needs the part-time if he asked us, but I'm sorry, one vote won't help you, sir, so it's defeated.

PROSECUTOR		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1080-1380-1080	Deputy	42,757.00	0.00
1080-1390-1080	Deputy	42,757.00	0.00
1080-1400-1080	Deputy	42,757.00	0.00
1080-1410-1080	Deputy	42,757.00	0.00
1080-1420-1080	Part-time Deputy	33,161.00	0.00
1080-1430-1080	Part-time Deputy	33,161.00	0.00
1080-1900	FICA	18,158.00	0.00
1080-1910	PERF	12,461.00	0.00
1080-1920	Insurance	5,640.00	0.00
Total		273,609.00	0.00

(Motion carried 6-1/Councilmember Bassemier opposed)

COMMISSIONERS

President Bassemier: Now we're to the Commissioners, Mr. Raben.

Councilmember Raben: Yeah, and actually, I think they left, but last week we had requested that they bring this request – vote on this request before their body and to my knowledge, they didn't vote on this Monday, so I am going to move that we set this in at zero.

Councilmember Sutton: If they didn't act on it, why don't we just defer it until they actually can bring it to us.

Councilmember Raben: You can defer last week but you take final action this week.

Councilmember Sutton: Well, we've deferred in this particular meeting before and since our issue was that they hadn't had a chance to act on it, give them a chance to give the consideration to it before their body before we take any action on it. That was our issue.

President Bassemier: Mr. Hoy, go ahead and we'll talk about it and then we'll –

Councilmember Hoy: Yeah, Monday night the Commissioners did take an action that changed this – would change this appropriation. Monday night they took a vote – because I was there at the meeting – where they removed the insurance and changed it all and so my understanding from their vote was that they are going to have to put a new appropriation on our desk anyway.

President Bassemier: Right.

Councilmember Hoy: Because they removed 1300-1920, they removed the Insurance, I can tell you that. They're not here but that's what they did and they had an entirely different thing that they voted and they did not take action Monday night on the 1300-1140-1300 Administrative Assistant. They took no action on that at all. So it's really kind of a moot question, I think, for us today except that we've got to vote on this particular appropriation. I think they're going to come back here next month.

President Bassemier: Yeah, I do too and I think it will be cleaner if we set it in at zero, too, and let them bring it back.

Councilmember Wortman: I second it.

President Bassemier: Jim, is that okay with you? That's what your motion is? And you've got a second over here. Anymore discussion on that?

Councilmember Sutton: You didn't ask me if it was okay with me.

President Bassemier: Is that okay with you?

Councilmember Sutton: It's okay with me.

President Bassemier: Roll call vote please.

Councilmember Hoy: Must have been a good day at the bank.

Councilmember Sutton: It always is.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Set in at zero, right? Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

COMMISSIONERS		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1300-1140-1300	Administrative Asst.	10,739.00	0.00
1300-1900	FICA	8,482.00	0.00
1300-1910	PERF	5,821.00	0.00
1300-1920	Insurance	32,000.00	0.00
Total		57,042.00	0.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

CIRCUIT COURT

President Bassemier: Proceed to Circuit Court.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Mr. President, I'll move approval of 1360-1390-1360, 1360-1900, 1360-1910, 1360-1920 for a total of \$33,122.

Councilmember Hoy: Second.

President Bassemier: Any discussion?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes. I am going to give a compliment to the Judge and perhaps to some other people because when we engaged in that PMSI study, obviously you were instrumental along with some other people in moving things along, reducing the jail population. It makes me feel very comfortable voting yes on this and thank you for your work.

Carl Heldt: Thank you.

Councilmember Raben: Judge, I'll somewhat echo some of his words there until he gets to the point that he's quite comfortable in doing this. I mean, I'm not comfortable because it's a new position, although I understand that a lot of what Councilman Hoy said is very accurate. You have worked hard and part of the works that you've done over the last year is what has resulted in a slightly less jail population, so I'm willing to go out on a limb and give you the benefit of the doubt as bad as it hurts. So...

Carl Heldt: Thank you. And I know it does.

Councilmember Sutton: That's kind of one of those backward compliment things. You've got to kind of read through it.

Councilmember Tornatta: That's like that backward motion.

Councilmember Hoy: You'll get a discount on your tires.

President Bassemier: Motion and a second. Roll call vote.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

CIRCUIT COURT		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1360-1390-1360	Bailiff	24,109.00	24,109.00
1360-1900	FICA	1,627.00	1,627.00
1360-1910	PERF	1,386.00	1,386.00
1360-1920	Insurance	6,000.00	6,000.00
Total		33,122.00	33,122.00

(Motion carried 5-2/Councilmembers Sutton and Wortman opposed)

Carl Heldt: Thank you. There’s also a repeal. I guess you’re going to take that up for the Part-time Bailiff.

President Bassemier: You want to go ahead and take that since he’s up here?

Councilmember Raben: We can while he’s here.

REPEAL/CIRCUIT COURT

Councilmember Raben: Account 1360-1970-1360 Part-time Bailiff. This is a repeal in the amount \$13,000, I’ll move approval.

Councilmember Winnecke: Second.

President Bassemier: Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes. And that passes unanimously.

REPEAL/CIRCUIT COURT		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1360-1970-1360	Part-time Bailiff	13,000.00	13,000.00
Total		13,000.00	13,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

Carl Heldt: The other matter, Mr. Chairman, in good faith as you recall, when I was in here discussing this with you, I offered to give you back the \$13,000 for the computer hook-up and attempt to find it someplace else. That has not been offered as a resolution. I'll stand by my word on that if you still want that back. If you want to give me this without that, that's fine, but I did offer that and if that was the consideration for you voting for this motion, I'll file that next month. You let me know what you want to do.

President Bassemier: What is everybody's pleasure? Anybody want to...want him to. I'm okay with it.

Councilmember Raben: I'm sorry, (inaudible – microphone not turned on)

Carl Heldt: What I was saying was that when I was in here discussing this matter with you, I think maybe last week or last month, I offered to give you back the \$13,000 that you gave me for the computer hook-up in order to help finance this. That's not on the agenda yet because I haven't filed that. But if, in fact, that was a consideration for you voting for this I'll stick by my word, obviously. But we need to do it next month. Is that part of the deal? Is that part of the agreement?

Councilmember Raben: (Inaudible – microphone not turned on)

Carl Heldt: Okay, we'll do that then next month.

President Bassemier: Thank you, sir.

SUPERIOR COURT

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Superior Court.

President Bassemier: Hold on, Jim, we're changing the tape.

(Tape changed)

President Bassemier: We're ready, Jim.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Superior Court 1370-1770-1370, 1370-3700, 1370-1900, 1370-1910 for a total request of \$4,369. I'll move approval.

President Bassemier: Do I have a second?

Councilmember Winnecke: Second.

President Bassemier: Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

SUPERIOR COURT

SUPERIOR COURT		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1370-1770-1370	Clerical Assistant	3,692.00	3,692.00
1370-3700	Dues & Subscriptions	200.00	200.00
1370-1900	FICA	283.00	283.00
1370-1910	PERF	194.00	194.00
Total		4,369.00	4,369.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

**PIGEON TWP. ASSESSOR/REASSESSMENT
GENERAL FUND REPEAL/SHERIFF
GENERAL FUND REPEAL/JAIL**

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Mr. President, I'm going to advance ahead just slightly. Pigeon Township Assessor/Reassessment account 2492-1150-1930 Unemployment for \$5,000. I would also like to include in this motion the two repeal requests for both the Sheriff and the Jail. Sheriff's amount \$31,722 and the Jail \$1380. I'll move approval.

Councilmember Sutton: Second.

President Bassemier: Got a motion and a second. Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

PIGEON TWP. ASSESSOR/REASSESSMENT		REQUESTED	APPROVED
2492-1150-1930	Unemployment	5,000.00	5,000.00
Total		5,000.00	5,000.00

GENERAL FUND REPEAL/SHERIFF		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1050-1130-0114	Chief Deputy/Change to Major	6,688.00	6,688.00
1050-1130-0001	Chief Deputy	2,260.00	2,260.00
1050-1130-0003	Captain/Change to Patrolman	14,900.00	14,900.00
1050-1130-0082	Corporal/Change to Patrolman	7,874.00	7,874.00
Total		31,722.00	31,722.00

GENERAL FUND REPEAL/JAIL		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1051-1130-0401	Paramedic/Change to EMT	1,380.00	1,380.00
Total		1,380.00	1,380.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

TRANSFER REQUESTS

COMMISSIONERS

President Bassemier: Move to the transfers.

Councilmember Raben: The first one is the County Commissioners and I am going to at this time move that we not accept these transfers.

Councilmember Sutton: All of them?

Councilmember Raben: All of them.

President Bassemier: Do I have a second on that?

Councilmember Hoy: Second.

President Bassemier: I have a second. Any discussion? Mr. Sutton?

Councilmember Hoy: Well, they all tie in with what we discussed earlier and then they're going to come back next month.

President Bassemier: They are coming back. That is correct.

Councilmember Sutton: Are you including the Convention & Visitor's Bureau in that, too?

President Bassemier: No, no. We're not there yet.

Councilmember Sutton: Okay, you said transfers. That's why I saying all of them. I thought you were referring to that one, too. Okay.

President Bassemier: Okay. Got a motion and a second. Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

COMMISSIONERS		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1300-1150-1300	Secretary	14,633.00	0.00
1300-3610	Legal Services	85,500.00	0.00
To: 1300-1140-1300	Administrative Assistant	14,633.00	0.00
1300-1130-1300	County Attorney	28,500.00	0.00
1300-1160-1300	County Attorney	28,500.00	0.00
1300-1190-1300	County Attorney	28,500.00	0.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

CONVENTION & VISITORS BUREAU

Councilmember Raben: Okay, next is the Convention & Visitors Bureau. There may be some questions here but I'll move approval of the transfers as they are listed and I'll make that in the form of a motion.

President Bassemier: Do I have a second?

Councilmember Winnecke: Second.

President Bassemier: Any discussion? I guess not.

Councilmember Winnecke: I think it would be helpful, Dolli, if you would just sort of generally outline –

Dolli Kight: Sure. What brought this about was our consultant study that we conducted last fall and his recommendations on where we should be putting most of our dollars, 70% of that into convention marketing, 30% into leisure travel. So what we did was move some of our dollars around. We didn't add anything to our budget, but we pulled money from our Advertising, Show Space Rental. We did take a couple reductions in various positions due to staff turnover and with all that we established an additional salesperson, so we have two Sales Executives out soliciting for convention business and moved dollars around into Convention Sales, Travel, Convention Services. Furniture and Fixtures is to refurbish one of our display booths which is about seven years old.

Councilmember Winnecke: Could you, I mean, the Advertising line item gets hit pretty heavily. How do you see that impacting your overall advertising effort for the year?

Dolli Kight: The consultant recommended that we do a little bit more one on one sales so we're right in front of the customer and so that takes a little bit of the weight off of our advertising. Last year we did more of a blanket advertising. We just made sure we had a print ad and all the materials that we could reach, the meeting planner, and this year we want to get right in front of their face and talk to them, so we don't feel quite the need for the print advertising.

Councilmember Winnecke: Are there specific objectives or goals for this new sales executive?

Dolli Kight: Yes, we have set goals and objectives. We had planned on doing that and going through that in our PowerPoint and I know you guys are running long today; we'll be happy to come back and do that another time if that would be better for Council. But we have set specific numbers on the number of contacts that they need to make. It's a little hard for us to set bookings at this time because we've kind of been out of this convention business and we're looking at this as a benchmark year and going forward. We'll be able to set them specific booking goals. A lot of that, too, we don't control those objectives such as rates or date availability, so our role is mainly to bring the group to the table. Here they are, they're interested in meeting in Evansville and it's up to the Convention Centre and the hotels to negotiate their rates that will satisfy the meeting planner.

President Bassemier: Mr. Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: I appreciate you being mindful of the time because there is another meeting in here at six and some of our folks are involved in that. I would like to see maybe next time could we see this at our Finance and Personnel meeting next month? Will that be soon enough?

Dolli Kight: Whatever works for Council, that's fine.

Councilmember Hoy: I mean, I'd like to see the presentation, but I think we are going over time today.

President Bassemier: Hey, before we all vote, I'd like to recognize a new staff member to your staff. Mr. Whitehouse, would you stand up? I just want to say we've been friends for years and he's a very hard worker and he is going to be an asset to their company. So,
—

Dolli Kight: And to Bob's credit, he has been doing a lot of the leg work on the Association of Indiana Counties and talking with the various Councilmembers and the County Commissioners and trying to get our ducks in a row for that and unfortunately, I think it was just out of our hands and that decision was made without any – I don't think there was anything we could have done.

President Bassemier: I've known him for years and he's a workaholic. We're lucky to get him. We have a motion and a second. Roll call vote please to approve this transfer.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

Dolli Kight: Thank you.

President Bassemier: That passes no trouble.

CONVENTION & VISITORS BUREAU		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 3570-3440	Advertising	70,000.00	70,000.00
3570-3530	Contractual Services	15,000.00	15,000.00
3570-3601	Rental-Show Space	5,000.00	5,000.00
3570-1130-3570	Service/Leisure Sales Mgr.	591.00	591.00
3570-1160-3570	Office Assistant	4,474.00	4,474.00
To: 3570-1170-3570	Sales Executive	31,055.00	31,055.00
3570-1900	FICA	3,500.00	3,500.00
3570-1910	PERF	3,510.00	3,510.00
3570-1920	Insurance	10,000.00	10,000.00
3570-1930	Unemployment	1,500.00	1,500.00
3570-3120	Postage/Freight	5,000.00	5,000.00
3570-3130	Travel/Mileage	13,000.00	13,000.00
3570-3380	Photography/Blue Prints	2,000.00	2,000.00
3570-3700	Dues & Subscriptions	5,000.00	5,000.00
3570-3792	Customer Sales	8,500.00	8,500.00
3570-3794	Convention Services	10,000.00	10,000.00
3570-4210	Office Furniture	2,000.00	2,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

AMENDMENTS TO SALARY ORDINANCE

President Bassemier: Jim, would you take the amendments to the –

Councilmember Raben: I would be glad to. First we have the Sheriff and the Sheriff/Jail. There is an attachment for that, that everyone received which is for account 1050 and 1051. I'll move that those amendments be made as previously adopted. Circuit Court, I'll move to amend the Salary Ordinance for line 1360-1390 Bailiff as previously adopted and account 1360-1970 Part-time Bailiff as previously adopted. Superior Court, I'll move to amend the Salary Ordinance for line 1370-1970 or excuse me, 1370-1770 Clerical Assistant as previously adopted. Then we've got longevity increments to address for the Jail/Sheriff so I would move that the Detention Officers receive \$500 for every three years of service effective the pay period following the anniversary date of hire. And Community Corrections, I would move we pay \$500 for every three years of service effective the pay period following the anniversary date of hire. Then along with that, I am not going to go through all of these so I asked Sandie to prepare these. You've got four other pages of amendments. I would like to enter these in as part of our minutes and move that they also

be approved¹. Then we've got the Community Corrections Salary Ordinance amendments, they're not completed as of yet. I would move along with this that we adopt those on our March 7th meeting. So I make that in the form of a motion.

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: Okay. Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

JAIL

President Bassemier: Anything on Old Business?

Councilmember Raben: Mr. President, I know everybody is trying to get out of here but again, I probably should have brought this up earlier but there was some action taken Monday as to extend any further services with Project Management Services, Inc. which we all know as PMSI. And if you look back approximately 14 or 15 months ago, this body, the County Commissioners, the Blue Ribbon Committee, which is made up of both parties, had assigned the task to our Sheriff to come up with an outfit that he was comfortable in working with to resolve our overcrowding issue. I know I was very much a part of that decision making. I know Brad had – when I refer to Brad, Sheriff Ellsworth, and I really should include Eric Williams because through all those conversations they were both a team working hand in hand and they were both very much a part of that decision process. The monkey was put on their back, basically. I know in one meeting Commissioner Mourdock and I told those two gentlemen, go out and find somebody, bring him to us. So we had a meeting with those individuals and we were quite comfortable with them. We decided that these were the people that we want working with this county. So later at

¹Salary Ordinance amendments attached.

some point and I don't have dates, I can tell you it was roughly 14 months ago – I'm in the area, correct? The Blue Ribbon Committee voted in favor of using Project Management Services based on their decision and honestly, these two guys are the people that I was particularly comfortable with making that decision. They've been a part of the jail overcrowding situation for how many years? For Sheriff Ellsworth?

Brad Ellsworth: Nineteen.

Councilmember Raben: Nineteen. Chief Deputy Williams?

Eric Williams: Thirteen.

Councilmember Raben: Thirteen years. Okay. So I believed in their judgement fourteen months ago. The Commissioners believed in their judgement fourteen months ago and this body believed in their judgement fourteen months ago. So why would we not continue if they've seen progress? They're comfortable with working with PMSI, it's my opinion that most of this body is still very comfortable working with PMSI. Why would we want to go backwards and delay this another 60 or 90 days looking for another firm? Does anyone –

Councilmember Sutton: I think, Councilman Raben...I don't want to go back and do something I said I wouldn't do and that is quote from the newspaper. I think I said that last week but I guess I will. I think there was a lot of effort and time put in that and obviously resources and I think one of the Commissioners did indicate they're willing to go back and revisit that issue and I think when we look at this process, we all are recognizing that there has been a ton of time put into this and a lot of hours and we want to make the best decision possible. But ultimately, we are the fiscal body. We look at the financial end of this. The Commissioners, in their role as the County Executives, approve the contracts for the county. That's not our role or position. We can state what our opinion may be on the use of any particular vendor, but it is the Commissioners who ultimately make that call. But I think that the input from the Sheriff's Department, I think, has been invaluable in terms of what they have provided with this and I am glad to see that this issue will likely be revisited. So I don't know if it's really appropriate before this body for us to banter this whole issue around because we don't have that ability to approve. We can express opinions but I don't know if this is necessarily the time for us to do that.

President Bassemier: Thank you, Mr. Sutton. Jim, where are you going with this?

Councilmember Raben: Well, I would like this body to send a message to the Commissioners that there again, we are the body that eventually is going to have to fund whoever they bring to the table. I know that if we, this late in the game, if we start with a new party there's going to be a larger expense just in terms of them going back through and familiarizing themselves with the process. And again, these people have developed a whole new culture inside this building. I mean, we don't do business today as we did a year ago. And again, my point in this is, and I would like to see a vote in support of continuing service with PMSI.

Councilmember Sutton: We don't have the ability to do that.

President Bassemier: Hold on. Before we do – Jim, I think, most of us were at the meeting Monday night and I think in all fairness, and I'm not going yes or no on anything, I don't think we ought to take a vote on anything on something like this until Catherine and Dave are in the room so they can – they've got a viewpoint, too, and I just, I don't know if this is the right thing to do when they're not here. And I'm not disagreeing with you because I have a lot of confidence in PMSI also. That's just my opinion. Mr. Winnecke, you had your hand up.

(Councilmember Wortman left meeting)

Councilmember Winnecke: I haven't said much today on this issue and I guess I think to

explain my vote earlier on the funding, I think what the Commission did on Monday as a body to delay, ultimately delay the project, was wrong. I think by us making a positive step by saying here's 2.7 million dollars, we know we can set aside this year, is a positive step forward. And I agree, we may not have any legal or constitutional grounds to pass a resolution and I think you're right, too. Catherine and David should probably be here to hear this. But clearly, I think this body has a right to say we'd like PMSI because too many people in this body and who come to this body requesting funding have put a lot of time in on it.

President Bassemier: Thank you, Mr. Winnecke.

Councilmember Tornatta: Just a quick comment and I think this should go on the record just to clarify things. I've heard nothing – kind of mixed emotions from people that have seen things in the paper and have heard about things. I think the PMSI, continuing with them, is going to be a structured situation and I think that many people think that, here again, we're just out to do another study. This would not be a study situation and we would have control on what they would do and it would be to my estimation on an hourly basis. So as not to say that we're coming out with once again another study, which is what no one wants to hear, it's merely just stating the purpose of this is just to move things forward and to give us the advantages of having somebody with experience on board who has familiarity with our situations around this county.

President Bassemier: Any more discussion? Mr. Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: I don't believe we have a motion on the floor, do we, Mr. Raben? Was that a motion?

Councilmember Raben: Well, maybe a motion is not in order, but again, I want it to go on record –

Councilmember Sutton: Well, I think, Jim, I don't mean to cut you off, I mean, I think that the degree to which we feel strongly about this no matter which side you may fall, I think we need to be at the Commissioners' meeting to express that. And I think as a Councilmember, I think that has some credibility and that means something, but with a Councilmember expressing those concerns, but I think in their meeting is the place where we need to do that where it's most appropriate.

President Bassemier: I'll echo that.

Councilmember Hoy: And I believe I am correct in saying they are not meeting this coming Monday night because it's a holiday. It's –

Councilmember Tornatta: The 26th, I believe.

Councilmember Hoy: For the next two weeks because of the presidents' holidays.

Suzanne Crouch: Actually, they have instructed the Auditor's Office to advertise a special meeting on February 22nd, a Thursday evening at 6:00 for discussion of the jail.

President Bassemier: I tell you, I'd like to say, I sure hate to vote on anything that we're voting on that pertains to a certain party that's not here to answer questions about it or whatever. I just think that we're wrong here by doing that and I just want to say that one more time.

Councilmember Raben: I think we've all agreed to that here as a political head. Again, maybe my point in this is expressing my feelings to you and the Sheriff and all parties involved and this is my place to do it, and I want to go on record as –

Councilmember Tornatta: And it's an open meeting. I appreciate hearing what you have to say because many times we get ridiculed for expressing those opinions in private and

I'd rather this be open so we have some type of cohesiveness with all of us on the Council.

Councilmember Hoy: Well, two of us did express publically our opinions Monday night. I did and Mr. Tornatta did in the Commissioners' meeting I think we made it real clear where we stood. And I am certain, Mr. Raben, you have a right to express that feeling which I hold very strongly, as the Sheriff knows because I expressed that to him and expressed that in the meeting. I don't know that we need –

President Bassemier: (Inaudible – microphone not turned on)

Councilmember Hoy: Yeah, and I have something else I want to bring to your attention. It won't take but a minute but we need to – what's that?

President Bassemier: We've got abandoned vehicles, yet. I think Sandie wants to address this.

Councilmember Hoy: Let's do abandoned vehicles and then I just have something we need to consider, I think.

(Jail discussion continued on page 36)

ABANDONED VEHICLES

Sandie Deig: The County Attorney, Phil Hayes, has asked that the Council request the Auditor to advertise the ordinance, I guess, for abandoned vehicles. It's my understanding, I think Mrs. Crouch has something...

Suzanne Crouch: I thought Monday, Sheriff Ellsworth, I wasn't there but didn't they kind of leave it where they were going to resolve some issues at their next meeting and wanted me to be there? I wasn't there at Monday's meeting. Maybe you –

Brad Ellsworth: I swear I heard it. My ears are going. I think they did. Brad Ellsworth, Sheriff. I think they did table that. They were trying to work out some things and they asked Jerry Bryan to see, there was something with the city and see if they would adopt the paperwork trail and, I guess, with a fee and tack it on theirs and see if they would work on that, but I think they were looking for some more information on that, too.

Sandie Deig: I didn't hear anything else from the County Attorney.

Jeff Ahlers: Phil Hayes and I have spoken a couple times this week. I thought that what he was going to do was redraft it and resubmit it because they were going to change the way it is currently written. I mean, now it has in there, well yeah, he was going to make the changes you're talking about and I said well, I think you ought to redraft it and resubmit it and then advertise it. And that's what I thought was going to happen but maybe I am mistaken, so...

Suzanne Crouch: He indicated in conversation that he had spoken with you but...

Jeff Ahlers: Well, maybe what we can do is just have him, you know, if he wants us to advertise his new one, but I mean, I guess he ought to submit it to us.

Sandie Deig: I think they need to determine who is going to do the work first, though.

Brad Ellsworth: Right. If I can comment real quick. I said that Monday night, I'll be brief, and I was up there three hours. But the question is, traditionally we had where the state, when we found an abandoned vehicle and towed it in to Mike's towing, the state would take after 30 - 60 - 90 days, the state would auction those and get the proceeds. The city started a program where they were doing it locally and getting a percentage off each car. Wolfe's Auto Auction was selling the cars and the city collected somewhere in the area of

\$60,000, was it? Suzanne, do you remember?

Suzanne Crouch: I was thinking it was more like \$48,000. That was on 654 cars.

Brad Ellsworth: Right. The county is certainly not going to have that kind of volume. In fact, the officer I put in charge of that a couple of years ago has already taken about 300 cars out of the county, so we won't see the proceeds off those. But I think the thing we discussed in the meeting, is the amount of work that the paperwork is causing going to be worth more than what we're going to see in proceeds? If it's not going to be a profit to us, we're better off letting the state do it. If it's going to make us something, like I said, but if it takes one of my people or Suzanne's people, a \$25,000 a year person, and we make ten, it's probably not a good business practice.

Suzanne Crouch: And I did do some research. Jerry Bryan had submitted some records of vehicles that were actually sold and I spoke to someone in your department, Deputy Poston –

Brad Ellsworth: Jim Poston.

Suzanne Crouch: And then when I actually went out to Mike's and sat down and reviewed the records and had them go over it, and what we determined is that there were actually 195 cars that were sold last year, but only 45 to 50 is what Deputy Poston told me were abandoned vehicles. Now that 195 cars generated \$3,295 and we're talking about only 45 to 50 of those.

Unidentified: 185 cars?

Suzanne Crouch: They're wrecked, most of them don't sell because they are wrecked –

Brad Ellsworth: They are in parts – these are the ones that people use for doghouses and there's trees growing through the trunks and planters – not on the west side, though.

Suzanne Crouch: And what happens to those –

Unidentified: (Inaudible – microphone not turned on)

Brad Ellsworth: Yeah, in Darmstadt. Let's pick on him.

Suzanne Crouch: So our concern was, is there really any money in this for the county?

Unidentified: (Inaudible – microphone not turned on)

Suzanne Crouch: Perhaps we'd better table it..

Brad Ellsworth: I think so.

Councilmember Raben: I'll move that we table this, the abandoned vehicle issue.

Councilmember Hoy: I second it.

Brad Ellsworth: Could I make one quick comment before, about the jail thing and I don't know what the direction, I met with the Commissioners individually this afternoon and I don't know if they're going to actually hire a different consultant or not.

President Bassemier: Excuse me, Sheriff, let's get this motion out of the way and then we'll go ahead.

Brad Ellsworth: Oh, I'm sorry.

President Bassemier: Everybody raise their right hand to defer.

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

President Bassemier: Is there any other business?

EMPLOYEE CHANGES (PINK SLIPS)

Sandie Deig: I just need some direction from the Council. Did I understand you to say there will not be a Commission meeting until the 22nd of February?

Suzanne Crouch: That is correct. Is it the –

Councilmember Tornatta: The 26th is the –

Suzanne Crouch: Is that the Monday? This is the 22nd they called a special meeting. They instructed us to advertise a special meeting.

Councilmember Tornatta: Executive meeting?

Suzanne Crouch: Just a special meeting to deal with the jail issue at 6:00. It's a Thursday. I believe the 22nd is a Thursday, isn't it?

Sandie Deig: Well, my question is, we have a number of pink slips coming through and normally I pick those up every week, check the salaries, sign off on them and give them to the Commissioners. The Auditor will not put those people on payroll until we have the Commissioners' signature on there, so I need some direction from this Council. What do you want me to do with all the –

Councilmember Raben: (Inaudible – microphone not turned on)

Sandie Deig: Before, in the past, I have taken like one or two to the individual Commissioners and had them sign off on them. I mean, I can do that but I want somebody up here on Friday so we're not holding up anyone's payroll.

Suzanne Crouch: And typically, if we do have occasions where, because of meetings that doesn't happen. If Sandie signs off on it and a Commissioner signs off on it, then we're comfortable in paying that individual until they can go through a Commissioners' meeting. And I think Sandie is just wanting to know if she has permission to –

Sandie Deig: Yeah, we're talking about a payroll, a whole pay period here.

Councilmember Tornatta: I'm fine with that.

Councilmember Hoy: I'm fine with it.

Councilmember Raben: I'm fine.

Sandie Deig: Okay.

JAIL (CONTINUED FROM PAGE 34)

President Bassemier: Did you have something about the jail, sir?

Brad Ellsworth: Sure. A, I appreciated, Monday night I know that we had three or four County Councilmen at that meeting and that's very much appreciated from our office. One thing we can thank goodness for is that we're probably, in our careers with county government, only going to go through this once. I don't know if we could live through it again. If we get through it in our careers.

Councilmember Sutton: If we hang on as long as Curt we might go through it about three times.

Brad Ellsworth: That's true. But I think it's going to be important, and I know I've made this speech that we all stay together on this, I don't know if the new Commissioners are going to hire a new consultant. I met with them an hour ago and it looks like they're ready to move ahead and I guess as the guy who lives down there what seems like 24 hours a day, I'm kind of in that rocking horse position of I almost feel like a liaison here and want to see that continued. Like I said, regardless of political affiliation, we need to stay together and be singing out of the same pew on this if that's possible. And I think that's going to take communication with everybody to see this through because we owe it to the public. And, like I said, I really appreciate you all coming to those meetings because then we're not reading about it in the paper what the other one said and getting our hair bristling up about something they read or somebody said so.

President Bassemier: I've got a question about the jail. In your opinion, I know we're talking about location and how big it's going to be, would you say that it would be an ideal situation if we could build this jail on one level (inaudible – microphone not turned on).

Councilmember Hoy: We shouldn't be discussing this. I feel uncomfortable with this discussion until we finish –

President Bassemier: I was going to pass some information on to you. You don't have to answer that. I just found out if we do build it on a flat level, it's going to take at least five acres just under structure. If you're talking about 200,000 square foot plus, so we're talking about (inaudible) then it's going to take another 15 acres (inaudible).

Brad Ellsworth: That's all those planning questions we have to answer and, you know, if that's how we want to build it and will it fit on a site we select, and that's all those questions that we have to plan, and that's not a study, a plan of action for here on out and that's what we lobbied for Monday. We'll work through that. I mean, like I said, if they decide not to hire anybody, if they hire an architect, they have planning teams. It's just, it's not what we learned in our schools, but –

Councilmember Raben: I feel like we all got spoiled because for the last year and a half, politics has never entered this process whatsoever. You know, we've worked together as a team, everyone of us, and it wasn't until as of recently that hairs have begun to split. But hopefully, we can get back on track and get back to normal again.

Brad Ellsworth: We're going to have to get back. It's going to have to be because, like I said, this is the biggest project any of us in here will ever take on and it's not a pleasant – I'd rather not do it. I mean, it's going to make life pretty, you know, I'd like to worry about law enforcement duties, but I think that's out the window, but it's something necessary. It's going to come up and we'll get through it but I think we need to work as a team and I would encourage the Council to communicate with the Commissioners. I left the Commissioners saying hey, you've got to talk to Council, so – you're kicking me off the floor, aren't you?

Councilmember Sutton: Just didn't get enough on Monday, did you, Sheriff?

Brad Ellsworth: No. Pat Shoulders taught me that.

Councilmember Hoy: He taught you what?

Brad Ellsworth: No. They say Pat likes a mike and I didn't want to be compared to Pat.

OLD COURTHOUSE

Councilmember Hoy: You mean Pat and Mike? Mr. President, there is an issue that I think we need to make a statement on. This has to do with the Old Courthouse and I want to

express my opinion and then make a motion for a resolution. It seems to me at this time with all that we have to consider as a County Council and County Commissioners with the Jail, so that presently it would be very wise of us to consider appropriating some funds to the Old Courthouse to assist them with their utility bills so that they have some time to regroup, look at the level of their rents and that kind of thing. I don't know how to do that except to make a motion that we contact the Old Courthouse Preservation Society, is that it, and ask them to prepare some sort of appropriation to come before us, probably has to go through the Commissioners.

Unidentified: (Inaudible)

Councilmember Hoy: It does have to go through the Commissioners? The logical one would be the Commissioners and, I am trying to shorten this motion, let me start again. I move that –

Unidentified: (Inaudible)

Councilmember Hoy: I think we need to say something publically so that we get that moving because they can't pay their utility bills.

Councilmember Raben: Do we need to throw a figure in there?

Councilmember Hoy: I would say that we throw a figure in there of \$40,000. That we overture the Commissioners to consider a request – here is my motion, that we overture the Commissioners to consider a request from the Courthouse Preservation Society for \$40,000 to assist them with their utility burden at this time.

Councilmember Winnecke: Second.

Councilmember Hoy: This is simply an overture. We have a second.

President Bassemier: Let's see if I understand this. You want us to ask them to request \$40,000 from the Commissioners –

Councilmember Hoy: Exactly, so that we send a positive signal to them because I don't think we need to have that building sitting in our doorstep, handed to us and say well, here, you've got it back. We have enough to deal with.

Councilmember Sutton: Do we know that that's the only issue that they have? I mean, is that the only financial related concern that they have that has gotten them to this point? Because –

Councilmember Hoy: It's the overriding, it's the overriding concern and it's a temporary fix to give them a chance to look at their rent levels and also – I may as well be candid. Why not? I think they were counting on the county renting the second floor for court rooms and if that ever happens, it's not going to happen soon enough. That whole second floor is vacant and I think it was a miscalculation on their part and I think we need to look beyond that to the value of making sure that building is in good shape and –

President Bassemier: (Inaudible – microphone not turned on)

Councilmember Hoy: Well, I looked at what they owed, how much they owe. They owe about \$11,000 for one month.

President Bassemier: (Inaudible – microphone not turned on)

Councilmember Raben: They can bring in the –

Councilmember Hoy: They can bring the bills in.

(Inaudible – several speaking at once)

Councilmember Hoy: Yeah, that's all. Just to send a positive note to them that we want to work with them, this is a building worth preserving and I think for everybody's sake right now, this is probably what we need to do and then we can address other issues later.

President Bassemier: I have a motion and a second. (Inaudible)

Councilmember Hoy: That's okay. It was a long motion.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

Councilmember Sutton: Mr. President, one other item. I don't want to sound like I am slow of foot or anything, Suzanne, but help me to see this on this Riverboat thing again. Help me to see that. On the cash balance that we started out with, the amount that we budgeted, and then ultimately what we have on the unappropriated line.

Suzanne Crouch: People could come in and file appropriations for and they can actually, in the past they can put it in any three of those line items that they want. So someone could come in and file for that entire amount in Economic Development if they want.

Councilmember Sutton: But our dollars from last year, where are they?

Councilmember Hoy: Mr. President, I move we adjourn.

Suzanne Crouch: Well, Riverboat is part of the General Fund.

Councilmember Tornatta: Second.

President Bassemier: Everybody in favor, say aye.

Councilmember Sutton: Well, wait. I am trying to ask a question and you're adjourning on me. She's helping me out here. I think it's going to be helpful here.

Councilmember Hoy: Do you want it on the record?

Councilmember Sutton: Well, –

President Bassemier: Do you want us to stop the tape or –

Councilmember Sutton: Well, go ahead.

(Inaudible – several speaking at once.)

(Meeting adjourned at 5:25 p.m.)

VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL

President Ed Bassemier

Vice President Lloyd Winnecke

Councilmember James Raben

Councilmember Phil Hoy

Councilmember Curt Wortman

Councilmember Royce Sutton

Councilmember Troy Tornatta

Recorded and transcribed by Teri Lukeman.

**VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL
MINUTES
APRIL 4, 2001**

The Vanderburgh County Council met in session the 4th day of April, 2001 in room 301 of the Civic Center Complex. The meeting was called to order at 3:37 p.m. by County Council President Ed Bassemier.

President Bassemier: Eric, would you open the meeting, please?

(Chief Deputy Sheriff Eric Williams opened the meeting)

President Bassemier: Thank you, sir. I want to welcome everybody to the April 4th, 2001 County Council meeting. Attendance roll call, please?

COUNCILMEMBER	PRESENT	ABSENT
Councilmember Tornatta	X	
Councilmember Sutton		X
Councilmember Wortman	X	
Councilmember Hoy	X	
Councilmember Raben	X	
Councilmember Winnecke	X	
President Bassemier	X	

President Bassemier: Would everyone please stand for the Pledge of Allegiance?

(Pledge of Allegiance was given)

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES
MARCH 7, 2001**

President Bassemier: We need a motion to approve the minutes of March 7, 2001.

Councilmember Hoy: So moved.

President Bassemier: Do I have a second?

Councilmember Raben: Second.

President Bassemier: All in favor, raise your right hand.

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATION REQUESTS

President Bassemier: Jim, are you ready on the appropriation ordinance?

CLERK IV-D

Councilmember Raben: I'm ready. Okay, first on the agenda is the Clerk IV-D account. Account number 1011-4220 Office Machines in the amount of \$6,800. I'll move approval.

President Bassemier: Second?

Councilmember Winnecke: Second.

President Bassemier: Roll call please.

Councilmember Tornatta: Hold on.

President Bassemier: Oh, I'm sorry. Discussion?

Councilmember Tornatta: I talked with Marsha today and we kind of came up with a way that it looks like we can handle this and get totally reimbursed. The Council can get reimbursed for 100% of this and you give me the number and I'll explain how we're going to do it. How about that?

Marsha Abell: You mean the number –

Councilmember Tornatta: The total number, what was the total number?

Marsha Abell: The equipment is \$26,000.

Councilmember Tornatta: Okay. The way that this is set up, we can have – we can pay for the full amount, get reimbursed from the state from the IV-D money 66%, she will repeal the remainder of that money back to the Council and that should cover the Council and get her the machinery she needs. And I checked this out with the state and they said that was fine.

Marsha Abell: And I can't do that. If I pay it all out of my account, I can't get the same amount back that you all can get back because that's all money the state's already given me. Mr. Tornatta called me today and then he talked to Joe Mamlin at Family & Children's Services and then I talked to him afterward, and this way the state will pay back – I'm going to use a round figure of \$30,000. If it was 30, you'd pay 20 and I'd give you ten of my IV-D money and then the state would give you back 20, and then I can get 66% of my ten. So I'll get back \$6,000 of my ten, so we're only going to spend about \$4,000 that way, whereas with new equipment purchased I couldn't get it back. It can only come back to you all. It comes back to the general fund, it doesn't come back to me.

Councilmember Raben: So what is the appropriate amount we need to set in here?

Marsha Abell: Well, we need \$26,000 but we're going to have to change numbering, the line items here and I don't know what the line item numbers are.

Councilmember Raben: I tell you what we may want to do, Marsha, if we're going to add \$20,000 to this line, we probably need to table this until last on our agenda because we can't exceed our appropriations over and above what's been advertised. So, you know, hopefully, there will be some cuts from some other lines so we don't exceed what's been advertised.

Marsha Abell: The end of the agenda today, you mean?

Councilmember Raben: Right, put it at the end of the appropriations.

Marsha Abell: Okay, that's fine.

Councilmember Bassemier: Okay.

Councilmember Wortman: I think in the IV-D we always did get reimbursed two-thirds anyway divided up to the Prosecutor, the Clerk and the County Council, if I remember.

Marsha Abell: Under equipment, that all comes back to the general, I don't get any of that. So see, it would all be coming back to you. It wouldn't be split three ways. It would all come back to the county general.

Councilmember Wortman: They've cut back considerable, though, too.

Councilmember Raben: Marsha, it is \$26,800 or \$26,000?

Marsha Abell: It's \$26,000.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, at this time I'm going to withdraw my motion.

President Bassemier: You're going to rescind it? Who seconded it?

Councilmember Tornatta: That's under the IV-D fund and it's for – now this is for the printer, is that what I'm to understand?

Marsha Abell: Yes. And this is under the child support only expense.

Councilmember Tornatta: And that's for the printing of the child support checks?

Marsha Abell: Correct. That's a machine that prints those checks.

Sandie Deig: It would still be Office Machines.

Marsha Abell: Well, the reason I was taking it out of there is because I don't have money to purchase it in my IV-D account. I've only got about \$13,000 in there.

Councilmember Tornatta: But if you did this, you could get out of the IV-D...

Marsha Abell: But if we did it this way, see, I can pay my third to the county out of my IV-D account and then the county will take the entire bill and we'll send it to the state, of which they'll send back 66%. And if I pay the 33%, then the county ends up not paying anything.

Councilmember Tornatta: Is that...

Suzanne Crouch: I think Sandie's right. You can use that same line item that is here. You would just –

Marsha Abell: Increase it?

Suzanne Crouch: – to \$26,000, but you'd have to wait until the end of the appropriations and make sure you have that much.

Marsha Abell: I'm willing to wait. That's fine.

President Bassemier: And so we need to rescind both motions.

Councilmember Raben: Well, I've withdrawn mine, I don't know who was –

(Inaudible – several speaking at once)

Councilmember Tornatta: I didn't throw a motion on the floor, I was just explaining what we could do as a statement.

President Bassemier: Curt, did you second that?

Councilmember Winnecke: No, I did. I'll rescind the second.

Marsha Abell: Okay, thank you. I'll wait. Thank you.

President Bassemier: We'll call you back.

PROPERTY TAX ASSESSMENT/BOARD OF APPEALS

Councilmember Raben: Okay, next, Property Tax Assessment Board of Appeals, 1091-3530 and 1091-1990, for a total request of \$5,700. I'll move approval.

President Bassemier: Do I have a second?

Councilmember Winnecke: Second.

President Bassemier: Any discussion? Mr. Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yeah, I'd like to ask if this is involved in the GIS? Is the representative from the County Assessor here?

President Bassemier: Ms. Musgrave, do you want to come forward?

Cheryl Musgrave: Cheryl Musgrave, County Assessor. And yes, it's to pay the part-time person to assist in proofreading the plat sheets.

Councilmember Wortman: That comes out of the GIS fund?

Cheryl Musgrave: I think this is a general fund appropriation request.

Councilmember Wortman: It's general fund, okay.

President Bassemier: Any more discussion?

Councilmember Winnecke: Cheryl, the \$133,000 or so that the county has appropriated for GIS this year, for 2001, do you have a feel for what additional appropriations you will need like this for the balance of the year that exceed that \$133,000?

Cheryl Musgrave: I'm fairly certain that this will cover it. We're just getting started in proofing the plat maps. This would cover a part-time employee for me through the rest of the year so I'm fairly certain this is it and the rest of the money that you're speaking of, that was appropriated for this year and has a set purpose. And it's not just a pot of money I can go back to, okay.

Councilmember Winnecke: And just so – I may have asked you this last week and I may have forgotten, I'm sorry – this person is already employed on staff, or not?

Cheryl Musgrave: Yes.

Councilmember Winnecke: Okay.

Councilmember Tornatta: Just to catch me up on the budget, what criteria did you work on? Was this in the original budget when you budgeted last year? Do you know?

Cheryl Musgrave: Well, I could look through it if you want me to.

Councilmember Tornatta: And not being here, I don't –

Councilmember Winnecke: That's why it's here.

Councilmember Tornatta: Okay, I didn't know if it wasn't allowed or it was -- someplace it was cut.

Cheryl Musgrave: No, as I mentioned last week, when budgets were submitted and they were going through the approval process, we didn't have any of the information at our disposal to know what we would have to do with the plat conversion process. So that all developed after the budgets were set.

Councilmember Tornatta: What kind of extra help do you see coming out of the township level?

Cheryl Musgrave: They're here and so I am sure they will discuss that with you.

Councilmember Tornatta: Okay, but you're controlling that system, I mean, is that right? Are you – you're heading that up. I just wanted to know from your perspective, is that going to require some extra help in those areas?

Cheryl Musgrave: Probably, but I'll let them speak for their own townships. This extra person, Extra Help person on my budget will be on loan to them throughout the process. This person, for example, this week is assisting in Pigeon Township and then when the next group comes in, they'll go to that township. So they will actually be in the township offices helping.

Councilmember Tornatta: Is that a field situation or is that just in the office?

Cheryl Musgrave: Well, I believe the township assessors would prefer the person to be in their office working on their maps where they can see them. So with the in-house offices yes, they'll go actually to the township. When it comes to the out-house, out of the Civic Center Offices, those maps are maintained in my office, and so they'll work there then.

Councilmember Tornatta: Alright, thanks.

President Bassemier: Mr. Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Cheryl, let me ask you something. Because there are some funds existing in these accounts, could we, I mean, do you see a problem with deferring this, this month and putting it back on the meeting for next month?

Cheryl Musgrave: Well, let me ask our payroll clerk. Tammy does all the payroll and I'd prefer that she answer that.

President Bassemier: Please state your name please.

Tammy Elkins: Tammy Elkins, Chief Deputy, County Assessor's Office. The current funds for the Extra Help will run out by May 11th, 2001.

Cheryl Musgrave: So, a month delay, will that be alright, then, Suzanne? No, so not for this one, no.

Suzanne Crouch: You won't get State Board approval until the end of May, so the money from May 11th to the end of May, they'd have to let someone go, I would presume. You wouldn't be able to pay them.

Councilmember Raben: We could simply cut that line back to 500 or something.

Cheryl Musgrave: Cut it back and then come back. Okay.

Councilmember Raben: Alright, we'll do that until everybody is a little more clear on this situation. I'll withdraw my motion and I'm going to make a new motion.

Councilmember Winnecke: I'll withdraw the second.

Councilmember Raben: Okay. My new motion is 1091-3530 be set in at zero, and 1091-1990 at \$500, and I make that in the form of a motion.

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

Councilmember Raben: And that will for sure give you enough to operate through the end

of May.

Cheryl Musgrave: Hold on. You're going to zero out 3530, is that what you said?

Councilmember Raben: 3530 for today, yes.

Cheryl Musgrave: And you want me to re-file that one?

Councilmember Raben: Right.

Cheryl Musgrave: Okay, because I think we can get through May.

Councilmember Raben: \$500 additional will carry you through the end of May, right, on the Extra Help?

Cheryl Musgrave: The Extra Help, I need now. The 3530, the Contractual Services, I can re-file and wait one month.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, but I thought we said that the roughly \$1,000 in the Extra Help that's available today would carry you through May 11th.

Councilmember Tornatta: Those are two different items, aren't they?

Cheryl Musgrave: Right.

President Bassemier: (Inaudible – microphone not turned on)

Cheryl Musgrave: Well, I understand what you're trying to do, just don't cut 1091. Go ahead and cut 3530 – I mean, don't cut 1091 a lot!

Councilmember Raben: What I was doing is, there's \$1,000 in there unspent right now –

Cheryl Musgrave: And we're going to run out by May 11th.

Councilmember Raben: I was putting an additional \$500 in to cover it through May because you'll be back in here May 1st. You'll be back in here May 1st. Suzanne, will that not work?

Cheryl Musgrave: Can you make it \$1,000, Jim?

Councilmember Raben: I don't know. Okay, let's simplify it. My motion is that 1091-1990 be set in at \$1,000.

Cheryl Musgrave: And 3530?

Councilmember Raben: No, 3530, set in at zero.

Cheryl Musgrave: And we'll re-file that.

Councilmember Raben: 1990 set in at \$1,000.

Councilmember Winnecke: But they're going to run out.

Councilmember Raben: No, they're not.

Councilmember Wortman: I'll second that. I'll accept your amendment and then I'll second that other motion. Alright. Now, Mr. President, are you open for discussion?

President Bassemier: Yes.

Councilmember Wortman: Yes. Okay, Ms. Musgrave, including the attorney, do you have

to have an attorney or can you use the County Attorney?

Cheryl Musgrave: Have to have an attorney.

Councilmember Wortman: What, ma'am?

Cheryl Musgrave: I do have to have an attorney on the board.

Councilmember Wortman: You do? The County Attorney can't serve and do that?

Cheryl Musgrave: Oh, if you want to retrain somebody, sure.

Councilmember Wortman: Retrain? Well, attorneys are pretty well all trained, aren't they, Jeff? That's the only thing. We get –

Councilmember Tornatta: That's on that tax board, isn't it?

Cheryl Musgrave: Yeah.

Councilmember Tornatta: The one that – what's her name?

Cheryl Musgrave: Rebecca Kasha.

Councilmember Tornatta: Curt, she deals with tax assessment and she's on the board. She serves on that board.

Councilmember Wortman: How often do you need an attorney? How many times a month, a week, or what?

Cheryl Musgrave: Oh, it's probably, this year we may have four or five meetings.

Councilmember Wortman: Four or five meetings?

Cheryl Musgrave: Hey, we're good. We're keeping those appeals out of this county. Did you get that article I sent you about all the trouble all those other counties are having with those bad appeals? You aren't having that problem here and our attorney is a big help in that effort. So be penny-wise and pound foolish on that one. So I just wouldn't swap attorneys is what I am telling you. She's good, she's already trained.

Councilmember Wortman: We could loan our attorney out here for them four or five meetings.

Cheryl Musgrave: Well, now that would be nice. Does he work for free?

Councilmember Tornatta: Attorney for hire!

Councilmember Wortman: I'm just trying to save money here, you know.

Councilmember Hoy: Do you work for free, Jeff?

Councilmember Wortman: Cause we've got to hold these taxes down. Okay.

Councilmember Raben: Alright, call for the question.

Councilmember Winnecke: Could you clarify the motion?

Councilmember Raben: The motion is 1091-3530 zero, 1091-1990 \$1,000.

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

PROPERTY TAX ASSESSMENT BD. OF APPEALS REQUESTED			APPROVED
1091-3530	Contractual Services	2,700.00	0.00
1091-1990	Extra Help	3,000.00	1,000.00
Total		5,700.00	1,000.00

(Motion carried 5-1/Councilmember Wortman opposed)

KNIGHT TOWNSHIP ASSESSOR

President Bassemier: Okay, Jim.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Knight Township Assessor, 1130-1990 Extra Help – I believe the officeholder has prepared a few things for us and would like to come up to the podium – but at this time to get it on the floor, I am going to move that it be deferred to bring it to the floor.

Councilmember Wortman: I second it.

President Bassemier: Okay, any discussion?

Councilmember Tornatta: Well, Mr. Folz...

Councilmember Raben: Mr. Folz, would you come forward please?

President Bassemier: State your name, sir, for the record.

Al Folz: Al Folz, Knight Township Assessor.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, last week your Chief Deputy was in and we had asked if –

Al Folz: I was gone.

Councilmember Raben: – possible to gather some information for us and I don't – have you had an opportunity to do that?

Al Folz: Yes, I have.

Councilmember Raben: Okay.

Al Folz: Yes, I have.

Councilmember Raben: Alright. Were you going to pass it around or are you just going to keep it to yourself?

Al Folz: I'm going to talk to you about it, okay?

Councilmember Raben: Okay, you've got the mike.

Al Folz: Alright, are we talking about the deferring of my Extra Help money or are we talking about Reassessment?

Councilmember Raben: Well, let's talk about Reassessment first.

Al Folz: Okay, that's fine. There we go, I found it. Alright, up to now on our Reassessment, and I am speaking here now of Knight Township, I don't know what the rest of them has on theirs, I have spent \$231,526 and 11 cents. Okay, now what have I accomplished for this kind of money? Well, this is my fourth reassessment so we're very cautious on what we do, what we spend and we know what to spend, what to spend it on. Alright, now we've got two reassessments now this time. One is land reassessment where we have to redo all the land and the next is our general reassessment. In other words where we go around now and data collect from the homes, see what people have added that there was no building permit. And people are very, very versatile. You know, there's things on these homes that you just wouldn't believe a person can do. But they do.

Councilmember Hoy: It's a creative community.

Al Folz: Very creative. A lot of decks out there, I'll tell you that. Besides my land now, I've had all my data, and all we're doing is fine tuning that now. We don't have anybody out doing anything like this. On my parcels, now when I speak of a parcel, and I'm surprised somebody was telling me that, you know, what's a parcel, that means that any section of land that has its own code. So you could have your home and if you've got three lots on the side of it, for example, why what you ended up with is four parcels unless you combined them. Alright, now, what we did last year, we data collected 24,000 parcels. I still have 3,000 parcels to go in commercial. Now, we've taken them in and we've checked them because the people that you send out and you train, you know, they do a good job. But still, we go through there and see if something looks like it's out of line. So that's what's been accomplished as far as Knight Township is concerned. Now, what we need to do or what I need to do is finish up the 3,000 parcels of commercial. We're also now going to have to put this data into the new software, whatever that's going to be because we don't have a manual, so this means that once we do get the manual, we're going to have to put in 27,000 parcels in all that new software. Now after that, which is going to be, by the way, going to be quite a chore, I figured that to put in 27,000 parcels we're going to have to tab around seven people and that's going to take almost nine months to be able to do this. And the reason I say the length of time, because some parcels of land have maybe ten to twelve cards with them. Now this is on apartment houses, people have a heck of a lot of them, a lot of the developers now have put up commercial office spaces that have maybe eight to nine different buildings sitting on there, so by the time we figured and added out, we're figuring maybe fifteen minutes per parcel. Now some of them are going to be not that long, and if you've got a small home just sitting there on a piece of land, why that's not going to take that long, but by the time we average out, we have about 6,000 maybe 6,300 parcels of commercial and industrial. Okay, so those take a little longer when you're looking at the commercial and industrial. We have like 35% of all the parcels in Vanderburgh County, so we have quite a few to be able to go through and it takes us time to be able to get it all done. I had a call yesterday about how much per parcel are we working with. Okay, I think I've told the Council this every time we come up here for money

as far as the appropriations are concerned. And a lowball figure would say, maybe like \$14 per parcel when you're completely finished. This means putting out Form 11's, getting those mailed, getting them in, defending our values to the Board of Review, and if all those are appealed to the state, which they might be, you never know, then of course we'd also have to defend the values to the state process also. Now, let me give you a little background if you've got a minute. In 1995 we spent \$1,180,463.37. Now, taking everything in consideration on how much it costs each of the eight assessors to be able to get their reassessment finished, this averaged out like \$17 a parcel. Well, I'm thinking that maybe we should round out between 14 and 15. As of yesterday, we had \$1,178,242 left in the Reassessment account. I'm sure you guys have that figure anyway, okay, now, the township assessors, just the township assessors, or township assessor/trustees, however you want to call it, that's fine, have spent \$680,651. Now, if we use a lowball figure say of \$14 per parcel and we have almost what, 77,000 parcels that we have, that means that we would be spending \$1,078 –

Paul Hatfield: Are you speaking for all the townships?

Al Folz: I'm telling them what exactly I got from last time, 1995. If we go like we did last time of \$17, that's a total thing, now each one is an individual thing and each one is different. If we would do that, then we would spend a total of \$1,309,001. Now let's take a high figure of \$17,000 of \$17 a parcel. If we have \$1,178,242 left in the account, going at say \$17 per parcel, you would still have \$550,000 left. That's subtracting the \$680,000 that's already spent from the \$1,178,000, okay. That's about it.

Councilmember Winnecke: Mr. President?

Al Folz: Now, if anybody would like to have a copy of this, I'd be glad to run it and make sure that it gets in your box. Now this was 1995 and this is what I've been going on.

Councilmember Raben: I'd like one.

Al Folz: Okay, sure.

Councilmember Wortman: Mr. President, I think it'd be advisable if the Council, Mr. Folz would submit this in writing, on paper so we could all digest this then.

Al Folz: Okay, it's a lot of figures.

Councilmember Wortman: Yeah, I think it'd be better because we're all trying to cram this in and some of us Dutchmen, it's kind of hard to get in at one time, you know.

Al Folz: I've never noticed that.

Councilmember Wortman: I think if you do that, all assessors, matter of fact.

Al Folz: But again, I'm speaking just for myself.

Councilmember Winnecke: Al, I just have a couple of questions. With the ten folks in your office, to what degree are you evaluating sort of the efficiency of what they do on a day to day basis? And how is the Extra Help used? Do you have one extra body in there that you're paying part-time?

Al Folz: No, I've got two and sometimes three, but these people have been with me a long time and some of them only work a few hours per day but they know exactly what they're doing and being able to do this. It's as efficient as if you guys would have given me a full-time person the last time that I could train to be able to do this. Now these take the places of that full-time person.

Councilmember Winnecke: I guess that's one of the ways I was going and, I mean, everyone has to do more with less and I guess that's one of the points I'd like to – are you

making sure that you're getting the most bang out of your ten full-time bodies and your additional part-time bodies?

Al Folz: Absolutely, and if I didn't, it would show up in the budget.

Councilmember Winnecke: The other question I have, you requested at budget time \$15,000 for Extra Help.

Al Folz: Right.

Councilmember Winnecke: With this request, that would get you to 20, so I guess I'm a little curious why 20 when in August you thought you needed 15?

Al Folz: You know, I didn't count at all on that GIS thing back then. I was told that new server is already being set up down there in the water department and the County Assessor brought the guy that's going to run this thing over up to the office the other day and said he's the one that's running it and they've run fiberoptic cables and all kind of good stuff and I'm going to utilize somebody there, I need to have some kind of protection that I'll be able to bring somebody in with this thing. I didn't anticipate the thing actually going on like it did.

Councilmember Winnecke: I can't claim the Dutchman disease as my colleague, Curt, can but I am suffering from a cold so forgive me if I missed a point here. As I understood the request, it's because you need to finish recording the construction and residential, mainly the commercial work in your township. What does that have to do with the Knight – with the GIS?

Al Folz: No, what I was saying, if I have to complete commercial data collecting, that's reassessment work. What I'm speaking of here, this is for regular budget and what we have is like 6,300 parcels, 6,300 schedules that come in because of personal property and this is what I was asking for the last time, because it's getting to be kind of overwhelming and we're running into some funny things down there and that people changed the names of their companies pretty quick. And all of the sudden they've got two or three names, now we've got to look those up and try to find them and say who are you and things like this and what it ends up a lot of time is double assessment. So we're trying to clear all this up and with our filings and such like this. Also, we have so many leases out there now that we've got, it's overwhelming also. So this would be a great help and the deadlines that the state has put on us now, you know, quite a few of them.

Councilmember Winnecke: So I guess if we approve this you wouldn't come asking for an extra full-time person at budget time this year?

Al Folz: I don't want one. I think I can keep my people and if they can come in there like one lady, she comes in because the children are in school. Now she's been with me about three years off and on, okay. Now she'll be leaving this summer because when the children are home she's gone, but she's just excellent. She's just excellent. She comes in, she knows what to do. We lay out her program for her and such like that. No, if I can get my Extra Help money it'll save the taxpayers money and still I can have it very, very efficient.

President Bassemier: Anybody else?

Councilmember Raben: Okay, the motion on the floor is to defer this request. I'm going to move first that I withdraw that motion.

President Bassemier: Who seconded?

Councilmember Wortman: I did.

Councilmember Hoy: Did you withdraw your second?

Councilmember Raben: Yeah. On 1130-1990 Extra Help there is just over \$3,000 in that account today. I'm going to move that we set that in at \$5,000.

President Bassemier: Do I have a second?

Councilmember Winnecke: Second.

President Bassemier: Any comments?

Councilmember Wortman: Yeah, Mr. President. Mr. Folz, now on all your permanent people down there, they come to work at 8 and then they quit at 5?

Al Folz: Uh-huh. They come in there, the office opens up – it closes at 5:00.

Councilmember Wortman: I know the office is open, does the people work till 5?

Al Folz: Not all because some of them come in before 8:00 and some of them will work through their lunch hour like this.

Councilmember Wortman: I see. They all put their eight hours in?

Al Folz: Oh yes.

Councilmember Wortman: That's fine. That's what I wanted. I want everybody to be worth their salt.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Mr. President, I think we're ready for the question.

President Bassemier: Okay, we have a motion and a second. Roll call vote.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

KNIGHT TWP. ASSESSOR		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1130-1990	Extra Help	10,000.00	5,000.00
Total		10,000.00	5,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

Councilmember Raben: Okay, thank you.

Al Folz: Thank you very much. And I will get this written out for each one of you, just what I was talking about and then, of course, we'll have to put in another appropriation, you know, for reassessment so we can get finished on this thing here. But, you know, I'll put out the information that I have, give you the thing that from 1995 so everybody has it in their hands and being able to see –

Councilmember Tornatta: Sarah is in the office and she'll make a copy of that if you want to just give it to her...of that form.

Al Folz: Oh, okay.

Councilmember Tornatta: She's just in the County Council office. She can run those.

PIGEON TOWNSHIP ASSESSOR

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Pigeon Township Assessor, I'm going to bring this to the floor 1150-1990 Extra Help \$5,000, 1150-1900 FICA zero and I make that in the form of a motion.

Paul Hatfield: Hold it.

Councilmember Raben: This is to get it on the floor, Paul.

President Bassemier: Do I have a second?

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: Okay, any discussion?

Councilmember Raben: Okay, I had a question. Paul, this FICA request is – that's not for this Extra Help line, is it?

Paul Hatfield: Yes it is.

Councilmember Raben: That figure would have to be adjusted.

Councilmember Hoy: Half the FICA that you would have to pay.

Councilmember Raben: Right, that figure will have to be adjusted. And again, as you just heard on Knight, we've reduced that figure. In your account you still have a little over \$2,300 –

Paul Hatfield: No, that's not correct. At the time that this was prepared, which was in February, we had \$2,334. Right now we're a deficit of \$1,078.

Councilmember Tornatta: That's minus?

Paul Hatfield: That's a deficit, yeah, that's a minus.

Councilmember Tornatta: What were you budgeted in the Extra Help line?

Paul Hatfield: Last August?

Councilmember Winnecke: \$6,200.

Paul Hatfield: Yeah, but you cut me from \$12,500 to \$6,200.

Councilmember Winnecke: The request was \$12,500 and it was cut to \$6,200.

Paul Hatfield: And you know what, I might make a remark here, this is real odd at least to me. We got cut to \$6,200, you give Knight Township \$10,000, you give the County Assessor \$8,000, you give Perry \$10,000, you give Armstrong \$1,600. Now let me tell you about Pigeon Township. We have right now very close to, and with new tax codes probably about 22,000. I don't know what you guys are thinking about. I can't run that office on a dime. Now, in order to help this situation, the Extra Help money is for two individuals who are in the field checking not only building permits but quite often we catch a lot of property or improvements that have been constructed without building permits. That's what they're for. This request has nothing to do with GIS, nothing. Now if you want to delay it, it's a question, you have to pay me now or you're going to have to pay me later because I don't waste that money.

Councilmember Raben: Paul, let me ask you a question. After looking at, and just tell me how the two coincide with each other, but as you look at the recent consensus report and you see Pigeon Township and how it has dropped significantly, I mean, in your township there's really no growth. I mean, what is causing the –

Paul Hatfield: Let me stop you. Well, there's a lot of building going on. From last year to this year, the total assessed value in Pigeon Township has increased six million –

President Bassemier: I'm sorry, Mr. Hatfield. I'm sorry, we're going to change the tape real quick.

(Tape changed)

Paul Hatfield: – information that I think I know what's behind this and that's what I want to tell you about.

President Bassemier: Okay, Mr. Hatfield, continue. I'm sorry.

Paul Hatfield: And they are out every day. They work and sometimes they're not working three days a week. For the most part that's what they're working, three days a week, because I tried to hold it down as much as I can but we've had a flurry of business since the first of the year from last year. But – whenever they're done, I'll continue.

President Bassemier: Okay, I understand. Jim?

Paul Hatfield: Get off the stage, Al.

Al Folz: Just keep on going, sir. I'm sure they'll hear you.

President Bassemier: Okay, continue, Mr. Hatfield.

Paul Hatfield: We need the money. We're at a deficit balance right now so what are you going to do about it? I mean, just tell me.

Councilmember Winnecke: What was the extra information you said you have that –

Paul Hatfield: I'll come to that in a minute because I know what's behind all this.

Councilmember Raben: There is a motion on the floor to set the Extra Help in \$5,000.

Paul Hatfield: Fine, if that's your decision, then fine. That's just fine. But I know what's behind this. I really do. You guys are so afraid of reassessment and all these big figures that are being bandied about. Well, let me tell you about that. I have firsthand knowledge and as soon as I leave here I'll let the Extra Help go, period. Okay? I'll fire them.

Councilmember Raben: We're not asking you to do that nor are –

Paul Hatfield: How in the hell can I do otherwise with a deficit balance? Tell me how I'm

going to handle that? Just keep on paying them and the deficit grows.

Councilmember Raben: You keep mentioning deficit balance. I thought you said that there was \$1,078 in that account.

Paul Hatfield: No, deficit. That means minus in any accounting parlance. So how do you want me to handle that?

Councilmember Raben: Share the information you have. Let's hear the rest –

Paul Hatfield: Well, the information I have has nothing to do with this. But I know what's behind your trepidation. I know. Hell, I've been around the world three times and to two or three church picnics. You're afraid of reassessment. Well, let me tell you where that's at. I talked to Tim Brooks this afternoon. As you all know, the State Board has formulated the three approaches and the counties will be able to – each county will be able to pick the approach that they want to follow. The manuals are now in the hands of the Attorney General's office. They should be out of the Attorney General's office by May 10th. Then it goes to the Governor, he will sign it. Now there's a possibility of lawsuits: one from the Manufacturer's Association and one from Tom Atherton, who is involved in the St. John's case, and those lawsuits will probably be based on subsistence allowance or other reasons, any reason they can find to file one in order to try to delay it. It won't work. You will have a reassessment of some kind. The problem is when it gets back to the tax court, Fisher was so close to putting the reassessment on market, and the Supreme Court stopped it. That may not be the case this time. I'm for it. I've always been for market value assessments. It's pure and it's not as difficult as people might think so. If it gets to the tax court and if Fisher decides that subsistence allowance is unconstitutional, it'll simply be taken out. It will not be computed in to the true tax. That won't stop it. Now if Fisher goes the appeal route, it might delay it awhile, but maybe not because Fisher can send it up the appeals court on the subsistence allowance, his decision. But he may also lay down the edict that the assessment can go along, go ahead, but the subsistence allowance will have to be withheld until it has been decided by the higher courts. You will have a reassessment and truthfully, I hope it is market. It will be a lot easier for me.

President Bassemier: Mr. Hatfield, with the \$5,000 that he's recommended, how long would that hold you just to see, more information –

Paul Hatfield: \$5,000, I asked for ten.

President Bassemier: I know, but I was –

Paul Hatfield: The \$5,000?

President Bassemier: Yeah, if that's approved –

Paul Hatfield: Hell, I don't know. It'll last me probably a couple three months anyway.

President Bassemier: Okay.

Paul Hatfield: But there's one other thing I want to tell you. I just heard Mr. Folz's spiel. On a reassessment budget, it's my intention right now not even to present one. We're going to handle the reassessment in-house with the people I've got. They're trained and with one caveat. There might be an opportunity where I might need other machinery or I may need a couple of people for Extra Help. That's all. That won't cost you anywhere near \$17 a parcel. I never heard such bull shivockey in all my life. But here I am. I'm asking you guys to cover the deficit and give me a little bit of working room. And you shouldn't have cut me to \$6,200 last time.

President Bassemier: Mr. Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Two questions: how many parcels do you have versus what Mr.

Folz has?

Paul Hatfield: Offhand I can't break it down. I know we have more commercial and industrial than Knight does. Residential, we've got about between 14 - 15,000 residential parcels. We've got a lot of commercial/industrial.

Councilmember Winnecke: I guess the other question is, if we got you to five, that's within a stone's throw of what you originally asked for.

Paul Hatfield: Excuse me?

Councilmember Winnecke: If we give \$5,000, that gets you to within a stone's throw of what you asked for at budget time.

Paul Hatfield: That's right. Depends on just how much work I've got. The budget was a guesstimation and you guessed wrong.

Councilmember Raben: And again, if reassessment is as close as you state it is, we've also got those funds that we'll be pulling from as well.

Paul Hatfield: Okay with me. I'm not going to ask much of it. And you know what? All of our data collecting is done. I'm through with my land. All I'm ready for is to give you the goddamned manual and I'll start assessing property.

President Bassemier: Mr. Hoy.

Councilmember Hoy: (Inaudible – microphone not turned on)

Paul Hatfield: I can't hear you.

Councilmember Hoy: I said, there's something else about Pigeon Township that Council needs to know when you talk about parcels and residential, Mr. Hatfield also has to deal, I think, with more non-profits. We still have to assess them and (inaudible – microphone not turned on).

Paul Hatfield: Yeah, more churches.

Councilmember Hoy: I think Council needs to know that work still has to be done. If you drive by, I live in Pigeon Township, you will see more property in this township that is not taxed, he still has to send somebody there because he comes to the Food Bank every year, they still have to run an assessment on there. And they still have to do the paperwork on that.

Paul Hatfield: Course, that's part of the parcel number.

Councilmember Hoy: Yeah, and there are a lot of parcels. So, I have some sympathy with some of the particular problems that he faces in our township. It's not comparable in some ways to Center or to Knight, I don't think. I think there is more work than (inaudible – microphone not turned on)

Paul Hatfield: No doubt about that. But I want you all to understand that this request has nothing to do with GIS. In fact, while I'm here, I might as well tell you, what we're doing in our office right now in checking these maps for GIS should have been done by the vendor. It's free labor and you're cutting me down on a request for Extra Help. I'll tell you what, if I don't get it, they're out. Somebody else can check those maps. My people are busy.

President Bassemier: Anybody else, any other questions? And I know you didn't mean to use God's name in vain, right? You apologize for that, right?

Paul Hatfield: Oh, I certainly do.

Councilmember Raben: Mr. President, the motion on the floor was 1150-1990 Extra Help \$5,000 and I would like to amend 1150-1900 FICA for the amount of \$383 and I make that in the form of a motion.

President Bassemier: Do I have a second?

Councilmember Winnecke: Second.

Paul Hatfield: Hold it. I want you to understand, your \$5,000 really isn't \$5,000. I don't want you all to get the impression you're giving me \$5,000 because \$1,078 of it is already gone.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, it'll be \$4,000 approximately.

Paul Hatfield: Close.

Councilmember Tornatta: That'll get you, at this point that will get you through for what, three months?

Paul Hatfield: I don't know.

Councilmember Tornatta: And then the opportunity is, if that's the case, you can come back and –

Councilmember Raben: Or the state says we'll start reassessment –

Paul Hatfield: This has nothing to do with the state, but I tell you what, if you're hell bent on that impression, I'll fire them.

Councilmember Raben: I'm not telling you to do that and I don't think this body is.

Paul Hatfield: No, but you're not giving me the money that would carry them through to the end of the year either, but that's alright.

Unidentified: Call for the question.

President Bassemier: Okay, roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: I think he (Inaudible – microphone not turned on), yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes, just to get him some money, get you started. Thank you, Mr. Hatfield.

PIGEON TWP. ASSESSOR		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1150-1990	Extra Help	10,000.00	5,000.00
1150-1900	FICA	765.00	383.00
Total		10,765.00	5,383.00

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

WEIGHTS & MEASURES

Councilmember Raben: Okay, next on the agenda is 1302-1130-1302 Deputy Inspector for the amount of \$1,000. I'll move approval.

Councilmember Hoy: Second.

President Bassemier: Any discussion on that? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

WEIGHTS & MEASURES		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1302-1130-1302	Deputy Inspector	1,000.00	1,000.00
Total		1,000.00	1,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

PUBLIC DEFENDER COMMISSION

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Public Defender Commission. There are seven different accounts. I'll move approval as they are listed and I'll make that in the form of a motion.

Councilmember Hoy: Second.

President Bassemier: Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

PUBLIC DEFENDER COMMISSION		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1303-3000	Bond & Insurance	25,475.00	25,475.00
1303-3120	Postage/Freight	3,000.00	3,000.00
1303-3130	Travel/Mileage	4,500.00	4,500.00
1303-3140	Telephone	10,000.00	10,000.00
1303-3600	Rent	10,025.00	10,025.00
1303-3370	Computer (Data Mgmt)	17,000.00	17,000.00
1303-4120	Buildings	6,695.00	6,695.00
Total		76,695.00	76,695.00

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

BURDETTE PARK (Discussion continued on page 28)

Councilmember Raben: Next is Burdette Park account 1450-3200 Utilities, in the amount of \$10,000. I'll move approval.

President Bassemier: Second, anybody?

Councilmember Hoy: Second.

President Bassemier: Second Mr. Hoy. Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

BURDETTE PARK		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1450-3200	Utilities	10,000.00	10,000.00
Total		10,000.00	¹ 10,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

COUNTY COUNCIL

Councilmember Raben: Okay, next is 1480-3610 Legal Services for the amount of \$10,000. I'll move approval.

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

¹See page 28 for continuation of this appropriation request.

President Bassemier: Yes.

COUNTY COUNCIL		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1480-3610	Legal Services	10,000.00	10,000.00
Total		10,000.00	10,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

President Bassemier: Next would be Roads & Streets. I'll hold off just a few minutes.

LOCAL ROADS & STREETS

Councilmember Hoy: Mr. President, I'll make a motion while Mr. Raben finishes, with his permission. Line item 2160-4364 in the amount of \$170. I move we approve that.

President Bassemier: Do I have a second?

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

LOCAL ROADS & STREETS		REQUESTED	APPROVED
2160-4364	Mt. Pleasant Rd. RRX	170.00	170.00
Total		170.00	170.00

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

SURVEYOR MAPS

President Bassemier: Do you want to take care of Surveyor's Maps?

Councilmember Raben: I can do it, that's fine. 2420-3371 Computer Hardware \$7,000 and 2420-3372 Computer Software \$8,000 for a total of \$15,000. I'll move approval.

President Bassemier: Do I have a second?

Councilmember Hoy: Second.

President Bassemier: Any discussion?

Councilmember Wortman: Yeah, is that legal drain involvement there, legal drain account? Does anybody know? Oh, okay, Ms. Freeman, come up.

President Bassemier: Please state your name for the record, please.

Linda Freeman: Linda Freeman, assistant to the County Surveyor. Bill was sorry he couldn't make it but he had a doctor's appointment. No, this isn't legal drain stuff. This is all either section corner perpetuation on the –

Councilmember Wortman: No, that's the next one.

Linda Freeman: Oh, the next one, I'm sorry. Surveyor's Maps is 2420.

Councilmember Wortman: Nothing to do with a legal drain, though. That's what I wanted.

Linda Freeman: No, this is a mapping account. It's a cash card that we get money in for selling maps and things. We use it for blue print machine maintenance and blue print paper and then other mapping type things.

Councilmember Wortman: Thank you.

President Bassemier: Okay, Mr. Raben.

Councilmember Raben: Have we voted on that?

Councilmember Hoy: No.

President Bassemier: Let's vote, I'm sorry. Roll call vote.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

SURVEYOR MAPS

REQUESTED

APPROVED

2420-3371	Computer Hardware	7,000.00	7,000.00
2420-3372	Computer Software	8,000.00	8,000.00
Total		15,000.00	15,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

SURVEYOR CORNER PERPETUATION

President Bassemier: Mr. Raben, your turn.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, 2650-2320 \$20,000, I'll move approval.

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: Any discussion?

Councilmember Raben: Yes, I do. On this GPS equipment, that seems like a lot of money. I had some small dealings with GPS equipment and can you tell me, how many instruments are these and –

Linda Freeman: Actually, this is only about half of what a good system will cost. I hate to put that one on you, but this is about, we're probably really looking at more like 30 or 40,000 which we'll probably try to enter into an agreement like a lease/purchase agreement for the type of equipment that we need for the accuracy. Yeah, you can buy those little hand-held puppies and get close, but for what we're using it for, for actual section corner monuments that surveyors and engineers will be using for development and for us to perpetuate the corner to a point, you know, like to a centimeter versus just being in this room with like a hand-held GPS or the less expensive equipment...yeah, we're really...

Councilmember Raben: Is this one instrument for one crew, or is this –

Linda Freeman: This would be – it's a set of instruments with the software that would be necessary to bring the points into the database and actually utilize them and then manipulate the data and come up with it. This is something that Bill has been wanting to do is to further perpetuate the corners with. Section corners have always been a main priority of our office and then this is just the new technology that's available. It is getting cheaper, but we do have a person on staff now that has a vast amount of experience with GPS equipment and, like I said, this is really not, this is probably about half of what we're really looking at spending, but this is money that we get out of the section corner perpetuation fund money. But what this will allow us to do is when these road projects come through or construction projects that happen like on the east side or where Sigeco comes in and drills one of our section corners out, we have no way, there was nothing there to reference it to maybe because it's just been out in an open field.

Councilmember Wortman: Mr. President, this here generates money, if I recall, the perpetuation fund.

Linda Freeman: The perpetuation fund money comes from the deeds that come through the Recorder's Office. It's by state statute, I think it's five dollars a deed now. So this isn't like money coming per se out of the general fund, it's money that we have used in the past for different things and then, like I said, the technology is there now and it's gotten cheaper and more reliable because they've got more satellites up and then also we do have a person on staff that has quite a bit of experience with this and that's, like I said, one of Bill's kind of I guess you might say pet projects that he'd really like to see come forth. The elevation isn't as good as it could be but the horizontal control is really getting down to the point.

President Bassemier: Anybody else? Okay, roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

SURVEYOR CORNER PERPETUATION		REQUESTED	APPROVED
2650-2320	Instruments	20,000.00	20,000.00
Total		20,000.00	20,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

GENERAL FUND REPEAL REQUESTS

COMMISSIONERS
SUPERINTENDENT OF COUNTY BUILDINGS

Councilmember Raben: Now we're on repeals. We have some requests from the Commissioners and the Superintendent of County Buildings. I'll move that both repeal requests be accepted as submitted.

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: Any discussion?

Councilmember Hoy: You all know that these Commissioner repeals are what we granted to the Public Defender (inaudible – microphone not turned on).

President Bassemier: No discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

COMMISSIONERS		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1300-3120	Postage/Freight	3,000.00	3,000.00
1300-3600	Rent	10,025.00	10,025.00
1300-3140	Telephone	10,000.00	10,000.00
1300-3860	Contractual Computer	17,000.00	17,000.00
1300-3130	Travel/Mileage	4,500.00	4,500.00
1300-3000	Bond & Insurance	25,475.00	25,475.00
1300-3530	Contractual Services	1,695.00	1,695.00
Total		71,695.00	71,695.00

SUPERINTENDENT OF COUNTY BUILDINGS		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1310-4120	Buildings	5,000.00	5,000.00
Total		5,000.00	5,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

TRANSFER REQUESTS

PROSECUTOR
ASSESSOR
ELECTION OFFICE

PUBLIC DEFENDER COMMISSION
CUMULATIVE BRIDGE

Councilmember Raben: Okay, now for transfers, is someone here from the Prosecutor's Office? Stan, my only question is, is this the last time we're going to change?

President Bassemier: (Inaudible – microphone not turned on)

Councilmember Tornatta: No, he did both of them.

Councilmember Hoy: Both repeals, yeah.

Councilmember Raben: Is this your final decision on these?

Stan Levco: It's my final decision as of now. I wouldn't have anticipated I'd come back and ask for a change when I first asked for a change and I don't anticipate I'll come back again.
Councilmember Winnecke: I guess I'll just follow that up, I mean, in December, we combined the two part-timers into a full-time. If you could explain why we are where we are today.

Stan Levco: I think one of the reasons is I had one of my full-time persons that I hired at the first of the year, and I had to hire four new ones, I had two people become judges, resigned

a couple of weeks ago, so I had that opening. I had Mike Cox, who has some experience as a criminal defense attorney had expressed an interest before and I thought, given the present situation that I'm in now, I need experienced attorneys more than I need a full-time new attorney. Ideally, I would rather have full-time experienced attorneys, but between one experienced and hopefully I'll get another experienced part-time attorney, but even one experienced part-time attorney and one without experience is a better situation for me now than hiring somebody just out of law school.

Councilmember Winnecke: In your arena, what do you classify as experienced?

Stan Levco: Oh, having tried a few jury trials. A few or more.

Councilmember Wortman: Is this, do you think, due to some of these speedy trials you've got to –

Stan Levco: Part of it, yeah. We're getting, and I don't know whether it's coincidence, but since the Public Defender Commission started and more defense attorneys, we're getting dramatically more requests for speedy trials which means we have to be prepared within 70 days or the person gets released from jail, which I guess to some people, that would be a good thing. But that's making us have to prepare for trials quickly or quicker than we used to.

Councilmember Raben: With that, Mr. President, unless anyone has any objections I'm going to move that the Prosecutors, Assessors, Election Office, Public Defenders Commission and Cum Bridge transfers all be approved as listed.

President Bassemier: Got a second on that?

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: Any discussion? Roll call vote please

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

PROSECUTOR		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1080-1070-1080	Deputy	41,560.00	41,560.00

1080-1100-1080	Deputy	19,349.00	19,349.00
1080-1140-1080	Deputy	5,091.00	5,091.00
To: 1080-1080-1080	Deputy	33,000.00	33,000.00
1080-1250-1080	Part-time Deputy	33,000.00	33,000.00

ASSESSOR		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1090-2700	Other Supplies	150.00	150.00
To: 1090-3550	Repairs to Bldg. & Grounds	150.00	150.00

ELECTION OFFICE		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1210-3530	Contractual Services	27.00	27.00
1210-2290	Election Board Meals	75.00	75.00
To: 1210-2600	Office Supplies	102.00	102.00

PUBLIC DEFENDER COMMISSION		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1303-1970	Temporary Replacement	33,160.00	33,160.00
To: 1303-1860-1303	Public Defender	16,580.00	16,580.00
1303-1160-1303	Public Defender	16,580.00	16,580.00

CUMULATIVE BRIDGE		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 2030-4401	Broadway Ave. Br. #273	1,000.00	1,000.00
To: 2030-3141	Communications	1,000.00	1,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

President Bassemier: Okay, Jim, amendments to the Salary Ordinance.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, amendments to the Salary Ordinance. First is the Property Tax Assessment Board of Appeals, amend the Salary Ordinance line 1091-1900 as the appropriation previously adopted. Knight Assessor, amend the Salary Ordinance line – I tell you what, Mr. President, let me back up from these amendments because I’ve got a late transfer which will also have to be included as part of the amendments. Let me back up.

President Bassemier: Okay.

LATE TRANSFER

COMMISSIONERS

Councilmember Raben: I neglected to mention that we do have a late transfer from the Commissioners Office that basically is transferring funds from their part-time secretarial account to – I’m sorry, their full-time secretarial account which was a shared position between the Council and the Commissioners and transferring it to their part-time account. So the motion is that 1300-1150 in the amount of \$11,000 be transferred to 1300-1990 part-time in the amount of \$11,000. I’ll move approval.

President Bassemier: Okay, everybody’s got a handout sheet on that?

Councilmember Hoy: Yeah. Second.

President Bassemier: Okay, do I hear a second? Mr. Hoy. Any discussion on that? Okay,

I need a roll call vote, please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

COMMISSIONERS		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1300-1150-1300	Secretary	11,000.00	11,000.00
To: 1300-1990	Extra Help	11,000.00	11,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

APPROPRIATION REQUEST CONTINUED FROM PAGE 19

**BURDETTE PARK
CLERK IV-D**

Councilmember Raben: Before we get back into the amendments, let's go back to the Clerk's request which was 1011-4220 and I would move approval of \$21,800 and I make that in the form of a motion.

President Bassemier: Do I have a second on that?

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: Any discussion?

Councilmember Tornatta: What's that...

Marsha Abell: Well, I'll have to take it out of accounts that are not IV-D, so we'll never be able to charge it back to the state. You know, the state will not pay me back for charging to them something that comes out of my general supplies budget, for instance, which is what I'm going to have to do.

Councilmember Tornatta: Do we...

Councilmember Raben: We can file the \$21,800, though, right? I mean, all we're losing is

the difference, right, between \$21,800 and –

Marsha Abell: Yeah, you'll file the \$21,500 but you're going to lose –

Councilmember Tornatta: We would have to pay the whole amount to get the 66%. Then she repeals the amount to us to get her 66%.

Councilmember Raben: But we cannot exceed what has been advertised. That's the problem.

Marsha Abell: But you're actually only going to pay 20 because I'm going to transfer into your account ten.

Councilmember Raben: We understand, but what we appropriate here today cannot exceed what has been advertised.

President Bassemier: What can we –

Marsha Abell: Well, actually, it's less than that.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, let's discuss something here just a minute. I see Steve Craig has left the building, but we could go in and cut Burdette Park \$5,000 and ask them to file a request for the balance next month.

President Bassemier: Is that agreeable with everybody?

Councilmember Hoy: You'll have to –

President Bassemier: We'll have to open it back up.

Councilmember Hoy: Yeah, you need a two-thirds to reopen.

Councilmember Raben: This is a lot to go through but in an effort to collect this money back, I mean, I think it is well worth it.

President Bassemier: Mr. Hoy, would you make a motion that –

Councilmember Hoy: I make a motion that we reopen the appropriation on Burdette Park.

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: I have a second. Any discussion on that? Okay, now we need two-thirds. Roll call vote please. Boy, it's been difficult today.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Okay, yes.

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

Councilmember Tornatta: Marsha, what is the number again?

President Bassemier: What do we have to get to?

Councilmember Hoy: What line is that? 1450-3200, that we appropriate \$5,000.

President Bassemier: Do I have a second?

Jeff Ahlers: Don't you need to repeal the original vote?

Councilmember Hoy: Oh yeah, repeal, that's right. I make the motion to repeal the original vote and we reopen and we reset that at \$5,000.

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: We've got a second on that, okay. Roll call on that.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

BURDETTE PARK		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1450-3200	Utilities	10,000.00	5,000.00
Total		10,000.00	5,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

Marsha Abell: So I am to understand that the money did get –

Councilmember Raben: We’re going to vote again right now.

Marsha Abell: Okay, I just don’t want to place the order until I’ve got the money to pay for it.

Councilmember Raben: I’m going to move that 1011-4220 be set in at \$26,000.

Councilmember Tornatta: Is that the total?

Marsha Abell: Yes.

Councilmember Tornatta: Okay.

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

CLERK IV-D		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1011-4220	Office Machines	6,800.00	26,000.00
Total		6,800.00	26,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

(Tape changed)

AMENDMENTS TO SALARY ORDINANCE

Councilmember Raben: Now let’s go to amendments. First is the Property Tax Assessment Board of Appeals, amend salary line 1091-1990 as previously adopted.

Knight Assessor, amend salary line 1130-1990 as previously adopted. Pigeon Assessor, 1150-1990 as previously adopted. Weights and Measures, amend salary line 1302-1130 as previously adopted. Prosecutor, I move that we amend salary lines 1080-1070, 1080-1100, 1080-1140, 1080-1080, 1080-1250 as previously adopted. Public Defender Commission, I move lines 1303-1970, 1303-1860, 1303-1160 as previously adopted. German Township Assessor, salary line 1120-1130 Real Estate Deputy to be set in as a COMOT VI Step 1 with an annual salary of \$25,372, which was recommended by the Personnel Administration Committee. County Clerk, amend salary line 1010-1210 as follows: change position title from Head Cashier to Head Cashier/Child Support. And County Commissioners, salary line 1300-1990 Extra Help as previously adopted and I'll make that in the form of a motion.

President Bassemier: Do I have a second?

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: Any discussion? Mr. Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: I thought you were still looking for a second.

President Bassemier: No. Okay, no discussion, roll call vote.

Councilmember Wortman: Excuse me. Mr. Raben, I think you read wrong 1080-1250 Part-time Deputy on the Prosecutor.

Councilmember Raben: I read wrong?

President Bassemier: What should it be?

Councilmember Raben: 1080-1080?

Councilmember Wortman: 1250.

Councilmember Raben: 1080-1250, I don't recall if I did or did not, but just so it goes on the record, the Prosecutor's amendments, I want to make it clear that we amend 1080-1250 as previously adopted.

President Bassemier: Second?

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

President Bassemier: Old Business? Okay, Jim, New Business?

<p style="text-align: center;">RESOLUTION TO SET LIMIT OF FUNDING FOR PROPOSED JAIL PROJECTS</p>

Councilmember Raben: Okay, New Business, we have six different items today. First is item A, a resolution on proposed jail funding. Have you passed out a copy of the ordinance?

President Bassemier: I think they've all been passed out.

Councilmember Raben: Okay. I don't know if everyone would like or counsel can read the ordinance in as a matter of record or we can vote on it now. What's everyone's pleasure?

President Bassemier: Why don't we let the counselor read it in for the record. Don't you think that's appropriate?

Councilmember Tornatta: Can we talk about it first?

President Bassemier: Yeah, I was going to say we're going to let him read it first and get it on the floor and then we'll discuss it.

Jeff Ahlers: It's a resolution to set limit of funding for jail projects:

WHEREAS, Vanderburgh County has been considering the construction of a new Jail, Juvenile Detention Center, and Corrections Facilities (hereinafter collectively referred to as "Jail Projects") and/or the remodeling and improvement of existing Jail, Detention and Corrections Facilities; and

WHEREAS, the Vanderburgh County Council believes it is in the best interest of Vanderburgh County to control unnecessary expenditures from the County General Fund and to keep the tax rates low; and

WHEREAS, the Vanderburgh County Council passes this Resolution as an expression of its intent to only approve funding for all Jail Projects not to exceed Thirty-five Million Dollars from all funding sources.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Vanderburgh County Council that it will only approve funding for all Jail Projects not to exceed Thirty-five Million Dollars from all funding sources.

President Bassemier: Okay, do I have a second on that?

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

Councilmember Raben: Well, first I need to make a motion that we accept and pass this ordinance as a body –

Jeff Ahlers: Resolution.

Councilmember Raben: Resolution, to set the limit of funding for jail projects.

President Bassemier: Second somebody?

Councilmember Winnecke: Second.

President Bassemier: Second by Mr. Winnecke. Now open for discussion. Mr. Tornatta, you were first.

Councilmember Tornatta: Sheriff, I need to ask you a question.

Brad Ellsworth: What if I wasn't here.

Councilmember Tornatta: You looked awfully comfortable back there.

Brad Ellsworth: Steve Craig just called me out.

President Bassemier: We all know your name, Sheriff, but for the record would you please state your name?

Brad Ellsworth: I'm Sheriff Brad Ellsworth.

President Bassemier: Thank you, sir.

Councilmember Tornatta: Do you think this is an appropriate avenue to take to show our expression, and I guess that's to the Commissioners?

Brad Ellsworth: Thanks, Councilman, for including me in this. I think Vanderburgh County needs a new jail. I think that through our last study that with the PMSI recommendations that the renovation of the old jail would lose beds and be virtually impossible to make that – they said we'd go down to a hundred and something beds if we renovated the current existing jail. As president of the advisory board, the Community Corrections Advisory Board, I believe it was last year that we penned a letter to the Council and to the Commission saying please don't include the building, the current existing building on Third Avenue in future plans for Community Corrections and I strongly believe that Vanderburgh County needs a juvenile detention center, and I put emphasis on detention, not correction, center. A juvenile jail, some place for the Evansville Police Department and the Sheriff's office to take juveniles who need to be locked up. If that can all be done for \$35,000,000, great. I'm all for it. If it costs a little more than that, then I think we need to go a little more than that. I can't say that's a bad thing to do because I don't know what these three projects – but I am a firm believer that we need to do all three projects.

Councilmember Tornatta: One of their points was not to, obviously, set a number on a project. Are we still in that phase?

Brad Ellsworth: In the schools that I've been to and I think Councilman Raben went with us as well as Commissioner Tuley at the time, the strongest thing they cautioned us was that if you set the number too low, let's put three million, that the residents will then hold you to that figure and if you go to four, you're a million dollars over budget; if you go to five, you're two. So they talked about not doing a number. They also talked about not going too high, that you'd scare people to death if you said this could cost up to a trillion dollars and then it is a \$35,000,000 project, you're going to scare people to death. So if I brought one thing home from there, you've never heard us comment on a number out of my office and I still hold true to that today. It's hard to say at this point what a number would be.

Councilmember Tornatta: I think the people are sticking close to a couple of numbers that we've seen in the paper every time that's been mentioned. And I think both numbers are just arbitrary and we've kind of deducted some type of number from this as a benchmark. But in my opinion, I don't think it's a good idea to set a number in stone because as Sheriff Ellsworth said, if we have a situation where we want to do more at what we would consider a good price and we go over that mark, then we're cutting our own throats. But that's just kind of what I pull out of that. And thanks for the information.

Councilmember Raben: And Troy, I might mention this figure of \$35,000,000. It's not arbitrary for one. It's the amount that has been determined that we can afford without raising COIT or hopefully raising any taxes. And again, we're not actually signing off on this much, this is simply making a statement that this is what this body has agreed to that we can spend without raising taxes.

Councilmember Tornatta: And we talked about also that if –

Councilmember Raben: I would rather, and again, I couldn't agree with Brad any more. I mean, and they work very hard to drill that in your head: don't throw numbers out. Don't quote numbers because nine times out of ten you end up beating it one way or the other. And again, we're not throwing out –

Councilmember Tornatta: Sure we are.

Councilmember Raben: Well, we are and we aren't. I mean, I like this number better than the \$50,000,000 number that's out there floating around.

Councilmember Tornatta: No one had to say that. I mean, that was said and that's all fine and good, I don't think anybody from here said that and we're paying for it. Is that, I mean, that's what I understand. That's what our job is. And the other side of that is I'd rather not tell anybody how much I'd like to pay for it in hopes that it came in quite a bit under. And looking at some of the RFQ's and what's been built, there have been some fantastic buildings built under a \$28,000,000 mark. I don't want anybody to think that the magic number is \$35,000,000 and run and get right up next to it.

Brad Ellsworth: You just said a number.

Councilmember Raben: That's the nice thing about competitive bidding. I'm sure the Commissioners aren't going to go to somebody and say okay, look, this is what I need a bid for. I mean, they're looking at 12 RFQ's now or 15, whatever the

number is, and are going to limit it down to, you know, take those on down and eventually they'll select someone that will design the project and hopefully next year or so will be out for bid. But you're stating it as if there's only one bid. There may be ten bids, there may be 20 bids, there may only be 3 bids actually turned in, but I'm sure –

Councilmember Tornatta: And I don't care that any of them have to know that number.

Councilmember Raben: – to build it that they are going to be as competitive as they have to be to –

Councilmember Tornatta: I don't want to put a number out there for them, myself. I mean, let them come up with that number and if it's too high, then we'll have to talk, we'll have to negotiate with them at that point. But that's just my...

Councilmember Winnecke: Couple of quick points. One, I think the reason it's important to get a number out there, I mean, theoretically, we just remodeled our bathrooms. We didn't tell the contractor how much we wanted to spend, but I think the reason we need to in this situation is because we're conducting the public's business. And I think, you know, PMSI recommended in their report or in its report that a jail, short of land costs, would be in the neighborhood of 28 to 32. So I think by putting this benchmark out there, I think it's significant and I think it's realistic. Thirdly, I think that at the end of the day we need to balance what we were able to spend with what we really need and everyone wants the best. Everyone is going to want the best. Everyone is going to want the Cadillac, including me. But if it's \$50,000,000, I'd rather pay 35 and get a really good, solid facility.

President Bassemier: I want to say something. I feel comfortable with that number, \$35,000,000. Just across the river, Owensboro, Kentucky, they're doing a 426 bed maximum security that's passing all state and federal regulations, and it's only costing them \$9,000,000. And this even has an indoor basketball court. It's nice. I've been over there. So I'd feel comfortable with that. We have a motion and a second. Roll call vote please.

Councilmember Hoy: (Inaudible – microphone not turned on) I'm reluctant to set a figure in, but what really frightens me to be honest with you, on some of the proposals, location, etc. (inaudible) \$50,000,000 a whole lot higher (inaudible) looking at all kinds of construction (inaudible) that I don't think we need to do. (Inaudible) but I'm afraid if we do not send some kind of signal (inaudible) get way out of hand. I've looked at some of these. You can't hear me? (Inaudible) The thing that I (inaudible) I'll try to be brief, I've been looking at some of the proposals and I can see that \$50,000,000 figure running much higher with some things that I don't think we need and I'm reluctant to put a figure on it but I really do feel that as a responsible Council, we probably need to make this statement so that we (inaudible) where we are as a Council. And I think we need to communicate something to the taxpayers as well, that we're going to try to keep this within bounds. I hope that these (inaudible). I've seen the figure on a 600 bed jail was \$20,000,000 and if that's the case, (inaudible) surely we can do that here and that will give us enough to take care of the SAFE house and the juvenile facility. And I totally agree with the Sheriff. I think we need to do all three. And I hope we do all three of them at the same time. But I'm comfortable with this figure at this point. It could come in and it's thirty-seven and a half million, (inaudible) we'll address that.

President Bassemier: Sheriff, I've got one more question.

Brad Ellsworth: Do I have to re-state my name since...Brad Ellsworth, Sheriff.

President Bassemier: I've been getting some calls (inaudible – microphone not turned on), did the study (inaudible) everybody work together and everything, could you give us how many inmates you had, an average in the last 30 days? How many inmates (inaudible).

Brad Ellsworth: We went over 300 today. It seems to be creeping back up, the number. It probably has varied between 200. I think we actually went below the number of beds on a day or two this – what month is it? Early last month and I believe today it went over 300 again. And so we've seen toward the latter part of March, it increasing again. It's hard to say. We're booking 10,000 a year, but average stay days has been down. But like I said, our numbers are up over three again. So I don't know – summer is traditionally the time when more things are going outside, there's more arrests because people are doing their activities, illegal activities out on the street as opposed to in the secrecy of their homes. And so we see numbers go up in the summer, traditionally. So it's hard to say. I know when we shot a line back for the Blue Ribbon Committee, we had projected numbers up in the 400's and then to continue to rise over the next five to six years and then, of course, like I said, we saw some down slide, too. So for whatever reason, the courts and the prosecutors and the judges working together to speed those up. So it's hard to say.

President Bassemier: Well, I mean, I've been reading the paper and hearing that the judges want more court rooms. Do you think if we granted more court rooms it will, (inaudible – microphone not turned on).

Brad Ellsworth: I can't say. That's more, they've been analyzing that, the theories the judges have talked about in these meetings, and I can't speak for a judge, but they were talking about the unavailability of courtrooms, how they're over scheduling trials. Sometimes scheduling multiple trials on a day and they have to notify five if one really goes, which in most cases really don't go to trial. If one trial goes, they have to notify the other five they're not going to go. What helps my budget and my efficiency is anytime I move people, that's what's more expensive and more dangerous for my staff. And so the shorter the movement, you include a couple of courtrooms under this roof where you go down the hall and possibly even where you click the – jails are different today. There are computer screen, touch screen, I can go back and instead of sending a guard back to open the door, search the inmate, I can go back, touch the screen, that opens cell number 32, the inmate walks out and he shows his I.D. card, comes by the guard station, you send him on down the way to the next place, never even having contact with the guard, and goes into the court facility, not the courtroom, but into the lockup. So that's what saves me: efficiency, safety for the inmate, safety for the officers. You all will have to decide on the judges' arguments for how additional courts affect that for them. That's a real hard – they're there every day and I'm not.

President Bassemier: (Inaudible – microphone not turned on)

Brad Ellsworth: If I could make another quick comment just about design and things, you know, we talked about sites and think I these are things that are going to take a long time. As you've been reading those books, you know we've had proposals of towers, and we've had proposals of one layer, and we've had proposals of different forms, and if we can put it in here, can we squeeze in here, can we get it

on that parking lot? The things that we have to evaluate and, us, and I mean the Council, the Commission, the Sheriff, is what's that going to mean? If we do put it on this parking lot if somebody says we can do this for 35, are we going straight up? How many people does that increase or does it decrease people? How does that affect the supervisor's ability to see these inmates? I had a situation today where the inmates are attempting to pry the ceiling out of one of the cells on the third floor and that, depending on the design, does not occur in a direct supervision jail. The guard is right there with them plus the ceilings are too high because you tier the cell area. They couldn't reach the roof unless they brought in a 24 foot ladder and hopefully we wouldn't let them do that. But I think we need to look at what is the efficient jail of today and then we want the best supervised jail we can get and the best designed. If we're designing around a dollar, we might find ourselves in trouble down the road and I'm not saying this 35 is a horrible thing, but I get a little nervous if we get this for 35 and they say we can do that but you can't get this kind of security equipment and we have to – we leave ourselves a million dollars short on security equipment because it's going to be 36 and not 35 and I guess that's where it makes me a little nervous. If we squeezed a little bit somewhere else, could we have got an efficient jail to run as opposed to something we're coming back a year down the road and go, oh boy, I wish we'd have done this because we've had – that's my only concern with the dollar figure, setting a number before we even get into a design phase and this is – and we're all going to learn a lot about jails here over the next several months, obviously, and all the things that we don't think about, we're going to have to think about.

President Bassemier: Mr. Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: I think the figure is more or less something that's what county government can afford without raising taxes. That's a number out there and people are concerned about their taxes and they're going to be faced here, another month here what they're going to have to be paying on property tax and you've got a lot of things: this reassessment, they're concerned about that. They're hearing all kinds of wild stories and you couple all that together and let's go back to our elderly people that's up in the 70 and 80's, that never had a good retirement plan, living on fixed incomes, this don't set too good with them. Now, what are we going to do, push them in somewhere else and take them out of their homes that they can't afford? These are things I'm hearing out in the public, see. And that's why I'm kind of hard on taxes. I still say I'm the taxpayers' friend. I'm going to stay that way. I think they're also, and when you go do a talk and I do, what they tell me is they don't want the little heathens that are breaking into their house and stealing their VCR or cutting their throat for \$40, and if the judges are letting them out, you know, and fear of crime, let's face it, fear of crime is worse than your actual chance of you being a victim of crime. But the public sure doesn't like either the thought of getting let out, people being let out that shouldn't be in there, and you'll have to ask a judge if they're doing that. If they're letting people out. I've heard some comments but they'll tell you if they're letting people out that they don't feel comfortable just because the number's over three. But I agree with you and I think that's where we have to decide when these proposals come back, are we going to go with 225, are we going to go with a juvenile, are we going with a jail only. I think we need to build, whatever we do, build it right and not try to piecemeal – if we try to get all three and then we just can't afford it, then there's no sense, you know, let's build something quality even if it's one of the pieces so that it's at least good for the next three or four sheriffs and residents and councils.

President Bassemier: We all agree with you, Sheriff, on that.

Councilmember Hoy: (Inaudible – microphone not turned on)

President Bassemier: I keep seeing a hand out there, myself. If she wants to speak please come up and state your name and your business please for the record.

Connie Engelbrecht-Hollander: I just wanted to speak about this right here –

President Bassemier: State your name please.

Connie Engelbrecht-Hollander: Connie Engelbrecht-Hollander, and I'm a taxpayer and I don't have a problem with spending money on restructuring a correctional facility, but you all – this really scared me and I'm glad I'm here today – when we're talking about putting a ceiling for all three projects, that means we're going to worry about building an incarceration center more than we're going to worry about making a correctional type center. And I know for a fact by just reading the paper, most of our crimes are in the young people and it seems like we need to do something in our schools as well and with a correction-type thing, teaching these kids and putting them in an environment that's not going to make them come right back out and do it again and we just have to pay house to them. If we change our overall problems when those kids are younger with a detention center or an educational center, and I don't mean lock up, knock 'em down-type thing, or I don't mean any kind of – just a good place where they can learn. And a lot of these kids have learning disabilities, I've noticed that. We have a very big number in AD and ADH kids and a lot of these people may even be in those products, and if we don't try to give them proper education, not just for them but for their families, and for the community about why some of these things are happening, we can build big, big, big jails and I know that's always been in the paper, but I didn't realize how serious this is. We've only got so much money to spend and yes, he may need more places to put people and we need a better system, but we also have got to spend an equal amount on education in these young people or we're going to continue to build more jails, there's going to be more people having to foot it.

President Bassemier: It's too bad you missed the meeting that Mr. Phil Hoy was over here too –

Connie Engelbrecht-Hollander: I heard him, I heard him.

President Bassemier: Oh, were you there?

Connie Engelbrecht-Hollander: I wasn't there, I wish I had been there.

President Bassemier: That was discussed. Yeah, that was very good that you missed. And that was all about what you just said.

Connie Engelbrecht-Hollander: Right, okay. That's the only thing when you start talking figures it's like \$35,000,000 might just get us a good jail but that means we don't have anything for the juveniles. I'm a taxpayer and I believe that you have a lot of mothers and a lot of fathers who would agree –

President Bassemier: And we agree with you. And that's all going to be taken into consideration. Thank you very much, ma'am. Mr. Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Well, I keep making this comment, the reason (inaudible – microphone not turned on) we can, however, ask the school system to set up all day schools (inaudible). That's an issue that needs to be addressed. That cannot be

addressed by this (inaudible). It has to be addressed by the school system and (inaudible). The other thing that I'm seeing and I hope it's true and I notice there's a judge sitting here that's working on a drug court and I'm in favor of that, and that is I think that public opinion is changing on just how many people we do lock up. Obviously we want to lock up the young man who kills for \$40. I don't think anybody would argue the other side of that, but we (inaudible). The federal government is wasting money in Columbia and all those countries. We are actually spending foolishly and I think we are (inaudible) because we have an addiction problem just as we had when prohibition came in, we had an addiction problem with alcohol. And my speech as you've heard –

President Bassemier: Yeah, I heard it. It was a good one.

Councilmember Hoy: A drug is a drug, is a drug. And, you know, some people, we're not doing any good by locking up some people. This is what society is demanding. I'm not sure I'm in favor of confiscating all their property. I've seen situations where I don't think that's quite the fair thing to do and I think (inaudible) lock up all the middle class people who (inaudible) instead of drinking a martini, you'd have to have a 100,000 bed jail. That doesn't make it right. It doesn't make drunkenness right, it doesn't make any drug right, but these are the realities we're dealing with and the (inaudible).

President Bassemier: Okay, well, thank you, Mr. Hoy. Jim, would you make your motion again?

Councilmember Tornatta: Can we table this?

President Bassemier: The motion is on the floor.

Councilmember Raben: I'm ready to pass a resolution.

Councilmember Tornatta: I don't think we're in any – we're passing this like we're in danger of, getting ready to get had on a big building and we're nowhere, I don't think we're even in the ballpark to even look at this. I think we're really too premature to be making these types of...

President Bassemier: Okay, motion and a second on it. Anybody else?

Councilmember Wortman: Call for the question.

President Bassemier: He called for the question. Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

(Motion carried 5-1/Councilmember Tornatta opposed)

<p style="text-align: center;">RESOLUTION TO SUSPEND THE HIRING OF FULL-TIME COUNTY EMPLOYEES IN 2001</p>
--

Councilmember Raben: Next is a resolution that is basically to set in place a hiring freeze and, again, this kind of goes along with some of our conversation. This is, in my opinion, is another opportunity to safeguard our checkbook for future expenses that we are definitely going to incur, so if this group would like, I'm sure our counsel would read this into the minutes as well.

Jeff Ahlers: Resolution to suspend the hiring of full-time county employees in 2001:

WHEREAS, the Vanderburgh County Council believes it is in the best interest of Vanderburgh County to control unnecessary expenditures from the County General Fund and to keep the tax rates low; and

WHEREAS, the Vanderburgh County Council believes it is necessary to control the growth of the County workforce and payroll; and

WHEREAS, the County Council believes it is in the best interest of the County to not hire any additional full-time County employees, except in the case of an emergency or extraordinary circumstances.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Vanderburgh County Council that no additional full-time employees shall be hired in any County office or department in 2001, except in the case of an emergency or extraordinary circumstances.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, and –

Councilmember Tornatta: And those are?

Councilmember Raben: And with that, Mr. President, I'll move approval.

President Bassemier: Do I have a second?

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: Okay, Mr. Tornatta.

Councilmember Tornatta: Do we have a list of extraordinary circumstances? What

constitutes that?

Jeff Ahlers: Essentially, I guess whatever you all determine that it is. I mean, I guess that it would depend upon the situation that it's presented. But, I mean, obviously, you're the County Council and you can consider and debate that issue and decide what you feel extraordinary circumstances are..

Councilmember Hoy: I think we'd have to consider those on an individual basis –

Councilmember Tornatta: Aren't we doing that anyway? I would think that the answer was yes. I mean, we do that when they come up for appropriations on jobs or whatever.

Councilmember Hoy: That's why we (inaudible – microphone not turned on)

Councilmember Tornatta: I don't know why we'd be signing this because, here again, we're signing something that it's part of our job to go over this anyway.

Councilmember Winnecke: Mr. President? I think it's important, I think it's part of sending a message. I think we get a lot of requests that may be – I don't know that people think through every request all the way to the nth degree. In my bank we have to do more with less as I said earlier, in your business, everyone's business. I'm not so sure that people in public office and I don't mean any disrespect, but I don't believe every person who holds a public office thinks in that regard. And that's why I think we send a message hey, it better be extraordinary circumstances or an emergency for you to bring a request to the Council.

Councilmember Tornatta: No, I understand what you're saying and when somebody wants a job and I don't have a spot for that person, then I just tell them that, you know, I'll keep your application and we'll look at that down the road if I need somebody. And that's a decision that I have to make and I don't put a sign outside on the front of my shingle that says we're not going to hire anybody. I think that could be a sign that you're slowing the progress maybe of your government if you put those types of things out there. And I'm saying as our job, we're supposed to investigate, go talk, we're liaisons to the offices, we're supposed to talk with these people and find out that they are doing their job and that's part of our job. In that case, then I think that this is just a regular order of business and not to – I've never liked anybody saying that they're going to have a big hiring freeze unless it's total. And with this, we're saying with exceptions and, you know, it might be very important to one person and it might not be very important to us. And in those cases, that's what we do every time when they ask for an appropriation.

President Bassemier: Mr. Whobrey? Please state your name.

Chuck Whobrey: I'm Chuck Whobrey, President of Local 215, the Teamsters. I just have a question. Are you talking about for your budgeting process? Are you talking about if a person in some department were to retire that...

Councilmember Raben: No, we're talking about --

Chuck Whobrey: That's – what I'm trying to – what are you talking about, so I'm clear?

Councilmember Raben: We're talking about new hires.

Chuck Whobrey: So you're really talking for new hires in the sense of additional budgeted slots, so you're not talking about if there's retirements, filing those budgets. So you're really talking about for the budgeting process.

Councilmember Hoy: That's correct.

Chuck Whobrey: That's what I was – just trying to understand your resolution.

Councilmember Hoy: Point well taken.

President Bassemier: Anymore discussion?

Councilmember Hoy: I think that what I'm concerned with myself and that is, when budget time comes, especially I think that anybody asking for new employees can make a case for that. And we've done pretty well and (inaudible – microphone not turned on) but I will vote for this. We have managed this budget so well. I'm in my ninth year and I've watched us manage it well, (inaudible).

Councilmember Wortman: Mr. Bassemier, this is to Mr. Hoy's response there. Through the years we've built this up and been conservative in our figures, so if something did come up and face us, we'd be able to handle it in the years ahead and we've got some expenditures coming up possibly, but we all go by the budget process and that's why we have it in August, then, when we go, unless something extraordinary happens, we live by our budget. And we get by and we work harder if that's what it amounts to. They knew the situation when they took the office, a lot of officeholders, and we did, too. So I think that's what we've got to look at.

Councilmember Hoy: (Inaudible – microphone not turned on)

President Bassemier: Mr. Hoy, we need to change the tape.

(Tape Changed)

Councilmember Hoy: (Inaudible – microphone not turned on)

President Bassemier: Okay, thank you, Mr. Hoy. It's running kind of late and (inaudible – microphone not turned on).

Connie Engelbrecht-Hollander: I just wanted to say one more thing that I didn't quite –

President Bassemier: State your name for the record.

Connie Engelbrecht-Hollander: It's Connie Englebrecht-Hollander. And I didn't finish what I wanted to say there all the way because I'm not good at speaking in front of all this. What I'm concerned with, with this worrying about just building incarceration, you want to see the whole picture, how the community can work together and it's not about just what we spend out of our budget that's a little normal budget for a jail, but maybe restructuring how we spend period, so that we could do a better – but the school board has to be involved in this, the city has to be involved with this, and I think industry has to be involved with this because a lot of these problems with these people is our air. I mean, that's a whole other issue and I'm not trying to stand on the podium on that. But we do have some health risks down here. It is a health problem as well. And if we don't combine all four things together, we're not going to ever get solved. Thank you.

Councilmember Hoy: Good point.

President Bassemier: Okay, Jim, you –

Councilmember Raben: The motion is on the floor. Let's vote.

President Bassemier: Okay, roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

(Motion carried 5-1/Councilmember Tornatta opposed)

<p>PERMISSION TO ADVERTISE PUBLIC HEARING REGARDING THE HOMESTEAD CREDIT FOR 2002</p>
--

President Bassemier: Okay, Jim, I'll take the next one. Okay, I need a motion. I'm going to read this because I want to get everything in there. I need a motion giving the Auditor's Office permission to advertise in a public hearing readings of the Homestead Credit for May 2nd, 2001 meeting and also like to include on the agenda the resolution proposing an ordinance of the Vanderburgh County Income Tax Council establishing the percent credit allowable for the Homestead for 2002. I need a motion for that.

Councilmember Wortman: I'll make that motion to that effect that you read the words and we'll adopt what you read.

President Bassemier: Do I have a second on that?

Councilmember Raben: Second.

President Bassemier: Any discussion on that? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

President Bassemier: Okay, Jim, it's back to you.

<p style="text-align: center;">DAY REPORTING PROGRAM SET APPROPRIATE SALARIES AND POSITION TITLE CORRECTIONS</p>
--

Councilmember Raben: Mr. President, item D is the day reporting program. There are some amendments to the salaries and position title changes. The judge is at the podium right now. I spoke with the judge today and I might hit on one subject that was of concern for me and the position that, as I'm talking I'm looking for my note here, the position which is salary account line 136Y-1300. I know from communicating with some other Councilmembers there is some concern as to this salary actually or this requested salary was to cover an amount that was being paid as a full-time employee plus for some part-time work that was being done in the evenings in terms of some educational classes. And I expressed concern with the judge that hey, it sounds like this individual is wanting to work less and make the same amount of money. But the judge has, I'll let you talk your way through this one. I know that's the concern that is shared by others here so I've got it to that point and you carry it on.

Wayne Trockman: Wayne Trockman, Vanderburgh Superior Court. Thank you for having me, Mr. President, members of the Council. Jim and I talked about this by phone yesterday and I know it was of concern to Jim at the time. I hope that I satisfied your concern. Debbie Mowbray is the Director. Debbie is – Jim, you started to say – had a base salary and then was being paid an additional stipend for some classes that she was putting on at the SAFE house at night. When I set the salary for Debbie and asked her to become the director of this program if it came to fruition, I set the salary as I budgeted this through the Department of Corrections grant at what Debbie was making. And I did that after discussions with Mike Brown

of the Department of Corrections and talking to him about, Jim, your concern exactly and my experience with Debbie and her position, is that it is an eight hour a day job but I know the other judges have had the same experience, too. We communicate late in the afternoons, many times on Friday evenings, over the weekends, etc. When a crisis occurs, the type of work that the individuals that I'd like to introduce you to tonight can't just say call me in the morning. And Debbie certainly does not. And, in fact, I included in the budget pagers for all three employees and cell phones which was approved by the Department of Corrections on the grant money that they are sending down, knowing that these people – and they've accepted the job knowing that they are going to be available 24 hours a day, seven days a week. So I thought that it was appropriate that Ms. Mowbray's salary stay where it was because it did reflect more than a 40 hour week and I expect that she is going to continue to work more than 40 hours a week.

President Bassemier: Anybody else? We've got a motion and a second...you want to take a roll call vote?

Councilmember Raben: I'm comfortable with it. I'm going to make a motion here, and this is under item D, under new business, day reporting program, and the following positions were approved by the County Council on October 2, 2000. The positions were the Director, which is unclassified; Day Reporting Coordinator, which is a PAT V; Administrative Aide, which is a COMOT V, so I'll move to set in the following salaries: account 136Y-1300 Day Reporting Director, unclassified, at \$46,800; 136X-1320 Day Reporting Coordinator, PAT V, at an annual salary rate of \$34,549; 136Y-1310 Administrative Aide, COMOT V at an annual rate of \$24,108. These are all non-union positions subject to assigned salary agreements being submitted to the Council. So if everyone is comfortable with that, I'll make that in the form of a motion.

President Bassemier: Does that cover it, Judge?

Wayne Trockman: And I have submitted those to Mr. Ahlers and faxed them to him, I think on Monday or Tuesday and I believe they've been approved.

Councilmember Winnecke: Second.

President Bassemier: Got a second on it. Motion and a second. Any more discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

Wayne Trockman: Mr. President, may I impose upon the Council for I promise less than 90 seconds?

President Bassemier: Sure.

Wayne Trockman: With regard to this matter, first I'd like to introduce to the Council the new employees, the drug court is set to start on Monday, April 9th, that's this Monday and we have stolen from Sheriff Ellsworth three of his best employees, many of whom you probably already know but, of course, I talked to the Sheriff before making the offers to them.

Councilmember Hoy: Before the theft.

Wayne Trockman: I didn't use that word and didn't really want to, Phil, but it may be accurate. Debbie, would you stand up? Debbie Mowbray, if you don't know Debbie, Debbie has been involved in the community in treatment and corrections and been at the SAFE house for 12, 13, 14 years. Joan Reed, Joan Reed has also been with the county for 13 years?

Joan Reed: Yes.

Wayne Trockman: About the same amount of time. Been involved in corrections all that period of time. And John Voight, John has been with the county for 17 - 18 years and involved in treatment in corrections during that entire period of time. Thank you, John. And let me introduce Lisa Whitehouse. Lisa is my Riding Bailiff and she has been very helpful in putting this together and helping with all the paperwork with the Department of Corrections. Thank you, Lisa. And then I think I've got about 30 seconds left so I want to repeat something, a pledge that I made to you when I was here in October and a request that I made to you when I was here in October and this is, I want to show to you that this program works. Phil, as you said, we need to start thinking more about people and less about jail beds. Now I want to show you that this works and I think that I can do that over a short period of time. And second, there are three positions. Two are funded completely by the Department of Corrections, all of the equipment, all of the other expenses are covered by the Department of Corrections grant which I wrote with the help of Ms. Mowbray and the help of Lisa Whitehouse, and we got about an additional almost \$140,000 annually from the Department of Corrections. But what I did not get funded by the Department of Corrections, and the Department of Corrections demanded before they would approve this grant, is that there be a local funding component to this program. And I put that together and I want to thank Sheriff Ellsworth who – is he still here? Thanks, Brad. Brad, Chief Guest, Stan Levco stepped up to the plate and made a pledge of \$20,000 to get this program off the ground. Lisa, Debbie and I have been writing grants already throughout the community. We've raised over \$30,000 already to help fund the one position that is not funded by the Department of Corrections and that's Mr. Voight. And Mr.

Voight took the job knowing that we would raise the money to pay him in the community. At some point when this program is a success, I'd like to come back and ask you to fund, to guarantee Mr. Voight's salary. I'd like to continue to ask the Sheriff and the Chief for a portion of their forfeiture money every year and continue to raise money in the community as we've already done to fund this position. But I think when we prove that this program is a success – not that it can be, but it is a success – I'd like to come back and ask you to reward Mr. Voight with making that job permanent because the agreement that I asked Mr. Voight to sign was different than the two that Ms. Mowbray and Ms. Reed signed and that is he understands that he is relying on us through a not-for-profit, and I've gone over my 90 seconds, not-for-profit foundation which we put together to raise these funds and through the help of law enforcement. He knew that that's what was going to fund his position. So I'd like to come back and make that request, certainly not asking for any promises, but I just want you to know that I'd like to do that for Mr. Voight at some point.

Councilmember Wortman: I'm surprised the Sheriff would help you after you stole those people from them.

Wayne Trockman: Well, we got the money and then we went for the people.

Councilmember Wortman: That's good, Wayne.

Wayne Trockman: Thank you very much.

Councilmember Winnecke: Thanks for staying late tonight.

CHANGE FILING DEADLINE FOR MAY MEETING

President Bassemier: Now we're ready to take E, to change the May meeting filing date to April 12, 2001. The reason is the weekend falls on this, Sandie?

Sandie Deig: The 15th falls on the weekend.

SHERMAN GREER/EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT RED CROSS BUILDING PROJECT
--

President Bassemier: And F, the last on the agenda is Sherman Greer. (Inaudible – microphone not turned on)

Councilmember Tornatta: I've got a comment before we go, Mr. President.

President Bassemier: Please introduce yourself and your business.

Sherman Greer: My name is Sherman Greer. I'm the Emergency Management Director for Evansville and Vanderburgh County and along with me I have Miss Trish DeVoy with the American Red Cross, the Executive Director. We're here to talk to you today about, well, we met with the City Council Monday night and they advised us to come here and talk to the County Council. We met with the Mayor and one of the County Commissioners, Miss Fanello, about this project that we're hoping that we can involve ourselves in with the American Red Cross. In 1995 the Emergency Management Agency moved from the basement of here to the Red Cross. We had to go out there and renovate the building, renovate our section of the building which is about 2,500 square feet that we have out there to put our

emergency operation center in. And that's where in case of an emergency or disaster situation that all of the department heads, County Commissioners, County Council, people will be able to come to and help us take care of that situation and get that situation taken care of as soon as possible. The American Red Cross is in the process of building a new facility and since we've been in that facility with them, we have a partnership that has grown over the last six years. We're both in about the same type of business and we're the last ones that most people think about but we're the first ones to call whenever we have an emergency or disaster situation or even which could be a house fire, through the Red Cross, they respond to those. Ninety percent of our job is planning, getting ready for any type of emergency or disaster situation that we may have and we think over the last few years we've done a fantastic job of doing that. I don't know if you realize this but last year Evansville, Indiana, the disaster assistance community corporation that we have within this area was named the model community for the nation for disaster preparedness. It was quite an honor to us and to this community that we are on the cutting edge of disaster preparedness within the United States. So this partnership that we started within, we'd like to continue on with this. And as you can see here, within your packet we gave you some information on how much it would cost the Emergency Management Agency, cost the city and the county for us to be able to move into this facility with them. One of the things that we really want to do with this facility also is make it a performance based type facility. In other words, we're always talking to people about how to build structures safer, businesses, industry and homes, we want to be able to have this facility built to where that when you come in there, you can see what a wood frame structure to be reinforced will look like. You'll see what a steel frame structure to have the seismic specifications and everything built in it, in that facility. Our plans are to be able to have plexiglass or something over these things to where people can walk in and actually look and see exactly what we're talking about. We're also going to strap down hot water heaters and make that building itself the safest building within this community for people to be in, in any type of emergency or disaster situation. And we need that because we're going to be the ones operating at that time. So for us to be able to do that and keep this partnership going, we would have to be able to go in on the purchase of this facility, or buy into this facility or lease this facility, lease to purchase this facility also. So with the figures that are in front of you and I would like to have Miss DeVoy to more or less answer any questions that you may have about the figures that we have presented to you. It looks like that right now we're paying about \$18,000 a year leasing at the American Red Cross and that's about \$1,513 a month on a monthly basis. Of course, going into a new building and buying into the building, it's going to cost a lot more than that. But if you look at, approximately, in a couple of years whenever they break ground or whenever they build this building, if we're not in there they have to find a place for us anyway because the facility that they have right now is going to be sold. So, eventually, we're going to have to move or move in with them. Do you have any questions?

Councilmember Raben: I have several. The building that you're coming out of there at Diamond and Heidelberg, what's going in there? Who...

Trish DeVoy: Trish DeVoy with the Red Cross. We'll sell it to the highest bidder.

Councilmember Raben: So that's an option yet, correct?

Trish DeVoy: Sure. We want \$400,000 for it.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, the actual annual lease for the new building, I'm having a hard time understanding under A, you've got annually \$73,000, and then

lease/purchase 15 years \$38,604. I guess I'm having a hard time figuring that out why...

Trish DeVoy: If you look at the lease, you're looking at \$12 a square foot times the 6,000 or so square feet which comes out to that amount. A lease/purchase would be a little bit different because it would be spread over a 15 year period or there's the option to buy in. And all of these figures are tentative because we're just now in the process of developing the cost and between now and the time that we break ground there's going to be inflation that affects these figures as well.

Councilmember Raben: You know, I tell you, this comes at a difficult time, Sherman, as you're aware of after sitting through this meeting, you know, with all of the things that'll probably hit us within the next year or two in regards to the jail. But let me state this, we've got, I'm sure both of you have read as of recently that the county has now accepted the responsibility of – has assumed the entire role over a building that we've always been responsible for and that, to me, Sherman, would seem like the most logical location should they move out and we're left with no place to go, would be to go to the Old Courthouse. What's your feelings on that?

Sherman Greer: Well, I don't want to be in the courthouse in an earthquake type situation, in the Old Courthouse. I would think that it is an option and, myself, I'll go wherever you tell me to go. I mean, that's, well, to a certain extent. But, I mean, I'll relocate wherever you want me to relocate. The problem is that most of the facilities are non-reinforced masonry buildings to where this would be a facility that we would be operational to be able to operate in an emergency or disaster situation. You know, I'm the last person in the world to want the earthquake to happen. I'm the last person in the world to want to be hit by any other type of situation, but still yet, we have to plan for those things and we have planned for them. So relocating in a facility like that may not be the best thing for us as far as communications and a lot of other things.

Councilmember Raben: I've not been privy to any engineering studies on that building, but it sure stood the test of time for a number of years and looking back at the workmanship and whatnot that's in that facility, I think we'd be hard pressed to probably find a better place to be in the event of a tornado or earthquake either one because...

Sherman Greer: I couldn't give you that information either because I'm not an engineer and I would think that we could get some information on that and find out exactly what the feasibility of that would be because it's just something that, as I said, wherever you folks want me to relocate is where we'll have to go. I know the costs and everything right now for the other facility is a lot of money but right now we're not asking for money. She may not be breaking ground for another what, two years on this new facility. All we're wanting right now and from the City Council, all we got from them was if we was to come here and you was to agree upon this, that we could get a resolution to where they would sign so that she can start her fund raising that – okay.

Trish DeVoy: If you don't mind, since we're part of a national organization we have a very long and tedious process that we go through in order to construct a new facility. It's called a real estate approval process and our national Red Cross is not very flexible. They want every penny accounted for that's going to be spent on construction and a pro forma budget, ten year projection, you know, the whole nine yards, and we have to have a signed document indicating what part the city/county government would play in funding the EMA's space in this facility, otherwise, it just

stops our project dead. Curt John suggested that perhaps the Mayor, City and County Councils could meet together and put together a resolution that could be included in our packet so that we could move forward on our project. Because our next step is to conduct a capital campaign. Our capital campaign will be for \$4,000,000. I can't even start on that until I have the approval from my national Red Cross, so some kind of documentation from all concerned parties would be very beneficial. You also have in your packet a lease agreement and it's a very general kind of agreement; that's something we'd have to have signed down the road and it is tentative right now and it can be changed, but that would be a requirement as well, something in writing that we have that we can fall back on because we don't want to build a building with 6,000 extra square feet. The Red Cross can't afford to do that. So we just need some kind of assurance that –

Councilmember Raben: Why are you relocating?

Trish DeVoy: Well, the facility that we're in right now is antiquated. That facility sits over abandoned coal mines. It's very much outdated. We've outgrown the space. We had to move our blood center out to Locust Creek Drive because our regulatory agency, the FDA, determined the facility was inadequate to collect and process blood. It's so old that it couldn't even be updated. We have continuous maintenance problems with the building. That's why I kind of snickered when you said that might be an option. It's the corner that's worth \$400,000, the building probably would be torn down by anybody who purchased that lot.

President Bassemier: I was going to say before Jim asked that question, now it's only worth \$200,000. It was 400 but now she's saying everything –

Trish DeVoy: No, no, no. No. The corner is worth \$400,000.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, we'll take this under advisement.

President Bassemier: Okay, yeah, we've got to be out of here by 6:00.

Trish DeVoy: Well, we have a time problem so is there – can you give me an indication because I have a board of directors I need to report to?

President Bassemier: Do you think we need to direct Sandie to check with the City Council and the Mayor and –

Councilmember Hoy: We need some time to think about this. We just discussed this today.

Councilmember Winnecke: Bring it back.

President Bassemier: Yeah, bring it back, bring something back.

Trish DeVoy: In a month?

Councilmember Winnecke: Next time we meet.

Trish DeVoy: I see.

Councilmember Winnecke: So you're looking for one resolution from all the governing bodies?

Trish DeVoy: That was suggested by Curt John. I don't know what's appropriate, yeah.

President Bassemier: Is it okay to vote on. Anybody in favor, raise your right hand.

Councilmember Hoy: What are we voting on?

President Bassemier: We're going to direct Sandie to approach the City Council and the Mayor's Office and whoever else is involved in this –

Sherman Greer: County Commissioners, yeah.

President Bassemier: Anybody else?

Sherman Greer: That's all.

Councilmember Raben: Yeah, I mean, we can decide something at our next meeting. We don't sign contracts as a body, we fund contracts. But, I mean, really this is ultimately a Commissioners decision to make, whether or not they relocate or where they relocate. This body can't do anything until they make that decision, so, I mean, I know what you're wanting from us, but again, we don't negotiate contracts or work leases or anything like that. So I see Commissioner Fanello standing there...

Catherine Fanello: Catherine Fanello, County Commissioner. I would encourage Miss DeVoy and Mr. Green to come to the Commissioner's meeting next Monday night but each of the Commissioners are aware of the project and I personally feel I would like to, if possible, try and utilize some space over at the Old Courthouse because as you well know, we've got a lot of projects before us and we want to try and save some money where we can. So I guess I would encourage them, as you said, we do sign the contracts, to come to the Commissioners meeting on Monday night.

President Bassemier: (Inaudible – microphone not turned on)

Sherman Greer: Like I said, I'm not an engineer, I don't know. I think you can do just about – most of the retro-fitting...

Councilmember Hoy: I have one thing that's important.

Councilmember Raben: Basically, there's nothing we can do as a body right now. I'd say we don't do a thing. We let the Commissioners work it out and if they need to come to us for an appropriation to relocate, then that's when we –

Councilmember Hoy: Or if we need a joint meeting with the other bodies, that's fine. It sounds like that's what your department, EMA is jointly funded.

Councilmember Wortman: Do you have to have the money in place before you do anything, really?

Sherman Greer: No.

Councilmember Wortman: Oh okay. I didn't know.

Trish DeVoy: Before construction but not right now.

OVERTURE COMMISSIONERS TO APPOINT TWO COUNCILMEMBERS TO COMMITTEE STUDYING RFQ'S FOR JAIL PROJECT
--

Councilmember Hoy: I have one item that's very important. The Commissioners are looking at RFQ's and they forming a committee. I would like to overture the Commissioners to include two members of this body on that committee.

President Bassemier: Is that a motion?

Councilmember Hoy: The motion is that we overture the Commissioners to have two members of this body on that committee they're appointing to look over the request for qualifications for the jail. I think we need somebody there.

Councilmember Raben: I think it's an outstanding idea and I guess this is in the form of a motion, and I would certainly second that, two members.

President Bassemier: I got a second. Any discussion on this? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

Councilmember Hoy: Mr. President, I have something that I think Council needs to look at and (inaudible - microphone not turned on) but I think we need to look at Senate Bill 137 (inaudible) attached to it, it's called community revitalization enhancement (inaudible). I believe that bill would (inaudible) county tax money for downtown (inaudible) problems with that and I'm just saying I think we ought to take a look at it and (inaudible). Just a point of information.

Councilmember Tornatta: Just real quick, it's been brought up about the courthouse, about they want to try and merge as a body with the county as opposed to the county taking it over and we ought to keep in mind that we'd like to put a couple of

people on that board as well. And I'll just make that as a motion that we need to –

Councilmember Raben: I'm already on it, but just get with Catherine if you want to.

Councilmember Tornatta: Okay. We want to work with that organization and I talked to the president and he's willing to work with us and with the county so this isn't a dead situation. They want to stay on board and try and work through things and they think they can rectify one of the problems they've got. So if we can do that, things will be fine.

Councilmember Hoy: (Inaudible – microphone not turned on) we have two people on (inaudible). I will second that motion.

President Bassemier: Any more discussion? Everybody in favor, raise your right hand.

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

Councilmember Tornatta: Motion to adjourn.

(Meeting adjourned at 5:59 p.m.)

VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL

President Ed Bassemier

Vice President Lloyd Winnecke

Councilmember James Raben

Councilmember Phil Hoy

Councilmember Curt Wortman

Absent
Councilmember Royce Sutton

Councilmember Troy Tornatta

Recorded and transcribed by Teri Lukeman.

VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL
MINUTES
MAY 2, 2001

The Vanderburgh County Council met in session the 2nd day of May, 2001 in room 301 of the Civic Center Complex. The meeting was called to order at 3:38 p.m. by County Council President Ed Bassemier.

President Bassemier: Sheriff, you want to open up the meeting, or the Chief, Eric Williams?

(Chief Deputy Sheriff Eric Williams opened the meeting)

President Bassemier: Thank you, sir. I want to welcome everyone to the May 2nd, 2001 County Council meeting. Attendance roll call, please?

COUNCILMEMBER	PRESENT	ABSENT
Councilmember Tornatta	X	
Councilmember Sutton	X	
Councilmember Wortman	X	
Councilmember Hoy	X	
Councilmember Raben	X	
Councilmember Winnecke	X	
President Bassemier	X	

President Bassemier: Would everyone please stand for the Pledge of Allegiance?

(Pledge of Allegiance was given)

APPROVAL OF MINUTES APRIL 4, 2001
--

President Bassemier: Can I have a motion for the approval of the minutes for April 4th, 2001?

Councilmember Sutton: So moved.

President Bassemier: Second?

Councilmember Winnecke: Second.

President Bassemier: Everybody in favor raise their right hand.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATION REQUESTS
--

RECORDER (TWO REQUESTS)

President Bassemier: Okay, Finance Chairman, Mr. Raben, you want to start out with the appropriation ordinance?

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Mr. President. The first on the agenda is the Recorder's Office: First Deputy/Bookkeeper including FICA and PERF for a total request of \$2,125.

I'll move approval.

President Bassemier: Do I have a second?

Councilmember Hoy: Second.

President Bassemier: Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

RECORDER		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1040-1130-1040	1 st Deputy/Bookkeeper	1,882.00	1,882.00
1040-1900	FICA	144.00	144.00
1040-1910	PERF	99.00	99.00
Total		2,125.00	2,125.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

President Bassemier: Okay, Jim.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, next is a request for a Deeds Deputy with the FICA, PERF and Insurance, for a total request of \$20,973. I'll move that that request be set in at zero and include account 1040-1990 Extra Help in the amount of \$8,000 and 1040-1900 FICA in the amount of \$612, for a total of \$8,612. I'll move approval.

Councilmember Winnecke: Second.

President Bassemier: Any discussion? Roll call –

Councilmember Sutton: Whoa...

Councilmember Tornatta: Is Betty around?

President Bassemier: Please state your name please for the record.

Councilmember Tornatta: I talked with Mrs. Knight-Smith on what the volume difference has been so far this year and I think we know or have an idea that probably interest rates played a big part in that but that still didn't get you caught up from what I understand and --

Betty Knight-Smith: Not hardly.

Councilmember Tornatta: And I went to about 20 different desks and there were piles on each desk so we're anywhere between seven to ten days behind. Is that --

Betty Knight-Smith: That's right.

Councilmember Tornatta: That's fair? Year to date last year to April, they brought in \$136,947. Year to date this year, you guys have brought in \$186,737 and --

Betty Knight-Smith: You've got that wrong, Troy. If you'll look on the sheet that I gave you last week, we brought in over \$240,000 in the last four months up to \$199,000 at the same time last year.

Councilmember Tornatta: Right, but I guess what I'm talking about is, not counting the Surveyor's perpetual fund or the Recorder's perpetual fund, that's just bare bones numbers which we can see there's a \$50,000 difference this year which means they're obviously processing more things. And over the course of last year not counting those perpetual funds, the whole year they did \$438,477. You're almost at the halfway point after four months.

Betty Knight-Smith: I need the other employee. I'm behind, I cannot get caught up. You've got eight people sitting downstairs in an office that doesn't bring in one dime. My office pays for their office plus mine and it's the only self-supporting office in the whole building. I need an employee and I know you voted to not give any new employees this year but I don't know how you can justify not giving the employee when it's needed. I told you that if we get caught up and things slow down then by attrition that I would leave the person go. But right now, last year, and compare that with this year, there's no comparison. This month alone we took in \$71,472. It's not easy for me to stand here and ask you to give me an employee when I know I'm probably going to get voted down, but I need it. We're supposed to be caught up to two days and we can't possibly get caught up. So I need that job and I need it now.

Councilmember Tornatta: And you've got some employees also that have -- one of them has, what, 125 days of --

Betty Knight-Smith: Sick leave. I've got 23 weeks of vacation, that's 115 days. They've got 317 and a half sick days. We've got 30 and a half personal days. That's a total of 463 days. That's 3,704 hours. There's 2,088 hours in a year's time, so that is over a year and a half for a full-time employee and if that doesn't justify a new employee, I don't know what does.

Councilmember Tornatta: And the only budget that we pay for is salaries.

Betty Knight-Smith: That's all. But in the meantime, this office, they've turned in \$438,000 last year alone to the county general fund.

Councilmember Tornatta: And the chances of you paying for that salary through the money that you turn in are pretty great.

Betty Knight-Smith: Pretty great.

Councilmember Sutton: Jim, could you give a little bit of explanation on the way you restructured that appropriation for the Recorder with the \$8,000?

Councilmember Raben: Okay, that's for part-time help.

Councilmember Sutton: How much are you thinking about there? How many bodies and for how long?

Councilmember Raben: Well, if she pays the max, which is \$8.00 per hour, that would take care of a thousand hours. I mean, she can do that with one person or two persons.

Betty Knight-Smith: Royce, when you hire a part-time person and they get some experience, they start looking for a full-time job so you can't hold them. I've got a part-time person and I still cannot stay up. I can't get caught up.

Councilmember Raben: Betty, but I would ask this, and it's really not hard to do because we probably have two individuals here today that could answer this question, but in what you know that has gone on within your own banks during this busy period of interest rates dropping, I mean, is the bank hiring extra people to handle this flow?

Councilmember Winnecke: No, at this time we're not.

Betty Knight-Smith: One company in two week's time sent in 759 mortgages. One company.

Councilmember Raben: And Betty, no doubt about it, I'm sure as the world that you're seeing a busier time than what we saw at this time last year, but that office probably went through the same situation back in '96 or '97.

Betty Knight-Smith: They have never taken in the amount of money that's been taken in in the last four months. I went back and checked the records. Seventy-one thousand dollars in one month?

Councilmember Raben: And that's substantial, but again, we did pass a hiring freeze and to me this is something I think we need to address in August when we go through our budget session. And waiting until August, I think that will give us a little better assessment as to is this fast paced busy season going to continue? Are we going to – are the interest rates going to continue to drop?

Betty Knight-Smith: When I get the calls from the banks and the different people that they haven't got their papers back, their mortgage copies back, then I'm going to say I asked for an employee but the Council told me no. How can you explain it to the banks that you can't get it back to them?

Councilmember Tornatta: In that hiring freeze, what was the emergency situation or what was the other – there were two issues that you said we could hire somebody? Now what were those two and I never did get a clear idea of what the explanation of either one of those, what the definition was.

Councilmember Raben: An emergency would pertain more towards law enforcement or something like that, public service in regards to safety and whatnot.

President Bassemier: Mr. Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: I favor the extra money to the line item and I respect Betty's request and I don't deny she probably needs the help. But I went back and I looked at last year's Extra Help money, in the office just south of \$4,000 was spent and you're almost at that level today. None of us have a crystal ball and know what the market is going to do the rest of the year but it's unlikely the market will sustain for an extended period. I'd say let's put extra money in the Extra Help budget and as that work gets caught up, those people's hours are cut back versus eliminating a new full-time position once the market changes.

Councilmember Sutton: I think, and Betty has expressed that she is willing to work with us and I think she's made it very clear in terms of she understands that her workload does come in cycles and there is a period of time when there is going to be a ton of things going on and this happens to be one of those and it just so happens last year there wasn't as much going on. But I think we have to realize too that there was in that office, there was more staff in that office at one particular point in time. But as the market kind of went down, but Betty has expressed that if there is, she'd be willing to make the adjustments necessary through attrition so that we are not in a situation where we've got more bodies than work. As I stated last week, I don't recall a time when Betty has come before us and the request has not been genuinely needed. I've had an opportunity to go through the office and I trust that everybody else, all the fellow councilmen, you guys have had a chance to go through the office as well, and I think she comes to us with a very legitimate request but I also recognize too these things do come in in cycles. Now how long this cycle will last, nobody can exactly know, not even Alan Greenspan. But if we're waiting until August to get some more indicators, she wouldn't get the position until January, so you're really talking about probably March, February or March before you get somebody in place of next year before we're really addressing the real issue and I know it's a very tough decision when we're talking about additional employees but this office does bring dollars back to the county, bring dollars back, whereas most of our offices are not income generating. So I really would like to see us keep the request. I know what the motion is, I'd like to see us keep the request as it is, as it's been presented before us.

President Bassemier: Anybody else?

Councilmember Hoy: I'd like for Mr. Raben to repeat the motion. We've had so much discussion I've – I was busy with something else and –

Councilmember Raben: Okay, the motion is the request as listed be set in at zero and that under account number 1040-1990 we set in \$8,000, 1040-1900 FICA \$612, for a total request of \$8,612.

Councilmember Sutton: Jim, have you spoken with Betty on – you come up with this \$8,000 figure. We don't want to just draw figures out of the air. Have you talked with Betty or spoke with Betty about, if this is the route you want to go, if this is adequate, if it's too much. I mean, what do we base this figure on?

Councilmember Raben: How I arrived at that figure, I believe she has some part-time money in place now that will take her into June. Effective June 1st, I believe there's 1,040 working hours for the rest of the year and a part-time employee, you can work, I don't know, 38 or 39 hours at the most, so this would cover one full-time or one part-time employee roughly 38 hours for the remainder of the year.

Betty Knight-Smith: The question you asked, Royce, no he didn't ask me. He decided that himself.

Councilmember Tornatta: And your rationale for not offering her that option to have that employee comes from a budgetary issue or, I mean, would she not be generating that kind of income to deserve that position if a caveat be put in there that she would then – if the types of numbers did not indicate that she was going to do that, that person be released.

Councilmember Raben: No, I certainly appreciate the fact that this is a money generating office but you're confusing this with the fact that the statement that I'm gathering when you make those remarks is that if your office does not generate money, that they don't work equally as hard. I'm sure there's other officeholders and department heads that would argue that, that it's not the fact whether or not you bring in money. I think there's a lot of offices that probably would like additional help that do or don't bring in revenues so again,
–

Councilmember Tornatta: And are those dependent on other factors which is in this case the banks and other factors that would need the expedience of the forms and the work

done? I mean, those are issues that I'm looking at right now. If she's seven to ten days behind and she's supposed to be two days behind, –

Councilmember Raben: I can promise you, the banks are as far or further behind than she is. And again, here's two bankers, you may want to confirm that. But I deal with the bank routinely and I know that particularly right now, if you want to even so much as apply for refinancing they'll tell you it will probably be 30 days before they even look at the application in a lot of cases.

Councilmember Sutton: Probably not in our case but others, maybe.

Councilmember Wortman: If I recall, in 1998, I believe there was an employee added in the Recorder's Office, is that right? Okay. Thank you.

President Bassemier: Ready? Roll call vote.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: I really would like for us to communicate with the officeholder if we're going to come up with a plan B, I really would like to see us keep the request as it is but given the nature of where we stand I am going to vote for it just so that we can get something in there though I am not really pleased with how we've structured it. So I'll vote yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yeah, this is a tough one and I would say, is this right, in 30 days at the end of May if she's more so, can she come back on a new employee then and resubmit? Legally?

Jeff Ahlers: Well, I mean, she can submit an appropriation request at any time.

Councilmember Wortman: That's the only problem. I'm going to monitor for 30 days and if it's more so, then I'll have to change, but right now I'm going to vote yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Well, I share Councilman Sutton's feelings. Mrs. Knight has never, ever asked for anything she didn't need but we need five votes to get this through and I don't know how these other three are going to vote, so I'm going to vote yes so you'll at least have the part-time person though I think you need a full-time person.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: No. I feel like she needs a new employee. I'll vote no.

Betty Knight-Smith: Thank you.

RECORDER		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1040-1210-1040	Deeds Deputy	12,376.00	0.00
1040-1900	FICA	947.00	612.00
1040-1910	PERF	650.00	0.00
1040-1920	Insurance	7,000.00	0.00
1040-1990	Extra Help	0.00	8,000.00
Total		20,973.00	8,612.00

(Motion carried 5-2/Councilmembers Sutton and Bassemier opposed)

SHERIFF

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Mr. President, next is the Sheriff's Department, 1050-1130-0222 Computer Systems Operator. The request is for a PAT V for the amount of \$4,042. I would like to make a motion that we approve it as a PAT IV Step 2 in the amount of \$2,603 and I'll make that in the form of a motion.

President Bassemier: Got a second?

Councilmember Winnecke: Second.

President Bassemier: Any discussion? Mr. Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: The only problem I've got here is why was that a PAT V listed when it was only approved to be a PAT IV. I can't understand why we'd overdo it if it factored out to a PAT IV. I'd like to –

Sandie Deig: (Inaudible – microphone not turned on)

Councilmember Wortman: But why was it factored from the Job Study to a PAT V?

Sandie Deig: (Inaudible – microphone not turned on)

Councilmember Wortman: Okay.

Councilmember Raben: Mr. President or Mr. Wortman, I will tell you this, this is one that is a borderline case. It did test out ten points over the PAT IV Step 1 but forty points below a PAT V Step 1. So I mean this particular request could actually have gone either way but it's closer to the PAT IV than the PAT V, but he was at the top end of the scale for the PAT IV.

Eric Williams: My understanding of the – Eric Williams, Chief Deputy, Sheriff's Office. My understanding of the, when they were rated at Job Study, that he fell in between based on his rating between the PAT IV and PAT V rating and whether or not he went to PAT V or PAT IV was just a call on the consultant. I had a hard time understanding myself personally how you could be in between the two but apparently there is a gray area in there.

President Bassemier: Anybody else? Want to hear the motion again? Everybody understand it? Roll call vote please.

Councilmember Raben: The motion is that this be set in as a – in the amount of \$2,603 which represents a PAT IV Step 2.

Councilmember Tornatta: Is there any reason that – would this affect his position if he would get PAT IV versus PAT V?

Eric Williams: He'll make less money.

Councilmember Tornatta: Well, I understand that. Is he looking at another job? Are we in jeopardy of losing him?

Eric Williams: I can't speak on behalf of the employee. He's indicated that he is not in the ballpark for what a position like his is currently doing in the private sector. He's a good employee and we want to keep him and that's why we went through this process. Whether or not he stays with us at this rate or not, I can't speak on his behalf.

Councilmember Tornatta: Okay.

President Bassemier: Anybody else? Roll call vote.

Councilmember Tornatta: I trust your jurisdiction on what you wanted to give him and if it's \$4,000 then that's what I think he needs –

Eric Williams: If I could comment, that's not what we wanted to give him, that's what he came out of Job Study with the recommendation, we just gave the Job Study a new job description based on what he was doing and the duties he performs and that's how the Job Study voted to send it to the Council.

Councilmember Tornatta: Right, and if you feel comfortable with that, I feel comfortable with you, so I am going to vote no.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: And you're not comfortable with that, the way it's set in?

Eric Williams: That's very difficult to answer. I do not want to cut my nose off to spite my face and alleviate any potential for a raise here. While we would like to see him get the raise the Job Study presented, we'll take what we can get. I mean, we don't want to come out as being ungrateful. We recognize the fact that the Council is trying to do something to make this employee be paid more in line with what he deserves. Yes, I'd rather see the Council set in the amount of money that the Job Study recommended through their vote, but I'll take what I can get.

Councilmember Sutton: I think in the past I think I've tried to be supportive of the Job Study recommendations so I am going to go ahead and vote yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

SHERIFF		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1050-1130-0222	Comp.Systems Operator	4,042.00	2,603.00
Total		4,042.00	2,603.00

(Motion carried 6-1/Councilmember Tornatta opposed)

COUNTY ASSESSOR

Councilmember Raben: Next is the County Assessor 1090-1200-1090, 1090-1900, 1090-1910, for a total of \$2,452, I'll move approval.

Councilmember Hoy: Second.

President Bassemier: Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

COUNTY ASSESSOR		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1090-1200-1090	Real Estate Deputy	2,171.00	2,171.00
1090-1900	FICA	167.00	167.00
1090-1910	PERF	114.00	114.00
Total		2,452.00	2,452.00

(Motion carried 6-1/Councilmember Wortman opposed)

PROPERTY TAX ASSESSMENT BOARD OF APPEALS

Councilmember Raben: Next is Property Tax Assessment Board of Appeals. I'll move approval of 1091-1990 and 1091-3530 for the amount of \$9,700.

President Bassemier: Second, somebody?

Councilmember Winnecke: Second.

President Bassemier: Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

PROPERTY TAX ASSMT. BD. OF APPEALS		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1091-1990	Extra Help	2,000.00	2,000.00
1091-3530	Contractual Services	7,700.00	7,700.00
Total		9,700.00	9,700.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

GERMAN TOWNSHIP ASSESSOR

Councilmember Raben: German Township Assessor, 1120-1120-1120, 1120-1900, 1120-1910 for a total of \$4,929. I'll move approval.

President Bassemier: Do I have a second?

Councilmember Hoy: Second.

President Bassemier: Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

GERMAN TWP. ASSESSOR		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1120-1120-1120	Chief Deputy	4,365.00	4,365.00
1120-1900	FICA	334.00	334.00
1120-1910	PERF	230.00	230.00
Total		4,929.00	4,929.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

President Bassemier: Mr. Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Okay, County Commissioners, 1300-3140 and 1300-3120 for a total of \$3,926, I'll move approval.

President Bassemier: Second, somebody?

Councilmember Winnecke: Second.

President Bassemier: Second over here. Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

COUNTY COMMISSIONERS		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1300-3140	Telephone	2,891.00	2,891.00
1300-3120	Postage/Freight	1,035.00	1,035.00
Total		3,926.00	3,926.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

PUBLIC DEFENDER COMMISSION (TWO REQUESTS)

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Public Defender’s Office, 1303-4220 for the amount of \$1,472, I’ll move approval.

Councilmember Hoy: Second.

President Bassemier: Have a second. Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

PUBLIC DEFENDER COMMISSION		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1303-4220	Office Machines	1,472.00	1,472.00
Total		1,472.00	1,472.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

President Bassemier: Jim?

Councilmember Raben: Okay, next Public Defender’s Commission. I should have caught these two together, 1303-1750-1303, 1303-1910 and 1303-1900 for a total of \$1,346. I’ll move approval.

Councilmember Hoy: Second.

President Bassemier: I have a second. Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

PUBLIC DEFENDER COMMISSION		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1303-1750-1303	Secretary	1,190.00	1,190.00
1303-1910	PERF	64.00	64.00
1303-1900	FICA	92.00	92.00
Total		1,346.00	1,346.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

SUPERINTENDENT OF COUNTY BUILDINGS

President Bassemier: Superintendent of County Buildings.

Councilmember Raben: 1310-3520, 1310-4120, 1310-3530, 1310-3200, 1310-2600, 1310-3440, 1310-3560 and 1310-3791, for a total of \$126,796, I’ll move approval.

Councilmember Sutton: Second.

President Bassemier: I have a second from Mr. Sutton. Any discussion on this?

Councilmember Wortman: Mr. President?

President Bassemier: Mr. Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Line item 1310-3560 A/C and Drinking Fountain/Soft Drinks. Can anybody here explain the soft drinks –

Councilmember Tornatta: I thought he pulled that actually last week.

President Bassemier: He did.

Councilmember Raben: He made that correction last week.

Councilmember Tornatta: So that's set in at zero.

Councilmember Wortman: So that would be zero?

Councilmember Raben: Take the air conditioning out and –

Councilmember Tornatta: It's set in at zero, right? David? Set it in at zero?

Councilmember Raben: Yeah, that is zero. So let me amend that motion, that 1310-3560 line be set in at zero.

President Bassemier: Okay. And what is your total now?

Councilmember Sutton: \$125,881.

Councilmember Hoy: Were you the seconder, Mr. Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes, I was. I'll accept the amendment .

President Bassemier: Any discussion on it? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

SUPERINTENDENT OF COUNTY BUILDINGS		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1310-3520	Equipment Repair	8,500.00	8,500.00
1310-4120	Buildings	11,411.00	11,411.00
1310-3530	Contractual Services	5,578.00	5,578.00
1310-3200	Utilities	90,000.00	90,000.00
1310-2600	Office Supplies	1,883.00	1,883.00
1310-3440	Advertising	1,000.00	1,000.00
1310-3560	A/C & Drinking Fountain (Soft Drinks)	915.00	0.00
1310-3791	Promotional	7,509.00	7,509.00
Total		126,796.00	125,881.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

BURDETTE PARK

President Bassemier: Jim, Burdette Park.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, 1450-3200 Utilities for a total request of \$5,000. I'll move approval.

Councilmember Hoy: Second.

President Bassemier: I have a second. Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

BURDETTE PARK		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1450-3200	Utilities	5,000.00	5,000.00
Total		5,000.00	5,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

LEGAL AID/UNITED WAY

President Bassemier: Okay, Jim.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Legal Aid/United Way 4290-3130 and 4290-3990 for a total request of \$841. I'll move approval.

President Bassemier: Got a second?

Councilmember Winnecke: Second.

President Bassemier: Okay, any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

LEGAL AID/UNITED WAY		REQUESTED	APPROVED
4290-3130	Travel/Mileage	600.00	600.00
4290-3990	Miscellaneous	241.00	241.00
Total		841.00	841.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

GENERAL FUND REPEAL REQUESTS

COUNTY COMMISSIONERS/REPEAL

President Bassemier: Okay, Jim.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, County Commissioners repeal request, line 1300-3860 in the amount of \$1,472. I'll move approval.

Councilmember Sutton: Second.

President Bassemier: I have a second from Mr. Sutton. Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

COUNTY COMMISSIONERS		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1300-3860	Contractual Computer	1,472.00	1,472.00
Total		1,472.00	1,472.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

TRANSFER REQUESTS

AUDITOR
CUMULATIVE BRIDGE
PIGEON TOWNSHIP ASSESSOR (LATE TRANSFER)

LEGAL AID SOCIETY OF EVANSVILLE
HEALTH

President Bassemier: Okay, Mr. Raben, going into transfers.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, we have four transfers before us today. Let me make sure there are not any – there is a late one for Pigeon Township Assessor. If everybody is comfortable with that, we'll take them all in one lump.

President Bassemier: Is that okay with everybody?

Councilmember Raben: I'll move approval of all transfer requests as they are submitted.

President Bassemier: Okay, any discussion? Okay, roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

AUDITOR		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From:1020-1200-1020	Bookkeeper II/Welfare	960.00	960.00
To: 1020-1220-1020	Administration Secretary	960.00	960.00

LEGAL AID SOCIETY OF EVANSVILLE		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1460-3520	Equipment Repair	300.00	300.00
1460-3140	Telephone	439.43	439.43
To: 1460-3540	Maintenance Contract	739.43	739.43

CUMULATIVE BRIDGE		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 2030-4401	Broadway Ave. Br. #273	5,500.00	5,500.00
To: 2030-4429	Engineer Equipment	5,500.00	5,500.00

HEALTH		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 2130-3510	Other Operating	4,540.00	4,540.00
To: 2130-1510-2130	Secretary/HCP	4,020.00	4,020.00
2130-1900	FICA	308.00	308.00
2130-1910	PERF	212.00	212.00

PIGEON TOWNSHIP ASSESSOR		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1150-1920	Insurance	10,692.71	10,692.71
To: 1150-1140-1150	Deputy Assessor/Business Personal Property	652.68	652.68
1150-1150-1150	Real Estate Transfer Clerk	5,896.63	5,896.63
1150-1180-1150	Business/Personal Property Deputy	1,428.33	1,428.33
1150-1190-1150	Real Estate Deputy	2,715.07	2,715.07

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

AMENDMENTS TO SALARY ORDINANCE

President Bassemier: Okay, Jim, we're ready to do amendments to the Salary Ordinance.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, we have several today so bear with me. Recorder, amend the Salary Ordinance in line 1040-1130 First Deputy/Bookkeeper as previously adopted with an annual salary of \$30,776, and also under the Recorder, amend the salary ordinance line 1040-1990 Extra Help as previously adopted. Sheriff's Department, amend the Salary Ordinance line 1050-1130 Computer Systems Operator in as previously adopted at a PAT IV Step 2 with an annual salary of \$29,344. County Assessor, amend the Salary Ordinance line 1090-1200 Real Estate Deputy as previously adopted at an annual salary rate of \$24,328. Property Tax Assessment Board of Appeals, line 1091-1990 Extra Help as previously adopted. German Township Assessor salary line 1120-1120 Chief Deputy in as previously adopted with an annual salary of \$30,776. Public Defender's Office salary line 1303-1750 Secretary as previously approved as a COMOT V, Step 3 with an annual salary at \$26,508. The Auditor, amend the Salary Ordinance line 1020-1220 Administration Secretary as the transfer previously approved. Health Department, salary line 2130-1510 Secretary/HCP as the transfer previously adopted. Superior Court, salary lines 1370-1790 Child Placement Officer as a PAT V Step 3, with an annual salary of \$34,549. County Commissioners, amend Exhibit H of the Salary Ordinance to the following: County Commission to pay part-time employee for Old Courthouse up to \$8 per hour; part-time office staff at a rate of up to \$8 per hour. Superintendent of County Buildings pay a part-time employee for Old Courthouse up to \$8 per hour and a part-time office staff employee for the Old Courthouse up to \$8 per hour. Pigeon Assessor, amend the Salary Ordinance as the transfer previously approved for the following: 1150-1140 Business Personal Property Deputy COMOT IV Step 1 with an annual salary of \$22,130, salary line 1150-1150 Real Estate Transfer Deputy at a COMOT V Step 5 with an annual salary of \$29,158, account 1150-1180 Business Personal Property/1st Deputy as a COMOT V Step 3 with an annual salary of \$26,508, 1150-1190 Real Estate Deputy as a COMOT V Step 2 with an annual salary of \$25,278, 1150-1170 Deputy Assessor change position title to Office Coordinator which is a COMOT V Step 2 at a salary of \$25,278. All salary ordinance amendments will be effective May 7th of this year. Community Corrections, we need to make the adjustments from the March 7th meeting as follows: 136.1-1290 Clerk \$25,583 and 136Y-1190 Corrections Officer up to \$25,865. There will be a test on this following approval. I make that in the form of a motion.

Councilmember Sutton: I didn't catch that, can you say that again? The motion?

Councilmember Raben: Were you sleeping? See I can say all that and the tape didn't go blank on me, Royce.

Councilmember Winnecke: Second.

President Bassemier: Jim, could you on number eight, could you take that separately, because a couple of us voted against that?

Councilmember Raben: On which one?

President Bassemier: The Recorder.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Mr. President, I can do just that. I will withdraw from that original motion the second item on the Recorder's Office which is to amend the salary line for 1040-1990 Extra Help. I will exclude that from my original motion.

President Bassemier: Do I have a second?

Councilmember Winnecke: I'll amend my second.

President Bassemier: Okay. Now, Jim, you're making a motion for the rest of them, right?

Councilmember Raben: Right.

President Bassemier: Okay, do I have a second on that?

Councilmember Raben: (Inaudible – microphone not turned on)

President Bassemier: And there was a second on that. Any discussion on those? Okay, roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Mr. President, now I'm going to make a motion under the Recorder's Office to amend salary line 1040-1990 Extra Help as previously adopted and that is my motion.

Councilmember Winnecke: Second.

President Bassemier: Any discussion on that one? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: No.

(Motion carried 6-1/Councilmember Bassemier opposed)

President Bassemier: We're going to change the tape.

(Tape changed)

<p style="text-align: center;">RESOLUTION DENYING COIT DISTRIBUTION TO SOLID WASTE DISTRICTS IN 2002</p>

President Bassemier: Under New Business, letter A, need a motion for the resolution denying COIT distribution to Solid Waste Districts in 2002.

Councilmember Hoy: So moved.

President Bassemier: Do I have a second?

Councilmember Raben: I'll second.

President Bassemier: Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

President Bassemier: We covered letter B last week.

<p>RESOLUTION PROPOSING AN ORDINANCE OF THE VANDERBURGH COUNTY INCOME TAX COUNCIL ESTABLISHING THE PERCENTAGE CREDIT ALLOWED FOR HOMESTEADS IN 2002</p>
--

President Bassemier: We go to letter C, resolution, I need a motion, the resolution proposing an ordinance of the Vanderburgh County Income Tax Council establishing the percentage credit allowed for homesteads for 2002.

Councilmember Sutton: So moved.

Councilmember Raben: I'll second.

President Bassemier: Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

<p>ORDINANCE OF THE VANDERBURGH COUNTY INCOME TAX COUNCIL ESTABLISHING THE PERCENTAGE CREDIT ALLOWED FOR HOMESTEADS</p>
--

President Bassemier: I need a motion for an ordinance of the Vanderburgh County Income Tax Council establishing the percentage credit allowed for homesteads.

(Inaudible)

Jeff Ahlers: It's a resolution to cast the votes for the ordinance.

Councilmember Wortman: Resolution and then an ordinance, two different –

Jeff Ahlers: Right, you have a resolution first to cast your votes to pass the ordinance.

President Bassemier: And that is worded right on the ordinance.

Councilmember Raben: Mr. President, I will move to pass an ordinance of the Vanderburgh County Income Tax Council establishing the percentage credit allowed for homesteads.

Councilmember Hoy: Second.

President Bassemier: I have a second. Okay, any discussion on that? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes and I would like to make mention that we were given a copy of a memo stating that this equates to roughly \$135 per household.

President Bassemier: Wonderful.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

JILL MARCRUM, PRESIDENT EVANSVILLE BAR ASSOCIATION

President Bassemier: Okay, letter E, Jill Marcum. Your honor, please state your name for the record.

Jill Marcum: My name is Jill Marcum. I'm here as president of the Evansville Bar Association. I'd like to thank you all for this opportunity and tell you, we don't really want anything right now. So I'm probably the only person here today who doesn't really want anything from you. What I do want to talk to you about is the Evansville Bar Association submitted to you a while back a courthouse action committee report regarding the space requirements for the Vanderburgh County courts and related systems. You should have received today a copy of our addendum and the addendum was as a result of some of the questions that the County Commissioners had. We wanted to come before you today to explain to you one, why we did the report, and two, answer any questions that you might have. Basically, over a year ago, the board of directors for the Bar Association had a long range planning session at which the issues of the space in the courthouse was brought up and we decided that we needed to, as a service to the community, study that issue and provide information to not only the courts but to the community. And as a result of that, we created a committee which we later named the Courthouse Action Committee. It consists of approximately 40 attorneys affiliated with the Evansville Bar Association and here with me today is Edward Johnson who is one of the co-chairs of that committee. We're happy to answer any questions you might have. I would also like to say that I know that you have a very full agenda so if, after you've had a chance to review the addendum, we'd be happy to come back as well and answer any questions that you might have. I would like to turn it over to Edward Johnson so that he can give you an overview and then we'd be happy to answer any questions. Edward?

President Bassemier: State your name.

Edward Johnson: Mr. President and members of the County Council, I'll be brief. I want to give you the overview and I want to tell you what the problem is and I think I can do it very briefly. In 1968, when we entered the court wing over there, we had five judges. We had no magistrates, we had no senior judges, we had five judges. At that time they all had an office and they all had a courtroom. Since that time in 1968, we have tripled the number of civil filings, we have tripled the number of criminal cases. There are a lot of reasons for this, but it's happened. It's a fact of life in Evansville, Indiana, that's happened. We've gone from the five judges that we had now to 21 judges, magistrates, senior judges, and so we have 21 commissioners, we have 21 judicial officers. All this in the same building that we filled up back in 1968 and the problem and the reason that we come before you and want to alert you to this problem is for about three reasons. Number one, we want to tell you we've got a problem over there in that without the court space, with only ten court rooms for 21 judicial officers, we're woefully short on courtrooms and there are many occasions in which litigants show up for their day in court only to find out

there's not a courtroom for them to have their day in court. We've got a judge, we've got a court reporter, we've got lawyers, we've got litigants who want their problem solved, but we don't have court space. And so what we're saying is – and we don't need to double the number of court rooms. We look at 17 as the optimum number because some of the senior judges can share a courtroom. But that would give every judge and magistrate over there who works eight and a half to nine hours a day over there, give them their own courtroom and we wouldn't have the shortages and we'd be back where other communities are: one judge, one magistrate, one courtroom. So we feel like we've got a real problem in the space over there. In addition to that, we're not the only people over there that are running out of space. The judges and the magistrates don't even all have a chambers to themselves. The senior judges have maybe one or two office spaces over there and the magistrates are – they have office space that an entry level clerk wouldn't have in any other business. So we need – we're going to be needing some courtrooms, we're going to be needing some office space. The Clerk's Office is crowded. We don't have any place to store the kind of records we've had. Think back to 1968 when we had a third of the business we've got now. You can see that the storage area that was there is no longer adequate. And we believe that rather than hiring the files to be stored off premises at a cost to the county, we believe we can turn a good portion of the Old Courthouse space into space which we can use to store these files and have them available to the citizens, have them available to the judges when they need them and not wait two or three weeks until we have to rummage through the files as they are now. A couple of things we found out in working – there were 40 of us from all over the legal community that worked on this and tried to put our best thoughts together. And one of the things that we found when we got into it was, we knew we were short, I mean, it doesn't take a rocket scientist to figure out we were getting cases bumped because there's no court space available. But what we found out is that if we build a new jail there is a tremendous concern for security. Right now we've got a jail that leads into the courtroom and you have a felon who is in jail and needs to get to the courtroom, he can't go down to Circuit or Misdemeanor court through a tunnel or a passageway and never have to interact with the public. This is a security issue. If we build a new jail, we've got to find a way in the new jail to get the worst hombres in our society from the jail cell to the courtroom and back again. And what we're suggesting is and what we'd like for you to think about, we've talked to the County Commissioners about this, this seems to be a good approach, would be to build some court space right into the jail building. Build it right there and so when you've got a triple ax murderer in jail that needs to get to the courtroom, he won't have to be walked across the back forty and walked through the parking lot by Sheriff's deputies. We'll be able to get him from his jail cell right down to the courtroom the same way we do under the existing system. And so if we could have some court space in the new jail building we'll be able to do two things: number one, we'll be able to alleviate some of the overcrowding that we have now and secondly, we're going to alleviate a potential problem for security with the new jail. And so all we want you to do is to understand that we've got a problem, understand that we're going to need some more space, we're going to need some more space in that building, we're going to have to realign some of the people that are over there now so that we can get the courtrooms and the offices for the judicial officers that we need and also with regard to the new jail, hopefully, we're going to be able to get some space for courtrooms and hearing rooms. They wouldn't all have to be jury ready courtrooms. Some of the things that we do with criminals or arraignments, bond hearings, and things that could be held in very small rooms as long as we had the security there. And finally, we'd like for you to strongly consider moving some of the storage of the court's files into the Old Courthouse where we can have access to them, we being the judges and the public as well as the lawyers can get access

to them and not have to have them stored offsite at a cost to the county. Now, that's a very quick overview. I'm like Jill, I feel a little guilty standing up before you because I know you guys, I read the agenda too, and I know there's a lot on today. But we just wanted to come and talk to you and answer any questions that you might have.

President Bassemier: Mr. Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Two quick questions. One, you talk about people showing up and not having court space. To what extent is the Bar Association communicating with the judges about scheduling?

Edward Johnson: We've been in constant contact with the courts. The courts are doing the very best that they can do. Part of the problem is there are some days where you can – kind of like a flight, it's kind of like taking a flight to Indianapolis. It may get over booked, three out of five days that little puppy may take off and nobody gets left behind. The judges are in some cases double and triple booking cases hoping they'll settle. A lot of cases settle. A lot of times you'll be double booked but you'll still be able to get in and have your case tried. But there are many times that since we don't have a courtroom per judge where we show up, if nobody is in a settling mood, and everybody is there to have their day in court, we get – we've been working very closely with the judges. In fact, Judge Knight is here today. Judge Knight has spent a lot of time working on the problem of how we're going to be able to schedule and how we're going to be able to get some more court rooms.

Councilmember Winnecke: My other question has to do with the record storage. You said people have to go over there and rummage through the records. How often does that happen since it's been moved to the Kinder Storage where the bar coding is –

Edward Johnson: We have had – I personally know and I have to ask Judge Knight, but I personally have had several occasions where the files just aren't there. We're ready for trial, that old divorce file from 1988 isn't there. Some other times they'll tell us, well, we can't locate it right now. The Clerk can't locate it right now. Well, here's the docket sheets, that's the best we can do, and finally no, Ed, we don't have it today but if you'll come back in a couple of weeks we'll see if we can find it. It is a problem and we can alleviate that problem if we could centralize the records over in the Old Courthouse and have maybe like a librarian to help with the archive records over there.

Councilmember Winnecke: The records are centralized now.

Edward Johnson: Well, they may be centralized but we're still having problems and again, Judge Knight can – he sees it more than I do because he's there every day and I'm only there for trial one out of ten days. So he sees it a lot more. But to answer your question, Councilman, it's still a problem.

Jill Marcum: If I could, I'd like to address the issue of how often people get bumped. The other day I was handling a matter down in probate court. I had a hearing scheduled for 1:00. The attorneys were there promptly. Their clients were there. One of the clients was on oxygen in a wheelchair. Everybody is ready to go. There's not a courtroom. Judge Niemeier had an emergency come up. He's handling a juvenile matter. He started at 11, they went through lunch, it wasn't like they took any breaks. They tried to get it done. They finished at two. So from 1:00,

well, from about ten till one when I realized that there was a problem until 2:00, I'm looking for a courtroom. Judge Lloyd was also looking for a courtroom. She heard her matter in a jury room. Senior Judge O'Connor also was looking for a courtroom. He happened to be in the right place at the right time and heard that microcircuit was done and he scooted up there to hear his case. That's how our day goes. You spend, because things are set and emergencies come up and we double book and triple book things because we're trying to move things as quickly as we can, those things come up and there are days when there just aren't courtrooms.

President Bassemier: Mr. Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Magistrate Marcrum, do you have any problems with lawyers not showing up when they are supposed to show up? Because I've run into that where the lawyer was in another court, he was in federal court and the family had paid \$500 for that lawyer to appear and he never appeared. They got billed. I'm not saying every lawyer does this but this is a complaint that I hear. Perhaps it's the constituency that I hang around with.

Jill Marcrum: I have had, I can think of one attorney in the past month who had a matter in Federal court. He called. He was delayed in federal court, he called and said I'm hung up here. I will be there as soon as I can. We waited and we held that trial. There are times –

Councilmember Hoy: There was no call in this case, just a bill.

Jill Marcrum: And I can't respond to that because I don't know. I mean, I know that attorneys have...

Councilmember Hoy: The other complaint, you know, and I wanted to raise the issue is with the rotation of judges, the other thing I hear and having had a lot of in the times past, the place I managed, we had folks there from Community Corrections. Frankly, their lawyers were judge shopping. It's a concern that I have. I think you need some more room. I'm not against you getting more room, but I'm also very, very interested in seeing the system function as well as it can. I can tell you this, that if that lawyer had not shown up for me I would not have gotten a bill nor would I have paid a bill. And I'm talking about people who I think get shoved around by the system and they're always low income.

Jill Marcrum: And I won't disagree with that.

Councilmember Hoy: One of the judges thought I was - they're not all African-American, they're, a lot of them are white, Hispanic...

Jill Marcrum: Well the race doesn't matter. I will tell you that in any profession there are people who make mistakes and obviously if that happened, that attorney made a mistake. What we're here to talk about, and while I appreciate your concerns and your concerns about the rotation system, that is more the legal process and if you want to come over and we'll help you understand the legal process, Judge Pigman gave me the authority to invite the County Commissioners. I am sure I have the same authority if any of the County Council want to come over and we'll try to help you to understand how our legal system operates. We'd be happy to do that but I think what's important to realize is that what we're talking about here are the physical space issues, okay. Other people have raised the issue of whether or not the judges should rotate. Quite frankly, that's up to the judges, okay. The Bar Association has no authority over that. That's up to the judges. What the Bar

Association's concern was the lack of courtroom, the fact that attorneys – let me tell you something: when those attorneys were there with their clients and I had to walk by that woman in that wheelchair at least four times and say ma'am, as soon as we find – you know, she's on oxygen, she's in a wheelchair – as soon as we find a courtroom we will hear your case, okay. Now, I don't know whether those attorneys billed those clients, but they were there and they were there in plenty of time to start their hearing on time. That's the problem that we're here to try to solve. No profession is perfect, okay, and we try to help any attorneys who have problems. We try to assist them and solve those problems. Again, that's a separate issue, okay. That doesn't solve, that's not what creates our courthouse space problem. What we're trying to do is move jury trials, both criminal and civil, we're trying to hold emergency hearings, we're trying to help people get their divorces, get their child support, get their custody determined so that they can move on with their lives. Whenever someone comes to court it's a traumatic event for them. And it's important to realize because nobody cares about it until they have to go to court. But when you're sitting there and you're trying to get custody of your child or you're trying to get your child support or you're trying to have your issue resolved whatever it is, it's extremely important that you not have to sit there and wait an hour for a courtroom and that's our position. That's the Bar Association's concern. We think that's in the public's interest and we think that's what's important.

Councilmember Hoy: My only response is that I understand your differentiation and I know that you, being a magistrate, have been on both sides of the bench so to speak, but I guess I just hear enough that I know that this kind of thing does mess with the flow of the system.

Jill Marcrum: What kind of thing messes with –

Councilmember Hoy: The things I mentioned about –

Jill Marcrum: The rotation system?

Councilmember Hoy: That because things get put off and then people waiting and sometimes waiting for...I don't think it's just space. I think we need to give you more space but I have some problems with the flow of the system.

Jill Marcrum: Well, and like I said, Judge Knight is here and, Judge, if I'm incorrect I know you're not the Chief Judge anymore, but if I'm incorrect, I think the court system would welcome the Council. We'd be happy to help them understand how our system works so that we could try to solve that.

Doug Knight: If we stopped the rotation – I'm sorry, Doug Knight, Judge, Vanderburgh Superior Court. Councilmember, if we stopped the rotation system today we'd have to have one courtroom for every Judge and probably every judicial officer. That would just be a given. I want to move my cases as fast as Judge X wants to move his or her cases and so I am going to compete even more fiercely for that courtroom space. That's the very first thing that happens when you get rid of the rotation system. There's a host of drawbacks, something that the judge's have examined over a great number of years in looking at the rotation system. Let's sit down and talk about it.

Councilmember Hoy: I think that's a good idea. The other statistic I would like to know is how many are settled out of court, you know...

Doug Knight: How many are settled out of court?

Councilmember Hoy: How many cases, yeah.

Doug Knight: Fortunately, a tremendous number of them.

Councilmember Hoy: That was my information but I don't know what the percentage is.

Doug Knight: And there is nothing that settles a case faster than an available courtroom. That's the most important weapon that we have and Councilmember, we over book. There's no question about it and we want to over book and will continue to over book because that settles cases.

Councilmember Hoy: Well, you understand we're dealing with a lot of financial issues and the other thing I have a problem with and I've heard the explanation but I just want to express my problem with it is if a relative of mine or a good friend of mine were going to court, I'd rather that courtroom not be in the jail.

Doug Knight: I agree with you.

Councilmember Hoy: There's something about that that gives a message that I don't think is a good message.

Doug Knight: There are other complications about putting courtrooms in jails and we've got to be very careful on what it looks like and how secure things are and we don't want to just presume people are in jail because they ought to be there at the end of the trial just like they were at the beginning of the trial.

Councilmember Hoy: I appreciate that. Thank you.

Jill Marcrum: I would like to –

President Bassemier: Thank you, Judge.

Jill Marcrum: Two comments real quick. Councilman, on the issue of the courtrooms in the jail, one, we've discussed this with the criminal defense bar because they, too, share that concern. It would be called the criminal justice building, criminal justice center, whatever, and there would be separate entrances. A lot of people don't realize our jail now is connected to the courts so there are ways to handle that. The other thing is that Susan Helfrich, the executive director of our Bar Association, reminded me that in particular with respect to fees, we have a grievance system, okay. And so whenever a client has a problem with an attorney's fees, there is a system that they can go through within the Bar Association that the Bar Association offers that if they'd like to utilize that system, we're happy to help them out with that. And if you'd like I can give you Susan's card with her number on it.

Councilmember Hoy: I don't want to beat this to death. We've got enough on our agenda. (Inaudible – microphone not turned on).

Jill Marcrum: Well, I think the Bar Association as well as the courts are the first to admit that no system is perfect. What we're trying to do is provide space so that people can have their hearings, their trials in a timely fashion and in a humane fashion so that they're not forced to sit two feet across from the person who has battered them throughout their marriage. Anybody else? Like I said, if there are any other questions down the road, we're happy to come back.

Councilmember Hoy: I'd like for us to have, Mr. President, a chance to look this over and have you all come back so that we could discuss what's in this packet because, obviously, –

Jill Marcum: You got it on short notice.

Councilmember Hoy: I read pretty fast but I can't absorb it that rapidly.

President Bassemier: You can set it up with Sandie, whenever is convenient for you all.

Jill Marcum: That will be fine. I appreciate it. Thank you.

President Bassemier: Thank you very much. Appreciate it.

<p>PRELIMINARY RESOLUTION FOR PROPERTY TAX ABATE- MENT OF PROPERTY LOCATED AT 5504 FOUNDATION DRIVE/ WOODWARD COMMERCIAL REALTY</p>
--

President Bassemier: Okay, moving on. If it's okay with everybody, they both pertain to each other, we'll take letters F & G. What I'd like to do is get a motion on the floor and a second and then we'll have everybody – we'll discuss it and then go from there and then we'll have it out of the way. Is it okay with everybody? I need a motion to approve a preliminary resolution for property tax abatement of property located at 5504 Foundation Drive/Woodward Commercial Realty and also motion for preliminary resolution for property tax abatement for acquisition and installation of new manufacturing equipment at 5504 Foundation Drive/Graham Packaging Company, L.P. Do I have a motion and a second on that?

Councilmember Hoy: Mr. President, I would like to request that we deal with these separately.

President Bassemier: Okay. Is that okay with everybody? That's fine, okay. I just thought they pertained to each other. If that's okay with everybody we'll take one of them at a time. Can we get it on the floor and then we'll discuss it?

Councilmember Raben: So moved.

Councilmember Winnecke: Second.

President Bassemier: Okay.

(Inaudible – microphone not turned on)

President Bassemier: We're moving on F, okay. I'll repeat it. Preliminary resolution for property tax abatement of property located at 5504 Foundation Drive/Woodward Commercial Realty. Okay, gentlemen, who is...please state your name for the record.

Mary Wildeman: Mary Wildeman with the Department of Metropolitan Development. I am here just to give you the department's recommendation for both of these tax abatement requests. We do recommend that you approve them and I believe Ken Robinson and the company representatives are here to give you a display.

Councilmember Wortman: Mr. Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Mr. Wortman? Ma'am? Do you want her back?

Councilmember Wortman: Can I ask you a question? In reference to Woodward Development, is there any other contractors bidding on this besides Woodward?

Mary Wildeman: The representatives from Woodward are here if you'd like to...

President Bassemier: Whenever you all are ready, please state your name and your business please, for the record.

Ken Robinson: My name is Ken Robinson, executive director of Vision 2000. There was a question...we can have that addressed when the company comes up and makes their presentation they can address all the contractor issues. I'd like to begin by addressing the issue of how we have been involved in this project and then introduce the company and then I will come back and talk specifically about the project that we're asking for the abatement on. This project surfaced about a year ago and as you know, Vision 2000 is the organization dedicated to bringing new jobs and industry to Vanderburgh County, the city of Evansville and the region. We are constantly asked to provide information about the competitiveness of Vanderburgh County in terms of investment for economic development purposes and that includes knowing, providing and knowing information about sites, buildings, workforce, cost of doing business, the approval process, how long it takes to get a project up and running and as you can imagine, we are in an extremely competitive environment for economic development, not only in the Midwest but in the country in general that companies are looking for opportunities all over the area to site new facilities. And in order for us to be competitive we have to have tools available to us, sites, buildings and we have to have a good cost of doing business in not only the state of Indiana because we're competing with Kentucky and Illinois and Ohio many times, but also right here in our home county, we have to have a good quality of life and cost of doing business. One of the features that we have to offer now is the Vanderburgh Industrial Park and I want to thank you for all of the help and support that you have offered to make the Vanderburgh Industrial Park what it is today. This map would not have been possible had it not been for the good fortune of the Evansville Industrial Foundation to secure the property and your help in making the infrastructure improvements that are out there today that are making this probably one of the top quality industrial parks in this part of the Midwest and our goal, as well as I know your desire, is to fill that park up with good quality companies and I believe Graham Packaging is one of those quality companies that we would all be proud to have in our neighborhood, so to speak. So to be successful in attracting good paying jobs, quality companies, we need to offer incentives in many cases and we're before you today to ask for your help in bringing this company to Vanderburgh County. And with that, I would like to introduce Paul Bailie, who is the director of finance and business development with Graham Packaging, to give you an overview of this quality company and then I will come back and explain the project.

President Bassemier: Thank you, Mr. Robinson. We're going to take a second here to change the tape.

(Tape changed)

Paul Bailie: Paul Bailie, director of business development and finance for Graham Packaging Company. Ladies and gentlemen, thank you for having me here today.

As Ken said, we've been working on this for over a year, looking for a place, a new home, for Graham Packaging in middle America. And as Ken says, you're competing, we're competing. It's all about economics. For me to be competitive, for my company to be competitive I need to get to the best economics. For you to compete with me you have to help me get to the best economics. So we're here today to ask you about tax abatements. You have a real gift here in Ken. He's like a bulldog. Once he got hold of me he wouldn't let me out of his sight for a year and so he's been holding on tenaciously to me and Graham Packaging, working to bring our company here to the Evansville area. So who is Graham Packaging? I tend to walk around. I'm going to take this off for a little bit and excuse me if my back gets turned to you as I look at the screen. I apologize. Graham Packaging is not a household name to you but I can guarantee you, you probably as recently as this morning, you've probably handled one of our products. So let me introduce you to our company and talk to you about the pride that we have in our products and in our company. As you can start to see, some of the products are starting to appear here on our little globe. We are a global company and I'll talk to you about that in a moment. Let's see if I can get the technology to work for me. We are Graham Packaging. I would like to give you this overview of our company. Who are we? We are an independent, privately held company generating over \$800,000,000 in sales in the year 2000 on a global basis with strong momentum going into the millennium. We believe our growth rate will continue as it has in the past years. We are focused on custom blow molded containers and converting market niches. Why is that important? It's because we are focused on containers that have an identity to them that give brand identity to our customers and add value to their product when they go to market. We currently operate sixty plants in fourteen countries and with a third of our plants we're either onsite at our customer's facility or we are near a site to where the opportunity exists. We service the blue chip customer community. This is sort of like a top ten or top twenty of our customer list. I'm sure you will recognize many of the names. Many of these customers are serviced 100 percent by Graham Packaging, in other words, they have no other supplier to package their product and take them to market. So they have put their trust in Graham Packaging to deliver their product to the retail shelf. We are focused on rigid custom plastic containers in three markets worldwide: the automotive market on the left, and you'll certainly begin to recognize some of the products here. We have about a 70% to 75% share of the automotive "quart motor oil bottle business" as well as the antifreeze. So you've seen Pennzoil, Texaco, Havilene, Castrol, those are all our bottles, bringing you automotive products. In the juice market, we have sold to literally every person who puts juice in a bottle in the United States. At one time or another they've put their product on the retail shelf in a Graham bottle. In the household care segment, household care and personal care, we are a strong second worldwide in that market with detergents, fabric care and personal care products. Where are we located? We are global. We're 60 plants worldwide, 38 in North America, 15 in Europe and 7 in Latin American. We rim the United States. We are in the major metropolitan areas in Europe and we are in the developing areas in Latin America. We employ over 4,000 worldwide. We have an affirmative action program. We are an equal opportunity employer. This is what I call our perfect curve. It doesn't get much better than this. We have been on a growth trend. We finished the year of 2000 at \$825,000,000 in sales and we have to keep that trend going or I won't be back here next year. So that's our intention. We've been growing at a compounded annual growth rate of 23% a year. Our drive is our growth and how we have changed over the years. In 1992 our sales were \$274,000,000, in 2000 \$825,000,000; 68% of the sales in the year 1992 were in the automotive sections while only 4% were in food and beverage and 28% in household care. We have changed that. While we have continued to grow in automotive and household care, we have really kicked up – this is where the growth

has been and we have been riding that wave, the things that are coming out of glass. All those sodas, those juices, that used to be in glass bottles, we're putting them in plastic we're riding that wave. So we've had great diversification, great for our risk profile. At the same time we were only 5% in Europe and 95% focused in North America. By 2000 we had grown to 17% in Europe and 3% in Latin America. What is that? That is Graham Packaging following its global customers around the world. We are a global supplier to our global customers. We want to be in every country they are. We want to be their one and only supplier. That's our goal. We've built our business on market conversions. What is a market conversion? That is when something is in one type of package material and moves to another. For example, the conversion of juice and drinks from glass, paper and metal to plastic. We've been seeing that. You're seeing it more now in the convenience stores. Even small bottles are going into plastic. The shift from – remember the old powders, the detergent powders into liquid fabric care? We rode that market. We grew our business there and in the automotive division. Remember those slimy old cardboard oil cans? We created the conversion out of the composite can into the plastic bottle. We are a clean neighbor. We do not pollute, we do not have air pollution, we do not have effluent pollution so we are a good neighbor. We have a great safety record. Our workman's comp is .67 versus a U.S. average of 1.0 so we're very safe. We have state of the art fire suppression so we think we're a very safe and proactive safety company. PET business: this is not pet food, this is not at all about animals. What is it, PET is polyethylene terephthalate, which means clear plastic in other words. We started this division in about 1992. I want to talk about it because we've gotten a lot of attaboys and a lot of exciting things that I think you should know about Graham Packaging. Our product focus is to be innovative, package solutions to add value to our customers' product as it goes to market, to give them brand identity, in other words, you can identify their product just by looking at our bottle, and to give point of sale differentiation, to know a customers' product when it hits the cash register. We do that by blending a design and engineering know-how that allows us to bring these value added solutions to our customers. For food and beverage which is where most of the juice and the PET bottles are located, you can see we rim the United States and we have middle America covered here in the north in Holland, Michigan and here in the south in Muskogee, Oklahoma, and we have this gap here which I call serving middle America. We've been looking in this area for a year now, Kentucky, Illinois, Indiana. Ken got a hold of me, he won't let go of me and we're here today to talk to you about being your neighbor, being somebody to bring jobs and investment to your community. Heat-set PET. What does heat-set mean? That means the ability to withstand heat. A lot of packages are filled hot, at 195 degrees and they wanted a form, we've been very proactive in developing new products. The first heat-set containers came out in the 1980's. They all looked the same. They were all round, they all had this label and they were all hard to hold and were just downright ugly. What has been Graham been doing? Well, the industry – just a little bit of background, if you ever took off one of these labels, you'd see these mechanical style vacuum panels that allowed these bottles to work. They were not friendly, they didn't offer any identity to the customers' bottles. And the industry just proliferated so across the industry every bottle looked the same, a round bottle with a label on it. What did Graham do? Graham introduced, and you'll recognize this bottle, in the mid 1990's we introduced the grip bottle, something you could really get your hands around. We changed the market in the mid 1990's. Customers loved it, they loved being able to grip – being able to get a grip on their bottle. Brand identify. What is brand identity? It's being able to identify your product by the way your bottle looks. This is the heritage bottle for White House Apple Juice. They came to us and they said can you make a plastic bottle that looks just like our glass bottle that we started off with years and years ago? We did it. It wasn't easy, but we did it. And then a

recent innovation, our third generation, instead of those ugly panels we came out with a rectangular bottle that utilized a panel that's hid behind the label to take up that vacuum when that heat dissipated. Revolutionized the first rectangular heat-set hot-filled bottled for Tropicana Twister. Even when we were stuck with the old round design we were able to design functional vacuum panels that had decorative features that had Snapple engraved in the middle of the bottle. What is wide-mouth heat-set? Heat-set is again is the ability to resist heat. It's one of our trademarks and our abilities. What is wide-mouth? That's the jars that used to be all in glass because plastic couldn't withstand heat. What have we done? In 1998 we introduced the applesauce jar to the applesauce industry for Tree Top and had great success. In 1999 Graham introduced the jelly jars which were not only hot-fillable, but also grippable. Great, especially for kids. They didn't slip out of their hands and they bounce, you know. They don't break when they hit the ground. Last year Ragu has launched two new packages that have been phenomenally successful putting sauce into grippable hot-fill plastic jars. We're proud about what we do, we think we're a value – I'm going to boast a little bit about what we've done. Ocean Spray named us supplier of the year in 1996, 1998 and 1999. Refrigerated and frozen foods package of the year, 1998. Remember the sticky cans, the frozen concentrate cans? It took us seven years to figure out how to make a plastic lid and plastic can that would freeze and thaw, freeze and thaw, and get to your home without leaking, but we did it. Dupont gave us the Diamond award for the Seneca, for the hot-fill apple juice jar. Food and drug packaging again gave us another award for the applesauce jar. Welch's named us supplier of the year in 1998 for the composite cans, the grippable juice bottles. AmeriStar gave us an award in 1999 for the frozen juice Twister and the Snapple. Again, a WorldStar award in 1999 for the Twister bottle, innovative design, innovative design again in the frozen juice category. And the AmeriStar award for 2000 for the grippable jelly, the grippable sauce. Have you seen Hershey's moollennium? It's the shape of their cow, Herschel the cow, we designed that bottle for them. It's been a great success. And taking the c-stores out of glass and putting them into small plastic bottles with a special coding to protect the product from oxygen degradation. That is Graham Packaging. If you think I'm excited about our company, I am. We'd love to be in this area. We need to service middle America. We've been around a long time. We've got a great track record with our customers. We're looking to invest about 22 million dollars in machinery equipment here and have a building built with local labor and a local contractor to house our operation. So if you are willing to compete with me, I'm willing to compete in middle America with you. Thank you for your time.

President Bassemier: Thank you, Mr. Bailie.

Ken Robinson: Now I'd like to just give you an overview of the project itself and...the project is located out at the Vanderburgh Industrial Park. This is the park design. They are located on lot 12, which is 23 acres. The ownership of the industrial park is as I mentioned, is the Vanderburgh Industrial or the Evansville Industrial Foundation with the assistance of the county putting the infrastructure in, making the park what it is today. The park is designed to attract quality projects, quality jobs, to the area. And really, I think we all have to look at that as an investment in our future. The project itself consists of 147,200 square foot manufacturing facility expandable on lot 12 to 200,000 square feet and the lot itself can accommodate up to 300,000 square feet. This is going to be a well constructed building. Here is a rendering from Woodward Commercial Realty showing the building as they're proposing, well constructed. We comply with all local, state, fire and safety regulations and codes and we'll have state of the art suppression systems built in, sprinklers, demising walls and the ongoing dialogue with local officials on the

construction of this building. The new facility is estimated to cost between five and five and a half million dollars and new manufacturing equipment, both of which we're applying for today in the abatement is valued at 22.3 million dollars. The project will employ 61 full-time employees with employment raising to 69 within five years. The salaries, this is the significant part of this project, for those initial employees will be over two million dollars annually. Hourly wages will be in excess of \$15 plus benefits and benefits include full medical, pension, paid vacations, etc., about 32% of base salary. Let me tell you that in my experience, it's unusual, it's great when you find prospects and projects that have this kind of investment and these kinds of wages. These are the kind of projects that any community would go to the mat for based on the quality of the company. And I thought that Graham, when I heard the presentation and did some research on it, was sort of the Cadillac of the blow molding industry. They're not the Cadillac, they're the Rolls Royce. They don't get better than this company when you're a 100% supplier to Proctor & Gamble, to Quaker State, there's a lot of faith in that you can deliver and I think those are the kind of companies we'd be proud of having in the industrial park. One of the things I'd like to in closing my comments is say that we have a wonderful plastics economy here in Evansville. We are built on plastics. We were some of the first to perfect injection molding and what we don't have is we don't have a blow molder and I think it's important as we diversify our plastics economy and Graham Packaging is going to give us that opportunity not only just to bring a blow molder in here but to bring the best blow molder in the country, in fact in the world, right here to Evansville, Indiana. I think it's a great fit. This project will also help to do one really important infrastructure item to the industrial park and that's to bring rail. And rail is very, very expensive, approaching a million dollars to bring it. With your help, we will be able to derive some incentives from the state of Indiana to help us bring that rail not to the site, to the park, but actually to the site of Graham and this will again help us make a rail served park a reality. Getting back to the training opportunities, Graham does a significant amount of employee training and I have, Ivy Tech is here today because they have the plastics technology program and we envision that there will be an expansion of their activities in the blow molding area and we want to partner with them as well as Graham and help bring that to fruition because we have a lot of money, time and effort invested in the plastics technology program. This will again help to diversify the training opportunities for these young people to get involved in an area of plastics that we really have no opportunities for them. It's a great way to keep some of those young people who may otherwise leave this area and be valued employees to Graham Packaging. And one thing that Graham has agreed and will help us in doing is attracting other companies to Vanderburgh County that see that we are a quality location that we can compete, that we can make a solid argument that we have the type of environment, both business, quality of life and location to be attractive to companies of the quality of Graham. And I just want to say that in closing, you know, economic development is a very, very competitive business. It's really a process of elimination. Companies are looking for ways to get rid of you, to eliminate you because they have other great communities that want their business. And I'll tell you flat out, I am really tired of losing projects to Owensboro, Kentucky and I really would like your help on this one. Thank you.

President Bassemier: Anybody got any questions? Anybody else? Mr. Woodward?

Bob Woodward: Mr. President, Councilmembers, my name is Bob Woodward of Woodward Commercial Realty and Development. I was just sitting here thinking that we've been doing business in Evansville for over 20 years and I've really never appeared before this group before. In fact, I have to admit I really didn't know exactly what you did but I figured out you have the checkbook of the entire county.

President Bassemier: You'll know today.

Bob Woodward: But even worse than that you've got to balance it at the end of every month, so I really don't envy your job. Woodward came into the equation about a month ago when we were asked, because things were getting very competitive and I think things were headed toward Owensboro, if we would like to bid on this project. Two days later we loaded the Woodward team and I might add our local banker into the plane. We arrived at York, Pennsylvania at 7:00 in the morning. We visited three of their facilities. We had a meeting in their boardroom with at least 15 people, everyone from the CEO, I think, to the janitor in the company, was there to answer our questions and particularly the questions of our banker. And I'll just publically say thank you right now to Old National Bank for sending a high level representative with us that day and approving the loan on the spot so that we could be competitive because it was a short term track. What I saw scared me and I'm going to express a little bit of it to you today because it's the new world. We walked into a huge factory and then we walked into a second huge factory and then we walked into a third huge factory that was as clean, as environmentally friendly and as perfect as this room, but not with a lot of employees and it suddenly dawned on me that that's the future of the world that we live in today. No longer are we going to be competing for a company that brings three or four or five hundred employees. The good news is we can become the silicone valley of the plastic business and of the other businesses and I'm probably going to be shot when – in fact, I'm going to look over my shoulder as I say this – at Vision 2000, you have one of the most beautiful, empty industrial parks I've ever seen. And as a developer, the first thing that we know we have to do is we attract someone into that park that we can stake our hat on in our park, whether it's General Electric, Merrill Lynch, Airborne Express, Frito Lay, Anthem, Accordia, it doesn't matter. We need a major client so that we can say this is a good place to be. See who located here. I have never seen a more competitive company. I have never seen a more diverse company. I will guarantee you, everyone in this room, from the time you got up this morning to the time you go to bed tonight, someone in your household will have handled a product in a piece of Graham Packaging. I was particularly impressed in the negotiations when one of the major issues was do you have the ability and the room to expand an additional 100,000 square feet within two years if we need it. And yes, because of the size of the lot, we do have that. As Woodward, we will own the building. The tax abatement will pass through to Graham. We are the contractor. As in every project that we do, there will be no one on our team that does the construction of this building other than local people. The question was asked earlier, were there other competitive bidders? I can't answer that truthfully but I am told there were two or three locally and I know the meetings have gone on intensely against Owensboro. The meeting in my office went on until 1:30 this morning and I know the competitor is Owensboro and I don't think they lied to me when they shared the lease price with Owensboro which is cheaper than ours because Owensboro has the money that doesn't have to be borrowed to build the facility and that in itself amounts to two or two and a half million dollars. So we have screwed things down just as tightly as we possibly can, yet giving the very best of quality because this is our building. It's not just Graham's and the one that represents you. It represents our company and we're very, very proud of it. And when I look at tax abatement, I've heard people say today we want a lot, we want a little, we don't want anything from you. I think Graham is the only person here today that says we want to give you something, because tax abatement really is meaningless on an empty piece of ground. There are no taxes there now. Graham is offering you a CD. It won't pay you interest this year, but next year it pays you 10%, the following 20, the following 30, the following 40. The taxes are phased in. So we have nothing now, we have nothing to lose except Graham.

Graham has a lot to offer and we need to get this park started. So I wholeheartedly encourage you to support this and I want to thank Ken Robinson for his help; he has been a bulldog on this. Ron Keeping was on the phone with us last night at 10:30, saying if there is anything that you need that we can possibly do to get this done. And David Mosby, I called last night at 12:30 because we had a question, expecting his wife to kill me, but he answered the phone and the only thing David said after he answered the question: call me back and let me know if we got the deal. Are there any questions I can answer for you?

Councilmember Hoy: You mentioned that you're going to use local labor.

Bob Woodward: Yes sir.

Councilmember Hoy: And should we grant the tax abatement, I think you know you have to pay prevailing wage under tax abatement. Are you aware of that?

Bob Woodward: I wasn't aware of that but I am sure that won't be a problem because probably 80% of the labor that we use now is union and I'm sure that's going to be –

Councilmember Hoy: That was my next, what is the percentage of...

Bob Woodward: Our projects that we're currently running now range about 70 to 80% union. They're bid jobs. This is a large job. I would suspect that the union percentage will be even higher because it's normally the union companies that have the ability to get in and move and we've pledged to have this facility finished by the end of December. Now I can tell you in our negotiations with Graham and what we signed with him last night, it is contingent on tax abatement for Graham. And Owensboro, Kentucky is still out there looming. And I'm like the rest of the gentlemen, I live in Evansville, Indiana and that's where I want to see Graham and I want to see hundreds of other industries, particularly the environmentally friendly that pay the kind of wages they do because it's this kind of industry that spins off the industry that we normally deal with that's the 10, the 15, and the 20,000 square foot building. And for every employee I suspect that we have here, there will be four or five more generated down the road in some other industry that takes care of them.

Councilmember Sutton: I was going to ask, Mr. Woodward, you talked about this building in terms of getting it constructed and all and a couple of months ago, I know our Commissioners worked and put together what I think is a great move in putting together a MBE program, minority business enterprise program and so I know you're moving along very rapidly on this project, very great project, but trying to get an idea as far as minority business enterprises, their opportunities, or has the window already been closed in terms of this particular project and moving forward with that and really being able to participate in the construction of this project?

Bob Woodward: We are certainly open. You're the first person that's mentioned it to me, but I would be delighted to work with anyone on this project. We're looking for quality and we have to be looking for price. Quality and price doesn't necessarily mean the lowest price.

Councilmember Sutton: Oh, absolutely. I agree with you there. But I guess what I am just wanting to hear is just that the deal isn't already closed already.

Bob Woodward: Well, let me put it this way: our construction company that builds

it, we are a general contractor with superintendents only and we will be subbing every aspect of this job. So we are expecting to have hundreds of bids in the various areas.

Councilmember Sutton: One other question that I did have, great presentation on the company, Graham, but I did have one question about just other things, supportive things in the communities that you guys are in. Obviously, you're all over the world and things outside the U.S. I have no clue about, but the kind of things locally that your employees or your organization has supported as a good neighbor for the communities that you're in. I'd like to hear about those.

Paul Bailie: We become active in our community because we have to live here so you'll find us on committees and councils. You'll find us participating in different activities and volunteer associations. We want to feel welcome, we want our employees to feel like we're all part of your family so we will, and you will find us involved in your community to a great extent. I can't give you an example of where we would be in your community today, but I know for us to be successful we have to be a part of your community and we will sign up for that.

Councilmember Sutton: Thank you.

Councilmember Raben: Oh, I'm sorry, I tried to catch you before you left the podium. Paul, I'd like to thank you for even giving our community the opportunity to be a part of your organization. My understanding, and I would have to agree, that opportunities like this are far and few and we've often had opportunities to grant abatements and work with service oriented type businesses, but \$15 an hour jobs are – don't come before us very often. But I do have a question, Bob addressed the actual structure of the building and the labor force and whatnot that will handle the five million dollar investment on the building, but the lion share of it is the 22 million dollars in manufacturing equipment so if possible, I'd like for you to brief us on that, where that equipment comes from, who you have in mind for installation and the plumbing, electrical, and whatnot of the manufacturing equipment.

Paul Bailie: Most of the equipment is proprietary, it is built in the United States and manufactured here in the United States. With regards to installation, we will have a project manager who will be responsible and a project engineer on the site where machinery installation to the greatest degree that we can other than for specialized installation which your typical vendors (inaudible) or unique equipment, we will use local labor to install for doing our pipe fitting, to do our mechanicals or electrical. So we will bring business to town in our installation of machinery as well.

Councilmember Raben: Can you just ballpark, give me an idea, percentage-wise of that, what would be like local versus brought in?

Paul Bailie: I can't off the top of my head, I cannot. I could get you that information, though.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, or possibly give me your pledge that wherever possible that, because we are dealing with local tax dollars, that, and I think you'll find our labor force and some of the magnificent structures around here, particularly with Toyota and some of the others, that we have a magnificent workforce and a very capable workforce and I would just ask for your pledge that where possible, you use local labor.

Paul Bailie: We will do that, sir.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, thank you.

Councilmember Hoy: Are any of your plants, I am going to go back to Councilman Raben's question again, I don't know if anybody from DMD is here or not who can answer this, but will they not also have to pay prevailing wage for this work?

Brenda Taylor: (Inaudible – comments not made from microphone)

Councilmember Hoy: Okay, it is a requirement for construction, is it not, that you pay prevailing wage?

Brenda Taylor: (Inaudible – comments not made from microphone)

Councilmember Hoy: That's what I was told.

President Bassemier: Mr. Hoy, I'm sorry, would she please come to the podium and state your name for the record, please.

Brenda Taylor: My name is Brenda Taylor and I'm from the Department of Metropolitan Development. I've never heard of that before.

Councilmember Hoy: Let me go back to the building itself.

Brenda Taylor: I've never heard of any type of prevailing wage in any statute or anything, right.

Councilmember Hoy: Or in the equipment?

Brenda Taylor: Or in the equipment, I've never heard of prevailing wages –

Councilmember Hoy: I was told that was the case but I wasn't sure. That's why I ...

Brenda Taylor: No, I've never heard of it, Phil.

Councilmember Hoy: Because I know when we receive federal dollars we have to pay prevailing wage, that's – do you know Mr., Marco, do you know?

Marco DeLucio: Marco DeLucio, I think what you might, there was a bill, I think, pending at the state legislative level that would have said any state incentives would have had to pay prevailing wage during construction. I'm not sure that bill went anywhere so I don't think that's the law, but I think what Mr. Woodward indicated, that during the construction phase that they were going to utilize 70 to 80% in union labor so that would be a prevailing wage.

Councilmember Hoy: Yeah, hope that's true. I am a member of the Central Labor Council and I can assure you that labor is going to be watching this project, they are watching all projects because we want our wages in Evansville to be excellent. These wages look good on this proposal and the question I had for you was, are your plants unionized or not? Are some of them unionized? This is a strong union city and how would you react to that?

Paul Bailie: We have a mixture of plants, both union and non-union. What's important to us is our ability to find good labor and keep it and be most productive and economic. Our philosophy is paying low wages doesn't always end up with cheaper labor costs. We've found that to be the opposite. What we have found is

paying prevailing or above in many instances, the prevailing wage, to attract talent ends up with the lowest labor costs for our product because it ends up being the most productive. So what I can commit to you is what we've submitted in our application as far as wages and –

President Bassemier: I'm sorry, we have to change the tape.

(Tape changed)

Councilmember Hoy: You mentioned that, to go back to wages, and this may sound unfair to you but you probably have been told I am the Dr. No of this Council when it comes to tax abatement. I'm probably the most stubborn guy around here. Have voted no many times. I, frankly, to be honest with you, don't believe in tax abatement. That's the way I was raised. I was raised in business and was, you know, that you didn't ask for those breaks and Mr. Robinson knows that as well as anybody and everybody around here knows that, so. And I lose a lot of votes...not in elections, but, because the general public is not happy with tax abatement and I understand that we're competing with Owensboro and they're hot competitors...two years from now or whenever this plant is finished, will you assure me that we'll be able to walk into this plant and ask anybody that these wages are exactly what they're paid? Because we have had situations where we've been told, yes, a forklift operator is going to get paid \$10.92 an hour and then we find out later that he's paid \$8.92 an hour. This has happened to us.

Paul Bailie: I think you'll probably be checking on me anyhow, but my intent is to comply with that. We have – of course, before you embark on anything like this, you draw up a business plan. And the business plan says, can I or can I not compete? Can I compete in this area, can I not compete in this area? What are the factors that drive economics? One of them is the tax abatements, the ability to compete in a local area. The other is, can I pay the wages and be profitable? My business model is complete. Those are the wages that are in my business model. They came from that business model. So those are my intents and they said I can compete at that wage level. So I have every intention to do so.

Councilmember Hoy: The other comment that I would make to Council and I don't make this to try to – it just bothers me. I went back – this has nothing to do with you, sir. It has to do with the whole issue. I went back into the minutes when we granted the money for this industrial park and this is the other thing that bothers me, and I am quoting the president of the industrial foundation who assured us that the foundation is not seeking or looking for tax abatement on our investment. And we're sitting here two years later in 2000, and I don't want to pay more on this. We've paid \$82,000, that's not a lot of money, I know that, in the whole scope of things: \$534,000 in COIT back-up on this because we backed up this whole project, you remember. If this industrial park does not go, we eat the whole pie, economically. Not just 1.6 million, but more nearly over three million. So this company coming in would help us with that. In 2001 they (inaudible) almost \$95,000. But I am disturbed that we had a group coming in here of local people who assured us that this moment is not going to come and here we are. We're here with an abatement and that has nothing to do with your firm at all – or with your firm, Mr. Woodward, it has to do with my feelings about the way this was sold to us so please understand that. But I would remind Council of that, if you'll look over those minutes. I am a member of the International Brotherhood of Magicians and can do the three shell act and I think it gets done on us quite often, and that bothers me about what we've done here. We've committed and now we're going to come back and we're going to commit some more and we're not going to recover, you know, we're going to pay

for a lot of this. I am curious as to where the money is going to come for the rail spur, for example. I thought the Commissioners were coming up with some of that. Is that not correct? And the state. I would like to know that.

David Mosby: David Mosby, County Commissioner. Yes, I have been in several meetings with the company of Mr. Woodward and we are willing to, out of the Commissioners budget, come up with some money to bring the spur, the rail, into the property –

Councilmember Hoy: Economic Development funds? Riverboat funds?

David Mosby: Either Economic Development or Infrastructure, one of the two.

Councilmember Hoy: Okay. The whole amount?

David Mosby: Not the whole amount, no. What we're trying to do and after several meetings with Ken Robinson, with your granting of the tax abatement on the land and the equipment and the money that we can possibly put up, we can match off with the state to get some funds to help move this whole process along. I agree with you, Mr. Hoy, we've got to do something with that property out there. I mean, right now it's sitting there idle. We're not doing anything with it. There's nothing out there. If we can get an anchor in there and get some movement, spurred and started, and that's one of the reasons I was interested in this deal. The only fact being it's \$15 plus an hour for the city of Evansville and Vanderburgh County, but we have got to get some movement so we can start generating some money to recoup what we've got out there.

Councilmember Hoy: Thank you.

Councilmember Winnecke: Just to respond to Councilman Hoy's comments. Councilman Tornatta and I were not part of that Council and certainly time has changed when the votes were made and I think from my perspective as still a relative newcomer, I'm looking at a park that's been out there for a year and a half to two years and this is the best prospect to date. With the competition with Owensboro and other regions of our area, I think we need to be as competitive as possible. And yes, while we're backing that with COIT now, if it sits out there for another two or three years, we're still using COIT to pay that off.

Councilmember Hoy: I understand that. I am just commenting on how things are sold to us, Councilman Winnecke, that's all. And every time I look at these packages and I heard the gentleman from Graham tell me that we're not going to be polluting the air, this is going to be a clean industry. I hope that's true. We were promised that with Azteca, it's still not cleared up. There are still complaints out there about what happened with that. I supported that. Frankly, I am sorry I supported that because we have some of the worst air in the country in this area and so I am hoping that you're shooting straight with me. I don't know you, you don't know me, and I simply feel a moral obligation to raise these kind of questions because we have such a high asthma rate and high respiratory disease rate in this area of Indiana. We're considered an area where people can take advantage of us, to be honest with you.

Paul Bailie: We're often in areas required to file air permits and discharge permits and I'm not sure exactly what's required at this location because we've not gotten that far yet. But, so we're accustomed to what our discharges are and I'm being downright honest with you, we do not pollute.

Councilmember Hoy: I appreciate that.

President Bassemier: Okay, we do need to speed up just a little bit.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, just one quick comment and I hope this comment certainly is not intended to change anybody's decision on this project, but about the comments made on the park and sitting idle. I think it was just two years ago roughly that the Industrial Foundation approached us with this project and to my knowledge, I feel as if the dust just settled. I mean, it just seems like 30 days ago when I was through there and I still saw bulldozers and culvert work and whatnot taking place, so it's not as if this park has been completed for two years sitting empty. I think the Industrial Foundation deserves that much that it's still undergoing construction per se, so it's new and fresh.

President Bassemier: Thank you, Mr. Raben. Mr. Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: I welcome the company here. I'm a resident of Scott Township, which you're going to be located out there. Great township. Lived there all my life and I want you out there and it's just like a subdivision, get that first company in, the rest will start coming along and I think that's the forerunner of this. So we welcome everybody that participated and especially the company. So we look forward to having you and good luck.

Councilmember Raben: Mr. President, just for the record, I'm going to, although I don't think I made this motion, but the motion was to approve the preliminary resolution for the construction of the project – or this is for the project located at 5504 Foundation Drive and I certainly, I think I seconded this.

President Bassemier: You seconded and Mr. Hoy made the –

Councilmember Raben: I'd like to bring it to the floor.

President Bassemier: Oh, you made it. I'm sorry. Okay, ready to vote? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: I think everything has been said but I think it is a fantastic project, be a true asset to our community and we'll look forward to some great jobs coming to Vanderburgh County and a great company. Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: I think just out of my basic concerns and just so that I've sent a signal that we're going to be keeping an eye on, I'm going to vote no.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

(Motion carried 6-1/Councilmember Hoy opposed)

<p>PRELIMINARY RESOLUTION FOR PROPERTY TAX ABATEMENT FOR ACQUISITION AND INSTALLATION OF NEW MANUFACTURING EQUIPMENT AT 5504 FOUNDATION DRIVE/ GRAHAM PACKAGING COMPANY, L.P.</p>
--

President Bassemier: Okay, we'll move to the next one. We need –

Councilmember Raben: Mr. President, I'll move approval of the preliminary resolution for property tax abatement for the acquisition and installation of new manufacturing equipment for the same address at 5504 Foundation Drive known as Graham Packaging Company.

President Bassemier: Do I have a second?

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: I have a second. Any more discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes. Votes passes.

(Motion carried 6-1/Councilmember Hoy opposed)

Councilmember Winnecke: Mr. President, before we move on. Can I ask – I would also move – we’ve not talked about this lately, but I believe there is a need based on the time frame of the company to call for a special meeting to pass the confirming resolution prior to our June meeting so they can expedite the –

Marco DeLucio: We’ve talked about that and while we would appreciate that, it’s not necessary.

Councilmember Winnecke: Never mind then.

Bob Woodward: Thank you very much.

President Bassemier: You’re quite welcome.

<p>CONSIDERATION OF SALARIES FOR COUNTY EMPLOYEES FOR PROPOSED 2002 BUDGETS</p>
--

President Bassemier: We’ll move to number H. Finance chairman, you want to take that number H and kind of talk about it a little bit.

Councilmember Raben: Well, I can take that number H, but there may be some further discussion on this. But just like always, prior to other departments and offices submitting their 2002 budget requests, we have to, ourselves, give them our view or send them a signal as to what we think will be acceptable for rate of increase for salaries. And looking back over the last ten years, it’s been pretty much across the board. We’ve done as little as \$500 flat across the board and we’ve gone as high as five percent. My personal view, this county or we as Council members realize we have a lot before us. I mean, we’ve got construction of a new jail, possible expansions of the courthouse or court space as we’ve heard today, voting machines. We’re now responsible for the Old Courthouse. There’s state issues that we can address as to what’s recently happened with the budget in terms of the state cutting counties’ road funding by 1.8 billion dollars. Something will have to make up from that for our county. There’s a lot of issues. Central Dispatch is going to approach us for a computer upgrade. Lord, I could go on and on. So I think at least leading up to budgets and in an effort not to create disappointment to the employees should we have to cut if they turn in a higher percentage, I think in my honest opinion, I think we should request that they file for three percent and if we can go four or if we can go five, that would be great for them. But it’s been my feeling that in the past, if we tell them five and it gets cut to three or four, there is hardship among the employees. So that’s my view and I certainly think as a Council, as a body, we have to consider that we do have responsibilities that are out of our control and I think three percent is the figure we should use this year.

President Bassemier: Okay, thank you, Mr. Raben. Anybody else want to comment? Mr. Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: This is an area I know that we have spent a great deal of

time with and one of the, I guess, concerns that have been expressed in past years during about this time is that by giving X number of dollars, whether it's five percent, four percent, that our tax rate would increase. And I think I heard those same concerns last year when we were about at this point. But we find ourselves in a very strong position financially as a county. We were able to give four percent, which I strongly supported that and several other Council members as well in really supporting our county employees with what we find is, we are competing against the private sector and in many respects we can't pay up to what the private sector is paying. A prime example is what we even have here today. Obviously, the county would not be paying at that rate of pay. But what we can do is try to make sure one, our benefits plan is in good shape, which we have been fortunate to be able to do that and I think our county employees deserve a four percent. However, I do concur with Mr. Raben. I do know we've got a number of initiatives that we're undertaking, but I really would like to see us start as a baseline figure on at four percent. I think it is very justifiable without jeopardizing our tax rate and without getting us in a situation where our unappropriated balance is extremely low. Like I said, we've been in a good position this year and I feel very comfortable, we'll be in a good position next year and I think four percent will be very doable again.

President Bassemier: Anybody else? Jim, how do you want to – do you want to just kind of make a –

Councilmember Raben: Mr. President...did anyone else have a comment, I guess? I would certainly like to make a motion that we need to bring it to the floor anyway, I guess, for further conversation. But I would make the motion that we as a Council instruct, I guess, possibly, the Auditor's Office to send a memo requesting that –

Suzanne Crouch: I think the Council –

Sandie Deig: I'll send a memo –

Councilmember Raben: Okay, so instruct our secretary, Sandie Deig, to send a memo to all departments that all budget requests for 2002 be submitted at a three percent salary increase.

President Bassemier: Do I have a second on that?

Councilmember Winnecke: Second.

President Bassemier: I have a second. Any more discussion on it? Okay, take a roll call vote. This is a –

Councilmember Hoy: I don't know. I'm hearing everything you say, Councilman Raben, and I guess I would like to go for the four again and then cut it if we have to because of what Mr. Sutton said. But I – we do have a lot on our table. It's just kind of a – I have mixed feelings. My thinking is if we went for four now and the problem is I'd hate to hold that out to the employees and say well, we're going to say four and then have to cut it to three, but I'd sure like to stretch for four if we could. Because I think we are competing with a stronger job market.

Councilmember Tornatta: Last year it was set up as four and then it was brought back to say that you might cut it to three, so why wouldn't we work off that same premise this year? It was voted in at four and then it was four all along and the thought was if you had to drop it to three, you would do that. That was last year, but it was set in at four and the thought was if you had, you know, the same kind of

situation, you had to drop it. So if you did it last year, I mean, I'd just suggest looking at it the same way this year.

Councilmember Sutton: And I think the key thing is the wording of what goes out to the officeholders and that is, this is the suggested level, that this does not in any way bind us or commit us to any particular percentage level. We still have a lot of things that are open questions for us for next year. But I think the wording of that, so no matter what percentage you probably say out there, there will be some who will be dead set and say that that's what the Council is going to do this year no matter what you say. But I think we just need to make it clear that we haven't committed to any particular percentage figure, but that four percent would be a nice baseline to start with.

President Bassemier: Thank you, Mr. Sutton. Anybody else? Okay, we have a motion and a second. Would you take a roll call vote please?

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

President Bassemier: Now you're voting – Jim, make your motion again, please.

Councilmember Raben: The motion is for three percent.

Councilmember Tornatta: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

(Motion carried 4-3/Councilmembers Tornatta, Sutton & Hoy opposed)

Councilmember Sutton: Just one other thing, Mr. President. Along that line, what I would like to see, though, is when we do get to budget time, I would like to see some, a matrix that shows the differences between three percent and four percent. If the four percent is broken down overall for salary increases so we can see the differences between the three and the four.

Councilmember Hoy: Mr. President?

President Bassemier: (Inaudible – microphone not turned on)

Councilmember Hoy: No, that's okay. My other comment will not endear me to the higher paid workers but one of the things that disturbs me when we do percentages and I don't know how to get around this, maybe some year we can figure out because those people that are way down there at the end, that three percent doesn't mean as much to them as it does to the folks up here and that gap just gets wider and wider and at the risk of making some higher paid employees angry at me, some year I'd like to see us as least in some measure address that 'cause you just get - the gap just gets bigger and bigger.

Councilmember Raben: I would certainly agree with Councilman Hoy and I think one year we – the year we gave \$500 across the board, I would venture to say that that probably helped more than what a percent of increase would have. I mean, you know, I would say that there were probably – that \$500 outweighed, the good outweighed the bad.

BURDETTE PARK ADVISORY BOARD APPOINTMENT

President Bassemier: (Inaudible – microphone not turned on) to Burdette Park Advisory Board (Inaudible).

Councilmember Sutton: I had the name and didn't bring it. Can we move that to June? I had that – I mean, there are so many other things here. I meant to actually have that.

President Bassemier: Okay, yeah, we'll wait on that.

Councilmember Sutton: Okay, appreciate that.

President Bassemier: You're welcome, sir.

JOHN BAYS/EXECUTIVE INN REQUEST FOR \$1,000,000 FROM VANDERBURGH COUNTY
--

President Bassemier: Okay, now we'll get to the last one. David Mosby, County Commissioner and John Bays, Executive Inn.

David Mosby: I know you all are about ready to get out of here, I believe. Thank you for the opportunity to, I want to thank the Council for the opportunity to let us come forward. Back on April the 9th, the Commissioners, myself, and Commissioner Fanello voted in support of an incentive package for the Executive Inn hotel. I believe everybody has got a letter in front of them and what I want to express to this Council today is that with the convention center being county property and us having a first class hotel is very important. It only took a short period of time when the hotel was shut down that we seen the Indiana Counties move their convention immediately to Indianapolis and there was talk that we lost one or two other conventions in this city in that short period of time. Mr. Bays came forward, he negotiated with the mayor. I sat in on a couple of meetings, the city attorneys, and he offered a very nice package to the city of Evansville, offered to have the hotel opened back up immediately, offered an eight million dollar investment, offered a no compete clause to the county in any way with our convention center and trying

to take business from us, guaranteed us that it would stay a motel for seven years which we did not have any guarantee that that thing would ever open up as a motel again. So there was a lot of things offered to us and in fact, he has offered to build the crosswalk and connect our convention center to his hotel in exchange for a million dollars from this county. The County Commissioners are willing to put up 500,000 of that million dollars if the Council would see fit to match that 500,000 and give that incentive to Mr. Bays.

Councilmember Raben: Mr. Bassemier and Mr. Bays,...Mr. Bays is here, correct?

David Mosby: Yes, Mr. Bays is right back here.

Councilmember Raben: I'm quite aware of –

President Bassemier: (Inaudible – microphone not turned on)

Councilmember Raben: Well, that's fine.

President Bassemier: Mr. Bays, would you please step forward, please? (Inaudible – microphone not turned on) had some questions for you.

Councilmember Raben: He would like for you to state your name for the record, I'm sorry.

John Bays: My name is John Bays and I'm the owner of the Executive Inn in Evansville.

Councilmember Raben: John, I'm quite aware of the type of operation you run. Boy, you know, I've been – it seems like I've been awful nice today, but –

Councilmember Tornatta: That's not a character flaw there.

Councilmember Raben: – but I do think you do a wonderful job at what you do and a lot of my remarks, please don't take them personal, okay. And again, of the people in this room, I'll probably be responsible for more rooms through the week that will stay at your facility than anybody here. But part of the – I'm disappointed in one thing and I probably need to direct this to David. It seems like this is another example of not being included from the beginning and I'm not particularly fond of that. But –

David Mosby: Can I answer that first before we go on?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

David Mosby: I was called by the mayor of this city, Russ Lloyd, and he asked me to attend the meeting. I did not set up the players. So the tax abatement went through the city and we were asked to come in on the back end knowing that the county had a vested interest.

Councilmember Raben: But when commitments start to be made, this body, particularly if it's from a financial standpoint, this body needs to be part of those conversations from the beginning. But again, that has no bearing on this project. I think –

David Mosby: Well I can assure you when I sat in the mayor's office, I said I would

not speak for the County Council and you can ask him or anybody else in that room, Mike Schopmeyer, Larry Downs. I immediately said I do not speak for the County Council and I can only commit to what the Commissioners can come up with. I did not speak for this Council.

Councilmember Raben: And John, I am compelled that this county do something or fulfill the commitment that's been made on behalf of the county. And along with that, I think we've already done a great deal of that, that's why you're here. We've got a 40 million dollar commitment across the street from you and that's why Evansville looks very appealing to you. But from a standpoint of dollars and cents and using general fund monies, I would like to mention and I see Joe is part of the audience. I spoke with Joe today as to the possibility of using Convention & Visitors Bureau monies. I know he has just recently been brought back on board and I also see Bob Whitehouse in the crowd and he's just recently been appointed interim director, so he's probably not prepared to answer these questions today, either. But Joe is reasonably comfortable that the Convention & Visitors Bureau does have funds available to fund the half million dollars and whether they decide they want to do it all this year or do half of it this year and the other half next year, I'm comfortable with the fact that Joe in his position, if he's good with that, I'm good with that. I trust that the funds are available and I state that because I know there's a resolution before everybody that has been given out by Ed Johnson and it purely states somewhere in there general fund monies and all this is because I do not care to see this resolution pass today with the intention of using Convention & Visitors Bureau monies that are far more suitable for this project than general fund monies. And if anyone has any questions, I'd be glad to address –

Councilmember Sutton: I'd like to hear about the project, I guess. We spent probably 30 - 35 minutes.

Edward Johnson: Can I address on that? On the resolution, that's a preliminary form resolution. I'd be glad to accept an amendment to make it either general fund or convention money. It doesn't make any difference to us. We certainly, what we want tonight if you can give it to us, what we want is a commitment from this group that you will come up with the money and where it comes from and how you do it, clearly is your business. We just want to have the commitment so we know we can go ahead with it and we know we can go ahead with the other commitments we made to the mayor, the covenants not to compete and the other things.

Councilmember Raben: The commitment from the standpoint of Convention & Visitors Bureau money, David and Catherine and Richard Mourdock would have to file a request to the Convention & Visitors Bureau Board and they will vote on it. But the request needs to come from the Commissioners Office. But we can certainly at some point through the conversation today show a sign of hands or something in support of the Commissioner's requesting that \$500,000 and showing our support to the Convention & Visitors Bureau that we agree that it is a good source or a good use of \$500,000. So we can do that in terms of making John comfortable and yourself.

Edward Johnson: And then can you come back with a resolution again? From a legal standpoint, I guess we would like the commitment, we'll take anything we can get. If we can get a resolution either today or the next meeting it would be helpful.

Councilmember Hoy: Mr. President?

President Bassemier: We need to change the tape.

(Tape changed)

Councilmember Hoy: It's on. Somebody keeps changing my switch here. It's on purpose 'cause I talk too much. But I have something to say that's why I talk so much. Anyway, well, my opinion is as good as anybody's. We have talked, Mr. Bays, you and I have talked. My understanding from you and tell me if I'm incorrect is that what you need from us now is an assurance that we will work with you toward – that you don't, you're not wanting this \$500,000 tomorrow.

John Bays: Correct.

Councilmember Hoy: You're going to demonstrate some things to us. Would you comment on that?

John Bays: Well, I'll try to make this real brief. What I want, I want to say a couple of things. One thing is I came here and after I talked to this city and everything, I came here and I bought this hotel. We sat down and we talked about incentive packages they're going to try to put together and a tax abatement. After we talked I came up and I bought the hotel. I just paid almost a million dollars in back taxes on the hotel. I had no idea what the back taxes were. I thought it was like two or three hundred thousand when it turned out it was almost a million dollars. I paid all the taxes on the property, I came and I started working on it thinking that we'd get the incentive package put together. I was hoping – well, I thought that once we got in here and that the County Council really checked me out and the City Council, they would be for this 100%. I would love to have 100% vote because it makes me want to do more and more to make everybody know that what they voted for me, an investment they made in John Bays, they got back real fast. Again, I've bought over 28 bankrupt properties, every one has been a major success. I'm going to spend millions in this town before I ever see a dime. I promise you this, your million dollar commitment with me, you will get that back way before I get a cent of profit. I'm going to be hiring hundreds of people over there. I'm going to train these people. My customer satisfaction index is the highest in the nation in every business I own. I go to towns, I bring millions. I mean, if you've checked me out you'll find every city will tell you, I bring business to town. I bring lots of business because of how we treat the people, how we make them feel like they own the place. I'm really into customer satisfaction. I mean, I've been successful because of my customer satisfaction. I committed to Owensboro to spend five million dollars. I spent thirteen and we're spending two more million right now in Owensboro. I said I will break all records in Owensboro of income they ever had. When I took over Owensboro, we didn't have one room rented. Not one. That place, the reputation, the bankruptcy court, had run it to nothing. Right now we did almost ten million the first year and I'm planning on next year breaking all records and breaking twenty million dollars in that town. I know you don't realize this right now, but a year from now you will think that this is the best investment that you've ever made. I am going to bring a lot of business here. I am going to do everything to make sure that you're so happy having me in your town that you're going to recommend me anywhere else I go and to something for the city. I mean, I'm not looking at I need this money to do this project. This thing is sitting on leased land. I'm having trouble, I can't get a mortgage on leased land. I'm going to spend a lot of money on this walkway. I don't want a Mickey Mouse walkway, I want a first class. Everything I associate with is first class. If I ever sell this hotel it will be to probably a billionaire because when people buy property from me they pay top dollar. I take nothing out of my properties, I upgrade every month on every (inaudible) hotel I've had I spent an extra \$100,000 every month upgrading and upgrading because I want to make it the nicest place in the state. I want to take all the business from all the other towns and

everywhere I've been, this is what we've done. And I think with that 40 million dollar convention center right there, you need me. I'm the guy that's going to fill that thing up. I am going to be there for you. You've got a riverboat right down the street. If I can't make this the most successful hotel I ever had, I don't need to be in business. I think the bottom line, this hotel is going to break all records and I'm the guy to do it. I've already spent – I've already contracted over four million dollars worth of work. I mean, I'm sure you've seen we're putting roofs on over there. We've completely redid, we're doing all new stuff in the kitchen, carpeting is going down, I mean, there's a lot of things happening over there right now. I've got at least 80 construction workers over there. I hired a hundred people to start off with. I'm making an investment in your community and I wish you guys would really make an investment in me because I will be the fastest return that you've ever invested. (Inaudible) in this county.

Councilmember Hoy: Mr. President, I'd like to make a motion that we approve this preliminary resolution with the change in section C on page 2 and that we strike from it the county's general fund and perhaps our legal counsel can give me some language here that we look into Convention & Visitors Bureau money and also we're going to have some more riverboat money come the first of the year. And I don't know why we couldn't take it from those two funds rather than general fund but that would give Mr. Bays assurance that –

John Bays: Yes, and I don't have to have this money right away.

Councilmember Hoy: That's a motion.

Councilmember Sutton: I know you've got a motion there but I think what is being requested here is that no matter what the source is, they're not looking for the dollars today and I guess what I was requesting is maybe that we leave the resolution just as it is in its form today. I know you've got a motion there on the floor, but just leave the resolution as it is and then because I know the Convention & Visitors Bureau, they have to meet at a board, they have to discuss this and a number of other things have to occur. I think we're all very excited about the prospects of how our convention business can be enhanced by the project but at the same time, it's kind of like what the discussion we just had just a few minutes ago out at the Industrial Park out there. We need to have some activity taking place. That doesn't necessarily mean that we can't go back and restructure, but I think, I understand, your point is taken. But I don't know, I guess moving that around, I think Councilmen have been kind of aware of this for at least a couple of weeks and, you know, here we are today, –

Councilmember Raben: Could we briefly take a comment from either Joe or Bob in terms of –

John Bays: Could I say one more thing real quickly? The tax abatement, I don't want it. Forget – you know, there's tax abatement in this deal. I don't need the tax abatement, I don't want the tax abatement. You can take that out of this agreement with the city and the county. I'm not interested in the tax abatement. And another thing, I mean, I really would like to get this resolution passed and the reason I've got three or four contractors ready to start building a skywalk across. I mean, I've got a lot of contracts that if this thing, if I know down the road it's going to happen, I'd like to make this happen. We need business over there now. I need to start making this thing happen. In the next ninety days you're not going to believe that's the same hotel when you drive past it. That's how fast we're going to do this and I mean, I really, I'm not asking for the money now. I'm going to be totally done before

you give it to me. But I need that money. And if we can get that resolution and I don't get the money until next year, I don't have a problem with that at all, but I need –

Councilmember Raben: Ed. And real quick, I think that's reasonable knowing what he has to do, that's reasonable that he would ask that this resolution be passed. Councilman Hoy mentioned changing the verbiage from County Council's general fund to Convention & Visitors Bureau...

Councilmember Hoy: Or Riverboat money.

Councilmember Raben: Or Riverboat money,...

Councilmember Hoy: We had an excess in Riverboat money at the beginning of this year of \$610,000.

Councilmember Raben: Well, but they're committing – \$500 of that, that's what the Commissioners are –

Councilmember Hoy: But you're committing existing funds, are you not, Commissioner Mosby? The funds you have now, on hand?

David Mosby: To this project, I will probably commit the money I have coming available January 1st of 2001 because we've got other projects going. We have done committed \$110,000, I think, to Emporia. There's probably going to be some money go out on the Graham deal. And take into consideration that last year, the end of 2000, the County Commissioners in their Riverboat account returned \$831,000 to that general fund. So you should have plenty of money there to work off of and we just discussed this the other night in the Commissioner's meeting. We returned \$831,000 plus \$679,000 plus another \$241,000 in Welfare to Work. There's about a million point eight that you ought to be able to work with. I feel very uncomfortable with going to the Convention and Visitors Bureau. And I don't want to set a precedent here so I will not commit to taking this to them and asking them for money.

Councilmember Raben: Well, I think it's the most appropriate use of their money there is.

David Mosby: I really don't when you have that much money that we didn't roll over from the year of 2000 to 2001 like we had in prior years. There's a million eight there in Riverboat funds that you've got in your general fund.

Suzanne Crouch: I believe that's overstated.

David Mosby: Well, I'm going off my figures.

Suzanne Crouch: Well, those are your figures, they're not the Auditor's figures which I'd be happy to share with you.

Councilmember Raben: Joe, you're the one I spoke with and a lot I might add, also what prompted our conversation is Councilman Hoy found – that he had cited prior to our conversation that he felt that that was a great use of that bureau's money.

Joe Vezzoso: Right. Joe Vezzoso. When Councilman Raben called me today, I was in agreement and I thought it was a good idea. But I did indicate to Councilman

Raben that that had to come from the County Commissioners to the Convention Bureau and so on. I was just appointed Monday. Bob was just appointed interim director Monday. We have tried to find out the amount of money that's in the brick and mortar account and have not been able to do that today so it's difficult to say how much money is even in there. There were some Councilmen that were reluctant to take it out of general fund and that was one possibility of funding for that money. So it would have to go through a number of steps to come back to you all for approval.

Councilmember Tornatta: Can this, if we approve this resolution, could we not find the money if we had to? I mean, from – one way or another? And if it had to come from the general fund then it had to come. But I think we need to show some backing here to make this thing go. We're dragging our feet and he's ready to go.

Councilmember Hoy: Yeah, that's what I'm feeling. I'd like to ask our Auditor what figure do you have, would you be able to offer us that got turned back into the general fund from Riverboat money?

Suzanne Crouch: Last year?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Unidentified: (Inaudible – microphone not turned on)

Councilmember Hoy: I know.

Suzanne Crouch: Well, it's all general fund money. You understand that.

Councilmember Hoy: Okay, but it's in the general fund account now.

Suzanne Crouch: Yes. It's all general fund money. It's part of the cash balance, that is correct.

Councilmember Hoy: I would –

Councilmember Sutton: Well, I'd like to hear the – your response, I guess.

Councilmember Hoy: We don't have a second yet, do we?

President Bassemier: No we don't.

Councilmember Hoy: Okay. I'll rephrase the motion and see if this will get a second, that we take section three and say that the \$500,000 will be paid preferably from Riverboat funds, Convention & Visitors Bureau money, and as a last resort, the county general fund.

Councilmember Tornatta: Second.

Councilmember Raben: I would –

President Bassemier: Mr. Mosby, did you say that you were going to commit \$500,000 (Inaudible – microphone not turned on).

Councilmember Raben: That's their commitment. That's another commitment, Ed, separate.

David Mosby: We've committed \$500,000 and we're asking the Council to commit five hundred out of the general fund.

President Bassemier: (Inaudible – microphone not turned on).

David Mosby: I don't feel comfortable with that, no.

Councilmember Tornatta: David, can...if we didn't do it out of the general fund, would that be a problem?

David Mosby: Where are you going to do it out of?

Councilmember Raben: We could do it out of CCD and have –

Councilmember Tornatta: I'm just asking if we found another area that we could pull that out of, would that be a problem or is yours contingent on the general fund?

David Mosby: Say that again.

Councilmember Tornatta: Is your \$500,000 contingent on us using the general fund for our \$500,000?

David Mosby: If it's going to – if it's \$500,000 coming anywhere else out of the Commissioner's budget, yes. I mean, I don't know what you're looking at and I don't know what you're thinking but I mean, we're committing \$500,000 of Riverboat money but if you're talking about taking it anywhere else out of our budget –

Councilmember Tornatta: No, not out of your budget. I'm talking out of our budget.

David Mosby: Yes, when we did it, it was hinged on the county coming up with \$500,000 out of the general fund.

Councilmember Winnecke: Mr. President. I think I may have a solution and maybe the solution is we amend the ordinance or the motion that's on the floor to indicate that we in theory back the use of the half million dollars and we sit down, a member of each party, from this body to sit down with the Commission to work out the source of the funding and the terms which is probably the way it should have been done in the beginning. But let's give Mr. Bays the commitment today knowing that this body will sit down with the Commission to work out all of the small details down the road.

Councilmember Tornatta: I'll second.

Councilmember Hoy: I'll accept – is that an amendment?

Councilmember Sutton: Okay, so his wording would just, would not make mention of any particular source of funding?

Councilmember Winnecke: Well, I think it should say that members of this body will sit down with the Commission and Mr. Bays' representative to negotiate the source of the money from the government side and the terms from both the government and the hotel side.

Councilmember Tornatta: Approving \$500,000?

Councilmember Hoy: Mr. Winnecke, is that an amendment to my motion?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Councilmember Hoy: I'll accept it.

Councilmember Tornatta: And I've got the second.

Councilmember Hoy: And I have a comment before we vote.

Councilmember Raben: So we completely strike –

President Bassemier: (Inaudible – microphone not turned on)

Councilmember Raben: All we were ever promising, Ed, was \$500,000.

Inaudible – several speaking at once.

Councilmember Hoy: The comment I have for the Commissioners is that while they have used that money, we're the body who delivered that million and a half to them from the Riverboat in those packages. I mean, I guess what bothers me is we're talking here, and I have to go on record and say this, simply say that wherever we take this money, this is coming from county tax money and we're the body who said one third of Riverboat money will go for Welfare to Work, one third will go for Infrastructure and one third will go for Economic Development, and then we laid that in the Commissioner's lap, okay. And all I want to say to the Commissioners is that's what we did and I just don't view that as Commissioner's money. I view that as tax money and if there's more Riverboat money, let's use it for this. If there's Convention & Visitors Bureau money, use it for this. That's how we finished the building when we had a four percent cost overrun on the Convention Centre. We went to the Convention & Visitors Bureau. That's what this issue is about. That's all I have to say.

President Bassemier: (Inaudible – microphone not turned on)

Councilmember Raben: As a matter of record, are we striking section three completely? Personally, I don't want general fund money –

(Inaudible – several speaking at once)

Councilmember Sutton: As I understand it, you're not striking section three, you're just not indicating the source of the funding that this body will commit to.

Councilmember Winnecke: The source of the funding, members of this body will sit down with the Commission and the hotel to discuss the origin of the funding and the terms.

Councilmember Raben: Joe, it looks like we're back to the round table.

Jeff Ahlers: Are you wanting to try to modify this or do you just want to make a motion that you're going to try to come up with something – an oral motion and then come back and get something in writing next time?

(Inaudible – several speaking at once)

Councilmember Winnecke: We're committing to the dollars today. What we work out down the road is where the money comes from and the terms.

President Bassemier: Everybody understand it? Do I have a second?

Councilmember Sutton: Second.

President Bassemier: Anymore discussion?

Councilmember Tornatta: Just real quick, and that's – as of right now, that's a workable deal?

Edward Johnson: We can live with that.

Councilmember Tornatta: You're okay with that?

President Bassemier: Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

(Motion carried 6-1/Councilmember Wortman opposed)

Edward Johnson: Mr. President, I have something I need to say. A couple of hours ago when I was here on a different matter I talked about problems the courts were having getting files – the old files retrieved. It could have been construed that that was in some way critical of the current Clerk's office. Not meant at all. The Clerk of this county does a great job. Under the circumstance she has to work with, she does a very good job. We in no way shape or form ever meant to criticize her. We have the utmost respect, she's been most helpful and I wanted to clear that up so nobody left tonight thinking that I had been critical of her.

John Bays: Mr. Bassemier, I'd like to say thank you very much. I will promise you

I'm going to give you much more than what we're telling you right now. You'll see.
Thank you very much.

(Meeting adjourned at 6:10 p.m.)

VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL

President Ed Bassemier

Vice President Lloyd Winnecke

Councilmember James Raben

Councilmember Phil Hoy

Councilmember Curt Wortman

Councilmember Royce Sutton

Councilmember Troy Tornatta

**VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL
MINUTES
JUNE 6, 2001**

The Vanderburgh County Council met in session the 6th day of June, 2001 in room 301 of the Civic Center Complex. The meeting was called to order at 3:32 p.m. by County Council President Ed Bassemier.

President Bassemier: Chief Deputy Sheriff Eric Williams, you want to open up the meeting?

Eric Williams: Oh yes, oh yes, oh yes, the Vanderburgh County Council is now open pursuant to adjournment.

President Bassemier: I'd like to welcome everyone to the June 6th, 2001 County Council meeting. Attendance roll call, please?

COUNCILMEMBER	PRESENT	ABSENT
Councilmember Tornatta	X	
Councilmember Sutton	X	
Councilmember Wortman	X	
Councilmember Hoy	X	
Councilmember Raben	X	
Councilmember Winnecke	X	
President Bassemier	X	

President Bassemier: Would everyone please stand for the Pledge of Allegiance?
(Pledge of Allegiance was given)

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES MAY 2, 2001
CERTIFICATION OF EXECUTIVE SESSION MAY 23, 2001**

President Bassemier: I need a motion to approve the minutes for May 2nd, 2001?

Councilmember Tornatta: So moved.

President Bassemier: Do I have a second?

Councilmember Winnecke: Second.

President Bassemier: Everybody in favor, raise their right hand for approval of the minutes.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

President Bassemier: Also, we need a motion for the certification of the executive session May 23, 2001. We need a motion to approve that.

Councilmember Sutton: So moved.

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: Got a second. Everybody in favor, raise your right hand. Anybody opposed? Okay.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATION REQUESTS
--

RECORDER

President Bassemier: Mr. Raben, you want to – our Finance Chairman, would you like to start the appropriation ordinance, please?

Councilmember Raben: I would be glad to. First is the Recorder's Office for a request for a new employee, a Deeds Deputy. The request is for \$20,973. At this point I am going to move that this be set in at zero.

President Bassemier: Just to get it on the floor. Do we have a second?

Councilmember Winnecke: Second.

President Bassemier: Any discussion?

Councilmember Raben: Mr. President, I might – let me just give you a little information that, with the help of Sarah, I requested that we try to contact the surrounding counties, which we contacted Posey, Warrick and Gibson, which two responded. And granted, all offices are different, but Warrick County, they've stated that their filings are up for Warrick County almost \$28,000 and about a 20% increase over this time last year. Gibson County, theirs are up a little over \$9,000 over last year. Gibson County does plan to make a request this year during budgets for an additional employee, but they do state that they only have three deputies and one part time, and have worked that way for the last ten to fifteen years. So I think those are important because even though they're smaller counties, they basically have the same problems we do. And I still think it's best that we wait until budgets to address this matter. I know that this is a busy season and it's busier than it was last year, no doubt about it, with the interest rates. But, you know, you look at even in the private sector like Wal-Mart or Kmart or shopping centers period, you know, they have busy seasons, Christmas holidays and things like that and they don't hire full-time people for a temporary problem. They hire additional part-time people and I think what this request is, is asking for a full-time person for a temporary problem.

President Bassemier: Okay, thank you. Do you want to address this, Mrs. Smith?

Betty Knight-Smith: In five months of the last year, they took in \$259,811.50, five months of this year we took in \$318,498.50, that's \$58,987 more, that's more than any month of the whole last year. I need the employee. Thank you.

President Bassemier: Okay, we have a motion – Mr. Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: I just kind of want to restate what I really said before, that I think it's a position that is needed. But the numbers that were kind of mentioned earlier, Jim, have you had a chance to go down to visit with Betty in her office? I mean, I think that would really, I mean, I think that would really, I mean, if we're going to really get a fair comparison of other counties and what their trends are. I mean, I think the first place we'd start with would be right here to get an idea and the

other thing, too, those counties are, if you really want to look at the numbers, population-wise, they're smaller, their trends are a little bit smaller, probably a more fair comparison would be maybe be, size-wise would be Parke County or St. Joe County would probably be fairer comparisons, but if you took maybe the size of those counties and maybe multiplied those up by the size, if they truly were the same size of Vanderburgh County and their trends are upward just like ours are, they'd have an even greater problem that they would be dealing with and they probably would look at it in a different light. But being those are smaller counties, it's a little hard to compare apples to apples.

Councilmember Raben: I think I had raised this question before and I would ask again, this problem starts at the banking institutions, that's where the actual applications and whatnot are, that's where it all begins. And I would question even if you'd look at it in terms of man-hours. Roughly, how many man-hours do you think your bank spends from the application through the closing? How many man-hours do you think your bank spends? If you had to guess.

Councilmember Sutton: I wouldn't really want to try to guess because, I mean, there are several...really, the process starts with the consumer or the person out there who decides they want to buy a home, refinance, whatever the case might be. And depending upon the complexity of the problem and the issues that they might face, some take longer, some are shorter, you know, on an average to complete it from start to completion, we hope to try to complete it as fast as possible, at least on our particular end, in between 20 and 30 days at least. But like I say, it just depends on the situation that you're dealing with and so I guess that's maybe what I am trying to get here, is if we're going to make a comparison, you know, across the board, it just depends on the situation. I think those counties are comparably smaller –

Betty Knight-Smith: Jim, if you wanted to make a fair estimate of it, why didn't you come down to the office? You have never been in there since I've been there and I don't think you ever went in when Betty was there. And Betty asked for an employee last year and y'all turned her down. You have no idea what it's like if you haven't been down there.

Councilmember Raben: I did speak to the former officeholder on this at great length, actually. I spent probably an hour on the phone with her and she acknowledged the fact that in '97 she went through the same turmoil and at that time, I think she stated she was maybe two or three weeks behind or further than that, so you know, again, I went to her and not to you. I apologize.

Betty Knight-Smith: She's not the Recorder. She's not there and she doesn't know what the figures are now.

Councilmember Raben: She spent eight years in that office.

Betty Knight-Smith: I know she did. But you should have come down and seen me but you didn't. So you can't make a fair estimate of it. You can't vote the right way because you've been told not to.

Councilmember Raben: Nobody's told –

Betty Knight-Smith: So let your conscience be your guide.

Councilmember Raben: Betty, no one has told me not to. But again, I mean, this body did pass a hiring freeze back in March, I believe. We're working under

something that is indefinite. The interest rates may go up next week, they may maintain where they're at through the summer, but looking at it from the private sector, never in my business have I hired full-time people for a temporary problem.

President Bassemier: Mr. Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Could we not, as a solution and a compromise to all parties involved, work out a transfer? You have one office worker who is going to be out of the office for four to six weeks for medical reasons, –

Betty Knight-Smith: I've got two out now.

Councilmember Winnecke: Two? Could we not transfer their salaries into additional money for Extra Help and bring in extra help until they're back and this problem gets a little more under control?

Betty Knight-Smith: I've got two out and I've got two part-time right now to replace them. They're only replacing what I've got. That's still not helping cover the load.

Councilmember Winnecke: Well, we appropriated additional money last month for Extra Help. What I'm saying is, transfer the money that's in their line items until they're able to come back to work so you can hire additional part-time bodies or temporary bodies so we don't have to hire additional full-time bodies.

Betty Knight-Smith: Lloyd, that won't solve the problem. That still does not solve the overload of the work we have now. What we've got is taking up part of the slack for the people that's in the hospital. I've got two people off. I've got one that's got six weeks vacation and had to cancel her vacation last week. Another one with ten years had to cancel her vacation this week because they can't take their vacations.

Councilmember Winnecke: What I'm saying is, there's money that's already in place in those line items that we can transfer to Temporary Help so you can get more help while those folks are still on medical leave.

Betty Knight-Smith: I need a full-time person.

President Bassemier: Okay. I have a motion and a second to set it in at zero. Any more discussion on this? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: No.

(Motion fails 2-5/Councilmembers Tornatta, Sutton, Wortman, Hoy & Bassemier opposed)

Councilmember Hoy: Mr. President, I would like to make a motion that on line 1040-1210 Deeds Deputy, we appropriate \$12,376; 1900 FICA \$947; 1910 PERF \$650; 1920 Insurance \$7,000, for a total of \$20,973.

Councilmember Sutton: Second.

President Bassemier: Have a motion and a second. Any discussion on it? Roll call vote.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

President Bassemier: Hold it a second. Do we have to get a motion to open this thing?

Councilmember Raben: You can make a new motion.

Councilmember Hoy: Yes, I make a motion to re-open.

President Bassemier: We better do that first.

Councilmember Hoy: Yeah, it takes two thirds.

President Bassemier: Let's back up a little bit here. We've got to open it back up on the floor.

Councilmember Sutton: Mr. President –

President Bassemier: We have a motion and a second to open it –

Councilmember Sutton: Well, he didn't – his motion was –

Councilmember Hoy: I withdraw my previous motion.

Councilmember Sutton: And I'll withdraw my second.

President Bassemier: Let's get it on record. He withdrew, you withdraw?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

President Bassemier: Okay, and make a motion to –

Councilmember Hoy: And then I make a motion to re-open.

President Bassemier: Let's do this right.

Councilmember Sutton: Second.

President Bassemier: He got a second. This is an important vote here, so roll call vote so we'll know how everybody stands.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: No.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes to re-open.

(Motion carried 5-2/Councilmembers Raben & Winnecke opposed)

Councilmember Hoy: Now, Mr. Bassemier, I will read that again. I move line 1040-1210-1040 Deeds Deputy \$12,376; 1040-1900 FICA \$947; 1040-1910 PERF \$650; 1040-1920 Insurance \$7,000; total of \$20,973.

President Bassemier: Got a motion. Do I have a second?

Councilmember Sutton: Second.

President Bassemier: Second. Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes. This is an unusual situation, so I cast my vote yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: No.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Before I vote, I'd just like to say that Mr. Raben, he's doing his job and he's trying to...he's done some research and nothing against his vote, but I'm going to vote yes that she does need this new employee. So it just takes five votes and it's passed. So you get your new employee.

RECORDER		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1040-1210-1040	Deeds Deputy	12,376.00	12,376.00
1040-1900	FICA	947.00	947.00
1040-1910	PERF	650.00	650.00
1040-1920	Insurance	7,000.00	7,000.00
Total		20,973.00	20,973.00

(Motion carried 5-2/Councilmembers Raben & Winnecke opposed)

Betty Knight-Smith: Thank you.

President Bassemier: You're welcome

Councilmember Sutton: One thing, Mr. President, Betty did indicate if those numbers do fall back down and there isn't reasonable justification for that position, she will be more than happy to come back and work with us on that and I appreciate that, at least that spirit of cooperation in an effort like that, recognizing what she's dealing with. She's willing to work with us as well.

President Bassemier: That's right.

JAIL

Councilmember Raben: Alright, Mr. President, next we have the jail 1051-2240 Medical in the amount of \$75,000. I move approval.

Councilmember Hoy: Second.

President Bassemier: Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

JAIL		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1051-2240	Medical	75,000.00	75,000.00
Total		75,000.00	75,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

PROPERTY TAX BOARD OF APPEALS

President Bassemier: Mr. Raben.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Property Tax Board of Appeals 1091-3530 in the amount of \$1,500. I'll move approval.

Councilmember Sutton: Second.

President Bassemier: Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

PROPERTY TAX BOARD OF APPEALS		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1091-3530	Contractual Services	1,500.00	1,500.00
Total		1,500.00	1,500.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

PIGEON TOWNSHIP ASSESSOR (TWO REQUESTS)

President Bassemier: Mr. Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Pigeon Township Assessor , Extra Help and FICA for a total appropriation request of \$4,522. I'll move approval.

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

Councilmember Raben: I tell you what, Mr. President, allow me to also include in that motion the next request which is 1150-1920, 1150-1910 and 1150-1900 for an additional \$12,073.

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

PIGEON TWP. ASSESSOR		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1150-1990	Extra Help	4,200.00	4,200.00
1150-1900	FICA	322.00	322.00
Total		4,522.00	4,522.00

PIGEON TWP. ASSESSOR		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1150-1920	Insurance	10,693.00	10,693.00
1150-1910	PERF	562.00	562.00
1150-1900	FICA	818.00	818.00
Total		12,073.00	12,073.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

President Bassemier: Mr. Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Okay, next is County Commissioners 1300-3051. Mr. President, at this time I would like to set this in at zero and I'll explain. Let's get it on the floor.

President Bassemier: You're setting it in at zero. Do I have a second on that?

Councilmember Winnecke: I'll second it for discussion.

President Bassemier: Okay, any discussion on this?

Councilmember Raben: Nothing other than we may allow us till next month to work out something possibly with the Sheriff's Department on this.

Councilmember Sutton: Jim, I couldn't hear you. Could you speak a little louder?

Councilmember Raben: Just to allow myself some time to work this out. We may get some assistance out of the Sheriff's Department on this.

Councilmember Sutton: You mean financial assistance?

Councilmember Raben: Uh-huh.

Councilmember Sutton: Well, what about in the meantime? We've got, we are over that cap.

Councilmember Raben: No we're not. We're below that cap.

Catherine Fanello: We have not been below that cap –

Councilmember Sutton: What number are you working with?

Councilmember Raben: Eric is in the audience, but it's 318, correct?

Eric Williams: (Inaudible – comments not made from the microphone)

Catherine Fanello: Right now?

Eric Williams: (Inaudible – comments not made from the microphone)

Catherine Fanello: What are we going to do for the next 30 days?

Councilmember Raben: Again...Eric may come to the mike, but I would rather not put him on the spot because the Sheriff is away on a conference this week, but –

President Bassemier: Please state your name.

Eric Williams: Eric Williams, Chief Deputy.

Councilmember Raben: My intent is to request that they use commissary monies.

Eric Williams: And I can't commit to that, but I did tell Councilman Raben that the Sheriff and I would be willing to meet with him and discuss that, but that's ultimately the Sheriff's call. But we're not opposed to it up front.

President Bassemier: Okay.

Catherine Fanello: And that's fine if you're trying to find an alternate source but, – I don't know why this mike is not working – but I don't know what we're going to do in the meantime and I'm going to personally hold this Council responsible if we go over our cap and we incur any liability because of that.

President Bassemier: Okay, any –

Catherine Fanello: I mean, unless you want to keep them at your house.

Councilmember Raben: I could.

President Bassemier: Anymore discussion? Miss Fanello, you got anything else to

say?

Catherine Fanello: No, just that –

Councilmember Winnecke: I'd like to pipe in if I could.

President Bassemier: Go ahead, Mr. Winnecke.

Councilmember Winnecke: I have not talked to the Sheriff or the Chief Deputy. I mean, I would share the Commissioner's concern. I guess I'd look and see if there's a way we can appropriate some amount of money to get us through 30 days and if there's compromise that can be worked out in the meantime, I don't think we should put the county in jeopardy in those 30 days. If, during the discussions with the Sheriff, the Sheriff wants to reimburse the county, the general fund from the commissary money, great.

Councilmember Raben: Let me say this: currently, do we have any prisoners housed outside of our jail right now?

Eric Williams: Yes, we do. At the last count, we have nine in other facilities, but all of those are nine that we've got either court orders to have them somewhere else and that we've made arrangements with those Sheriffs through gentlemen's agreements, we house a few of theirs, they house a few of ours –

Councilmember Raben: So we don't have any –

Eric Williams: Right now we are not paying any outside agencies to house our prisoners.

Councilmember Raben: And should we a week from now need to shuffle prisoners to other jurisdictions, I mean, it's not like the Holiday Inn where you pay up front. We're billed and those bills would be due in July, correct?

Eric Williams: I would assume that's how the other Sheriffs will work it. They'll bill us like they do the DOC, on a monthly basis.

Councilmember Sutton: Jim, we can't, I mean, we can't encumber costs unless the dollars are actually there. I mean, we know that.

Catherine Fanello: Are you --

Councilmember Sutton: If you incur, I mean, that's just like if we send --

(Inaudible – several speaking at once)

Councilmember Sutton: – we're saying that we do have the money for that.

Catherine Fanello: No, but is it the county's policy to encumber costs before or incur costs before there's an appropriation?

Councilmember Raben: I tell you what, it's this body's policy, though, if there is other funding sources available, that we take –

Catherine Fanello: And that's fine, I don't have a problem with that, but in the future I wish we would know about this ahead of time. I mean, this has been on the table

for a week, it was at last week's meeting and I'm coming to the meetings.

Councilmember Raben: The Sheriff is out of town this week.

Catherine Fanello: He wasn't out of town last week.

Eric Williams: I guess my point would be, and as I discussed with you and I'll say it on the open floor, and that's in a lot of these cases, you know, we're not going to be opposed to try and help do what's right for the county in this situation, but there is no means to put the county on notice that we have a problem that we need to have some financial support other than to get a request before this body. It is actually the Commissioners request, so we really don't have a say in it but I know the Sheriff well enough to know that he is always open to work out situations and we are not going to put the county in a situation where they are going to be liable if we can prevent it. That's just the way we do business. But I can't commit that money on his behalf.

Councilmember Hoy: Mr. President, I'm not committing, I'm still thinking about this because I was ready to commit the 20, in terms of encumbering costs, as I recall, we have had bills come to us for the lodging of juveniles in institutions which bills had already been incurred and then we voted the money for those. I mean, we vote the money when we get the bill. I don't think we're in any legal danger there, but I agree with Mr. Winnecke, I'd like to see us put some money here, at least some, to guarantee that we can take care of some immediate costs.

Councilmember Raben: We can put in \$5,000. I'll go along with that.

President Bassemier: Would that be okay with you, Catherine?

Commissioner Fanello: That would be fine. I think that's fine till we can work out a fair solution.

Eric Williams: I think it would be appropriate for the Council to have some money in place so that we don't get ourselves in a pinch.

President Bassemier: Okay, that sounds good. Everybody is happy here. Do you —

Councilmember Raben: I'll amend my motion.

President Bassemier: Do we have a second on that just to get it on the floor?

Councilmember Raben: I'll amend my motion for 1300-3051 for \$5,000.

Councilmember Winnecke: And I'll second that.

President Bassemier: Got a motion and a second. Any discussion on putting the \$5,000 in that account? No discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes, but I also would ask that at our next Council meeting, if we could have some type of report that gives us an idea of where we stand. I mean, if we begin to dip into this \$5,000 or, so we can get a true sense of where we stand on this, it will be very helpful.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

President Bassemier: Mr. Wortman, do you agree on the \$5,000, sir?

Councilmember Wortman: Yeah, that's fine, and I think the Sheriff and the Commissioners work together on that and then come back and I think that's good. I vote yes.

President Bassemier: Thank you, sir.

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Thank you, Councilmember Hoy. Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: A point of interest, we've got to remember the Blue Ribbon Committee is going to start here pretty soon and if history repeats itself, when everybody was working together, the attendance has dropped at a pretty good rate. So I'm hoping this will happen again. And I vote yes for the \$5,000. Thank you.

COUNTY COMMISSIONERS		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1300-3051	Lodging of Inmates	20,000.00	5,000.00
Total		20,000.00	5,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

SUPERINTENDENT OF COUNTY BUILDINGS

Councilmember Raben: Next is the Superintendent of County Buildings. I'll move that 1310-1140-1310 be set in at \$15,157; with the Insurance set in which is account 1310-1920 set in at \$6,555; Extra Help, 1310-1990 set in at \$17,000; PERF, which is 1310-1910 set in at \$1,251; and FICA set in at \$1,160 and that is prorated for the remainder of the year.

President Bassemier: Jim, I'm sorry, on that 1310-1910 PERF, how much was that, sir, twelve what, I mean, \$1,000 what?

Councilmember Raben: \$1,251.

President Bassemier: 250 even?

Councilmember Raben: \$1,251.

President Bassemier: Okay, do I have a – we've got a motion, do I have a second on that?

Councilmember Hoy: Second.

President Bassemier: Got a second, Mr. Hoy. Any discussion?

Councilmember Hoy: I have a question. Yes, Commissioner Fanello, would you please come back to the mike? I have a question. I don't want to make any assumptions about this. And my assumption is, however, is that both of these employees are going to strictly be at the Old Courthouse.

Catherine Fanello: Yes.

Councilmember Hoy: This has nothing to do with your staffing here whatsoever?

Catherine Fanello: No.

Councilmember Hoy: Thank you.

Councilmember Winnecke: Catherine, could I ask one other question? I think Tammy was in the process of sort of getting a capital improvement inventory. Where does all that stand?

Catherine Fanello: That is coming together very quickly and I'm hoping that maybe by the next Council meeting we have a good report to give you.

Councilmember Winnecke: The rain reminded me of that.

Councilmember Hoy: I have one more question. This question has surfaced before and I want to keep it alive because in tandem with what we're doing there, which we support as you know, I support anyway, I'll speak for myself. You have a non-profit organization. They have been given certain gifts: there is an oriental rug, there are other gifts such as that, that were given to the non-profit. By doing so, those donors receive tax credit, etc., and I understand that some of those donors want to see those objects remain there, which leads me to conclude at least in a penultimate way that we need to have the county and this non-profit working together. Is that still...

Catherine Fanello: That is still on the table, so as soon as the committee comes back with their recommendations we will see some type of recommendation about that.

Councilmember Hoy: Okay, appreciate that.

President Bassemier: Okay, anymore discussion? Got a motion and a second. Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

SUPERINTENDENT OF COUNTY BUILDINGS		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1310-1140-1310	Maintenance	29,088.00	15,157.00
1310-1920	Insurance	10,000.00	6,555.00
1310-1910	PERF	1,528.00	1,251.00
1310-1900	FICA	2,226.00	1,160.00
1310-1990	Extra Help	17,000.00	17,000.00
Total		59,842.00	41,123.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

COUNTY COUNCIL

President Bassemier: Okay, now to us.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, County Council, we have Accrued Payments, FICA, PERF and Sheriff's Retirement, for a total request of \$57,763. I'll move approval.

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: Got a second. Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

COUNTY COUNCIL		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1480-1971	Accrued Payments	50,000.00	50,000.00
1480-1900	FICA	3,825.00	3,825.00
1480-1910	PERF	1,313.00	1,313.00
1480-1911	Sheriff's Retirement	2,625.00	2,625.00
Total		57,763.00	57,763.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

REASSESSMENT/COUNTY ASSESSOR

President Bassemier: Okay, Jim.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Reassessment Fund request, Reassessment/County Assessor, Contractual Services for \$55,000. I'll move approval.

Councilmember Hoy: Second.

President Bassemier: Got a second. Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Just real quick, I'd just like to say I talked to Cheryl and if at all possible, I'd like to see a financial along, – we just got something today on kind of a dateline on when the GIS is going to happen. Catherine brought up a great point and they're going to work on some type of capital plan on the Commissioner's side and all the officeholders, and I think that's a good plan, something we need to see. And I talked to Cheryl about trying to – most of this stuff, she indicated to me has been paid for or has been budgeted, but for some of the other things, the last thing I want to do is see us get hit with these fees, or not necessarily the fees, but some of these acquisition costs or computer enhancements that we didn't plan on and that's the part where you get into a bind with your money. So –

Cheryl Musgrave: It's really hard to hear you guys with that rain on the roof. Cheryl Musgrave, County Assessor. The document that he's talking about is that bar chart sort of thing. That was prepared by the – I'm being truthful – that was prepared by

the consultant to the whole project. I didn't prepare it. I'm familiar with it, but as I told Troy before the meeting, when I come up for appropriation, I'm here representing the Assessor's interests. That document speaks to the global plan and it speaks to city departments, county departments and far more than I have any interest in, truthfully. I'm interested in this project for what it will do for the Assessors. I'm pleased to work with others so that we tailor what we're doing so that it will be useful for them, but truth to tell, if it's not useful for the Assessors, I kind of lose interest in it and they can go do whatever they want.

Councilmember Tornatta: But you're spearheading the process.

Cheryl Musgrave: That, the head of the committee is Roger Lehman and there's a department head who is 50/50 funded, city/county. His name is Matt Arvay. He's been on the job I'm thinking a month now. If you want the sort of plan that you're talking about, you have to speak with Roger and Matt. When I'm up here in front of you, I'm talking to you about what the Assessors need.

Councilmember Hoy: Mr. President? Were you finished Councilman?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yeah.

Councilmember Hoy: Mr. President, would you give – it is hard to hear in here.

Cheryl Musgrave: Yeah, it is.

Councilmember Hoy: Matt's last name, please?

Cheryl Musgrave: Arvay. A-R-V-A-Y. 7858 is his number.

Councilmember Hoy: I have a comment, sir. Very few compliments are handed out in this building in public meetings, so I want to give you one because the charts that you gave us on remote connectivity, alternatives under consideration, it's a wonderful way to give us the picture of what you're trying to do. It's not that I mind reading, although I would like to read some novels and plays and poetry and other things that I have in my library other than –

Cheryl Musgrave: GIS and –

Councilmember Hoy: County stuff, yeah. But very seriously, this is an excellent piece and I want to thank you for it.

Cheryl Musgrave: You're welcome.

President Bassemier: Thank you, Ms. Musgrave. Anymore discussion on that? Got a motion and a second. Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

AMENDED REASSESSMENT/COUNTY ASSESSOR		REQUESTED	APPROVED
2492-1090-3370	Computer (Data Mgmt)	36,184.00	36,184.00
2492-1090-3310	Training	4,000.00	4,000.00
2492-1090-3530	Contractual Services	14,816.00	14,816.00
Total		55,000.00	55,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

CENTRAL DISPATCH

President Bassemier: Okay, Mr. Raben, Central Dispatch.

Councilmember Raben: Central Dispatch, 3290-3890 for the amount of \$50,000. I'll move approval.

President Bassemier: Do I have a second on that?

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: I have a second on that, Mr. Wortman. Any discussion on that?

Councilmember Tornatta: This should save us quite a bit of money. If we had to do this later down the road, this should save us two to three times, so this is a good deal.

President Bassemier: Okay. Roll call vote. Thank you, Mr. Tornatta.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

CENTRAL DISPATCH		REQUESTED	APPROVED
3290-3890	Central Dispatch	50,000.00	50,000.00
Total		50,000.00	50,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

TRANSFER REQUESTS

**CORONER
CUMULATIVE BRIDGE
CONVENTION CENTER OPERATING FUND (LATE)**

**VOTER REGISTRATION
RECORDER (LATE)**

President Bassemier: Okay, that concludes our appropriations and, Jim, you want to get into the transfers?

Councilmember Raben: I'd be happy to. We have a late transfer that's been added, but at this time I'll move that all transfers be approved as submitted.

President Bassemier: Do I have a second?

Councilmember Sutton: Second.

President Bassemier: Any discussion on that? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

CORONER		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1070-3130	Travel/Mileage	2,000.00	2,000.00
To: 1070-3530	Contractual Services	1,500.00	1,500.00
1070-2600	Office Supplies	500.00	500.00

VOTER REGISTRATION		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1220-2700	Other Supplies	1,500.00	1,500.00
To: 1220-3410	Printing	1,500.00	1,500.00

CUMULATIVE BRIDGE		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 2030-4401	Broadway Bridge #273	40,000.00	40,000.00
To: 2030-4391	Boyle Ln. Bridge #260	40,000.00	40,000.00

LATE TRANSFER

RECORDER		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1040-1160-1040	Microfilm Technician	2,427.00	2,427.00
To: 1040-1970	Temp. Replacement	2,427.00	2,427.00

CONVENTION CENTER OPERATING FUND		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 3650-3204	Utilities-Water	15,000.00	15,000.00
To: 3650-3205	Utilities-Gas	15,000.00	15,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

GENERAL FUND REPEAL REQUEST

COUNTY ASSESSOR

President Bassemier: Okay, Jim, the Repeal, number eight.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Mr. President, I'll move approval of the Repeal as listed.

Councilmember Hoy: Second.

President Bassemier: I have a second. Any discussion on that?

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: We have a second and a third.

Councilmember Sutton: Double second.

President Bassemier: Double second, that's okay. Any discussion? No discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

COUNTY ASSESSOR		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1090-1150-1090	Real Estate Deputy/Hearing Officer	1,500.00	1,500.00
Total		1,500.00	1,500.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

AMENDMENTS TO SALARY ORDINANCE

President Bassemier: Okay, amendments to the Salary Ordinance, Mr. Raben.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Mr. President, first is the Recorder, amend the salary ordinance line 1040-1210 Deeds Deputy as previously adopted with an annual salary of \$22,130; Pigeon Township Assessor, move to amend salary line 1150-1990 Extra Help as previously adopted; Superintendent of County Buildings line 1310-1140 Maintenance as previously adopted with an annual salary of \$29,088; and line 1310-1990 Extra Help as previously adopted; County Council, move to amend line 1480-1971 Accrued Termination Payments as previously adopted; and last is the Prosecutor’s Office which, Mr. President, I...allow me to, let’s take the ones I’ve read first.

President Bassemier: Okay, that will be fine. Do I have a second on that?

Councilmember Winnecke: Second.

President Bassemier: I have second, Mr. Winnecke. Any discussion on those? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

President Bassemier: Now the Prosecutor.

Councilmember Raben: Okay. Is Stan in the audience? Stan, if you didn't care to briefly go over your request for a rate of increase.

Stan Levco: Okay, Stan Levco, Prosecuting Attorney. Famous last words, but I think this should be routine. What it was is, last year Terry Maurer became a magistrate, so I appointed Mike Perry to be head of the drug program which is a more responsible position than the average Deputy Prosecutor position. He's in charge of three other employees and I told him at the time that, subject to Council approval, I would recommend a ten percent raise each of the first two years. The first one has already been in effect. Assuming he gets this next one, and it would be really six percent more because he's already gotten four percent at the first of the year. Assuming he gets this next one, he still would be a couple thousand dollars less than what the previous person in that position made and that's not counting the fact that his salary would have gone up three or four percent for two years in a row now, too. And the money is in the grant, it's already been budgeted.

Councilmember Raben: Yeah, and I understand that, which that makes it somewhat easier on us, but what I have a problem with is in July of '98 that job was – when it was previously under our Job Study, was approved as a Step II at \$41,855, then in May of 2000, you requested that that job be unclassified, okay? And in January of 2001, that salary went from \$49,320 to \$51,293. So from July of '98 to January of 2001, he realized nearly a \$10,000 increase in his salary line. And with this, I mean, you're talking another \$3,000. I know you've heard me express before because your office has a lot of these individuals that are unclassified, but I think it's hard – it's hard to be both. You can request that someone be unclassified and through longevity and step increases, when the classified individuals catch up or go beyond them, you know, you can't say okay, now we're ready to catch him up again. You know, we make them unclassified to move them ahead and I just really have a problem with this. I think we either need to stay unclassified and live with the standard percent of increase that we as this body votes on annually, or we live within the Job Study.

Councilmember Sutton: Stan, does this particular individual, their responsibilities have changed? I guess that's –

Stan Levco: Dramatically.

Councilmember Sutton: I mean, when they first came in –

President Bassemier: Hold it. I'm sorry.

(Tape Changed)

Councilmember Sutton: The individual that we're speaking about started as just a regular deputy and now they have additional responsibilities. Can you take us through the progression of that person's responsibilities because we're not talking about a job, we're talking about an individual because they haven't been in the same position the entire time.

Stan Levco: Right. His original responsibilities would have been Misdemeanor Court and trying cases and just handling routine matters. When this position, the head of the drug program became open, although ultimately, I am in charge of it, he still is directly in charge of it on a day to day basis of all the drug cases. And as you know, those have increased pretty dramatically over the years. I'd say roughly 25 of the cases we file are drug cases, so they're all filed through that part of the office. He's directly responsible for two attorneys and one secretary. Before that, he was, I certainly don't want to say just a Deputy Prosecutor, because that's a very high position to be, but he was a Deputy Prosecutor and now he's head of the Drug Law Enforcement program, and it's a federal program.

Councilmember Raben: Stan, what was the date when he assumed that new responsibility?

Stan Levco: May 4th of last year.

Councilmember Raben: Of 2000?

Stan Levco: Yeah.

Councilmember Raben: You know, again, this individual in just one year, you're talking about going up \$5,000 in –

Stan Levco: Yeah, I mean, his responsibilities increased dramatically. It was the position, I could have argued with you, and I know I gave some consideration to asking for him to be moved up even more dramatically in the first year, but I thought I wanted him to be in the position for a while before I asked for it. In my thinking, I could have asked for a twenty percent raise on the first day given how dramatically his responsibilities increased from being a Deputy Prosecutor, head of the program. In the office, he's probably the only other attorney who has direct responsibility over other attorneys in that way. I mean, I have a domestic violence prosecutor, but it's one. That program is one. That's the only other prosecutors in the office that are their own entity.

Councilmember Winnecke: Stan, where do you see this position going in the next twelve to twenty-four months in terms of salary?

Stan Levco: Not – the normal four percent, so three percent. And that is all I committed to him and I don't have any intention otherwise at this point.

President Bassemier: Jim, what was your recommendation? It is hard to hear you, I'm sorry.

Councilmember Raben: Well, actually I've not made a recommendation –

President Bassemier: Okay, that's probably why I didn't hear it.

Councilmember Raben: My recommendation, again, I'm still very uneasy with flip flopping. I mean, it happens too often that we go back and forth to whatever at that particular time –

President Bassemier: Before you make that whatever you're going to put in there, remember Mr. Levco, he always gives us money back or tries to over the year, so we've got to keep that in mind, too. I know this is a different circumstance, but if he didn't need it, usually, or didn't think somebody deserved it, he might be afraid they

might move on to another position or something like that. So anyway, go ahead. I didn't mean to interrupt you.

Councilmember Raben: My recommendation at this time is going to be to deny the request.

President Bassemier: Is to deny the request?

Councilmember Raben: The amendment to the salary line.

President Bassemier: Do I have a second on that? No second, Jim. Another recommendation?

Councilmember Raben: Well, then just to speed things up, I'll move that we amend the salary line to reflect the ten percent increase.

President Bassemier: Do I have a second on that?

Councilmember Winnecke: I'll second that and I say I'll second it because if I got additional responsibilities at the bank to this extent, I would hope that I would be compensated likewise, and I'll second it.

Stan Levco: I'd be the first to vote for you.

Councilmember Winnecke: Thank you very much.

(Inaudible – several speaking at once)

Councilmember Raben: Stan, you may have addressed this earlier. I'm unclear as to whether you stated this was what happened last year or this year. In 2001, this individual received a four percent increase. So is this six in addition to that or is this the full ten?

Stan Levco: Six is in addition to the four, for a total of ten.

Councilmember Sutton: Now, I guess that's the question I was posing is, separating the person from the position. Obviously, the responsibility curve has drastically increased and if that person is up to that responsibility level, appropriate compensation ought to be forthcoming. So if they are not up to it, Stan would not have put them in the position. And since the previous person was compensated at that level, it would seem only the just thing to do would be to compensate them at the level with the previous person if they have the equal amount of experience and all.

President Bassemier: As I said before, all due respect to Jim. Jim has got a rough job here. He's got a very unpopular position. He's doing his job and I have a lot of respect for what he's trying to do so please don't anybody get mad at him here.

Councilmember Raben: I don't need anybody to apologize for me. I'm just concerned about where this body is going to take this county when we start meeting the demands of the new jail and running the courthouse and things of that nature. I prepared myself January 1st to buckle down and I wish at some point this county would follow suit because next year it's going to be difficult.

Councilmember Hoy: I'm not trying to make Mr. Raben feel good today at all. I

might buy him a beer afterwards, though, because it is a tough job. I would encourage my fellow Councilmembers to take a look at the statistical report that we get every year from Farm Bureau on what various counties spend. That's all I'll say, but if you'll make those comparisons with similar counties, you'll see we do rather well in some areas and we overspend in some areas that have begun to concern me and that's why I will vote for this. I think the man deserves it, but I also am listening very carefully to Mr. Raben.

President Bassemier: Same here.

Councilmember Hoy: I spent some time with that book last night, about two hours, highlighting what various positions pay, what various departments cost versus the population of those counties and there's some food for thought in there. We spend a lot more money, I'll just be candid with you, in some areas than comparable counties do and I'm beginning to wonder why.

President Bassemier: Okay, thank you, Mr. Hoy.

Councilmember Wortman: Mr. Bassemier? Is there any federal money involved?

Stan Levco: This is federal money.

Councilmember Wortman: All of it? 100 percent?

Stan Levco: No, I think...

Councilmember Wortman: That's what I wanted to know.

Regéne Newman: (Inaudible – comments not made from the microphone)

Stan Levco: 75/25%.

(Inaudible – several speaking at once)

Stan Levco: This money has already been appropriated.

President Bassemier: Good point.

Councilmember Raben: You know, my father told me as a child, save your pennies and the dollars take care of themselves and that's something we need to try to follow as a Council because I'm telling you, times are going to get difficult when you start trying to make 2.5 or 3.5 million annual jail payments along with, you know, nobody knows what the full effect of the new courthouse is going to bring us and we've got quite a lot to be frank.

President Bassemier: And I'm not disagreeing with you. I just think Mr. Levco has got a good employee there and he wants to take care of him and he wants to keep him. So I got a motion and a second, anymore discussion? Roll call vote.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes. It passes.

(Motion carried 6-1/Councilmember Raben opposed)

Stan Levco: Thank you and could I, – just to alert the Council what may be coming, hopefully, I'll be coming before you in a couple of months. The federal government has got a nationwide grant for gun prosecutors, prosecutors who just prosecute gun crimes and I'm going to be applying for a grant for one or more of those. If I do and they grant it, it will be an 80/20 match. So if it gets to the point, I will apply, if it gets to the point where I get accepted, I'll let you know.

President Bassemier: Well, thank you, sir. Okay, that's everything on that.

JILL MARCRUM - EVANSVILLE BAR ASSOCIATION
--

President Bassemier: Going into old business, Ms. Marcum. As you know, Ms. Marcum, she appeared before us last week and she's wanting to – she's asked us all to, if we have any questions, she wanted us to all think about them and that about sums it up, if we got anything. You got anything to add?

Jill Marcum: Well –

President Bassemier: And I've got to tell everybody, I told them to make it brief.

Jill Marcum: Yes.

President Bassemier: Now we're at a point that...

Jill Marcum: Basically, the reason that we came to the Council is we're not looking, we're not asking you for money today. We want you to understand the needs of the court, the physical space needs of the court and so that when we do come, when the time does come to allocate money for the court system, that you have an understanding of what it is that we actually need. And we have several people here from the Bar Association, the officers, members of the bar, we have four judges,

Judge Lloyd, Judge Pigman, who is the chief judge of the Superior Court, Judge Knight is here and Judge Tornatta, I know, was here and Judge Heldt from the Circuit Court are here. So to the extent that our collective group can answer any questions that you might have had about either our original report or the addendum, we're here to do that. And before I forget, I also want to say that to the extent that we can help serve on a committee, answer any questions for you at some later date, we're happy to do that, we're happy to offer our services to help in any way we can. So with that, I'll open it to questions and refer it to the proper person.

Councilmember Tornatta: Well, I think we've got a few people on the advisory committee now for the, if you will, Blue Ribbon committee, it's the detention assessment committee. Is that...anyway, I think we've got some people on that from, a couple of judges or whatever, so –

Jill Marcrum: Well, and I'm here representing the Bar Association and the Bar Association is separate and distinct from the judges and it's the Bar Association who did these reports. The judges did not serve on the committee, the judges did not – the judges were consulted and asked their opinions, but no judge, no magistrate was a member of the committee for the sole purpose that we wanted this to be an independent study, something that represented the community as opposed to the judges coming forth and saying here's what we want. If you ask the judges, there's probably a lot of things, not a lot, but there are probably some things in here that the judges disagree with. This is the Bar Association and to the extent that the Bar Association can help, we're willing to do that. If you don't need it, that's fine, but –

Councilmember Tornatta: I guess what I'm saying is they have a list, the Sheriff's Office has a list and for instance, Judge Pigman is on that, Judge Trockman, –

Jill Marcrum: And they are judges and they are members of the Bar, but they do not – I'm talking about the people, we're willing to offer these people up again to help serve in any –

Councilmember Tornatta: I'm just saying, you pointed out they were in the audience as a representative for you and I'm saying that they're on this committee, so you will have some input for sure.

Jill Marcrum: No, they are here as judges just to help because – it's difficult because the courthouse problem is not just a Bar Association problem. It's the judges' courthouse. They run the judicial system, that's their job, okay? The attorneys who practice in the Bar are the ones who come into the system, who bring their clients, the community, into the system and help them work through the system. The judges are here because there are certain questions in terms of the judges' caseload and how many cases we file that they have the best information on. So they're here for that respect, they're here to help answer any questions and, in fact, Judge Pigman has given me authority to invite all the members of the Council to the courthouse to help you understand how our system works, not only the physical layouts, but the system, because ours is a different system, I think, than many others in the county. So the judges are here, but the Bar Association is also here. And those really are two separate and distinct entities.

Councilmember Tornatta: And I'm going to serve, as well as Mr. Hoy and Mr. Raben are going to serve, on the committee –

President Bassemier: Blue Ribbon.

Councilmember Tornatta: Blue Ribbon committee, if you will, and yeah, I will be more than willing to have that and I think Catherine is going to look for an appointment off the Bar, as well, to serve on that committee. Is that...?

Jill Marcrum: Well, it's whatever you want. We're here to –

Councilmember Tornatta: I would rather take that back because you have to be a part of it as the judges, as the law enforcement.

Jill Marcrum: The Bar Association is representing the public. These are the attorneys who come and represent the individuals who come into our court system. Your constituents, our constituents, okay, that's who they represent. They bring a different view than the judges do.

Councilmember Tornatta: And you will be a part of it.

Jill Marcrum: I'd be happy to, to the, you know, I'm just here to offer help, assistance, answer any questions. So if anybody has any, we're happy to –

Councilmember Hoy: I raised all my questions the last time you were here. Appreciate the response concerning particularly persons who do not have money, whose lawyers do not show up, I have to say this to get it on record, those people are not going – they're always calling after the fact, okay? It's not as if they call me and say, well, can you go with me to rectify this? That's just not going to happen. People who – most people are intimidated, even middle-class and upper-class people are intimidated by this building, by the system, and I think you all need to keep that in mind. And you've certainly beat night court to death in this report and I read every word of it, although it would still please me immensely if someone had the courage to really experiment with it besides New York City. That's a whole different venue.

Jill Marcrum: And night court has two different functions. If you're talking about night court to solve the space problems, that's not going to do it. If you're talking about night court as a convenience to the community and were willing to expend the money to provide that convenience to the community, that's a separate issue and I think the judges are happy to entertain that.

Councilmember Hoy: Some of us would like to do that. The other thing that I guess I would like to – I don't guess, I know – I would like to know, is how many times are the rooms really used? I mean, how many cases are plea bargained rather than heard in front of a jury? I don't know what that statistic is, but I don't think there are –

Jill Marcrum: And judges, if there's anybody who wants to come up or anyone from the committee.

Councilmember Hoy: That would be an important thing for us to know as to how often you need – obviously, from the statistics from other counties, more space is needed. I have no argument with that.

Jill Marcrum: Well, and the interesting thing, if you look at the other counties, there are counties who are larger, who don't have the caseload that we have in this county. Vanderburgh County is considered a large county according to the weighted caseload study that's done by the judicial center, whereas –

Councilmember Hoy: That's a whole other issue which –

Jill Marcrum: But it goes towards the size and the number of judges that we have and the number of courtrooms that we actually need. Elkhart County and several of the other counties who you would think are comparable to us in size, Elkhart, which is Goshen and Hamilton County, which is Noblesville, they both have 182,000. They have 11,000 more people. They have fewer judges because they have a lower caseload than we do. So you can't exactly look at the other counties and say oh, they're the same size so we need the exact, same number of people. It's apples and oranges, it doesn't work.

Councilmember Hoy: No, my question goes beyond what you're addressing now and it addresses my concern that we have so many more cases and I've lived in some of these other counties, I don't think they are any more law abiding than we are, and that's not in the purview of your report, I understand that –

Jill Marcrum: Exactly.

Councilmember Hoy: But it is certainly within the realm of my concern that we have hundreds more cases filed in this county than Elkhart County, or percentage-wise than Allen County, I lived up in that area for five years and I can tell you, you're just as safe either place and that's where my questions are coming from and that goes beyond just what you're asking about here. I think you need more rooms. I'm not opposed to that, but I am concerned.

Jill Marcrum: Appreciate that. Anything else?

President Bassemier: Anybody got any questions?

Jill Marcrum: Okay, appreciate the time. Thank you.

BURDETTE PARK ADVISORY BOARD APPOINTMENT

President Bassemier: Okay, (inaudible – microphone not turned on) Burdette Park Advisory Board appointment and that's Jerome Richey.

Councilmember Sutton: Yes, Jerome, Jerry Richey will be the appointment there.

SUZANNE CROUCH, AUDITOR/PERMISSION TO BROADCAST THE COUNTY COUNCIL MEETINGS LIVE VIA THE INTERNET
--

President Bassemier: Going into the new business.

Councilmember Raben: Mr. President, I don't want to harp too much on this one subject but I wanted to verify the numbers with our Auditor, but one other thing that this body needs to remember too, and I'm sure everybody is quite aware that next year the state has cut \$100,000,000 in Local Roads & Streets and what the state says today is they're going to take those levels back to the '95 and '96, so that's going to put another tremendous strain on our county. We'll have to make that up with something, so...you know, again, I wish, I hope everyone keeps that in mind as well.

President Bassemier: Okay, thank you, sir. Okay, under new business, we need a motion for the Auditor to give the Auditor permission to broadcast live the County

Council meetings via the Internet. Do I have a –

Councilmember Hoy: So moved.

Councilmember Raben: I'll second.

President Bassemier: You've got a motion and a second. Discussion please? Mr. Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes, I would welcome that same thing happening with this body if it can be arranged.

Councilmember Raben: I think it's a wonderful idea.

Councilmember Sutton: Suzanne, with what is being proposed here, what is the actual cost for this that we're talking about? I mean, for the County Council side, I mean, what are we looking at here?

Suzanne Crouch: The actual cost, there's a phone line that we will have to have put in of \$110.

Councilmember Sutton: You'll have to speak up a little bit louder. It's a little hard to hear with the rain.

Suzanne Crouch: There might be a problem with this audio for live streaming. There's a \$110 phone line cost, that's a one time cost; there's a \$30 Ameritech one time cost; there's \$300 training cost and if the city also goes this route, hopefully, we'll be splitting those with the city. Those are one-time costs. We also have a laptop that we have shared the price with the County Assessor, that's with budgeted money and, quite honestly, that's being used for other functions besides this, but we will use it for this also. The monthly costs are \$62 a month, which equates to \$744 annual cost, which we have within our budget. And that's for the monthly charge for streaming, static IP address, and then the phone line cost on a monthly basis.

Councilmember Sutton: And who will be the actual individual that is going to be directly responsible for handling this whole streaming process? I mean, obviously, you're going to have someone who is chiefly responsible for this.

Suzanne Crouch: Certainly. We have a network specialist within our office who will be responsible for setting it up. It's a relatively simple process. The laptop will be set up in this room and be hooked into the sound system and that will provide the live streaming that will be provided through WCS, through their server. And, in fact, we're training our recording secretaries also. So it's a relatively simple process of just setting up, bringing the laptop up here, hooking it into the sound system and basically going with it.

Councilmember Sutton: And who would we probably say would be our perceived user on this? I guess I kind of look at it, you know, I use the Internet a lot and I'm pretty sure there's several people here besides Curt that probably use the Internet here on Council. But Curt can speak up for himself, but I guess I'm trying to get an idea of as we think about doing this, how much of an audience are we looking at? I know you can't just say okay, we're going to have 2,000 people readily listening to County Council proceedings, but I guess trying to gauge as we look at leaping forward in this direction, are we going to be actually hitting some folk or have there been some people express some interest in wanting to hear what's going on in our

body that in some way or another either they can't attend the meetings or they don't get the minutes or anything like that? Who is our perceived user, I guess that's my question?

Suzanne Crouch: I think you raised a good point and that is that this is about the future. It's interesting that whenever I got into this project that we accessed the Department of Commerce survey from the year 2000 and it had some interesting statistics in that. In 1998, there were 18% of the individuals in the United States that used the Internet, and in the year 2000, that had increased to 41%. Sixty-seven percent of our 18 to 24 year olds have Internet access and that is how they access their information, so this is about the future, it's about opening up government, it's about making it more accessible to the people. It's allowing people to access government in meetings, not only in their homes but in their schools. And I think perhaps at this point in time, Councilman Sutton, I'm not sure that we can determine exactly who those people are, but we will be able to monitor how many people are actually accessing. In addition, that audio will be available for people to access at a later time, so someone could conceivably, the next morning, click on and listen to the meeting or listen to parts of the meeting. If an individual – if there's a part of the meeting that is of interest to them, they can listen to that portion. And what the Commissioners decided to do was to start posting their agendas on the Auditor and on the Commissioner websites ahead of the meetings, so that if people had an interest, they could access that meeting or we will even, we're working on having the agenda where you can click onto a portion of it the next day and go to that portion of the audio and listen to it if you so choose. So I think it's –

Councilmember Tornatta: Those numbers that you were talking about are great. The amount of individuals that want to get on, did they say what they're hitting? I mean, you've said what, 67% of the kids –

Suzanne Crouch: Eighteen to twenty-four year olds, yes.

Councilmember Tornatta: Yeah, I mean, are they trying to hit government sites or –

Suzanne Crouch: Well, I have a fourteen year old and it's not like when I grew up, we used the phone. Our children are using the Internet. If she wants to take a sample test preparing for one coming up, she goes to the Internet. If she wants to talk to her friends, she goes to the Internet. So those young people are using the Internet for all types of things and all kinds of things. And I just know from my personal experience that that is what my daughter uses it for.

Councilmember Tornatta: I would love to have an open opportunity for people to pick this up and use the Internet and as long as the costs stay in line, then that's fine, but I guess what I'd hate to see is just to pull a number from somewhere that it says 67% of the kids or 41% of the kids are now using the Internet. But they're chatting with their friends, they're talking on a chat deal where they're doing something else and by no way are we actually hitting our target. Our target is being passed up over a very generic number that we're getting.

Suzanne Crouch: But we have, and I know that you have seen high school and college students at your meetings and we see them at the Commissioner meetings all the time, and this will be a wonderful opportunity for those people and those young people to access our proceedings and to be able to, hopefully, become involved a little bit in government and, hopefully, become a little bit involved, more involved in the process, because that's the group that's not voting.

Councilmember Tornatta: Right, and that's why I would push to talk to WNIN, to talk to Sigecom or whoever we have on the docket to talk to, because those free access channels are ways that people are going to watch that kind of thing. I don't even know if my computer can handle a streaming. And that's another question.

Suzanne Crouch: And quite honestly, I think we should do it all. You know, looking at cable is not new. In 1991, the County and the City looked at it and at that time, the cost was \$60,000 and that was using WNIN. Then they turned around and a candidate that was running for City Council in 1995 proposed that we do the City Council meetings on a public access channel and the cost at that time was estimated to be about \$25,000. I don't know what the cost would be currently, but I think it's something we ought to explore. This is one opportunity to reach out and to hopefully provide access and open the doors to a group of people that aren't participating within our process. And someone mentioned that there was a survey done on one of the TV stations and that only 21% of the people said they'd be more interested if, in fact, we did this or would participate in government more. But out of 165,000 people, 21% is about 30,000 people. I'll take those people participating any –

Councilmember Tornatta: Right, but that wasn't the number. I assure you that wasn't the number that called in to FIE at that time to give you that, but I mean, I'm fine. I think it's a great situation. I would like to monitor this after a year and I'm sure you're going to have a hit counter to see what kind of numbers we're looking at just to make sure that we're not, just, you know, it's a great idea. It's great, people come up with all kind of great ideas, getting them to fruition until people actually take those in, much like these Internet companies that thought they had great ideas but if no one is spending the money or putting the time into that, it doesn't matter. And I wouldn't want to see a lot of money expended toward that if we're not hitting anybody with it.

Councilmember Sutton: And I guess that's probably, you know, I would kind of concur. I mean, we were just talking earlier, you know, our thoughts about watching our pennies and the dollars come home, that type of thing. And I think the access is really good. I mean, I think it's good that we are looking at technological advances in order to reach, but I think we'll just need to monitor and see how effective we are with it. You know, if we see that there is obviously a great interest, obviously, it would be something to be pretty much a no-brainer, but we're going to obviously be incurring monthly costs with this so we might want to just monitor it and see how we do and see how the public responds.

Suzanne Crouch: And I think that's a good point. You know, the Assessor's website, she went public with her property tax information in 1998, I believe, the database went up in July of 1998 and she's had over a half million hits on that site. Our site, we average about a million hits a month on the written minutes alone, so you know, I think it will be interesting to see what kind of interest is out there. But it's a minimal cost and I think if we can involve some people, if we can open that door of government a little wider and encourage participation, I think that's something that we all want to do.

Councilmember Tornatta: I'd like to, do we have a motion?

President Bassemier: Yeah, we're still under discussion. Mr. Hoy, let me just – as president, I'd like to commend Ms. Crouch for putting this together, all this hard work and time. I think it's a big step forward to open government up to Vanderburgh County. I think when people see what we're all about, I think we'll get more people

out here and my hat is off to you. And I'd also like to commend Ms. Musgrave, too, for what she's done in her department and working on this project and her doings, also. So I want to thank you. Good work. Mr. Hoy, go ahead.

Councilmember Hoy: I was just going to add about the television survey. I watched those in the paper and to say they're unscientific is an understatement and I wouldn't bet my life on that survey that comes in. And the second thing I would say about surveys, I've never tried to run my life on what surveys said anyway.

President Bassemier: Okay, you got a motion and a second. Let's vote on this. Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Will this start next month?

Suzanne Crouch: Yes.

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: What if it wasn't going to start next month? Yes.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

INDIANAPOLIS DOWNS/EVANSVILLE OFF TRACK WAGERING UPDATE
--

President Bassemier: We'll go on to the next one is Indianapolis Downs/Evansville off track wagering. Is there someone out there to give us an update for this?

Bev Oswald: That is correct. I'm Bev Oswald with Oswald Communications and I'm not here asking for money today. That's the good news. Actually, I represent a group that will bring a tax basis to Evansville, the Indianapolis Downs. As you're

aware, the Indiana Racing Commission last week voted approval of the racetrack. They are planning to open in the fall of 2002, approximately. They're planning on opening approximately four off track wagering parlors, the first to be in Evansville and our company has been engaged to help with identifying appropriate sites and help with the public relations activities. And I spoke with Mr. Raben a couple of weeks ago and he said we would like an update on what's going on. He said we're waiting for the vote. Doug Brown, an attorney with Stewart Irwin is representing the group and they'll be applying for as soon as the order comes through, which will be about four to six weeks, applying for the application for Evansville, which has already been approved by this body, the County Council. So if there's questions, I can get back to you with answers, if there's anything. But I think it's going to be exciting. Also, there'll be some opportunities with cross promotion, as Jim (Inaudible) from Aztar, with the group and as the president of the Convention & Visitors Bureau, I think it will be another attraction for Evansville for guests that are going to be here. The facility will be built – I don't know if you read the article in the paper – similar to like a Friday's, a really nice dining restaurant facility with T.V.'s throughout, well done, entertaining type place, and we'll be able to seat several hundred people because they will be featuring all the major races, the Kentucky Derby, Breeder's Cup, etc. So, any questions?

President Bassemier: You all have any questions?

Bev Oswald: Thank you.

MIKE DUCKWORTH/FREEDOM FESTIVAL
--

President Bassemier: Okay, now we have Mr. Duckworth from the Board of Public Works, also Transportation Services and a (inaudible – microphone not turned on) from the Freedom Festival, so...

Mike Duckworth: Good afternoon, President Bassemier and members of the Council, first of all I'm glad to be up here without it raining, so you can hear me.

Suzanne Crouch: Can we change the tape please?

(Tape change)

President Bassemier: Would you start again?

Mike Duckworth: I said I was glad to be up here without it raining so hard, so at least you could hear me. I'm here today wearing a couple different hats. Mike Duckworth, Director of Transportation and Services, City of Evansville. I'm also a member of the Freedom Festival Board of Directors and I'm wearing a couple of hats here today. First of all, to tell you, of course, we're excited about the Blue Angels and Thunder on the Ohio taking place, commencing June 28th through July 1st of this year. With the addition of the Blue Angels and that activity we're anticipating, of course, a lot bigger crowd and we're working off of the number of about 100,000. Not to get caught short, we're working on such things as parking, we have a number of different lots where we will be able to park folks that will be going to the river front and shuttling back and forth with METS trolleys and buses. And the other thing that we are having to look at is, of course, when you bring that many people together or you have to plan for that many people, you have to have ample security and where that comes into effect with the County Council is the fact that because of certain requirements that the Blue Angels have put on us, there's certain areas that have to be cleared due to their flyovers and it's called basically

clearing the show box. That area extends into the county as well as other activities that take place on this event. I'm going to mention some of those areas that will be affected just to give you some example of where we will need extra patrols and security for these four days of events. First of all, 41 and Waterworks, that includes the show box; Waterworks at the levee; Marina Pointe; Waterworks Road, we have to keep that area clear of parking because of the requirements that the Blue Angels require us to do; Harbors Edge, which is a small community located there near Waterworks Road, we have had to even evacuate some of the residents during the time that the planes are in the air because you're only allowed essential people to be in that area; and, of course, the airport and there will be displays, exhibits, and last year they had a balloon launch that included about nine balloons. This year it's increasing to about 50. We also have to ask for escorts from the Marriott and different locations of hotels back and forth to the airport for Blue Angel dignitaries and, of course, we have to have supervision of security from the Sheriff's Department. Today I am here to make a request to the County Council. In this four day time period, we will need in excess of 400 hours of extra security to be provided and hopefully by the Sheriff's Department. I met with Major Wallace, Chief Deputy Williams and Sheriff Ellsworth in regards to this. They have worked up a budget and I am here to request that the County Council extend funding in the amount of \$18,000 to help us cover the cost of the security.

President Bassemier: Of course we can't vote on this today.

Mike Duckworth: I understand.

President Bassemier: This would need to be advertised. You're kind of looking for (Inaudible – microphone not turned on)

Mike Duckworth: Exactly, and I've talked to, like I say, Chief Williams and Sheriff Ellsworth. We would like to run that basically through the Sheriff's overtime account and have them handle the payment of those officers and, of course, that would assist the Thunder officials on our efforts to do other things as well.

Lloyd Winnecke: Mike, just two quick questions: how will all this be coordinated; and secondly, –

Mike Duckworth: I'm sorry, how long what?

Councilmember Winnecke: How will all this be coordinated, and secondly, what is the total security ticket for that day – for the week?

Mike Duckworth: As far as the coordination of that event and the security for the Sheriff's Department, we have about 10 different law enforcement agencies that are involved in this and they are each given basically their territory or their jurisdiction and what needs to be done in their areas. That includes everything from security on the water with DNR, the Coast Guard, the Kentucky Highway Patrol, even extends into closing roads and providing security by Henderson County Sheriff's Department on the Kentucky side and, of course, the Indiana State Police, Evansville City Police, the Sheriff's Department and there's a number of other agencies, FEMA, that we have to all deal with their – they're all being given their areas of jurisdiction and assignments and, of course, their supervisors will help carry those out. As far as the total cost, we're looking at \$18,000 in county expenses, right at \$43,000 from the city police, and roughly, we estimate about \$2,000 on the Henderson County side. I'm sorry, \$1,400 from Central Dispatch as well.

Councilmember Sutton: Maybe you did answer it in your description, Mr. Duckworth, would this be – are you looking for individuals, this would be like overtime pay or is this off duty officers that, deputies that we're looking at here?

Mike Duckworth: It would be Deputy Sheriffs supervised –

Councilmember Sutton: Worked into their normal work hours?

Mike Duckworth: No, this would be folks working off duty. Of course, we can't pull officers from their regular details and deplete security out in the county. This would have to be folks off duty and working additional assignments for just the event itself.

Councilmember Sutton: What, I was going to ask, Mr. President, what area would be making this request? I mean, from which department, I mean, because since this is off duty, basically, it wouldn't really actually be out of the Sheriff's budget per se, so which department are we talking about here?

Mike Duckworth: I think it would be the Sheriff's Department because of the fact that it would be their officers that we are paying and it would be paid through their -- basically, we are asking that you allocate the money into their Sheriff's overtime line item and maybe Eric can speak to that a little more.

President Bassemier: (Inaudible – microphone not turned on)

Suzanne Crouch: Well, this is news to me. I'm not sure about the Sheriff's overtime. I missed part of it. Will they be working as Sheriff's Deputies as –

Mike Duckworth: Yes.

Suzanne Crouch: Is that correct?

Mike Duckworth: Yes.

Suzanne Crouch: So it would be above and beyond their normal, is that right, Eric or Mike?

Mike Duckworth: Exactly, but they...

Suzanne Crouch: They aren't off duty, they're actually...

Councilmember Sutton: It would be like if they had...

Eric Williams: Eric Williams, Chief Deputy Sheriff's Office. They are going to be on duty officers but outside of their normal 40 hour work week, so we will be paying them overtime to work this detail.

Suzanne Crouch: And that would be appropriate.

Eric Williams: Yeah.

Councilmember Sutton: And how does the compensation differ when they work off duty?

Eric Williams: Time and a half.

Mike Duckworth: That's basically the way they're working that with the city police.

President Bassemier: (Inaudible – microphone not turned on) and we would have to pay time and a half?

Mike Duckworth: Yes.

Councilmember Hoy: I'm just curious, I'm not against this, but how long is this show?

Mike Duckworth: I didn't hear your question.

Councilmember Hoy: How long is the show?

Mike Duckworth: Well, the entire event lasts four days. On Thursday –

Councilmember Hoy: No, I mean the Blue Angels.

Mike Duckworth: On Thursday they will be in the air three and 3/4 hours; Friday, one hour; Saturday, one hour; and Sunday, one hour for their shows.

President Bassemier: (Inaudible – microphone not turned on).

Councilmember Winnecke: Maybe the Sheriff should make the appropriation for the next month meeting and I don't see that it not pass.

James Raben: (Inaudible – microphone not turned on)

Eric Williams: Our intention was and we've worked with Mike on this and we're supportive of it, but we don't have the funds that would carry us through the year of the year for this extra above and beyond what we thought about. What we're basically looking for is a pretty firm commitment from you that when the appropriation comes back to you at a later date, that you'll fund it for that. But we are going to end up having to order people to work this. I mean, we are so short staffed because of probation – right now we are at 13 below our manpower because of probationary, those are people that we can't use. And that's the reason we can't come up with people just to work them out of their schedules to do this, so this is going to be mandatory overtime that we're going to order people to do this.

President Bassemier: See, we're running out of time, that's why Mr. Duckworth is here. He called me just the other day. We're running out of time.

Eric Williams: The Sheriff's Office is prepared to go on and order the people on the overtime and pay it out of our existing budget. Just, we want to let you know that we'll have to come back and make that appropriation and Mike wanted to come because it's part of the Freedom Festival and make you understand that it's not us asking for this; we're trying to be compliant.

President Bassemier: Mr. Raben, any questions?

Councilmember Raben: No, I think everybody is clear. The money is in their account to cover it for now but by the end of the year, he's going to run short. So probably what Eric needs to do, at our next meeting, come in and go ahead and make the request for the additional –

Eric Williams: And I will tell you now, we were going to be in to make a request for

more overtime money anyway later on this year, but this is going to speed that process up substantially.

(Inaudible)

Eric Williams: Okay, as long as we've got the secret sign, I'm good to go.

Mike Duckworth: I don't know the signals here, I was playing in the dugout and didn't look, but I hope that means that we can go ahead and proceed with the county's part of the security. We think it's a good event for the community. A lot of it does take place in the county and although it's technically a city event, we know the folks throughout the tri-state and Vanderburgh County will participate and I think it's a good deal. Thank you very much.

<p>CONFIRMING RESOLUTION FOR PROPERTY TAX ABATEMENT OF PROPERTY LOCATED AT 5504 FOUNDATION DRIVE/ WOODWARD COMMERCIAL REALTY</p>

President Bassemier: Okay, I need a motion confirming the resolution for property tax abatement of property located at 5504 Foundation Drive/Woodward Commercial Realty. I need a motion and a second.

Councilmember Sutton: So moved.

Councilmember Winnecke: Second.

President Bassemier: Okay, any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

(Motion carried 6-1/Councilmember Hoy opposed)

**RESOLUTION FOR PROPERTY TAX ABATEMENT FOR ACQUISITION
AND INSTALLATION OF NEW MANUFACTURING EQUIPMENT AT 5504
FOUNDATION DRIVE/
GRAHAM PACKAGING COMPANY, L.P.**

President Bassemier: Okay, I need a motion for the approval of a resolution for property tax abatement for acquisition and installation of new manufacturing equipment at 5504 Foundation Drive/Graham Packaging Company, L.P.

Councilmember Winnecke: So moved.

Councilmember Sutton: Second.

President Bassemier: Okay, any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

(Motion carried 6-1/Councilmember Hoy opposed)

**CONFIRMING RESOLUTION FOR PROPERTY TAX ABATEMENT FOR
REDEVELOPMENT OR REHABILITATION ON PROPERTY LOCATED AT
3401 NORTH GREEN RIVER ROAD/
WARREN SPURLING**

President Bassemier: Okay, I need a motion for a confirming resolution for property tax abatement for redevelopment or rehabilitation on property located at 3401 North

Green River Road/Warren Spurling. Do I have a motion?

Councilmember Tornatta: So moved.

Councilmember Raben: Second.

President Bassemier: I have a second. Any discussion? No discussion? Okay, roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: I'm going to be consistent, I'm going to vote no.

President Bassemier: I'm sorry, it's no?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: No.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes. So that's 4-3. It passes.

(Motion carried 4-3/Councilmembers Wortman, Hoy and Winnecke opposed)

<p>TAX ABATEMENT REVIEW FOR REHABILITATION OR REDEVELOPMENT OF PROPERTY LOCATED AT 3078 NORTH ST JOE AVENUE/ LEISURE LIVING WEST</p>

President Bassemier: We need a motion to approve tax abatement review for rehabilitation or redevelopment of property located at 3078 North St. Joe Avenue/Leisure Living West.

Councilmember Raben: So moved.

President Bassemier: Do I have a second? Do I have a motion for a second? Hear no second. Going once...no second?

Edward Johnson: I'm Edward Johnson and I represent Leisure Living West and we're here on the preliminary, this is not a final adjudication. This is just a preliminary to see if we can have tax abatement. I understand that we'd come back again next month for an actual presentation. I understood from the Department of Metropolitan Development, today was the first, the preliminary, to see if they would go ahead and publish it and we would have a hearing next month. In any event, I'm prepared to tell you why we wanted it if you'll give me an opportunity.

Councilmember Raben: I'd like to hear it.

Councilmember Tornatta: I'll second.

President Bassemier: Okay. We've got a second now.

Edward Johnson: Do you want me to go ahead and make a brief presentation understanding that we'd have an opportunity if we had four votes today to come back again?

President Bassemier: (Inaudible – microphone not turned on)

Jeff Ahlers: No, that was Spurling's, was a confirming resolution.

Edward Johnson: His was confirming, right. Ours is a preliminary and I had asked the Council if you all would give us a vote today. It's not binding on you next month, but it will give us an opportunity to come before you. We're kind of the west side Spurling-type people. We have Leisure Living West is for moderate income people. We have an opportunity to have the final part of tax abatement for three years, not ten, three. And it will allow us to lease these and we'll tell you more next month and we'll give you some specifics, but allow us to keep the rents where they are rather than raising them. We've got 47% of the people out there and we've got 76 units already built and every one of them leased are low to moderate income. So it's an opportunity to provide apartment living for people over 55 who are primarily moderate to low income and the abatement will allow us to pass the reduction down a little bit and that's why all we're asking is for the four votes today and let us come back and talk to you a little bit in more detail.

Councilmember Tornatta: And I didn't want to seem disinterested. I've been out to both locations, your location and Mr. Spurling's locations and I think you're doing good things. Pete took me through and you have some different things that Mr. Spurling's might not have and he has some different things that you don't have, but I think it's being said that you are doing something for the elderly in this case, and not all elderly, I found out, but you are doing some stuff and I would be interested in hearing more from your side next month.

Edward Johnson: I hope everybody else does and I won't take your time today if you'll – I hope you'll give us an opportunity to come back.

President Bassemier: The question I'm going to ask Mr. Spurling and I know we talked about this, if you get this tax abatement, you're going to help lower the rent rate for the elderly people?

Edward Johnson: Absolutely. This is not going in to the owner's pocket. This is not to increase our profit margin, this is to keep the rents for the 55 and older people here at the level they are.

Councilmember Hoy: But Mr. President –

President Bassemier: Let me ask a question because I know Mr. Spurling told me the same thing. He would help pass that on to the elderly people.

Edward Johnson: And we'll give you some specifics next month.

President Bassemier: Okay.

Councilmember Hoy: But this discount is only given for three years because once the tax kicks in, then the rent goes up.

Edward Johnson: That's true. It will give us an opportunity for three years.

Councilmember Hoy: That's a short time and I forget what your rents are, but you're welcome to come back next month. You know what my vote is going to be. If I were going to vote for one, I would have voted for Mr. Spurling's because I am familiar with it, I'm familiar with his rents, he's got a good project. I am just not a tax abatement person as you know.

Edward Johnson: Councilman Hoy, I know that. I figured I was going to get one no vote today.

Councilmember Raben: Mr. President, I would ask why the inconsistency here in the votes.

Councilmember Sutton: We haven't taken a vote yet.

Councilmember Raben: Well, I assumed we had when we were barely able to get a second. But I –

Councilmember Hoy: That's a good question.

Councilmember Tornatta: The issue that I have and I wanted to, the reason I want to hear more next month and I tried to find out stuff. I wasn't able to get in touch with Pete was, the rent is quite a bit higher than at Lakeside and I did say that. The other side is the monies that are spent generating this plot for what they're going to do, 1.5 versus almost 10 million out on the east side. When you factor that in, if you look in the green book that I was handed on tax abatements and look at some of the criteria for which they're going to get tax abatement, which you can get tax abatements, that falls in to a more favorable stance on tax abatements than this one does. Not saying that these people aren't more worthy and, I mean, I'm open to look –

Edward Johnson: I appreciate that.

Councilmember Tornatta: I didn't want to send a message by no second on that, but I think that some of these things need to be looked at and I'm more than willing to look at it. And it's by no means, I don't know what...political side, I'm sure that's what that leads to, but I don't know what political side that is and I don't care, but I want to make sure that we have apples to apples, if I am going to vote for one over another or both of them at the same time.

Edward Johnson: And we'll come back with some specifics next month if we are invited back.

Councilmember Winnecke: Mr. President, I would just maybe comment. I think I've been pretty consist -- not pretty consistent -- I think I've been very consistent in the 18 months I've been on the Council, in regards to granting abatements for apartment complexes. In my opinion, an abatement is an inducement to help attract jobs and help the economy. And while I think this project is a nice project, Mr. Spurling's is, in my opinion, they don't rise to the level of granting an abatement and while I think both are nice, I won't support it.

Edward Johnson: But we'd like to have at least a chance to talk to you next month.

Councilmember Tornatta: In the stipulations, though, it does say that part of a tax abatement is for reduced, moderate to lower income, that is a viable tax abatement --

Councilmember Winnecke: That means it meets the criteria. It doesn't mean that's an absolute and that --

Councilmember Tornatta: But it is thrown in there, so it's meant to be a criteria.

Councilmember Winnecke: I'll grant you that it fits the criteria outlined by the legislation, but in my opinion, I just don't think it --

Councilmember Tornatta: That's fair.

Edward Johnson: We had abatement on this project in the early stages and we were able to keep the rents at a lower level and we complied, we were audited, the late Mike Robling sent us some correspondence, we were audited and we're way over the requirements of meeting the needs of the low and middle income.

Councilmember Raben: I still raise the question, why the inconsistency here? And a lot of things relate to the price tag or the amount of rent, you know, land acquisition costs, the construction costs, the interest rate today versus when the other one, when monies may have been borrowed for the other projects, even the design of the complex and the facility, so I mean, just because one rent is higher doesn't mean that that individual is making more off that rent than the other guy. But still, I'd like for somebody to tell me why the inconsistency is here.

Councilmember Tornatta: Have you checked to see what they've done versus what --

Councilmember Raben: Sure I have.

Councilmember Tornatta: -- versus what Lakeside's done?

Councilmember Raben: Sure I have. I support both projects.

Councilmember Tornatta: Lakeside put in a lift station, I mean, put in a road, no cost to the taxpayer. They put in a lift station at no cost to the taxpayer for other acreage around there. Those are some things that I weighed in because I was on the fence as well. I've got no allegiance to Spurling versus Mr. McCullough. I've got no allegiance either way. But when I started factoring those in and I have not cast a no vote toward you at all. In fact, I called this morning and talked to Carol about some instances that I was just kind of curious about, so in my opinion, that's my answer.

Councilmember Hoy: Mr. President? There's something I'd like to introduce in to this discussion and I guess this is as good a time as any. I see Mrs. Wildeman is in the audience and I'd like to ask you to the microphone at this time. You may relax. This is not going to be --

Mary Wildeman: Okay. Mary Wildeman, Department of Metropolitan Development.

Councilmember Hoy: Thank you. I had a conversation with City Councilman Steve Melcher and two years ago, we appointed, I believe, someone from this body and someone from the City Council to come up with some sort of guidelines on tax abatement. Can you tell us the status of that document, where are we in that process?

Mary Wildeman: We're very close. We're down to a draft, there's a few revisions that need to be made and I can get a draft to everyone on this Council.

Councilmember Hoy: Thank you. That's my only question.

Mary Wildeman: Okay, thank you.

Councilmember Hoy: I want to follow that by a statement because I'm not here to grill DMD, they're doing their job and that's all we can, you know, ask them to do, but I would implore my fellow Councilmen to take a look at this. Both of these projects, first of all, they don't fit the job description, these are not necessarily in depressed areas. I know the Kmart store is closed, but that doesn't make it a depressed area. Certainly Green River Road is not a depressed area. These do not meet what I consider some of the criteria, they are apartments, they do not provide a lot of jobs. And on one hand, they offer a short discount in rent, they don't offer anything to those senior citizens who have worked hard, bought a house or whatever, and never get a break on anything. And I could make you a list longer than this desk here of people in this county and I just think granting abatement is in a lot of ways an unfair thing anyway particularly if it comes to these apartment buildings. But I would also say, you know, at some point, it seems to me that someone has to say that this sort of stuff has got to stop. We just ended welfare as we know it for the poor, I think it's time we ended welfare as we know it for those who aren't poor. There's a strong financial firm behind this west side project, I know who they are and I think everybody sitting around this table knows who they are. They're wonderful people, they're friends of mine but I don't think they deserve an abatement, that's all.

President Bassemier: In all fairness to you, sir, do you want to comment to that?

Edward Johnson: Well, first of all, I do think it's going to be good for the area, I think it is a depressed area. Secondly, I think it will create an additional job or two with the additional part. We're only a small part of this project. It has already created several jobs. Only a small part of this project is we're even asking for abatement on, but we'll spread the savings back over to all the residents. And again, this is preliminary. All I ask you to do is vote yes so we can come back and show you the exact things and then you can judge it for what it's worth. If you don't like it, you can vote against us, throw us out. If you like it, you can give us the abatement on the small 18 units we're asking for and we can go on down the road. So --

President Bassemier: And that's a good point.

Councilmember Hoy: We're just voting for them to come back?

Edward Johnson: Give us a shot next month.

Councilmember Hoy: Mr. President, I call for the question –

Councilmember Sutton: Now Mr. Hoy, you spoke at length, now give somebody else a chance.

Councilmember Hoy: Well, I'm going to vote for them to come back because –

Councilmember Sutton: I've had my arm up for a while here, it's getting a little tired. I guess I just wanted to at least make a couple of comments because I think that you've got two projects that both developers have put a great deal of time and effort into these projects and they feel very good about what they have done and what they have been able to provide. However, I do see these two projects as two different types of projects, meaning the same type of, they're trying to meet the same type of need in terms of that for senior citizens. But in terms of their approaches, I think their approaches are different and I think that's probably the area where at least I'll speak for myself and there's probably other Councilmen that feel the same way, I think the approaches are probably the area where we see the differences between the two projects. I think as well, when we talk about economic development and trying to spur economic development, in the district that I represent, when I see decent, affordable, good housing that's being built, that's being constructed, which we need more, that's economic development in the area that I represent. Some other neighborhoods, it's just another addition to the area, but this particular project, these two projects that's we're looking at, in a sense they are providing economic development but what's the approach in terms of how they are doing that? And I think that's probably the area for me as I look at the two. I see a difference in terms of what they're providing, what services are available, the rent levels, there's some differences there, so I think the question that Jim asked, I think is a very good question. It's a question that –

Councilmember Raben: Could you list some of these examples so we know? I mean, what are some of these examples?

Councilmember Sutton: Well, I can't make your decision for you. I only have one vote and that's mine, and I –

Councilmember Raben: – what are the examples?

Councilmember Sutton: I think just clearly just what I said. I think there's a difference in the rent level, there's clearly a difference in when you look at the projects in and of themselves in terms of what services are provided for that age bracket as opposed to one project, there's a difference there. If you've had a chance to visit both of those projects, it's becomes very clear.

Councilmember Tornatta: What numbers are you looking for? I've got \$375 for a 630 square foot apartment at Lakeside, you've got 499 for a 704 square foot apartment at Leisure Living and it goes all the way down to 870 square foot rents for \$500 versus \$660 for a 968 square foot unit at Leisure Living. Leisure Living has carports, some of the – most of the Spurling does not, however, Spurling does have some garages. Leisure Living employs six full-time employees, well, I'm not even sure it's full-time? Four full-time and a couple part-time. And Lakeside Manor has 20 employees not counting contractors. I think that was brought up before. They have 20. Lakeside Manor is 10 million, this is 1.5. Those are some of my reasonings. Lakeside Manor puts, and, Pete, I can't remember, I know Lakeside

and you do the trash removal, I'm not sure about the washer and dryer,

Pete McCullough: All that's furnished.

Councilmember Tornatta: Yeah, all that's furnished in there. As far as the setup, Pete's done some different things. I really like the way Pete walks down there and people go out and say hi to him, it's a nice community. But the same thing happens over at Spurling's, it's just a little bigger. So, I mean, those are the things I like. I like that people feel safe, they feel that they have a nice community atmosphere that maybe they didn't have and they don't mow the grass, they can plant flowers in the yard if they want to, they've got all the securities they had at home, but now they have it at some other place where that kind of stuff is taken care of for them. And the one thing we did like is they have a secured, covered area for the vehicles, if they drive vehicles, and there are not dark spots as to have somebody come up and rob them or steal from them and that was another nice thing that they had. So those are some of the things that I'm comparing in contrast, I mean, rent numbers and square foot numbers.

Councilmember Sutton: I'd be interested, I guess, Jim, –

Councilmember Raben: In terms of fairness in abatements, I mean, we're as quick to respond or to support a business that comes in with 50 or 60 new employees as we are for somebody with 200 or 300. I don't think the amount of dollars that you're spending, these two are so unique to our standard abatement request that we see. I don't think it's about a question of dollars and cents spent, doesn't even enter into the picture. I think, again, all of us have always supported these or the ones of us that have in the past, because they do fill a need. There is a need out there. The west side, you know, I cited before Golden Towers Apartments was kind of the haven for this type of living. USI took over those apartments and Pete designed these and filled that need for those people that lost their housing there. So, I mean, the investment, that has nothing to do with what we're here for today.

Councilmember Sutton: Well, how do you see the similarities, Jim? I mean, your question was, you asked how are these different? What do you see as the similarities, I guess, –

Councilmember Raben: They both fill the same needs and they're single story dwellings and, like Troy cited, these have carports, most of Spurling's does not. This is more money, but again, I ask what is construction cost today compared to when Bill put his project in. I mean, you know, naturally, cost, if you built a home five years ago and build one today, you can expect to pay more for that home you build today than you did five years ago. So that's all relative to the rent rates.

Councilmember Tornatta: This is a new phase, isn't it?

Councilmember Sutton: I think it's the second phase, though –

Councilmember Tornatta: This is a new phase.

Councilmember Sutton: Remember, I mean, we had two phases to the project, to Spurling's project, I mean.

President Bassemier: In all fairness to Phil, he called for the question, (inaudible – microphone not turned on)

Councilmember Raben: We can vote on it.

Councilmember Tornatta: Roll call.

Councilmember Sutton: Well, we didn't get a second.

Councilmember Tornatta: Yeah, we did. I seconded it.

Councilmember Hoy: The only thing I would add is that as you vote on this, I want you to know that my mother-in-law, who is on a very limited income, will probably unhappily contribute to this tax abatement. She pays her taxes. That's my point is why should all of those people who have paid for their homes and are struggling to live in them and paying their property tax and paying all their taxes, why should they subsidize this? I just don't understand it.

Councilmember Tornatta: You can move.

President Bassemier: Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: No.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

(Motion fails 3-4/Councilmembers Sutton, Wortman, Hoy & Winnecke opposed)

President Bassemier: Is that four to three no?

Teri Lukeman: Four no/three yes.

(Inaudible – several speaking at once)

President Bassemier: There's four no's and three yes's. So we don't hear it next week is that...

Edward Johnson: Thank you.

President Bassemier: I'm sorry.

<p style="text-align: center;">COUNCILMAN HOY/REQUEST PERMISSION TO ATTEND AIC DIPLOMA CLASSES</p>

President Bassemier: Let's see, one more thing, Mr. Hoy has got something. Let's see, Councilman Hoy, request for permission to attend AIC diploma classes.

Councilmember Sutton: No.

Councilmember Tornatta: Zero!

Councilmember Winnecke: How much is this?

President Bassemier: Alright, anybody want to make a motion to adjourn?

Councilmember Sutton: So moved.

Councilmember Winnecke: How much is Phil going to spend?

Councilmember Hoy: Seventy bucks tuition, a hundred bucks lodging.

Councilmember Tornatta: Oh yeah, right.

Councilmember Hoy: And travel.

President Bassemier: Okay, it passes 6-1, Phil didn't vote. He's not sure. Do I have a motion to adjourn?

Councilmember Sutton: So moved.

(Meeting adjourned at 5:25 p.m.)

VANDEBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL

President Ed Bassemier

Vice President Lloyd Winnecke

Councilmember James Raben

Councilmember Phil Hoy

Councilmember Curt Wortman

Councilmember Royce Sutton

Councilmember Troy Tornatta

Recorded and transcribed by Teri Lukeman.

**VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL
MINUTES
JULY 3, 2001**

The Vanderburgh County Council met in session the 3rd day of July, 2001 in room 301 of the Civic Center Complex. The meeting was called to order at 3:35 p.m. by County Council President Ed Bassemier.

President Bassemier: Sheriff Deputy Williams, you want to open up the meeting?

Eric Williams: Oh yes, oh yes, the Vanderburgh County Council is now in session pursuant to adjournment.

President Bassemier: Thank you, sir. I'd like to welcome everyone to the July 3rd, 2001 County Council meeting. Attendance roll call, please?

COUNCILMEMBER	PRESENT	ABSENT
Councilmember Tornatta	X	
Councilmember Sutton	X	
Councilmember Wortman	X	
Councilmember Hoy	X	
Councilmember Raben	X	
Councilmember Winnecke	X	
President Bassemier	X	

President Bassemier: Would everyone please stand for the Pledge of Allegiance?

(Pledge of Allegiance was given)

APPROVAL OF MINUTES JUNE 6, 2001

President Bassemier: Before we approve the minutes Mrs. Lukeman would like to say something to everybody.

Teri Lukeman: Before you get into the approval of the minutes, may I make a clarification to the information the Auditor shared with you last month? Suzanne had mentioned that the number of hits to the Auditor's website were a million, but actually the Auditor's website receives an average of a thousand hits per month and the written minutes are being accessed on an average of one hundred to one hundred twenty times a month. So if anybody had any questions about those statistics, we hope that clears it up and we apologize for any inconvenience. Thank you.

President Bassemier: Thank you, Mrs. Lukeman. Okay, I need a motion for approval of the minutes of June 6, 2001.

Councilmember Raben: So moved.

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: Everybody in favor, say aye.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATION REQUESTS
--

**COUNTY ASSESSOR
GERMAN TWP. ASSESSOR
PERRY TWP. ASSESSOR**

**CENTER TWP. ASSESSOR
KNIGHT TWP. ASSESSOR
PIGEON TWP. ASSESSOR**

President Bassemier: We'll get into the appropriation ordinance. Finance Chairman Mr. Raben, you want to start?

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Mr. President, I'm going to add several into one motion. First is the County Assessor, which the request is for \$1,694; Center Assessor in the amount of \$2,258; German Township Assessor in the amount of \$500; Knight Township Assessor in the amount of \$2,000; Perry Township Assessor in the amount of \$1,500; Pigeon Township in the amount of \$2,000; at this time, Mr. President, I would like to defer all these requests until our next meeting pending more –

Councilmember Sutton: Second. Well, he was there, he said defer, so I figured he was...

President Bassemier: You want to add anything, Jim?

Councilmember Sutton: I'm sorry, Jim. Did I cut you off? Was there more that you wanted to add to that? My apologies.

Councilmember Raben: No, no, no. That's –

President Bassemier: Thank you. Any discussion?

Councilmember Tornatta: Jim, what type of information are we looking for? Just...

Councilmember Raben: The same information that we discussed some of last week.

Councilmember Tornatta: Trying to find out exactly what we gave versus what they –

Councilmember Raben: Right, and who didn't get anything, so we need more time with that.

Councilmember Tornatta: And would the County Assessor, would that be kind of the same since she is an officeholder? I mean, are they – when they had that going through, I was looking at that thinking that if the County Assessor is an officeholder, would she also, I mean, has a salaried officeholder where she is, would she be getting a thousand as well?

Councilmember Raben: Well, it stipulates that she can, but again, –

Councilmember Tornatta: And would that raise her higher than all other officeholders, I guess, is what I'm looking at.

Councilmember Raben: Yeah, her's, you know, we won't find where she was ever given any increases above and beyond her salary that she works for, but again, that's part of the same motion. I included that, so we'll address that next month as well.

President Bassemier: Mr. Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Just a comment on that and I'm not advocating anything at this point except that we defer, but if you will look in the Farm Bureau book on the various counties, you will find that not all counties do as we do where all of the elected officeholders get the same. It varies considerably. Some of it apparently is done on some kind of job evaluation by the office. I don't know what their criteria is, but it doesn't always have to be the same

and that’s my only comment. It may just be the way we have to do it. I’ve been out of town, but I did look this over and I’m curious also as to legally, what we’ll have to do.

President Bassemier: Anybody else? Okay, Jim?

Councilmember Raben: Motion.

President Bassemier: Oh, we need a motion.

Councilmember Tornatta: Second.

President Bassemier: Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

COUNTY ASSESSOR		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1090-1110-1090	County Assessor	1,000.00	
1090-1120-1090	Chief Deputy	500.00	
1090-1900	FICA	115.00	
1090-1910	PERF	79.00	
Total		1,694.00	Deferred

CENTER TWP. ASSESSOR		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1110-1120-1110	Chief Deputy	500.00	
1110-1130-1110	Real Estate Deputy	500.00	

(Table continued next page)

1110-1140-1110	Deputy Assessor/Business	500.00	
----------------	--------------------------	--------	--

1110-1170-1110	First Dep/Ofc Coordinator	500.00	
1110-1900	FICA	153.00	
1110-1910	PERF	105.00	
Total		2,258.00	Deferred

GERMAN TWP. ASSESSOR		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1120-1120-1120	Chief Deputy	500.00	
Total		500.00	Deferred

KNIGHT TWP. ASSESSOR		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1130-1120-1130	Chief Deputy	500.00	
1130-1130-1130	Real Estate Deputy	500.00	
1130-1160-1130	Deputy Assessor/Deeds	500.00	
1130-1190-1130	Second Real Estate Deputy	500.00	
Total		2,000.00	Deferred

PERRY TWP. ASSESSOR		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1140-1120-1140	Chief Deputy	500.00	
1140-1130-1140	Real Estate Deputy	500.00	
1140-1140-1140	First Deputy	500.00	
Total		1,500.00	Deferred

PIGEON TWP. ASSESSOR		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1150-1130-1150	Real Estate Deputy	500.00	
1150-1190-1150	Real Estate Deputy	500.00	
1150-1120-1150	Chief Deputy	500.00	
1150-1180-1150	Bus/Pers. Prop. Deputy	500.00	
Total		2,000.00	Deferred

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

GERMAN TOWNSHIP ASSESSOR

Councilmember Raben: Okay next, Mr. President, back to page one, German Township Assessor, Computer Hardware in the amount of \$3,000. I'll move approval.

President Bassemier: Do I have a second?

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

GERMAN TWP. ASSESSOR		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1120-3371	Computer Hardware	3,000.00	3,000.00
Total		3,000.00	3,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

KNIGHT TOWNSHIP ASSESSOR

Councilmember Raben: Okay, page two, Knight Township Assessor, Extra Help in the amount of \$5,000. I'll move approval.

President Bassemier: Second on somebody?

Councilmember Hoy: Second.

President Bassemier: Mr. Hoy. Any discussion on that? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

KNIGHT TWP. ASSESSOR		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1130-1990	Extra Help	5,000.00	5,000.00
Total		5,000.00	5,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

President Bassemier: Mr. Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Okay, County Commissioners, Southwest Mental Health. This is part of their contract and I'll move approval in the amount of \$21,088.

Councilmember Sutton: Second.

President Bassemier: I have a second. Any discussion on that? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

COUNTY COMMISSIONERS	REQUESTED	APPROVED
----------------------	-----------	----------

1300-3020	Southwest Mental Health	21,088.00	21,088.00
Total		21,088.00	21,088.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

SUPERIOR COURT

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Superior Court, account 1370-3310 and 1370-3730 for a total request of \$7,000. I'll move approval.

President Bassemier: Do I have a second?

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: Second from Mr. Wortman. Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

SUPERIOR COURT		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1370-3310	Training	3,000.00	3,000.00
1370-3730	Continuing Education	4,000.00	4,000.00
Total		7,000.00	7,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

THE CENTRE

President Bassemier: Mr. Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Okay, next is The Centre, account 1440-3798. Mr. President, I would recommend that we would set this request in at zero and fund this request out of the Food & Beverage account which currently has an account balance of 3.6 million dollars and

there is ample monies to cover our bond payments and adequately fund this, so I would move that in lieu of using general fund money we would ask them to just get with the Auditor's Office and request that out of that account.

President Bassemier: Okay, do I have a second?

Councilmember Raben: The motion is to set this in at zero.

Councilmember Wortman: Second. And that is – well, discussion, go ahead.

President Bassemier: Any discussion on that?

Councilmember Wortman: Yeah, in other words, that's verified, that money.

Councilmember Raben: Yeah, I verified that with the Auditor's Office and actually at the rate that account is bringing in money, we could actually, we're almost at the point of making our payment for...actually, through 2020 at the rate it's growing. And it's raised significantly over the past five years and should again in the sixth year, so I'm comfortable with it and the Auditor's Office is comfortable with it.

Councilmember Wortman: Mr. President?

President Bassemier: Wait a minute. Mr. Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: As I understand it, wasn't that the tax used for the airport terminal previously? There's nothing illegal about us paying those off early. I assume there is some early penalty, but we could –

Councilmember Raben: We checked. It says that it can be used for construction, renovation, equipping –

Councilmember Hoy: No, I mean, I was just thinking in addition to this of paying the bonds off early.

Councilmember Raben: Well, and that could be, I mean, we're not, again, I'm telling you at the rate of growth, at what it's raising today, we could make – you know, the payment goes up annually, but at the rate it grows today, if it maintains that at the higher level it's going to be in year 2020, we've already met that, so...

Councilmember Hoy: Good.

Councilmember Wortman: I think the Food & Beverage Tax has got a proven record already with the airport being paid off and now it's getting in here, we've got excess money and all I can say is I guess just keep building restaurants and sell the stove at home, I guess, is what it amounts to.

Councilmember Hoy: Keep eating those burgers and fries, Curt.

President Bassemier: Okay, anybody else?

Councilmember Sutton: Yeah, I guess I'd like to see on the monthly financial report we get at the beginning of the month, I guess I'd like to see that total reflected on this layout that we have of all the different accounts. Is that possible, Bill? I know you're speaking on behalf of Suzanne, but is that possible for us to get a layout of that because I'd like to see how we're doing on that total?

Bill Fluty: I think they're in your printouts that you get but I'll talk to Suzanne and see if that is a possibility.

Councilmember Sutton: Well, I mean, I know it's on these, but is there a way we can get

it on the tally sheet where we have all of the different accounts listed together.

Bill Fluty: I'll check with her. It doesn't seem like much of a problem there, but –

Councilmember Sutton: Yeah, that would be helpful if we could do that.

Bill Fluty: Okay.

President Bassemier: Okay, thank you. Anybody else? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

THE CENTRE		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1440-3798	Food Services	250,000.00	0.00
Total		250,000.00	0.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

BURDETTE PARK

Councilmember Raben: Okay, next is Burdette Park 1450-2210 in the amount of \$3,000, I'll move approval.

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: I have a second, okay. Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

BURDETTE PARK		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1450-2210	Gas & Oil	3,000.00	3,000.00
Total		3,000.00	3,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

RIVERBOAT

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Mr. President, I’m going to bring this one to the floor. Riverboat, 1490-3111 Welfare to Work. I’d move that be set in at zero.

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: Second from Mr. Wortman. Any discussion on that?

Councilmember Raben: We have guests today that we had asked that they be part of this conversation today, so...

Gary Heck: Is that my cue to –

President Bassemier: Yes. Please state your name please, for the record.

Gary Heck: My name is Gary Heck. I’m with Phillip Lieberman & Associates and I’m here to request that the \$124,871.01 that lapsed at the end of 2000 be re-appropriated to the Gatekeeper program, as it’s commonly called. All the other funding from previous years has been re-appropriated at the end of each year. My understanding was that with the change in the Commissioner’s office, this particular request couldn’t be submitted in a timely fashion since they left office on December 31st and they didn’t know exactly what the 2000 balance was left until after that point in time. So I’m here to ask that you not set it at zero, but instead, that you set it at \$124,871.01, which has been the past practice over the last four years. I’d be happy to answer any questions.

Councilmember Raben: Mr. President, I might ask, Gary, what do you have planned for this \$125,000?

Gary Heck: This money is used in one of five different ways: it helps with childcare for those who either aren’t eligible for the state’s and the federal government’s childcare in

(inaudible) fund childcare program. It's set at 143% of an income guideline. This money is set at 150%, so there is a little bit of a gap there. And then Vanderburgh County has lost about a million dollars in that particular program, so there is potentially waiting lists and folks who wouldn't be served if this money wasn't there. That's just one. The second category is called safety net and it allows for the repair of personal automobiles or household appliances for folks to remain productive. This is not a welfare program. This is set up for those individuals who have already demonstrated initiative. They're residents of Vanderburgh County who are involved in productive activity for at least 25 hours a week. Up until the Commissioner's meeting on June 19th, they had to have a child that they were responsible for and they had to meet an income guideline by their family size. The requirement to have a child is no longer in place. The third program is transportation assistance, which could help pay for bus tokens or cab vouchers while their car was being repaired or for any other reason to allow them to remain productive. The fourth category is employment and job training skill enhancement, which would allow them to get more marketable skills so they could hopefully have a better job and become more productive members of Vanderburgh County and pay more taxes. And then the fifth category was to set aside last year to do some matching funds for a program that added two additional staff to the Prosecutor's office and the child support collection program and that money has been utilized some but not much.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, let me maybe ask the question this way, since the beginning of the Gatekeeper's program, what annually, how much have you spent annually over the last, what, three or four years?

Gary Heck: The program started in July of '97, and we have spent in the neighborhood of \$380 - \$390,000 over those years. There is a balance of some money there, –

Councilmember Raben: Right, you have a balance today of about \$760,000.

Gary Heck: I understand that, but I do believe that they will use that money for two reasons. One of them is that we feel like we've been good stewards of the program for the county because when someone comes in the office and asks for childcare, in theory, we could put them towards any program. We thought it was in our, as the steward of that money for the county, we should use the state money first instead of using a combination of both. So, I mean, if your pleasure would have been to just spend this money, I can assure you we could have spent the money a long time ago. But I don't think that's what this group or what the County Commissioners or what's in the best interest of Vanderburgh County. I think the way we've administered the program has been in the best interest. And I can tell you that we're faced with the time now where the state doesn't have the resources that they've had in the past to put towards this program and we're going to see a much greater need in the near future and as far as I know, Vanderburgh County is the only county in the entire state, maybe the country, that has a backup childcare plan in place that will actually use these funds. The other thing that has happened is that as of the June 19th meeting, the County Commissioners have approved two things: they've allowed childcare to go for a full year instead of six months and they also had now have made it so that anyone who lives in Vanderburgh County that meets all of the other requirements short of having a child, would also be eligible for the program. So we believe that we're going to see an increased utilization in some of the programs that hadn't been utilized so far. So I understand that there still is a balance there. That's not to say that it will be there by the end of December.

Councilmember Raben: I guess, I mean, the way I kind of view it is not, do we actually need it, but we could have had it, so we want it. And that's kind of how I feel about this request.

Gary Heck: Well, I certainly don't mean to sound like that if that's what I'm saying. I guess what I'm saying is, things have changed now from the way the program was set up previously and I think that you'll see that there will be an increased utilization in usage of the funds.

Councilmember Sutton: Say Jim, I had a chance to meet with Gary and Phyllis on this issue

along with Commissioner Fanello and one of the concerns that we spoke about was just the amount of that balance that hadn't been used up to this point and we also talked about how the programming was going and what they have learned over the course of providing this particular service and that is very creative and innovative in its structure and implementation, but if we see dollars that aren't being effectively being used or if there isn't a need for a particular service, have they had a chance to go back and revisit what they're doing. They have done that and they have prepared summaries and reports on what their experiences have been and have summarized those. And some of the conclusions that they have presented to the Commissioners are a result of they're just continuously reassessing where they are as a program. And I think it's really a good point that Gary brings up about the reduction in the amount of state dollars that are going to be available that are ultimately going to have an impact upon this. They've had a number of requests as well on this childcare issue. They were cutting off at six months, you know, six months is rather rapid especially if you are newly getting into the workforce, that type of thing, you're just getting into your job training, whatever you may be engaged in, so really there has been a great need for some time, but they really wanted to take as conservative of approach as possible on this, but to the extent that it was so conservative, that there were a lot of people being really left out of the bucket. So some of the changes were really needed changes that need to be made to the program that I think will greatly enhance its effectiveness and use across the county. Phyllis has been really involved with this things. Phyllis, you might want to add some things, too. I know you don't like getting up speaking at the microphone, but you know this thing inside and out as far as TANIF is concerned and everything and the experiences that Vanderburgh County has had with this program.

Phyllis Donahue: My name is Phyllis Donahue. I've worked with Division of Family & Children for, this is my 30th year, so, you know, I've watched that pendulum swing. And as Gary said, I mean, the state had as much money as we could ever need for childcare, and a lot of that is federal funding, too, so as the federal laws change about how they're going to fund what we do in each state, this is the year it's going to get us. I mean, true enough, I mean, I could look at this and say what's going on here? How come we're not spending this money? Well, it's because Gary did, I mean, they were good stewards of the money. Anytime they could draw federal and state dollars, they did. That money is not going to be there this year.

Councilmember Raben: Phyllis, we still have \$400,000 more than we spent any of the previous three or four years, so we've got a lot of room to take on more obligations. And the other thing is, too, what this Council needs to remember is this appropriation, this \$125,000 is coming back out of the general fund. So why would you appropriate it today when they don't need the money? If they do need the money next year, we'll appropriate monies from the general fund at that point, but let's don't put the cart before the horse and make that account larger than it already is before we have any further needs.

Councilmember Sutton: Ordinarily, when are you actually going to lose a million dollars, Phyllis? When does that take effect?

Phyllis Donahue: From what we understand, the appropriation is already not going to be there. We've already sort of lost it, I guess. But, you know, of all the years, of all the times for us to lose the \$124,000 in the five years we've been doing this, this is like the bad year.

Councilmember Winnecke: I guess I'd just like to clarify some of the figures. Roughly since July of '97, we've spent \$390,000 and there's roughly a balance today of \$760,000. And Gary, I thought I heard you say –

Gary Heck: We've spent a lot more than that. The money –

Councilmember Winnecke: What's the \$390, then?

Gary Heck: Out of last year, \$500,000 was set up last year, we've spent \$375,000 of that. Since 1997, we've had 2.6 million in as Councilman Raben just mentioned. There's about \$700,000 –

Councilmember Winnecke: So the \$390,000 were year 2000 expenses and so did I hear you correctly when you said, referring to the balance of roughly \$760,000, that by the end of December, that may be gone?

Gary Heck: That's correct.

Councilmember Winnecke: So it's possible, based on this lack of state funding, that we'll spend \$760,000 in the last six months of the year?

Gary Heck: We're going to spend a lot more money in childcare than we ever have this year. But there's also, because of the change that the Commissioners did on June 19th, there is a whole new client base that's eligible for services that haven't been eligible up until this time. And so where we have distributed almost 4,000 applications and we've had about 2,000 come back in looking for assistance. I believe that once this becomes public knowledge, there is going to be another 1,000 to 1,500 folks who are eligible for this program, that were never eligible prior to the June 19th date. And so I personally believe we're going to need the 125,000 to meet that need and then we still may run out of money.

Councilmember Winnecke: I guess my feeling is, I'd like to see sort of how you project the shortfall from the state, how it might affect you and how this money could help versus –

Gary Heck: Well, for instance, last year we served 2,200 families with about seven million dollars in childcare assistance through the state's CCDF program. This year we have 6,000,000 and we're currently serving about 2,000 families, so there's 200 families that were served last year that aren't being served now that are now being served in one step or another through the Gatekeeper, so you've seen increased usage of childcare funds where we went a long time without their being much of a need for it because we had ample funding sources from other sources. And I appreciate the fact that I'm not the kind of person that would normally come ask for money. If I didn't think we were going to need it, I'd say you all certainly have a good, proven record of not funding things that don't need to be funded, but I believe we're going to need the money otherwise, I wouldn't be here today asking you for it.

Councilmember Winnecke: But the fact of the matter is, you don't necessarily need it today, the money?

Gary Heck: No. I mean, if you're saying, do you need it right now? No, we have ample funds to pay bills today. My understanding, that this was our only opportunity to ask for it and if that's not the case, then I won't necessarily prolong this discussion.

President Bassemier: Mr. Hoy.

Gary Heck: I guess my fear was that if I didn't get it today and ask for it today, you may make another decision next week, and then the money is not there.

Councilmember Raben: You have until November 15th of this year, right? November 15th would be the last filing date.

President Bassemier: Mr. Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Okay, I was asked to sit in the same meetings that you sat in on, Councilman Sutton. I've been on vacation so I wasn't able to – I'm looking at a paper here that was in my packet and I'm operating a little behind today, since I just got back yesterday, so I've been doing a lot of reading, but this – there are three things on the sheet that's addressed to the Vanderburgh County Commissioners. I assume those were all voted affirmatively on the 19th, is that correct?

Gary Heck: If the three things are –

Councilmember Hoy: To serve single individuals, –

Gary Heck: Childcare for 12 months –

Councilmember Hoy: Childcare for 12 months and then to add the –

(Inaudible Councilmember Hoy and Gary Heck both speaking at once)

Gary Heck: – as a possibility as being eligible, that's correct, sir.

Councilmember Hoy: Because, and that leads me to my question, and you know I'm supportive of what you're doing. When does Indiana, I know they're starting to pull out now, that's obviously, I don't think the public realizes, I'm not sure I even realize and I'm supposed to know this, and under Welfare to Work there's a five year limit that the feds have set, what affect is that, is that number three here? Is that number three here, is that the TANIF control group, that –

Gary Heck: That TANIF control group is a seven year program that started under Evan Bayh and then a year after we started that, the federal government passed their federal reform and that will, I believe, expire at the end of next year which would be like September 30th if the federal fiscal year is October 1 to September 30th. My understanding, and I am certainly not an expert in this, but that since Indiana is in this waiver program, as far as the federal government is concerned, their five year time limit on the TANIF life expectancy, if you will, hasn't even started yet because we're still operating under this waiver with a control group and a test subject group, an experimental group if you will. So I don't know that the state has a real good feeling for how it's going to shake down and when the five years will actually start officially for a lot of folks yet. The program that Governor Bayh started had a two years and out with a work first rule and that's been in effect for several years now and that's what folks have been faced with on a daily basis. I guess what that leads to is my question, you're beginning to see the shutdown –

Gary Heck: We're seeing a couple of things. One of the things is that five year program that you talked about, that was all based on 1994 TANIF data and the TANIF numbers in Indiana were quite high then, over 60,000 families. And under TANIF we're serving substantially less than that, so I think when the re-authorization for funding comes into play, we're not going to see as much money available and a lot of the childcare assistance has been in block grant transfers from the TANIF money that wasn't necessarily needed to serve TANIF clients that was able to move into childcare. That's where Vanderburgh County went from about 2.6 million dollars in childcare assistance to seven, because we had a documented waiting list of people who needed the services and when they started to re-appropriate dollars, we had all the documentation ready and we got the money right away. Last year that was reduced by a million, we were better off than Marion County that lost ten million and we were better off than any other county because we had another program that could dovetail what we were doing here using local support. But once again, we didn't use as much money locally as we could have done all along. I mean, it's not like road repair where we could – I mean, if we were fixing roads, there's a lot of roads we could fix and we could spend every penny. In childcare you have to have a child, you have to meet the income requirements, you have to be a resident of Vanderburgh County, you have to be working 25 hours a week or more or involved in productive activity and you have to apply for the money and you have to follow through and provide all the documentation and take your child to childcare. We feel that we've administered the program real well and we'd be remiss if we didn't come and ask for it. If we've got other opportunities to do that, I'll wait later in the year. I don't need to prolong this meeting but I feel strongly enough about it that I don't want you to give the \$124,871.01 to anybody else until I have a chance to come back and get it.

Councilmember Hoy: I assure you, we are going to hang on to every cent we can. You know our reputation.

Gary Heck: I don't want you to forget that figure now.

Councilmember Hoy: Okay, I assure we won't. The other comment is – a couple of

comments – and that is, I think that probably you’re going to have to come back which you can, and we will watch the figures. And if you can – understanding all this mess, I think the people who wrote the Welfare to Work legislation, etcetera, I think they’re worse than the people who write tax law.

Gary Heck: These are the people at the federal level?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Gary Heck: Oh, okay.

Councilmember Hoy: I mean, to try to understand all this, they’ve almost made it impossible and I’ve done a lot of reading on it and I am concerned that we don’t undercut you, but I promise you that I’m in your corner even though we may deny this today. You have other opportunities. And to my fellow Councilmembers, as you know, I am still a minister. If you want to read what’s really happening, there’s a new book out called Nickel and Dimed in America. You read that and you will understand, you’ll begin to understand what the folks that they’re dealing with are dealing with out there on those low paying jobs and how it’s impossible to live on those wages. And that’s why they do need assistance.

Gary Heck: Just as a reminder, this program was set up to help people through circumstantial disruptions. When you first come off of welfare, you haven’t had a savings account with a lot of assets so that when your car needs tires or your transmission on your vehicle goes out, you don’t have anything to fall back on to get it repaired and if you don’t have reliable transportation, it’s very difficult to hold and keep a productive job because employees need people who show up on time for work, that have a good attitude, that are productive, and add to all of that. That’s what this is all set up to do.

Councilmember Tornatta: Gary, –

President Bassemier: Hold on a minute. Mr. Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: I think here we go again. The federal and the state government are cutting the funds and, of course, they pass it on to us and we’ve got to stop somewhere, too. Now I’m not saying it’s not a good program, that’s fine. But we can’t take care of everybody.

Gary Heck: And, once again, this isn’t welfare and anybody that’s eligible for public assistance, they don’t qualify for this program.

Councilmember Wortman: But the federal government and the state government is good at this, see. They’re running out of money, why did they cut? See, you’ve got to think of that, see. Then they pass it on to us, see, the counties, and then we’ve got to come up. Are we going to starve other areas, you know, we’ve got a lot of funding mechanisms to put in place here. So we’ve got to be careful, see.

Gary Heck: I certainly understand that. And I guess what I’m saying is, I’m not asking you to starve other areas, I’m just asking you to return the \$124,871.01 that was set aside for those programs, that isn’t there now. That’s all I’m asking. I’m not asking you for three million more that’s not there. I’m just saying, it was there and all of the sudden because of a change in administration it’s not there, that’s all I’m asking you to do.

Councilmember Wortman: But I think if you spend what you’ve got first and then screen everything and then come back and I think the Council will consider it. That’s the way I would look at it.

Gary Heck: I thank you for that, sir.

President Bassemier: Mr. Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Gary, I was just going to say, I've experienced the program as far as seeing it from the outside and seeing what you do for the individuals in there and it's a great program and I think a lot of us are in favor of that. You've been talking with Royce, maybe the last meeting in September, first meeting in October, why don't we have, talk to him in the meantime or one of us, or any of us on the Council, and let's look at where you are and then make a decision at that point since we can, and that's before the November date, if that's okay with you?

Gary Heck: That's certainly fine with me.

Councilmember Sutton: I think the Council would be very interested in seeing how the interest level, what the changes that you've made, what type of response you ultimately do get and how the money begins to flow, and then we can take a look at it. If you could put something together for us about that time that would reflect how the flow of money is going.

Gary Heck: I'd be more than happy to do that.

Councilmember Winnecke: I think that's exactly the point I'd like to make and not to beat a dead horse here, but I think I'm very interested in seeing how the rate of local expenditures does, in fact, change between now and early fall so we really have a good handle on when to appropriate this money and when you'll actually need it.

President Bassemier: Mr. Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: (Inaudible – microphone not turned on)

Gary Heck: I'd be more than happy to do that. Thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today. Anything else I need to do?

President Bassemier: Any other discussion?

Councilmember Tornatta: Keep us posted.

President Bassemier: We got a second on it, –

Councilmember Winnecke: That was one penny, right?

Gary Heck: 124,871 and a penny.

Councilmember Tornatta: Hold on a second, Gary, it's set in at zero.

President Bassemier: Okay, we're going to vote on it right now. Anymore discussion? We're going to vote on it. Okay, roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

RIVERBOAT		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1490-3111	Welfare to Work	124,871.00	0.00
Total		124,871.00	0.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

Gary Heck: I'll be back.

President Bassemier: We know you will.

SURVEYOR CORNER PERPETUATION

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Surveyor Corner Perpetuation fund, there's two requests: 2650-2320 and 2650-3371 for a total of \$8,100. I'll move approval.

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

SURVEYOR CORNER PERPETUATION		REQUESTED	APPROVED
2650-2320	Instruments	2,100.00	2,100.00
Total		2,100.00	2,100.00

2650-3371	Computer Hardware	6,000.00	6,000.00
Total		6,000.00	6,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

CONVENTION CENTER OPERATING

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Convention Center 3650-3203 and 3650-3205 for a total of \$106,000, I'll move approval.

Councilmember Sutton: Second.

President Bassemier: Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

CONVENTION CENTER OPERATING		REQUESTED	APPROVED
3650-3203	Utilities-Electrical	40,000.00	40,000.00
3650-3205	Utilities-Gas	66,000.00	66,000.00
Total		106,000.00	106,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

TRANSFER REQUESTS

COUNTY ASSESSOR
HIGHWAY
TREASURER (LATE TRANSFER)

PROPERTY TAX ASSMT. BD. OF APPEALS
AUDITOR (LATE TRANSFER)

President Bassemier: Okay, Jim, transfers?

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Mr. President, we have it looks like five transfers. One is a late transfer for the Treasurer. I would like to take these all at one time in one lump motion and move approval for all as they are listed.

President Bassemier: Is that okay with everybody? Okay. Any discussion? Taking them all at once, right?

Councilmember Hoy: Yeah, and I seconded.

President Bassemier: You seconded, okay. Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

COUNTY ASSESSOR		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1090-3372	Computer Software	3,100.00	3,100.00
To: 1090-3370	Computer (Data Mgmt)	3,100.00	3,100.00

PROP. TAX ASSMT. BOARD OF APPEALS		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1091-3140	Telephone	800.00	800.00
To: 1091-4210	Office Furniture	800.00	800.00

HIGHWAY		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 2010-3200	Utilities	3,500.00	3,500.00

2010-2590	Paint	2,500.00	2,500.00
To: 2010-3140	Telephone	3,500.00	3,500.00
2010-3370	Computer (Data Mgmt)	2,500.00	2,500.00

LATE TRANSFER REQUESTS

AUDITOR		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1020-1200-1020	Bookkeeper II/Welfare	5,000.00	5,000.00
To: 1020-1990	Extra Help	5,000.00	5,000.00

TREASURER		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1030-1260-1030	Counter & Post. Clerk	3,684.28	3,684.28
To: 1030-1970	Temp. Replacement	3,684.28	3,684.28

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

AMENDMENTS TO SALARY ORDINANCE

President Bassemier: Amendments to salary ordinance.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Mr. President, I'll move – well, first there is a sheet for the County Clerk which is just some position title changes. That sheet, I'm not going to read each line individually, so that's included in this motion. With that, we have Knight Township Assessor, amend salary line 1130-1990 Extra Help as previously adopted; the Auditor's Office, amend salary line 1020-1990 Extra Help as transfer previously adopted; Treasurer, salary line 1030-1970 Temporary Replacement as previously adopted; along with the list for the Clerk, and I'll move approval.

President Bassemier: Do I have a second?

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: I have a second. Any discussion on that? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

PROPOSED JAIL SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

President Bassemier: Okay, Old Business, Jim?

Councilmember Raben: Mr. President, we may want to –

President Bassemier: Hold it a second, Jim.

(Tape changed)

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Mr. President, all of us received a letter from our Council Attorney Saturday and it pertains to –

President Bassemier: Friday.

Councilmember Raben: Friday, okay. Well, I'm a little further out. It pertains to a private settlement agreement that we need to act upon, or this body needs to act upon. I might add that we did have a scheduled executive session for today but due to a problem with a few notifications it didn't get out to some TV stations, we've had to cancel that. So if anyone has any questions with the draft that has been prepared by our attorney, I would direct those questions to him right now.

Councilmember Tornatta: Is there a way that we could both of the – is it legal to get the Council and the Commission together or is that not an idea?

Jeff Ahlers: I guess to answer your question in two ways, number one, we have a deadline to have this matter resolved if it could be resolved by July 13th and filed with the court. So we're kind of on a short deadline and so I think that Mr. Raben has indicated that he would like to move for approval of this draft and then we can ship it off to the other parties and it would be up to them to approve it or I guess if they have any changes they want for you to consider, obviously, they would need to act quickly. In terms of your question concerning a joint executive committee meeting, I have checked and made numerous phone calls. The statute itself is silent as to specifically referencing that you can have a joint executive session meeting and it is also silent in that it does not prohibit that. I suppose under home rule if it doesn't prohibit it, that I guess there is maybe some implication that you can do it. I did call as well the Association of Indiana Counties attorney and the Public Indiana Access Council and both of them, it was their opinion that you probably could hold such a meeting, but none the less, they couldn't point to any authority.

Councilmember Tornatta: I guess I'm just looking instead of sending it back and forth and we draft one and approve one, and it not with the other side just getting together and figuring out where we want to go with it and have our draft at that time.

Councilmember Hoy: Mr. President, when you – I want to be clear because I've been on vacation so I feel out of the loop just a little bit – when you say the other side, do you mean what the Commissioners would propose, right?

Councilmember Tornatta: Right.

Councilmember Hoy: What have they – I'd like to ask our attorney, what have they proposed?

Jeff Ahlers: I've not received anything from them since I've been involved in this litigation for the past five months, so I have no idea what their proposal in terms of a settlement would be. We have received a proposal from the plaintiff's attorney, Ken Falk. I've not received anything else from the Commissioners and that was my concern in bringing to the Council's attention a month ago, that we may need to take some initiative so that at least we can show to the court good faith on our part in having passed a version or approving of a version that we would be willing to enter into.

Councilmember Hoy: And my second question then is, I think I've got the answer to this one, but I want to make sure, so if it's redundant, it's redundant. We're on a deadline?

Jeff Ahlers: That's right. The court set a deadline, actually rescheduled an earlier deadline that had been set in June, moved that up to July 13th, in which we are to, if we have reached a settlement to the case, that we are to have filed the stipulation and private settlement agreement with the court. That then provides, this agreement provides that under class action trial rules that Mr. Falk would give us clients in the jail 30 days notice and then at that point it would be asked that the court would then enter this stipulation as the order of the court. In the event that the parties have not reached a stipulation by July 13th as the court's order now stands, that we would then be ordered on a date in August that is set, and I don't have that off the top of my head, to appear before Magistrate Hussmann to set deadlines in this case and to get a prospective trial date as it's currently ordered.

Councilmember Hoy: Thank you.

Councilmember Raben: I might, Troy, and with no disrespect to the Commissioners, but I think it's probably in the best interest of the county that we act in the manner in which we're doing because to be quite honestly, their lack of leadership is what's gotten us where we're at today and the track record, particularly with their legal counsel, who was ready to sign off on the initial private settlement agreement which truly favored the plaintiffs, I don't know that I want to use his initial version of this, you know, should he decide at some point to prepare one. So I'm much more comfortable to with what we have.

Councilmember Tornatta: I just – I don't want independent thinking and that's – I don't want, let's say that if the case is that you don't agree with what their thinking, I'd sure like to have them in front of me to make that determination and decide that instead of doing everything –

Councilmember Raben: The deadline is July 13th. They should have been in here with that frame of mind weeks ago. We've met, we've discussed it, we've kind of outlined, you know, the guidelines that we would like within this document. So with that, Mr. President, I'm ready to make a motion.

President Bassemier: Okay, let one more, I think Mr. Winnecke wants to make a comment.

Councilmember Winnecke: I guess I'd like to reiterate part of what Jim says, I guess my past life leads me to believe I'm not a big fan of executive sessions. I think this Council, this body, took the initiative to have an executive session a couple of months ago, it seems. I don't even remember when, at which point we presented our thoughts to our legal counsel, who has then drafted what we have before us, or it had been sent to our homes. And I think this body has acted appropriately. I think another executive session this time with the Commission, quite frankly, this late date with the deadline looming, I don't know is going to be very productive.

Councilmember Tornatta: And you've got to count the Sheriff in there as well. He's got his own counsel, so that's three heads, that I think that's the same page –

Councilmember Winnecke: You know, but you've got a big room with all those people, that's a lot of cooks in the kitchen. I think that's why attorneys, quite frankly, are utilized. The Council's attorney, the Commission attorney, and the counsel representing the Sheriff,

we've given our legal counsel what we feel should be in the draft, should be in the stipulation. I would think the Commission would do the same thing, the Sheriff would do the same. At that point, the three attorneys can put it together. But I think we're showing leadership by passing off on this draft, this version that this body said it would be comfortable with.

Councilmember Tornatta: And have they got together?

Jeff Ahlers: Yeah, to respond to that. I mean, in fairness, the attorneys, Mr. Falk, Mr. Bodkin, Mr. Hayes and I have met on several occasions and have discussed the lawsuit and I think the discussions have been somewhat productive. The problem comes is that we have a July 13th deadline and we've not received, other than from Mr. Falk, any proposal from the other parties. If this is approved by the County Council, there is nothing that says that if someone requests changes, this body can certainly consider that. But at least this puts forward a draft of the settlement agreement that we send to the other parties and say that's what the County Council believes would be an appropriate way to resolve this matter.

Councilmember Sutton: But wouldn't that discussion need to have occurred with the other two attorneys, the attorneys for the Commissioners and the attorney for the Sheriff prior to us really...I know you said you guys have met, you've had some fruitful discussions seemingly, and you seem to be on the same page with the issues, and if that's the case, if they do feel the same way that a representative of the Council for this body feels, wouldn't it be important for us to have this in their hands and to have discussed this with them prior to us trying to act on this here today?

Jeff Ahlers: And I understand your comments, Mr. Sutton. I guess the question becomes, in dealing with a Council that has seven members. You know, I took the comments that I've received. Some of you have called me and given me your comments. We've had the executive sessions, and what I've tried to do is put what I believe has been the collective wisdom of this body as to what it would like to see. Some of you may agree or disagree with certain portions and the problem becomes for me, is that without this Council passing something and saying this is what we want, it makes it difficult for me to be able to go to the other parties and represent this is what I can my client to do. So I guess that's what I'm asking for is some directive today. But it's up to this Council to decide whether it wants to approve this version.

Councilmember Raben: And I might ask one question: would all of us here that have read this agreement, would they not agree that this is truly within the best interest of the county? You know, again, back to the Commissioners, I'm not so sure –

Councilmember Sutton: And Sheriff.

Councilmember Raben: – that they're looking at this best interest of the county. I'm not sure whose side they're on in this issue. But I know whose side this body is on and I'm comfortable with the verbiage that is in this stipulation and I think it would be (inaudible) of us if we do not act on it today.

Councilmember Sutton: Well, Jim, I think your using pretty strong language there. I mean, I think we've clearly said there's three different bodies that are involved with this and I think Troy's question and my question even for Jeff is if they've had up this point as Jeff has indicated, what seems to be productive efforts toward this, I guess I'd like, their the legal heads on this, we are not. We're trusting that they can take what we have said in our deliberations and deduced that down into a legal document, but ultimately what that one document is going to represent is going to have to be something where the three of them come together. Yes, it's good to know that he's got our seal of approval on what is put together, but ultimately, he's going to have to have discussions with the other two counsels to come up something that is one. We can't have three different documents coming –

Councilmember Raben: Yeah, but Royce –

Councilmember Sutton: – that's what I'm saying, when is that discussion going to occur with the three of them?

Councilmember Raben: This may initiate that. How do we ever get to that document? We've got less than two weeks to file this with the court. Either the Sheriff's office or the Commissioners' attorneys, they can work from this document. They can get back with us but the time we set up a meeting with all three bodies, determine what we all want, and everybody has a chance to rewrite a document before we come up with one, I don't think you'll accomplish that in two weeks. I mean, we're getting the wheels in motion with limited time right now.

Councilmember Sutton: Well, if you're saying that –

Councilmember Hoy: Go ahead and let Mr. Sutton speak.

Councilmember Sutton: I was just going to say, if you feel like we can't, we're not going to be able to do that in two weeks, we're no better off. We've got to have one document that's submitted. I mean, if we say okay, yeah, we've done our part. Yeah, that's good for us to stick out our chests and say that, but that's not the completion of the process.

Councilmember Raben: Well, we're one body that is part of the –

President Bassemier: We'll have one more comment. Jim, you make it, and then, Royce, you make it, and then Mr. Hoy.

Councilmember Raben: Other than we're one body named in this suit, we have every right to defend for ourselves.

President Bassemier: Okay, Mr. Sutton.

Councilmember Sutton: I guess I was just going to say what, we've just got to come up with something collective. That's all I'm trying to say, because though we are separate bodies, we all are speaking really, the suit is really Vanderburgh County, in essence. So how do we get to that point, is really my question. If we do what you're proposing to do today, how is it going to get to completion? How are we going to finish this? That's really what I want to try get at.

President Bassemier: Okay, let's get to Mr. Hoy.

Councilmember Hoy: Well, I have a comment and a question. It's no great secret to anyone that there's been tension between this body and the Commissioners for some months. I would like to see that tension diminished, however, if I recall, we had an executive session and we asked our attorney to meet with the other two attorneys and you have done that.

Jeff Ahlers: That's correct.

Councilmember Hoy: And what was to issue out of that meeting was a common document. Is that correct?

Jeff Ahlers: Well, that's what we had hoped.

Councilmember Hoy: Okay, and that has not happened. We have nothing in front of us from the Commissioners nor from Mr. Bodkin and I refuse to take responsibility as a Councilman for whatever lack of action there is on their part. And I know that's a strong statement, but I believe that to be true and so I am going to vote for this even though I'm not happy with the fact that it may exacerbate the tension that already exists and I would like to see it diminish as I said. But I don't feel that as a Councilman I'm a party to that by voting for this. Thank you.

Councilmember Winnecke: Two brief comments. If everyone recalls, I know we were all here, the meeting, the special Commission meeting in this chamber back when the bond counsel was in from Indianapolis. It was early in the year. If you recall, Phil Hayes stood up here and pointed to all of the Councilmembers in the back, and held up a piece of paper and he said, and you will have to sign off on a stipulation agreement that you'll be comfortable with. I mean, he told us that and was very dramatic about it. I think by our actions today, we're making a public record of what this body supports, what we've asked our attorney to do and I think it's important for all the reasons everyone else has stated, that we do that today in order, not for political reasons, but to meet a deadline that's been set out by the court. I agree with Councilman Hoy, you know, I think everyone would like see the tension diminish between our two bodies. But this is not, in my opinion, about republicans, democrats or Council versus Commission. It's about a deadline that was set by a federal court judge.

Councilmember Tornatta: And I totally agree. I'd just say that we all have to go in under one head. I mean, let's say we get it started but, Jeff, if you obviously do what you have to do because I really think the Sheriff's office is tremendously involved in this portion of the case and as far as the Commissioners, you know, everybody is going to have trouble answering for them, but I know they've worked real hard and the Sheriff's office has worked real hard to try and bring things together. So I think they're, you know, in doing this, I'm in favor of this as long as we're doing this in order to move things along. I'm not in favor of doing this if we're trying to be heroes and fly solo. That's not – we've got to be team players and that's part of being team players. You talk about working out the tension and playing as a team when you need to, when you all have to bond together, and if you're doing that, then that's what we wanted, I think.

Jeff Ahlers: And if I could respond to that, Mr. Tornatta, something that I probably should have mentioned earlier, that I had a telephone conversation today, quite lengthy, with Mr. Hayes as well as then we put Mr. Falk on the phone and orally I discussed with them, gave an overview of the changes that I made in this document. While they haven't seen the actual document unless one of you, which everyone, obviously when they got their copy was free to do with whatever they wanted, shared that with them. I didn't want to do that until I had the seal of your approval saying this was your document. So they are aware that we are meeting today, so I assume that if they thought that we were doing something inappropriate that they would be here to address that. But I want, if it makes you feel better, I just want you to know that I discussed with them that this was occurring today. And, in fact, I did also advise them that we were not going to have the executive session and that it would be addressed at an open meeting so that they knew that they could present. My concern was, and I've not, in terms of the Sheriff, I know you've got a separate attorney, but in some sense, and I don't want to speak for him, but that I think that him and Mr. Hayes have been kind of working together. And I understand the Sheriff may or may not, I don't know if he has separate issues, the concern that I had is that we're bearing down on a deadline that is ten days away and what we are faced with is either signing the plaintiff's version or that's it, or we pass our own version. And if that creates then some discussion, that can do that or if you want to say this is the only version we'll sign. I mean, that's obviously something that you guys can consider on a different day. But my concern was of showing good faith to the court with respect to their deadline as well as showing some respect to the plaintiff in that they proffered their version and I think that it's entitled to some response. And so far, none of the defendants have really, other than orally and verbally, said here is our written version and so I've put together what I think I heard all of you saying that you wanted, and if it doesn't, obviously, changes can be made. But this is the version –

Councilmember Raben: Thank you. Mr. President, I'm going to make the motion. I move that the County Council approve this version of the stipulation to enter into a private settlement agreement and that the Council agree to be signatory to this version upon the passage and the execution by all other parties to the jail lawsuit pending in federal court. That's my motion.

President Bassemier: Do I have a second?

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: Second by Mr. Wortman. Any discussion on that motion?

Councilmember Winnecke: Could you repeat the motion just to make sure we all understand? Thank you.

Councilmember Raben: I can repeat the motion. That we, the County Council, approve this version of the stipulation to enter into a private settlement agreement and that the County Council agree to be a signatory to this version upon its passage and execution by all other parties to the jail lawsuit pending in federal court.

Councilmember Sutton: Now what does that mean? Jeff, can you explain that because that last part, I know what my impression is but I don't want to just wrongfully assume what that last part especially means.

Jeff Ahlers: Well, I guess the last part being that obviously, it requires as you discussed, the approval of the other parties. So I guess it's a question of either, I suppose if you all want to sign today, you can amend that to say we'll sign it today. I think the motion that Mr. Raben was making is that we're moving that we approve this and with the other parties' approval of it, that then we all agree to –

(Inaudible Jeff Ahlers and Councilmember Tornatta both speaking at once)

Councilmember Tornatta: -- overriding the other parties' approval? With or overriding?

Councilmember Raben: I think we need to – I don't know. Jeff, is it with or overriding?

Jeff Ahlers: Well, I don't know that it says either. All it says is that we're approving this and we're agreeing to sign this.

Councilmember Tornatta: Well, you said all three parties, that's what I wasn't...

Jeff Ahlers: Well, I guess we're saying that subject to, that, – well, I guess what his motion means is, is that if the other parties don't approve it, we're not bound by it either. And obviously, we can't unilaterally enter into a settlement agreement, so we're saying we approve this version if you pass this motion, and that upon the approval by the other parties to the lawsuit, we'll become a signatory to this version of the document which I have just given as an exhibit to the Council Secretary to be made of record so that when he says this version, it is of record as to what that is and make that a part of the minutes.

Councilmember Sutton: So your motion, Jim, I guess, Jeff, good answer, this motion is saying that, okay, we're saying that this is our version, this is what we're signing off on. Well, if that's the case, why in it do we have the Sheriff and a line for him to sign, we've got all three Commissioners lines for them to sign off on, too, if this is just our version?

Councilmember Raben: This is our version of the agreement. This is a stipulation (inaudible) as part of the prior settlement agreement.

Councilmember Sutton: But it's asking for those other parties to sign off on it.

Councilmember Winnecke: Not to interrupt, but because theoretically, if they agree to everything in this, this would be the agreement and this would be the document they would sign.

Councilmember Raben: I mean, that's even –

Councilmember Tornatta: But if they don't sign it, it doesn't fly. Is that –

Councilmember Raben: Their signature is required because their name is on the line, so

it's exactly what it says.

Councilmember Sutton: In your discussions with the other two, Jeff, is there anything in discussions that you've had with them that has outlined the points we've had in our executive session. Is there anything or points or areas that seem to be things that they are uncomfortable with or things that are additional things that they want? Have you heard anything different other than what you have prepared here?

Jeff Ahlers: Well, I'm sure there's a lot of different areas. I mean, I don't want to say a lot, but obviously, one area is that the plaintiff's version contains a clause that they pay attorney's fees. I mean, that the county pay the plaintiff's attorneys fees. You know, there are provisions in his agreement that say that the jail population shouldn't exceed 329. We've placed in there that would be 350 to give us a little more room there. We've also placed in some language that a couple of you suggested that limit the remedies available to the plaintiffs in the event that, you know, for example, if the population for a short period of time exceeded the population we're agreeing in here, that they can't run off and go ask the court to award them a million dollars or something that we've put in here that they waive the right to ask for attorney's fees and monetary remedies, so we've tried to reduce that.

Councilmember Tornatta: But the Commissioners and the Sheriff's department are in for that?

Councilmember Sutton: That's what I'm saying, you're talking about the plaintiff? That's what they're wanting? I'm talking about maybe from the Sheriff and the Commissioner's side, the discussions you've had with their attorneys.

Jeff Ahlers: Well, and I guess, again, that's what's difficult to understand because I've not received a written version from them. I mean, there have been discussions where we have talked about ways, for example, concerning the population cap, how to deal with that and I know the plaintiff still has some ideas that they're working on in terms of language, if they can't agree to the 350 figure, to try to massage that. My concern was as I had told all of you, was that it would behoove me as your legal counsel to advise you to sign a document that, for example, has a 329 population cap and if recently we've exceeded that cap, it's difficult for me to advise you to sign something that says you're going to agree to that when we've seemingly had some problems with that. So that's why I raised it to 350 because that hopefully is something that we can maintain. And if you don't think that that's something that's workable, then that's something you have to consider and whether you want to pass this. I mean, these are all areas I've tried to put in collectively, what everybody had suggested. I've also put in language as I had heard many Councilmembers state to protect the taxpayers to make sure that there would be no levying of taxes or issuances of bonds without the approval of this Council and to alleviate those concerns and protect the taxpayers. We have made some modifications in terms of in paragraph 15. The plaintiff's version required us to set forth dates that the remodeling or the building of a new facility would be completed in various stages of the project. We have not received those dates, so I've tried to modify that language to say by July 2002, the county will attempt to give those dates. But to a certain extent, unfortunately, this County Council, these are not things that they control, that the County Commissioners have those dates. And if they don't give them to me, I can't put them in the agreement. So I've tried to give us enough flexibility to be able to protect the taxpayers under this agreement. Those are the primary changes. Of course, you know, you can compare the versions and see, you know, there's also some clerical changes here and there and I'm sure that there may be more that could have been made. But that's essentially are the large big picture areas where changes have been made.

Councilmember Hoy: Mr. President –

President Bassemier: Hold on just a second. Mr. Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: I think here of this discussion, I'm trying to put it all together, I

think Mr. Ahlers has done a good job and eliminating some of these executive sessions which I'm not fond of neither, and I think this is another thing, the joint, I think we ought to bring this out in the open to a certain extent, but the three attorneys have been working on it. So we've got to get the ball rolling some way or another and I think this is a way to get it going and then we get together and they'll put their ins and outs in, and I think that's the way to look at it. So I think he's done a good job here and we're trying to do something. We've got to take care of things here and we can't wait around till the deadline and then they sit and point fingers at one another. We've got to get on the ball and get something going.

President Bassemier: I'd like to agree with Curt. The counselor, he's done a good job on this. Anybody else? Mr. Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Mr. Raben called for the question and I'm fine with that.

President Bassemier: Okay, I'm sorry. Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: When we do have a final version which I'm comfortable with them working together, I'd be happy to vote yes. But until we get a final version, I'll vote no.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes. It passes 6/1.

(Motion carried 6-1/Councilmember Sutton opposed.)

AUGUST 13, 2001 FILING DEADLINE
--

President Bassemier: Okay, going into new business. Sandie, do you want to take that first one and let everybody know the 2001 meeting filing date? We'll get you involved in this.

Sandie Deig: I'd like to permission to send a memo to all the departments to show July 13th as the filing date because the 15th is on a Sunday.

President Bassemier: Is it okay with everybody? Everybody in favor raise their right hand.

(A show of hands indicated all in favor/none opposed.)

President Bassemier: Okay, B was taken care of last week. C, Steve Perry – okay, I guess that's it.

Councilmember Hoy: Mr. President, since – Eric is here, Officer Williams. I have a question. If you wouldn't mind. It's not a scary one. You've been sending some e-mail information to me and I think to Mr. Raben and to a lot of other people. Would it be possible for you to send these detention division papers on – is that asking too much to send that, to e-mail that rather than print it? I'm just thinking --

Eric Williams: Chief Deputy Williams, Sheriff's office. I'd much prefer to e-mail it to everyone I could. I'd just as soon never print it.

Councilmember Hoy: I'd love for you to e-mail these to me if you would.

Eric Williams: Like I've told you, e-mail the addresses and I'll add you to the list. I mean, the list is about 200 people long and I'll make it 500 if that's what you wanted. It doesn't make me any difference.

Councilmember Hoy: Okay, that's just a request if you would do it.

Eric Williams: Right now, I was instructed to prepare that in printed fashion for the Council and deliver it to Sandie so she could see to it that it was delivered appropriately and I would much rather e-mail it to one address for the whole Council and be done with it. But if you have individual addresses, we'll send you every report we can.

Sandie Deig: I have to have a hard copy, okay.

Councilmember Hoy: Okay. But he could --

Sandie Deig: For the rest of you.

Councilmember Hoy: Yeah, okay. That's my personal request then if you don't mind.

Eric Williams: That's easier for me.

Councilmember Wortman: What are we talking about here? I missed the subject.

Councilmember Hoy: Jail reports of the -- these big, thick reports on who's in jail and why and all of that. And I just, I look over these and the paper stacks up. I had much rather just have them, since I have e-mail, I'd rather just receive them e-mail just like I do the minutes.

Councilmember Wortman: Well yeah, because everybody don't have e-mail.

Councilmember Hoy: No, and you can have a hard copy, okay. I don't care.

Councilmember Winnecke: Who would that be, Curt?

Councilmember Wortman: No, I mean, I'm poor. I can't afford that.

Eric Williams: For the Council's information that do not get the e-mail reports, the e-mail version is more informative. There is more data in that one because I put a cover on that one that also includes the current inmates that we are now housing out of county and what expense arrangements we've made for those in particular. It also gives the current status of the electronic home detention monitoring system. How many available bracelets there are and how many are in use. Any other current information I have on Wednesday. I sent Wednesday's out today. I did it today since tomorrow is a holiday. I do that big report once a week. I do it every day and if anybody wants it every day, they can have it every day. But I just e-mail it to the big group once a week.

President Bassemier: Phil, you've got to remember, Curt is still used to the Pony Express.

Councilmember Hoy: Since this is not a hardship, then it's not a difficult request.

Councilmember Tornatta: That's it. I just had a – in the Commissioner's meeting, I've attended the last two and something that has come up is the issue on the O'Day center out at Burdette Park and I think that one of the parts of that information that we need to know is the funding that was in place for that center is no longer in place for the center. And we need to maybe look at and to see if that money was not encumbered and should have been in the Commissioner's budget for the O'Day center, because they're about a million eight short, --

(Tape changed)

Councilmember Tornatta: They're a million eight short approximately, and the Commissioners are up for giving approximately a million dollars in CCD money and it's in my interest and I think they county's interest, Burdette Park's interest to finish the building and not, it was once mentioned that we want to do it pay as you go and I don't think that's a good policy for the county, especially dealing with a building that has funds from the Indiana Building funds and is for kids and people as a learning institute as well as just a recreational facility at Burdette Park, which is growing leaps and bounds. So that's going to be coming down the pike but I think that's something we need to pay close attention to and it is looking like it's going to be \$800,000 to a million dollars that would fall on us if we want to go through with this project. So it's something to pay attention to.

President Bassemier: Anybody else? We need a motion to – I'm sorry, Mr. Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: I was just going to inquire about, obviously, next month we've got our budget hearings, yippee. I just wanted to get an idea what it's looking like in terms of when we'll start getting some of the preliminary information for budget hearings.

Sandie Deig: Hopefully by the fourth week of July, I'll have it all together.

Eric Williams: Could I add one comment? In reference to the e-mails, the Council had sent a letter to the Sheriff's office five or six months ago asking for similar information out at the Community Corrections Complex that we are providing out of the detention center. The problem at that time was, and still continues to be is that is all manually hand-kept records out there. However, this last week we did install a new software tracking system. We looked for months and months and finally

found one, so we hope to have that populated with data and on-line within the next two weeks. So hopefully by the end of this month, we'll be able to add the Community Corrections reports to the detention center report, so you'll have a overall picture of who is in confinement within the county.

President Bassemier: Thank you, sir.

Councilmember Tornatta: Sandie, do we e-mail in the office, right now?

Sandie Deig: No, I have it in my home, though.

Councilmember Tornatta: At your home? Is there an expense to have that in the office?

Sandie Deig: No, but I'd like to discuss it off the floor with you.

Councilmember Tornatta: Okay, okay.

President Bassemier: Okay, do I have a motion to adjourn?

Councilmember Tornatta: So moved.

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: Got a second. Everyone in favor say aye.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

President Bassemier: Let's go home.

(Meeting adjourned at 4:50 p.m.)

President Ed Bassemier

Vice President Lloyd Winnecke

Councilmember James Raben

Councilmember Phil Hoy

Councilmember Curt Wortman

Councilmember Royce Sutton

Councilmember Troy Tornatta

Recorded and transcribed by Teri Lukeman.

**VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL
SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES
JULY 12, 2001**

The Vanderburgh County Council met in special session the 12th day of July, 2001 in room 301 of the Civic Center Complex. The meeting was called to order at 2:30 p.m. by County Council President Ed Bassemier.

President Bassemier: I would like to call to order for July 12, 2001 Special County Council meeting–

Councilmember Winnecke: No, I’m sorry.

President Bassemier: Roll call.

COUNCIL MEMBER	PRESENT	ABSENT
Councilmember Tornatta	X	
Councilmember Sutton	X	
Councilmember Wortman	X	
Councilmember Hoy	X	
Councilmember Raben	X	
Councilmember Winnecke	X	
Councilmember Bassemier	X	

President Bassemier: Everyone please stand for the Pledge of Allegiance?

(Pledge of Allegiance was given)

**CERTIFICATION OF EXECUTIVE SESSION
JULY 12, 2001**

President Bassemier: Do I have a motion to approve certification of the Executive Session for July 12, 2001.

Councilmember Sutton: So moved.

Councilmember Raben: I will second.

President Bassemier: (Inaudible. Mike not on.)

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Here. (Inaudible. Mike not on.) general obligations (Inaudible. Mike not on.).

Jeff Ahlers: Just to speak briefly to get everybody on the same page, uh, we have been, uh, the attorneys have been working to, fast and furiously, versions have been coming across our desks. So, I think progress is being made in terms of working out details of a settlement. Obviously, anything that is ultimately done is going to have to be approved by all of the bodies. If we reach an agreement on everything, and as I had pointed out to you, the differences in some of the versions. Currently today, just a couple things to be covered in light of the action that the Commissioners took on Monday night. They made a motion to ask the court to extend the deadline in terms of instead of by July 13th having to submit a settlement agreement, if there were to be a settlement, to get an extension of that deadline. I would suggest today that would be a good idea for this body to also take official action in terms of extending the deadline. We did, I believe, get that accomplished yesterday. Mr. Hayes and Mr. Falk and I called Magistrate Hussman and advised him of the status of the case, and since the next meeting with the court is on August 13th, expressed to the court of giving us to August 13th with the view that, hopefully, we're not going to need that much time, but since that would be a deadline going before the court to get this accomplished. Mr. Falk has drafted a stipulation which we have all looked at and whatever modifications were to be made have been made. It is now being circulated for signature, and I think some of the attorneys have signed it. I'm going to sign it as soon as we get out of this meeting, upon your approval. We will get that filed with the court, and it's anticipated that, uh, that would get our deadline extended to August 13th. I guess we should take official action on that if there is a motion to—

Councilmember Sutton: Mr. President, I make such a motion that we join in that extension—

Councilmember Winnecke: Second.

Councilmember Sutton: —of August 13th.

President Bassemier: Is there any discussion on that? Roll call roll, please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

Jeff Ahlers: With that having been done, I will execute the stipulation and see that that is filed with the court today. The only other thing for today is, that I know, and, I guess, that was expressed by Mr. Winnecke and I know Mr. Tornatta was also at the Commissioners meeting on Monday night, but, I know, that some of you have some questions of the Sheriff and the Commissioners in terms of some of the items in the settlement agreement. Although, while they refer to as, obviously, generally all of the defendants, uh, would be bound by the terms, some of them may or may not require budgetary financing or have a price tag to them. Which, obviously, isn't named in the settlement agreement, and to the extent that, uh, I guess, to establish if, you know, if there are any issues that need to be quantified in terms of expenses. If you have questions in those regards, or anything else with regard to the documents, so I don't know if you want to—

President Bassemier: Anybody got any questions? We have the Sheriff here, we have Commissioner Fanello if anybody's got any questions for these people.

Councilmember Winnecke: Mr. President. Catherine, I've got a couple of questions of you, and I would preface this by saying that some of this is legalese, so—

Commissioner Fanello: Well—

Councilmember Winnecke: —some of us have had trouble understanding it, so—

Commissioner Fanello: I may have had trouble understanding it myself.

Councilmember Winnecke: The latest, I guess it's the latest version, in paragraph 13, uh, which starts out talking about the number of beds. The last part of that paragraph is different than what we passed at our last meeting. This is where it gets a little convoluted in my mind. I guess, I would like to know if you have a feel or if this is attorney-ese?

Commissioner Fanello: Okay.

Councilmember Winnecke: What the intent of the last part of this paragraph is from your perspective?

Commissioner Fanello: Well, let's go back to...and I don't have a copy of your version.

President Bassemier: (Inaudible. Mike not on.) Right here. Say your name and all for the record.

Commissioner Fanello: Catherine Fanello, County Commissioner. Do you have a copy? First of all, let me say that I was a little disappointed in the original paragraph 13 that the Council proposed, because I think it really violates the spirit of us working together. I think that, Councilman Winnecke, you and I had lunch a few weeks, or about two weeks ago, I believe, and there has been a rumor floating around, and I wish that you would have maybe called me or been a little bit more direct with your question. The rumor that is floating around was that the Commissioners, and more specifically the Democrat Commissioners, were wanting to get around the Council in some way. That is just completely untrue. You have your statutory authority and we have our statutory authority, and in no way, at any point in time, was it ever my intent or Commissioner Mosby's intent to try and circumvent the Council. What we would like to try and set up this whole deal that is in the best interest of the whole County. I think that comes...and I'm speaking simply from a number standpoint, because I don't know what the County's bonding capacity is at this point, but I know that our bonding capacity is limited, so we wouldn't want to use it all up in one project. Because we have the Old Courthouse facing us and we still aren't sure what we are going to do with that, and you never know what projects are coming along. So, I was disappointed to hear that, um, so I wanted to bring that out. So, I guess, paragraph 13 upset me because I think it violates the spirit of the Commissioners and the Council working together. So, in my opinion, that, the language in there about what the Commissioners should do and what the Council should do really doesn't have a place in this settlement. Um—

Councilmember Winnecke: So, does that mean, excuse me for interrupting, does that mean that you would be in favor of dropping paragraph 13 altogether?

Commissioner Fanello: —I would be in favor...I think that we have to have something in there about—

Councilmember Winnecke: About the bed...number of beds.

Commissioner Fanello: —the beds, but although all three of the Commissioners, I believe that is right. Mr. Bodkin was in there and the Sheriff were in there, I think that we wanted to leave out a number altogether. But, yes, in my opinion, I would like to leave out—

Councilmember Winnecke: The last part of—

Commissioner Fanello: —the last part of paragraph 13.

Councilmember Winnecke: The last question that I think I have relates to the, uh, you have my...that's alright, whatever paragraph it is relating to the attorney fees.

Commissioner Fanello: Okay. That is—

President Bassemier: (Inaudible. Mike not on.)

Commissioner Fanello: Um...discussion has gone back and forth about that. I know that Mr. Falk, obviously, would like to have attorneys fees. I'm in complete favor of us not paying anybody anything that we don't have to, to them. So, I mean, my first intent, you know, is to protect our funds. I am in perfect agreement with whatever you want to do about that paragraph—

Councilmember Winnecke: If Mr. Falk's position is that attorneys fees are not a deal breaker, would you be in favor of abolishing that from the stipulation?

Commissioner Fanello: Oh, exact...yes. I mean, without a doubt. As long as that does not cause a...cause him to want to give up something else in the agreement. I think some of these things came in the beginning while I will bargain for this if you, you know, do this—

Councilmember Winnecke: Sure.

Commissioner Fanello: —so if that doesn't violate anything else in the agreement I'm more than happy to leave it out.

Councilmember Winnecke: I think that is all the questions I had at this time.

Commissioner Fanello: Anything else?

Councilmember Hoy: Mr. President, obviously before the 13th of August, then we have to present a document that the Commissioners and we and, I guess, you too, Mr. Sheriff, have to sign off on. My question has to do from this point on, how do we get to that point? What process are we going to set out?

President Bassemier: Are we going to have to meet all again, or what?

Jeff Ahlers: I think what's...I think what's currently planned is for Mr. Hayes and Mr. Bodkin and I to get together, uh, in the next few business days, try to sort through the three or four different versions that there have been, see where we think we can find some common ground or at least then be able to, if possible, narrow down the disputed areas. Then, of course, once we have another draft or drafts, if there is no, you know, consensus, regardless of what there is we, obviously, come back here. So, obviously, sometime before, you know, probably in the next week or two we, probably, need to come back here and have another meeting for me to update you on what the progress is and to discuss with you the latest versions of the agreement.

President Bassemier: Okay.

Jeff Ahlers: I think that also on the issues that I pointed out to you where there are differences, uh, you need to be making some decisions as to which issues, um, how you feel about them. Whether you, you know, are going to stay with the language that you have, whether you are willing to, to change any of the language and that kind of thing. So, ultimately it is, obviously, your decision.

President Bassemier: Jeff, do you...are you suggesting that when you all meet to have one or two from this body? Or are you just going to get involved and just—

Jeff Ahlers: I don't think—

President Bassemier: I know you suggested yesterday–

Jeff Ahlers: I think, you know, we are open to any suggestions. I guess the original intent was to see what we could work through ourselves, but, obviously, from my perspective anybody that would like to as long as we don't have a quorum present and have open door problems that, uh, is more than welcome to come and attend. We have a very big conference room, so–

President Bassemier: Mr. Sutton, a question?

Councilmember Sutton: I think my contention even at our last meeting, and, you know, I still feel the same, and the reason why I voted against the previous agreement was because, obviously, there was a great deal of time spent, but no unified document was gathered to put together, and it served no purpose for us just to have a document just representing the County's...the County Council's interests only. So, what I would suggest that we do, uh, I think that we need to as a Council set a specific date that we would like to see, uh, that unified document come together from all of the three parties. A specific date that gives enough time frame for the three attorneys to get together from all representing entities, draft a document that conclusively puts together all of the ideas and suggestions from the three bodies, work that out bring that to us for us to mull over and then we can, with ample time, make our decision on whether the document represents, at least from the Council's perspective, and the County overall. I'm not just thinking about Council, I want to think about the County overall and move in that direction. I think that we ought to space out at least a two week time frame back from the date when that is actually due in. So, I don't know where that would put us date wise. You say the 13th of next month, so if we pull that back a couple of weeks, I think that ought to give us ample time to be able to have a document that would give us an opportunity to mull over.

Tom Bodkin: Mr. President, may I address?

President Bassemier: Sure.

Tom Bodkin: Tom Bodkin, Counsel for the Sheriff. I don't see any reason, at least based upon my own calendar, I can't speak for Phil Hayes, I don't have his, or Jeff's for that matter, although I could get closer with his cause we have talked. I don't see any reason why we could not know by the end of next week whether we can have a document that the lawyers can come to you with and think is a good deal or not. We are, I think, fairly close based upon what I know happened at the Commissioners. What the Commissioners have indicated they want. What the Sheriff has indicated he is willing to try to get done, and, I think, that we, uh, if Jeff is willing to do it, I am certainly willing to commit whatever time we have to next week to get one done, or not, but we need to get to a point where we know we are going to get it done or not. We really do.

Councilmember Sutton: It sounds like you guys are very close.

Tom Bodkin: Very close.

Councilmember Sutton: I think you are. I mean, you are on the right track.

Tom Bodkin: There are some other language, proposed changes that, I think, you are going to like better. That I know the Commissioners and the Sheriff like. That I mentioned briefly to Jeff but he hasn't had a chance to see the words, so he

doesn't know if he likes them or not. So, I think that by the end of next week we will be in a position to know if we are going to get there or not.

Councilmember Sutton: I mean, I think this is just an excellent opportunity for us to show a spirit of cooperativeness from all of the bodies and no one body can do this alone, so you guys need to get in a room—

Tom Bodkin: I have the great advantage of one client.

Councilmember Sutton: —and if you have to do some beating up, whatever you guys need to do.

Tom Bodkin: One person, so it's easy for me to e-mail him, you see.

President Bassemier: I guess the question that I am going to ask is do we mind... and Jeff and they all put their minds together and they bring it back to us after they've got it all...do we... do you—

Councilmember Winnecke: I think they should do it, yeah. That's the appropriate manner.

President Bassemier: Pardon?

Councilmember Winnecke: That's appropriate, I think,

President Bassemier: Yes. Okay. That's what we are paying them for. I'm just saying if you want a couple of us...do you want a couple of us there? Or just let them work it out and then bring it back to all of us?

Councilmember Winnecke: Let them work it out.

President Bassemier: Work it out, okay. Troy, you got a question?

Councilmember Tornatta: Okay, um, Falk's 13 is different than the 13 that we looked at. Is different than what we had, uh, kind of talked about. What part do we think that we are going to drop out? Or is this all...is this all something come to the part where you are going to get your heads together—

Councilmember Winnecke: I think this is where they get there heads together—

Councilmember Tornatta: Okay.

Councilmember Winnecke: —based on—

Councilmember Tornatta: 'Cause his...his is pretty much doing what...putting everything together as opposed to segregating everything out.

Jeff Ahlers: Actually, Falk's paragraph 13 adopts, for the most part, the Council's position on paragraph 13. I think he took one of our sentences out and left the other two is what I'm looking at. I mean, those are things that we will have to sort through. I guess there is two issues here, there is obviously the issues between the defendants and the plaintiff and then the issues among the defendants. So—

Councilmember Tornatta: Well, I guess we talked about dropping...dropping that out. I would like to, I mean, if that's the case you need to be informed at what point to

drop that...that we are comfortable since we are all here.

President Bassemier: Dropping what?

Councilmember Winnecke: The last part of 13.

Councilmember Tornatta: The last part, but where does that start? After new facility?

Jeff Ahlers: I guess, if that's what you are referring to, yeah. Where it starts with nothing.

Councilmember Tornatta: Uh-huh.

President Bassemier: Okay, run that by me again. You are talking about leaving in everything up to new facility and dropping everything that follows, correct?

Councilmember Tornatta: Right.

Jeff Ahlers: No, I'm not talking about anything—

President Bassemier: Okay.

Jeff Ahlers: —what Mr. Tornatta is talking about—

Councilmember Tornatta: No, no it was talked about that Lloyd asked would Catherine be okay with everything up to the final part and dropping that off. If that is the case, and we wouldn't want that, at what point would we cut the bottom off?

President Bassemier: I...I, uh—

Councilmember Tornatta: If you—

President Bassemier: —I think, I think—

Councilmember Tornatta: —if you are going to fight that, let's talk about it now. I mean, that's why we are here.

Councilmember Raben: Why...I'm yet...I'm still concerned about any chance that something could limit our authority through the whole process. I think something in paragraph 13 needs to protect this Council. I, you know, the original agreement of paragraph 13, I don't think restricted the Commissioners of any powers, but simply prevents them from stripping us of ours.

Councilmember Tornatta: Would, would it not be like I said earlier, would it not be an issue that you put in the responsibilities of the County Commissioners and the County Council, if that makes you feel better. To say what our jobs are, and if that is the case then they can't overstep that boundary.

Councilmember Sutton: The law tells us that.

Councilmember Tornatta: I mean—

President Bassemier: (Inaudible. Mike not on.)

Councilmember Tornatta: –so, I mean, you wouldn't necessarily have to put it in there, but if it would make feel better, you could put the state statute inside of paragraph 13. It would make it longer.

President Bassemier: (Inaudible. Mike not on.)

Councilmember Tornatta: Well, I think it's important that we talk. I keep, I keep coming back to the fact that we get done with a nice meeting and everything is all rosy and the next thing I'm getting calls from one side or the other saying well that is not what we went over and that is not what we said. Let's talk about it now. We are all here.

President Bassemier: (Inaudible. Mike not on.)

Councilmember Hoy: Yes. The reason I supported that language is, and I'm addressing what you said, Mr. Tornatta, and also your feelings about it, Commissioner Fanello. The reason I supported that language is because I'm sitting here in my ninth year of doing this and you've been sitting here since Noah built the Ark, and Councilman Raben has been here a long time, Councilman Sutton...hmm?

Sheriff Brad Ellsworth: Can we use the Ark as a jail? I mean–

Councilmember Hoy: Just float it out on the Ohio. I don't...I'm not speaking for those persons I just mentioned, I am speaking for myself. One of the continuing problems we have had as a Council is, and this is not a reflection on the current Commissioners, so be patient with me and listen to what I have to say. That is on too many occasions we have been left out of the process for one reason or another and sometimes because of legal language. Since you have laid this on the floor, I'm just going to lay Mr. Hayes' document on the floor, and I consider Mr. Hayes' document, at that point, so vague I don't know whether anybody really understands what Mr. Hayes is trying to say. I say that carefully. Phil Hayes is a long time friend of mine, but I don't think the language is as clear as it should be. I'm coming from that history of being on this body and then all of a sudden finding that we didn't exercise what we are supposed to do as a fiscal body. I don't see this, you know, in the same light as it has been portrayed as any kind of, you know, language that is too strong or inflammatory, it's simply a clear statement of what I feel our obligation and our duties are as County Councilmen. I also have to say that, language I liked that Mr. Ahlers wrote, I liked that language because it is real clear. I think, at this point, um, niceness is one thing, and I want to be as nice as I can be, but clarity will ensure that we stay on a good even keel between the two bodies. That is what I'm interested in.

Councilmember Tornatta: In the Baptist church, they say, Amen. One thing, Catherine, what Lloyd said is that in his question, and from being in the meetings past, that...he wasn't trying...one thing that he was not trying to do is load a question or anything else. I do know that he was asking that question because we all thought that Phil had some vague information, and that is all the way around. I think that it is hard to read. I think that when it is hard to read, there is too many interpretations. I mean, I know that's his question coming in, and not to be construed with trying to load a question for you. Now that's just being fair to both sides.

Commissioner Fanello: Well, and, and, I–

President Bassemier: Catherine, just one second, please.

Commissioner Fanello: Sorry.

Jeff Ahlers: One of the things that I would suggest is, with respect to that is, Mr. Tornatta, is let us see what we can work through, and to answer maybe yours and Mr. Sutton's questions was, you know, one of the reasons that we had this body pass a version was, I guess, of course everybody always thinks that their job is tougher, but I think it is more difficult for me in representing seven people, and, I think, it was important for us to have a version that I knew that I had a majority of this Council's support for as opposed to that of Mr. Bodkin who has one man to get the approval of and Mr. Hayes has to get the approval of two Commissioners. It's a little bit different. Here when we have seven people, and I thought it was appropriate to say that this is a version that we approve of. As it exists now, while the Commissioners have, apparently, discussed a version and we have the version that Mr. Hayes drafted, technically, I guess, that has not been approved by the Commissioners. So there is no approved version to really compare it to. I mean, we can talk about it and compare it, but in terms of an official approved version, they didn't take any official action the other day. So anyway, in that regard, I would just only recommend that we see what the next few days bring, but, you know, of course that is a decision up to you. I know one other thing to mention was, I think, you still, we need to ask the Sheriff some questions.

President Bassemier: Ms. Fanello. Your name again, please.

Commissioner Fanello: Catherine Fanello, County Commissioner.

President Bassemier: Thanks for your patience.

Commissioner Fanello: As far as an official draft, that is probably correct, but we did kind of go through it and say this is what we want scratched, this is how we want you to change this, so. I don't...I can't agree with you Councilmen Hoy on your prior statement, because I think that it's very clear... there is no way we can restrict the Council's powers. I mean, your powers are very clear in the statute and our powers are very clear in the statute. This is going to have to be a project where the two bodies work together. I'm not interested in violating that in any way. I do think that the way the paragraph...the way the...and let me finish...the paragraph—

Councilmember Hoy: I'm going to.

Commissioner Fanello: —that you guys did come up with doesn't really have a place in this lawsuit. That it seemed more like it was the Council versus the Commissioners or the Commissioners versus the Council and I just don't think that is appropriate and I don't think it sends the correct message to the taxpayers, because they are the ones that we are protecting in this lawsuit. Not the seven Council members up here, but the taxpayers.

President Bassemier: Mr. Hoy.

Councilmember Hoy: Were you finished? I was going to let you finish up.

Commissioner Fanello: Go ahead.

Councilmember Hoy: My response to that is we are not sure at this point when this project is going to move forward, develop, get finished, etc. During that period of time the players can change. You may not be looking at the same... seven same people that you are looking at here today. We may not be looking at the same three

people, you know, um, I'm not going to say that about the Sheriff, I think he is safe for another term or two, if it were possible. We have seen that happen and that is why I want the language as clear as possible when the attorneys get together.

Commissioner Fanello: I guess I'm a little—

Councilmember Hoy: They could do similar to what Mr. Tornatta suggested, maybe not copy, you know, directly from the, um—

Commissioner Fanello: I guess I'm a little confused then. I mean, you, I guess, passed a resolution at the beginning of this year that says you want to set aside \$35 million to do the project. I mean, as far as I'm concerned, the project is moving right now. I guess I don't understand, you don't know when it's going to be started. In my mind, we are moving and we are getting a contract signed with the design team and we are getting a schedule in place, so are we not moving forward on this right now?

Councilmember Hoy: You are moving forward, but, um, at this point you still don't have a signed contract.

Commissioner Fanello: Well, and we are very close to that.

Councilmember Hoy: I know, but I'm...I—

Commissioner Fanello: I mean, that is something that—

Councilmember Hoy: —I'm not disagreeing with you, I'm saying that there is a process here, and in the process we are still very much at the front end of the process. That is all I'm saying. That we—

Commissioner Fanello: I guess, I want you...I want you or the rest of the Council members to tell me what do you think you've been left out of? Where do you want to come in at? Because, I think, we've made a very decent effort over the past few weeks as far as the design team coming in to make sure that everybody was involved and kept informed of all the meetings that were taking place, so you need to inform me of what you are talking about, because you—

Councilmember Hoy: You really...I would really rather not—

Commissioner Fanello: So, this—

Councilmember Hoy: —but you have asked me to be very candid, I will. I would really rather not resurrect all the instances where there has been tension between this body and your body since January 1, 2001.

Commissioner Fanello: Well, I don't doubt that there has been tension, because—

Councilmember Hoy: You came to us in February with two proposals that you hadn't even approved in your own body.

Commissioner Fanello: Two proposals for what?

Councilmember Hoy: Financial proposals. They were laid on our desk—

Commissioner Fanello: Those were for you guys to consider. I can't make the decision.

Councilmember Hoy: But your body has to approve them first.

Commissioner Fanello: Okay, so—

Councilmember Hoy: So, we are getting—

Commissioner Fanello: —then I won't bring information to you first to look over. I mean, I am trying to make the—

Councilmember Hoy: No, you are missing my point.

Commissioner Fanello: No, I am not.

Councilmember Sutton: Can I add something to this that might be of benefit—

President Bassemier: You have the floor.

Councilmember Sutton: —to maybe both parties engaged—

Councilmember Hoy: What I'm reflecting on and then I will defer to you is, as I said before, and that is previous history, if you remember in my prior statement, I excluded the current Commissioners and said—

Commissioner Fanello: I...I understand that.

Councilmember Hoy: —and there is a number of points along the way where all of a sudden this Council found out that we had given too much ground, too much latitude—

Commissioner Fanello: Well—

Councilmember Hoy: —Mr. Wortman, you have been sitting here a long time, and whenever I made that statement I saw heads nodding from both parties, and that is why I think it is important...this is not a personality thing, it has nothing to do with you personally, with Mr. Mosby or Mr. Mourdock. It has to do with the kind of clarity that I like to see, particularly, you know, in processing through this. As this goes down the road, um, there are going to be change orders, I mean, all kinds of things that are likely to occur in a project this large.

Commissioner Fanello: As do every project.

Suzanne Crouch: May we change the tape, please?

President Bassemier: Yes.

(Tape Changed.)

President Bassemier: Mr. Sutton.

Councilmember Sutton: I think what both of you are saying has some merit and a degree of legitimacy to it, but, I think, as we look at this we don't need a legal settlement that we are proposing to put together here to outline the duties and the responsibilities of the Council. Nor the duties and responsibilities of the Commissioners, or the Sheriff. That is clearly all we're going to lay out of the state statute. I think what we are debating and looking at here is who is going to assume

leadership. Or who is going to assume a certain amount of responsibility of moving this forward. So much of what I heard in our last meeting disappointed me because of this bodies interest in wanting to take the lead in moving forward. No, this body doesn't take the lead. The county takes the lead, in building this. This building, and the county includes all of its departments, and all of its bodies elected, and not elected to move forward in making this very big decision. Now, if the County Council wants to truly take a leadership role, not the lead, but a leadership role in this big project that we do have, let me name some things that we can be doing in the interim. One is we need to be preparing and looking at the financial package. We have already said \$35 million. How do we want to structure that? How do we want to go about doing that if we are looking at \$35 million on this project? We need to look at the scope and the impact on our bonding authority as a county. Have we done that? Are we doing that? No. Let's take a lead and start doing that. Let's take a look at the anticipated staffing costs that we are going to be asked to undertake as a county, as a body. That is going to be a large cost. It is obviously not going to be staffed at the level that the jail is staffed at now. Are we looking at that? Are we thinking about that? The Sheriff surely is. Also, looking at the cost and benefits of the type of facility. We have already talked about a Juvenile Facility, Safe House, we haven't talked about specifically, and granted, we don't know what type of facility we are going to have. We haven't really looked at the ramifications of doing one as opposed to another or doing the entire thing. So as a body I really would highly encourage us to engage in active dialogue that addresses these issues, and I think we will be moving forward in respect of what we need to do. Now Commissioners, if they have things that they need to be doing regarding this, obviously, they play a role in this as well, but I'm not on the Commission. I'm on the County Council, but I think these are the type of things that we need to be doing. This is not an entire list, but this is a start.

Commissioner Fanello: Very well said, Councilman Sutton.

President Bassemier: Mr. Raben.

Councilmember Raben: Catherine, while you are up there, let me ask you something, 'cause I know you have spoken a lot on paragraph 13, and this question pertains to our version. What in paragraph 13, or where in paragraph 13 is the County Council overstepping the Commissioners?

Commissioner Fanello: Okay, and I'm going to go from this here and I.....

Councilmember Raben: Where do we restrict the Commissioners of any authority?

Commissioner Fanello: Can I borrow one of your versions? 'Cause I'm not sure that this..... I'm going to start with the sentence that says, the Vanderburgh County Commissioners shall not obligate Vanderburgh County, including the citizens of Vanderburgh County, or the Vanderburgh County Council, to levy taxes, increase taxes. Now, I'm going to stop right there. I don't think we have any authority to increase taxes, as far as I know. That's your job, is that not correct?

Councilmember Raben: Okay. Levy or increase taxes? I mean technically, I guess, you could, if you establish your own authority.

Suzanne Crouch: And I think budgets drive taxes.

Councilmember Raben: Right.

Commissioner Fanello: Yes, but you have to approve those budgets. I can't approve a budget, you have to do that.

Councilmember Raben: There again, that is just part of what Councilman Hoy was saying when we discuss clarity. If you sign a contract or establish a separate authority, who in turn commits.....

Commissioner Fanello: As far as I.....

Councilmember Raben: Again, the county is obligated by the agreement that you signed. In return we are obligated to fulfill that agreement. The fiscal body is obligated at budget time to fulfill your agreement.

Commissioner Fanello: So if....let me just ask you this question. If the Building Authority comes in next year and says, I'm raising maintenance costs up to \$5 million, you're going to pay that, whether we can afford it or not?

Councilmember Raben: That's not the same thing.

Commissioner Fanello: That really is the same thing. We have an agreement where we are renting property from them now, but I don't think we are talking about the same thing here. I'll disagree with you. It goes back to what Councilman Sutton said, he had a very good point, you don't know how you are you going to fund it yet. As far as I know, which I haven't really sat down with the Auditor and gone over this, but I don't know that we have enough bonding capacity. Or if we did, you would be using it all up on one project.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, well let me just state this, if you can't... technically, you say you can't do that anyway, what's wrong with leaving it in there?

Commissioner Fanello: Well then why would you want it in there if we can't do it anyway? Then what is the purpose of putting it in there?

Councilmember Raben: Again, it comes back to clarity.

Commissioner Fanello: Well then, okay then, I think it should be rewritten to...we need to put in this is the Council's responsibilities, and this is the Commissioners responsibilities, but the way it is written shall not obligate, and then the Vanderburgh County Commissioners shall not take any action or create any building authority, jail authority. I mean, I could turn around and say well I don't want the Vanderburgh County Council to do this, or this, or this. I mean, I just think it violates the whole spirit of this agreement.

Councilmember Raben: Again, I.....

Councilmember Sutton: I think that sounds like, violates is kind of a strong word.

Councilmember Raben: I don't see that.

Councilmember Sutton: I think it is just an unnecessary part, I guess, of what we are...the settlement agreement.

Commissioner Fanello: You know Kenneth Falk doesn't care whether that is in there or not. He doesn't have anything to do with the settlement

Councilmember Raben: I agree, but it does. We as a Council, or I as a Councilmember am concerned about where this whole thing can go and how we can be...how the Council can be completely bypassed. I think this language.....

Commissioner Fanello: We can't be bypassed. I mean, we can sit down, Councilman Raben, and I'll sit down with Counselor Ahlers and we will restate the statute. I'd be more than happy to sit down and do that. So that everybody knows.

Councilmember Tornatta: And the important part, this is in the record, so I mean, if you went back on your word.

Commissioner Fanello: This is a meeting and the public should know what we are talking about.

Councilmember Tornatta: I mean, if they go back on their word then.....

President Bassemier: Mr. Winnecke is.....

Commissioner Fanello: Let me finish the sentence here.

President Bassemier: Okay. Go ahead.

Commissioner Fanello: Issue bonds, borrow funds, appropriate funds, approve leases or contracts without the approval of the County Councilmen. Now the part about leases and contracts as far as I understand from the state statute is that that is an Executive.

Councilmember Raben: The funds should be in place prior to signing.

Commissioner Fanello: Exactly. You hit it right there. Can't do anything without you. I mean, you just answered your own question.

Councilmember Hoy: It's been done, I'll give you an example....

Commissioner Fanello: Well then, this is nothing against you personally, then you all need to stay on the ball. You have a counselor there who needs to be aware of those situations, if something like that happens....

Councilmember Hoy: Catherine, this is a due extension. Just to give one example that comes immediately to mind. When they signed a contract for rent in Darmstadt that we had not approved, and it came before us, and they had moved. We felt in a bind. We don't want to be in that kind of bind. I want to respond to my esteemed colleague over there, Mr. Sutton.....

Commissioner Fanello: Since I was going to read this, can I finish this sentence here?

Councilmember Hoy: ...and say to Mr. Sutton that I did not feel that in our last meeting we were jumping ahead, and trying to take the lead. Since we had a deadline on us, and we were responding to the deadline, and no one else was, in my estimation. So I didn't feel this body was jumping ahead. We had, the hammer was supposed to fall on a certain date. We had nothing on our desks, except what Mr. Ahlers had prepared. Frankly, through this whole thing, if Mr. Ahlers had not researched whatever that reform act is, which I can never inform my lawyer, who Mr. Ahlers is, that reform act, he is the one that brought that whole marvelous package, highly detailed, to our attention. Mr. Ahlers' expertise for one thing. So, we were in

the spot where, I felt as a Councilman, we had a deadline and we had to respond with something. I'm not saying it is a perfect document, but we did our best with it. And I don't feel, Mr. Sutton, that we jumped ahead, or that we were trying to take the lead. I think that we were just responding to a situation before us. We were facing a deadline and we said okay, we'll fulfill our obligation to meet that deadline at this point. Now we are at the point where it has been extended, which I am delighted to see, because I think this gives us some time to reasonably work this out. Now I am very comfortable with the three lawyers getting together and doing that.

President Bassemier: Mr. Winnecke.

Councilmember Winnecke: Since Commissioner Fanello and I each have a EUTS policy board meeting in this room in 30 minutes, I have three direct questions. One for Catherine, and two for the Sheriff. First, Catherine, while you are up, relating to paragraph 13, the whole intent, in your opinion, what is the intent of creating a jail authority?

Commissioner Fanello: I don't know. That has to come down with... we are going over the financial, that has to do with where we are financially. All I want to see is the best decision. What is going to not hurt the taxpayers in anyway. So I don't know. I mean, like Councilman Sutton said, you guys have got to start looking at that stuff, and that's, that's information that really ought to...should have been coming to the Commissioners. I don't really think that I should be gathering all the financial data. That is something that you guys need to take a lead on, and help us make the decision.

Councilmember Winnecke: I would concede many of those points. I guess my questions still is what is the... if the intent of the Commission is to create a jail authority, why? I don't know the answer to it.

Commissioner Fanello: And I don't know the answer myself, 'cause I don't know what we are doing.

Councilmember Winnecke: Well, what purpose would it serve?

Commissioner Fanello: My question to you would be, then how do you as a Council see this project as being funded?

Councilmember Winnecke: Well, I think the Council, in my personal opinion is, that in the beginning of the year we set aside \$2.7 million, and based on the financial information provided by the County's Chief Financial Officer, the Auditor, there is enough money to set aside that much money for up to ten years to help fund, or to help service any jail debt. So, I'm comfortable with that until another scenario is presented. My only question is, if a jail authority is created, I don't know the purpose it would serve?

Commissioner Fanello: Well, in a financial sense, the purpose it would serve is that your bonding capacity wouldn't be limited. I mean, you aren't going to be able to just go out and build a jail and just set aside \$2.7 million. That's a little more complicated and you know that, you work in a bank. It's a little more complicated than that. So a jail authority, it all depends, like I said, on what financial, what our financial status is, and how we want to bond. I mean, that would take, that would free up our bonding capacity, for the county to do other things.

Councilmember Winnecke: Okay.

Commissioner Fanello: Because that is my concern that we are going to use up all of our bonding capacity on one project.

Councilmember Winnecke: That's a fair answer. Now in interest of time, I have two more questions for the Sheriff, if it is okay. In paragraph 12, we are regressing a little bit here, of one of the agreements, it talks about temporary beds for prisoners. We talked about this briefly in the Executive Session, and maybe Mr. Bodkin can help. I think this is something that we would... everyone would feel more comfortable if it were more clearly defined. Is that right?

Sheriff Brad Ellsworth: Brad Ellsworth Sheriff of Vanderburgh County, assisted by my attorney Tom Bodkin, and a heck of a guy. Things like that are the things that need to be clarified. That could be simply a mattress, which we provide now, and sheets, and blankets. Or it could mean, I don't know what Mr. Falk is thinking of, bunk beds I put up and down the hallways of the current facility. Or the thing we refer to as canoes or boats that a plastic, polymer composite bed that raises the inmate 8" off the floor. I have issues with either of those things that would interrupt the flow of operation of that, by clarification on that, from Falk.

Councilmember Winnecke: Given current standard operating procedures, do you have mattresses and sheets to accommodate necessary people that would not be an additional cost to the county?

Sheriff Brad Ellsworth: It's additional cost with the money you give me. Then I supplement that with Commissary. We can make sure we have a mattress for everybody, and sheets and towels. There is nobody sleeping on a hard floor or a hard bunk in that jail, nor has there ever been.

Councilmember Winnecke: I understand that. And my last question then I'll be quiet. I promise.

Sheriff Brad Ellsworth: Oh, that's okay.

Councilmember Winnecke: Relating toward the end of what I'm looking at is paragraph 19 regarding the recreational. Do you anticipate additional personnel to meet the issues outlined there or do you feel comfortable with what we are able to provide today?

Sheriff Brad Ellsworth: However the final agreement reads, we are going to have a lot of staffing needs down the way. We are going to have a lot of staffing issues. This turn around for the new facility, if and when that happens that I don't for see changing a lot of procedures now but, the physical plan isn't going to let us change a lot of the procedure in the current facility. I can't see doing a lot of staffing for this when we know on the horizon we are going to have to. It will not take the same staffing levels as you said to operate a new building. We will comply with whatever, but it would depend on the wording. If it says what's reasonable, I think we are being very reasonable now on our exercise policy.

Councilmember Wortman: I was just listening to everybody here, and I think, and along with Mr. Hoy's statement over there, we had a deadline to meet, and we weren't making any progress, and I think that's what the Council was concerned about if more or less anything. To get something a'movin here. And then, as far as, setting aside this \$35 million, that's not to raise taxes ,hopefully. Will the Commission be comfortable with that \$35 million?

Commissioner Fanello: Whatever you want to spend.

Councilmember Wortman: Well that's what they set aside. Are you comfortable with it?

Commissioner Fanello: I'll do whatever you ask me to do.

Councilmember Wortman: Okay, thank you.

Sheriff Brad Ellsworth: And also in there that if the Council and Commission as person or at least somebody that's dressed like this is going to run the building. I'd rather stay in what we got than with the price and get three sub-standard products, for \$35 million. Or some kind of product that is run by the price. I'm all for keeping taxes low and not raising them, but you are running into some dangerous problems when you let that price run what we have built. I mean, especially if you decided on all three. I'm not saying they can't do that, but you got some major questions to ask yourself. There are things that if we reduce quality and people are busting out of paper thin walls, or whatever, we are going to be sorry down the road. This project only comes along once in our political lifetimes. Curt, you weren't here when they built the one in '69 were you? I didn't think so. You weren't that old. So, they were better before that. We are going to do this once. So, hopefully, in our, maybe in our physical lifetimes, not only just political, that it's time to do it right, and.....

Councilmember Winnecke: But in all fairness, Sheriff, \$35 million is a lot of money. We are not going to build something with paper walls.

Sheriff Brad Ellsworth: It's a ton of money. I don't think any of this is going to, you know, it will probably have our names in the cornerstone of this facility. It's an unpopular thing to build. It is all across the country, but it needs to be built effective and efficient. And cost is in mind that has a flow, and the design needs to drive this more than the dollars. I know we can't spend...we are not going to build the Lexington Jail, but we need to build what is right for Vanderburgh County.

Councilmember Wortman: The only thing is, and I think it should be built right, be practical, but I do not want a hotel type jail. So, no fancy stuff and all that. I think that's why the \$35 million was set in. So we don't succeed, and work from there. We had to have a figure to work by.

Sheriff Brad Ellsworth: I have toured about 30 jails since we started this project, and I haven't seen one with any hotel finishings yet. I don't know if you have ever sat on a stainless steel toilet, but it's not like home. But the reason they put stainless steel toilets in showers, 'cause these people over here don't treat it like the Holiday Inn in your \$75 suit. They try to break out of the place, and they try to tear it up on purpose, and that's why the design, that's why I press so hard for direct supervisors 'cause you save money because less and less problems like that occur. In some direct supervision jails you can go with a china toilet over stainless steel instead of a \$3,000 toilet. There is nobody I have heard yet that wants to do anything fancy for this particular population. Just it needs to be healthy, safety for the staff, safety for the inmates. I need to be able to do the job that the constitution tells me I have to do. But I don't think we need to cut corners. When I say cut corners, I'm talking about sub-standard stuff, based on a price. Unfortunately Vanderburgh County is facing because somebody years ago didn't plan ahead, and I'm not talking about anybody present, or this body, or Commission, or whatever, that we are facing three issues at one time. We have a Community Corrections Center that is, as you know, this week the roof blew off again. Do you want to stay in Community Corrections? You all decide. If we are going to stay in that and you think that is a good idea, then

we need a new Community Corrections Center, of some form. Juveniles, we have no place to house juveniles in Vanderburgh County either. That commits a murder, if it's a murder it is in adult court. We don't have any place to put a juvenile. The fact that our jail has been overcrowded since Sheriff De Groote, the guy that hired me 20 years ago. We wouldn't be facing a three pronged issue had somebody got off their butts and planned this years ago when the problem first got bad. Unfortunately, this body and the last Commission and this Commission and this Sheriff's office, we are finally moving. I commend you all for finally moving. I commend you all for finally, somebody doing something. But it's getting a little ugly here between the Council and Commission. I feel like I need to stand up here and be the mediator between some of the stuff. And I don't mind saying, here is your turn to tell me to shut up, paragraph 13 has nothing to do with the agreement between the ICLU and it has nothing to do, it's not going to mean a hill of beans. Let's take that out of there. Then let's get the three attorneys together, or two attorneys together, we'll take mine out of it. Then they can come up with another separate document. We'll get Jeff and Phil together that spells out the duties of the Council and Commission. That is a totally separate clean document. You all can frame it or do whatever you do, and clean this one up to go with the ICLU. Then you all know. That is just a personal opinion from somebody who has been to every meeting and is getting frustrated.

Councilmember Tornatta: And that brings a good point, one that I want to make to not only to the Council, but to the Commission. I think we far to overstep some of our thoughts, and not consulted the Sheriff's office, who I believe have went over and above what you could expect that office to do to try and maintain the professionalism that it's gonna take to build this facility. They know the sticks the bricks. They know what should go in and what should not. They are, in conversation with them, they are cutting some amenities that would help them to cut costs for the county. Now if they are taking that leadership role, how could we ever ask them if they are going to build a hotel? How could we ever ask them and question their judgement on building a facility, when they have been to places they have worked to find out the information so we don't have to. Why are we not relying on them more? Why is the Commission not asking them more questions, or relying on them more in their decision making? Because, I believe, that when it all comes down to it, they are the ones that are going to end up saving us or costing us, but as you see they have done the leg work to try and save us money and try and help us out. I think we have to put a little bit more faith in what they are doing along way.

Councilmember Hoy: I don't know if it is appropriate to make another motion here today is it, Mr. Ahlers? I'll make a motion. I want to go back to what Mr. Sutton said, because, as I said, there is only one point he made that I disagree with. I fully agree with you, Mr. Sutton, on investigating our bonding capacity. I would like to make a motion that we get the necessary people together to look into the bonding capacity for this project. Also, and I think the Auditor can do this for us fairly handily, give us a report on current projects which we have bonded and where those projects are right now. That's my motion. Then I have a comment on it. Sir, my comment is it could well be, as Commissioner Fanello said, we may have to bond ourselves to our fullest capacity to do this project. However, as we have seen sitting on this Council eventually, we pay certain bonds off. We will begin to pay some things off which will expand the bonding capacity, or keep it where it should be. That's why that information, I think, would be helpful

Suzanne Crouch: The bonding capacity for Vanderburgh County is 2% of our assessed valuation. Our assessed valuation is \$1 billion, \$427million, some \$360 thousand, I'm not for certain. Percent, that means our bonding capacity is

somewhere in the neighborhood of \$28 million that we can bond and back by property taxes. Currently the only project that we have on the books that is backed by property taxes is the USI Union Township overpass, and that is in the neighborhood of \$8.4 million bond. All the other bonds that we have are either payable by freedom beverage, or by TIF revenues, or by COIT. And I'll be happy to make a list of those bonds and provide that to you. Where those sources of revenues that make those payments come from. I'll be happy to do that.

Councilmember Sutton: I think that along lines with that, if we want to evaluate that perhaps maybe some information that assures we get some type of blended structure. Where it is not just coming with one source, might be very helpful. So if you could maybe outline the bonding capacities on each of those different sources and where we stand and what we have remaining.

Councilmember Wortman: We're still gonna have to have a price. What this project is going to cost before we can do anything.

Councilmember Hoy: You are absolutely right. I just want to see where we are plus, we set aside \$2.7 on January 1st. 2002 we are going to be able to set aside another big hunk of money. You don't have to bond that money. You have that up front. If it takes three years, who knows, we may have a third hunk. I'm doubtful we will, but that is what I mean about looking at the full picture, so that we can follow through on what you said, Mr. Sutton.

Councilmember Sutton: I think we need to be careful on that \$2.7 million. Let's keep in mind that that was just for this year. What was talked about in future years was based on a projection of if we set aside \$2.7 million a year. Not that we...cause we don't have the authority to obligate the future Councils for \$2.7 million over the next 10 years. We need to get rid of this note all together. We don't have that much money sitting aside. We just have the \$2.7 million, and so as we think about options, we need to look at the difference sources that are out there because there is no.....I can't see that a Council....who knows who will be on this Council five, six, seven years down the road. Setting aside \$2.7 million from their General Fund for this project, and being happy with that.

Councilmember Hoy: Well by that time we'll be making the payments out of the General Fund on the bonds anyhow. I mean, indeed when this contract is signed and we sign the financing on it then, in truth, those future Councils and future Commissioners will be bound by those decisions. Just as we are currently bound by decisions made by a previous bodies to bond and interchange and a bridge in Union Township

Councilmember Hoy: Anyway, that is the only comment I have, um, I think that we are, you know, acting as wisely as we can.

President Bassemier: Okay, the Sheriff walked up. Did you want to add something before it gets to Mr. Winnecke or answer to Curt?

Councilmen Wortman: I guess, probably you're going to point the finger at me. Twenty years ago, and I should of thought of this and (inaudible) built a new jail.

Sheriff Brad Ellsworth: Long before your time.

Councilmen Wortman: But I know, and at that time, I think, it was talked about, you know.

Sheriff Brad Ellsworth: Sure.

Councilmen Wortman: Just as you—

Sheriff Brad Ellsworth: I've got letters from the group to the Councils and Commissions and a Federal Judge even—

Councilmen Wortman: Right.

Sheriff Brad Ellsworth: —that I've still got in the boxes where De Groote was calling and asking. They had Commissions on jail overcrowding and they had a jail expansion team—

Councilmen Wortman: Right.

Sheriff Brad Ellsworth: —that, you know, that Kinkle and his group, you know, were part of in drawing jails—

Councilmen Wortman: Uh-huh.

Sheriff Brad Ellsworth: —so, you know, nothing was done. We're basically paying for now...we're going to plan and we're going to fix what didn't get done.

Councilmen Wortman: See at that time—

Councilmember Hoy: You're absolutely right. When I got out of graduate school in 1962 we advocated then a Juvenile Facility. When I became Director of the Youth Service Bureau in 1972, every study we had ever done said build a Juvenile Facility. When I came on this Council I said let's build a Juvenile Facility, and as soon as I said that the Juvenile Judge was standing right where you are standing saying oh, no let's not do that. We are...we're paying the debt off for that kind of delay. You are quite right, Sheriff. So, we do have our hands full. We do have a motion on the floor though.

President Bassemier: Okay, that was still on discussion. Mr. Winnecke.

Councilmember Winnecke: Actually my question is not related to the motion, so I shouldn't ask it now.

President Bassemier: Okay. Alright, I've got a motion...it was we had a motion and a second—

Councilmember Winnecke: I was trying to stay focused here.

Sheriff Brad Ellsworth: Was Curt's question about—

Councilmen Wortman: I just remember at that time we didn't have a lot of taxes or assessed valuation wasn't that high—

Sheriff Brad Ellsworth: Sure.

Councilmen Wortman: —and we had a heck of a time hiring extra deputies at that time. I remember we discussed this and that and it was rough—

Sheriff Brad Ellsworth: Sure.

Councilmen Wortman: –you know, we was in a financial bind that time, I remember that. So, we just as we go along we try to do the best we can see.

Sheriff Brad Ellsworth: I've just got a comment about what Curt said earlier, but if you want to vote first and then I'll–

President Bassemier: That will be fine.

Councilmember Winnecke: Could we...could we repeat the motion please?

President Bassemier: (Inaudible. Talking over each other.) Does Mr. Hoy need to repeat the motion?

Councilmember Winnecke: In 15 seconds or less.

Councilmember Hoy: The essence of the motion was that we ask the Auditor, and whomever else we need to ask, what our bonding capacity is? Which she has given us a hand at, and also when certain bonds will be paid off. She has clarified a number of things already, which I appreciate. So, that we know where we are heading, because that, I think, your questions...your issue, rather as Mr. Sutton said, an issue that we need to directly address, so why not address it today?

President Bassemier: Okay. I have a motion–

Councilmember Hoy: Explore the bonding now, and then we can have some things done when contracts come down our way.

President Bassemier: Okay. Did he repeat that okay?

Councilmember Raben: Yeah, he just did.

President Bassemier: Okay, I have a motion and a second, let's roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmen Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

Councilmember Hoy: Mr. President, I think as...and this is not a motion. Not a motion. I'm just speaking personally, as I always do, we are looking at three facilities. I think that as a Council we need to look very, very hard at the size and scope. I would like to do this in cooperation with the Sheriff since it is, you know, under your jurisdiction, but I think we need to, to look at the size and scope of Community Corrections, and have a really good thorough discussion of that and also...that ties in with what you raised too, Mr. Sutton, about the scope of this, because our Community Corrections program is the largest in the state. It is larger than Marion County, and I think that we have carried this ball long enough without, you know, stopping the game, to use a sports analogy, and said wait a minute, where is this going? I don't want us to do that as a body alone, I think, obviously, we want your input and input of your staff, but as we look at budget this year, I think, it's, that's something we should look at. In this process, I don't know whether we need to address that, Mr. Sutton, with a motion but that ties in, I think, with one of your questions about the scope of this. If I were...and I'll make this my last comment, I promise you, maybe. If I were to make a decision between Safe House size and Juvenile Facility, I would move the Juvenile Facility ahead of Safe House in terms of priority. I think it is much more necessary to build that, to build that adequately than it is to increase Community Corrections. Um, and we handed you, um, a good mess of pottage when we handed you that, and did not expect you to, to, um, straighten all of that out overnight. I appreciate the work that you have done. I'm just saying—

Sheriff Brad Ellsworth: And the Advisory Board. Include the Advisory Board in that.

Councilmember Hoy: —yes, I do, and the Advisory Board too, but I think maybe that is something...the scope of that needs to be looked at as well.

Sheriff Brad Ellsworth: That ties into what, if I can, when Curt said, you know, what...we need to get a handle on the price here of what we are building, and I think that is what we need to do, and I kind of go back to the PMSI study, and the numbers, although crude and they are kind of those starting numbers of 500 to 700 bed, you know, 500 expandable to 700. This design team will come close to that, I'm sure. They talked about a 225 Community Corrections Center, and I think, Councilman Hoy, you are exactly right, that is something that we have to look at and say who is being placed out there? I know early on in Community Corrections...we came and tried to redo some things on who was being assigned to Community Corrections and the board at that time overrode that and who was being placed out there. So, a lot of the Community Corrections are C's and D's only, and we've got people out there who aren't just C's and D's. So, I think that is something that the Community Corrections Advisory Board can revisit and the number is out there.

Councilmember Hoy: A gentleman, excuse me, Sheriff, but just to back up what you said. I am aware of a case where a gentleman was placed there for what will eventually be five years—

Sheriff Brad Ellsworth: Remember the twenty year one?

Councilmember Hoy: Yeah. There is even one longer. This is not what Community Corrections was created for, and I don't think we have a disagreement do we, Sheriff, on that.

Sheriff Brad Ellsworth: Yeah, like I said, I think there is a consensus. We've had a jail that has been 100% overcrowded for years and years and years. 100% every day. So, I think, I don't think anybody says we don't need more jail bed space in Vanderburgh County. We've got a Corrections Center that has served it's purpose. 115 year old factory, but it's...you all know what's happening over there. The Community Correction Advisory Board has written a letter to this body saying, please don't include this building in your future plans. We've got juvenile, so I don't think...I think what we need to do is let this design team based on those numbers, is do their design. Five expandable to seven, somewhere between 100 and 200 or 225 on this Community Corrections and a small Juvenile Center and let them come back with that pr...you know, we are going to be able to get pretty close on 150 a square foot or whatever once they get this design, and then we can say...you know, if it's \$150 million, you're gonna say, can't do that. Um, we need to cut 50 off, you know, that takes out the Community Corrections, we're out of that business. Or, you know, we cut the juvenile to where it's something you are going to..you know, they can design all three and come in and say it's \$69 million and then you say, well, we're confident with what they did, we're all comfortable with that, we can do it. I'm not...I'm just throwing numbers out here, because I don't want to get quoted on a number. That was a fatal mistake early on in this process, but, um, you know, I think we need to let the design team do this based on their programming. They are going to start that next week, and coming down and talking to the staff, and the jailers and office space and how many programming rooms in the jail. Let them do that and they are going to come back with a pretty rough foot estimate on it, and then we can say we are going to have to not do Community Corrections at all, and lay off 63 people—

Councilmen Wortman: Well, I think it's true. I think that if you compile the jail and then juvenile as Mr. Hoy said, Corrections Center out there. If you might come in and you might do 'em for \$38 million, see it's not set in concrete, but at the same time we want to be practicable and we had to set a figure somewhere—

Sheriff Brad Ellsworth: Right.

Councilmen Wortman: —see and thata way we can go from there. You do that anytime—

Sheriff Brad Ellsworth: Absolutely.

Councilmen Wortman: —you make a projection. I think that is common sense.

President Bassemier: Sheriff, if you could in the next couple of weeks, and I'll be glad to go with you or whatever there. They just completed that...I think you've been going around in your...and that's great, I mean, you've been everywhere and checking out other facilities. If you get a chance sometime in the next couple of

weeks, go over to Owensboro—

Sheriff Brad Ellsworth: Sure.

President Bassemier: —to that Daviess. Mr. Taylor is over there. He has opened the door for us over there—

Sheriff Brad Ellsworth: Sure.

President Bassemier: —and I understand that they have just completed a 427 bed facility with indoor basketball court, meets maximum, I mean, it meets Federal and State regulations and stuff for \$9.2 million and that does not count the land. They've got a couple of other facilities over there with the juveniles and similar to what we might want to do here, so if you could take a couple—

Sheriff Brad Ellsworth: Absolutely.

President Bassemier: —if you would check that out and see how he did that—

Sheriff Brad Ellsworth: I've been to North Carolina, Owensboro is not a (Inaudible. Talking over each other.)

President Bassemier: You probably, you've probably met Mr. Taylor. If you need to make contact with him, but he, he's welcomed us over there anytime to show us through there—

Sheriff Brad Ellsworth: Sure.

President Bassemier: —and I think it just opened...Susan just, she's from Kentucky she's probably, she probably aware of their opening, but \$9.2 million...and that's a 427 maximum security, and it's fantastic. I mean, I worked in the jail here back in 1969 and I'm familiar with jails and if you'd go over there, I think that you would be impressed at how it is shaped like the wagon wheel and you can see everything...every quarters and everything. It's well put together. So, if you could do that for me—

Sheriff Brad Ellsworth: How about week after next? We'll just set it up.

President Bassemier: Appreciate that.

Sheriff Brad Ellsworth: Okay. That is all I had on that, you know, the design team. Where we are at on design, they are coming down and starting programming and that next week and meeting with the different staffs and all that, so, we are moving that way.

Councilmember Hoy: I move we adjourn.

Councilmember Tornatta: Second.

Meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL

President Ed Bassemier

Vice President Lloyd Winnecke

Councilmember James Raben

Councilmember Phil Hoy

Councilmember Curt Wortman

Councilmember Royce Sutton

Councilmember Troy Tornatta

Recorded by Teri Lukeman. Transcribed by Madelyn Grayson & Mike Cundiff.

**VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL
MINUTES
AUGUST 1, 2001**

The Vanderburgh County Council met in session the 1st day of August, 2001 in room 301 of the Civic Center Complex. The meeting was called to order at 3:32 p.m. by County Council President Ed Bassemier.

President Bassemier: Sheriff, you want to open up the meeting?

Brad Ellsworth: Oh yes, oh yes, oh yes, the Vanderburgh County Council is now in session pursuant to adjournment.

President Bassemier: Attendance roll call, please.

COUNCILMEMBER	PRESENT	ABSENT
Councilmember Tornatta	X	
Councilmember Sutton		X
Councilmember Wortman	X	
Councilmember Hoy	X	
Councilmember Raben	X	
Councilmember Winnecke	X	
President Bassemier	X	

President Bassemier: Would everyone please stand for the Pledge of Allegiance?

(Pledge of Allegiance was given)

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES
JULY 3 AND JULY 12, 2001**

President Bassemier: Okay, I need a motion to approve the minutes of July 3, 2001 and July 12, 2001.

Councilmember Raben: So moved.

President Bassemier: Do I have a second?

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Here – I mean, yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Here – yes. You’ve got me off track, Curt.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATION REQUESTS
--

SHERIFF

President Bassemier: (Inaudible – microphone not turned on)

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Mr. President. I'll move approval of 1050-1300-1050 in the amount of \$150,000.

President Bassemier: Do I have a second?

Councilmember Hoy: Second.

President Bassemier: Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

SHERIFF		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1050-1300-1050	Overtime	150,000.00	150,000.00
Total		150,000.00	150,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

JAIL

President Bassemier: Okay B, Jail.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Jail 1051-1850 and 1051-2240 for a total request of \$85,000. I'll move approval.

President Bassemier: Do I have a second?

Councilmember Winnecke: Second.

President Bassemier: Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

JAIL		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1051-1850	Union Overtime	10,000.00	10,000.00
1051-2240	Medical	75,000.00	75,000.00
Total		85,000.00	85,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

COUNTY ASSESSOR
GERMAN TWP. ASSESSOR
PERRY TWP. ASSESSOR

CENTER TWP. ASSESSOR
KNIGHT TWP. ASSESSOR
PIGEON TWP. ASSESSOR

President Bassemier: Okay, I guess you want to take all the Assessors, Jim?

Councilmember Raben: Yes, I would. Mr. President, we have the County Assessor, Center Township, German Township, Knight, Perry, Pigeon, and what I would like to do, Mr.

President, in an effort to not confuse our existing salary ordinance any more than what it probably already is, I would like to establish new line items for the Level II Certifications. And in doing that, what we will have to do is zero out the requests. For instance, let's go to County Assessor. We'll zero out the County Assessor \$1,000 and Chief Deputy \$500 and insert a new line item and we'll approve the FICA and PERF as it is on the sheets, okay.

Suzanne Crouch: Can't you just change the line items on it instead of zeroing them out?

Councilmember Raben: We can. I mean, I can do it this way fairly easy as well. So let me start with the County Assessor 1090-1110-1090 zero, 1090-1120-1090 zero and insert line item 1090-1972-1090 Level II Certification at \$750 and FICA and PERF as well, no there is a correction on that as well. FICA should read \$58 and PERF \$42. Then we go to Center Township Assessor line 1110-1120-1110, 1110-1130-1110, 1110-1140-1110, 1110-1170-1110 all set in at zero and insert line item 1110-1972-1110 Level II Certification for \$1,000, FICA \$77, PERF \$55. German Township Assessor line 1120-1120-1120 zero and insert line 1120-1972-1120 Level II Certification \$250. Knight Township Assessor 1130-1120-1130, 1130-1130-1130, 1130-1160-1130, 1130-1190-1130 all set in at zero, and insert 1130-1972 Level II Certification at \$1,000. Perry Township Assessor 1140-1120-1140, 1140-1130-1140, 1140-1140-1140 all at zero and insert 1140-1972-1140 Level II Certification at \$750. And Pigeon Township Assessor 1150-1120-1150, 1150-1130-1150, 1150-1180-1150, 1150-1190-1150 all be set in at zero and 1150-1972-1150 Level II Certification be set in at \$1,000. And I hope everybody is clear on that and I make that in the form of a motion.

Paul Hatfield: Wait. Did you say \$1,000?

Councilmember Raben: \$1,000, yes.

Paul Hatfield: That doesn't cover the four.

Councilmember Winnecke: Second.

President Bassemier: I have a second on it. Mr. Hatfield, do you want to come to the podium, please?

Councilmember Raben: That rate, Paul, would be for half of the year.

Paul Hatfield: I stand corrected.

President Bassemier: I have a motion and a second. Anymore discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

COUNTY ASSESSOR		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1090-1110-1090	County Assessor	1,000.00	0.00
1090-1120-1090	Chief Deputy	500.00	0.00
1090-1900	FICA	115.00	58.00
1090-1910	PERF	79.00	42.00
1090-1972	Level II Certification	0.00	750.00
Total		1,694.00	850.00

CENTER TWP. ASSESSOR		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1110-1120-1110	Chief Deputy	500.00	0.00
1110-1130-1110	Real Estate Deputy	500.00	0.00
1110-1140-1110	Deputy Assessor/Business	500.00	0.00
1110-1170-1110	First Dep/Ofc Coordinator	500.00	0.00
1110-1900	FICA	153.00	77.00
1110-1910	PERF	105.00	55.00
1110-1972	Level II Certification	0.00	1,000.00
Total		2,258.00	1,132.00

GERMAN TWP. ASSESSOR		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1120-1120-1120	Chief Deputy	500.00	0.00
1120-1972	Level II Certification	0.00	250.00
Total		500.00	250.00

KNIGHT TWP. ASSESSOR		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1130-1120-1130	Chief Deputy	500.00	0.00
1130-1130-1130	Real Estate Deputy	500.00	0.00
1130-1160-1130	Deputy Assessor/Deeds	500.00	0.00
1130-1190-1130	Second Real Estate Deputy	500.00	0.00
1130-1972	Level II Certification	0.00	1,000.00
Total		2,000.00	1,000.00

PERRY TWP. ASSESSOR		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1140-1120-1140	Chief Deputy	500.00	0.00
1140-1130-1140	Real Estate Deputy	500.00	0.00

(Table Continued next Page)

1140-1140-1140	First Deputy	500.00	0.00
1140-1972	Level II Certification	0.00	750.00
Total		1,500.00	750.00

PIGEON TWP. ASSESSOR		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1150-1130-1150	Real Estate Deputy	500.00	0.00
1150-1190-1150	Real Estate Deputy	500.00	0.00
1150-1120-1150	Chief Deputy	500.00	0.00
1150-1180-1150	Bus/Pers. Prop. Deputy	500.00	0.00
1150-1972	Level II Certification	0.00	1,000.00
Total		2,000.00	1,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

President Bassemier: Okay.

Councilmember Raben: Okay next, Mr. President is County Commissioners 1300-3120 Postage in the amount of \$50,000. I'll move approval.

Councilmember Hoy: Second.

President Bassemier: Any discussion on that? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

COUNTY COMMISSIONERS		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1300-3120	Postage/Freight	50,000.00	50,000.00
Total		50,000.00	50,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

CIRCUIT COURT

President Bassemier: Okay, Jim, Circuit Court.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Circuit Court 1360-3723 Psychological Evaluations at \$4,000. I'll move approval.

President Bassemier: Do I have a second?

Councilmember Winnecke: Second.

President Bassemier: Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

CIRCUIT COURT		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1360-3723	Psychological Evaluations	4,000.00	4,000.00
Total		4,000.00	4,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

THE CENTRE

President Bassemier: Okay, Centre.

Councilmember Raben: Centre account 1440-3798 \$240,000. I'll move approval.

President Bassemier: Do I have a second on that please?

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

THE CENTRE		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1440-3798	Food Services	240,000.00	240,000.00
Total		240,000.00	240,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

COUNTY COUNCIL

President Bassemier: Okay, County Council.

Councilmember Raben: And account 1480-1971 Accrued Payments \$50,000. I'll move approval.

President Bassemier: Need a second.

Councilmember Winnecke: Second.

President Bassemier: Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

COUNTY COUNCIL		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1480-1971	Accrued Payments	50,000.00	50,000.00
Total		50,000.00	50,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

GERMAN TWP. ASSESSOR/REASSESSMENT

President Bassemier: Okay, German Assessor/Reassessment.

Councilmember Raben: Mr. President, at this time I would like to set this request in at zero.

President Bassemier: Do I have a second on that?

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: Any discussion?

Councilmember Raben: Well, the only reason in doing this, Mr. President, is – and Tim Schaefer is aware that this is the case – but he had proposed or prepared this request from other discussions with other Assessors’ offices that they were as well going to prepare budgets. But as I stated last Wednesday, what I think this body should do is for September or...we’ll come up with a budget that will be workable for all the Assessor’s offices for the remainder of the year.

President Bassemier: Okay, thanks for explaining that. Mr. Hoy, you’re awful quiet, okay. Okay, do I have a second on that. Curt seconded? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

GERMAN TWP. ASSESSOR/REASSESSMENT		REQUESTED	APPROVED
2492-1120-1140	Field Coordinator	5,463.00	0.00
2492-1120-1900	FICA	418.00	0.00
2492-1120-1910	PERF	272.00	0.00
2492-1120-1990	Extra Help	8,000.00	0.00
2492-1120-2600	Office Supplies	213.00	0.00
2492-1120-3120	Postage/Freight	75.00	0.00
2492-1120-3130	Travel/Mileage	250.00	0.00
2492-1120-3410	Printing	250.00	0.00
2492-1120-3600	Rent	600.00	0.00
Total		15,541.00	0.00

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

CIRCUIT COURT SUPPLEMENTAL ADULT PROBATION

President Bassemier: Circuit Court.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, 2600-2720 and 2600-3530 for a total of \$13,000. I'll move approval.

President Bassemier: Do I have a second?

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

CIR. CT. SUPP. ADULT PROBATION		REQUESTED	APPROVED
2600-2720	Lab Supplies	3,000.00	3,000.00
2600-3530	Contractual Services	10,000.00	10,000.00
Total		13,000.00	13,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

GENERAL FUND REPEAL

PUBLIC DEFENDER AGENCY

President Bassemier: Okay, General Fund repeal, Jim.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, we have a repeal for the Public Defender’s Office and account number 1303-3948 in the amount of \$45,160. I’ll move approval.

Councilmember Hoy: Second.

President Bassemier: I have a second. Any discussion on that? Okay, roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

PUBLIC DEFENDER AGENCY		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1303-3948	Death Penalty	45,160.00	45,160.00
Total		45,160.00	45,160.00

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

TRANSFER REQUESTS

COUNTY CLERK
SUPERIOR COURT (2 REQUESTS)
PIGEON TWP. ASSESSOR
AUDITOR (LATE)
COUNTY ASSESSOR (LATE)
HEALTH (LATE)

PUBLIC DEFENDER AGENCY
CUMULATIVE BRIDGE
CIRCUIT COURT SUPP. ADULT PROB.
COUNTY COUNCIL (LATE)
HIGHWAY (LATE)

President Bassemier: Okay, we'll go to the transfers.

Councilmember Raben: Mr. President, I am going to lump all the transfers in together. So I will move approval that all transfers be granted as they are listed.

President Bassemier: Do I have a second on that?

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: Second by Mr. Wortman. Any discussion on that? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

Councilmember Raben: Mr. President, just a matter of clarification, we had a few late transfers and that was part of my motion as well, that the late transfers be included.

President Bassemier: Okay.

COUNTY CLERK		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1010-1250-1010	Cashier/Misdemeanor	4,620.00	4,620.00
1010-1270-1010	Deputy Clerk	5,405.00	5,405.00
1010-1340-1010	Deputy Clerk/Sup.	1,995.00	1,995.00

(Table continued next page)

To: 1010-1670-1010	Court Clerk	4,620.00	4,620.00
1010-1170-1010	Circuit Court Clerk/Archives	3,410.00	3,410.00

1010-1200-1010	Small Claims Clerk	1,995.00	1,995.00
1010-1180-1010	Juvenile Clerk	1,075.00	1,075.00
1010-1310-1010	Counter Clerk/ Misdemeanor	920.00	920.00

PUBLIC DEFENDER AGENCY		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1303-3948	Death Penalty	697.00	697.00
To: 1303-3310	Training	460.00	460.00
1303-3130	Travel/Mileage	237.00	237.00

SUPERIOR COURT		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1370-3010	Other Insurance	3,000.00	3,000.00
To: 1370-4210	Office Furniture	3,000.00	3,000.00

SUPERIOR COURT		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From:1370-3010	Other Insurance	4,495.00	4,495.00
To: 1370-1770-1370	Clerical Assistant	1,321.00	1,321.00
1370-1801-1370	Small Claims Secretary	2,651.00	2,651.00
1370-1900	FICA	304.00	304.00
1370-1910	PERF	219.00	219.00
Total		4,495.00	4,495.00

CUMULATIVE BRIDGE		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 2030-4722	Seminary Rd. Culvert #538	125,000.00	125,000.00
To: 2030-4721	Church Rd. Culvert #978	125,000.00	125,000.00

PIGEON TWP. ASSESSOR		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 2492-1150-3400	Printing Plat Sheets	4,395.00	4,395.00
2492-1150-3380	Photography/Blue Prints	800.00	800.00
2492-1150-3372	Computer Software	425.00	425.00
To: 2492-1150-3370	Computer (Data Mgmt)	5,620.00	5,620.00

CIRCUIT COURT SUPP. ADULT PROBATION		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 2600-3510	Other Operating	1,000.00	1,000.00
To: 2600-3130	Travel/Mileage	1,000.00	1,000.00

LATE TRANSFER REQUESTS

AUDITOR	REQUESTED	APPROVED
---------	-----------	----------

From: 1020-1200-1020	Bookkeeper/Welfare	1,100.00	1,100.00
1020-1140-1020	Tax Corrections/ Settlement	10,296.00	10,296.00
To: 1020-1260-1020	Tax Mapping Supervisor	11,396.00	11,396.00

COUNTY COUNCIL		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1480-3520	Equipment Repair	160.00	160.00
To: 1480-4220	Office Machines	160.00	160.00

COUNTY ASSESSOR		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1090-3530	Contractual Services	35,000.00	35,000.00
To: 1090-3370	Computer (Data Mgmt)	35,000.00	35,000.00

HIGHWAY		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 2010-1920	Insurance	4,570.72	4,570.72
To: 2010-1008	Highway Engineer	4,570.72	4,570.72

HEALTH		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 2130-3510	Other Operating	861.00	861.00
To: 2130-1290-2130	Supervisor Vector Control	861.00	861.00

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

AMENDMENT TO SALARY ORDINANCE (CONTINUED ON PAGE 21)

President Bassemier: Alright, amendment to the Salary Ordinance.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, we have several here today. Let me start with the Sheriff. Amend the salary line 1050-1300 Overtime as previously adopted. Jail, salary line 1051-1850 Union Overtime as previously adopted. County Council line 1480-1971 as previously adopted. The Auditor's Office, line 1010-1126-1120 (actual number should be 1020-1260-1020) Tax Mapping Supervisor classification PAT IV Step 2 as transfer previously adopted with an annual salary of \$29,344 and delete salary line 1020-1140-1020 Tax Correction/Settlement position. Health Department, salary line 2130-1160-2130 Director of Nursing be set in at PAT MED IV with an annual rate of \$48,904 and that was approved by the personnel recommendation committee. Along with that, in the Health Department, line 2130-1290 Supervisor Vector/Rodent Control at a PAT V Step 4 with an annual rate of \$36,242. Again, that was also recommended by the Personnel Administration Committee. County Highway, line 2010-1008 County Engineer, to set the 2001 annual salary rate at \$64,000. And just as a note, all salary increases are effective the next full pay period which is August the 13th. Then we have all the County Assessor's Offices. Sandie, does anyone have a copy of this?

Sandie Deig: I can make some.

Councilmember Raben: Well, or I can read it in to the minutes, that's fine.

President Bassemier: Why don't we do that?

Councilmember Raben: Again, all requests have been prorated for a six month

period effective July 1st. Level II Certification incentives shall be paid out in equal increments and I'll go through the employees' names. County Assessor's Office, new salary line 1090-1972 Level II Certification at \$750 be paid to as follows: Cheryl Musgrave, County Assessor and Tammy Elkins, Chief Deputy. Center Township Assessor, again, account 1110-1972 Level II Certification in at the \$1,000 and this would apply to Rebecca Galey, Donald Cobb, P.S. Majors, and S. Pruitt. German Township 1120-1972, again, Level II Certification to D. Van Allen. Knight Township Assessor line 1130-1972 Level II Certification in at \$1,000, and this would apply to Shirley Reeder, John Gerard, J. Gries and L. Crowe. Perry Township Assessor, salary line 1140-1972 Level II Certification and it, again, is for \$750 and it would be Nancy Locke, J. Page and K. Swartz. And then we have Pigeon Township Assessor line 1150-1972 which, again, is a Level II Certification line for \$1,000 and it would apply to Judy Stricker, Dorothy Joest, P. Schnur and J. Sutton. Then we also have for the Sheriff's department some line item changes and some new lines. And I would just, Mr. President, like to request that this be made part of the minutes. And I think that wraps everything up there. And that is my motion.

President Bassemier: Do I have a second?

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: Second by Mr. Wortman. Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

President Bassemier: Okay, under old business, I don't think we've got anything under old business.

Jeff Ahlers: The only thing we'll have is there is a new draft coming that I'm going to give to you with some minor changes in the Jail lawsuit settlement to be

presented, so I don't know if, Mr. President, if you could proceed with the rest of the agenda. That should be arriving soon.

President Bassemier: Okay, thank you. Also, for information purposes, last Friday the Sheriff and Councilman Wortman and I, we visited Davis County Detention facility. That's a 423 bed facility, maximum security, 9.2 million dollar facility. I think we all picked up some ideas. The Sheriff thought it was very interesting and just – I thought it was a very nice facility. Curt, would you like to say anything about it? I know you was kind of impressed, especially for the price.

Councilmember Wortman: Thank you, Mr. President. Yeah, you and I and Brad went over there and I got an education is what I did, and it was worthwhile. A day well spent. And I appreciate you'se two going along and we went through everything. They showed some of the tricks that goes on in these jails and, of course, that's something the two gentlemen sitting in the front row are aware of all the time anyway, they've always got their eyes open. So has this place over there. But that was a fine facility and, of course, the two gentlemen here have visited about 25 of them, I think. So they're the ones that's going to have to really live with this situation, a new jail and what have you. And I think that's what impressed me over was this. So I'm going to be a good boy because I've seen how they do over there.

President Bassemier: Yeah. They also, they have other complexes over there. There's four complexes. They also have a juvenile detention center, I think. Sheriff, was that a 54 bed facility over there, juvenile detention?

Brad Ellsworth: (Inaudible – comments not made from microphone)

President Bassemier: And, of course, they've got two other complexes. That's on about I think he said 20 acres and so, anyway, I just...

Councilmember Hoy: Is it strictly, the juvenile facility over there, is that strictly detention or is that treatment and detention both?

President Bassemier: We didn't really go through it, but it's –

Brad Ellsworth: They also have a treatment facility. It's on the same campus and not under the same roof, but within 25 yards there's also treatment and long-term holding.

Councilmember Hoy: Because presently, and correct me if I'm incorrect, Monday night the vote of the Commissioners was strictly for detention here.

Brad Ellsworth: That's my understanding, include that in the plan.

Councilmember Hoy: So we have that part but we don't have the treatment facility that some of us who were in on and some of your folks were in on PMSI's, you know, that study. We were advocating also some sort of treatment facility as well.

Brad Ellsworth: And I know – I think there is a Commissioner here. I know that they talked about, you know, possibly obviously keeping the relationship with the Youth Care Center in their efforts.

Councilmember Hoy: In fact, they voted to sign a contract with Youth Care, but I

think that's important to get that in the record that we're looking at two different things.

Brad Ellsworth: I think, and if I may just for a second, because the more we all learn about each other's business and hear, the better off we are. There's just a lot of, I shouldn't say problems, but there are things that could happen that county government won't be able to just go to a board meeting and stop. Take the worst case scenario where an employee of a private company would mess up, molest a juvenile inmate. The problem you might have there is at the next board meeting, they think that's so heinous that they decide to close down the facility and that would be their right to do it and leave the county high and dry, where we wouldn't be able to just do that. Obviously, we'd guard against that. But those are the kind of things that you have to think of in advance, I think, and that's why I think having a juvenile detention, and I stress detention over correction facility, is important to us.

President Bassemier: They, we talked about, of course, they transport their inmates out to court. It seemed like it wasn't that big of a problem to them. They were telling us that it takes just as many men like what we would take over to our courts to transport these through their vehicles to court. And then, of course, I was thinking, how many acres, I was just thinking, just throwing this up, if we got some ground, you have about 28 acres out there in your facility, don't you, out there on Kansas Road?

Brad Ellsworth: I think it's 28 currently.

President Bassemier: We can kind of use that for food for thought if we can't find any ground.

Brad Ellsworth: If we could leave those pretty oak trees out there, that would be a wonderful setting. It's sits a little low. A few years ago when we had the horrible rains, you know, the water got up to the back of the one building, so we'd have to think about that. But that's certainly an option. To the Sheriff's Office, you know, if it's not directly connected to courts, whether we travel one mile or ten, it's not going to make that much difference, you know, that we're going to load up a bus or a van or whatever it ends up being. So that's not, if we travel, we travel. And that shouldn't be a concern for this.

President Bassemier: And I've tried to think, I know it might be a little problem, maybe the city police booking, having to go out there, but maybe we can utilize our present jail and keep it, maybe, in service also. So these are food for thought. Mr. Hoy.

Councilmember Hoy: I just wanted to go back to what the Sheriff said about using a private facility and the reading that I've been doing, what the Sheriff is saying is not just something out of his imagination, but it's from your reading, it's from my reading because a number of private facilities have been closed because municipalities and so forth thought they could save a lot of money and then they found out that they have a lot of problems. I think Alabama closed all of their private facilities for juveniles because they had so many lawsuits over treatment. The state of Missouri has had, I believe it's Missouri, had a horrible experience with private facilities. I am not saying the Rescue Mission would do that because they don't do that kind of thing, but we have to be careful as we move into this and I was glad the Commissioners voted to do this part of it under the county auspices.

Brad Ellsworth: We just can't delegate liability. It's ours regardless. If somebody

had a problem, they'd sue them and sue us. And like I said, we don't have the option of closing, we'd deal with it, but I know we have probably some of the most stringent hiring practices with lie detectors and voice stress and outside psychological evaluation and we still have problems every once in a while. But I think we're in the right direction.

Councilmember Wortman: Mr. President, I want to tell the Council, I know as Brad pointed out quite a few things, but one in particular like shower curtains, that he didn't want that. An inmate could hang himself with it, see. Things like that, see, so that was some of the points he brought out.

Brad Ellsworth: There's a lot of things after, you know, the people that were on before me and my career and even the people that work there now that with major problems and things like that, you know, where a shower head comes out, points out into the shower. I've been to jails where it was on the back wall and shooting out on the floor. Just little things like that, you know, and in our discussions with the architect who has been coming down on a weekly basis now, you know, those are all the things that we want to think ahead. And there's not a perfect jail out there but we'll do the best we can.

President Bassemier: (Inaudible microphone not turned on)

Brad Ellsworth: And you two saw from meeting with Jailer Taylor, and we certainly appreciate him giving us, taking the time to give a tour, is it seems like whether it's a ten bed jail or a thousand bed jail, everybody has the exact same problems. They have inmates that are doing the exact same thing and that's why it's nice to go compare notes and see what they did right and see what they did wrong. But every jail I've been to, whether it's been 50 beds or 500, they have the exact same problems. And it's just experience and you try to out-think them really.

President Bassemier: I know this is a small thing, but the garage where they bring the trucks in, they put a ten foot door instead of a 12 foot door. Now they can't bring the buses in, but they do use (inaudible – microphone not turned on) So that's the problem. We probably won't have that problem (inaudible). Those are just minor things (inaudible).

Brad Ellsworth: And that's things you'd think somebody would think about over the course, but there's one where you go back and you say what would you have done differently and they would have put two foot higher doors and I was in a brand new opened jail up in Lagrange County and they didn't put a roof over their exercise yard and people were coming in from the woods 20 yards back and throwing weapons up over into their outdoor exercise yard and they had to go back and retrofit an \$80,000 chain link fence over the top. Just, here's a brand new jail and they didn't think to cover their outdoor exercise yard.

President Bassemier: And you said something about a shower head, they put it out on the floor instead of back (inaudible)

Brad Ellsworth: And I appreciate you all going along. The more you see, the better eyes for us. So I appreciate you all going along.

President Bassemier: You're welcome.

Brad Ellsworth: Thank you.

President Bassemier: Okay, now we had a little time and I wanted to get that in, so under new business, Mr. Shively. He's got some things, also, to say.

Les Shively: Mr. President and members of the County Council, I'm embarrassed to say that, and by the way, thank you for placing us on the agenda. Ms. Deig told me that this was going to be a lengthy agenda and not to be here any sooner than 4:00 and to keep it short and all that. So there are other people that are supposed to be here with me today that have not arrived yet. So I don't know what your pleasure is, I don't know if Mr. Ahlers is ready for his business...he's not?

Jeff Ahlers: It's on the way, hot off the press. It will be here in five minutes, so it's up to you. We can either take a brief recess or if you want to proceed.

OLD COURTHOUSE

Councilmember Tornatta: Well, we can talk about something real quick. At the Commissioners meeting there was some talk from, I think everybody got their book for the Old Courthouse, \$750,000 for the slate roof. I think they have \$600,000 budgeted at this point, so just a little heads up from the Commissioners. I don't know if Catherine has got anything to say about that, but that's –

Councilmember Hoy: She does.

Councilmember Tornatta: But they came through with a very – with an excellent packet. I wasn't, part of the packet per se, was at some of the meetings, but they really did a bang up job on some of that. And Catherine and the Commissioners are going to come up with kind of a point list on things that they want to get done, aren't you, Catherine?

Catherine Fanello: Yes. That's what I was going to talk about. I'd like to work, I don't know how you want to kind of do this with the Council, but I'd kind of like to work with a couple of members on the Council if you want to put together a small committee or something. But to go through and prioritize some of the budget needs here. And I think it's going to have to be a joint decision about whether we want to restore the courthouse to its fullest extent. There were comments made Monday night that we just don't want to band-aid the project and I agree with that. And I think the general recommendation was that we need to turn the Old Courthouse back into a complete government center. Commissioner Mourdock made the suggestion of moving like the Auditor's Office, the Treasurer's Office, some of the constitutional offices over to that and Marsha had even talked about moving a couple courtrooms over there. So I guess we really need your input to kind of help us decide what our priorities are because we need to know I guess really how much money you want to put into it. So, I mean, I'm all for restoring it to its fullest extent and making it back into a government building and utilizing the Civic Center space for the courts building or any other space that we need so we don't have to go outside looking for other expensive space. So that's just what I wanted to add and would like your input and help on prioritizing some of the...

Councilmember Raben: Catherine, where is the society's, with their efforts on raising money for that facility? Have they all but...gone away or...

Catherine Fanello: They have stopped their efforts. And what they recommended in this study, if I can find it real quick, is for us to establish a foundation like the parks foundation, someone that would help raise money and also establish an

advisory board who would kind of oversee the building and make some decisions regarding the use of the building. And I think that's a good idea for us to establish a foundation like the parks foundation to go out and help raise money. But the society, to answer your question, has stopped that.

Councilmember Hoy: Did they not also, and I read some of that, I think the society also was willing to let their 501(C)3 status move over to the new –

Catherine Fanello: Foundation?

Councilmember Hoy: Foundation, the new non-profit.

Catherine Fanello: Yeah, if they can do that. Yes, I believe –

Councilmember Hoy: Yeah, that's probably feasible and then you have the sense of continuity because they can't, the 501(c)3 cannot legally give their money to anything else but another 501(C)3. And that would make that possible and also we wouldn't have to go through all the legal hoops you have to jump through to get that status which takes a lot of time.

Catherine Fanello: I was trying to find that real quick about the foundation, but it's under section three, financial and operations. Establish an advisory board to assist the county in the overall management of the facility and it's got some other procedures that they would handle. They also suggest a full-time building manager. I mean, we've put a full-time maintenance person in and we have a part-time maintenance person, so I don't know, you know, we'll have to look at that and see if we want to go any further with that. But establish an Old Courthouse foundation, help raise funds to supplement the governmental funding. Marsha brought up a very good point the other night that there is a lot of grant money out there and we probably need to hire a professional grant writer to go after that money and I agree with that.

Councilmember Raben: We're involved in so many things right now with Burdette Park, you know, just the jail, I mean, if you look at what a professional grant writer can do for you and the percentage, most of them work off of a percentage of what they bring in, and that could be anywhere from two to maybe five percent, but a good one will make you a lot of money, they'll save you a lot of money.

Catherine Fanello: Exactly, and I think we have so many projects going on, like you said, that it would be useful to have a grant writer on staff.

Councilmember Hoy: And you may have mentioned this, if you have I apologize for bringing it up again, but it would seem to me, also, that it would be good for us not only to do the roof and all of the things that Mr. Fosse, the architect, mentioned, but all the scaffolding is in place. Those copper domed things, the cupolas need to be done and they're expensive. They're about \$70,000 each, I think, but in the long run it would be cheaper to have that done at the same time because you've got your scaffolding in place and I think the word he used is an architectural word, that you would protect the envelope of the building so that it doesn't lose any integrity and then we can move from there with grants and so forth. It's a good report, excellent job.

Catherine Fanello: You know, they suggested we hire an architect or contract with an architect to do an overall, you know, plan that would come in phases like a phase one, phase two, phase three plan, you know, so we're not trying to budget

everything at one time, but we're taking it in phases. And I think that's probably a great idea. But as far as the roof, like Troy said, we put in \$600,000 in the budget because we weren't exactly sure and they didn't have their figures back yet, but it did come back to be \$737,000 is what Will Fosse said in the proposal and he suggested that we do the windows as well. And those were \$314,500.

Councilmember Hoy: Commissioner, the slate that he recommended, there is a modern substitute for that. Is that what he has recommended?

Catherine Fanello: I believe so.

Councilmember Hoy: I mean, it's still slate but it's...

Catherine Fanello: But it's not...historic.

Councilmember Hoy: Not quite as brittle.

Catherine Fanello: Exactly. I think he's recommended the most efficient.

AMENDMENTS TO SALARY ORDINANCE (CONTINUED FROM PAGE 14)
--

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Mr. President, can we go back to – was everybody finished with the Old Courthouse? Thank you. Can we go back to the Salary Ordinance amendments? I left one out. And I would like to move that Superior Court salary line 1370-1770 be classified as a Small Claims Reporter with a classification of PAT IV and also we would need to amend that salary line which is 1370-1801 and it be classified as a Small Claims Reporter with a classification of a PAT IV.

Councilmember Hoy: Second.

President Bassemier: Mr. Hoy, got a second. Any discussion on that? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

JAIL SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

President Bassemier: Okay, still waiting? Counselor, you want to...

Jeff Ahlers: Thank you, Mr. President, bringing back on the agenda as we had discussed was the Vanderburgh County jail inmates lawsuit pending in federal court. I can tell you that all the parties in the case and attorneys have worked very hard and diligently to reach what I think is a settlement that is good for the county. I can't tell you how many drafts we've been through and I apologize for the short delay as another change that didn't get in at the last minute, we got changed, and this is for sure got everyone's comments that everybody wanted all the way up to date into the agreement. The changes from the last agreement that I sent to you in the mail or that Sandie had delivered to you a couple days ago, there's just a couple minor changes that I'll go through to point out with you. Otherwise, for the most part, it's the same document. In paragraph ten, that should remain 6:00 p.m. At one point that had been changed back to 9 and it's back to 6:00 p.m. Then there are some other minor changes in that paragraph that are mainly just clerical changes with commas and whatnot, nothing substantive. In paragraph 12, temporary bedding has been changed to just say bedding for all prisoners. And you'll see that in your new copy. Paragraph 13, everything is the same as in the version that I sent to you and that I believe that you previously passed except for the last two sentences have been modified and that was the same paragraph 13 that was approved by the Commissioners this Monday night, that they okayed placing that into this version. And I believe the Commissioners have on their agenda to approve and sign the document in its entirety on next Monday. But that they did discuss it at this past Monday's meeting and approve the inserting of this paragraph 13 that exists in there.

Councilmember Hoy: Excuse me, Mr. Ahlers. I believe that was approved Monday night, was it not, Commissioner?

Catherine Fanello: Yes it was approved by Commissioner Mosby and Commissioner Mourdock –

President Bassemier: Can you hold just a second? I'm sorry, Catherine.

(TAPE CHANGE)

President Bassemier: Just want to change the tape. Okay, you are on.

Jeff Ahlers: If I could, I would give you just a couple more comments and you can have everybody discuss. Okay, so this agreement in the form that it is in now, is what was passed by the Commissioners on Monday night, by a two to one vote. They had just not because of the some of the changes, coming relatively close to the meeting, didn't have a, I guess a complete copy in nice, neat legal form to sign, so it has been approved and they are going to sign it when they are all together on Monday. Like I said, the last two sentences are fairly close to the prior draft but there have been some changes made so you may want to look at those closely. I

think that fulfills the concerns that the County Council had with regard to funding of the jail but preserves the rights of each of the parties to do what they need to do in order to move forward with either adding jail space, building a new jail, whatever it is that the County Commissioners and the County Council's then decides to fund, whatever you intend to do. In paragraph 15, we changed the language, it did say in that first sentence, it said, "we will proceed as soon, it said, as soon as, with all deliberate speed" and we have changed that to, "as soon as practicable". Because when we get into this area with regards to the dates and with regard architects and getting construction going, and the plaintiff's counsel, Ken Falk, with the ICLU recognized that we obviously, you know, in being honest, can't pinpoint what dates anything will proceed because we are just now getting underway but, they understand that in good faith, that it has been the intent of the county to add some jail space one way or another. In paragraph 17, we have taken out, similar to the comment I just made, we have added language that talks about that the plans needs to be first approved and that a lot, the purchase of a lot be approved, in order for time deadlines to start kicking in. It also has a language that allows some flexibility that if, you know, it is not going to be able to be done within two years from the date the plaintiff, it previously had the date the plans are approved, now we've got it to where it is after the contracts are let in terms of construction. But, once again, those dates can be changed. We changed in 17, also it had stated that it had with regard to an operational date and we have now changed that to a completion date because obviously there could be a time period that could pass between the time when it would be operable versus the time that it is completed, which allows the county more time. Paragraph 19, since the Sheriff came before us, in a previous meeting recently, and discussed the issue in terms of recreation of the prisoners and said that they were, you know, meeting whatever obligations he felt were necessary and that we took out the language that talked about putting in that the Sheriff make a feasibility assessment and report to us, etc., etc., we consider that to already being done and unnecessary and it was agreed by all parties, including the plaintiff, that that be eliminated as well. I believe that takes care of any of the major changes other than paragraph 27, which dealt with attorney's fees. You will notice that we took out the language and the Commissioners passed this language, stating that Ken Falk would be paid \$5,000 in attorney's fees and it now just states that in consideration of the acts and covenants in this agreement that the plaintiffs and their attorneys agree to waive claims for attorney's fees and then the rest of the language is pretty much the same as it was before. Mr. Falk has agreed to all of the changes in this agreement other than he was leaving on vacation and wanted to think about, since there is still some time before the 13th, and he didn't have to have an open meeting like we do. He has the ability to act unilaterally. He wanted to think about whether or not he's willing to waive his attorney's fees or how that might be dealt with. In terms of the defendants that we were all in agreement that our position at this time was to, as far as the settlement goes, not to agree to a place in the settlement document, any language for the payment for attorney's fees. As I said, I believe the Sheriff is here and can obviously speak for himself, but it my understanding in talking to his counsel and to Mr. Hayes, that the Sheriff is in agreement with this document, the Commissioners have passed it and I have been involved in drafting it and have shared all the drafts as we have come along. Most of them, some of them came out so fast, that I would update you as quick as I could, where we are. So, I don't know if you have any questions, whether you want to make a motion to pass and then have discussion, or however you would like to proceed, Mr. President.

Councilmember Hoy: I will move passage, Mr. President.

Councilmember Raben: Second.

President Bassemier: Any discussion? Catherine, do you wanna?

Catherine Fanello: Yes, I just want to reiterate my position. I can not in good conscience sign --

President Bassemier: Please state your name.

Catherine Fanello: Catherine Fanello, County Commissioner. I want to reiterate my position on paragraph 13 and in good conscience can not sign this agreement with that kind of language in there. I believe that the language is too questionable. I believe it is too political and I believe it gives the taxpayers the wrong impression. So, I will not be signing this document. So, I respectfully ask that you would remove language from that paragraph, which it has no place in this lawsuit. So, thank you.

President Bassemier: Catherine, I was curious, on the political end of it, what, I mean, I read it. Where's the political, how do you feel like it is political?

Catherine Fanello: Well, about restricting, who restricts powers and the parties shall not take any action. Let's see, "the parties shall not obligate Vanderburgh County, Vanderburgh County Council, Vanderburgh County Commissioners, levy taxes, increase taxes, issue bonds, borrow funds". And I think I went through that a couple of meetings ago. I, it's confusing, it's too political, about, I mean, you guys only have the authority to set the budget, which drives the tax rate. Commissioners don't have any authority over those types of things and you have the ultimate fiscal responsibility and we have the ultimate executive responsibility. So, it doesn't have any place in this lawsuit, because it makes it look like it is a lawsuit of the Council versus the Commissioners versus the ICLU and really this is the Council and the Commissioners versus the ICLU, so I just think that it is too political and it gives the wrong impression and I can't in good conscience sign it.

President Bassemier: Thank you, ma'am. Okay, I have a motion and second. Any more discussion? Roll call vote, please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes. Motion passed unanimously.

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

Councilmember Hoy: President Bassemier?

Jeff Ahlers: Thank you, Mr. President. I will circulate four original copies for signatures so that we can present on to the Commissioners, the Auditor can have one and then I can have a copy of copies in case we need them in terms of circulating signatures. If the Sheriff would like, he can sign as well. Yeah.

President Bassemier: Mr. Hoy, go ahead, I am sorry.

Councilmember Hoy: I just wanted to publicly thank our attorney, Mr. Ahlers. He has worked very hard on this and also the other two attorneys as well. It's, I appreciate the cooperation in bringing us to this, finally, to this moment.

President Bassemier: He did do a good job. Good job. Les, are you still by yourself?

LES SHIVELY/21ST CENTURY CORRECTIONAL CORPORATION
--

Les Shively: We are all here.

President Bassemier: God bless your heart. Are we ready? Okay.

Les Shively: Mr. President, members of the County Council. Again, for the record, my name is Les Shively, I represent an entity known as 21st Century Correctional Corporation. You may have heard that name before. Let me give you a little bit of background on this company and why it was formed. About a year and a half ago this company came into being and the purpose of this entity formed by a local business man, Ken English, was to come up with a way to meet the needs of this community to construct a new jail, which now you have obligated yourselves by virtue of this settlement of the lawsuit, to address the community correctional issue, and to provide a juvenile detention facility which this county has never had. This county started out in 1999 with an ad hock committee composed of what they called the stakeholders. The judges, the prosecutor, the public defenders, elected officials, Commissioners, County Councilmen, a whole array of all the, as they say it, the stakeholders in this issue. From that a consulting firm, a private consulting firm was hired, PMSI. I am not going to bore you with what their final report of May of last year provided. By now you are well aware of the fact that they recommended a correctional complex, a complex that would total approximately 749 beds, broken down between so many for juveniles, so many for the jail and so many for community corrections. Mr. English put together this company based upon successful efforts in other communities to basically provide a private way, not to operate, but a private way to fund this project, these projects, without the county having to borrow money, a sale and lease back arrangement. This arrangement was also set up so that the risk of cost overruns would be immediately upon entering into a contract with this company, those risks would be shifted to the private company. The cost would be fixed and the county would be in a position to make actually annual lease payments that would allow the county to do this project without having to incur debt. Community, excuse me, 21st Century Correctional Corporation put together a group of notable locals to make this a reality. They selected Edmund Hafer and Associates, who by the way, put together a proposal to the County

Commissioners earlier this year, that I believe was one of the Sheriff's top choices as a design entity. Industrial Contractors is the contractor selected by 21st Century to actually build this facility. Industrial Contractors projects' reputation is well known in this community and certainly they have a vested interest in seeing this project done right, they are a major player in southern Indiana and the Evansville community. Where are we today, after a year and half, following the highlights or low lights or however you want to describe what has occurred. My client first made a presentation in spring of last year to the County Commissioners, to basically mirror what PMSI had consulted with the county, and recommending to the county to do this privately. At that time, the former Commissioners indicated that the proposal was too premature for consideration. In the spring of 2001, the new Commissioners sent out requests for proposals for various design entities and 21st Century responded to that request for proposals by an alternate proposal again putting forth the sale and lease back, absorbing all of the cost, construction, design, all in one, one contract. The company, however, my client was not given the opportunity to make that presentation at a public meeting before the Commissioners and shortly thereafter, after a series of interviews with other entities, United Consulting was hired to do the design work. As of this date, I do not believe that there is actually a contract with the county and United Consulting. In fact, what is occurring, as I gather from the media and talking with those in the know, is that we are going through a series of additional public hearings on whether the complex should be at one place or different sites, or part of it operated by a not-for-profit entity, or whatever, which to me seems very similar to the discussions that we went through in 1999 and 2000 with the help and facilitation of PMSI. We also now hear that the projected cost, although no final design as of yet, is between \$50 and \$70 million, just in construction costs, which will translate to the taxpayers when you add in underwriting and interest, a cost of between at least \$100 million or more, depending upon a lot of variables, not the least of which is the interest rate at the time that you would go to the bond market. The problem of jail overcrowding persists, in fact as recent as this morning's paper, there is an article on the front page that is talking about the fact that the law enforcement community, this Police Department, the Sheriff's Department have advised their people in the field about arresting people, putting them in jail and sort of being very judicious with jail space, will still have the problem and we haven't solved it yet. Well, several months ago, I guess actually the earlier part of this year, the County Council took a bold step and I applaud you all for doing this. You drew a line in the sand, you said, here is how much that we are going to spend, and as the elected county fiscal body, here is the number and you looked at the County Commission and said you need to make it work within this number. We are here today to tell you that it can be done within that number. It can be done without borrowing money and it can be done so that it saves the taxpayers tens of millions of dollars. Now, how much will be saved? The cost difference is dependent upon a lot of factors, not the least of which is the selection of a site, which hasn't been done yet. City Councilman Curt John, in May of this year, assembled a group of community leaders and governmental officials to discuss why, I wouldn't call it a crisis, but a challenge facing this community. All of the capital projects that are going to look for funding from the tax base. The Voc Tech center that was approved, the first time that the School Corporation has gone to market, in I don't know how many years. The ice rink that is already there, Burdette Park, something is going to happen pretty soon with Mesker Park Zoo. We have the Evansville Sewer and Water Utility, although they don't use the tax base, they are going to affect the taxpayers, the rate payers, they are looking for \$250 million over the next ten years for their capital improvements. We need to be careful, as Councilmember John pointed out, in his May 24 meeting. We need to coordinate, we need to be smart, we need to be efficient in how we use the tax base and when and where we use debt. I can tell you, if you look just up the road at

Indianapolis, it is living proof that the progressive way of government is not to fund every capital project with bond issues. It is to look for private sector solutions. We believe that this is the way to go. The way Marion County did their new jail with bipartisan support without having to borrow money and what we are simply asking you all to do tonight and I know that you have had a long meeting and again a lot of these final figures are subject to many things, as I said before, not the least of which are site selection. We would ask this body to pass a resolution requesting the County Commissioners to give this proposal by 21st Century Corrections Corporation a public airing and once that is done, engage the services of an independent consultant, Umbaugh and Associates, Arthur Anderson Company, whoever the Commission and Council feels comfortable with, that doesn't have a dog in this fight, that isn't tied necessarily to this community, to compare the conventional method of hiring a design firm, going to the bond market, and by the way, going the conventional way will also involve another entity, I hear that they are talking about hiring a construction manager, which will add another four percent to the cost of the project. Let's pass a resolution and ask the Commissioners, as the executive branch, to look at this at a public hearing, asking the tough questions, then bring in the independent consultants, the financial consultants to analyze it and do what's best for the taxpayers of Vanderburgh County. You know, if it is about building a jail only, and if it is about doing it within your budget, to me that is a no brainer. With me today is Ken English, who started this concept and put together 21st Century Correction Corporation; Mr. Ed Hafer, of Ed Hafer and Associates; here to answer any questions that you have about this proposal.

President Bassemier: Mr. English, do you want to come forward, please? Please state your name for the record.

Ken English: Ken English.

Councilmember Winnecke: Mr. President, I don't have any questions, but I have an observation if I may. Where did Les go? I'm sorry. I think that it is premature for this body to act on a resolution like that. I think that what is going on now, Commissioner Fanello and myself have had two or three discussions. We are trying to set up a meeting now between key members of the Council, of the Commission, of Crowe Chizek to examine what the county's fiscal condition is in terms of financing a project like this. I think part of the process needs to be, what is the final number going to be? I think to sit down and say it's \$50 million, it's \$70 million, no one knows that for sure. I think that we need to know what that number is before that meeting occurs and at that point, we need to get the parties together. Crowe Chizek, we have already communicated with them to set up a meeting and we hope to do as soon as we can get some numbers back. I have to say that Commissioner Fanello has been open in these communications and for those reasons, it would be premature to act on a resolution like that at this time.

Les Shively: May I ask in response, Mr. Hafer is here, I know that Mr. English has looked at the PMSI recommendations, done preliminary design and they're a lot closer to a number than anyone else that has been involved in looking at this problem and solving this problem. If not now, at what point in time would it be appropriate to consider such a resolution or to at least have a public discussion of the comparison of the two methods of financing this capital project?

Councilmember Winnecke: In my mind, after we have an idea of what United Consulting says that it may cost to build the facilities.

Councilmember Raben: I do agree with you on maybe the timing of asking us to do

such a thing, but, I do think it is probably fair at some point that their proposal be looked at for two reasons. We might find 60 days down the road that Brad can't get everything that he needs to get for the sum that we have set. This does offer an alternative. If, in fact, they can do a lot more for the dollar limit that we have set, I think at some point in time, the Sheriff's department and the Commissioners are going to start cutting from the proposal that will be given to them from, what is the name?

Councilmember Winnecke: United Consulting.

Councilmember Raben: United, or they are going to need an alternative proposal. So, really I see no harm with this. It may at some point in time, we may, it may come down to this.

Les Shively: Let me just add to this, too. We are almost at an apples and oranges comparison. I don't mean this as disrespectful towards local government or any government, but you all know and many of you are involved in private business. If you have a capital project here, the cost of the public sector to do that versus private sector, eleven times out of ten, the private sector can do it cheaper. It is just the way it is. It is the way, private sectors work on capital projects with different variables and different approaches. So, to say, well, let's see what United comes up with in terms of a number, to me that may not fully analyze the issue as what are the facilities that are going to be needed for the county and how is, what are those costs? Because it is one cost, quite frankly, if you do it the conventional, old fashioned public project way and it's one fee if this gentleman and his company enter into a contract locked into a number and have to deliver on that number with the same set of specifications, that number is going to be lower every time.

Councilmember Raben: Well, again, I am not, I mean, I will go along with Councilmember Winnecke, I am not ready to act on a resolution today but, you know, I would like to say one more time, you know, that this body did set a limit on the amount of money that we intended to spend on a jail and if we found out months down the road that to get what Brad needs in a jail and a juvenile detention facility, you know, United may come back with a \$50 to \$70 million dollar figure. So, where are we at that point? You know, what does it really hurt to have an option to fall on?

Councilmember Tornatta: We've already got a, the Commissioners have already voted on that and stated their opinion, is that not the direction that we have to go at this point?

Councilmember Winnecke: Well, again, and I have stated that I am not ready to act on anything today. But, I do think that an alternative proposal-

Councilmember Tornatta: Well, that's what we had when they pared them down and went to the sixth and then decided on-

Councilmember Raben: Well, that was on a design team, this is something totally separate, this is a private contractor, or a privately owned facility that the county would lease. I mean, we would really, I mean, they never were, as far as I know, Ken English's group never was part of a design team or had a proposal in as a design team. He, I mean, it has always been my understanding that -

Ken English: (Inaudible)

Councilmember Raben: Right, and it has been that way from the beginning, so.

President Bassemier: Catherine, do you want to add to this? It's good that we are having this discussion.

Catherine Fanello: Catherine Fanello, County Commissioner. Councilmember Raben, you are correct to a certain extent. What the Commissioners decided that night when we picked a design team is that I know that Commissioner Mosby and I said that we needed something to compare it to and if United did come back with something that was so outlandish that we just couldn't possibly afford, I mean, we would look at private proposals, and Commissioner Mourdock had a very good suggestion, that if we are going to look at private proposals, we need to put out RFP's geared towards private proposals and let other people apply as well, because I know there are numerous people across the state that are in the privatized jail industry. So, I agree with you to a certain extent and I think that we are doing all that we can right now but we are not in any way counting out private proposals at all. As far as whatever they are designing or have designed to this point, I think that probably Brad would have to answer questions about that. So, go to the Sheriff.

Brad Ellsworth: Brad Ellsworth, Sheriff. After going to the Commissioners meetings and what I have seen, we are working and what I remember from the Commission meetings is that we are working with United now on the programming. In all due respect, Ken English is the first one that I met with in his proposal about that but we are doing the programming now on office space, doors, shower heads, which way they face. I think where we are at now is that they design what we feel Vanderburgh County needs. That might be, I should call it, the pie in the sky, juvenile, community corrections and jail. What we really need is designed and we get costs, that is when you give this to Mr. English and say what can you build this for. Can this beat the other people that might build it. I think that is what Mr. Mourdock meant was then we would offer it, is there anybody else out there that wants to take a shot at building this thing. The design that the stakeholders have designed for our building, and that was my understanding between the Commission and what is going on now. Present what we think we need to them and like I said, I don't know what they were, I saw the artist's rendition but I don't know if that means wooden doors, metal doors, hydraulic doors, electric doors, you know, that is the kind of thing. Once we get the drawings then we can present it to him and say what will you build this for? Then we get the building we want.

Councilmember Raben: Both you and the Commissioners, are you open to doing that at some point? When you are finished with the design and I guess the works that United does on preparing the design, is that something that can be forwarded on to other organizations?

Catherine Fanello: Well, I don't know that we can just actually take their design and forward it on but, I mean, I am sure that all of the information that we can gather, I mean, it is our information. You know, they come back, you know, like Brad said, we present what we need and they come back and tell us how much that is, that is the time that we talked about saying if it's not something this county can afford or do, I mean, that is the time to look at private proposals, like Commissioner Mourdock said, go out for other private proposals. We haven't closed the door on that.

Brad Ellsworth: If United designs it within these meetings, don't they then bid that out, different sections of electrical and bid it anyway. So, basically, it is taking this and bidding it to the private, and like I said, I am a novice at this, but would it not be the same as their bidding out the different aspects as them bidding the whole project out to them?

Councilmember Hoy: That's why, what Commissioner Winnecke said is true, when we reach that point, and with all due respect to Mr. English and Mr. Hafer, and Industrial, then you are still going to bid that, if you have a private building of it, and I certainly don't want a private entity running it, that's for sure, and that's what my speech earlier was about, that's just the wrong way to go, but in terms of construction, then you might have several people interested in doing this and so this would be, I am just saying the same thing that everybody else has said, is that it is too early to do this.

Brad Ellsworth: Well, on behalf of the Sheriff's office, the guts is what I am interested in and whether or not it's Mr. English who builds it or whoever, I don't care. If it is quality work -

Councilmember Raben: And I think that's, all of the parties that are involved, I think we want the most for our dollar. But, at some point in time, let's look at our lease rental option and see, maybe what it does have to offer for us. We may end up with an extra 100 beds, I mean, you just never know.

Catherine Fanello: Like Councilmember Winnecke said, I mean, I am trying to get this meeting set up with Crowe Chizek and, I mean, we, you guys need to take a good look at the financial information and we all need to take a look at that and see where we are and that plays a big part in everything.

Les Shively: I think there is some confusion about what Mr. English's proposal is all about because you are still thinking inside the box not outside the box in the sense that, it is a whole different approach to doing a capital project. You are doing an apples and oranges type of situation. All we are saying is, give this company and the people that they are affiliated with, Ed Hafer and Associates, Industrial Contractors and let me show you from the bottom up how, what there costs are gonna be, how they are going to do it and what it's going to cost the county. Because, how they come up with that and how that's different from the approach of hiring a design firm that comes up with costs and then you bid it out. You lose, you lose the economic efficiency if you say, okay we are going to do the design, and now if private entities want to come in and do it, you are losing that efficiency. All that is built into what they are putting on the table and the program that the sheriff alluded to that United is doing now. What this company has done is taken the basic skeletal program from PMSI and taken it to the next level, much the same way, in certain respects, that United is doing. But, all that is built into their total package. All I am simply saying is that before you get too far along and there are too many commitments out there and contracts signed, give them a listen. That is all I am saying, give them a listen and let them explain to you, there is a company out of Indianapolis, and I am remiss in not recalling their name, but there is a company that does nothing but provide consulting services for local government on doing private, public projects like this. What this basically is, it's a method of getting it built, not taking out of the hands of the Sheriff for operation, but getting it built so that you don't have to borrow money, and so you have that property tax base to use for other things, shall we say attractive and pleasant to the taxpayers, like zoos, ice rinks and things of that nature. The concern that I have and my client has is that if you wait six months from now you are not going to be able to realize the efficiencies, the cost savings, the bottom line, if you get too far along and now we have United Consulting, we've got a contract with them. We are thinking inside the box and doing things the same way we have for the last 50 years. We have to think differently. People, there are more demands on government and there is not a heck of a lot more money in government hands. You have got to be creative. All we are asking is give us a listen. We haven't had that opportunity. We are either

premature a year and a half ago or we're either too late. Just give it an airing, that's all we are asking.

Catherine Fanello: I have, you know, the information that they sent to me, I guess whenever I took office, I don't know if that financial information has changed or if any of that information changed in any way. We are not saying that we won't listen to him. They can come and make a presentation any time that they are ready to make one and if they want to make that financial information available, I mean, that is something that we can consider whenever we know the county's financial status. I'm not saying that they can't make a presentation, I don't think any of us ever said that.

Councilmember Tornatta: Les, are you saying that our decision, we would consider a decision before we hear what United has come back with? Because, I think everyone is okay with listening to the approach that we got but I think we are already working on a contract to get with United to find out those numbers for which we contracted, you know, hired them and voted on them to take care of.

Les Shively: But, you don't have a contract with them yet.

Catherine Fanello: Let me clarify just something that you said earlier, Les. When you talk about holding these public hearings, the reason that we are holding the juvenile public hearings and the community corrections, is to talk about the bed space. Which, obviously effects the contract and we are very close to, you know, getting a draft of the contract and I talked with United this morning and talked with Phil Hayes and he has a draft in hand that he is going over. So, it's not like we are not working on it, but, there was the, you know, juvenile proposal on the table and that was come to, you know, we came to a decision on that Monday night and this following Monday, we will have community corrections. Those public hearings really only have to do with bed space only. We are not talking about site yet, and the reason that we are not talking about site, is that because we want a design and we don't want a design driving the site. I mean, we want to have full control over what site we go out and pick, so, I mean, I think we are moving forward as far as a contract is concerned.

Councilmember Wortman: My understanding that 10% is the construction, or building of the jail, and 90% is operating. So, I think that we are going to have to be real careful here so that we don't get way out here - this is what bothers me - is the operation.

Catherine Fanello: I don't know because I haven't heard those percentages before from anybody. So, I don't know.

(Inaudible)

Catherine Fanello: Oh okay, I think, I don't know if the Sheriff can add anything to that, I don't know if that's true everywhere or if there is a general percentages of operations, I don't know if you know anything about that, but, that I have not heard.

Brad Ellsworth: I am not sure of exact numbers, that's what jailer Taylor said, but that is exactly right. You are talking about a huge over time, over years, percentage on this staffing and that is why this programming means that we are going through now. Inmate movement and how critical that is, of how many times it takes bodies to move an inmate and that staffing is probably more important, the floor plan that allows for the minimal inmate movement. The way to staff it and how many posts

you have, and 24 hour posts, you know, you need to put a guard here versus not here or close this floor down at night. That is the things that we are working through right now, to get that most efficient, to add the least amount of manpower for the budget. So, that is all in the programming phase. We have books and charts on staffing and analysis and we have been to schools on that too, so that's very important.

Councilmember Raben: You know, Mr. President, and Les, it sounds to me like, I am confused now as to why, what the Sheriff and the Commissioner Fanello have offered. To me, why is that not workable? I mean, the Sheriff is already going through meetings, daily he said, in terms of design and what he would like to see within the facility. When that is all completed, why is that too late for Mr. English and Mr. Hafer and yourself to make a proposal on the project? I mean, I'm -

Les Shively: I am sure that Mr. Hafer could address that in the design phase a lot better than I can. I would say this though, one comment with respect to Commissioner Fanello, looking at a projected cost and not knowing where you are going to put the complex, I mean, to me, every report that I have read and every community that I have picked up on and has built jails in the past five years, one of the major cost driving factors is your site selection. Now, I kind of scratch my head when I hear that. All I am simply saying is that before this project gets too far along with their commitments, contracts, what have you, you need to give this thing a good airing because it is a totally different approach to doing capital projects.

President Bassemier: Well, Les, that is why we have that 28 acres out there on Kansas, see they have the training center, it was about \$3 million for about 30 acres or 28 acres, and not only that but that brings up a point since Catherine is here, the inmates over there and the trustees over in Davis County in Owensboro, they saved over \$300,000 by inmates (inaudible) doing some of the work. They don't want to take any work away from the union people or whatever but there are some things that they can do.

Councilmember Hoy: Mr. President, I think the real issue here is, that the Commissioners via a process of RFQ's, have chosen, already chosen an architect, I don't think that you have signed a contract-

Catherine Fanello: We have not signed a contract yet.

Councilmember Hoy: But, you have chosen an architect, and what this proposal would do would replace that architect with Mr. Hafer, is that not right? You are laying a whole package out here that includes an architect, a construction firm, everything.

Les Shively: That's correct. That's exactly right.

Councilmember Hoy: The Commissioners have already made a decision -

Les Shively: They haven't signed a contract and all that I am simply saying-

Councilmember Hoy: I understand that but I am just trying to clarify the difference-

Les Shively: You stated it very well.

Councilmember Hoy: So, that's the difference.

Les Shively: That is the difference, but by the same token, before the contracts are set, before there is a position that they can't undo without cost and penalty with no cost to the county, that is why we are saying before that happens, let's get all of the questions answered and make sure that this sale and lease back arrangement isn't the most prudent way to proceed for the county. Because, once there are contracts and once that initial selection for design work by the County Commissioners is placed into a contract, which you as the fiscal body have to pay for, let's look at the other alternatives. You know, we are saying to you that we think, that depending on certain factors like site selection, you are talking about saving millions of dollars over the period of time that this would be financed or leased that could go for other things that this county needs, and what is it going to cost to get a little bit of time before those positions are taken, contracts are written that you can't undo.

Councilmember Tornatta: We don't have anything to do with contracts in this body.

Les Shively: I understand that.

Councilmember Tornatta: So, to go against an established, they have approved to have a contract signed with this company and I don't know, you're going to have to tell me.

President Bassemier: We are going to change the tape.

(TAPE CHANGE)

Councilmember Tornatta: No, I'm not sure how you reverse the vote on a contract. Do you have that knowledge, how you do that?

Catherine Fanello: All I know is that you're the fiscal authority and we're the executive authority on...

Councilmember Tornatta: Right, so I guess it would go back to getting in with the Commissioners on their docket and going through them first and then if they are willing to do something, then it will come to us. Is that not the rite of passage?

Catherine Fanello: All I can say is I can assure you, every Commissioner, all three of us want nothing more than to save this county as much money as possible. None of us want to spend any more than we have to and I don't think anybody in this room does either. So I think that right now we're taking the steps necessary, you know, the Sheriff is getting his information together and what he needs. I mean, we've pretty much given him the design control because he is the expert and authority in his area. So, I mean, he's handling that whole deal. And to answer your question, we probably will have a contract signed in about – I've been told that there will be draft for the Commissioners to approve or make changes to by the 13th.

Councilmember Wortman: I guess, Mr. Shively, this firm versus the government, has this been done before?

Les Shively: Yes sir.

Councilmember Wortman: And was there considerable difference in the financial?

Les Shively: Yes.

Councilmember Wortman: Enough to be recognized?

Les Shively: Yes sir.

Councilmember Wortman: And you have several cases of that illustrated? Is that possible to relay to the Commissioners and the Council?

Les Shively: Yes sir, and that's what we want the opportunity to do. Exactly, and one of – and I've got to be very careful because Marion has some private operations involved, but Marion County is one right here and there are others, and Mr. Hafer's affiliation with Jacob's facilities, which was one of the premiere designers in this country, can bring all that information. That's what we want to do. When we show you that, I think you'll just be amazed because it's a whole different approach to doing capital projects. And it's never really been done around here.

Councilmember Wortman: Thank you.

Councilmember Raben: But, Les, we can still make that comparison based on one document. I mean, that's the nice thing about having two proposals is that they would both be very much alike in scope of the project, so I'm still confused as to why we can't allow United to complete the design work and know that everybody is bidding on the exact same project. Then we really do find out what the true savings is. We don't have two different designs.

Les Shively: In one sense, but you do lose a component of savings and that is the one stop shopping aspects of, you sign a contract with a company that designs it, builds it, boom, boom, boom, down the line, you're losing a little bit of –

Councilmember Raben: But the county is already on the road to spending this other money. I understand there's not a contract that's signed as of yet, but there is going to be. So, I mean, you know what I'm saying, we're going to get that regardless. So –

Les Shively: I understand that. But be aware of this fact, the Commissioners are talking about, I don't know if they did this last Monday, but I think it's scheduled in the not too distant future, to start interviewing contract management firms. Well, to me, that's not leaving the door open for sale on a lease back if you've got the design firm, now it looks like we're heading down the road of the old way of doing things, which is going to be extremely costly, and not only costly, it's going to have a real impact on the ability of the county, the city, the school corporation, to do the necessary capital projects in the next five to ten years that need to get done around here.

Councilmember Hoy: I have a question. You mentioned Mr. Hafer and Jacobs because, is it Jacobs?

Les Shively: Yes, Jacobs Facility.

Councilmember Hoy: Because when they were looking for RFQ's, I believe that Mr. Hafer and Jacobs made a proposal and I'm wondering why they didn't come in with this kind of – that would have been an opportunity to make this kind of proposal and I'm wondering why not. That would have been – then the Commissioners could have looked at that –

Les Shively: The RFQ did not – it was a request for qualifications for design companies. It did not, and to do a direct response to the RFQ, there was no flexibility to respond with that set up other than the way the 21st Century Correctional

Corporation did by virtue of submitting an alternative response.

Councilmember Hoy: I understand that one firm did, however, and correct me, Commissioner, if I'm incorrect, virtually came to the microphone and said, we can't do this anyway. They said you have not, I forget the name of that firm, but they –

Catherine Fanello: It was HOK with –

Councilmember Hoy: – and it was an incredible statement that they made. Am I not correct in that?

Catherine Fanello: That was HOK with Veazy, Parrott & Shoulders. And also, one of the requirements were that one architect couldn't be on two different teams, so I don't know if Mr. Hafer was on both teams, that would have been a problem.

President Bassemier: Mr. Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: With all due to respect to everyone who was speaking, I think we're starting to beat a dead horse here. And I guess to beat it one last time, I guess, my opinion is the Commissioners made a decision. I, personally, wrote a letter to each of the Commissioners endorsing the Hafer/Jacobs group. I thought they were the most qualified. The Commissioners selected United. I think this Council is duty bound to honor the Commission's decision, as much as I'd like to see someone else get the work. And I think if we do what you're suggesting at this time, we're going to circumvent that process. I think our, as been articulated, our role is to finance whatever is done and the Commission's job is to be the executive branch, and I think we should allow them to do that work.

President Bassemier: Is there any more questions (inaudible – microphone not turned on)

Les Shively: Thank you very much for your time. I hope we can continue the communications, Commissioner Fanello. Simply, we, again, we appreciate being placed on the agenda and allowing to have this public discussion. I think it's been helpful to everybody. Thank you very much.

President Bassemier: Anybody got anything to add?

Councilmember Tornatta: Motion to adjourn.

Councilmember Hoy: Second.

(Meeting adjourned at 5:01 p.m.)

VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL

President Ed Bassemier

Vice President Lloyd Winnecke

Councilmember James Raben

Councilmember Phil Hoy

Councilmember Curt Wortman

Councilmember Royce Sutton

Councilmember Troy Tornatta

Recorded by Teri Lukeman. Transcribed by Teri Lukeman and BJ Farrell.

VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL
BUDGET HEARINGS
AUGUST 7, 2001

The Vanderburgh County Council met in session this 7th day of August, 2001 in Room 301 of the Civic Center Complex. The meeting was officially opened by President Ed Bassemier at 9:08 a.m.

President Bassemier: I want to welcome everyone to the August 7, 2001 or day one of our budget hearings. Attendance roll call, please.

COUNCILMEMBER	PRESENT	ABSENT
Councilmember Tornatta	X	
Councilmember Sutton	X	
Councilmember Wortman	X	
Councilmember Hoy	X	
Councilmember Raben	X	
Councilmember Winnecke*		X
President Bassemier	X	

(*Councilmember Winnecke joined meeting after roll call was taken.)

President Bassemier: Would everyone please stand for the Pledge of Allegiance?

(Pledge of Allegiance was given.)

President Bassemier: Before we get started, Finance Chairman, do you have anything to say before we get started?

Councilmember Raben: Not at this time. I think everybody understands we’ve got a very large budget this time and everybody is as concerned as I am about protecting the tax rate we’re going to have to make some major decisions and some heavy cuts. I’ll update you as we get into next week.

President Bassemier: Thank you, Mr. Raben. Anybody else got anything to say? Okay.

TREASURER’S OFFICE

President Bassemier: First on the agenda is the Treasurer’s Office. Please state your name.

Z Tuley: Z Tuley, Vanderburgh County Treasurer.

President Bassemier: Thank you, ma’am. Anything that you have to say about your budget before we ask you questions?

Z Tuley: The only thing that there would be a change there has been a very nice cut in the printing. I found out something that I was going to need to use has become available through the bank at a much reduced rate because it is not that difficult for the banks to capture our canceled checks as they go through the system, so this is going to save quite a bit in the printing. So I have...I don’t know if you need a copy of it?

President Bassemier: Yes, sometime if you can get us a copy.

Z Tuley: Okay, I’ll get you a copy.

President Bassemier: Did you say something about the savings is going to be about \$10,000?

Z Tuley: Right, now that this is available.

President Bassemier: Okay. That is on page 11, I'm sorry. That's on page 11.

Z Tuley: Right. I turned in this budget in mid June and the letter that I've got from Integra that tells me it's available is dated July 24th.

President Bassemier: Okay, questions? Mr. Hoy.

Councilmember Hoy: A comment and a question. But I'm the liaison to the Treasurer's department and she has gone over all that printing with me. I don't know whether you might want to take a moment to, you know, go into the rest of it or not. As far as I am concerned it's things she is going to have to do.

Z Tuley: Right.

Councilmember Hoy: To collect taxes and keep us going. But if there are any questions about it, otherwise and then I think Mrs. Tuley it might be good if you touched on the office machine request. You and I have been over that also and the Council might like to hear that.

Z Tuley: Okay. I am asking for replacement of four old computers. They're about 200 megahertz and what is available now is a gig, am I saying that right? What it is it will speed up the process so that when the girls answer the phone and they need to switch screens. With the 200 that we have now the process the changing these screens is real slow, so what you're talking about what should be a two minute phone call is probably taking more like five. This is a real killer for all the taxpayers and a burden to our staff at heavy tax time in particular because most of the taxpayers are calling from their work and we're holding them up from their job and they're on the phone wanting answers and we're having to sit there and wait for our computer screens to change. Now last year I replaced three computers that you all appropriated me the money for and I told you then that I wasn't asking for everything that I needed at that time, but I was asking for everything that I couldn't do without. Now I want to take this on and to step forward and I told you I would phase these computers in and not ask for the entire office to be replaced all at once. So this year I would like to do four.

President Bassemier: Mr. Wortman.

Councilmember Wortman: Mr. President, thank you. Is the Council like last year didn't we put some of this in for this year instead of spending it in next year's budget put some of this like computers and cars for the Sheriff and things. I think we should keep this in mind for what the total is going to be so we can probably regulate that and have that for you, see. Like we have officeholders like here for an example, see.

President Bassemier: Anybody else?

Councilmember Tornatta: Mr. President?

President Bassemier: Mr. Tornatta.

Councilmember Tornatta: Z, we had talked on three computers on replacement but it is going to end up being four?

Z Tuley: It's really four. I quoted three off the top of my head.

Councilmember Tornatta: Okay, but that's all in this?

Z Tuley: It was four when I pulled it up.

Councilmember Tornatta: Okay.

Z Tuley: And then it will be like three in 2003 and then we should be brought up to par.

Councilmember Tornatta: Okay, and that's a couple of cameras and then the calculators, right?

Z Tuley: Right, right. We had three calculators go out this year and I asked our bookkeeper to go back through the purchasing records and find out how old some of these calculators were. Nine of them were purchased before 1993, so I am not anticipating to have to replace all nine of them, but it is quite possible, so I have figured in for I think I figured in about half, five or six, that I would probably have to replace because there is no way they're going to last that long.

Councilmember Tornatta: Z, did you also...we talked about the other supplies because we had shifted some of that over to contractual services.

Z Tuley: Right.

Councilmember Tornatta: Did you find out anything more on that?

Z Tuley: I don't think that as far as budget preparation that I was willing to let go of any of that because in the past I did not prepare this budget and in the past at the end of a year we would be quote/unquote without money and needing particular items so we would have to wait until the first of the year and then load up, so to speak. So, no, I didn't really want to give there.

Councilmember Tornatta: Okay, and what we're talking about here is the contractual services had been set at zero. The other supplies was actually taking care of the contractual services. So now we're looking at a request in contractual services and I had asked her before about the other supplies would that take that down some on other supplies. Just looking at what they had spent this year and obviously you see that there is a discrepancy on this year versus the other years and it looks like that's because they are trying to put that in contractual services.

President Bassemier: Z, on your extra help are you going to need that?

Z Tuley: I really would like some extra help. I haven't actively sought anyone at this time because I couldn't make a firm commitment until coming before you all, but the Treasurer's Office lost a staff member and a position was given up. That's one less body to answer the phone. From the time that the bills go out all the way through the end of May we are clobbered with constant phone calls. I'm not asking that someone fill that entire time slot, but when it does get down to about four weeks before tax deadline in May and a couple of weeks so basically six weeks out of the year I really need to bring someone in that is willing to work at that time and work the 40 hours and answer the phone where we used to have a body that answered those phones and to help pick up some of the slack, particularly during the lunch hours we really hurt. I think that if the wage for this position was set at a decent scale that I could have someone who just wants to work a little bit for a little extra money and come in. I really would like to have somebody that I can make it worth their while to stay with me so that they come back year after year and me not have to retrain.

President Bassemier: Okay, thank you. Mr. Wortman.

Councilmember Wortman: Mrs. Tuley, 3610 how are we doing on legal service collection on them taxes?

Z Tuley: Well, at this time what that is set in for is for all of our bankruptcy difficulties. We

hire Bob because he is a bankruptcy expert and right now what he does is when we run into where we have a tax sale/bankruptcy you can't really on some of them sell those properties because they are protected by bankruptcy, but sometimes there are little more difficult tasks. Right now he is handling the convention center which has went well above and beyond what I have set in the budget, but basically what he does is he takes care of the bankruptcy side which we do run into an awful lot.

Councilmember Wortman: As a matter of fact he is making headway so it's a worthwhile venture then?

Z Tuley: Oh, yeah.

Councilmember Wortman: Yeah, thank you very much.

Z Tuley: He is protecting us very nice.

Councilmember Hoy: He gets first claim on those funds and he has done well with them.

Z Tuley: Without representation we would really be in trouble and for some of the things that we thought might be okay to go ahead and like sell on tax sale we would have gotten into more trouble, so I think that—

Councilmember Hoy: What I would like to do between now and next week so we can move ahead is we'll sit down again and go over your budget. We're a little...I'm a...I'll speak for myself because this is not just for you, but as we go through this whole process because we have made promises on Sheriff's cars and things like that and I am hopeful we can still do that, you know, out of this year's budget. However, all of us are sitting here on pins and needles as you know and this speech isn't just for you as you know because we've worked well together, but when I went to the Commissioners last night and I heard the Sheriff saying we need 700 to a 1,000 bed jail and judges standing there wanting more beds in community corrections rather than less. I mean, you know, I have to go on record as being dismayed that the week before when we were talking about juveniles there was not one judge there speaking for young people, but there were umpteen judges last night saying give us more beds, give us more beds. So, you know, I think that's the crunch we're facing. But why don't we take some time to go over this. I think we can iron this out and get what you need.

Z Tuley: Okay.

President Bassemier: Anybody else. Thank you Ms. Tuley.

Z Tuley: Thank you.

WEIGHTS & MEASURES

President Bassemier: Okay, the Levee Authority we're going to pass for now. Kelly had two other meetings at 9:00 so I am going to work him in. Weights & Measures. That would be on page 88. Loretta, please state your name.

Loretta Townsend: Loretta Townsend, Weights & Measures.

President Bassemier: I thank you, dear. Do you got anything you want tell us before—

Councilmember Raben: The games begin.

President Bassemier: Yeah, it would be nice.

Loretta Townsend: Uh, no. I've just asked for what we need, no more and no less and that's about it. I mean, we've got eight that...of course, the top part of it we have no control

over so that is out of our hands. Eight of them remain the same. We cut two of them by \$1,300 and seven of them we had to add more. Like I think the most we added to one line item was like \$200 for a total of pluses of \$750 so we have pretty well stayed within what we have for a number of years.

Councilmember Raben: Loretta, in this...maybe I need to direct this question to Catherine, but in terms of the rent that is submitted...

Loretta Townsend: Yes?

Councilmember Raben: I don't know, Catherine, I hate to put you on the spot here, but she has \$5,300 for rent.

Catherine Fanello: We have not changed her rent. That is still based on if she is staying where she is until we prioritize the needs over at the courthouse. Until we kind of get a budget for the restoration and we see exactly what office we're going to move over there. Like I don't know if you were in there that night, but Commissioner...I know Councilman Hoy. Commissioner Mourdock made the comment about moving some of the constitutional offices over like the Auditor, Treasurer and things like that. I think that is, you know, definitely something that all the Commissioners want to look at, but we just don't know yet so we did leave it the same for right now.

Councilmember Raben: Okay.

Loretta Townsend: This is the amount, Jim, that was agreed upon by Mr. Bayes, too, for next year's rent. No, I asked because I always call and talk to them before I have to turn in my budget to see what the following year is going to be and this is the amount that it will be for 2002 at the hotel.

Councilmember Raben: Okay.

Loretta Townsend: So where we are now.

Councilmember Tornatta: That's the entire amount for the county, right?

Loretta Townsend: No. No, no, no, no. The entire amount for the county will be \$2,916.65. The city pays \$2,386.35. So it is actually less than \$3,000 for the county.

Councilmember Tornatta: Is that something that we would like to adjust down? I mean, for our budget? Because, I mean, we wouldn't want to carry anything in our budget for the city, is that right?

Loretta Townsend: It's a contract that was drawn up. I think it is renewable every three years and this isn't the year. I looked at it early in the year, but this isn't the year for it. They pay 45 percent and the county pays 55 percent.

Councilmember Tornatta: Right, I thought you said...if that's the case does the city reimburse us?

Loretta Townsend: Yes.

Councilmember Tornatta: Is that how it works?

Loretta Townsend: Yes.

Councilmember Tornatta: Okay.

Loretta Townsend: Every so often they send...somebody sends the bills. I guess the Auditor's Office does to them and they in they send a check back and it is quietused in.

Councilmember Tornatta: Okay.

President Bassemier: Mr. Wortman.

Councilmember Wortman: Ms. Townsend you always within your.

Councilmember Raben: I think we picked up...Troy, I think we—

Loretta Townsend: We must be relatives, Curt.

Councilmember Wortman: Yeah, we must be related, yeah, but you've done a good job and we always appreciate you coming in with a budget you never raise and if you do come back later on in the year if you need it you ask for it. Because otherwise you won't ask for it if you don't need it and you've been very good about that.

Loretta Townsend: Well, what helped us a lot was cutting back on travel. You know, there has been conferences and this type of thing, but I just can't see paying \$180 a night to stay someplace because the conference is there. I mean, that is so...I haven't gone in a couple of years and won't as long as they do that stuff.

Councilmember Hoy: Mr. Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Mr. Hoy.

Councilmember Hoy: Mrs. Townsend, what is the split between the city and the county, I forgot?

Loretta Townsend: Forty-five city and 55 county.

Councilmember Hoy: Fifty-five county? Thank you.

Loretta Townsend: I gave to you all a thing something like this that breaks it down, the exact amount for each county and each city because it shows you that really what we're asking for you're not paying the whole freight on it.

President Bassemier: Anybody else? Thank you, Loretta.

Loretta Townsend: Okay.

COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

President Bassemier: County Commissioners. That will be on page 82 and then also on 141 on CCD. Page 82.

Catherine Fanello: Okay. I don't know if you have any questions on the Commissioners' budget. I'm sure you'll have some questions on some of the contractual items.

President Bassemier: And please state your name, I'm sorry.

Catherine Fanello: Catherine Fanello, County Commissioner.

President Bassemier: Thank you. Okay, anything you would like to tell us before we—

Catherine Fanello: We did add an assistant county attorney and that salary was put in at your Council attorney's salary, so we are asking for that. Insurance, I talked to Dennis Feldhaus over at ONB Insurance and our insurance is supposed to go up between 12 and 15 percent, so I did increase the insurance account to reflect that. Actually, less than 15 percent. I'm hoping it won't go up that much. The other items like Southwestern Mental Health and Hillcrest, those are all based on contracts and they have sent us those amounts

and I've got copies of those if you need them. The Soil & Water account did go up a little bit. They asked for, I believe, some filing cabinets and a cell phone and you had some dues increases, didn't you?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes, the file cabinets...if anybody complains about furniture they should go out to SWCD and you will see the county outcast's desk there and all that. We're not asking for that, but the file cabinets are shot. The state doubled the dues and we have met that and cell phone is something we need in the budget badly because Mr. Wathen uses the vehicle and we have 65...at last count 65 developments going on in the county which means he is on the road a lot, so that's what that is about.

Catherine Fanello: So a little bit less than...well, a \$1,400 increase over last year. The Patient/Inmate Care account if you notice in '99 and 2000, '99 we spent \$1.8 million and 2000 we spent \$1.9 million and in conferring with Bart O'Connor over in Judge Niemeier's office they suggest that we put it in at \$1.9 which would be, you know, reflective of what has happened the last couple of years, so that one did go up from last year.

President Bassemier: Anybody got any questions?

Councilmember Hoy: This is a very small amount, but as you know we're looking at everything.

Catherine Fanello: I know.

Councilmember Hoy: Under 3070 Memorial Day Service it went from \$1,500 to \$2,000.

Catherine Fanello: Yes. They sent a letter requesting actually that we increase it by \$1,000 and I only increased it by \$500. Just the cost of providing flags and Memorial Day services they asked for an increase in order to do those programs.

Councilmember Hoy: And we had not spent anything by June 30th so the bills will be coming in?

Catherine Fanello: Yes, they should be.

Councilmember Hoy: Okay, thank you.

President Bassemier: Mr. Sutton.

Councilmember Sutton: I've got a question...no, that's okay. I'll just ask a little bit later.

President Bassemier: Okay.

Councilmember Raben: Catherine?

Catherine Fanello: Yes.

Councilmember Raben: Deposition is 3170. There has been nothing expended.

Catherine Fanello: I just put that in there. Actually you can cut it if you want or not put anything in there. I didn't know if you traditionally do put something in there, but we haven't had anything this year.

Councilmember Raben: Okay. And Examination of Records 3280 that is doubled?

Catherine Fanello: Yes, I thought that...well, in 2000 we spent 22. I guess we could ask Suzanne, do you know how much they are going to—

Suzanne Crouch: I'll have to look that up, but I do believe they have increased their cost.

Catherine Fanello: That's what I thought, so—

Suzanne Crouch: And sent a letter to that affect.

Catherine Fanello: Okay.

Suzanne Crouch: I'll try to get that information for you.

Catherine Fanello: So I just went ahead and put it in at 20.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, you know, one question I did have, too, in this budget there is nothing for a commitment that you've got with Bayes for January.

Catherine Fanello: That's what I was going to bring up today. The Graham commitment and the Bayes commitment. Now the Bayes commitment, our commitment is coming out of our Riverboat money for the Bayes, the \$500,000 that the Commissioners were putting up, so that is going to come out of Riverboat next year. But I did want to bring up and Lloyd is not here and we talked about it the other day, but the \$300,000 from the Graham packaging and I think he talked to you about that as well, so I didn't know if...we probably need to set that in somewhere today or I don't know if that actually needs to be appropriated this year or if it is going to be paid out this year or if we're not paying it out until January of next year because it is for the rail spur.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, and that...since you brought that up that was a question of mine. I guess just as recent as yesterday and we'll find out when he gets here, but he had insinuated that it was no longer for a rail spur that it was for items other than that.

Catherine Fanello: Oh, that I am not aware of because I had a meeting a couple of weeks ago with everyone. Actually, Ed Bassemier was there and everything I know that we're giving them and all the grants coming from the state I think there is \$452,500 coming from the state. That is supposed to all be for the rail spur.

Councilmember Raben: Okay.

Catherine Fanello: We can talk to him when he gets here.

COMMISSIONERS CCD

President Bassemier: Anybody else? Okay, let's go to page 141, CCD. Do you want to say anything about that, Ms. Fanello?

Catherine Fanello: Uh, let's see. We put in \$1 million for the Discovery Lodge and I think probably most of you are aware that won't cover everything. I think we need about another \$900,000 unless we're going to...maybe not that much if we're going to go in and cut some of the design, but that's something, I guess, that we need to talk about. One hundred and twenty-five thousand for motor vehicles for the Sheriff's Department and \$500,000 for St. George and Oak Hill intersection improvements.

Councilmember Hoy: I have a question about, excuse me, Motor Vehicles.

Catherine Fanello: Uh-huh.

Councilmember Hoy: I had a note someplace is that money for the Sheriff in two places?

Catherine Fanello: Yes, actually they're need \$250,000 this year and traditionally I had noticed in the past budget that the Sheriff, I think he paid for quite a few things out of CCD funds, but some of the Sheriff's vehicles have been paid out of there before. So we did vote in our meeting to put \$125,000 in there.

Councilmember Hoy: I thought this had to do with a van for Community Corrections?

Catherine Fanello: It could. They had several vehicles they were purchasing. You would have to ask them.

Councilmember Hoy: It was a \$45,000 van.

Councilmember Raben: I think Community Corrections—

Councilmember Winnecke: I think they had that in Community Corrections, \$45,000.

Councilmember Hoy: Yeah, I thought there was a note on that that said it was in both places, in his rationale. In the Sheriff's rationale I believe there was a note that he also—

Catherine Fanello: They have a couple of big projects that they actually...they actually sent us a letter about three projects they have.

Councilmember Hoy: Does anybody have the rationale with them? I apologize, I forgot mine.

Councilmember Raben: No, but there is in Community Correction and there is \$250,000 in the Sheriff's budget.

Catherine Fanello: Then they would need to cut their \$250,000 by \$125,000.

Councilmember Hoy: Let me go back again, Commissioner. The \$125,000 for vehicles is all for the Sheriff's Department?

Catherine Fanello: All for the Sheriff.

Councilmember Hoy: Okay, thank you. That's clear and we can go from there.

Councilmember Sutton: Catherine, I was going to ask you on the Discovery Lodge with what has been requested at the \$1 million mark if this amount were appropriated how would we anticipate that these funds would be used being that this would not make up the total amount.

Catherine Fanello: We wouldn't...I don't think you would find myself or Commissioner Mosby signing off on anything until we had all funds in place and we said so in our Commissioner meeting because obviously you can't go in and build half of a building. The site work, I believe...Steve Craig is here. I believe most of the site work is finished. There is probably some things they need to do on the outside, but the million dollars would have to sit there until you can fund the remaining portion of it because we're just not going to sign off on it until all the funds are in place.

Councilmember Sutton: And you said the amount that is was—

Catherine Fanello: Yeah, it came in at \$1.9, around \$1.9 something and I think we had originally anticipated about \$1.6. So obviously there is probably some room to make some cuts there, but we just won't start it until we know for sure we have all the funds in place.

Councilmember Raben: You know this...I know would probably not allow something like this, but you know part of the shortfall that we've got I wonder, I mean, actually the School Corporation could probably pick up some of that because of what is done out there, but I don't know how you would ever get that to happen.

Catherine Fanello: I don't know, I mean, unless you would talk to somebody who might be willing to do that.

Councilmember Sutton: Once upon a time there was some discussion about, you know, and I know they had applied for some grants for this lodge. I didn't know if there were any thoughts or considerations of continuing that process?

Catherine Fanello: Oh, yes. What we're hoping to get is some Build Indiana funds, but as you know earlier this year they were suspended and obviously the suspension has been lifted, but we're still hoping to get some grant money. So any grant money that we got obviously we would just give you back the money that you appropriated.

Councilmember Raben: And actually, Royce, since 2000 Build Indiana has given \$195,000. The Build Indiana Fund gave \$145,000 in 2000 and \$50,000 in 2001.

Councilmember Sutton: Keep it coming.

Catherine Fanello: So we'll continue to seek out that grant money.

President Bassemier: Mr. Hoy.

Councilmember Hoy: The thing that is confusing me and we need...at least I would like to see this cleared up. Coming back to the vehicles is under the Community Corrections' budget on page 105 there is \$30,000 for a vehicle. In the Sheriff's rationale there is \$45,000 for a new prisoner transport van which would not be the same as that it seems to me.

Catherine Fanello: See, I don't know exactly which ones.

Councilmember Winnecke: Phil, that's not the line.

Councilmember Hoy: In Community Corrections?

Councilmember Winnecke: There's what, four of them?

Councilmember Hoy: It says Motor Vehicles \$30,000.

Councilmember Winnecke: Yeah, there is four different categories under the Sheriff and it is under one of those.

Councilmember Hoy: Well, my confusion arises from \$30,000 there, you know, and I'm not criticizing you, Commissioner. In his rationale this money for the \$45,000 was also requested from the CCD budget and also their budget.

Catherine Fanello: In their defense they may have not realized that we actually put \$125,000 in our CCD.

Councilmember Hoy: We just need to—

Catherine Fanello: Clarify it.

Councilmember Hoy: —clarify it, that's all.

President Bassemier: Any more questions?

DRAINAGE BOARD

President Bassemier: Drainage Board. That would be—

Catherine Fanello: I don't think anything really changed in that except a three percent increase.

Councilmember Hoy: This is the Old Courthouse in CCD.

President Bassemier: Page 79. It looks like pretty well everything stayed the same.

Councilmember Hoy: On the Old...where is it? Okay, never mind.

Catherine Fanello: Okay.

Councilmember Hoy: The Old Courthouse is someplace else.

Catherine Fanello: Yeah.

Councilmember Hoy: We'll look at that.

RIVERBOAT

President Bassemier: Okay, Riverboat, 129.

Catherine Fanello: The one thing that we did change in the Riverboat which is quite obvious is moving some money from Welfare to Work to Economic Development because of the amount of money that Welfare to Work had left over this year. I justify it this way. They had over \$1 million with this year's budget. Surely they are not going to spend \$1 million this year, so my rationale is they had actually two year's worth of budget, so we did cut it down to \$250,000 for next year and we added \$250,000 to economic development because we will be using all of our \$500,000 for the Bayes deal.

President Bassemier: Any questions?

CONVENTION CENTER OPERATING FUND

President Bassemier: Convention Center Operating Fund, 190.

Catherine Fanello: I think what you see there, I don't know if Sandie wants to answer some of these questions, but mainly the electricity and the gas are the ones you seen the main increases in. Other than that I don't think anything changed.

President Bassemier: Any questions on that? It's 190. Go ahead, Mr. Sutton.

Councilmember Sutton: On that utilities, gas, it's a pretty large increase there.

Catherine Fanello: That's just based on estimates from Vectren and I think everybody is going...she actually, I believe if I am correct, came back and asked for an additional appropriation this year to cover some of her utilities.

Suzanne Crouch: We had spoken, Catherine, to Sandie. I don't know if you're aware of it.

Catherine Fanello: Un-huh.

Suzanne Crouch: With this particular fund their projected revenues don't match or are far more optimistic than what the actual revenues were for last year and this year so based upon the revenues and the budget and, you know, cash carryover it looks to us that they're going to have to cut \$41,000 just to be at a zero balance for next year, so we had suggested that it be a cut of about \$45,000 just to kind of give you a little wiggle room and I don't know if Sandie has had a chance to think about, you know, where.

Catherine Fanello: In this one I don't know exactly where and I have a question mark here by the Contractual Service account. I had a question to ask what that was for because I could not remember and lost my note. The \$80,921.

President Bassemier: On page 190.

Catherine Fanello: Is it? Okay. I thought that was under the regular Centre budget.

President Bassemier: Sandie, yeah, if somebody could come forward please. State your name for the record please.

Kathy LeBarron: Kathy LeBarron, The Centre. It is my understanding that it is in the contract that the county has with the Building Authority...oh, sorry. It is my understanding that it is in the contract that the county has with the Building Authority.

President Bassemier: Yes. Would you state your name again, please?

Kathy LeBarron: Sorry, Kathy LeBarron.

President Bassemier: Yeah, we didn't hear it the first time.

Catherine Fanello: I can ask Steve Utley exactly what it is for.

Councilmember Hoy: Before we built this building that line was to cover contracts for pest control, HVAC services, you know, those normal contracts that you have. I don't know whether that is what it is or not, it may well be.

Catherine Fanello: I'll make sure.

Kathy LeBarron: I have never used it.

Catherine Fanello: Okay, it must be a Building Authority. I guess, I mean, we can cut the electricity and gas, but I mean if it goes up we'll be right back.

Councilmember Hoy: I haven't seen the word mercy written across my bill at home, I don't know if anybody else has or not.

Catherine Fanello: So I really don't know where to take...out of this one I really don't know where to take the \$45,000. The other, the energy savings contract that's a set amount, so really all we have are the utility bills. We can't cut the depreciation reserves obviously.

Councilmember Raben: We can maybe take five of it off electrical and the other \$40,000 off of gas. That would still be double what we appropriated last year for the gas.

President Bassemier: Anything else, Jim?

Councilmember Tornatta: If we're looking at everything to double, then I mean, aren't we cutting that inappropriately?

Councilmember Raben: Find somewhere else to cut \$45,000 out of there and I am comfortable with it. But you are, you're leaving your gas double. Forty thousand is what was budgeted last year. That would leave—

Councilmember Tornatta: We're already over that, right, at this point?

Councilmember Hoy: We would be at \$108,000 if you took six months. If that \$53,963 is six months and you double it then you got, you know, right at \$108,000.

Councilmember Tornatta: Right, and that's if it stayed the same as last year...this year.

Councilmember Hoy: That's right and you don't know.

Councilmember Tornatta: And if it is going to be more.

Councilmember Raben: What you probably have though in that project \$108,000 is December, January, February and March, or the beginning of March, but you probably have your bad months are part of this. I mean, gas is primarily the heating of that facility so do you understand what I am saying? So that, I'm sure that has tapered off a whole lot since...

Suzanne Crouch: And hopefully revenues will come in higher than what is projected right now and then they could seek an additional appropriation. Hopefully that will happen.

Councilmember Tornatta: Yeah, but you know I have always heard that one thing about this budget hearings are we try to cut everybody and tell them to come back. That's not...I don't know how you do budgets that way.

Suzanne Crouch: Well, part of it is because we have to factor in revenues pretty conservatively at this point in time because we're trying to project 18 months out what revenues are. If we project them liberally and we approve budgets high then we run out of money.

Councilmember Tornatta: Oh, I don't see this as being high. I mean, if you look at the number and it is double—

Suzanne Crouch: Perhaps their expenditures aren't high, but if their revenues are not coming in to support the budget, the budget has to be cut.

Councilmember Tornatta: You can't cut their utilities because they're using it. That's pretty much a standard—

Suzanne Crouch: I mean, I don't know where you cut it, but I'm telling you it has to be cut. Perhaps the...I don't know, Sandie, if some of the utilities can be picked up in the General Fund. That doesn't help you all, I mean, this particular fund does not have enough revenues right now projected to support the budget so \$45,000 has to be cut.

Councilmember Winnecke: Mr. President?

President Bassemier: Hold it. Let's change the tape real quick.

(TAPE CHANGE)

Councilmember Hoy: It's the same question that I asked in my first couple years sitting here. It has to do with...it's simply the way we have to manage the budget in order to get along with the State of Indiana. We don't have home rule. So we have to get this in under a certain amount in September so that the State Board of Accounts is pleased with what we submit. And then we sort of pick and choose during this time who is going to have to come back and then we grant it. I use to think it was some sort of a hardship, but actually most of the officeholders and people who are in the budget that I've talked with have said, you know, coming back here is not that difficult when you are coming back for something that you just have to have. It's a strange way of budgeting, but I don't know, a gentleman sitting over here for a lot longer than I have been sitting here and it's just the nature of the beast, and it is a beast.

Councilmember Tornatta: Everybody that I've talked to just said that they don't know why they have to budget something, especially that they know they're going to need, and come back for the budgeted item. They think it is kind of crazy how you go and do that. I can understand your point in what you're saying on some items, but like on stuff that we know is going to be that type of number how do you cut that?

Councilmember Hoy: Well that's what everybody told me my first couple of years because I was new and that's what they're going to tell you because you're new. I'm not trying to demean the fact that you're new. You are very welcome on this council and you've been

a great addition. Nobody wants to come back, but they will and we don't shoot them dead.

Councilmember Raben: The other thing you have to look at, personal services account for a little over 62% of this entire budget. So, you are cutting from a small piece of the pie. I mean, your other choice is to start cutting personnel. So, you know, I don't know what this council wants to do, but I think you find these other lines first and cut from them. But back to this gas, again Troy, if you look at how utility bills run, particularly gas which I'm sure the large part of this is for the heating, you've got December bills that are payable in January. So you've got January, February and the early part of March which are your harsh months of the years. For the remainder of the year, you know, this gas we'll use very little of this until November. So, you really can't double the expended to date and assume that's what it's going to be because that's tapered way back, you know, probably since April.

Catherine Fanello: A good example of that is the Old Courthouse because we thought our bills were going to be a lot higher and they really have actually been a lot lower than we thought throughout the summer months, so...

Councilmember Raben: And back to what Councilman Hoy was saying, we do operate under a statutory freeze which is 5%. Like he said, we either cut it or the state does. Because if you exceed that 5% that's what they're going to do. They'll find the lines that they opt to cut.

Councilmember Wortman: Echoing Mr. Raben's statement there I think that's very true because if you didn't have this 5% freeze, taxes would be so high you couldn't afford them. Now I want to cite you another example in Lake County. They went bankrupt and couldn't make their payroll. Now that's an example, so you've got to learn to say no. A lot of departments come in here asking for the moon and they can't have it. They got to operate, we understand that, but at the same time we've got to learn to say no when we have to. That's the idea, to keep everything in line. It's just that simple.

President Bassemier: Thank you, Mr. Wortman.

Councilmember Hoy: We're not going to shut off the heat in the middle of the concert I'm sitting at. I know we'll have the money there, Sandie.

Councilmember Sutton: The challenge for us during the course of this week and next week is to insure that we are mindful of all of our new challenges and responsibilities that come before us and some of the existing things and fund them appropriately. In many cases we say, well in some cases we say no, and in some of them we are saying not right now. It doesn't mean no permanently, but in order for us to meet that limit within the freezes as the other councilmembers have spoken about there have to be some adjustments made to the budget. Now, what items will ultimately end up being no items, I think that's something that we look at from a priority standpoint of what we need to do. What items end up being not right now, we'll definitely communicate those ideas and those budget line items to each department head as they come forward because we just can't do it all. We'd like to be able to do more, but we have limited resources and we have to fund and budget them as we see fit. I guess when each department comes up here they see only through the lens of their department only, and we're trying to look at the entire county. So, that's what we have to try to communicate, that it is bigger than just any one department.

President Bassemier: Thank you Mr. Sutton. Anybody else?

THE CENTRE

President Bassemier: Okay, let's move to The Centre, page 116.

Catherine Fanello: Okay, on The Centre basically that's the management fees in the Operating Account. The only thing that's changed from last year, I think, is the Food Services because we have taken over that responsibility.

President Bassemier: Any questions?

SUPERINTENDENT OF COUNTY BUILDINGS

President Bassemier: Okay, none. Superintendent of County Buildings, page 95.

Catherine Fanello: All the increases you see in there are basically due to taking over the Old Courthouse. We've added a couple of accounts like Building Supplies. The Utilities I think are fairly conservative. Contractual Services and Repairs to Buildings and Grounds, those are all for repairs. Those are very conservative. Obviously we'll need more than that depending on what we decide to do with the recommendations. The roof at the Old Courthouse, we set it in at \$600,000, but it did come in or Will Fosse had made the presentation, I believe he said \$737,000. Is that correct Councilman Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: That's correct, plus he mentioned that didn't include the cupolas or whatever they're called. There are about four of those at \$70,000 each.

Catherine Fanello: Yes, \$70,000 each.

Councilmember Hoy: And if I may make a comment here to the council, I don't know but the people I've talked to said that when you put that scaffolding up for the roof and spend the money on putting it up it would be wise to go ahead and use that to do those cupolas at the same time and not put it up twice. It would save some money.

Catherine Fanello: And then the window...oh, I'm sorry.

Councilmember Hoy: I'm sorry, go ahead.

Catherine Fanello: I was going to say the windows, I think, were our next priority.

Councilmember Hoy: They were, the windows were next. My comments, and I'm sitting here struggling with this budget as all of us are, there is, I don't understand this kind of construction, there is a roof underneath the roof. There are two roofs on this building. So if you go over and look at the lower roof you won't see leaks, you have to get up above that sub-roof. That's where you see the daylight. Part of this as I think the architect said protecting the envelope of the building. I have another suggestion, I know you are working with a nonprofit group. I would love to see some action there. For example, and you can pass this on if you will, why not have people adopt a window? If that was broken down and they said to me that you could do this window for \$500, I might give \$500 for that.

Catherine Fanello: And I think you have a good point. I think that's why we should go ahead and take the recommendation to establish that foundation board that they were talking about.

Councilmember Hoy: That's right and the priorities which you also talked about. Because we're in for a—

Catherine Fanello: I believe that we should seek out going ahead and contracting with the grant writer.

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Catherine Fanello: I think Councilman Raben's agreeable—

Councilmember Hoy: I think that's a good idea too. We need to lay all of that out in front of ourselves because we own it.

Councilmember Raben: Catherine, the 3530 Contractual Services —

Catherine Fanello: Yes, that would just be, I mean obviously it really could have been in repairs, but that's really just anything that might come up at the Old Courthouse. Tammy is...I can go get the printouts of what she's spent so far this year, but just any kind of repairs or anything that might be needed, or something on a contractual basis.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, because we do have a maintenance person there today that I would think would take care of a lot of it. Of course, obviously not the roof, but rusty pipes and things of that nature.

Catherine Fanello: But anything that we might have to contract out. I just tried to be conservative as far as Repairs to Buildings and Grounds and Contractual Services, I think it will be actually a lot more than that.

President Bassemier: Suzanne?

Suzanne Crouch: Commissioner Fanello, with the report that the Old Courthouse presented they had a memorandum from State Representative Becker about the establishment of the Cum Courthouse Building Fund. I think that legislation was enacted in 1995 and it allows the county to establish that. The County Commissioners would have to establish that fund. I don't know if the Commissioners or Councilmen to give some thought to perhaps establishing that fund? It's too late to do it for 2002, but it could be done for 2003. What then could happen is the Cum Bridge fund that rate has been set at 0.15 for as long as I have been sitting with this council, next year they're going to have in excess of \$4,000,000 surplus. I don't believe they have any huge projects on the drawing board. So, what the Commissioners and the council might think about doing next year is perhaps, because wasn't the cost \$5,000,000 to \$10,000,000 for the Courthouse?

Catherine Fanello: That's what Will Fosse estimated. He really didn't know, but that was kind of thrown out there.

Suzanne Crouch: So it's probably going to be an ongoing cost. What the Commissioners and Council might consider doing is set in the Cum Building fund for the Old Courthouse perhaps set in a rate of a nickel or seven or eight cents, whatever that is, and then reduce that Cum Bridge by that. Therefore, there's no raise in taxes, but you're putting money where it needs to be as opposed to accumulating it where we don't really at this point in time have any needs. So, I don't know if that's something you might want to discuss with the Commissioners?

Catherine Fanello: I can discuss that with them and just check with John Stoll and make sure about our bridge projects which before I leave today we did go ahead and have our department heads do a five year plan so you can kind of see what we are thinking about as far as projects. So, I'll hand those out to you and John's is in there.

President Bassemier: Okay, thank you. Any more questions? Thank you very much. That covers it.

LEVEE AUTHORITY

President Bassemier: We're going to go back to the Levee Authority, the second one, page 191. Kelly's back. State your name sir, and tell us what you have for us. Kelly, state your name.

Kelly Lawrence: My name is Kelly Lawrence and I'm the superintendent of the Evansville/Vanderburgh Levee Authority District.

President Bassemier: Do you have anything to report before we –

Kelly Lawrence: No.

President Bassemier: Any questions for Mr. Lawrence? Any questions? Mr. Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Kelly, this Teamster Scholarship Fund, can you explain that please?

Kelly Lawrence: No I can't. I did not put that in my budget. Mr. Whobrey, can you explain that and help me out here?

Chuck Whobrey: This is why I come to these meetings. My name is Chuck Whobrey. The Teamsters Scholarship Fund is what is called a Taft Hartly fund where you have equal number of employer and union trustees. It is a fund that we established about four years ago and we negotiate into contracts employer contributions into that fund. The county is a participant as well as the City of Evansville. This current year is the first year that the city came into that. In this particular county we awarded \$50,000 in scholarships to 54 sons and daughters of our members who work for employers who contribute to that fund. That's what that is about and we negotiate that into a contract that they contribute so much per week and that's a contractual item. We're going to get it up to where we award \$100,000 in scholarships per year in a couple of years.

President Bassemier: Thank you Mr. Whobrey. Any questions?

Councilmember Hoy: My basement is dry, Kelly, and I'm very happy.

President Bassemier: See you tonight.

VETERANS SERVICE

President Bassemier: Veterans Administration, that's on page 80. State your name sir and what you have for us also.

Mark Acker: Good morning ladies and gentlemen. Mark Acker, Veterans Services, Vanderburgh County.

President Bassemier: Hi Mark. Turn to page 80, I'm sure somebody has some questions.

Mark Acker: I've got some good news for you, it may make you smile a little bit. Under line item 3310 you can drop that \$2,000. The Commissioners paid that under a different account because these are state mandated schools that we go to. Before I wasn't aware of it, so it will be coming out of the County Commissioners account for travel under special. The only thing that I would ask is that you try to retain, if possible, line item 3930. I'm still trying to find janitorial services and it's kind of hard to negotiate a deal if you have no money to work with. I did have the JOBS program through Southwestern and they terminated that contract. So, I'm now trying to find a \$15 a week office cleaning service. That's rather difficult to do.

Councilmember Hoy: I'll comment on that because I'm the Councilman that put you onto that. We use to use that at the Food Bank and it worked modestly well. But they're out of personnel and they can't handle all their contracts.

Mark Acker: I'm sorry to loose them, they did an outstanding job.

Councilmember Hoy: Yeah, they're very good but we lost them too. It's just a fact of life.

Councilmember Sutton: How many hours a week were they putting in?

Mark Acker: They would come in and they were probably there 45 minutes, vacuum, pick up the trash, take it out. Basic service to just keep the trash out of there, boxes, whatever may be accumulated once a week. They would come in Friday evenings.

Councilmember Hoy: So you dust your own desk and things like that.

Mark Acker: Yeah you dust your own desk and knock the cob webs down, but they did keep the floors clean and keep the trash out for us.

Councilmember Hoy: They sent a crew in, didn't they?

Mark Acker: Yeah, they'd send a crew in and they'd be there about –

Councilmember Hoy: Three or four people.

Mark Acker: Three or four people, about 40 minutes for \$15 a week. Unfortunately, you can't find that today anywhere else.

Councilmember Sutton: That's why I asked my question.

Mark Acker: Now, on the other hand if you don't mind increasing my salary by \$15, I'll be happy to haul the trash out. With Vectren breaking my back, 30% raises Vectren and other services including our water department. I'm afraid we're all going to be in the poor house. I don't mind saying that, I'm a taxpayer. I just don't understand it myself either. I don't appreciate it. Troy, he calls me on the phone, and Phil, some of the other councilmen, Mr. Wortman, and Mr. Bassemier, they've called me on issues and asked me about budgets and I appreciate that. It's nice to see concerns and try to cut the budget and do what we can. Other than that I don't have much else to give you unless you need some paperclips.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Mr. President and Mark this may be another question I need to direct to Catherine, but as far as his rent figure of \$9,000 –

Mark Acker: That was set before the county took over the operation and that was a raise implemented by the former not for profit organization and I think Catherine had said something to me, and I don't want to be out of school here, but we'd be looking at that in the future on adjustments. But I set it in as to what it originally was. It's kind of like I'm paying you –

Councilmember Raben: Right, and this is probably a conversation that needs to take place other than in this room today, but we may have to determine how we're going to do that as long as we're fronting the budget to maintain, or to operate the Old Courthouse. I don't know if it's necessary that we conserve rent. So, that just creates a bigger paper shuffle. So, we'll address that later.

President Bassemier: Anybody else? Mr. Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Sounds good.

Mark Acker: One of the easier budgets, huh?

Councilmember Hoy: You going to come in and apply for a vacuum cleaner aren't you?

Mark Acker: Well as a matter of fact I bum one off of the Old Courthouse.

President Bassemier: Anybody else? I thank you sir.

Mark Acker: Thank you.

COUNTY HIGHWAY

President Bassemier: County Highway, page 130. Good morning sir, please state your name for the record.

Ralph Kissinger: Ralph Kissinger, Superintendent of County Highway Department. As you know this is my first time here so I've got a lot to learn.

President Bassemier: Okay, anything you'd like to tell us.

Ralph Kissinger: I could say it was a computer error, but it's not, it's my error. In the County Highway budget line item, it's actually 1750 Clothing Allowance, that should read \$41,000 instead of \$49,490.

Councilmember Sutton: One more time.

Ralph Kissinger: It is actually 1750 Clothing Allowance should read \$41,000 instead of \$49,490.

President Bassemier: Okay.

Ralph Kissinger: I'm sorry, \$49,440.

President Bassemier: That's page 133. Okay, Mr. Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Ralph, line 1990 the Extra Help, what do you pull, I mean what do you use that for? Obviously extra help, but I mean –

Ralph Kissinger: Pardon me? Extra Help?

Councilmember Tornatta: Line 1990.

Ralph Kissinger: I was told in the past that there was summer help hired at the garage. Actually as far as I'm concerned that can be deleted because I don't have any part time help at the garage.

Councilmember Tornatta: Okay.

Ralph Kissinger: I hadn't talked to anyone about that, but as far as I'm concerned I haven't hired any part time help.

Councilmember Tornatta: Well, I know you're running a pretty efficient staff down there and are getting a lot of stuff done. I just, I didn't know...by looking at this you hadn't used anybody so if that's someplace that was just carried over in the budget then maybe we can look at that.

Ralph Kissinger: I think it was carried over in the past for standby, in case it was needed. I'm going to try to operate my department with the people I have. I'm trying the best I can to get what work have done with what we have, and so far it has worked. I don't for see coming and asking you for any more additional help this time. In the future if it mandates I will come and ask, but this time I don't anticipate adding anyone to my staff.

President Bassemier: Mr. Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Ralph, is the corrections center sending any people out to help you to weed eat or anything out there? Do you remember?

Ralph Kissinger: No.

Councilmember Wortman: State Highway is getting most of it.

Ralph Kissinger: No. As you know we've had a lot of rain this year, weeds are a problem. I actually did shut the paving down for one week, we were far enough ahead on it, to get everyone I could out to weed eat guardrails, mow intersections, do whatever we could do

to get caught up on that. I think we can handle it right now with what we have. I mean, if you want to give me three or four more people, I'd be glad for them to work. But I'm not asking for them right now.

Councilmember Wortman: At one time, see, they sent some out, you know. But the State Highway is getting a lot of that I'm afraid.

Ralph Kissinger: Yes, and as I say I'm new at this. I haven't explored all those avenues yet, but I'm open for suggestions.

Councilmember Wortman: You're doing a fine job.

Ralph Kissinger: Thank you, I appreciate that.

President Bassemier: Mr. Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Well, Curt, you're talking about along the 41 corridor is where the State Highway took over, but did the Community Corrections ever provide help for county roads?

Councilmember Wortman: Right, that and Burdette Park, yeah, they did that.

Councilmember Raben: I knew Burdette, but I didn't know –

Councilmember Wortman: Yeah, at one time they sent two or three out there.

Ralph Kissinger: There is one other item in, actually it's in the County Highway budget. It's account number 2560. It's for Concrete. Actually most of that is used for bridge approaches and things and I think that if we could transfer a line item, I know I didn't request to, but maybe we could delete that and transfer it into Cum Bridge. It would be more appropriate.

Suzanne Crouch: And that would be, I've spoken to Commissioner Fanello and I know she's spoken to you, Ralph, and I've also spoken to John Stoll. This again is another fund that is going to have to be cut, that the state cut the funding.

Ralph Kissinger: Certainly.

Suzanne Crouch: And right now with the revenues that are projected to come in and with the budget as it exists that would leave \$118,000 deficit. So, we suggested \$200,000. I think you could probably get by with \$150,000, but I think that John Stoll said that there may be some other costs in there that could be allocated to Cum Bridge.

Ralph Kissinger: John and I talked and Ms. Fanello and I talked, we do have some suggestions where this can be done with, you know... If you have your suggestions I'm open for them. I was told one time \$700,000, another time \$400,000 –

Suzanne Crouch: Yeah, and in the past, I think it was '95 or '96, the state, we had to cut \$600,000 out of the budget too. So, this is one of those funds that kind of struggles.

Ralph Kissinger: I'm sure I'll operate on whatever I'm told to operate on and I'll do the best I can with it.

Catherine Fanello: I was going to ask Suzanne a question. Does that leave any room for additional appropriations this year?

Suzanne Crouch: Well this year you do have an unappropriated balance.

Catherine Fanello: Okay, I didn't know if you were taking what you had as far as projecting

a end of year cash balance with the –

Suzanne Crouch: We do. What we do is when we factor how much money will be available, we factor that you are going to spend every single penny in your budget, and you can see that you don't. But the state requires, they say that because you have that budget, you have the authority to spend it. Your budget this year is about \$3,000,000 and if you looked the last three years, Highway has only expended \$2,500,000. But we really have to, the state considers that you're going to spend all of that. So, even with cutting that you hopefully will have some additional to appropriate next year. But the state at this point in time is just extremely conservative.

Ralph Kissinger: And I understand that. We talked earlier about where we could make cuts.

Catherine Fanello: I think I'm going to go ahead and let Ralph go through some of those cuts, but we did find some. If we could possibly, I was just talking to John, move maybe some of the Highway expenditures to the Local Roads and Street account number. Which one did you just say?

Ralph Kissinger: Line item 2560 which is Concrete. Most of that is actually used for bridge approaches. If we could allow that into Cum Bridge which last year was budgeted \$20,000. We are putting more culverts in and instead of using gravel for fill we're using flowable fill so we don't have the settlement in the road. It is working a lot better. John can attest to that. He's checked some of the work. And actually we ordered flowable fill through the concrete company so that is being paid out of that account. It could also, I think, be paid out of the Sand and Gravel account too, but I'm trying to keep it as close to what the line item is.

Catherine Fanello: I'll just let him go through some of those cuts.

Councilmember Tornatta: Ralph, a pretty big jump in the Gas and Oil, is that –

Ralph Kissinger: When I made the budget out at first the rumor was going around through the oil industry that there would probably be a 30% to 40% increase in oil prices this year. So I tried to budget that into what we had and what we were working on this year. I did go back and, let's see if I can find the actual line item there, okay it's on this page... I think I had originally figured it and my original budget request was for –

Councilmember Tornatta: \$166,000 –

Ralph Kissinger: Correct, \$166,000 and after re-figuring and looking at what we had this year I think I can drop that to \$133,000. Yes, line item 2210.

Councilmember Tornatta: I mean is this a place, you know, we've cut the Centre's gas or utilities, is this a place where we could look at cutting in to?

Councilmember Raben: It doesn't effect our General Fund.

Councilmember Hoy: This is not General Fund money.

Councilmember Tornatta: Okay.

Councilmember Hoy: So it won't effect those...

Councilmember Raben: I mean, really and truthfully we actually don't, this body doesn't have to set these lines. We can simply state that \$200,000 or \$150,000 needs to be cut and they can make these adjustments in September themselves.

Councilmember Tornatta: Okay.

Councilmember Hoy: And then according to our Auditor, there actually is going to be some money left anyway from this year, right?

Suzanne Crouch: They have an unappropriated balance for this year.

Councilmember Hoy: Yeah, and that could be carried over.

Suzanne Crouch: If it's not expended.

Councilmember Hoy: Okay, so you'll be able to replace that.

Ralph Kissinger: That's another thing I had a question on, which this may or may not be the appropriate time to do this, I have conflicting reports on how I could and could not encumber money. So, I do need some guidelines on that. I've looked through my office and I have no guidelines on that. I want to make sure that what I do there, what I do encumber is properly done. I don't want to have to come back and explain what has happened. I don't want to put you in that position, I don't want the Commissioners in that position.

Suzanne Crouch: Ralph, we have a letter that we send out year end, and I'll go ahead and get that to you now so you can be thinking about it, and it actually has guidelines on what you can encumber and the process. So, we'll get that to you right away.

Ralph Kissinger: I'd appreciate that. Okay, and I would like to assure you that any of the monies or funds left in any of these accounts I would stress that they be returned to the General Fund because that is taxpayers' money.

Suzanne Crouch: Well, it will actually stay within your Highway fund.

Ralph Kissinger: Okay.

Suzanne Crouch: Anything you don't spend out of those line items will stay there and if it is available you can appropriate it again next year.

Ralph Kissinger: And that's just simply the Highway fund?

Suzanne Crouch: That's correct.

Councilmember Raben: So, it's really not important that you worry about encumbrances, because you'll have it the following year regardless.

Ralph Kissinger: Okay, I just needed a guideline.

President Bassemier: Mr. Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Ralph, I'll work with you on that as I have in the past for all the superintendents out there.

Ralph Kissinger: I appreciate that.

Councilmember Hoy: Can I have an alley I want paved, Curt?

Councilmember Wortman: On 2230, Garage and Motor, do you anticipate any major motor repairs or anything? The new equipment out there is in pretty good shape. That would be one item if you don't anticipate too much.

Ralph Kissinger: And I did make, and I think I made an adjustment there, you'll have to bear with me for a few minutes until I find those line items. I do think there is some adjustment to be made there. I originally asked for, Garage and Motor, \$63,000 and I can

go back, I think I can make the appropriation to match last year's at \$63,000.

Councilmember Raben: You know, again Curt, you and Ralph and John can work on this budget. We'll approve the amount in September, but the actual lines we don't need to know where your cuts are coming from.

Ralph Kissinger: Okay, these are just suggestions that I had come up with where I could trim if necessary. I'd be glad to make some copies of these and give them to all persons involved.

(TAPE CHANGE)

Councilmember Wortman: So work with John Stoll on all the approaches from bridges and culverts and everything. We can extend that out, you know, the 500 feet each way, you know, we can pick up a lot there and then let money for other areas, see and we'll work together on that. But I'll call you and then we'll work this out.

Ralph Kissinger: And I have been in close contact with John. I'll probably call you at work.

Councilmember Wortman: Yeah, yeah, yeah, that will be fine. That's fine. Thank you.

President Bassemier: Anybody else? I was going to come up to your salary. You're asking for your increase. Tim is here. You went through Job Study here a few weeks ago and we factored you in a pay raise, increase, and would you, since some of the Councilmembers wasn't there, would you explain why you feel like you need a bigger increase in what Job Study –

Ralph Kissinger: I don't have my Job Study with me, but basically the Commissioners and I looked back. There hadn't been a Job Study since 1991. There were actually, I think, two years where the county employees actually got raises but the supervisors at the garage did not. One year it was in the form of a clothing allowance, I believe, that was awarded to the county employees and another year, I just think there was no raise compensated to them. Other county departments with not even similar employees, the department heads are compensated much higher than what County Highway is. For instance, I know there's different responsibilities at Burdette Park, but the salaries are higher there, Department of Weights and Measures, and if you look through the city's budget, the department heads, I believe, this year are up over \$64,000 and I'm not asking for \$64,000 by any means, but the Commissioners and I talked and they thought that this was a fair request. And I also requested raises for all my foremen and my assistant superintendent.

President Bassemier: Mr. Deisher, I know I'm putting you on the spot, could you tell us how that was factored in? That you came up by, what was it, somewhere around \$2,500 increase through Job Study. I don't have that exact amount. But could you tell us how you factored that in for the increase?

Tim Deisher: Sure, we looked at job descriptions and responsibilities and making comparables within the county is a little difficult to do but felt some increase was justifiable and made a recommendation to do so. I made a call to try to get information from other counties and didn't get that information at the meeting. They supplied, I think, Catherine, the County Commissioners supplied some information on some comps, but that was what the Job Study passed.

Councilmember Raben: You know, Mr. President, I might also add, too, holding a position that he holds, I mean, the coldest night of the year when the snow is falling and you're out, I mean, it's not a Monday through Friday job. If it snows on Saturday night, he's probably in getting the trucks out. So, you know, it's not your standard eight to five, five day a week job that we see in so many offices. It's –

Ralph Kissinger: And I did bring up the Job Study, I can't speak for my assistant and my

foremen, but if this pay raise was approved, I would consider it part of my obligation that I come in at those times. There would be no comp, I would take my two weeks' vacation and whatever other holidays I'm provided, and I would take that as part of my job description. I also stated at the meeting that, at that time, I think I had over 150 hours of comp time, now I've got almost 180, that I don't know how I'll ever use because if I do, I won't be able to do my job. I don't see any way that I can be away from that office and still get the things done that need that need to be done in that office.

President Bassemier: Okay, anybody got any questions? Thank you, sir.

Ralph Kissinger: Thank you.

CUMULATIVE BRIDGE

President Bassemier: Cum Bridge, 136.

Councilmember Hoy: I want to make a quick comment, Mr. President. Mr. Raben and I were discussing and we need Mr. Ahlers to check this for us and this is not a criticism of you, Ralph, okay. You've worked plenty. My information is that the term comp time is illegal except in terms of law enforcement and public safety. I know it's used a lot, but my last check in with the Department of Labor is that there is no such thing and if you give any hours, they must be taken within a certain limited amount of time and I just want to make sure – I may be incorrect, but I want to make sure we're within the law.

Ralph Kissinger: Excuse me, Mr. Hoy. I think I misstated that. I was supposed to call that actually departmental leave, that is set out that we take departmental leave to compensate for the time we work overtime. I didn't – it's not actually comp time, but it is considered departmental leave where we don't get overtime, so we are compensated by the leave even though it's taking the amount of hours that we have worked off on another time. I misstated that.

Councilmember Hoy: Yeah, it's a term that's commonly used and I don't think we're gonna, I just don't want us to open ourselves to any problems with DOL, that's all.

President Bassemier: Okay, Mr. Stoll. State your name please.

John Stoll: John Stoll, County Engineer.

President Bassemier: Okay, anything you want to tell us?

John Stoll: Basically, the new bridges that are budgeted in for next year are either bridges that were called out in the latest bridge inventory or in the case of the University Parkway bridge, that's the new bridge that's part of the University Parkway project between USI and Upper Mt. Vernon Road. The culvert projects on page 140 are just larger culverts that aren't quite large enough to qualify as a bridge, but they're still eligible for bridge funding. But basically, it's all just based on what needs are out there on the – what culverts have deteriorated and also the bridge (inaudible) dictates what bridges we replace.

President Bassemier: Mr. Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: John, the old Princeton Road culvert, is that down there in Pond Flats there?

John Stoll: Yes.

Councilmember Wortman: And is that going to keep the water from backing up considerable, be more of an opening there? I guess that's what it amounts to?

John Stoll: We haven't looked at it, but it would be sized for a minimum of 50 year if not 100

year storm. So if it's substandard size now, we'll get it fixed.

Councilmember Wortman: Will the Corps of Engineers be involved in that?

John Stoll: I'm not sure what the drainage is off the top of my head. The Corps probably wouldn't be but DNR may.

Councilmember Wortman: I know years ago they wanted to, talked about Mesquite Avenue putting a bridge there and elevating the road, but see, that might have blocked the water, see, and having it back up because it's got to gradually go out because I know the farmers was against that years ago. But this would be a larger opening there and let the water get out of them bottoms down there for the crops, I guess.

John Stoll: Right, as long it doesn't cause a problem like what you're talking about.

Councilmember Wortman: Okay, that's fine. That's out in the good area of Scott Township, you know.

President Bassemier: Mr. Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: John, on page 136, Assistant County Engineer. Is that position unfilled?

John Stoll: Yes, at this point in time.

Councilmember Sutton: Any progress that we seem to be making in that regard in terms of any bites or nibbles on that position?

John Stoll: Not really. The last time it was advertised was – I believe it was over a year ago but the applicants we had were either not really that qualified or they wanted salaries well above and beyond what the county would pay. So, not much success.

President Bassemier: Anybody else?

Councilmember Sutton: Thank you.

President Bassemier: Okay, Local Roads & Streets.

John Stoll: I was going to say one other thing in regard to the bridges, as far as the bridge tax goes as far as reducing that, we do have one large bridge remaining that is not currently funded out on Green River Road. That bridge over Pigeon Creek is one of them that has to be replaced. We really don't have in place, any funding in place for that right now so I don't know if we want to cut the bridge tax in half or anything, but reductions could be done, it's just a matter of how much and we'd have to take a look at the revenues. But the estimated cost of that project including the road, which basically the project runs from Lynch to Heckel. So we've got about a five million dollar estimate on that project. Half of that probably is the bridge. So we'll need a big chunk of bridge money somewhere along the lines but that project is not currently scheduled as it stands right now.

President Bassemier: What bridge was that?

John Stoll: Green River over Pigeon Creek.

Councilmember Wortman: That was talked about years ago, I think on that. And now is that in anticipation of the widening of Green River? We'd do it all at the same time?

John Stoll: Yes.

Councilmember Wortman: Okay.

John Stoll: It was designed. The right of way was acquired but there never was any federal funding to get the job done and with all the other federal aid projects we've had, there's still not any federal money available for it. So unless more federal money comes available, which that doesn't look that likely, we may have to put substantially more local funds into that project.

Councilmember Wortman: And no help from the state, neither.

John Stoll: It remains to be seen, but I doubt it.

Councilmember Wortman: Okay, thanks John.

President Bassemier: Okay, Local Roads & Streets.

Ralph Kissinger: I had one thing to add to Cum Bridge under my account through my department. Line item 4230, Motor Vehicles. I have misquoted that. On my capital improvements that I have submitted to the Commissioners, I can reduce that from \$50,000 to \$35,000.

Councilmember Wortman: How much, Ralph?

Ralph Kissinger: From \$50,000 to \$35,000, that's the Motor Vehicles account 4230.

Councilmember Wortman: I've got \$25,000 in there now, Ralph.

Ralph Kissinger: I do?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes sir. You cut that down, see.

Ralph Kissinger: Okay, then I had already taken care of that. I didn't get a copy of the actual budget on that.

Councilmember Wortman: Okay. Thanks.

LOCAL ROADS & STREETS

President Bassemier: Okay, Local Roads & Streets, that'd be on page 151. John, you got anything to tell us about that?

John Stoll: The biggest item we've got budgeted for next year is the \$700,000 for the Eickhoff/Koressel Road. That's in anticipation that we would get all the right of way acquired for the first two miles of that road in the next year and the \$700,000 would be part of the local match for the federal funding for that project. We're estimating the project would cost up to five million dollars and that would be just for the grading and bridges portion of the project for those first two miles. But the \$700,000 in road and street combined with the \$300,000 in bridge would cover our local match.

Councilmember Hoy: In the acquiring of the property, are you all acquiring any of the property at the intersection so that should the day come that we need to put in some better intersections, we own the land? I made this suggestion to the previous Commissioners because, and I'll try to make this short because I don't want to be here forever, but I want to get it on record because what happens is, you build this road like Diamond Avenue, it doesn't have enough traffic to qualify for real intersections, so then gas stations and all this stuff gets built up around the intersection so you can't put in a real intersection when the traffic reaches the proportions that originally would have – and my suggestion as we acquire this property is to acquire larger sections at the intersections so that, because I predict this is going to be a very busy road, you know, and I'd hate to see, you know, I won't be sitting in this seat when you put those intersections in that are going to cost, you know, tons of dollars to buy up businesses. I'm wondering if that would not be a good plan

to follow instead of just buying the usual intersection property. You follow my line of –

John Stoll: There's definitely some merit to the idea. The problem with the way you do federal aid projects, they only let you acquire the right of way needed to accommodate the project as it's currently designed. So we're buying the right of way. I think it ranges about 50 feet either side of the center line on roads like Hogue and Upper Mt. Vernon. So we'll get a pretty wide strip of land there and then it's been designed right now for the side roads to be shoulders and open ditches. So ultimately when the situation occurs like you're talking about, when it's reconstructed they could at least come back in and put curbs and storm sewers and fill in the ditches and at least have some right of way available so it won't necessarily be a shoulder and an open ditch road anymore, but there would be enough room that you could get some extra lanes in.

Councilmember Hoy: Because I know what'll happen. You'll have a traffic light at every major intersection, you know, and we'll be back to square one as we are on the Lloyd and 41. You know, we also could control that through zoning, it would seem to me. If we just didn't zone those for business and left them, then they couldn't build anything there.

John Stoll: One thing that might slow that from happening on this corridor is the fact that there's not a lot of sewers out there, so without sewers it should slow the commercial –

Councilmember Hoy: They'd need two and a half acres for their toilets as well, wouldn't they?

John Stoll: They have to go to the state to get a commercial approval. So they've got some other obstacles.

Councilmember Hoy: You know, every time I leave to go see my kids, it takes me longer to get out of Evansville on 41 because it's so ill-planned, and longer to get through Terra Haute because it's so ill-planned, than the rest of the trip. And I will make this speech every time I get a chance, John, you know that. It's not aimed at you. It's aimed at all of us because we simply don't plan and we zone not in intelligent ways.

Councilmember Raben: You know, I think that's a great idea that you presented there in terms of doing that. The only unique thing about this project, Phil, is that there's really only two intersections. I mean, we have Hogue and Upper Mt. Vernon Road and they're miles apart, so it's not like you've got an intersection every block.

(Inaudible)

Councilmember Raben: Well, I don't know. With the frontage roads –

(Inaudible – several speaking at once)

John Stoll: Intermediate between the intersections. And ultimately when the road is done we'll have intersections in addition to Hogue and Upper Mt. Vernon, there'll be one at Marx and New Harmony Road and at Diamond. So we'll have five major intersections but there are going to be intermediate breaks in the right of way because the county doesn't have enough funding to go out and buy whole 40 acre tracks of land so we have to leave them a break since we can't leave them landlocked. So there is some potential in the intermediate areas between the intersections but there again, the county could help control that by not providing a median crossover, things like that, so we wouldn't get traffic signals everywhere.

Councilmember Raben: John, on a similar topic, you and I had discussed a while back our means of transportation north and south on the west side and we discussed Red Bank and Boehne Camp Road and what have you. Did you ever take an opportunity to look at Rosenberg, extending that?

John Stoll: I did. I don't remember the exact elevations but the biggest drawback to that was the amount of fill needed to bring the road up so that it was out of the flood plain. I don't recall exactly how far it would have to be raised but it was a substantial amount of fill. Not to say that that's impossible by any means, but that was the biggest drawback.

Councilmember Raben: If, I mean, if you could, that's something you need to continue to pursue, may alleviate some of the traffic problems that are there today.

Councilmember Hoy: Yes, because I would love to see the plan for Red Bank and straightening out the two north and souths. You've got two right angles, I mean, –

Councilmember Raben: Well, it's the hill.

Councilmember Hoy: Yeah, you've got the hill, too. You hit the hill and –

John Stoll: Yeah, it's either in a valley or on a ridge, either one.

Councilmember Tornatta: I still like everybody coming down St. Joe.

Councilmember Hoy: I would rather see us stop the sprawl, that's where I'm going with this.

Councilmember Raben: John, do you know offhand, what is that grade on the hill at Red Bank and Hogue?

John Stoll: I don't know off the top of my head.

Councilmember Raben: There's none like it, I'm sure, in many other counties in this state, that's for sure.

John Stoll: Especially that north approach.

Councilmember Raben: South approach, well...

John Stoll: Southbound.

Councilmember Raben: Yeah.

President Bassemier: Mr. Winnecke.

Councilmember Winnecke: John, I have two quick questions. Under Equipment Lease & Rental and Other Contractual in the budget, Equipment Lease & Rental, this year we have \$58,000 budgeted. We haven't spent any this year but you're asking for \$60,900 next year and then under Other Contractual, a little over half million budgeted for this year but we haven't spent very much. What are those two?

John Stoll: Ralph will have to speak to the Equipment line item, but the Other Contractual is what we do our contractual paving work out of and at the time that this was run, we hadn't paid the contractors basically. They hadn't invoiced us for all the work that they've done. But right now we've probably got 500 of that \$550,000 obligated in paving contracts. So by the end of the year, it will be spent way down. On the other line item, Ralph will have to speak to that one.

Ralph Kissinger: That was one I was going to get up and talk – line item 3830 –

Councilmember Winnecke: 3630, Equipment Lease & Rental.

Ralph Kissinger: Yes. That was one place that I can make some cuts. I figured up we are currently renting a tractor to pull the lowboy trailer with that hauls the paver and roller. And John and I are getting ready to do a bridge project down in Union Township. I think we can

reduce that actually below last years'. I think we can go to \$40,000 on that.

Councilmember Winnecke: So we rent it, but we haven't rented it this year. Is that, or we just haven't been invoiced yet?

Ralph Kissinger: Yes, we have rentals and there are expenditures on that. They should have been –

Councilmember Winnecke: They just haven't hit the books yet.

Ralph Kissinger: They should have hit the books because we've been paying rent on that since March, I believe, or April. I think I've got an actual printout in my briefcase. I'm not –

Councilmember Tornatta: Is that coming out of some other line?

Suzanne Crouch: It's possible that the invoice was turned in and the actual cut, their check wasn't cut until after June 30. But I'd have to check on that.

Ralph Kissinger: – an agreement with (Inaudible) on this tractor and I think it's three something a month we're paying on it.

Councilmember Winnecke: Well, you think for planning purposes next year, a –

Ralph Kissinger: Actually, I think I can do it for \$40,000. I mean, I don't foresee any big projects coming up where we'll need to rent. The only time I would need to rent or lease is if we had some major piece of equipment break down or I'd have to replace it for the time it was down.

Councilmember Winnecke: Okay, that's all my questions.

President Bassemier: Anybody else?

Councilmember Wortman: I think there's a lot of times that was a pay loader that was leased out there and had a contract on it, you know, pay as you go, years ago.

Ralph Kissinger: That could be possible. And then we actually have the new one and a backup. So I don't think that will be a problem anymore.

Councilmember Tornatta: Okay, and the County Highway we have the same of situation with the equipment lease and that's about \$5,300. Are we pulling this out of separate...how do we know what budget to pull that out of?

Ralph Kissinger: That's a good question. There's similar line items in three different departments and we take it where the money's available, is all I can tell you. If we have equipment to lease and rent, I mean, I don't know how to...that's another question I was getting back to, define what is County Highway and what is Local Roads & Streets. That paver is used for patching and it's also used for paving, so we have a patch budget in the County Highway and we have a paving budget in the Local Roads & Streets. So I think that can be divided up.

President Bassemier: Ms. Fanello, you want to say something?

Catherine Fanello: Yeah, I was just going to say, I gave Mr. Ahlers a copy of the statute. That's one of the accounts I wanted to see if we could maybe move over to Local Roads & Streets altogether since we have to cut the Highway budget. Maybe we could just pay for it out of one fund.

Councilmember Tornatta: And then you have the Sand & Gravel and some of that stuff.

Could that all be put over in Cum Bridge as well, some of those?

Ralph Kissinger: I don't think all of it can but I think some of it can.

Councilmember Tornatta: There's Bituminous Materials, those kind of things, you know, we have in a couple different spots. If that could be moved over to one from the other, that's a great way to cut some expense. I mean, if we're just throwing stuff around in other accounts.

Ralph Kissinger: The only way to define that is, I think the Bituminous in the County Highway goes to patching pot holes and the Bituminous in the Local Roads & Street goes to paving. That's the only way I can define that.

Catherine Fanello: And just to comment on what you said, Councilman Tornatta, that's why I gave Mr. Ahlers a copy of the statute. There are certain things you can pay for out of Highway funds, certain things you can pay for out of the Local Roads & Streets. So I'd like to see if we could move some of that Highway to Local Roads & Streets.

Suzanne Crouch: And I think John and I spoke about the bridges out of the – they comprise about five percent of all the roads in Vanderburgh County and it's possible you can move five percent of some of the costs. That's not a whole lot, but you can move five percent of some of the costs –

John Stoll: Like salt.

Ralph Kissinger: I had been told in the past there was, I think, Councilman Wortman brought it up earlier, there were so much approach to the bridge and then so much approach on the other side of the bridge. It could be billed to Cum Bridge and it hasn't been done for years, and I don't know the procedure on that, but it can be done.

John Stoll: It's 500 feet either side.

Ralph Kissinger: And that even includes culvert, too, doesn't it?

Councilmember Hoy: It does, because what we did down on Waterworks Roads, in order to expedite that cave in, instead of calling it culverts, I believe we called it a bridge since it –

John Stoll: (Inaudible)

Councilmember Hoy: – or was it the reverse? I knew –

John Stoll: It wasn't designated as bridge, but it could have been, so nobody has to deal with that again. We got it designated as bridge, so it will be inspected every two years.

Councilmember Hoy: But it was also a way of getting it quickly done because we had –

Ralph Kissinger: If the Council would like I can get some figures together on what we paved to and from bridges this year and let you know what is there if you would like.

President Bassemier: Okay, well thanks. Any other questions?

Councilmember Wortman: Mr. President, I'd like to have a short pause for a good cause.

President Bassemier: Okay, I was getting ready to recommend that. We've been through thirteen, got eight more. Let's take a ten minute break.

(TAPE CHANGE)

President Bassemier: Burdette Park, page 118.

BURDETTE PARK

Steve Craig: Steve Craig, Manager of Burdette Park.

President Bassemier: Okay. Anything that stands out in your budget we should know about?

Steve Craig: No.

President Bassemier: Okay. Just thought I'd throw that in and see if you would volunteer. Maintenance/Carpenter?

Steve Craig: Okay, what that is, is my old job. When I got into management they never replaced me. So, we've been running the last five years with four union workers instead of five, which we had done for the previous nine years. I was wanting to reinstate that because we have a shortage of full timers there when we work, as you know, we are on a seven day schedule, and when we work weekends and that, I have to give my employees off during the week, and that sometimes puts us with only two people, or all the time puts us with two people there. If one of my other union employee's is taking a week's vacation, or a day off, or some time off, I'm running the park on certain days with one full time employee there during the week if the two have taken their days off.

President Bassemier: Okay. Any questions? Anybody else? Troy? Okay, I—

Councilmember Winnecke: I did have one question. What's, on the software—

Steve Craig: Yes, sir.

Councilmember Winnecke: —that's a pretty significant increase. What are you buying?

Steve Craig: This is was to be used to upgrade our software program, which was designed by Lieberman, and when Joyce and I had talked about this, this was the amount that he had told us that we would probably need to be updating our software with their programs.

Councilmember Winnecke: Well, I guess, I'm not sure what kind of software is it? For what purpose?

Steve Craig: It's for doing our reservations and running our office, you know, with all the chalets and the building rentals and that, that we are constantly working with them. I don't think we've ever got it right. There is still glitches that, for some reason, they can't seem make to work, you know, where it's compatible to us. They are constantly out there upgrading stuff, and changing different programs in it to get it where it works real, you know, or works smoother for us.

Councilmember Winnecke: Burdette Park.

Councilmember Raben: Steve, why don't you go ahead and hit on 4120, 4130 and 4140. 4120 is the Buildings.

Steve Craig: Okay, 4120, as you know, in the last three years we've been updating all of our restrooms in the park to ADA standards, and number 18, which is our second largest building, the restrooms in that facility at the present time aren't handicap accessible, and we were wanting to do the same thing that we had done to the Bishea Building and number 13 in the last two years is to make it handicap accessible. We have a couple other restrooms that are just for the park, and two of them are not ADA acceptable either. They were built probably 15 years ago, and at the time that they were built, they were ADA acceptable, but they aren't now. Number seven is one of our smaller buildings. The floor

is rotting out, and we are going to put a concrete floor in that building, because we've jacked it up the last two years. On the \$85,000, what in the past we've done, we've shared the cost with the Commissioners. What the Council has not gave us to do, or gave us enough money to do it, then the Commissioners have kicked in and gave us the remaining amount. Not that I'm asking all of it from the Council, but we were going to have, or try to get all the restrooms in the park, outside of the ones at our main office and pavilion, which that will be a major project when we redo our pavilion. Because when we update these they've, the Building Commission then makes us put the proper amount of restrooms in the building that is needed. Before we started this none of our building probably had the proper amount of restrooms in there to accommodate the size of the picnics and receptions that the building have. So, as we've done this they've all gotten larger than what we've had in there, but that's according to the code.

Councilmember Raben: You know, this is another, which I'm glad Catherine is moving forward, or at least, looking at the idea of a grant writer. The Old Courthouse, Burdette Park, these are all areas that there has got to be tons of Federal Funds available. Particularly on upgrading, you know, a public facility to mediate ADA standards and what have you. So, at some point in time, if we ever had just that right person, it could sure, it could sure alleviate a lot of problems for this county.

Steve Craig: I agree with you 100%. If I would make a suggestion for the county, it would be that we have at least one and maybe two grant writers for the whole county, because I don't know if one of them would be able to accommodate, you know, the Sheriff's department, the Courthouse, you know, all the different departments. I think they would be worth their weight in gold to have a grant writer.

Councilmember Raben: Well, I think you would just single out one or two areas at a time to work on. You know, concentrate your efforts for the first couple of years on be it the Old Courthouse or Burdette or both, and just kind of gradually move through the county and other areas. You know, I don't know if two or three are necessary, but, you know, just one good one and hit on two key areas would probably—

Steve Craig: You know, I—

Councilmember Raben: —probably be a great help.

Steve Craig: If they could possibly get several million dollars for the county, I mean, to me that justifies whatever their wage would be. You know, there is a lot of grants out there, they are just so difficult to come by and when you get into writing them and that they're, if you don't know exactly what you are doing, you are lost. By the time you done with it, you know, the grant's done or, you know, you're not eligible for it due to something that happened. Because we'd applied for over 50 of them in the last three years and received only a couple of them. I think if we would have had somebody with more knowledge and been on it then we would have got more grants than what we did.

Councilmember Hoy: I would support Mr. Raben's suggestion that they ease into it, being a grant writer. Because I'd have to go back and look at how many grants I wrote and the percentage. You're not going to land on all of them for a lot of reasons. They run out of money. I've written grant applications where they sent the paperwork, they solicited our grant, we submitted our grant and then they sent us a notice and said gee, we don't have any money this year.

Steve Craig: Well—

Councilmember Hoy: So, you're gonna, you're gonna miss a lot. I would like to see us ease into it on a couple of these things and see how it works out.

Steve Craig: We had several of them approach us and we did the work and then they come back and told us we weren't eligible—

Councilmember Hoy: Yeah, right.

Steve Craig: –for ‘em.

Suzanne Crouch: We had...the State Board of Accounts did a seminar for different county departments and, I guess, there is two ways you can go, you can either contract with someone and pay them a percentage of the grant, or you can actually have a county employee who does that. We have a position in our office that we haven't filled, and we even thought about, perhaps, going with that route.

Councilmember Hoy: That probably would be the best route to go because there are some grants...grantor, people who grant money, grantors who will not let you include a percentage for the writer. Some will and some won't. There are some that, I mean, they are very restrictive in terms of what you can spend the money on. So, it's not, it's not as if you can just include a percentage in every grant you write, because some of them, I mean, they are right down to the size of the tire on the vehicle almost, you know.

Councilmember Raben: Yes. All we need to land is a few big ones, though. What was it the Greenway? Wasn't the initial grant like a million and a half?

Councilmember Hoy: Yeah.

Councilmember Raben: It was quite a bit. So, there's...every now and then you catch a big fish.

Councilmember Hoy: That's where I'm speaking from, Councilman Raben, is that I'm Finance Chairman for the Greenway and we've banded this about as to whether or not we can hire somebody or give 'em a percentage, and we ran into a number of situations where you couldn't give a percentage. They wouldn't allow it. Then some will. It's dicey. I think it's certainly worth looking into.

President Fanello: Mr. Winnecke.

Councilmember Winnecke: Steve, what are the conditions of the restrooms? Is the sole purpose to just bring them up to ADA compliance? Or are they not functioning in other ways?

Steve Craig: They are all in good shape, or were in good shape. Number 18 is fine. First of all, it doesn't have enough facilities in it to accommodate the building, which is just an inconvenience to the people that are using it, but the main reason that we are doing this is so that they are all handicap accessible.

Councilmember Winnecke: So, the plan would be, theoretically, to complete all restroom renovations in 2002? Everything would be ADA compliant?

Steve Craig: Yes, sir. Outside of the main office one for the pavilion, because once we get into that with the size of the picnics and that we have at the pavilion, we're going to have a major restroom at that building.

Councilmember Winnecke: Okay.

Councilmember Sutton: Unfortunately, some of those regulations are, you know, obviously, not based on practicality. I mean, you'll have more restrooms than you probably need, but it's the reg.

President Bassemier: Thank you, sir.

Steve Craig: Yes, sir. You wanted me to comment on 4130 too you said, Jim?

Councilmember Raben: Yeah.

Steve Craig: Okay, the basis of that is that we have two riding lawn mowers that one is 13 years old and one is 12 years old. We've been repairing them for the last several years, and then this year we had to do some welding on the frames and that and they are probably at the point where we should either scrap 'em or trade 'em in. They did offer us a very small amount for a trade in, and this price that was in here for the two new mowers. We were looking to buy new, eight new weed whips. Our weed whips are about six years old and they are used everyday, sometimes for six, seven hours a day. A lot more than any homeowner would ever use one, and we are piecemealing the eight of them that we previously had and we are down to five of them now that run, and that was because we scraped the other ones out. The other monies that was involved in that was to go around and every year we, our safety man meets with OSHA and they go around and it seems like every year the playground equipment that was fine for us when we were kids is no longer fine for kids. You have to either eliminate 'em or, well, usually they just tell us to get rid of 'em. As we eliminate 'em and I always like to replace 'em with a newer piece of playground equipment so that we're not going backwards. You know, at least standing still with the amount of playground equipment that we have out there for the kids. The 4170, Water Attraction. This is two of the kids slides we have we, originally, back in the early 90's we put in five kids slides. We've already taken one of them out of the pool and put it back on the beach because it was no longer safe. We have two of 'em that we've been repairing for the last several years, and my maintenance man said that there couldn't be no more welding done on the inside of it because there wasn't nothing left there to weld. If we, I mean, if we can't afford to do these, I will probably have to take two of them out and just leave a void there because they have deteriorated. They were not made to last ten years. The guys that sold it to us out of New Brownsville, Texas said that they usually last four or five, and, I think, they are kind of made that way as a planned obsolescent program for New Brownsville. With a little bit of work and welding we've kept them, you know, running for the last four or five years, but it's been on a prayer.

Councilmember Winnecke: Steve, on the equipment for the playground equipment—

Steve Craig: Yes, sir.

Councilmember Winnecke: —on the replacement. How much equipment are you talking about?

Steve Craig: Well, probably one or two pieces. Small pieces, because the new playground equipment is quite expensive.

Councilmember Winnecke: So, is this replacement has it been mandated by these OSHA inspections?

Steve Craig: No, they didn't tell us we had to replace 'em. There is just some of them that they told us that we could no longer use. We've eliminated like teeter totters and your swings that had four swings on 'em you can't have two of 'em so close. We took the middle swings out and just certain pieces of equipment that's been in the park, you know, for numerous years. It's been out there some of it 20 years and that they no longer condone. We've taken some of 'em out. I think that the last new piece of equipment we put in was two years ago. It's just that the safety regulations on 'em anymore, I mean, if a kid can find out a way to get hurt on a piece of playground equipment, they will. It's just that we've been eliminating 'em as we went along, and we felt it was time that we—

Councilmember Winnecke: Okay.

Steve Craig: —put a piece or two back in.

Councilmember Sutton: A lot of...there are a lot of entities that are facing kind of the same thing with playground equipment in having to eliminate playground equipment because of

safety, new safety regulations and all. Playground equipment is very expensive. It's just, it's pretty astronomical. You can't just run over to your local Lowe's or Home Depot and pick up something that may have off, that is just not made to handle the type of wear and tear that you would have at the place there. So, your other option is not to have any playground equipment or try and replace it with something.

Steve Craig: Well, they had, I think, it was a park or a church in Newburgh where they told them to take it all out because it wasn't safe and then they came back the next year and told them it was safe and they had already taken all the playground equipment out. You know, the regulations just, you know, what's safe and what's not safe is just constantly changing.

President Bassemier: Anybody else? Thank you, Mr. Craig.

Steve Craig: Thank you. You all have a nice day.

President Bassemier: Okay. Thank you. Okay, Co-Op Extension Service, page 74.

CO-OP EXTENSION SERVICE

President Bassemier: I want to thank you, sir, for your patience. Please state your name.

Bob Meyerholtz: I'm Bob Meyerholtz, Chairman of the Extension Board for the Co-Operative Extension Service. As you can see, our particular budget has not requested very much. I can tell you that the Extension Board is much more liberal than the staff. The staff says we don't need this and the Extension Board says, yes. I think this year we pretty well went with the staff recommendations as far as anything that they requested. I can answer any questions that you might.

President Bassemier: Anybody got any questions?

Councilmember Wortman: No, I think they run a pretty good ship out there. Out there in the promised land, again. I might recall, get everybody's attention, next year that lease, I think, will come forward, so we can get down to negotiating and see what that's gonna be—

Councilmember Tornatta: 'Cause that's awful expensive out in the promised land.

Councilmember Wortman: —get ready (Inaudible. Talking over each other.) Do what?

Councilmember Tornatta: It's awful expensive out in the promised land.

Councilmember Wortman: Well, the same thing.

Councilmember Hoy: You know, I've been preaching for 42 years that you couldn't buy your way in, Curt.

Bob Meyerholtz: We have discussed the lease and, I think, the Extension Board and the staff would like to have some guidelines from the Council as to what they would like to, what they would expect for this staff to work toward.

Councilmember Hoy: Have you all considered, I think you have, but, I'm a person who likes to get things out on the floor, as you know. One of the things that would be good is if we could get, maybe, Farm Services, the Administrative, FSA and SWCD and DNR and NRCS and you guys all in the same building.

Bob Meyerholtz: Well, 4-H Center is, I think, the 23rd of August has their first meeting to try to put together an administrative building possibility for all the services located out at the 4-H Center. As I said, it's the first meeting, I believe, is the 23rd of, 23rd of August. Mr. Tornatta and I sat on that committee and, hopefully, things will come about that we can

bring all those people together.

Councilmember Hoy: We're doing fine with our location, but, you know, it would be nice to get those all interfaced with each other.

Bob Meyerholtz: Right. You're right.

President Bassemier: Mr. Winnecke.

Councilmember Winnecke: Two quick questions. What is Contractual Services used for?

Bob Meyerholtz: Contractual Services is...3530 you're talking about?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes, sir.

Bob Meyerholtz: 3530 is the lease agreement for computers that are tied into Purdue University that we pay a certain amount on a, I think, it's a three year basis to tie the computers into that program.

Councilmember Winnecke: Do you know how many computer there are?

Bob Meyerholtz: Seven.

Councilmember Winnecke: Seven.

Bob Meyerholtz: I think there is four now covered by the Contractual Services and the increase of \$1,250 would then put all seven of those computers on that service.

Councilmember Sutton: Councilman Winnecke, did you say 3370 or?

Councilmember Winnecke: 3530.

Councilmember Sutton: 35, okay.

Bob Meyerholtz: 3530.

Councilmember Winnecke: That's what you were talking about right?

Bob Meyerholtz: Oh, yes, that's what I was talking about.

Councilmember Winnecke: Then 3370—

Councilmember Sutton: That's what I thought the computer was covered under 3370.

Bob Meyerholtz: You are exactly right. 3370 is the computers. I'm sorry. 3370 is...3530 is the charge that the University—

Councilmember Sutton: Yeah.

Bob Meyerholtz: —covers for the three Purdue staff members that we have. That they charge the county so much each year, and they are increasing that by \$1,250 this year.

Councilmember Winnecke: Thank you.

Bob Meyerholtz: I apologize for that.

President Bassemier: That's okay. Any other questions?

Councilmember Sutton: At least...I was going to follow up on line item 3370, that's why I

kind of caught that. The lease agreement, who dictates the terms on that? Does the Co-Op Extension kind of dictate that? Or is that something that we have coordinated and who would that vendor be?

Bob Meyerholtz: Purdue is the, as I understand, Purdue is the people that initiated this. At the time as I understand this the Council agreed to finance four, the four professional people, computers for the computer service. The extra three then, the \$2,100, \$700 a piece then would be for the other, rest of the staff.

Councilmember Sutton: Okay, thank you.

Councilmember Winnecke: Are those computers just used for office functions? Or is there specific software that unique to it?

Bob Meyerholtz: There is specific software, as I understand, specific software that is connected to the University that they then can make all the connections with...if you take an item out...your tomato problem, then the horticulturalist can contact the university with that through that software and get your answer as to what is wrong with it and that type of thing.

Councilmember Winnecke: Okay, thank you.

Councilmember Sutton: Bob, who's providing your Janitorial Service? It's line item 3570 at \$1,200. What's, who provides that for you?

Bob Meyerholtz: The...we have hired a lady once a month to come in and do the cleaning of the office. They pay that lady \$75 to come in and clean the entire office. They also supply all the bathroom supplies and that type of thing with it. There is no trash collection in that figure.

President Bassemier: That couldn't be in that group, huh?

Bob Meyerholtz: They've worked out an agreement with their neighbor, neighboring business to take care of the trash. So, he pays the trash.

Councilmember Sutton: So, the lease agreement that we have does not--

Bob Meyerholtz: Does not cover--

Councilmember Sutton: --include that?

Bob Meyerholtz: --not as I understand, that's right.

Councilmember Sutton: Okay.

President Bassemier: Anybody else? Thank you, sir. Appreciate it. Okay, Legal Aid.

LEGAL AID

President Bassemier: 123. Morning, Ms. Hartig.

Sue Hartig: I'm Sue Hartig. I've been the Director of Legal Aid since 1986, and an attorney since 1979. Legal Aid has been around since 1958. Currently we're a 50-50 City/County agency. Last year with a budget of a little over \$300,000 we provided services that would have cost over \$800,000 had the individuals gone to private attorneys. We used his figures when we did that. I would like to remind you that you have several big criminal justice issues, the jail, community corrections, juvenile, but keep in mind that the common person that walks into the courthouse isn't going into the courthouse because of a criminal matter. It's a civil matter. Custody, visitation, child support, be it in juvenile court or divorce court.

CHINS, the child in need of services with the Welfare department in juvenile. Guardianship and adoptions, evictions, small claims matters, suits on medical bills, return of a deposit and protective orders. Those are the kinds of cases in which we represent low income people. There are now 16 different judicial officers. Eight judges, six magistrates, a law clerk and a court administrator, all of whom hear cases that our three attorneys appear in front of. We went from a staff of four to a staff of six back in 1993. We worked on 815 in 2000. That averages 272 cases per attorney. Compare that your cap that the Public Defenders office is using. Right now we have 297 cases pending, and for three attorneys, it should be 210. We have a very active board of 12 people. Six attorneys appointed by the Bar, and six non-attorneys, three appointed by the Mayor and three by the Commissioners. Kelly Lonnberg, one of our attorney board members is here with me today. We thank you for your continuing support. City and County provide about 80% of our budget, United Way the other 20%.

President Bassemier: Okay. Any questions for Ms. Hartig? Okay. United Way/ Legal Aid, oh, I'm sorry, Troy.

Councilmember Tornatta: Okay, on the rent—

Sue Hartig: Uh-huh.

Councilmember Tornatta: —is that paid by the Commissioners?

Sue Hartig: It's the same rent that all other government offices pay. We show it in our budget so that you can recoup 50% of that from the City. If we didn't show it as a line item, the County couldn't bill the City for half of it.

Councilmember Tornatta: The Commissioners don't have that in their budget?

Sue Hartig: No.

Councilmember Raben: It needs to be in your budget for the reimbursement part of United Way too.

Sue Hartig: Right.

Councilmember Tornatta: For a fact, the Commissioners don't have that in their budget?

Sue Hartig: We do a claim for them and actually pay that.

Councilmember Tornatta: Then, just one question on...is that, why would it have law books in there too. I've seen a lot of different line items for law books. Is that something that would be covered under the law library over here? Or is this separate?

Sue Hartig: That's a good question. When I have a client in my office, there are some minimal law books I need right there. I can't leave my office in the Civic Center, walk back to another building and look that up in the law library. We have one set of the Indiana Code. We have two extra copies of the title on family law. So, each of the three attorneys have that. There are other specialty books on poverty law. A subscription that we take, it's called Advance Sheets, and it's a little booklet that looks like a TV Guide or a Reader's Digest. It comes out every week with all the brand new cases in it. We circulate that among the three of us. These are things that we couldn't use what's in the law library or what the judges have or what's in the Prosecutor's office.

President Bassemier: Mr. Wortman.

Councilmember Wortman: Mr. President. Ms. Hartig, on Junior Legal Secretary number two, it looks like a little reduction in the wage there. Salary.

Sue Hartig: It's a reduction on your side. The increase is on the—

Councilmember Wortman: City side?

Sue Hartig: —United Way.

Councilmember Wortman: United Way. Okay. Then the next is page 124, yellow pages went from \$600 to \$1,500. Can you explain that, please?

Sue Hartig: Yes. Our board discussed this and we feel we have a duty to do some form of advertisement to let people know that we are out there. Our clients are not going to know to look in the blue pages in the front of the phone book and say, I wonder if that's a City funded agency or a County funded agency? So, we need our own independent listing in the phone book. We've cut, and we have a very minimal listing. We need to list the office and then the three attorneys names. The board discussed this at length, excuse me, and decided that they didn't want to pursue a different kind of a yellow pages ad.

Councilmember Wortman: Thank you.

Sue Hartig: That still won't be much. That won't be an eighth of a page, or anything like that. Those are very expensive.

President Bassemier: Okay.

Councilmember Sutton: During...I was going to ask you, Ms. Hartig, during like non office hours if someone tries to reach your office—

Sue Hartig: Uh-huh.

Councilmember Sutton: —what do they...is there voice mail system that's in place?

Sue Hartig: We have an answering machine. We are struggling to get voice mail, but the glitch we had, the provider told us if we the e-mail, or the voice mail that the county system has, the phones would no longer roll over. We have three incoming lines and three secretaries, and when we tried that everyone was getting a busy signal. We got all kinds of complaints, so, we hope to go to voice mail someday, but for now we have an answering machine.

President Bassemier: Anymore questions? I think that pretty well covers it. Thank you.

Sue Hartig: Thank you.

President Bassemier: Okay.

(TAPE CHANGE)

CORONER

President Bassemier: The Coroner's office, Mr. Erk, page 1, I'm sorry 34.

Don Erk: My name is Don Erk, I am the Vanderburgh County Coroner. I might say that the budget that I have submitted is fairly reasonable and I would be more than willing to address any questions that any of the Councilmembers might have in reference to this budget.

President Bassemier: Got any questions for the Coroner? Anybody?

Councilmember Tornatta: I just wanted to make a quick statement. Looking at this, Don, I had talked to Annie, your Chief Deputy, that you guys are now approximately 40 cases

down. So these numbers reflect 40 cases down and that's plus or minus ten cases, so you are experiencing a little bit of, you're experiencing some low numbers at this point.

Don Erk: Yes, we have had some unusual cases in the last year which obviously, I don't have any control over that. But, our case load is down this year on the amount of autopsies that we have had to do. I can only guess what it will be next year and that is kind of what we have set in here and whether that is realistic or not, I have not way of knowing.

Councilmember Tornatta: She noticed it, and she also said that somehow has a way of catching up. So, anyway, maybe it is something that we need to anticipate. Also, July 1, started charge backs to the counties?

Don Erk: That is correct. There was a new law enacted in July that took effect July 1. I think it was done by Ft. Wayne because their ambulance was bringing in patients from all over there area, which it is a state law now. We can bill other counties in Indiana, in southern Indiana, if they come in, if they get hurt in Pike County, we had one yesterday that got hurt there, we can bill that counties now for (inaudible) the problem with it is and it leaves me with an unknown criteria in the sense that if somebody gets hurt here in Vanderburgh County and taken to Wishard Hospital in Indianapolis and they die in Indianapolis, they are going to bill us back from Marion County. So, I don't know how this is all going to shake out. Probably, hopefully, by next year, I will have a little better feel on it. I don't know how many people from Vanderburgh County are taken to Indianapolis. I would doubt that Ft. Wayne, Lake County or Richmond, will effect us because I can't visualize very many people being transferred from this county to this hospital up there. The smaller counties are trying to get into the program in the sense that they, to ask them to repeal this law, they are very upset about it because they don't won't to be billed for the deaths that occur in their county. The actual death occur here, but the accident or whatever that brought them to the county. The other problem that I have which is a little bit unique in a sense that Marion County and some of the different ones, is that we do an awful lot from Kentucky and Illinois. There is absolutely nothing that we can do about it. They are brought here by life flight and they are in the hospital. I would say that we get more out of Kentucky and Illinois than we do out of Southern Indiana, to be honest. I can not control that fact.

Councilmember Tornatta: That is a good heads up, just to have an idea and the other thing I was going to say was that you have got a 2002 truck, that is a 4 x 4 and you stayed under the amount that we got, has all of the bells and whistles that you needed. So, that is going to turn out real good for you.

Don Erk: Yes, we have ordered and were waiting on it. But it has come in under the budget that they set.

Councilmember Sutton: Do we have, how is it determined what the amount will be in terms of charges for like, if we do an autopsy for someone that is from another county, what does that amount determined to asset that rate?

Don Erk: We set it at \$100 per case, anybody that is brought in there and I think that we generated about \$30,000 worth of revenue for the county this last year. That is a figure that you have to look at and decide what reasonable amount is reasonable on it and I would like to raise it, I am no sure that we can do that at this particular point.

Councilmember Sutton: What, how long has it been at that level?

Don Erk: It has been there for about three years, I believe.

Councilmember Sutton: I am pretty sure that our costs have gone up over that three year period.

Don Erk: That is correct and I am looking at it very strongly to raise it to the other counties,

especially the out of state. I feel that they need to carry more of their share of the burden. Illinois is putting in a morgue over there which might cut down on some of our caseload, I don't know. It is a basically a barn that they have converted into using as a morgue and so they are doing some of their over there rather than bring them over here, which is great.

Councilmember Sutton: Likewise, it will be interesting to see what other counties are charging for the same service.

Don Erk: Well, you have got to realize that there is only five only four morgues in the whole state of Indiana. So, when you are talking about other counties, Lake County has a morgue that is fully supported but, they do not do any from anybody and if that is what the Council would like for me to do, I don't have a problem with that. It does generate some revenue, it is something that you have to look at. Well, does it generate enough that it is worth our time or are we actually spending more. At \$100 we are probably starting to get close. By the time you figure the chemicals, the extra hazard waste, all of the things that go with those cases. You know you have to look at the thing at it's total.

Councilmember Tornatta: Can there be out of state fees imposed?

Don Erk: You can impose them but you can't enforce them. You can't force another state to pay anything. If you can, I am not aware of it. You mean to transfer these costs back to Kentucky?

Councilmember Tornatta: Well, wherever they are coming from. I mean if we providing the service for them.

Don Erk: Well, they are life flighted here into the hospitals. They are treated in the hospitals, they die here, the state law says that the county is responsible for it, wherever that death occurs. Of course, obviously because of the situation where you are 25 miles from Illinois, ten miles from Kentucky, we get a lot out of there. It is kind of unique in that sense. I don't think Lake County or Richmond or Marion County gets them from all over the state. But, they are basically state cases, I doubt if they get from Ohio or Illinois. Once in a while they might get one. It wouldn't be a huge amount, does that make any sense?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yeah, I am just thinking that is something that we have a lot of call for, maybe that is something that we need to look into making some type of raise for the different states.

Don Erk: Well, I would think that you would have to change the state law on it in order to do that because we are responsible for it, under state law.

Councilmember Raben: Only if they die in your county. I mean, again, if there is a homicide in Mt. Vernon, Indiana, and there Sheriff's department brings or transports that body for an autopsy to Vanderburgh County, we can charge whatever the heck we want. If they opt to bring it here, we can set that. Because I have had this argument for the last ten years. I think we are way to giving with the \$100. We do have a lot of wear and tear. You are opening up our morgue in the middle of the night, we are probably paying a Chief Deputy to be inside the facility while the autopsy is being performed. Again, the only ones that we are bound to are the ones that actually die in this county. That is not always the case. I mean, that jurisdiction that body, that persons firm may opt to bring it back and bring their own autopsy to, correct?

Don Erk: That is correct.

Councilmember Hoy: The other sad thing that has happened, I have been assigned to your department, since I got elected. It is kind of like when I go to see my kids in Danville, Illinois, sorry Royce and Troy, but I see that blue and yellow bank sign there where my Old National Card is good. If you drive around the tri-state and the other states, particularly southern Illinois and Indiana, you will see familiar names like St. Mary's and Deaconess.

What has happened is that the two big hospitals here have bought up, the own the tri-state, consequently, well they do, they medically own the tri-state, so when it is heavy duty treatment, they are going to be in one of these two hospitals right here and that is where they are going to die.

Don Erk: Exactly.

Councilmember Hoy: We are the center of this tri-state and that is just going to happen. The flip side of that coin is that if you go to any of the shopping centers, you can check the license plates and you can see that those folks are spending their money here and they are spending them at our hospital but it is a major, major regional change and you know it is a business change for the hospital. They have been sending, well when I was in Leadership Evansville in 1985, one of the tours we took was a cat scanner that was on the back end of a semi-truck. One of the major hospitals that is still in existence is still driving that thing around the tri-state and now one the MRI's on are those things and that is just the way the business runs, so this is a bill that we are going to have. I agree with Councilmember Raben, we might want to raise the ante a little bit on Indiana, but good luck collecting from the other two states, because I don't think you will. You have a law that you have to follow.

Don Erk: Well, I can try anything but I don't think that it is realistic.

Councilmember Hoy: You don't have to, I think that Council knows, that you don't have to do an autopsy in every case but in some cases you have to, you are mandated. You have to.

Don Erk: Kentucky does have a regional morgue at Madisonville that they put in the last couple of years. But, like I say the thing of it is, the major hospitals are here and anytime there is a life flight, tissue or organ harvest, I guarantee you that it will wind up in Vanderburgh County and it is going to be our case. It is a beast that I live with and there is not much that I can do about that. As far as the morgue fees, yes I can look at them very strong.

Councilmember Sutton: I guess that my point is, I do see by virtue, just by virtue of what we are providing, we need to be compensated for our services, appropriately. A \$100 is charitable but not reasonable in terms of what is being provided, what is expected of this staff. If there is a way that we can go back and revisit that, I think we need to do that as soon as we can do that. Even if, a county had their own morgue, you know, say Pike County or something like that. The cost that it would take to actually staff a morgue and the equipment and things like that wouldn't come anything near what they are paying for an autopsy down on this end.

Don Erk: That is absolutely correct. As a matter of fact, I know that the Warrick County Coroner looked into installing some kind of facility to do some work up there and he dropped it within two weeks. So, you know, he knows that once you checked into anything at all that you couldn't provide the air conditioning and the storage. The freezers and things, you couldn't begin to do that for the amount that they are paying and he obviously came to the conclusion quicker.

Councilmember Raben: I have always thought that it was unfair. I mean, I always thought that we were leaving way to much under the table. You know, the pathologist and the fee today is what \$700 some odd.

Don Erk: No, it is more than that. It is \$890.

Councilmember Raben: It is \$890 that they collect for performing an autopsy and we collect a \$100.

Don Erk: Well sir, one problem that you've got is like the pathologist, I spoke to them in

reference to this, is that they would pay a morgue fee themselves but they are going to reflect it in the cost of their autopsies. They, have -

Councilmember Raben: Why do we care? I mean I personally don't care what he charges a county in southern Illinois.

Don Erk: Oh, you mean for the other counties. I see-

Councilmember Raben: The choice is pay our fee or build your own morgue and if he opts to charge more, so be it. I mean, that is, what these guys are saying and what I have been saying forever, is let's make it worthwhile.

Don Erk: Okay.

Councilmember Hoy: I agree with that. I just think that realistically that if you have statistics that would help us, even if you doubled it, you are not looking at a great huge dent in our budget.

Don Erk: No.

Councilmember Hoy: If you doubled all of those outside autopsies to \$200, we are still going to be looking at a fair amount of money here. I am not against that. I think it is probably a good idea.

Don Erk: Well, a lot of it is a service to the other counties, I don't think there is any doubt. Part of this will be offset, I hope, we will be able to bill Warrick County. I have one from Pike County right now but we will bill them into the General Fund. I don't know how this whole thing under this new statute will come out but I will do everything that I can to make it reasonable and obviously looking at the morgue fees is one place that I will be looking very strongly this year.

Councilmember Wortman: Mr. Erk, like they come from Illinois, see in the hospitals see, you have to pay their insurance, their insurance pays for their stay there if they pass away, don't they? Like if they die there at the hospital and they are treated, say for a week or two?

Don Erk: Insurance from? I mean, I don't.

Councilmember Wortman: See, they bring a patient in from Illinois. Now, the hospitals charge them for that don't they?

Don Erk: Sure.

Councilmember Wortman: Yeah, and they collect don't they?

Don Erk: Sure, they charge them under the insurance. Yes.

Councilmember Wortman: I was going to say, yeah. I don't know how we can work that but-

Don Erk: So, you are saying to charge the state of Illinois, for somebody being in the hospital and dying?

Councilmember Wortman: Well, I don't know how they do it, but I am sure that the hospital says, you have insurance, and you are going to pay for their treatment here, right?

Don Erk: Right.

Councilmember Wortman: If they die, then somebody, we are responsible for that again.

Don Erk: Yes.

Councilmember Wortman: But, their insurance don't cover that, does it?

Don Erk: No.

Councilmember Wortman: See.

Don Erk: No, it does not.

Councilmember Wortman: That ought to be brought up, maybe with the legislative, it would be something to think about it, when you think about it.

President Bassemier: Mr. Tornatta.

Councilmember Tornatta: Let me understand something. You were talking about the \$100. Is that all we get, or do we bill them for other services?

Don Erk: Well, we bill them for other services. If we do histology, there is part of that money goes into histology.

Councilmember Tornatta: The doctor's fee?

Don Erk: Yes, they bring in block slides. Any of this is billed for separately.

Councilmember Tornatta: The \$100 right now that we are getting?

Don Erk: Is a morgue fee.

Councilmember Tornatta: Yeah, okay.

Don Erk: That is to cover expenses of operating that morgue.

Councilmember Tornatta: Okay.

Councilmember Raben: If a pathologist comes into our facility, he collects \$800 and some. He bills that county.

Councilmember Tornatta: Right, but we are not responsible for those types of, in fact, we are not responsible for any fee aside of running the morgue.

Councilmember Raben: Right. What we are doing.

Councilmember Tornatta: I think some of that misconception from the \$100, I don't want it to look like the \$100, is just covering, we are getting just a portion of what actually was billed. We are billing that county for what we are doing and then that \$100 is just an overtop fee that you would spend at the Centre or anything else, the percentage fee.

Don Erk: Well for instance, on most autopsies, the doctors fees are somewhere between \$200 and \$400. We charge them, if we do DNA cards, which we are doing DNA on everybody coming in, we charge those doctors, and they in turn either take care of it in their fee to that other county or bill that other county. I don't know and don't care. But, we do get a fee out of that. We get a fee out of any histology. Anything that comes up in reference to that, they are billed separately for. They are billed to the doctors themselves. Does that clarify what you are talking about.

Councilmember Tornatta: Do any other counties have to pay a fee to the morgue at this time?

Don Erk: No.

Councilmember Tornatta: Okay, I didn't know if there was a percentage or certain fees that they paid, pay to the morgue for using their facility.

Don Erk: No, I checked with all of the doctors. I checked with all of the different coroner's offices within the state. The worse situation is really over like in New Albany. They get all of theirs, winds up, in Jewish Hospital in Louisville. They have the same problem over there, which I am sure that Louisville doesn't like at all. But, they get them all over southern Indiana. But, I have checked with all of the different coroner's offices that I could find within the state of Indiana. No one in the five counties that have morgue facilities charge the doctors to use that facility.

President Bassemier: Any more questions?

Councilmember Raben: But they should, because if that doctor, another sort of doctor, another surgeon, when he goes in and performs surgery in Deaconess Hospital, there is a fee assessed to him for using that operating room.

Don Erk: They say that there is not.

Councilmember Hoy: When you get your bill, because I look over my medical bills, and anytime that I was in for an outpatient procedure recently and that is diced up very cleanly.

Councilmember Raben: That's part of the (inaudible)

Councilmember Hoy: Yeah. In the position that we are in here and correct me on this if I am incorrect is that you have to deal with forensic pathologist and there are only a few of those available and our fee is still under other areas.

Don Erk: The average for the state of Indiana is \$150.

Councilmember Hoy: Yeah and our pathologist charge eight

Don Erk: Yes, \$890.

Councilmember Hoy: Our one pathologist, who is also our Health Officer, is recognized throughout the country. When they were doing the investigations on GAC or one of those mass murders in one other state, he is the guy that is called in. Whether or not we like his fee, he is top. No, they don't, they separate that bill out, look over, if you have to go in for a test, you will see and you will see how much you pay for the Kleenex, too.

Don Erk: It's not cheap. The regular, I checked into the regular pathologist, if we drop the forensic pathologist you are still looking at over \$120,000 a year, is as cheap as you will get a medical doctor.

Councilmember Hoy: So, we can get out of here on time, you might want to take a look, from what I am hearing here, at maybe raising that fee for using that space. Because, it is very reasonable than them building anything and I don't think they are going to build anything.

Don Erk: I will look at it and I will undoubtedly for this next year, it will be raised. The side thing that they have and their argument back to me is that they pay for a transport to bring that body over here which is their problem not mine and that is basically what I have told them. But, it does add to their costs. So, therefore, it gets cheaper for them to have the doctor to drive on the road and they pay him several hundred dollars, I think it is \$100 an hour but anyhow, that's their problem.

Councilmember Tornatta: You are going to raise the price of your tires, aren't you, Troy?

Councilmember Raben: Thanks, Don.

Don Erk: Anything else?

Councilmember Tornatta: Thank you, Don.

LOCAL EMERGENCY PLANNING FUND

President Bassemier: Next, is . Emergency Fund, page 182.

Councilmember Hoy: Is there, if there are any comments on LEPC, I am on that Board. I don't think that there will be, but if you have questions. I could probably give a stab at answering. I don't think that there are many differences on that.

President Bassemier: Okay, that's it. I want to remind everybody tonight, joint city county tonight at 5:00. I need a motion to recess until tomorrow.

Councilmember Wortman: I make a motion that we will recess the meeting until tomorrow at 9:00.

Councilmember Winnecke: Second.

President Bassemier: Meeting is recessed.

(Meeting recessed at 11: 54 a.m.)

AUGUST 8, 2001

The Vanderburgh County Council met in session this 8th day of August, 2001 in Room 301 of the Civic Center Complex. The meeting was officially opened by President Ed Bassemier at 9:08 a.m.

President Bassemier: Sheriff, do you want to open the meeting?

Brad Ellsworth: I'll try this time. Oh yes, oh yes, oh yes the Vanderburgh County Council is now in session pursuant to adjournment.

President Bassemier: I want to welcome everyone to the August 8, 2001 day two budget hearings. Attendance roll call, please.

COUNCILMEMBER	PRESENT	ABSENT
Councilmember Tornatta	X	
Councilmember Sutton	X	
Councilmember Wortman*		X
Councilmember Hoy	X	
Councilmember Raben	X	
Councilmember Winnecke	X	
President Bassemier	X	

*(Councilmember Wortman joined meeting after roll call was taken.)

President Bassemier: Would everyone please stand for the Pledge of Allegiance?

(Pledge of Allegiance was given.)

President Bassemier: Finance Chairman, Mr. Raben, do you have anything to say to this group before we start?

Councilmember Raben: No, sir.

Councilmember Sutton: I was going to say, Mr. President, if I could add?

President Bassemier: Sure.

Councilmember Sutton: Normally at the beginning of our budget session our Auditor will give us kind of a general overview of where we are and what we should anticipate for our budget hearings for the two weeks in terms of how much we need to from a projected standpoint cut so that we can get an idea of where we stand in relation to the freeze as we're going through looking at budgets we can have at least a ballpark figure of what we're trying to shoot for so I didn't know, Suzanne, if they just left you off the agenda or you stepped out of the room.

Suzanne Crouch: Well, I passed out the budget overview and it looks like you need to cut \$10 to \$11 million. However, the insurance...that's a little deceiving because the insurance is in every department's budget and also is in County Council's budget this year, so that's about a \$5 million that is kind of a false cut, you know, so to speak. That's kind of the estimate on what needs to be cut or needs to be trimmed in order to stay under the freeze.

Councilmember Sutton: So \$6 million is your guesstimate of where we need to be?

Suzanne Crouch: Five to \$6 million, yeah.

Councilmember Sutton: If you exclude the insurance?

Suzanne Crouch: And I do think that is doable. It's just going to present a challenge in how you do it, but I do think that is doable. The budget this year was last year or this current year is \$44 million and for 2002 it has been a proposed \$57 million. That's a considerable increase over what we've seen in past years. Typically we have about a \$4 million increase for the proposed budget over the current budget, so you can see why there has to be considerably more cut this year.

President Bassemier: Thank you.

Councilmember Winnecke: Can I ask a question on the insurance, if it's alright?

President Bassemier: Go ahead, Mr. Winnecke.

Councilmember Winnecke: Suzanne, could you talk a little bit about this new state law that allows government entities to buy insurance or go through the state's plan. Is that something that we could pursue? Would it be greater cost savings if it tried that?

Suzanne Crouch: The legislature, and I don't have that information in front of me, but I'll make copies perhaps at break and disseminate that to the Councilmembers, but the legislature this past session passed a law that allows county units to participate in the state's insurance program. We've asked to be placed on the agenda, the Auditor's Office, for the Commission meeting Monday to start that process and what we have to do, the way it works is that we gather our information on our employees and on our benefit plans and we submit that to the state and then what the state will do is they will look at that and present a cost back to us. Then it would be up to the Commissioners to decide by October 1 whether they want to participate in that or not. It may not be a cost savings, but I thought it ought to at least be something we pursue at this point in time to see if there is any kind of an advantage. The state offers five insurance plans as opposed to the county's three, so at this point it is at least something we ought to pursue. There may be a savings and there may not. I will get that information and get that to you all at break.

Councilmember Hoy: I don't use the county insurance, so I don't know the answer. What percentage are employees paying?

Suzanne Crouch: Our employees are paying eight percent.

Councilmember Hoy: Out of their own?

Suzanne Crouch: Out of the total cost of the package.

Councilmember Hoy: The total cost, eight percent?

Suzanne Crouch: Yes, and the county picks up 92 percent.

Councilmember Hoy: Okay, thank you.

Suzanne Crouch: And I don't know what that is on the state level.

President Bassemier: Anybody else? (Inaudible, mike not on.)

Councilmember Sutton: Well, I did get that. I did see it, but I guess normally Suzanne just kind of just for the record will read through and at least since the people in the audience don't have the benefit of having this nice summary, so it will give them a chance to at least hear what we're trying to accomplish during the course of the next two weeks.

President Bassemier: Okay, we'll get started.

Councilmember Hoy: Mr. President.

President Bassemier: I'm sorry.

Councilmember Hoy: This probably isn't the right moment, but maybe it is because a couple of us have been talking about the people who support us as Councilmen. Mrs. Deig and Sarah and the Auditor's Office and I just want to thank them all, all of those folks for helping to make our job move more smoothly. We often forget that because they provide us with the information and Mrs. Deig is not the Auditor, but I don't know how many times I have called her on this budget. I'm sure other Councilmen have too and we always get good information.

Sandie Deig: Thank you.

DIVISION OF FAMILY & CHILDREN'S SERVICES

President Bassemier: Point well taken. Anybody else? We'll get started. Division of Family & Children Services, page 142. Please state your name for the record.

John Schroder: My name is John Schroder. I am the Assistant Director with the Vanderburgh County Office of Family & Children. I have budget projection sheets that we used to prepare the budget to present to Indianapolis that is then sent down for filing with you all. I would like to pass those out at this time and then we can review any changes.

President Bassemier: Anybody got any questions for John? John, is there anything you would like to say?

John Schroder: No, the only...really the only account that we deal with in this area is the Family & Children's Fund now. The Welfare Fund no longer exists and supposedly any remaining funds were to be transferred then to the state because they are taking over those accounts and did actually about a year and a half ago or a year ago. There also are a couple or one...there were two accounts originally. They're going to roll those into a single account. The Destitute Children and Child Welfare Services Fund is to be rolled into the Child Welfare Services Fund and it is although it is a county account it is reimbursed at 100 percent by the state on any expenditures made. Other than that the accounts are about the same, what they are used for. It hasn't really changed all that much.

Councilmember Hoy: John, would you...Mr. Schroder, would you explain the Preservation Services? What is that exactly for?

John Schroder: Preservation Services are payments that we make for children who are in danger of abuse, neglect or exploitation and the payments are made for various things like counseling, even transportation, drug treatment for parents or possibly children. A lot of different counseling services. One of the goals of the Family & Social Services Administration Division of Family & Children is trying to keep families together as much as possible as long as it does not endanger the child. If these children...if we are in a case that involves family and we feel that although there is a problem, but the danger to the child may be minimal instead of removing the child from the household and placing them in a foster home or therapeutic foster home or institution what we try to do is provide services. This has been really the emphasis from our central office in Indianapolis about trying to do this.

Councilmember Hoy: Is this what the wraparound program is?

John Schroder: That's part of it, yes.

Councilmember Hoy: Thank you.

John Schroder: The wraparound includes other areas, but yes that is right.

Councilmember Hoy: Thank you.

President Bassemier: Mr. Tornatta.

Councilmember Tornatta: Yeah, I just had a question just to clarify a couple of things. Line 32560 and 32700, are those just anticipating a problem?

John Schroder: It is an account that we are...they ask us to have. Although at this point in time in this county we do not utilize those. If we are mandated basically what these accounts are in there for is to keep them active so if someone decides to utilize the insurance part of it or if we have a provider that does work with that then we would be able to start it up right then and just ask for a transfer coming from other accounts to that.

Councilmember Tornatta: Okay, and most of the other things on their request are all...are those all contracts, I mean, or are those set at a certain amount? This is probably somewhere where I am a little green. Do we...because obviously if you look on what is spent and what is projected it might not look like it is going to hit those numbers.

John Schroder: Correct, and no they are not. We are required if we have a child or if we have a family or children where there are circumstances we have to provide the service.

Councilmember Tornatta: Okay.

John Schroder: We have some contracts. Now the contracts are on a per service type basis. For instance, we were talking about the Preservation Services where we have counseling.

Councilmember Tornatta: Right.

John Schroder: If we don't refer children for the counseling then no we don't have to pay it. On the other hand if we have children that require the service, for instance placements in an institution there again, yes, every time we place a child with an institution we sign a contract, but the contract isn't for a year or for 365 days. It's for the number of days a child might be in that institution. So our requirements are on an as needed basis in most situations.

Councilmember Tornatta: Okay, thanks.

Councilmember Hoy: One other question, and I can't find the line item in the Commissioners' budget for Hillcrest Washington. Is that in addition to your budget or included in your budget?

John Schroder: That's not...Hillcrest Washington is not part of that fund.

Councilmember Hoy: That's fine. What I am looking for, as you know, is how much we really spend on children and how concerned I am about some things.

John Schroder: No, actually that used to be part of the old welfare budget, but when the state...when we moved out of county administration to state administration the state licenses those institutions they felt that would be a conflict of interest and they rolled that over to you all and I believe that was assigned to the County Commissioners and they have a contract for that.

Councilmember Hoy: Yeah, it's \$1,450,000 just to add on the 12. I'm not against spending on children, I'm just concerned about family life, as you know, and what has happened.

Councilmember Raben: You said with the closure of welfare that the funds were transferred into this budget.

John Schroder: The Welfare Fund?

Councilmember Raben: Yeah.

John Schroder: No, sir. With the completion of welfare, the accounts, all but two of the accounts that were in the old Welfare Fund were assumed by the State of Indiana for payment and they rolled the Destitute Children and Child Welfare Services into the Family & Children's Fund, but funded them for reimbursement at one hundred percent. However, any funds remaining in the Welfare Fund as of about the 1st of July of this year were to be forwarded to the State of Indiana.

Councilmember Raben: Okay.

John Schroder: And I believe that transaction was supposed to have taken place this last month.

President Bassemier: Anybody else? Thank you, Mr. Schroder.

John Schroder: Okay, thank you.

PROSECUTOR

President Bassemier: Okay, the next one is Prosecutor, page 37.

Stan Levco: Good morning.

President Bassemier: Good morning.

Stan Levco: My name is Stan Levco. I'm the Prosecutor of Vanderburgh County.

President Bassemier: Thank you, sir. Mr. Levco, anything you would like to enlighten us on?

Stan Levco: What?

President Bassemier: Anything you would like to enlighten us on?

Stan Levco: Yeah, do you want me to go through?

President Bassemier: Yes, and I want to ask you some questions, if you don't mind.

Stan Levco: I'm going on the flexible assumption that things you would be most interested in would be things that you haven't funded in the past, so I won't go through the ones you've already funded.

President Bassemier: Okay.

Stan Levco: The handout that we gave you, I'll go through them, I guess, in order. The first thing I am asking I'm not asking for any new attorneys although I have applied for a federal grant for gun prosecutors, two gun prosecutors. I'm optimistic that will happen and if it does I will be asking for a matching grant at that time. I think they are asking for 20 percent with a \$40,000 salary, but I haven't, you know, there is no certainty that I'll get those and if I do I don't know when it will be.

Councilmember Winnecke: Is that a federal grant?

Stan Levco: Yes.

Councilmember Winnecke: Can I ask a question about that?

Stan Levco: No...yes.

Councilmember Winnecke: I guess I don't understand why we need special...prosecutors whose special intention is to prosecute firearms offenses. Don't all people...all prosecuting attorneys in your office prosecutor people who commit firearm offenses?

Stan Levco: I guess the answer would be twofold. What they would say and the reason I would do, do you want to know both?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Stan Levco: I guess what they would say is we need to have special emphasis on prosecuting firearm offenses and if we have somebody exclusively trained in that area we'll be more affective in doing that. I think that is true, but my main feeling is if I can get an extra prosecutor or two that means I can free up some of the other prosecutors who are prosecuting those now and it will give me one or two extra people to prosecute.

Councilmember Winnecke: So we're not inadequate in prosecuting firearm offenses now?

Stan Levco: No.

Councilmember Winnecke: Okay.

Stan Levco: And I have thought of even, but I can't, I don't have enough personnel. I have thought of trying to make one or two in the office to focus on that.

Councilmember Winnecke: Do you know off the top of your head what percentage of offenses your office files on are firearm offenses?

Stan Levco: No, but it certainly wouldn't be anything approaching 50 percent or 33 percent. If I had to guess I would guess in the neighbor of 10 to 15 percent.

Councilmember Winnecke: Okay.

Stan Levco: Maybe 25 maximum, but I don't think it would be that high. On the question of the legal secretary I know you all know this. Our caseload has doubled in the last ten years since I have been prosecutor and I don't believe I have asked for any other legal secretaries, but I know I have asked for some support personnel, but generally speaking I have not asked for additional personnel even approaching the increase in the filing, so I am asking for an additional legal secretary. It's just based on workload and the extra filing. Do you want me to proceed?

President Bassemier: Go ahead, yeah.

Stan Levco: On part-time Deputy Prosecutor salaries I have asked for...I have six part-time Deputy Prosecutors. Two of them came here this winter that was switched from the full-time into the part-time and they were put in at \$33,000. The other one I think is slightly over that. The other three are under that. I have asked for them to be put in at \$33,000 because that is what the Public Defender part-timers make. Now, in fact, some of the Public Defender part-timers do not make that so that it wouldn't be exactly accurate to say they all make it, but at least I am asking that for my other three who don't. I will say that two...well, I just stop it there. Want to go through the travel and the mileage?

President Bassemier: Stan.

Councilmember Tornatta: Stan, one of the deputies you have zeroed out. Is that a typo or is that—

Stan Levco: What page would that be?

Councilmember Tornatta: That is 37. 1070-1080.

Stan Levco: Could that have been a full-time perhaps that went into the two part-time?

Councilmember Sutton: Right.

Councilmember Tornatta: Okay.

Stan Levco: The mileage is just generally speaking. I take most of the money that we do...that we go to seminars that we need to for continuing legal education. I take most of that out of the incentive fund and I have just asked for an increase for the county to pay more of the ones that are in state. It's really not a major increase. The next one that is far more difficult and I would ask Tim VanCleave to speak to it would be the computer software. We've asked for an increase. We've asked for \$81,000 to upgrade and he can explain this better than I.

Tim VanCleave: Good morning. Tim VanCleave from computer services. The reason for this line item in the Prosecutor's budget is the new record's management system being installed by the Evansville Police Department and Vanderburgh County Sheriff. It has a different licensing structure than the application in the past. The site license that is in use by...that will be in use by the public safety does not cover offices outside of the public safety arena, therefore the judicial arena has to pick up their own costs to access that information. Without these licenses they would have to go back to receiving the paper records from the Police Department and the Sheriff Department and I don't think that would be in the county's best interest. It would increase the storage and increase the possibility of losing information between the public safety and the Prosecutor's Office.

President Bassemier: Mr. Hoy.

Councilmember Hoy: This is not my field, computers, so this is going to be a layman's question. One thing we're striving for in geographical information systems is that as we develop that project, you know, all the systems match. You know that.

Tim VanCleave: Right.

Councilmember Hoy: So that we don't do what some other cities and counties did. In the area of law enforcement, courts, prosecutor, etc., are all of those systems matching, is my first question, and the second question is do they need to match and I guess the third question is this moving towards that?

Tim VanCleave: The records management system being installed by the public safety arena is not my specialty. The reports that I have gotten I know that last month that the GIS manager did communicate with the sale's representative and some of the folks at OSSl, who is the new records management system, and I do believe they are working towards that goal of those two communicating together. As far as the judicial items there is some modules within the Courtview product that can utilize the GIS information. However, I don't know that it is a large need for the judicial system.

Councilmember Hoy: I'm sorry, I wasn't clear with one of my questions. I understand that GIS is moving in sync. That's what I am told and what I have observed. I was just using that as an illustration.

Tim VanCleave: Okay.

Councilmember Hoy: Do we need to have the Prosecutor's Office and the court system, etc., are they moving in sync and do they need to move in sync and if so is this part of that? Because my understanding was we had different systems and that was causing us problems. I don't know. It's an I don't know question, but, you know, if that is where we are moving that will help me make a decision on this budget.

Tim VanCleave: This will help provide their access to the information that is in the police

and sheriff records. Maybe Chief Deputy Williams could help on this one.

Eric Williams: Eric Williams, Sheriff's Office, but also president of the Data Board and I also sit on the Project 42 committee, a senior committee that is studying the CAD records, police management system. Yes, that is the intent of basically everything we are doing is striving to move everything to a uniform platform so that the data is usable within other applications.

Councilmember Hoy: And this expenditure would move us in that direction?

Eric Williams: The expenditure the prosecutor is asking for is so that they have access to our data and our records so we can transfer information in an efficient manner to them without having to kill a lot of trees and do it by paper. Our move that you'll see in our budget is to bring us in line with a lot of the other applications to be client server based, open database compliant, so that we can exchange data readily as opposed to have the bottlenecks we have with data exchange now.

Councilmember Hoy: I'll take your word on efficiency. On killing trees I think computers are an aphrodisiac for killing trees.

Eric Williams: There you go.

President Bassemier: Thank you.

Councilmember Tornatta: Stan, are you on with the Clerk's Office right now? Did we get that set up?

Tim VanCleave: This particular line item was not included. This is joint funded between Circuit, Superior and the Clerk's Office. Some of the equipment needs for the Prosecutor's Office is covered, but this particular need is more of an office by office basis and due to the contract negotiations with the RMS project not knowing exactly what the needs are and what the costs are going to be we have been trying to as best we can project what we'll need to support the judicial offices.

Councilmember Tornatta: Okay, and that is part of the Courtview system?

Tim VanCleave: No, this is actually part...most of this \$80,000 will go to purchase licenses to access the judicial or the records management system.

Councilmember Tornatta: Okay, but did we ever get connected to the Courtview system in the Prosecutor's Office?

President Bassemier: Excuse me, sir. Could you step a little bit closer to the mike? I'm sorry.

Tim VanCleave: Sorry.

President Bassemier: That's okay.

Tim VanCleave: The Prosecutor's Office does presently have access to Courtview 2000.

Councilmember Tornatta: Then that has just been recently?

Tim VanCleave: They have been using it for about the past year or year and a half. They also have a software package called Proslink. That is what the state has requested them to use to produce information for them.

Councilmember Tornatta: Okay, that's what I need. Okay.

Tim VanCleave: Now there is some discussion about trying to make Proslink and Courtview 2000 talk to each other so that the Prosecutor's Office is not the one being caught in the middle as far as which system to use to manage their office because the county would like them to use Courtview 2000 and the state would like them to use Proslink, so there are some plans to address that this year.

Councilmember Tornatta: Do they do the same thing?

Tim VanCleave: Not exactly. There are some overlaps of information that are needed to file the cases into the county's judicial system, but some of the information comes back to fingerprint tracing and some of those types of information which Courtview is not presently set up to handle.

Councilmember Tornatta: Okay, well I was told that they were supposed to have that link and already have it in place.

Tim VanCleave: The link between the Courtview and Proslink?

Councilmember Tornatta: Right, so they just enter it in one time and it takes care of it.

Tim VanCleave: Right, that is scheduled to be developed later this year. I believe towards the fourth quarter of the year. They just came up on the new client server version of Proslink this year and are currently in the process of translating a lot of their old Word Perfect documents. In essence, what they used to do on a typewriter they took over to VAX mainframe Word Perfect, so now they are in the process of getting it transferred over to be used by the new state system, Proslink. Once they get that piece developed within Stan's office then we will be able to make the move to make the two applications talk to each other.

Councilmember Tornatta: So I think I followed that. The Proslink, you're Pros as in Prosecutor?

Tim VanCleave: Yes.

Councilmember Tornatta: That's a state program funded by the state? The state paid for it?

Tim VanCleave: Yes.

Councilmember Tornatta: Courtview the county paid for?

Tim VanCleave: Yes.

Councilmember Tornatta: To what...maybe this is more of a Stan, I don't know who to ask this of, but to what extent are both programs used or not used?

Stan Levco: Courtview is used all the time in the courts, but they can't communicate—

Councilmember Tornatta: I mean in that office, in the Prosecutor's Office. I don't think it's used at all.

Councilmember Raben: I don't think he uses Courtview.

Councilmember Tornatta: I went down there and talked to him and they're not...they had no communication with the Clerk's Office which they are not working with the Courtview system so if they're not and so if they're not working with then they don't have the communication for the process which kind of puts everybody doing different things. When I originally got on that's one of the things I was looking into, talking to Marsha on how she did it and how everything was communicating from the court side. They were supposed

to do some work to try and get that all tied in so they were using the system as well because what happens is they get...what types of service would you get depositions or stuff or court cases passed up to the Clerk's Office and then is shot back down to you and I don't think that communication is there to do that so everything has got to be done on paper and files and have all the paper trail, right?

Tim VanCleave: Presently the Prosecutor's Office does file cases just like every other attorneys office. They take their paper request to the Clerk's Office and file that information with the front counter just as other attorneys file their civil suits. The Prosecutor's Office has to take and file their cases that they are going to be prosecuting in the criminal division with a paper document. It would be possible as we move forward in the project that we could potentially eliminate that paper filing that as cases become ready to be filed they would be able to set that up so that the Proslink system that they need to report their state information would electronically transfer the cases over to Courtview so that the Clerk's Office could cut down on some of the data entry time and preparation for filing those cases in the criminal division.

Councilmember Raben: Tim, would he not have...or has he not had that ability with Courtview 2000?

Tim VanCleave: There is a module in Courtview 2000 for the Prosecutor, but it does not house all the data that he needs for his state reporting, so they would in essence being doing duplicate entry which I believe, and I don't want to speak for the Prosecutor's Office on this, but I believe there is not enough time in their day to duplicate entry all the information that would have to be processed.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, to hand carry paper filings and stuff, I mean that was something he never could do on Courtview, correct?

Tim VanCleave: Correct.

Councilmember Raben: Okay.

Councilmember Tornatta: Jim, let Marsha clear some of this up. We talked about that. Marsha, if you would.

Teri Lukeman: I want to change the tape.

President Bassemier: We're going to change the tape.

(TAPE CHANGE)

Marsha Abell: County Clerk.

President Bassemier: Thank you.

Councilmember Tornatta: Okay, we talked as soon as I got into office about how the court system was and the efficiencies and inefficiencies of the court system and the computer system. You had just kind of brought out that maybe the prosecutor was not on the system and it made double, triple, maybe even more entries to come about. Are they using it now? Is it anymore efficient than it was six months ago?

Marsha Abell: There has been no change from our end. Our problem with it is as Mr. VanCleave said, the Prosecuting Attorney has to file his cases just like any other attorney who does walk in and file cases and that is true. However, when an attorney walks in and files our case in our office, it doesn't have to be ready for court in 15 minutes. That is a problem that we have. The courts starts at like 8:00 in the morning and my staff is there at 7:00 a.m. and when they bring cases to us, you know, at the last minute, then we have to manually put all of that in and get all of that ready for court and of course half of the time

my staff is late getting into the court room because we can't get all of that. If that was done in the computer when they worked the case and all they did was transmit it to my office, then it would be there, and all we would have to do is print it out and run the case into the court room. As it works now, it doesn't work.

Councilmember Raben: Marsha, that is the point that I was trying to make. All along when we put Courtview 2000 in place, back in 1999 or whenever it was, I mean that, Courtview 2000, the entry, that entry that you are discussing there could be done at the prosecutor's level, correct?

Marsha Abell: That's correct.

Councilmember Raben: With Courtview that's been available for the last two or three years.

Councilmember Tornatta: Then they could enter there and with the cross, I am going to say with the cross to the cross link, they would have maybe as many as, they might have to enter it three times but maybe only two times. One is sent to the state and one is sent to the Clerk's office, and then we have no more entries. Right now they are doing it and before they do it, the Sheriff's department and the Police department are doing it. So, how many times are we entering that in? Then, if we put a "d" in place of a "b" then that is where we have trouble down the road with identification and everything else and that is why we want to try and get everybody on the same system, so that we only have the minimal amount of screw ups, if there are some screw ups in the process.

Marsha Abell: And there are. There, you are exactly right. You know, my staff is under a time constraint trying to get that stuff in and it is not unusual that they could type someone's name wrong.

President Bassemier: I guess that we better move on and get back to-

Councilmember Tornatta: We just need to have a heads up on that.

President Bassemier: Yeah, and it's, thanks you Marsha.

Stan Levco: It could be dangerous for me to give my opinion on this but my understanding is that we could do this but we need a whole lot more personnel to input the data. I guess, I certainly don't want to, I am not saying that we won't do this, but you give us the people to do it.

Councilmember Winnecke: Like, what does that mean? You need a whole lot more people, I mean like 20 people?

Stan Levco: Oh, I think two more.

Councilmember Raben: Stan, how long does it take to fill out the paperwork.?

Stan Levco: You know, I can't personally tell you. I can tell you that I have discussed with people who tell me that it is going to take a number of full time people to do this.

Councilmember Raben: Let me ask Marsha. How long when he files a case in your office or brings a filing up, how, what is the standard time for entering that, in the Courtview 2000?

Marsha Abell: Well, for one person to get it ready for the court, about 20 minutes.

Councilmember Raben: Okay and you don't know Stan as to whether or not to do it by hand with paper and ink if it takes ten minutes or 20 minutes? I mean to fill out the paperwork that you carry to her office, how long does that take?

Stan Levco: I can't tell you.

Councilmember Raben: Okay.

Stan Levco: I guess it depends on how many cases you have and how much paperwork we are talking about.

Councilmember Hoy: But, why wouldn't it be as quick or quicker to enter that onto a computer as to?

Stan Levco: Are you talking about filing cases? We can't file the case on a computer?

Councilmember Hoy: (inaudible)

Stan Levco: I think it does.

Councilmember Hoy: So, if you have to file a hard copy, you are still going to have to carry it down to her office then? So, what we are talking about is?

Councilmember Raben: Entering the case into the computer is not as simple as printing out a form when you have put all of this data into place, it is not as simple as printing out a form that basically gives you a hard copy?

President Bassemier: I am sorry, you have to come to the mike. Hold it, hold it, you have to identify yourself, please.

Dorothy Patterson: For a secretary to do that case, it could take her up to two hours to do that case. To run those copies could take 15 minutes after she runs, types up that case, and to run it over to Marsha's office to the Clerk's office and then her (inaudible) twenty minutes like she says. But for a secretary to do that case, it could take her two hours. It depends on how long it takes for the prosecutor to run his case, write it up and then she gets it and then she's got to sit there and do all of the book work on it. So, if you take, I mean that's 30 minutes or up to two hours. It depends, so it depends on how large the case is.

President Bassemier: Mr. Hoy.

Dorothy Patterson: Every case is different.

Councilmember Hoy: Okay, what I am looking at here is \$81,660, which if this moves things along and makes things work better, it makes sense. It's still not making sense to me as to what this will and won't do and I don't understand, I have just been told that those cases have to go up hard copy anyhow. So, I don't know, I don't work in your system but I am trying to understand it.

Marsha Abell: The only thing that we have to have in hard copy is a signature of the of someone from the Prosecutor's office on the arrest sheet, you know that they are bringing them on charges. But, if they could input and they must input in, I am sure in their office, although I don't work there, the name of the defendant and the charge and those types of things, if those are electronically transferred into our system then we automatically have the file already set up. It already generates the, it already generates, and this is what Courtview did and all of you that were then now that I went out to Williamsburg and I, she went along, and she looked at that system and that is exactly what they told us it would do. That when the prosecutor set up their case with their defendant and their charges and everything like that, all they had to do was transfer it over to the clerk's record and we would automatically generate a cause number, that stuff could have even been done at 4:00 in the morning and could be laying on a printer waiting for us to get there. All we have to do is slip into a file jacket and walk it into the court room. Right now, we have to put all of those charges in, generate that cause number and do all of that before we can get it into

the court room and it is impossible on a heavy day to get all of those cases into the courtroom by the time the Sheriff's deputy gets those defendants in for their case. We can't do it and you know, if he thinks that it would take his staff some more time, it's taking my staff that kind of time and we are trying to get it ready to get into the courtroom.

Councilmember Hoy: My question then. If his staff enters that onto a computer, why should that take anymore time than putting it on hard copy? I don't understand.

Marsha Abell: To me, it shouldn't, because all we would do is virtually, they would either send it to us or we could go out and grab it and pull into our system. It would send through Courtview, I understand that if they do a link, we just go out and grab it. Is that right, Tim? We just go out and grab that information and pull it into our system and it automatically will set up the file, then we generate the case number off of that.

Councilmember Hoy: And you have that capability, it is placed now with Courtview.

Marsha Abell: It is in our system, yes.

Councilmember Hoy: But, not in the prosecutors office? They have Courtview now?

Marsha Abell: They didn't purchase the prosecutors modules, is my understanding, is that correct?

Unidentified: (Inaudible)

Councilmember Hoy: It is there then?

Unidentified: (inaudible) It is there but-

President Bassemier: You have to come to the mike again, I'm sorry. We want to hear everything you say and the public wants to hear too.

Tim VanCleave: The prosecutor's module was part of the initial contract with what is now Maximum, Incorporated. However, the prosecutor's module does not meet all of the needs of the state reporting. So, what we do have is a prosecutors module that we might be able to utilize some of the components of that to help in the filing process. But, they are also in the process of trying to align themselves to meet their state report needs by using cross link. I don't know which avenue it is, at best, specifically at this point to pursue whether to do ahead and have the Prosecutor's office to start using Courtview to initial input that information or to try harder on getting cross link information built so that the information can pass into Courtview. I have studied that in detail enough to give you an advisement on that.

Councilmember Hoy: But, that's what this would do?

Tim VanCleave: No, this \$80,000 is focused on access to the arrest records that are being generated by the police and the sheriff. After, sometime after the first of the year, when the new records management system comes on line, the Prosecutor's office will no longer have, have electronic access to those records without this expense.

Councilmember Hoy: You understand that some days we are sitting here, I am sitting here, I will speak personally, feeling like I am in some giant labyrinth called computer land and nobody knows how you get to the center of the doggone thing. I don't mind spending money and this stuff and I don't think that any of us do, but we are seeing more paper, we are seeing more expenditures, and we are all wondering what to buy next and that is why you have so many questions and that is where I am coming from.

Marsha Abell: Let me just say, and I know that you can't debate this on this floor and maybe this is a discussion for later. But, if in fact it doesn't produce the state required

forms that the prosecutor needs, I believe that if you would get Mr. Harrison to pull that contract that we have with Courtview you will see that in there, there is a part that says any legislative changes or any state required forms will be added to the system at Courtview's cost. They have to comply with the state law, that is part of their cost, that is part of their costs, part of their contract. I remember reading that when the contract was done. So, you know, it wouldn't cost any money to have Courtview prepare that.

Councilmember Hoy: Mr. Ahlers, would that be in the realm of your checking or should we just check that ourselves with Mr. Harrison, with who, Mr. Harrison, did you say?

Unidentified: Yes, Joe, Jr.

Councilmember Hoy: Joe, Jr.

Jeff Ahlers: He has a contract, you are saying?

Suzanne Crouch: He approved the contract.

Councilmember Hoy: He approved the contract.

Jeff Ahlers: Okay, I will call him.

Councilmember Hoy: Okay. Thank you.

President Bassemier: Mr. Winnecke.

Stan Levco: (inaudible) I believe is just for us to get access to the police records.

Councilmember Winnecke: I guess and I think that where I am coming from on this request is, one I have a question. It says, Computer Software, but it is \$81,600. Are we buying software and hardware? Because down a little bit, into the explanation is says and it talks about 25 work stations. So we are buying?

Stan Levco: It is just the software.

Councilmember Hoy: And the license?

Stan Levco: The \$8,000 extra is to upgrade 16 other.

Councilmember Winnecke: Okay, I follow it now. I guess my concern is that I was not here when Courtview was purchased, so I don't know to what extent the Prosecutor's office lobbied for that. But, I mean for the discussion that I am hearing it is not being utilized to its potential. Is this gee whiz information that you are asking for. How much are you going to use this? I guess, is my question.

Stan Levco: I mean, we need to know the records of people that we are investigating. So, I mean, I don't know where you draw the line. I guess you -

Councilmember Winnecke: Well, I guess my point is that at some point, we bought money on Courtview, which I assume was going to increase the efficiency of the office and if it is not being utilized to its potential, my concern is and I don't know that is why I am asking. If this is for records management or records inspection, do you use that everyday?

Stan Levco: Yes.

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

President Bassemier: Okay, thank you, Mr. Winnecke.

**DRUG LAW ENFORCEMENT
VICTIM/WITNESS ASSISTANCE
STOP DOMESTIC VIOLENCE
ADULT PROTECTIVE SERVICES**

Stan Levco: Next, thing that I had was on a number of grants, the Drug Law Enforcement Grant and the Victim Witness and the Domestic Violence, I have asked for additional monies on each of those and it has to do with the cost of living and the increase in insurance. Any questions on that?

Councilmember Sutton: I have a question on the last one before you got into those, on line item 47 and this is your regular budget, the Community Development.

Stan Levco: What page is that?

Councilmember Sutton: It is 40 in our book. Each year you have plugged in an amount for that and you haven't used that as of yet. Do we need to just go ahead and eliminate that?

Stan Levco: I would rather that you didn't eliminate it, I had it in there for a reason, I guess you would probably want to know what it is.

Councilmember Sutton: Well, it has been in about the last six years and you still haven't used it.

Stan Levco: Well, I contribute out of an incentive fund money to YCAP, a YMCA program for troubled youths and I just feel like I need to have that in there just so that I have an item for that. I really don't know what the practical effect would be if you eliminated it, but that is why I have it in there.

Councilmember Sutton: Well, I guess I was looking for it. We have talked about it and that line item being used. I guess I haven't seen that yet.

Stan Levco: Well the fund is being used in the sense, I guess that we contribute roughly \$10,000 a year, I guess that I could take \$99.00 out of this and use it but I just don't. I just have it in there so I have, in a sense, I have an official Community Development budget.

Councilmember Sutton: Okay.

President Bassemier: Okay, do you want to move on to Prosecutor, IV-D, 41?

PROSECUTOR IV-D

Stan Levco: The IV-D, I guess I could speak briefly on it, because I have spoken on it at length over the years. It is generally this, I think our IV-D staff is grossly understaffed. We can continue the way we are continuing and we will get along, it just means that people won't get the services. I know that you can always make comparisons to other counties, I have just thrown St. Joe in there as a comparable county that has, I think, roughly the same case load that we had and more than double the employees. So, I have asked, I originally asked for five more because (inaudible) was cutting out two. It turned out that we have found out in the last couple of weeks that we are not going to cut out those two. So, I have asked for three more and it's just people. It will be people getting child support that need the money that we will be able to given them better services if you give us more employees and I think what's important is that the county gets back, I have 66% but it is actually 66 and 2/3 percent, so the county gets back two thirds off the top for anything you pay plus there is an incentive money that we get from it. It used to be that we clearly made a profit off of each employee but now it is so complicated that nobody knows how much we are making on that. I can just say that you are getting back more than 67% percent of what you put into this. So, I think it is a good thing, I understand that you have a hiring freeze, so, but I didn't want to not ask for it.

Councilmember Sutton: I think last year we had a discussion about this at great length about the importance of this area and the work that is done in trying to collect child support and the importance of that to so many families here in our community. We were able to add one officer last year, I know that you requested I think it was four, last year and we were able to do one. You know I still continue to think that this is a very important area. The whole area of child support. It just can't be stated enough about what is being done in that area and what we might be able to do this year might be different. But, I think it is an area that we really do need to take a look at.

Councilmember Raben: Stan, in , I guess, 2000 we gave you two employees and in 2001 we gave you one new one.

Stan Levco: Are you talking about IV-D?

Councilmember Raben: Yeah, IV-D. Can you provide us with some type of report on the percent of increase in collections that you've made in, since 1999? Show us our rewards for this three people that you have already added.

Stan Levco: Do you have those figures now? I know that I have collected, we can get that to you.

Councilmember Winnecke: What is the case load for each of the, we have ten or 11 for enforcement?

Stan Levco: For each one?

President Bassemier: Come to the mike please.

Dorothy Patterson: If you use 14 case enforcement officers, it would be 1,017. Total cases would be 23,930.

Councilmember Winnecke: Okay, a 1,017?

Dorothy Patterson: A 1,710.

Councilmember Winnecke: Oh, a 1,710.

Dorothy Patterson: Per enforcement officer.

Councilmember Sutton: Can you also talk about the process and how that works because a person doesn't just come in and automatically get the child support enforcement put right into place. You know there is some period of time as a result of being short here that they have to wait. Could you talk about that a little bit?

Dorothy Patterson: Right now we are three to four months behind. Most of the people that come in are custodial parents that have requested our services. They come in and request enforcement, wage withholdings, modifications and at that time we have to let them know that we are three or four months behind and of course they are very upset with that and they can't quite understand that. But, we have, our enforcement agents are broke down into sections, like two enforcement agents do wage withholdings, we have two enforcement agents do court, we have two paternity agents, one that does court modifications, IC's, we have one that does that tax intercepts and just answer phone calls that are complaints. We have intrastate and interstate in other states, so we have them all broke down that way. So, right now we are three to four months behind right now. We get quite a few complaints, they call the mayor, they call the governor. But the state breaks it down into enforcement agents as to caseload and right now they have it down to 1,710 per case, per enforcement agent.

Councilmember Winnecke: Is there a state standard?

Dorothy Patterson: The feds, we had asked the state if they are going to break that down and the feds have not been able to do that because each county does their case load differently. We do it per enforcement agent. We did it for just how I stated it, wage withholdings, court, paternity agents. Some counties by alphabet, different counties do it differently. It depends on their employees and how many employees they have.

Councilmember Winnecke: What did you say the overall was, 20 some odd thousand?

Dorothy Patterson: There is 23,938.

Councilmember Winnecke: Did you say 23,948?

Dorothy Patterson: 23,938.

Councilmember Winnecke: Okay.

Dorothy Patterson: We have 2,242 TANF cases, 776 foster care cases, 20,920 non TANF cases, that is not, they are not any aid.

Councilmember Sutton: I think that information is really significant and when we think about a three to four month wait, possibly, you are talking about that is a period of time, even before they come to your office, they have been going through the process trying to get that child support, so you are talking about really, when you add the whole time that they go through the process, maybe as long as five to six months-

Dorothy Patterson: Right now, you are two million dollars in felony cases behind that you can not file. We don't have enough staff and possibly more. Really we should go in and evaluate every case every year.

President Bassemier: Mr. Wortman.

Councilmember Wortman: Do you have room for extra personnel down in the office.

Dorothy Patterson: I can find room.

Councilmember Wortman: You would find room. Stack them and-

Dorothy Patterson: I would stack them somewhere.

President Bassemier: Mr. Hoy.

Dorothy Patterson: I'm sorry.

Councilmember Hoy: You have 23, 948 cases.

Dorothy Patterson: No, 938.

Councilmember Hoy: Yeah, 38 for child support?

Dorothy Patterson: Yes.

Councilmember Hoy: So, a lot of those have to be repeats.

Dorothy Patterson: I'm sorry.

Councilmember Hoy: A lot of those are repeats, the same people.

Dorothy Patterson: No.

Councilmember Hoy: Because there is only about 30,000 in the whole school system.

Dorothy Patterson: Well, that's the stats that they gave me at state. That's the case load that they gave me at state.

Councilmember Hoy: In our county?

Dorothy Patterson: In our county, Vanderburgh County.

Councilmember Hoy: The math doesn't make sense to me since we only have about 25,000 kids in the school system, that's all.

Dorothy Patterson: That's the case load we got.

Councilmember Hoy: Yeah, but you have a person who you have tracked down?

Dorothy Patterson: That has four or five children by two or three different fathers.

Councilmember Hoy: Either that or is tracked down and then they change jobs and you have to track them down again.

Dorothy Patterson: Oh, yeah, that goes on.

Councilmember Hoy: That is what I am talking about of repeats.

Dorothy Patterson: These are actually cases that I have in Vanderburgh County.

Councilmember Hoy: I am just having trouble believing that there are that many children.

Dorothy Patterson: These are active cases.

Councilmember Hoy: Because that would mean that 90% of the kids in this county are on some kind of support.

Dorothy Patterson: (inaudible)

Councilmember Hoy: I understand thatrealistically.

Dorothy Patterson: It is realistic to me either unless you look at all of those files in my office.

Councilmember Hoy: But, there has to be some repeat business, I guess.

President Bassemier: Anybody? Anymore questions for her? Thank you ma'am.

PRE-TRIAL DIVERSION

Stan Levco: I have a notation on the Pre Trial Diversion. But there isn't really anything that needs to be changed.

President Bassemier: Okay, that is on page 178. Does anybody have any questions on that? Mr. Hoy, have you got anything?

Councilmember Hoy: What page?

President Bassemier: That was 178. Got anything else to add, Mr. Levco?

Stan Levco: No.

President Bassemier: Any more questions? I guess that finishes you up. Thank you, sir.

Stan Levco: Thank you.

President Bassemier: Okay, we will go to the Public Defenders Commission, page 91.

PUBLIC DEFENDER COMMISSION

Steve Owens: Good morning. My name is Steve Owens and I am the Chief Public Defender.

President Bassemier: Okay, we are on page 91, here.

Councilmember Hoy: Mr. President, before he begins.

President Bassemier: Mr. Hoy.

Councilmember Hoy: I am liaison to this and it is a brand new department, so there are a lot of changes. I have talked with Mr. Owens and we are not sure we can get or what we can't get but I hope that Council will be understanding as we are sifting out what's actually needed here and it is not easy.

President Bassemier: Okay, do you want to say anything and get started?

Steve Owens: A couple of things, one is on page 94 of the budget that I oversee under line item 3946 I think he shows an amount that we are requesting of \$60,000 for Pauper Appeals. That is incorrect and actually we are requesting zero. That \$60,000 figure should be under line item 3947 which is Pauper Transcripts.

President Bassemier: So, we didn't get anything there?

Steve Owens: Pardon me?

President Bassemier: We didn't gain anything there.

Councilmember Sutton: We were getting a little excited there.

Steve Owens: We haven't gained anything at the moment.

President Bassemier: I saw Jim over there kind of smiling, so.

Steve Owens: Well, the other thing would be that in many of the line items that are shown throughout page 93 and somewhat over to page 94, if you look at what was actually budgeted in 2001, you will note that there are a lot of zeros there in those categories. Those are accurate except for the expenses that we are asking in many of the line items that we are asking for in 2002 were paid out of the Commissioners accounts or actual special appropriations that I had to come before this body and ask for earlier in the year. So, the increase in our requested budget for 2002 compared to 2001 is not as great as it would seem with respect to the final numbers. In terms of what we are asking for in increases for the year, I think that maybe the most important this is for the additional personnel for the Vanderburgh Juvenile Court. The public defenders in that court are grossly overworked. We are in drastic need of having at least one additional person assigned to that court and we have asked for an extra part time position to be assigned to the Juvenile Court specifically. You will notice that I have also asked for substantial increases for that position as well as the other five part time Misdemeanor Public Defenders. We have asked that they get a substantial salary increase over what they had for 2001. The reason for that is frankly when this agency was started, the felony public defenders in Superior Court which is where misdemeanor and juvenile deputies lie where given a substantial salary increase to bring them up to the same level at the Circuit Court public defenders. The juvenile and misdemeanor public defenders received a three percent cost of living increase. So, they went from making roughly \$5,000 a year less than

the felony public defenders to making in excess of \$9,700 a year less. What I am attempting to do, ideally I would like to have them all making the same because I think they are all valuable. I realize that in all likelihood the Council was not going to grant us a close to a \$10,000 a year increase for those five or six positions in one year. So, what we are trying to do is make some of it up and at least put them into the same position that they would have been in before the implementation of the agency. I have also asked for an additional full time public defender to be added to the staff. We have a new court, actually a new division of Superior Court, which is the day reporting court with Judge Trockman. They have requested and I agree that they need to have a public defender that is assigned to that court. That court meets weekly for two to three hours a week. The cases are ongoing for eighteen months, thereabouts. We would like to have a full time public defender that is assigned specifically to that court and would also overlap to pick up the excess appeals that were not, they we are now having to farm out. In addition, that public defender could do some other cases as well. I have also asked for an administrative assistant. We are borderline under the state guidelines for secretarial help. We have 16 part time felony public defenders and under the Commission guidelines, we are right on where we need to be in terms of reimbursement. If you add a part time to juvenile, if we add another full time person to our staff in addition to myself and our appellate division, we are going to really be over in what we need in terms of secretarial help. The administrative assistant, one of the secretaries is basically filling that position now, she does most of the reports, prepares most of the documents that we need to present to the Council as well as the state. She would be able to pick up the additional slack time. That position was approved by the Job Study Committee, I believe last year but was not funded and I am asking that the Council fund that position.

President Bassemier: Any questions for Mr. Owens? Mr. Tornatta.

Councilmember Tornatta: I meant to ask Stan this as well. The law books that you requested, is that something that the law library picks up or does this have to be a separate purchase or how does that work?

Steve Owens: There are some publications that are going to be specifically for defense purposes. We buy various trial tactic manuals. We have a number of publications that are put out by the Public Defender Commission that are unique to us that wouldn't be used particularly by the Law Library, wouldn't be used by the Prosecutor's office. I am sure that if you look at the prosecutor's library you will find a number of things put out by the Indiana Prosecuting Attorney's Council that they would not particularly like us to have. So, what we are asking for is access or some additional money to buy those kinds of books. If there is a duplication within my office, Stan's office and the County Law Library for example, of Indiana Statutes, I think we all have our own sets of Indiana Codes. It is very time consuming, every time that you need to look at a statute to run across to the Law Library. That is why we have our own set, that is why Stan has his own set. The Law Library, often times, the books that you need are not available.

Councilmember Tornatta: I guess what I look at, is what they always tell me that the Law Library is there for a purpose for all of these people to go in and use. However, we are buying books for the individual departments and not using the Law Library.

Steve Owens: Probably, and again, this may not be the appropriate place to even bring it up. A county wide West Law for all departments, for Prosecutors office, Legal Aid and the Public Defenders Office, the Law Library would be the way to go and we could all access the same data base from our offices, without having to go to a central location but in terms of the overlap of volumes, I don't have Northeastern Reporters in my office, so if we need that hard bound volume, we have to go to the Library and the monies that we are asking for in the budget wouldn't by a set of Northeastern set of reporters.

President Bassemier: With that last question, you all thought Mr. Jones was back, it must be the chair. Any more questions?

Councilmember Hoy: Rick Jones used to sit there.

Councilmember Sutton: Something about that seat.

Councilmember Hoy: Something about that seat that asks questions about law books.

Councilmember Tornatta: One more question. Is the telephone, is that picked up by the Commissioners?

Steve Owens: The telephone was picked up by the Commissioners apparently in the 2001 budget. We were told by the Auditor's office that we need to transfer a number of things that were paid by the Commissioners, like rent, telephones, computers and things that you see that are zero in 2001. We needed to transfer those to our budget. So, while they have paid for the hardware for 2001, they have asked us to have a separate line item. So, that when we apply for reimbursement, we are paying that out of the Public Defender account.

Councilmember Tornatta: Okay.

Councilmember Hoy: I see our Auditor shaking her head. There are several of those that were shifted over, is that not correct?

Suzanne Crouch: That's correct and it is strictly in order that we get our fair reimbursement.

Councilmember Tornatta: Reimbursement, okay.

Councilmember Sutton: Mr. Owens, there's just a couple of items that I would like for you to kind of give us some enlightenment on. I am on page 93, in that big book there. I am looking at Computer Data Management and you've got a request there for \$3,000. Can you talk to us about what that request is for.

Steve Owens: The Computer Date Management that we are asking for, we currently have one computer terminal for each of the full time staff. My terminal is used by the part timers primarily. That is a combination of potentially buying another computer terminal or buying some software that would be unique to our office.

Councilmember Sutton: Do you have something already in mind.

Steve Owens: Well, there a number of things that come across our desk, there is a, for example, there is a public defender module of Courtview that they have sent to us. There are a number of CD materials on desk that are sent to us that may or may not be usable at any given point in time. So, I can't sit here and tell you that I am ready to buy a particular item, that's the line item that we put in. I think that we transferred, as I recall, about \$17,000 from the Commissioners for 2001 to actually pay for the computers, licenses and the things that we had.

President Bassemier: Excuse me, sir.

(TAPE CHANGE)

Councilmember Sutton: Okay, same page, looking at Training and then Travel and Mileage, are those linked together or are we talking about two separate requests?

Steve Owens: They're really two separate requests. We pay, as you probably are aware, the attorneys are required to have so much CLE training.

Councilmember Sutton: Right.

Steve Owens: We're sending I think five, or perhaps six people to the death penalty seminar in September. So, we try to separate those out. The county's policy on mileage and per diem, we're trying to pay that out of the Travel account. We pay the training out of the, or the CLE fees, out of the Training account.

Councilmember Sutton: Okay. And probably the last item I wanted to see if you could...when you were here before us back in like April of this year I had several questions about the state reimbursement amount. At that time the state had put a hold on any new reimbursements at that particular time, but we're going to receive work back, I guess it was going to be July, I guess here, first part of August, can you let us know where we stand on that? Because at that time I think we were anticipating receiving some reimbursement and hadn't received a dime.

Steve Owens: We haven't received anything. We currently have a request for reimbursement pending before the State Public Defender Commission. They're meeting on August 29th. Our first request is for approximately \$260,000. That maybe somewhat lessened than what we are requesting based upon the fact that many of the fees that we have asked for reimbursement we actually for 2000 expenses that predated the existence of our office. We're pushing very hard to have the Commission reimburse us for those, and if we get everything we'll be around \$260,000.

Councilmember Sutton: Yeah, I mean I think this is really a very significant point in that a lot of what we're doing, I think the whole Public Defender Commission, I think you guys are doing some great work. I know there was a lot of effort put into getting this form together. One of the things we anticipated was getting some reimbursement. There are some things that are outside of our control, but I think that we are all under the impression that we would get some help from the state in the form of these reimbursements of 40%, I guess is the figure. I guess there's been a lot of red tape, I guess, what we've been experiencing here and why we haven't seen the reimbursement to help us out on this.

Steve Owens: I think the problem begins first with the state puts in deposits twice a year. They put one in and June and they put one in December. The holdup on applying for reimbursement at the end of the first quarter of this year was based upon the fact that the June deposit was not going to cover all of the requested reimbursement. The legislature, I think, put in an additional \$7,000,000 into the Public Defender fund for 2001/2002. That deposit didn't go in until July. So we made a decision to holdup on requesting reimbursement until there was going to be a likelihood that we were going to get our full 40%. That money is there. It appears that there is going to be sufficient funds to cover all the request for reimbursement. The question on our particular reimbursement is that we didn't go into existence until January 1st. Many of the funds that I've come to you for, and many of the things that we've paid, were for monies that, for services that were rendered in 2000.

Councilmember Sutton: And that money is already gone on the state side.

Steve Owens: Well, that money has been spent. It's been spent out of our 2001 budget for the additional monies that I have come to the Council and asked for.

Councilmember Sutton: Well I mean the state money is already depleted for 2000.

Steve Owens: The money for 2000 has been depleted. What we have tried to convince the Commission, we had a number of conversations with Mr. Carusillo and other members of the Commission, is that many of those expenses actually came into being after the county approved the Public Defender Agency. I believe the cut off date, and don't hold me to this, but I believe it's September 10th of 2000. The position that they are taking right now is that it is possible that they will agree to reimburse us for those expenses that we incurred between September 10, 2000 and January 1, 2001. They may reimburse us 40% of those expenses. That's the position we've taken, that those cases were ongoing, that we had approved the formation of the agency and that we incurred those expenses. Some of them overlapped into 2001. For example, an appeal that may have been appointed to a public defender in November of 2000 would not have been paid until 2001. So, that's where the \$260,000 figure comes from. If they take the view that they're not going to reimburse for those expenses that were incurred in 2000, the check that Vanderburgh County gets is going to be somewhat less.

Councilmember Sutton: Well, at this point I think you've done what you possibly could by submitting the request, but we really need some, you know, \$260,000 that's a pretty significant chunk. It would really help us out today, next week. It would really be a good help to us. I don't know what we can do at this point, but I think we need to continue to pursue this in trying to get those funds back to Vanderburgh County.

Steve Owens: Well we're talking to them pretty much on a daily basis.

Councilmember Hoy: Mr. President?

President Bassemier: Mr. Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: I know we've got a heavy agenda today, in fact I'm hoping next year Mr. Raben and I will be speaking. Perhaps we need to, this is our heaviest day, we need to put some of these on another day almost, there are so many of them. A couple of things just to remind Council, and that is that we are not reimbursed for the work done with juveniles, that's not in the legislation. Secondly, I did sit down with Mr. Owens and what he's presented is what I encouraged him to present because it is realistic. Thirdly, he and I talked before this meeting, we'll sit down and rework this, you know, for next week if that will help expedite matters here. Then I had a question, you did submit, I got a copy anyway of what you submitted to the state. Was that submitted to all the councilmen or just was I the one who got that?

Steve Owens: No, we submitted a copy of the request for reimbursement and a summary report of the first six months to all the councilmembers.

Councilmember Hoy: To everybody, so you all might want to take a look at it, it was in the notebook that Mr. Owens submitted to all of us. I thought that was the case, but I wanted to make sure. But I'll be glad to sit down with him because we are shaping a new department and it's been hard work and they've worked hard on it. I'll be glad to spend some time with him between now and next week.

President Bassemier: Anybody else? Thank you, sir.

Steve Owens: Thank you.

President Bassemier: Do you want to take a break, or do you want to take a break? Curt? Short recess, ten minutes?

Councilmember Hoy: Curt, if you weren't here he'd be asking me, you know that.

(Recess)

COUNTY CLERK

President Bassemier: Alright Ms. Abell. Do you want to state your name please and tell us what to look for?

Marsha Abell: Marsha Abell. I can't get this thing down here close to my mouth. When I get it down here it starts to fall.

President Bassemier: That's okay, do the best you can. We can hear you.

Marsha Abell: If you had a pedestal for me to stand on that would be nice, like Les Shively has on his show.

Councilmember Sutton: Les is not here, he can't defend himself.

Marsha Abell: You ready for me?

President Bassemier: Yes, please.

Marsha Abell: Marsha Abell, County Clerk.

President Bassemier: Anything you want to –

Marsha Abell: Anything I want to start with, is that what you want me to –

President Bassemier: Yes.

Marsha Abell: I'd love to start.

President Bassemier: Anything you want to call our attention to, changes.

Marsha Abell: You want to start with the Clerk's budget?

President Bassemier: Please, and that's page 1 in our book.

Marsha Abell: I do have a comment about salaries, which is the biggest part of my budget. There were three people that I appeared before the Salary Administration Committee and asked for an increase from COMOT III to COMOT IV on. They were out of line item 1160, 1320 and 1570. What I'd like to say about those, that was not approved by the Salary Administration and I would like for the Council to please consider it. As those of you who were there might know I has just gotten out of oral surgery and I wasn't in any position to really make my case, but the two people that are 1160 and 1320 are court people that sit in the court room and make court notes. Their job has increased drastically in the last few years and we're putting more and more work on them. In fact we've increased their workload because the Commissioners requested that we get the abstracts out sooner, as a matter a fact we're under a 24 hour, we're supposed to have those done. So that's increased their workload. They also are going to start tracking the amount of bond money that's not given back to the Public Defender's Fund. Mr. Steve Owens had asked me for that and that's not something that we can track in the system right now. But those two people can track that for you and that would give you some means for trying to put more money in the Public Defender's Fund. But it's not a trackable item right now, it's something that my staff would have to manually do. Those two people would be doing that. So, I'd certainly like for you to reconsider that those people be brought up from a COMOT III to a COMOT IV. I think those who were in there will recall that I indicated that there is a statute that indicates people that's in the court room should be treated as a First Deputy. Now, obviously a COMOT IV is not a First Deputy, but even an increase from a COMOT III to a COMOT IV. This is a highly demanding job and I just think COMOT III is not nearly high enough for them.

Councilmember Winnecke: Which two line items are those?

Marsha Abell: I said it was 1160, it's 1160 and 1570. I'm sorry I gave you the wrong one, 1160 and 1570. The other person was 1320. As I recall the comments were made that, you know, the job description hasn't changed since the Job Study was put in place. Well, our office has all changed because we've gone to a new computer system since then, which is very demanding. But the other thing that has changed with this 1320 is she is the one who has had to take on housing court. That is a huge extra amount of work right now, doing that housing court. That was basically just a small claims entry before and now we're having to set it up as a separate type case and track that. That is additional work she's gotten with no additional compensation. To bring her from a COMOT III to a COMOT IV would give me only one person in small claims with a COMOT IV. Right now I have none, so I don't have anybody that wants to work in small claims, they all want to work somewhere else. I obviously have to have someone working small claims. I also would like to pass out just to give you some information, I happen to have Warrick County's pay schedule and they're also on the COMOT system as we are. In Warrick County, which certainly doesn't have anywhere near the caseload that we have, their COMOT III's start

out at, this is their 2001 and I compared it to our 2001, their COMOT III's start out at \$19,741 and ours start out at \$19,232. We're \$500 below them and they haven't gotten anywhere near the caseload that we've got. I had two people quit just this last week. One is going to work for Vectren, I can't remember where the other one is going, but people leave constantly because I can't pay the kind of money that's needed to be paid for those type jobs. They're computer oriented. They really need a great deal of skills and ability and I have more COMOT III's than any county office in the county, but yet I'm expected to run one of the most technical offices in the county and deal with some of the most intelligent people in our community, that being the lawyers and the judges. It makes it very difficult to do when I'm offering a starting salary lower than what they offer if you want to sling hamburgers at McDonald's. So, I want to pass these around for you to see. That's virtually all I have to say about my salaries. Those are my biggest requests.

Councilmember Sutton: Marsha?

Marsha Abell: Yes.

Councilmember Sutton: By chance, would you know over in Warrick County what type of pay increase they received last year?

Marsha Abell: You mean for the 2002 budget? I don't know what they have proposed.

Councilmember Sutton: Actually on their 2001 budget, how much they received?

Marsha Abell: Is that just their pay scale? Then I don't.

Councilmember Sutton: I think also when we talk about comparisons, I mean, we would like to see our employees, many of our employees just up where we can, but I think over the last three or four years we have as a Council really worked very hard to try to get some very reasonable pay increases. Last year we were at 4% last year? And the year before we were at 3%. So I think when we start comparing counties to counties there are several things you can kind of look at. Some counties didn't even receive any pay increase last year. We were fortunate to be able to do that. Also when we look at our total package we offer a very nice total package. So that needs to be factored in too. I know you can't eat your health plan, per se, but it sure costs an awful lot of money if you have to go to the doctor and you pay for it out of your own pocket. I just think that's important that we at least talk about that. I know, like I said, we would like to do a lot more in some areas, but we've got to look at the whole picture too.

Marsha Abell: I understand that, and I would like to say that the only pay increase that anyone in my office has had in the five years I've been there is we did away with two of my COMOT II because nobody else in the county was still a COMOT II. I've gotten no other pay increases. As a matter of fact, the last time I was before Salary Administration is the only time I've actually been before Salary Administration except for when set up the archivist to do the old records. So, my staff has really set back and not gotten good pay increases the whole time I've been in office, and I'm not asking for that many, I asked for a few. But I think with the type work we have to do and the type jobs that we do, you know we're not just sitting there typing. They really have to understand what the statute says about why they're increasing, for instance, why they're increasing \$4 for their filing fee. They have to answer those questions and I can't find people qualified to understand when you have to quit talking because you're giving legal advice and when you have to answer questions and those type of things when I can't offer any better salaries than I do. And with that, you can go on to the rest of my budget if you want to.

President Bassemier: Okay, anybody got any questions for Marsha on this first part?

Councilmember Winnecke: I do have one question, Marsha, on the Record Storage that \$60,000 that's, the increase in that, is that due to retrieval?

Marsha Abell: Yes.

Councilmember Winnecke: That's like \$1, if we retrieve something from the storage facility it's like \$1 a copy or something like that, is that right?

Marsha Abell: That's correct.

Councilmember Winnecke: In addition to the, the \$46,000 is really the annual rent, that's the base, is that right?

Marsha Abell: That's correct.

Councilmember Winnecke: So it could be that much, it could be less, could be more.

Marsha Abell: Could be less. What we based that on is we have 60,000 brand new cases every year so we figure we're going to have probably that many retrievals and filings of the old cases that we're bringing too. We just guessed at it. We don't know exactly how many we do because Elizabeth has been doing them herself.

Councilmember Winnecke: At what point do they get over there?

Marsha Abell: Right now they're getting over there like 1999 because we don't have any room for them. And there's a lot of cases still open from 1999.

Councilmember Winnecke: Are you satisfied with sort of the status of that process?

Marsha Abell: Yeah, Kinder's done a really nice job of setting up some new shelving for us, it makes it easy for us to get to what...they saw why we kept wanting to put stuff together because they may have 16 filings in one box rather than, you know, or close by without, you know, putting stuff all over the warehouse. So he actually cleared out an entire section just for our records. So, I'm happy with what he's got over there. And I'd also like to say that the project is completed with the exception of filing some small claims things back. Elizabeth is coming back to our office. We've got printouts that are this thick, everything's bar coded and the last three weeks there's only one file requested we couldn't find. So, it's been really good.

President Bassemier: Good.

Councilmember Raben: Are we still looking at relocating that record storage?

Marsha Abell: That's up to you and the Commissioners. If they want to use the Old Courthouse, you know, we could adapt it. My gut feeling is that if you use the Old Courthouse it would be great for like the last five years records, but stuff older than that I think you should leave at Kinder because a lot of that is ancient stuff. We've even found, I'm going to guess at this, maybe four large shelves of stuff we're going to send to Indianapolis for their archives that we don't need to keep here anymore of farm cases where a dog killed a sheep and that kind of stuff that we don't have any need for.

President Bassemier: Anybody else? Okay Marsha, you want to go on?

Marsha Abell: You might like to know I have three more people pregnant in my office.

Councilmember Sutton: Congratulations.

Councilmember Winnecke: That's a great story.

Marsha Abell: Had seven this year, three this year. I guess we'll have to be having some temporary help in there.

COUNTY CLERK IV-D

Marsha Abell: IV-D is just simply the supplies. Those are basically the checks, they don't use many supplies.

President Bassemier: Sure, just wanted to get it on the record. Any other questions for Marsha?

Councilmember Tornatta: On the 2600 and 4220, are those set pretty high or do you expect to go through that by the end of the year?

Marsha Abell: You mean that \$10,000?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yeah.

Marsha Abell: That's not set high. We produce –

Councilmember Tornatta: I was just looking at what's been expended on both those accounts, I mean, from looking at that I see it is high and then I don't have anything to go back date on.

Marsha Abell: One of the reasons we haven't expended much is because we're in a little controversy with the last check printer. He printed checks we couldn't use and we didn't pay for them. There's a \$9,000 bill hanging out there that I haven't paid yet.

Councilmember Tornatta: Okay.

Marsha Abell: That I'm hoping we're not going to pay because the checks are in the basement. We had to have them reprinted, their checks didn't work in our Child Support, the bank actually couldn't take them. So we're in a little controversy.

Councilmember Tornatta: Okay.

Marsha Abell: So if you add \$9,000 to that and figure it's just six months down you know we're...that's not high.

Councilmember Tornatta: Okay, alright.

President Bassemier: Anybody else? Thank you Marsha.

Marsha Abell: What about Election Office?

ELECTION OFFICE

President Bassemier: Okay, I'm sorry.

Councilmember Raben: On 1160, 1170 and 1180, there are sizeable increases on both of those, can you explain that?

Marsha Abell: Those are for the people who work on the election. I was kind of hoping some of my Election Board would be here. If this amount is approved, we would propose that these people that work Election Day be paid more. Currently the election Inspectors get paid \$90 a day, the Democratic Judges get \$70, the Republican Judges get \$60, and then the Clerks get \$60. I am to the point where I can't find anybody to work 12 hours for \$90. I don't know what we're going to do. There was a time when everybody that worked in the Civic Center worked Election Day and we didn't have this kind of problem, but that's not done anymore. The two party chairs just can't find workers. We opened some polls last year with only one Republican Inspector and no Democrats at all, and that's really not a good way to run an election, to not have both parties represented at the poll. The

Inspectors of course had to be there because they had the equipment. If they didn't have the equipment I'm not sure they would have shown up.

Councilmember Raben: So what are you proposing?

Marsha Abell: I think this brings the Inspectors up to \$100 a day, I had those breakdowns. I think this brings the Inspectors up to \$100 a day, and brings everybody else up to about \$80 a day. The Inspector is a little more because they have to come down on Sunday and pick up the equipment, so they have a little bit of extra work involved. But even at that it's just...and it's not, I will tell you, it's not just Vanderburgh County. All the Clerks complain across the state. We've complained to the State Election Commission about it. It just is impossible to find people that want to spend 14 hours of their day. It almost has to be someone who is just faithful to one of the parties to do it really.

Councilmember Sutton: Are there any suggestions you may have of what we may be able to do or what some other counties may have done –

Marsha Abell: Well I have a suggestion, I'm not sure I'll get out of the building after I make it. I certainly suggest that the employees –

Councilmember Sutton: I see the Sheriff sitting back there he's got two –

Marsha Abell: He's going to escort me out.

Councilmember Sutton: They've got side arms so you'll be okay.

Marsha Abell: I think that the employees in this building should work Election Day and be paid their regular salary as they are now, and then get this money on top of it. That's why we get Election Day off. It's not a holiday, the banks don't close, the post office isn't closed. The reason that the Civic Center was always closed on Election Day was because the people that man the polls were the workers in the city and county jobs.

Councilmember Sutton: I don't see anything wrong with that.

Marsha Abell: Thank you, you can walk out with me when. Let them all try to kill me.

Councilmember Hoy: So this would be a bonus for... I mean they get –

Marsha Abell: Yeah, we get paid anyway, so then this would give them an extra \$100 for the day or whatever to work the polls.

Councilmember Winnecke: Marsha, what's the Other Supplies? That's a pretty sizeable increase as well.

Marsha Abell: Well, our equipment, we presume that you are not going to buy new election equipment this year since the County Commissioners have told me that they don't think we're going to. Our equipment is so old, the supplies are to replace all of those plastic, not all of them, but all the plastic backs that need to be replaced that allow you to punch through the card. This is a county election and we'll run out about four, at least four machines per precinct at 167 precincts plus the ones that we keep down here. So we need to replace almost all of those plastic pieces. They are spring loaded and they're just not working anymore. That increase is because of those supplies that relate to the machinery and the printing cost increase relates to the fact it's a bigger ballot, more people on it and it's just going to cost us more to have it printed. We've had a large increase in Legal Advertising. That may not be needed, but when we did this budget there was talk that the legislature was going to increase the number of times we had to publicize the voting locations. We know we're going to have to publish them more this time because you're going to redistrict and people are going to be voting at different places. So, we're probably going to have more in Legal Advertising. I will tell you that we may be able to come in

under this because Mr. Jeffers told me this morning, I talked to him and he said he hopes to get it down from 167 to 150 precincts which would cut down on three workers per precinct which could be a sizeable amount of money. But they haven't done that yet so I hated to put it in the budget that way.

President Bassemier: Anybody else? Anything else you want to add Marsha?

Marsha Abell: Well, we could have new election equipment.

President Bassemier: Thank you very much.

Councilmember Tornatta: Part of that is a reimbursement though isn't it? We're worried about not getting the reimbursement from the state.

Marsha Abell: You mean on the new election equipment?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yeah.

Marsha Abell: I think that's true and I've written a letter to the Secretary of State and asked for clarification on that.

Councilmember Tornatta: Okay. If you find out anything different that would be good to know.

Marsha Abell: I will probably definitely come up here for an appropriation if the 50% reimbursement is a definite, I would. You'll know, yes.

President Bassemier: Okay.

Marsha Abell: Thank you.

President Bassemier: Thank you ma'am.

SHERIFF

President Bassemier: Okay, next is the Sheriff on page 15. Good morning Sheriff.

Brad Ellsworth: Good morning. I'll warn you that I've brought my budget team with me and I may have to defer a question or two to them.

President Bassemier: Okay, you –

Councilmember Hoy: The team is armed.

Brad Ellsworth: No bullets, just armed.

President Bassemier: Sheriff do you want to point out anything that's outstanding here and then we'll –

Brad Ellsworth: Sure, I'd like to start with my request for the increased longevity pay for Deputy Sheriffs. As you know the Deputy Sheriffs receive \$565 for every three years of service from the time they're sworn on until the time they retire. Most other county employees, if not all other county employees, are on a step system. What that means is that the other county employees steps when the county gives a 3% or 4% raise or whatever the step is also increased by that same percentage. For approximately 12 years that's remained the same at \$565, their longevity worth has not increased as the other county employees' has. My proposal is we went in and calculated if they were receiving the same, we calculated it at 3% over the last 12 years and I know we had a couple of 4%'s in there and I think we had an across the board dollar figure, but we went and figured 3% yearly.

That took it up to about...I've lost my train of thought, up to about \$826, something like that, if the \$565 would have increased by the 3% every year. So my proposal on that is to reward these deputies for their longevity along like the other county employees would be to increase that from \$565 to \$900 for the 104 deputies, not including myself because I'm under contract until I'm out of office. That's the proposal on my longevity. Any questions on that, or further explanation?

Councilmember Winnecke: I guess a question, when we spoke yesterday I was sort of intrigued by the description of today's force, sort of the youth. Could you talk about that a little bit, I think it's pretty—

Brad Ellsworth: We are currently approximately 13, maybe 14 deputies short. We've had in the last two years what I'd called mass retirement. That's going to happen every 15 to 20 years where a large group came on at the same time and they decide to retire. So, we're actually working about 13 deputies short right now. We've got four or five in the academy or at least in their probationary period, five will come on September 10th. To us a person is in training for their entire first year, so they're a body but we can't turn them loose and count them as a car. They are in the academy for three months, they are then in our field training program for another few months and on probation. They don't ride alone for the next two or three months until their year is up. So they are in training for their first entire year. We've got a very young department. I know that Major Woodall is like number three now, and he is in his early 40s, on longevity in our department. So, that tells you how young we are. But we do want to reward, you know, this is not dissimilar to what the city is going through on longevity. We need to reward the deputies that are there for the experience and the knowledge they have of the job. Like I said, if that had been going up sequentially with the years similar to the other county employees it would have been around \$800 and something so I put in the request for \$900.

Councilmember Winnecke: I guess the other question I have, we spoke briefly at the break Eric, could you tell us what the dollar figure represents in terms of just the longevity issue?

Brad Ellsworth: Yeah, if you agree to the \$900 it would have an impact of \$107,453. To be quite honest what I'd like to do and probably next year, I think it's too late obviously this year, is formulate over the next year and go to a step program for the deputies so that we could fall in line and be included as opposed to the flat dollar figure.

Councilmember Winnecke: So, just to clarify, this budget is \$107,453 higher than what it would be with just a flat 3%.

Brad Ellsworth: No, just at the flat \$565 —

Councilmember Winnecke: Right, right.

Brad Ellsworth: It would impact the budget \$107,453 unless we'd leave it the same at \$565.

Councilmember Winnecke: Right, okay.

Brad Ellsworth: The next thing that I requested that would be out of the ordinary is I've requested that the uniform allowance for the 105 deputies go to \$1,500. My reasoning for that is that these clothes are not going down in price and the cleaning is not going down in price. I talked to a deputy yesterday who cleans his, he gets about two days wear out of this uniform and his cleaning bill is about \$700 a year. We get \$1,000 presently. By the time taxes are taken out it usually comes into about, cash money about \$700 that the check is for. We get that twice a year, I think it might be broken down quarterly now, but it's about \$700. Recently when we renegotiated the Community Corrections contract and the jail contract we went to instead of a replacement system to a Clothing Allowance for the jailers and corrections officers. Their Clothing Allowance was up to \$1,000 very similar to the deputy sheriffs', exactly the same price as the deputy sheriffs'. My argument for raising the deputy sheriffs' Clothing Allowance is the huge difference in replacing this uniform, this shirt

is I think \$51 now, the pants are, depending on what you get, between \$60 and \$80 depending on the blend, shoes are close to \$100, we have gun belts, we don't make them replace their guns, jackets, any damage, if they're out chasing a suspect or they get blood on it or they get a briar that tears, they are responsible for replacement. It is several hundred dollars more to replace this uniform as opposed to the Dickies brand that we have the corrections officers and detention officers in. I think that justifies, and there's more likelihood they'll have to replace the uniforms due to the fights and the altercations and the being out, you know. We talked about yesterday road flares. I don't know how many pairs of pants, you almost can't light a road flare without the next day seeing what looks like cigarette burn holes up and down your leg. That costs the deputy, like I said, a \$60 pair of pants because we won't let them wear it again. We're not going to have them out there in ragged clothes. So, that's my justification for that increase also.

President Bassemier: Okay, Sheriff, we're going to change the tape.

Brad Ellsworth: Okay.

(TAPE CHANGE)

Councilmember Tornatta: Okay.

President Bassemier: Anybody got any questions while the Sheriff is thinking? Got anymore (inaudible).

Brad Ellsworth: I've got several here for my justification. I don't if there's anything that you particularly want to...I've requested an EMT for the jail, that's, I think, even under Sheriff Hamner's administration he requested that, and I've continued. We feel that medical costs are raised substantially because we don't have medical personnel that are in the jail round the clock. One EMT is not going to give us 24 hour, seven day a week, but eventually, we would like to get to that. I don't blame the jailers a bit, when somebody is injured in the night, or comes in, we do an assessment, but, and we would caution them that if they are not EMT's, they are not medical personnel, they will send somebody to the hospital, in their judgement, because they don't want to take the liability of them coming into the jail, so they will send 'em to the hospital. We think that by having the third shift and more coverage from medical that might, even though it's a salary, that it would reduce the medical costs. Medical is probably the biggest liability area in a jail. It's certainly expensive, I know that. We try to cut that anyway we can, but it's an area that we have to just be careful on every turn. So, we've asked for that EMT as a new assignment. We've asked for, probably the biggest increase you'll see is the request for \$660,000 for computers. If you have questions on that, I'm going to defer to Eric, because he is the President of the Data Board. This is...we've also put this request in to the County Commission out of CCD. That's a huge hit, but it's preparing us for what already...the wheels are turning. City has there money in place. This is a joint project for Central Dispatch and the CAD system. I think you've heard it referred to as Project 42, I think. Like I said, if you have any questions on that, I'm going to have Eric step up. He's a little more familiar with it than I am.

President Bassemier: Anybody got any questions to that?

Councilmember Raben: Now, we're talking about computers, right? This \$600,000?

Brad Ellsworth: Right.

Councilmember Raben: I had discussed one thing with both the Sheriff and Eric, the 911 Fund has some surplus in it this year that we should carry over that next week we may look at, you know, we'll probably propose that we shift, you know, about 75% of this, or probably two thirds of this towards that 911 budget. Because this, the bulk of what this is is to communicate with the officers out in the field, so, that would certainly qualify, and it runs through 911.

Councilmember Tornatta: Did they say that part of the 911 Fund was put in there for their...did we talk about that last night that they put some of the 911 Funds, or is that on the City side? To try and get them up to the point where they could take care of this.

Councilmember Raben: I, I think that was, I think that conversation was about city.

Brad Ellsworth: One of the, one of the bright points in this is within the next year, all cellular phone calls..we've got one company up and running so far, is that all cellular phone calls that dial 911, those phones have to go into the county coffers. They're earmarked for Dispatch and for Emergency 911 Central Dispatch, but, I think, even from the one company, if I remember correctly, and this was, the meeting was a couple..that our first month check from one company was like \$35,000. So, if you multiply that times the other, I don't know how many cellular companies there are, but it seems like they are endless, they all would be coming to Central Dispatch. We will see some real money coming in to that from those funds. It will cause more work out there, no question about it, but, certainly, that is going to help the 911 Central Dispatch Fund. I've also asked to move a Clerk Typist to Administrative Assistant. Traditionally, this was kind of the last Deputy Sheriff that was doing, what I would say is civil work, or paperwork in the office. He was doing all the evictions himself, and handling all the paperwork that went with evictions and Sheriff's sales. We've moved one of our Clerk Typists, we put the Deputy out on the road, as part of this manpower shortage that we've been having, and moved a Clerk Typist into that position. She now handles all the civil, the civil work of Sheriff's sales and all the evictions, and so we've asked...but we think that those responsibilities go up and above what a Clerk Typist is responsible for, and we've asked that she be moved to Administrative Assistant as opposed to Clerk.

Councilmember Sutton: Which position is that, Brad?

Brad Ellsworth: That's 1050 1130 0207.

Councilmember Sutton: 1050.

Brad Ellsworth: 1130 0207.

Councilmember Raben: That may be shifted over to—

Brad Ellsworth: Did I—

Councilmember Raben: —you're in the jail now.

Brad Ellsworth: That should still be.

Councilmember Sutton: No. I see a couple of Clerk Typists positions.

Councilmember Tornatta: Is that 1130?

President Bassemier: Page 22. Page 22.

Councilmember Tornatta: Page 22 at the top. Did you have that line item right?

Councilmember Sutton: I'm assuming you're referring to—

Councilmember Tornatta: 1130—

Councilmember Sutton: 0207.

Councilmember Tornatta: Yeah.

Councilmember Sutton: That's what I'm assuming.

President Bassemier: I'm going by—

Councilmember Sutton: Which is on page 22.

President Bassemier: That will have to go to Job Study for an upgrade. Tim, that will have to go through Job Study.

Councilmember Tornatta: Page 22, Brad.

Councilmember Raben: (Inaudible. Mike not on) Is it a step increase along with (Inaudible. Mike not on.)

Councilmember Sutton: It isn't an increase. It's an upgrade.

Eric Williams: It's not a change in job description, we are changing this person to match another job description. It's not a new job, we already have Administrative Assistants in there. We're wanting to put this person in that kind of position.

Councilmember Raben: But, I mean—

Eric Williams: It's not a Job Study issue really.

Unidentified: Yes it is.

Councilmember Raben: Other than it's (Inaudible. Mike not on.) it's also a significant increase. (Inaudible. Mike not on.)

Eric Williams: We currently have Administrative Assistants with a job description. This person is now performing that same job description as Administrative Assistant, so we're moving one Clerk and exchanging that for an Administrative Assistant position which we already have like of. I mean, we can go to Job Study with it, but we are just going to tell you it's exactly like everything we already have.

President Bassemier: Sandie, do you want to address that?

Eric Williams: We just increased this person's work load to match that of the person that they were working under.

Councilmember Raben: (Inaudible. Mike not on.)

President Bassemier: I'm sure it has to go to Job Study.

Eric Williams: We'll do that.

Brad Ellsworth: Vehicles, any questions on that? We requested...we've done this several different ways in the last several years. As we said last year, if we could keep some of our replacement of ten a year—

President Bassemier: I'm alright.

Brad Ellsworth: —that's a good number for us. We requested \$250,000. We also requested the same amount out of CCD Funds. It seems like I heard that they were going to put \$125,000 out of CCD into our Vehicles.

President Bassemier: That's what I got down.

Councilmember Raben: \$125,000. Back to...just to clarify something for Eric. You currently only have one Administrative Assistant line. If you had two, and you were shuffling people around, you're correct, you would...because you only have one line in

there, I mean, that's why it has to go to Job Study.

Brad Ellsworth: That will be fine.

Councilmember Winnecke: Hey, Brad, back to the computer request for a second. It might be good to explain the three elements of that. Of Project 42, so everyone—

Brad Ellsworth: You know I'm going to defer that to the President of the Data Board, my Chief Deputy.

Eric Williams: Basically, Project 42 are the CAD records, Fire Management, Mobile Data Computing Upgrade Project. This is a project that will be instituted...couple years ago began to research, but the crux of the project is to get rid of the current systems that we have which are no longer compatible with a lot of the other systems that are out there. It's not going to be compatible with the NCICU 1000 or the Federal Government System or the Bureau of Motor Vehicles System. Those types of things. Basically, what it will be replacing is the Computer Aided Dispatch Center's all their operating software. Their records management system for criminal arrest records, which is all of our case files, arrest histories, suspect information, contacts with the community, those types of things, and the Jail Management System. Now, we recognize that the Jail Management System was replaced in '99, but we at that time selected a fairly inexpensive system and that was basically to get us through the Y2K problem, because we did have a product that would not work after 2000. The reason, and we were originally not going to include that in this project, but with the PMSI study and the encouragement of everybody to move towards systems that do communicate with one another, and are integrated and share data and keep them all in line, we thought we ought to add that to this just to see what the cost factor would be so that now the jail records and computer dispatch would all be sharing central data. The advantages of that are fundamentally that you only put the data in once. If it's wrong once, it's wrong everywhere. The problem we have now, if it's wrong in one place it may be wrong in three different places. It's very difficult to track down. This will allow those to all be working, functioning together. The information will be able to be delivered to the officer on the street while he's in his patrol car. You know, jail information, records information, previous dispatch information, premise information, a wide variety of things.

Councilmember Winnecke: Not to interrupt. Is this the same information that will accessible to the Prosecutor's office with the quick request that was made?--

Eric Williams: Basically, what the Prosecutor is looking for is licensing for the records portion of this so that they can directly access the computer data files that we maintain on individuals as far as their arrest records and their criminal involvement in any crimes and those types of things. It's just that aspect of it.

JAIL

Councilmember Raben: Ready to go to jail?

President Bassemier: Let's go to jail.

Eric Williams: Let's go to jail.

Brad Ellsworth: Don't do that. We're full.

President Bassemier: Page 27.

Brad Ellsworth: I spoke out of turn on the EMT, because that would be in the jail budget, that EMT, but that argument is still the same. In the jail budget I am also asking for the addition of a Clerk Typist, a second shift Clerk Typist position. We feel that the increased work and then the amount of phone calls and paperwork generated out of that would justify

the, another Clerk Typist position up there. The two jail Sergeants, who we call Master Control are plagued with, I think we ran some numbers in the last couple of weeks and they are answering and dealing with 51 phone calls an hour, along with their other duties which is court paperwork and that. This would relieve them of some of those duties, and then also the paperwork with the courts and also the transferring to prison and other detention areas. What we are asking to do is move a Detention Officer out of the Misdemeanor Housing Fund and create a line item for a new Detention Officer. Now, that wouldn't create a new Detention Officer, per se, not another body, but we'd ask it to come out of that grant and then pay out of the grant the Clerk Typist at a cheaper rate.

President Bassemier: Anybody got any questions?

Councilmember Sutton: Can you say that again?

Brad Ellsworth: Right.

Councilmember Sutton: I'm looking at the Detention Officer—

Brad Ellsworth: What shows a new Detention Officer line item. It's not going to create a body, what we'd ask is one of the...out of the Misdemeanor Housing Grant that we receive from DOC, it's split between the Corrections Complex and the jail, that money has not gone up. It originally funded like four positions, and as the employees got raises, we had to start pulling people out of there. I think it's down to a Correction Officer and is Stacy in that line item? And a Clerk Typist position. What we'd ask now is that we pull the Correction Officer out of Misdemeanor Housing, move that over to the General Fund, it doesn't create a new body, it does create a new line item, but then would place that with the second Clerk Typist in the Misdemeanor Housing Fund.

Councilmember Sutton: Are we totally bearing the entire cost on the Misdemeanor Housing Correction Officer previously? Or are we sharing some of that cost with the Grant or anything like that?

Brad Ellsworth: Actually, what we've had to do...originally...I can't remember what that...Corrections funded a couple positions and some extra stuff, food and things like that. Originally, when I think this came under Sheriff Shepard. It was enough, the \$88,000 that the jail received, was enough to fund like four Correction Officers positions. The money never went up, but their salaries did, and benefits and so it slowly we went back to three and then to two until the last, I think, Sheriff Hamner's last term, and although there's a surplus in there now, I think, the total...we talked about this yesterday and it's really at \$53,662, we believe. It's been vacant for about a month, or a month and a half. We made a job offer for that position, but as soon as we fill that position, that money will be spoken for, or at least \$40,000, I guess.

Councilmember Raben: Could I, Brad, could I address this real quickly with the Auditor? Cause I know we had discussed this and I've not addressed this with her yet. The information that was provided to me by your office is that the Misdemeanor Housing Account had a surplus in it. Can you verify that that is correct?

Suzanne Crouch: With the budget for next year, I believe, it was \$80,000, correct?

Brad Ellsworth: For the jail. Now, the whole grant is \$100,000.

Suzanne Crouch: Right. It's split between the—

Brad Ellsworth: Could that have been the \$90,000 been between the two entities? Between Community Corrections and the jail because we split it? Or is it total \$90,000?

Suzanne Crouch: There's \$80,500 to the one and \$80,500 to the other.

Brad Ellsworth: Right.

Suzanne Crouch: Right. Hmmm? Yeah, the grants. That's what we're talking about. The Misdemeanor Housing—

Brad Ellsworth: Right.

Suzanne Crouch: —Offender—

Brad Ellsworth: Right.

Suzanne Crouch: —So, on the Misdemeanor Housing Offender, the budget is for \$80,000. With the cash balance, and with the revenues coming in next year, we are showing that you will have a surplus of \$90,000 next year. On the other fund, on the other grant fund, I think, we show \$85,000.

Brad Ellsworth: The other grant being the half that—

Suzanne Crouch: The other \$80,500—

Brad Ellsworth: —Community Corrections gets?

Suzanne Crouch: —yeah, the one's Misdemeanor Housing Offender, and one's Misdemeanor VCC...one's Misdemeanor Housing and one's Misdemeanor Offender.

Brad Ellsworth: Okay, okay. We...I was under the impression it came under the same grant. It was a handshake deal years ago between Circuit Court and the Sheriff's department, we took half, they took half. It was sent down to one grant and then they split it. I could be wrong. We can re-look at that.

Suzanne Crouch: Okay.

Brad Ellsworth: I'll call you after the meeting.

Suzanne Crouch: Alright.

Brad Ellsworth: See how much is there.

Councilmember Raben: If I'm understanding what you are saying, that what, your understanding is still correct. That's what I think you said, that it's still split \$80,500—

Suzanne Crouch: \$80,500.

Brad Ellsworth: Right.

Councilmember Raben: —per account, but—

Suzanne Crouch: Part of it is for Community Corrections, which took over from Circuit Court—

Brad Ellsworth: Right.

Suzanne Crouch: —and then the other is the Sheriff.

Brad Ellsworth: Right.

Eric Williams: We're under the understanding...we understand that part of it too, that there's, well, there's \$53,000 in there right now, and we expect to spend about \$40,000 out of that. There may be sufficient cash balance to cover that next year. That may end up

being the case, but—

Suzanne Crouch: Uh-huh.

Eric Williams: —we all know that as time goes on that these salaries are going to continue to go up, and they will within the next two years outweigh or outpace that grant. So, it was our thought this year, when we are asking for the new employee, to go on and put that new employee, the cheaper one, in this grant to prolong that grant a little longer before we have to make another change and just go on and make that move this year, the Detention Officer, into the General Fund. Because it will either happen this year or...it will have to happen sooner or later, or we are going to have to get rid of a person. It would just seem like the timing was better as opposed to getting caught half way between next year and the next year, we're asking for a change this year and let's go on and just make that change now at budget time.

Suzanne Crouch: But the \$53,000 you have now, that doesn't...your grant money hasn't come in—

Brad Ellsworth: Sure.

Suzanne Crouch: —so really you're going to have \$130,000—

Eric Williams: We anticipate there will be about \$13,000 maybe left over this year in that grant, and then with the \$80,000 that adds on top of it, now the two Detention Officers would outpace that \$80,000, more than likely, and then we would be already getting into that surplus that was left from this year. It just...it's just a management decision where you put the new person, if you are going to grant it. If you leave the Detention Officer in the grant, it's not going to run out into the red next year, it just seemed like this was the opportune time to make the shift, now. You know, it's a management decision, and whatever the pleasure of the Council is we're, obviously, willing to work however you want us to work. It just seemed that this made more sense to make a switch this year. That was from our viewpoint. It may be a different viewpoint from your side too, so.

President Bassemier: I'm sure we'll talk about it. Anymore questions on this from the Sheriff?

Councilmember Hoy: A little confusion on Vehicles under jail. I think you've got it under jail, Sheriff?

Brad Ellsworth: Right.

Councilmember Hoy: Request for \$45,000. You've also put that in CCD budget, correct?

Brad Ellsworth: Did we put a transfer in?

Eric Williams: We did (Inaudible. Not at mike.)

Councilmember Hoy: They did not include it?

Brad Ellsworth: They are not going to include that. That's for a transport van, I believe it's over \$100,000 now the transport van, and we're running hard to get 'em out of the jail. To DOC, so. That's one of those...we can keep it for short trips, but it, obviously, takes a pretty substantial van when you're moving 12 at a time, and you have to...you've got the whole, well—

Councilmember Hoy: Do you use it on the road or in town?

Brad Ellsworth: That's used on over the highway with 12 inmates going to anywhere in the state—

Councilmember Hoy: Okay.

Brad Ellsworth: —or we go to pick ‘em up, or. It’s a secure van. I don’t know if you’ve been down to see it, but it’s, basically, it’s gutted and then a whole new interior is welded in, an aluminum interior. Doors to separate different departments for males and females and anybody dangerous that has to be segregated from the others. It’s pretty costly.

Councilmember Hoy: Is that a...it’s got a V-8 engine in it, right?

Brad Ellsworth: Oh, yeah. We’ve tried, we’ve tried diesel and that thinking it would last longer—

Councilmember Hoy: Yeah.

Brad Ellsworth: —the last diesel wasn’t any better. This one is gas, but it’s a V-10, I think.

Councilmember Hoy: I’m just looking for places to save, because I’m running mine at \$114,000, going to New Hampshire. It’s not the same as what you are running, but those motors are—

Brad Ellsworth: We’ll keep that.

Councilmember Hoy: —they are more like truck motors is all I’m—

Brad Ellsworth: We’ll keep that other van also until such a time that it won’t go, you know, we deem it unsafe. I mean, there’s times we’ll send Officer Forshee up to Plainfield and Snooch Van Meter to, you know, to Boys School and it’s...they’re on the road constantly. Again, it’s getting to that point where, you know, we’re here now and instead of coming back here in an emergency.

President Bassemier: Okay.

Councilmember Winnecke: I would just like to say, I would like to compliment you and the staff. The rationale that you give for the over and above expenditures is really helpful. It’s a lot of detail, and it’s very helpful.

Brad Ellsworth: Thank you, Councilman. I appreciate everything you all do, in traveling to jails and all you’ve done over the last year for when we come to you.

President Bassemier: Eating at Mc Donald’s.

Brad Ellsworth: And the Mc Donald’s, yeah, that’s right.

President Bassemier: Where are we?

Brad Ellsworth: We were on jail.

President Bassemier: Okay.

Brad Ellsworth: I don’t have anything else. Unless you have a question.

SHERIFF MISDEMEANOR HOUSING

President Bassemier: Okay, Jail Misdemeanor Housing. We hit that a little bit.

Councilmember Raben: We’ve already discussed that.

President Bassemier: Yeah, right. Anybody got any questions on that though?

COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS

President Bassemier: Okay, Community Corrections.

Brad Ellsworth: I don't think there is anything in there extraordinary or out of the way. Unless you have questions of?

President Bassemier: 101.

Brad Ellsworth: Oh, the one thing we did want to bring up. There was a question on the rent, and that can be cut to \$36,000. I don't know what we listed it as, I think \$43,000. We can cut that to \$36,000. I believe that is out of the contract running from March to March, and it's, the rent has not gone up on that.

President Bassemier: What number was that, Brad?

Councilmember Sutton: Sheriff, could I?--

Brad Ellsworth: I've got 1361 and \$3,600.

Councilmember Sutton: 36? Is that what you said?

Brad Ellsworth: \$3,600.

Councilmember Tornatta: What did you say put that in at?

Brad Ellsworth: \$36,000.

Councilmember Tornatta: So, it went down? From--

Brad Ellsworth: It really didn't...the rent didn't go down--

Councilmember Tornatta: Okay. Okay.

Brad Ellsworth: --that was just--

President Bassemier: Rent, there.

Councilmember Raben: Sheriff, not to put you on the spot. I know--

Brad Ellsworth: Oh, boy.

Councilmember Raben: --yourself and the Commissioners were...met on this, or this was part of their meeting Monday night. I know you and I had discussed this somewhat yesterday, but, give me your feelings on an attempt, or give us some guidance, and I'm sure there are some that may not go along with what I'm about to say, but I think there's a few on this Council that are under the same opinion that I am, but give us some guidance on what you think we ought to do in terms of an attempt to scale back the Community Corrections Program in lieu of building a new facility, you know, that we may have in two to three years. I think you've already made it known that you're interests are, you know, 150 beds for total both male and female. Again, I guess, what I'm asking is, I would like to begin scaling back this program effective 2002, but not without your input and direction on what we can or can't do there.

Brad Ellsworth: Well, it's a tough situation. I think our community has accepted Community Corrections. I think it's a worthwhile program. I'd be remiss if I didn't say that. Certainly, the judges and in the Commission meeting the other night are all very supportive of, if not the 225 beds, then increasing that. From my position, if we leave it at 225 beds or 300 beds, we can run the operation if you fund that, but if we set at a \$35 million limit on the

construction...we know that to say that the existing complex, I don't think, has a future. The Community Corrections Advisory Board says that building...please don't include that in future plans. I think we sent a letter to you all. I also don't think that we are going to build a quality complex of the jail, the juvenile detention center and a 225 bed correction complex for \$35 million. I don't think you can do it. I'm not an estimator, but I don't think we are going to be able to do it. For a juvenile center of only 24 beds, there's very little wiggle room to cut back there. With a...with the jail, which we are just getting out of the lawsuit over that, that's the things you get sued over is the jail. I don't think you get sued over Community Corrections. There is only 62 counties in the state of Indiana that have a Community Corrections program, so you don't even have to run one. So, what might make sense, and what most counties do is they have an area of their jail, or an area that they set aside for Community Corrections. Lexington, Fayette County, I can't remember if any Councilman went to that, but it's a 900 bed jail and they've got 60 Community Correction beds. Which is a rather large city, rather large county. La Grange County has built their jail, but one pod is devoted to Community Corrections. It might be 40. We've got more bed sleep there people than anybody in the state. We've got the biggest program in the state, even than Marion County. So, we've got a large program. The judges like this, and, I think, there are judges in the room and they may want to talk to this, you know, when I'm finished, and I certainly welcome that, but if, if we can't...we've basically told the architect is start drawing, you draw what Vanderburgh County needs. You know, is it the 600, and I'm going to say it's 600 jail beds expandable to 1,000, would be, I think, a reasonable number. Like I said, the 24 bed juvenile, there is not a lot of wiggle room there, and the 225 bed Community Service. When that building is built and they can't do it for \$35 million, there is going to have to be cuts. You know, either in the quality of the building or in beds and start to clean the thing. It's my gut feeling that the easiest thing to do that, way to do that is, like I said, we're getting sued over jail beds, we're not going to get sued over Community Corrections beds. So, we have to decide which portions of that project to either eliminate all together, juvenile, we're not going to do it, or cut back the jail beds which we'll fill. Like I said, I invite the judges to come...what the argument is if we've got a Community Corrections Complex that's been full forever, it's always in use with some beds, people waiting, we've got a full jail that, and like I said, I'll let one of the judges discuss this I don't want to speak for 'em, but those people that they sentence out there very well could get sentenced to the jail and cause crowding there again. So, it's a dilemma that, it's a dilemma that we are in based on the fact that we fell into three projects at once. It's going to be very expensive, but the only way to scale that back would be, that I can see, there's no way to do lay offs right now, because the Correction Officers I have over there could...if we said we are going to limit you to 150 beds right now at the current center. The way it's laid out, I would still need the same amount of guards to watch those people for around the shift. We're not overstaffed that way. I've already not filled two Case Managers jobs currently that I've decided not to fill. We've cut back, we've went to a cold breakfast and eliminated two cooks positions. So, we've scaled back a little bit already just by the, just through management decisions. But the way to cut that back is either reduce bed size when we build this new thing or this new complex, I don't know how you begin to scale back right now. I think, like I said, I would really appreciate it if the judge would discuss this, because this is a hot topic. Like I said, we can run whatever you give us the money to run. If it's 1,000 beds, we can run it with the employees and the—

Councilmember Raben: You may have just answered it. That was my question. Can we begin to scale back today.

Brad Ellsworth: I don't see that happening right now with the numbers in the current facility.

Councilmember Raben: Okay.

Brad Ellsworth: Even with what we've done just managerially.

Councilmember Hoy: The Advisory Board, I was told the other day by a member of that board, is now limiting the length of sentence at Community Corrections. Is that correct? What is that limit?

Brad Ellsworth: We did. Shortly after that I took over as management of that we visited that, and judge you might help me if I'm wrong, but we on a direct placement, on a direct placement we limited on six years, to do three actual living there years. On a bring back or a modified sentence where the judge sends them to prison and then modifies the sentence and brings them back, it was no more than one year? Judge, do you remember? Two years? Two to do one. If they had two years left on their sentence, they could bring it back at that time and they could actually bed days one year. That's the limits at this point.

Councilmember Hoy: Because you were before us recently where I had mentioned that someone had been sentenced for ten years, and you said we had somebody there sentenced for 20 years.

Brad Ellsworth: A couple of years ago there was a—

Councilmember Hoy: I think that is too long. The other thing that bothers me still, I know you got a grant now. Will that modify anything in terms of expenses? My first question, and secondly the other thing that concerns me is that we are subsidizing, I think we're subsidizing, the Department of Corrections. Immense...you know, with lots and lots of money. They don't seem to want to give us very much assistance. They did give us the grant, but I don't think that that is enough.

Brad Ellsworth: They gave us, they gave us a substantial increase. Like I said, it's broken up in several different ways, but it's still dollars that, you know, they broke it up into, now that includes Judge Trockman's day reporting program, and that's \$171,000 for him and his program. We did...it's a substantial increase, of course, they touted it as unheard of at 28% over the top and it really, you know, they put in some money toward juvenile, they put in some for CTP, but we could use all that. So, we are really looking at somewhere between 28% and 40 something percent increase over the last grant. It's our first shot at writing a new grant. There is not a formula. That's the problem with DOC. They don't have a formula: if you defer this many inmates, you get this many dollars. That's the only true way to compare it is, you know, why would we who, you know, say 900 inmates get less money than, and I'll just make this up, La Grange County who might defer 200? You know, if it's that grant writing skill, then we need to hire a grant writer, but they need a formula. That's really the only true way to say, if you are deferring this many...now, there's another question about and then I know the judges, and we talked to the Commissioners, I've set up a meeting that's not got a date yet with Ohlemiller and the DOC higher ups to discuss them supplying bricks and mortar money toward this new complex. In agreement that we would continue to defer people out of DOC. He said we would meet early in September on that. He said he would call me back early August, we'd meet early in September. The attorney for the County Commission says he can't find any statutes where that's been done before, or that allows for that, but we know that Hamilton County...Major, am I right? Hamilton County received bricks and mortar money for their Community Service Project. Towards the refurbishing of theirs, and it was either Lake or Allen that received, I think, in the area of \$1 million, if it wasn't \$1 million exactly toward their new building for Community Service. So, we'll know more, and the judge and I had a discussion yesterday about, you know, we need a definitive answer if you build this, we will give you this. Whether it's \$1 million, \$2 million, \$3 million or zero. Then we can have a report to come back and say this here's what DOC's going to do and we may be able to make better judgement, but they won't give us that number yet. Hopefully, at this meeting they will.

Councilmember Hoy: What, my other question then is—

Brad Ellsworth: Okay.

Councilmember Hoy: —the grant that we just got, what kind of—

Brad Ellsworth: Savings?

Councilmember Hoy: –savings, what kind of relief from this are we going to get as a county?

President Bassemier: Hold that thought. We're going to change the tape.

(TAPE CHANGE)

President Bassemier: Okay, Sheriff.

Brad Ellsworth: You're not going to see, what we've tried to do is get people being paid out of one account. That is one of the areas that we're going to have – and we tried to move as many people over into the grant as we could, fund as like people. What we tried to get the grant to do is fund, tried to move all the Correction Officers into the County General fund, all the fix it people, programs directors, case managers into the grant. You're not going to see an immediate we can cut this budget. A lot of the money came in as (inaudible) but it's money we won't have to, capital improvements, vehicles, I think we got a one time, was it \$125,000 in cars...\$170,000 for vehicles for the case managers to go out and do the home checks. It's going to buy us a van and I think five cars. But that's money we won't come to the County Council for. It's a one time thing. We won't have to come to you for vehicles for the Community Correction Center for several years hopefully, based on this grant. The computer software, the BI reporting, the put money into our electronic home detention, \$75,000...into electronic home monitoring. How we determine to use that in regards to electronic home monitoring is up to us. So it's going to save us through us managing your money better and using that money first.

President Bassemier: We're not going to see a reduction of the two million dollars?

Brad Ellsworth: No.

Councilmember Hoy: That's really where I was going with that.

Brad Ellsworth: Right. And I wish I could tell you that, but I can't.

Councilmember Hoy: The other thing, and I don't – Councilman Raben and I went out, as you know, and you all gave us a tour and one of the disturbing things to me and Councilman Raben pointed this out to me, I'm glad he looked at it, was at the job chart, especially for the women. And I don't see how in the world that person there is getting ahead working where they're working and paying the fees and they've got a family at home, you know, that just, I'm not asking you for an answer but it really disturbed me. And I looked at the men's chart, too, on jobs and I know what jobs don't pay in this county. And so my question does go to recidivism and we didn't get an answer from the judges on that, you know...

Brad Ellsworth: And I'm no expert on recidivism, but in anything I've read, it's probably up in the high 80's or low 90% on recidivism.

Councilmember Hoy: And I'm really concerned about this as you know and we've talked about them and that is, with all of the thousands and thousands and thousands of dollars we've spent on computers, why can't we get an exact on that figure? It would seem to me that –

Brad Ellsworth: On recidivism?

Councilmember Hoy: Yeah sure. I mean, it would seem to me that with the computerization, that ought to be one of the benefits, you know, that we get from the system is, if it's 90%, you know, at the SAFE House...and I know it's high. It's high at the DOC.

Brad Ellsworth: I could give you a great number that kind of shocked us a little bit. When

we switched over to the new jail package in '99, we were exporting that information. We went back over eight years and there were 77,000 bookings into the jail, and I think you were here the other night when I talked to the Commission, there was only 22,000 different names out of that list of 77,000, so that's four to one. You know, four times per person and I talked to the Commission, that's skewed by, you get the town drunk who gets arrested every week for public intoxication, his name is in that pool. So he may have 150 arrests in his lifetime. Another person may have one but that's a pretty good number there. You know, an average of four times that a person comes through the system, but it's hard. Like I said, there are documents that say what the national average of recidivism rate is and like I said, I would image it's high 80s or low 90s or maybe even high 90s. But, you know, when a person gets arrested in Evansville we don't track...if they don't come to the Safe House again for a second time or their second offense or they go to DOC, you know, I wouldn't have those local numbers.

Councilmember Hoy: Because the goal of Community Corrections is to assist the person and to keep that recidivism rate low and if we're not doing that or if that system is not doing it I'm not saying it's anybody's fault. I'm just saying obviously it's not working and we have this big program that is not working and that raises a lot of questions from me in terms of...the town drunk raises a lot of questions, too. I would just as soon see that person taken home and not be behind the wheel and I know you've got a lot of pressure on your staff and you're doing your best with that, but I've learned being involved in therapy and for a long time being trained in therapy, which I'm not allowed to use legally, but you know—

Brad Ellsworth: I would love to—

Councilmember Hoy: You know, there are just people who simply are not going to receive help. As far as I am concerned the best remedial programs are the ones that don't cost us a nickel and that is AA and NA. In fact, they won't even take a contribution from me. They self fund and when somebody gets real serious about AA and NA usually good things happen. Beyond that I haven't seen a whole lot of programs frankly that make a lot of difference in terms of drugs or...well, in terms of drugs because I consider alcohol just as much a drug as I do anything else. So I just really interiorly trying to deal with all this and I know you are, too. I appreciate—

Brad Ellsworth: If you come up with a system you and I will be not in Evansville we'll be on the national circuit lecturing.

Councilmember Hoy: Frankly, I don't think there is a system. The system...the only cure that happens is in the life of the person who really wants it.

Brad Ellsworth: Absolutely.

Councilmember Hoy: I cannot...you know, nothing you do or I do even locking them up will not create that motivation. As far as booze is concerned you can get plenty of booze in state prisons. We all know. We know it is made there. We know drugs get in there. We know that there are businesses conducted out of lockers and we just need to get honest as a society and that is that the system we set up is violated even when you've got barbed wire fence. I don't have an answer.

Brad Ellsworth: But until the new system is in place do you stop doing this one? I don't know.

Councilmember Hoy: I don't know either. That's, you know, we're all dealing with that and we're looking at a lot of money and I'm wondering, well, what's it doing?

Brad Ellsworth: When we walked through the jail the other day with Councilman Wortman as he, and I could see the surprise in his eyes, that was not unusual for the jailer in Taylor to walk in the middle of that cell and I'll do it in my jail in any cell up there and be very comfortable with people while they are housed in jail or while they are at the Safe House. The problem is you release them some time. Like I said, there is a lot of good guys in jail,

but you put them back in their neighborhood and you put them back on the rock or back on the bottle and then they go back to their old way of doing business, so you can't pull them out forever.

Councilmember Hoy: I'm just saying that and I'm not saying release them, but inside they, you know. I've talked to too many who ran businesses out of their lockers.

Brad Ellsworth: Absolutely.

Councilmember Hoy: (Inaudible.)

Brad Ellsworth: And I've got people who through my career now where I have seen...where I had the dad in jail when I was rookie patrolman and the sons and now the grandkids and that's who they've grown up with and that's all they've learned.

President Bassemier: I'm sorry, Phil, but we're going to have to move on. We're supposed to be out of here by 12 noon. We're going to have to make a decision here. We might have to go to recess for lunch. They're out of here at one. I don't know how we can get done, but we better move on.

Councilmember Sutton: Mr. Chairman, how much more do we have to go with on the Sheriff's side?

Brad Ellsworth: That was it, I think.

Councilmember Sutton: Are we just kind of—

Brad Ellsworth: That was it.

Councilmember Sutton: Okay.

Brad Ellsworth: I don't have anything to add.

Councilmember Sutton: I mean, we wouldn't want to—

President Bassemier: Sorry to interrupt you.

Brad Ellsworth: No, hey.

Councilmember Raben: (Inaudible, mike not on.)

Councilmember Sutton: Well, but then you've got all the courts. I mean, would we want to recess and come back or something? Sandie says their meeting lasts generally about an hour and a half. The Parks Board meeting generally lasts for about an hour and a half and they're due to come in here at noon.

DRUG & ALCOHOL DEFERRAL SERVICE

President Bassemier: Let's go ahead and go to Drug & Alcohol Deferral Service, page 114.

Councilmember Sutton: We can't do this.

President Bassemier: (Inaudible, mike not on.)

Bill Campbell: That's okay. I appreciate...I very much appreciate you going forward. Hopefully this will not take long or induce much pain. Bill Campbell, Director of Drug & Alcohol Deferral. The budget that has presented is essentially the same budget that has been presented for a number of years. Basically, the only increase is in the longevity of the salary increase and the one little item in cleaning. Past that it's the same budget you've

seen for a number of years.

President Bassemier: Anybody got any questions? Thank you, sir.

Bill Campbell: Okay, thank you.

SUPERIOR COURT/SUPERIOR COURT SUPPLEMENT ADULT PROBATION

President Bassemier: Okay, Superior Court, page 106. State your name.

Terry Dietsch: Terry Dietsch, Senior Judge Vanderburgh Superior Court. I stopped smoking a couple of months ago and this morning has been a real test.

President Bassemier: I didn't hear. What did he say?

Teri Lukeman: He said he stopped smoking, but today has been a real test.

Terry Dietsch: I didn't say I had quit. I said I stopped. A couple of things I would like to call to your attention. Other than that as usual our budget is pretty straight forward. All of the salaries are based upon a three percent raise. We have nine step raises, one of which we missed and I would like to call your attention to that. On page 110, 1770 there was a step that we were unaware of and the figure on that line item should be \$35,526. That's a housekeeping chore and that particular line item and also line item 1801 there should be a designation change in the terminology used on those line items. I thought it was going to be done on this sheet, but evidently for whatever reason it wasn't. Those two should read Small Claims Reporter. A couple of lines down item 1805 is a new line item for a proposed new employee. Judge Niemeier is here and he will answer any questions you might have regarding that proposal, but before we do that I would like to go ahead with the remainder of the budget, if I may. We sent to you earlier a rationale on a number of items where we were asking for an increase and the reason for the increases were rather self evident. We to the best of our ability we go to the vendors ahead of time to find out what they anticipate their percentage increase is going to be on certain items and then we factor that in. On several line items like office supplies, maintenance contracts, we put in a figure that we think is necessary to get us through a given fiscal year. You folks always cut that back by about \$10,000 and then we come back for additional appropriations of about \$10,000, so those figures that we ask for are pretty nearly correct or at least as correct as we can get. For example, on our maintenance contracts we know exactly what they are going to be. Obviously, if we don't have that amount appropriated then we're going come back for an additional appropriation. As usual I understand in some instances why you do that and we are perfectly willing to cooperate in order for you to meet your bottom line as long as you understand that those things...that the additional appropriations will have to be approved. That's what we do every year. We have one other item that pertains to the juvenile division and I will leave that up to Judge Niemeier to explain and that is that the contract between the juvenile division and CASA has been increased for fiscal 2002. On our user fee supplemental budget I would simply note that that budget is exactly the same as it was for 2001 and that has been done on purpose and specifically we did not intend to ask for any percent increase or longevity increase on the salary figures contained in the supplemental budget. I know one year we did that and for some reason or another someone added them on, but that was not through inadvertence. That's on purpose. I would be happy to answer any questions you might have.

President Bassemier: Anybody got any questions for the judge?

Councilmember Winnecke: Judge, in the rationale book that we were provided there was a pretty extensive sheet on court technology. Is that somewhere in here? I may have missed it in this budget.

Terry Dietsch: When you say court technology you mean Councilman Hoy's wonderland?

Councilmember Winnecke: His labyrinth, yeah.

Terry Dietsch: No, our understanding was that that is going to be contained either in the Council's budget or the Commissioner's budget.

Councilmember Winnecke: Okay.

Terry Dietsch: The reason I brought that up originally was because I had heard all these rumors about better get a handle on those numbers and include them in your budget which to me was very foolish. I just couldn't understand that thinking. Then I got together with Mr. Raben and he had Tim, I'm sorry, and I talked to him about it. He came to the Council and that is when it was decided to put those items into the Council's budget. I think properly so.

Councilmember Winnecke: That's all I had.

Terry Dietsch: Judge Niemeier is here if you would like for him—

President Bassemier: Oh, okay. Sure, Judge.

Terry Dietsch: —to enlighten you.

Brett Niemeier: Brett Niemeier with the Vanderburgh Superior Court. I did have the opportunity to receive a memo from Sandie requesting some statistics that might be helpful to you. I've had an opportunity now to compile those.

President Bassemier: We're going to have to come back aren't we, Judge? Curt, we're going to have to come back.

Brett Niemeier: I'm not for sure if I answered all of the questions—

President Bassemier: Sandie, we're going to have to come back.

Brett Niemeier: —that you presented. I answered them the best I could. As you know court does not have the ability yet in computer programming to come up with all the available statistics that we would like to have. The reason for the new position, quite frankly, is that we are spending...once you get your sheet and I kind of cheated on you, too, because the top sheet is the information you requested. The attachment is a letter of explanation of why I think this position is necessary and also a job description. The Job Study Committee has recommended the approval of this new position at a PAT IV level. I haven't come before you to ask for that to be implemented immediately because I thought it might be better to put it in the context of the entire budget. I would also note that Superior Court has not had a new employee for over 15 years, so it's not like Superior Court comes in and asks for things that are unnecessary. The top sheet of the handout shows the detention costs from 1997 through the year 2000. As you can tell over \$2 million spent every year in detaining juveniles. The next figure is the most important figure and that is the reimbursement figure on what we are collecting from the parents whose juvenile was detained. As you can see, Vanderburgh County last year only collect \$9,371. The reason why it was so low is because we don't have a person to collect it. The other counties...I just took a sample. I thought you might be interested in Posey County, Warrick County since they are close by. Monroe, Elkhart, it all speaks for itself. Some counties...several counties around the state do not collect any. Again, I'm sure they don't collect it because they don't have anyone to collect it. I know there is a lot of material in there. I think we should be able to do, obviously, a much better job in collecting reimbursement costs for detention and the other aspect that shouldn't be overlooked in this new position is that the federal government has given us a program whereby we can provide in-home services to families. Instead of families having to drive someplace they could actually have the therapist go in-home to treat the family and also the juvenile. Approximately \$372,000 worth of services right now are not being administered to our families locally because we, again, do not have an

individual to be able to complete all the necessary paperwork that is required by the federal government and I think that is something that shouldn't be overlooked. So not only would this person be able to collect some reimbursement money from parents who I think rightfully should pay whenever it is financially feasible for them to pay some of the detention costs, but also this person would allow us to provide necessary services for families who currently are not receiving them.

President Bassemier: Anybody got any questions for the judge?

Brett Niemeier: Okay, thank you.

President Bassemier: Thank you, sir. It's 12:00 or after. There is a meeting supposed to be starting.

Teri Lukeman: Ed, wait.

Suzanne Crouch: (Inaudible, mike not on.)

Sandie Deig: They're going to go over there.

CIRCUIT COURT/CIRCUIT COURT SUPPLEMENTAL ADULT PROBATION

President Bassemier: Oh, wonderful, wonderful. They're going next door. Okay. Alright, Circuit Court. The way I understand it that meeting is going to go next door and we're just going to go on.

Carl Heldt: Carl Heldt, Circuit Court judge. No new employees. Standard salary raises. The one addition is 3371 \$10,000 Computer Hardware. That is for two terminals for employees that don't have them that need them. Both of which are new employees, I believe, or new since the terminals were bought and also for a printer that's going kaput and I think it is out of date and we need a new printer. So \$10,000 there. 3530 Contractual Services another \$500 because our maintenance agreement for the new reporting systems requires \$3,500 so \$500 there. Other than that I think it's the same. Just our regular raises. Supplemental adult probation user fees, of course has no impact on the county budgets and the only raises there are a total of about \$4,500 for training, travel and lab supplies that are required by the people that need them, so it's not much. Not much to talk about unless you've got any questions?

President Bassemier: Any questions for the judge?

Carl Heldt: Alright, thanks.

BOND ISSUE

President Bassemier: I'm glad we got that over with today. That's great. Okay, Suzanne. That would be Bond Debt Prepayment, 196.

Suzanne Crouch: Suzanne Crouch, Auditor. Any questions?

President Bassemier: Suzanne, do you want to go ahead?

Suzanne Crouch: It's just the same as it has been prior years. We have listed the bonds that we're making payment from outside of TIF areas or outside of TIF revenues.

Councilmember Hoy: How close are we to paying off that USI overpass, do you know?

Suzanne Crouch: Someone asked that last year. I believe it is 2014, but I can check that. I'll double-check that.

Councilmember Raben: We refinanced those what?

Suzanne Crouch: We refinanced that in 1996.

Councilmember Hoy: Oh, that's right. We did, didn't we? Stretched it out a little bit more.

Suzanne Crouch: Yeah, I'll find that out.

Councilmember Hoy: Okay, thank you.

Councilmember Tornatta: Suzanne, are we moving toward...I saw a lot of microfiche or micro—

Suzanne Crouch: Oh, in my budget?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yeah. Are we not going there? I'm sorry.

Suzanne Crouch: Are we moving backwards, is that question?

Councilmember Tornatta: Did we start on page—

President Bassemier: We started on seven.

Suzanne Crouch: Oh, I'm sorry. I went to the bond thing.

Councilmember Tornatta: Oh, 196. Okay. Okay, now we're done with that.

AUDITOR'S OFFICE

Councilmember Tornatta: I would like to talk about page number nine.

Suzanne Crouch: Alright.

Councilmember Tornatta: The microfilming and scanning.

Suzanne Crouch: Correct.

Councilmember Tornatta: Are we moving more toward, is that all computer driven stuff and then are there other...is there some equipment in house that we can use?

Suzanne Crouch: Right, we last year the Council appropriated money for us to do a scanning/document imaging project. The cost that we had gotten from SCT was \$100,000, but with the monies that was appropriated, and I believe it was twenty something, I would have to check, but we were able to scan our property record cards in house using our own personnel so you can see the considerable savings and we scanned 80,000. They're in the process of doing that currently. What this is for is to, I've got to look at my rationale for a snap...I'm not as computer knowledgeable as a lot of people, but it's for a snap drive for the service to expand the document imaging into bookkeeping, so what we're looking at doing is using the server and, you know, using the equipment we have and supplementing that so that we can start scanning our personnel records and our pink slips.

Councilmember Tornatta: But this is more...not microfilm or fiche or anything like that?

Suzanne Crouch: No, we are requesting a microfiche machine. That is—

Councilmember Tornatta: Is there one in house?

Suzanne Crouch: There is one in house, but it has...it is literally on its last leg. It was there long before I came in.

Councilmember Tornatta: Is there one, like Z, does she have one that she is not using any more or some other office?

Suzanne Crouch: I don't know. Hardly anybody uses microfiche machines and the reason we have to use them is because of the technology before we got into the scanning and we have payroll records that we have to keep to infinity for people to reference them.

Councilmember Tornatta: Right.

Suzanne Crouch: And those are on microfiche.

Councilmember Tornatta: I guess what I am asking is could we get that from another office that has discontinued using that? I mean, I don't know how they cost. I didn't really have anything to see what they cost.

Suzanne Crouch: We could check into that. I'm not sure very many offices do have them.

Councilmember Tornatta: Okay.

Suzanne Crouch: It would only be offices that have to keep old records. Most offices are allowed to destroy records over a period of time. I'll talk to Marsha. That's the only office I am kind of thinking of that perhaps might.

Councilmember Tornatta: I was just thinking if it was going to be a big expenditure maybe see if we had one in the building.

Suzanne Crouch: I'll check on that.

Councilmember Tornatta: And if we could because they are probably not using it because of technology.

Suzanne Crouch: Right.

Councilmember Tornatta: Then we—

Suzanne Crouch: Sure, I'll look into that. In fact, we have requested two computers and two printers and what we do with the old ones is we move them to someone else that doesn't have this much use, so we're very big proponents of not throwing stuff out until it is about ready to die. But I'll certainly look into that. Marsha would be the one that might have old records that she might like to have to.

Councilmember Hoy: You are talking about equipment and not employees right?

Suzanne Crouch: True.

President Bassemier: Any more questions?

Suzanne Crouch: Oh, yes, I'm sorry. In the book, thank you, Teri, for that. There is a line item that we need to delete and then we need to add a new one because we went to Job Study and then Council also approved an employee change, so we need to delete 1020-1140. Zero that out and then we need to add 1020-1260 which is Tax Mapping Supervisor and that amount is \$30,225.

Councilmember Tornatta: That was in the summary or the amendment?

Suzanne Crouch: Right. Thank you.

Councilmember Tornatta: Adjourn?

President Bassemier: We've got a second and a third.

(Meeting recessed at 12:08 p.m.)

**VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL
BUDGET HEARINGS
AUGUST 9, 2001**

The Vanderburgh County Council met in session this 9th day of August, 2001 in Room 301 of the Civic Center Complex. The meeting was officially opened by President Ed Bassemier at 9:02 a.m.

President Bassemier: I want to welcome everyone to the August 9, 2001 budget hearing, the third day of budget hearings. Attendance roll call, please.

COUNCILMEMBER	PRESENT	ABSENT
Councilmember Tornatta	X	
Councilmember Sutton	X	
Councilmember Wortman	X	
Councilmember Hoy	X	
Councilmember Raben	X	
Councilmember Winnecke*	X	
President Bassemier	X	

President Bassemier: Would everyone please stand for the Pledge of Allegiance?

(Pledge of allegiance was given.)

President Bassemier: Before we get started into our budgets, our Finance Chairman, Mr. Raben, do you have anything that you would like to say before we get started?

Councilmember Raben: No, sir, Mr. President.

President Bassemier: What did you say?

Councilmember Raben: No.

President Bassemier: Okay, we will go to the Recorder, page 13.

COUNTY RECORDER

President Bassemier: Good morning, ma'am.

Betty Knight Smith: Good morning.

President Bassemier: Would you like to start it out and enlighten us on some of your changes. I think it was only one, really.

Betty Knight Smith: There is only one change right now. On my part time account cut that back down to \$6,000, with a new employee I can get by without that.

Councilmember Winnecke: Is that the Extra Help line item?

Betty Knight Smith: What?

Councilmember Winnecke: Is that the Extra Help line item?

Betty Knight Smith: Um, um, 1990.

President Bassemier: Uh, 1990, okay. Betty-

Betty Knight Smith: Other than that, everything is three per cent.

President Bassemier: Looks like you have a pretty tight budget, here, so-

Betty Knight Smith: What?

President Bassemier: Pretty tight budget, here, good job.

Councilmember Wortman: Mr. Chairman, you have got to remember one thing, she is self supporting up there.

President Bassemier: That's exactly right.

Councilmember Wortman: If we had another 45 departments like her, we would be in good shape.

Betty Knight Smith: Thank you, Curt.

President Bassemier: Anybody? Jim?

Councilmember Raben: Betty, I don't know that I heard this from you but maybe another source on Council but there was a mention that you may be willing to not shift but reimburse the County on that new employee with the Perpetuation Fund?

Betty Knight Smith: I would be glad to, if you can find a way to do that. I told them that to start with. I don't know how to do it because I can spend that to run the department but I don't know about the employees. But, if you can figure out a way to do, I would be glad to.

Councilmember Tornatta: It can't be used on employees unless you figure out a way around that.

Councilmember Raben: That's about all there is in her budget, too.

Betty Knight Smith: Yes, that's it.

President Bassemier: Thank you, dear.

Betty Knight Smith: Thank you.

President Bassemier: Okay, the Convention and Visitors Bureau, 186. Please state your name, ma'am.

CONVENTION AND VISITORS BUREAU

Bev Oswald: Bev Oswald, I am the president of the Board of the Convention and Visitor's Bureau and with me today is Bob Whitehouse, our interim director and Bill Geist, a consultant with Zeitgeist Consulting Company that specializes in bureaus. Thank you for giving us the opportunity to present our proposed budget today. This as you can imagine is an exciting time for us with the Centre, which has been a catalyst in the development of Evansville, which I believe will be a rising star in the meeting and convention business and considered by many, across the nation, to be one of the finest centers of its size, of its type for a community our size. With the Centre in full operation and now with the Executive Inn in operation, which brought to us, Mr. Bays, is making a substantial commitment there, we feel like we have a lot of opportunities in front of us. Not like the movies, build it and they will come, we feel like we are going to have to go out and really sell, sell, sell. So, you are going to see a new budget and what you are going to see is a significant change in our direction of marketing. We are believing that, and we know that to market convention sales, it's by direct sales, face to face, relationship building. It is not advertising for tourism and leisure but we also know that the dollars come from the convention business. So, we are going, here is what we propose to do and Bob is going to pass out a revised budget. We apologize for this but this is the first time that Bob has gone through this process and the very budget had to be turned in, in mid-June, he had been appointed as an interim director, just a couple of weeks before, that budget he presented had not been presented to our Board and it had not been totally analyzed by our Board. So, I think that he tried to put some numbers together that would work but the Board as I said, we have had a shift in our direction, as well. In this, you will see, as this

is laid out, the 2001 budget, the preliminary budget-

President Bassemier: Let him pass it and let everybody have a chance to look at it. Just give us a couple of minutes, here.

Bev Oswald: Okay.

President Bassemier: Thank you, ma'am, you can go ahead.

Bev Oswald: The three line items that you will see are out 2001 preliminary budget and the 2002 budget that we are proposing today. If there has been a change from what you received in June, there will be a rational for that but we will address those first. The other thing, on the revenue side, yesterday is talking with Suzanne's office, we had projected more revenue and had a budget that was about \$1.1 originally, which you had seen. Understanding the way that the states guidelines are, they have to take the last 18 months of revenue, actual revenue collected, to determine our budget. We have had as you are aware, a situation with the Executive, where those taxes were not collected so, when you look at those trends, we end up having yesterday, to shave about \$275,000 off our budget. However, we know realistically, and I am sure that this community believes that Mr. Bays is going to pay his taxes and he is going to be in there a very strong way, at least I hope so because I quit my war making and it is going to be between, the projected revenue between 8 and 10 thousand a month. That is at 50% occupancy on the low end of that and I think they are expecting a lot better than that. We don't anticipate being in a problem situation, but in redoing this budget, we do have \$200,000 out of our reserve account. The other issue then that comes up was a request by the County Council to give \$500,000 to Mr. Bays this year. We had a couple of proposals and as this cash flows now, it is not feasible for us. We can get together again after this meeting or some other time but that is not in this budget, it was in your original budget under special grants. So, that item has been reduced from \$150,000 to \$25,000. So, that is where that actually fell.

President Bassemier: Okay.

Bev Oswald: On the first page, and most significantly in our change of direction, is to have direct sales as our primary marketing effort. We have added an extra sales person, we have also put in our proposed budget an increased salary for the Executive Director, as most of you know, our director had resigned in May. We have been in a search and we did studies and talked to our consultant, the average size bureau, of our size income, is \$70,00 to \$75,000 for the director level. The sales person is \$50,000. So, we are below the average on the sales person for us to even go out and do a search for any kind, we have to at least be able to offer competitive salaries. We do feel that the most critical thing this year is having the people to do the job and to go out and do direct sales. I think, as I said, there is a line item for each one. Another big change then, the monies in advertising have shifted considerably do to the fact that of our market strategy change. You will see a significant decrease there from \$280,000 to \$102,422.00, that is the biggest change and that is the change in our strategy in marketing. There is a lot for you to see today because it was changed around so I was not trying-

President Bassemier: That's fine.

Bev Oswald: I am just pointing out the primary major changes and the process we took yesterday, and thank you to, for our consultant, we took a significant more out of advertising. We took the monies for the Centre, we took yellow page ads, we just started cutting, so we had to cut \$200 something thousand yesterday, which was fairly substantial but we feel those revenues will be there and we would like to be able to come back and utilize them and help promote our city, if that in fact, does happen. The other major significant change is line item 3130, Travel and Promotion. We are proposing and we have cut this, we were really proposing a \$100,000 is what we would like to have, but based upon our budget cut, we could not do that, that is to do direct sales and that is to have two people full time doing that. One person, the Director, being involved in that

process too. We are just one person and only acting at half a year, we have already exceeded that, the budget that was set out this last year. One other comment that I want to make, based upon the fact of redoing this budget several times, we have really spent a lot of time and being, very, very specific like on trade shows, we are way ahead of where we have ever been as far as what specific venues we are going to, what trade shows, the actual cost on them because we have had to be very diligent in that. So, I think as a planning tool, we are better off than where we have been, we just are tight on the particular travel side of this promotion. Any questions that I can answer?

Councilmember Winnecke: Bev, I have a couple of questions regarding the personnel, you are adding, you are proposing adding a Sales Director. Do you have a Sales Exec, are there two people then who will be out selling the community?

Bev Oswald: Yes.

Councilmember Winnecke: And then, what is expected, are there goals expected of these individuals?

Bev Oswald: Yes.

Councilmember Winnecke: How is that determined?

Bev Oswald: We have a number of actual contacts that they have to make and it will be determined as their success on actual bookings. We do have a sheet set out as to what that should be. We have one sales person currently, but he is acting as our interim director and we plan on having another sales person plus the director be involved in that process as well. So, they have had specific goals of what we need and our goal as a Bureau, back in 1995, which was peak, we had over 50,000 delegates in our community for conventions and that is our first goal, to achieve that.

Councilmember Winnecke: What does the Board expect in terms of how often those people are out in the community traveling and selling the city?

Bev Oswald: We plan and that is why the budget was originally at \$100,000, for them to be out weekly. Because it is a face to face, it is strictly the way it is, we are targeting of course, Indianapolis, Chicago and doing blitz as we go into community with two or three or four people, involving the hotels with that, to go into the community and blitz it and we have only been able to do that like once this year.

Councilmember Winnecke: What is the Board finding in terms of the salary challenges or opportunities for the Executive Director. I mean \$70,000 is a large increase, what are you finding anecdotally out there.

Bev Oswald: We are actually on the low end with that. Over 50% of the bureaus pay more than we do, 25 % pay over \$80,000. Seventy is on the low end for a bureau our size, its between \$70,000 and \$75,000 plus benefits.

Councilmember Winnecke: Are those of comparable size communities?

Bev Oswald: Yes. For example, Bloomington, their bureau director makes \$72,000. It is a very specialized industry and there are not that many that have convention and bureau experience and hotel experience doesn't necessarily translate into bureau experience.

Councilmember Winnecke: So, the Board's goal is to have 50,000 delegates in the community next year?

Bev Oswald: No, the way the tourism and convention business works, large conventions book out two years. We, when the Centre was not totally complete, people would not

book and we have our share of change in our bureau. So, we have a goal for next year, just to get things leveled out and to try to increase, we still want to increase conventions for next year, but we are looking more towards 2003 and 2004 and we are partnering a lot more with the Centre which needed to happen as well as working on a weekly basis with the Centre and the Executive on planning sales trips and they are working together on that.

President Bassemier: Anybody else? Bev, I know that you have been interviewing candidates for this new director, when do you plan on appointing that position?

Bev Oswald: We have a meeting next week with the full board and also with the finalist and the candidates. Mr. Whitehouse is a finalist and we have two others.

President Bassemier: Are you saying that you are going to appoint that person next Wednesday?

Bev Oswald: We will be interviewing and I think that the Board would probably like to make a decision if we can come to a determination there, we would like to do that next week. We would also like, I know that we are void of one board member, if the Council could appoint someone, it would be helpful if they could do that prior to Wednesday, if you could do that.

President Bassemier: Of course, that has to be in a special meeting and that would have to be advertised for us to do that, so.

Bev Oswald: I kept anticipating that you were going to have an appointment. Actually, Mr. Guier said that he had resigned or sent a letter in April because he wanted, he didn't really want to be on the Board, I think, for the last couple of months, he had a lot of personal things. I just kept thinking that we are going to have a Board member, I didn't know what your time frame was.

President Bassemier: Well, we just got his resignation a couple of weeks ago.

Bev Oswald: Oh really. Okay, I thought that he said he had sent it in April.

President Bassemier: Is that correct, Sandie?

Sandie Deig: I received it just last week.

President Bassemier: Just last week, so we just found out about it officially, last week.

Bev Oswald: Okay. He had indicated to me that he had sent it in April and thought that he might have a new board member as early as May or June at the latest.

President Bassemier: Well, if he sent it, we didn't receive it.

Bev Oswald: So, I will just keep waiting to hear who is going to be on our Board. But, if it's possible to have a special meeting, it would be helpful for us to have another board member.

President Bassemier: Well, just for your information, I have talked to a couple of candidates so-

Bev Oswald: Well, good.

President Bassemier: Of course, the word has been put out. So, I will just ask maybe sometime in this meeting or after the meeting, some advice from some of our other council members, okay?

Bev Oswald: Okay, great.

Councilmember Raben: What do we need to call a special meeting? We need, what 48 hours?

President Bassemier: Yeah, 48 hours is what? They are going to do it next Wednesday, so.

Councilmember Raben: We could call a meeting for Tuesday.

Councilmember Winnecke: Tuesday morning.

Councilmember Raben: Tuesday morning.

Councilmember Winnecke: Or just prior to our budget hearing, Tuesday.

Councilmember Raben: There you go.

President Bassemier: Okay.

Councilmember Winnecke: That's 11:45.

President Bassemier: We could take about it later, if we wanted to.

Bev Oswald: We do have a quorum for our, for our executive session. But, it would certainly be great, if you could. I am sorry if that is an imposition if you have to do that.

President Bassemier: Okay, anybody else got any questions for Bev? I guess the next one is the Tourism Capital Improvement.

TOURISM CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT

President Bassemier: Yeah, it is just a couple, Transportation and Pagoda, I don't.

Bev Oswald: Okay.

Councilmember Winnecke: Mr. President, I know Bev and the board and Mr. Whitehouse has worked really hard in the last few months and I have taken some calls at the bank and they have worked really hard to get all of this straightened out and I think publicly they should be acknowledged for their dedication to this cause. The community owes them a debt of gratitude for that they have done in the last few months.

Bev Oswald: Thank you.

President Bassemier: Point well taken, and thank you Mr. Whitehouse, and the consultant there, thank you very much for your hard work in this, I appreciate it. Mr. Wortman.

Bev Oswald: Thank you.

Councilmember Wortman: I think that the board contributed a lot to Mrs. Oswald there and they took an aggressive approach here and got a lot of things straightened out, I think. It is a credit to the Bureau over there.

Bev Oswald: Thank you very much.

President Bassemier: Okay.

Bev Oswald: Tourism Capital Improvement.

President Bassemier: Yes, please. I was going to say that if you had anything that you want to add, there is only three things on there.

Bev Oswald: No, I think that is as submitted.

President Bassemier: Okay, just for the record.

Bev Oswald: Again, thank you for your time.

President Bassemier: Thank you very much. Okay, next is Voters Registration, that will be on page 72.

VOTERS REGISTRATION

President Bassemier: Hey, hi, Connie. For the record, please state your name, both of you.

Connie Carrier: Connie Carrier from Voters Registration.

Anthony Bushrod: Anthony Bushrod, Voters Registration.

President Bassemier: Give me a chance to go to 72, here. Do you have anything that you want to enlighten us on, before we ask you a few questions?

Anthony Bushrod: Uh, not really.

President Bassemier: Okay, Councilmembers have you got any questions for them?

Councilmember Sutton: It looks good. Not really any changes outside of the salary adjustments. Printing has gone up just a fraction it looks like. It doesn't look like it is much of a difference from last year.

Anthony Bushrod: The reason for that is the(inaudible)and also the cost of getting the new applications for the voters registration has been passed onto us, the state no longer pays for that.

Connie Carrier: And with redistricting we are going to notify the voter if their precinct has been changed.

Councilmember Sutton: That should be very soon.

President Bassemier: Anybody? Mr. Hoy have you got anything?

Councilmember Hoy: Not a thing.

President Bassemier: I saw you kind of look over here, I thought.

Councilmember Hoy: No, I was nodding at the new appointment there is a good friend of mine, I am glad to see him.

President Bassemier: Well, you got off easy, thank you very much.

Connie Carrier: Thank you.

Anthony Bushrod: Thank you.

AREA PLAN COMMISSION

President Bassemier: Area Plan Commission, 76. Good morning, Mrs. Cunningham,

please state your name for the record.

Barbara Cunningham: Barbara Cunningham from the Area Plan Commission.

President Bassemier: Thank you.

Barbara Cunningham: Mr. Sutton, did you? I thought that you were asking something? I think that I will go through and answer some of the questions hopefully that were asked at the joint meeting.

President Bassemier: Okay.

Barbara Cunningham: As I said before, we have two step increases under Personal Services, we have two step increases. The Chief Draftsman is a 25 year step increase and Zoning Enforcement Officer, which is 1220, is two year step increase. Mr. Sutton also had some questions about the salary of the Executive Director. So, I did a little, I ran up here, god, I am really out of shape.

President Bassemier: Well, no hurry take your time.

Councilmember Winnecke: We've got two and half hours.

Barbara Cunningham: Two and a half hours to do it, okay. I looked back to see and I think that there was a question about the salary and the salary was put in as the Job Study asked for it to be in. So, I look back to see what the salary of the Executive Director has been in the last five years and in 1997, it was \$48,424 and that included a 15 year step increase. Let's go up to 2000, it was \$53,000 and that was the year, 2001 was the year of the 20 year step increase and that is when the salary really jumped in that Executive, excuse me, Director's salary. So, I think that might give you some assistance as you go through it. As I said, in 1997 it was 48, 1998 it was 49, 51 in 99, 53 in 2000 and the big jump was to 59 in 2001, Okay? Now, back to the other things, I think I will just go through, if? First I want to say like I always do that we 85% county funded and 15% city funded. We have taken in and we are an income producing agency and we have taken it through August 8, \$157,829, that goes into the General Fund. Last year in the year 2000 we put in \$278,358.98 into the General Fund as an income producing agency. We are also, when you go into Legal Services last year, we repealed in other areas some monies that we had left over. But, particularly in Legal Services, we repealed \$15,000 from last year from Legal Services. I will just go through the ones that we are asking an increase and so, I will go all the way down to Travel expenses, we asking for \$2,000 to be put into Travel expenses, a little different from Visitors and Convention Bureau, we are asking that to be brought back up to the 82 line item amount. This takes all of the National Conventions, State Conventions and some other things that the Executive Director mostly and then some other staff members get to go to. We are requesting an additional \$245 in the Telephone account. In GIS, our request is \$5,500 and I know that Lloyd you had a couple of questions on that, so on the GIS thing, so I looked into it. We still have, from the monies you gave us not in this year's budget, but had been encumbered the time before, we still have \$13,000 left and there are some things that are needed in the office. One is a workstation that is going out, which is a \$9,000 workstation, so we will be utilizing some of that money. But, we also have on GIS, where are my notes, we have this year we got a lot of hardware, software and training is that we have spent out money on. Next year, we are doing maintenance subscriptions and we are paying for some upgrades and we find that the maintenance subscriptions are really a good deal because what we do when we purchase the equipment that we have the opportunity to have a maintenance subscription for the software at about half of the price that new software would cost. So, it is well worth it and that's what we are going to be doing. Our GIS software, our Info software, are ArcView software, auto cad software and we are also going to do some training with that money. Do you have any other questions? I don't have any other answers, I think. Then we go to Rent and we don't know what the rent is. So, we put last years rent in. I am sure that you will be getting the information from the County

Commissioners on what the rent. That was a new line item for us last year. Uh, Legal Services, we have \$35,000 in this year's account left, we are not asking for an increase. But, as you know, we never know how much we need in Legal Services. I will tell you that if we have money left in that we certainly will, will give it back to the County as we do. Copy Machine has no increase, Equipment no increase, Dues and Subscriptions no increase, Employee Education, no increase in this account. Now, we have not spent that yet, but I have plans, in fact, I was staffing scheduling next week and there is a good APA program that we can get over the telephone that will, I think be a great assistance to the staff. Interns, as of today, we have 50 cents left in this year's account. We have used it all, we've had two good interns. I think that is about all, unless you have some questions. Mr. Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: The last one, Mrs. Cunningham, Misc. Equipment, what is that actually?

Barbara Cunningham: That equipment, the \$15,000 for new equipment, this year we got \$5,000 that we used to purchase a new computer in office equipment. Next year, we are going to be asking for two replacement computers, a replacement fax, a needed hard drive equipment and Curt, I have lent the County, furniture and equipment for a long time and so some of that we will be taking with me and we will have to do some replacement of that.

Councilmember Wortman: Okay.

Barbara Cunningham: When my dad got rid of his office and when Jack got rid of one, I brought in quite a bit of stuff, some of that I will be taking and some of that I will be leaving with the County.

Councilmember Wortman: Thank you.

President Bassemier: Mr. Raben.

Councilmember Raben: Uh, I really have no questions, but Barbara it has been a real pleasure working with you.

Barbara Cunningham: Well, I was going to say that too. It has been a pleasure, this is probably my last budget hearing.

Councilmember Raben: I know that I have called you on several issues over the years and you have always been quite helpful and thank you.

Barbara Cunningham: Well, good, it has been a pleasure. You have always been very fair to the Area Plan Commission and I appreciate that.

President Bassemier: Thank you.

Councilmember Hoy: Mr. Raben said for me, you've also, and my experience, and I have dealt with your office as you know, apparently you have picked a staff that is helpful and courteous too.

Barbara Cunningham: A good staff.

Councilmember Hoy: They were, they work very well with the Food Bank on some issues we had, thank you.

Barbara Cunningham: They are good staff and they will continue to be.

President Bassemier: Mr. Sutton.

Councilmember Sutton: It goes without saying, Barbara knows that I am very fond of her

and the office and what they do. Barbara gave me my start in City County Government. I don't know if you guys know it, that's the only beef that I have with Barbara is that intern salary is only a \$100 higher than when I had the intern job some almost 20 years ago. That is my only beef.

Barbara Cunningham: This year we had two.

Councilmember Sutton: Yeah, they got two people out of it.

Barbara Cunningham: They are underpaid.

Councilmember Sutton: So it is only a \$100 higher than it was way back then.

Councilmember Hoy: So, we blame her for you, is that what you are saying?

Barbara Cunningham: That's right.

Councilmember Sutton: It's her fault.

Councilmember Raben: Barbara, I would like to withdraw that.

Barbara Cunningham: Well, thank you very much, it has been a pleasure.

Councilmember Sutton: I was going, I did have one question that I wanted to ask you. This, Area, is 85%?

Barbara Cunningham: County.

Councilmember Sutton: And 15% City.

President Bassemier: Yes.

Councilmember Sutton: I guess that I was going to ask, as we are looking at this whole area with Area Plan. I mean, if we spend, if we are responsible for 85% of this budget, I guess our involvement in terms of who the next Executive Director might be, I really think that we need, I know that the ordinance says something different and I think that there needs to be some, we need to revisit that ordinance has it at 50/50. I think the county, being that we are putting up the majority of the dollars to fund this department, needs to be the entity that determines who that will be. So, I know, that's a little bit, it doesn't necessarily fall within this budget, but I think that it does really reflect what is, I think, is a true and fair sense of where things need to be. So, I don't know what needs to be done on that Mr. Ahlers in terms of adjusting that ordinance but I really think action needs to be taken in readjusting that.

President Bassemier: Thank you, Barbara.

Councilmember Sutton: So, is there something that you can maybe get to us that reflects, if we could take a look at the old ordinance and obviously there would be some discussions with the City in terms of what we might need to adjust that.

Jeff Ahlers: Why don't a get a copy of the ordinance and we can meet and you can tell me what areas you would like to adjust, is that okay?

Councilmember Sutton: Well, I would like to adjust it to 85/15 rather than 50/50.

Jeff Ahlers: I think that what will occur, obviously, I will take a look at it, but obviously that will require working with City Council. Obviously, I don't know that we can unilaterally do it, but I will check the statute and see.

Councilmember Sutton: Okay.

President Bassemier: Thank you, Mr. Sutton. Okay, Surveyor's office.

Teri Lukeman: Ed, I need to change the tape.

President Bassemier: We are going to change the tape first.

(TAPE CHANGE)

SURVEYOR

President Bassemier: Okay, sir, please state your name.

Bill Jeffers: Bill Jeffers, Vanderburgh County Surveyor.

President Bassemier: Thank you, sir. We're on page 32. Mr. Jeffers, is there anything you want to...(inaudible)

Bill Jeffers: One page 33 we omitted in our original packet \$1,000 for Equipment Repair which is the same as the year 2000. We omitted \$100 for Dues and Subscriptions which is the same amount budgeted for year 2000. I'd like to make note of that.

Councilmember Raben: Mr. President, I might say this budget only constitutes a little over 5% increase, there's no fat in this budget. This is a good clean budget and we appreciate that.

Bill Jeffers: Are there any questions then regarding the budget request?

President Bassemier: Thank you, sir.

Bill Jeffers: Thank you for the opportunity to come and see you.

SURVEYOR CORNER PERPETUATION

President Bassemier: Mr. Jeffers, there might be some questions on the Perpetual Fund and the Map Fund. We'll go to page 179.

Councilmember Sutton: It's going to be a short day today.

President Bassemier: Any questions on that page?

Councilmember Raben: There again, Mr. President, these are pretty lean budgets. There's just not much to..

SURVEYOR MAPS

President Bassemier: Okay, let's go to the Map Fund on page 153.

Bill Jeffers: I believe we just added \$500 on that due to...we're using some upgraded equipment related to the GIS program and we have a new plotter. We anticipate another \$500 needed to complete the year 2002.

President Bassemier: Any questions?

Councilmember Winnecke: I do have a question, it has nothing to do with the budget though. How is the redistricting, redrawing the lines?

Bill Jeffers: The County Clerk, Ms. Abell, asked me yesterday if I could give her some idea

of how many total precincts we were shooting for, and I told her 150 and that is what we're shooting for to help reduce the cost to the taxpayer of operating polling places in some of the smaller precincts. However, we will have to be dividing some of the huge precincts where it is inconvenient for 1,200 voters to make it through one door in a 12 hour period. We still are shooting for the 150 precincts. I hope we make it. Legislative Services will be here tomorrow and Wednesday to help us, excuse me, next Tuesday and Wednesday. Then we will be submitting our reprecincting proposals to the County Commissioners for their review and approval. If they approve our new precinct lines, those will be submitted to the Indiana Election Commission for their approval. Then and only then can the County Commissioners pursue what you may be referring to as redistricting of councilmatic districts and Commissioner districts which are required to be redistricted to balance population about 43,000 persons per each of the four districts.

Councilmember Winnecke: That's the role, I don't know the answer, that's the role of your office though?

Bill Jeffers: The role of our office is to draw the precinct lines in accordance with Indiana State Election Commission guidelines and census data. I feel it is the role of the County Commissioners to determine the district lines, same as it would be the City Council's role to determine the ward lines next year.

Councilmember Winnecke: Thank you.

President Bassemier: Thank you, Bill.

HEALTH DEPARTMENT

President Bassemier: Next is the Health Department, page 143. Simply state your name.

Sam Elder: My name is Sam Elder, I'm the Executive Director of the County Health Department. I have the chairman of our board, Dr. Del Rio, with us today and Dr. Heidingsfelder, the Health Officer. Any questions you have of them feel free to ask.

Councilmember Hoy: Mr. President?

President Bassemier: Mr. Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes, I met with the Health Board this morning at their regular meeting and I have a handout for the Council which I'm going to pass out and when we get to that part concerning the move and the rent I would be happy to speak to that. This is a quick read.

President Bassemier: I know you've spent a lot of time with this, Mr. Hoy.

Councilmember Hoy: Yeah, we summarized things pretty well here. I wanted to have that noted and have Council have a look at it. I'll be glad to speak to it whenever it comes up.

President Bassemier: Okay, Mr. Elder do you have anything that you want to tell us, something that stands out that we should know about, then we'll ask you some questions about it?

Sam Elder: Well I know that you don't want to go through it item by item, I don't believe you do, you haven't in the past, but if you have any questions on any of them, if you would like for me to enumerate the things that were increased I can do that.

President Bassemier: Okay.

Sam Elder: I wanted to be sure that you understood that the moving expense is to be taken out of the budget, that's the \$839,670. That was included in there so you would

know it. Now that money is in the County Health Fund. It's an unappropriated balance and if you had any questions on that you should ask the Auditor. This money, a lot of it came from appropriations by the County Council for the move over the years because you know we've been involved in this since '93 and you've given us extra money several times to work on that. The County Health Fund does not revert, it stays with the Auditor. It's an unappropriated balance, we can't spend any of it without Council action. But that part is to be eliminated from the budget, but we felt it was necessary to be included so that you would understand just what it was.

President Bassemier: Okay, any questions? Mr. Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Sam, on line 1180-2130, Pediatric Nurse Practitioner, is that a new position for this year?

Sam Elder: No, that position has been in there. We've had some changes with the clinics with the funding from some of the grants. We anticipate that once we get moved with a central location for a clinic that in all probabilities we'll need that position. So it was left in even though it's not been filled.

Councilmember Tornatta: Okay, and then would that still go...I mean is there a base salary for that?

Sam Elder: Yes.

Councilmember Tornatta: Okay, because it looks like there's been a step up for that and there wasn't anybody in that position.

Sam Elder: That's 3%.

Councilmember Tornatta: 3%? So the base will increase even though no one is in that, the base will still increase? Or is that a base, or do we have a base number?

Sam Elder: That's the increase that we got from Mrs. Deig on what we should put in, that's a 3% raise on all the salary items.

Councilmember Tornatta: Okay, I didn't know what a base...okay, alright thanks.

President Bassemier: Anybody else? Jim? Mr. Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: We have some other folks here, Dr. Heidingsfelder is our Health Officer, I always forget your title, but he's our doctor and the President of the Board, Dr. Del Rio-Hoover is here. Did I get that right? So, if you have questions about the paperwork in front of you...this has to come to us first in this budget and then it has to go to the Commissioners for them to sign. But I requested that they, and I think it is a good idea for them, to prepare this for us. The only thing I would add to the one page where it says needs and uses is that I had to go down and get a death certificate this week. This building has a drive up window and that's going to be a wonderful addition. Before I had the purple sheet filled out on the death certificate, she'd taken the name and already gotten it out of the computer which means that for a lot of things we can move traffic a lot faster. We've put a lot of thought into this and I have worked with them every step of the way. So we are willing to answer questions. I had a question for our Auditor. Good morning.

Suzanne Crouch: Good morning.

Councilmember Hoy: You know how I am, but we do have money saved back for this?

Suzanne Crouch: That's correct. You can zero out that line and that will still leave them with a healthy operating balance.

Councilmember Hoy: Yeah, that \$839,000 could be zeroed because the money is there and it's carried over, so that would help us in meeting our 5% cap.

Sam Elder: As I understand it, after everything is -

Councilmember Hoy: Except for, never mind, it won't help with the 5% cap, Mr. Raben just corrected me.

Sam Elder: As I understand it after the budget is passed we will ask that money be transferred into the account. Is that correct?

Suzanne Crouch: It would come from an additional appropriation, right.

Councilmember Hoy: Thank you, my coach here, thank you Jim, is telling me it has an effect on the overall rate which it won't be the hit that you might expect. I'm hopeful that this body will look favorably on this and we're hopeful that the Commissioners will look favorably on it, too. It was a thoroughly studied move, and I really commend the board. I can't vote on that board, I'm just their liaison, but they did an excellent job.

President Bassemier: Thank you. Anybody else? Mr. Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Sam, I've got a few questions if you could. I'm looking at line item, I'm on page 146, line item 1990 under Extra Help. You've got a pretty significant boost there from the previous year. What are you seeing or projecting that might cause you to need the additional help?

Sam Elder: In the additional help what they include in that is the interns that we work on the mosquito control program in the summer. Now this summer we didn't have but one intern, we normally have three. Every week birds are collected, you know wild birds, and they're checked for Saint Louis encephalitis. If there's any activity in the birds, history has shown that it always shows up in the birds before it shows up in people because pipien mosquito carries Saint Louis encephalitis mainly in our area and they are feeders on birds. When the birds all leave the nest they switch over and then they bite people. That's the common household mosquito. If we'd have had any activity, any positive birds that are ever collected here then we would have accelerated our mosquito control program. We'll not need all of that money this year, but I don't know what we'll need next year.

Councilmember Sutton: I guess, if you look at how we've been over the years in terms of what we've expended we really haven't spent anymore than, you know, \$7,000.

Sam Elder: The increase is mainly though is a security officer for the buildings, see we won't have that there.

Councilmember Sutton: Okay.

Sam Elder: I think we had two part time security people figured in the budget, maybe we won't need them. I think Dr. Del Rio expressed a thought that she didn't think we'd need them either, but that's the increase.

Councilmember Sutton: I'm on line item 3200 now, on Utilities I know you're looking at, you've got this proposal I guess that's just been passed around to us that a couple of sites that you are focused on—

Sam Elder: It's been finalized now.

Councilmember Sutton: It's finalized so you are actually at the one location? Are Utilities, aren't they included in on the lease agreement?

Sam Elder: They are included on the lease, but he's capped it at \$85,000, and after

\$85,000, the Health Department would have to pay it, and the, that would have been adequate money for last year, but you know the utilities took a big jump, and we based that overrun on what SIGECO told us.

Councilmember Sutton: Okay.

Sam Elder: You know, that's the worst scenario today, but, my goodness, it might go up again. So, it might be worse than that.

Councilmember Hoy: This would have been true wherever we went.

Sam Elder: Wherever we are.

Councilmember Hoy: Yeah.

Councilmember Sutton: Then I've got a couple other, I guess, it's related to the facility there, I lost my place there, under the rent figure, does that need to be adjusted based upon what you know now? In relation to when you actually initially submitted this. Is that on...let's see—

Sam Elder: If you remember last year you appropriated \$250,000—

Councilmember Sutton: Uh-huh.

Sam Elder: —and that was approximately \$70,000 more than what it would have been in the Civic Center, because you felt that there was a possibility that we might move in this year. We don't feel that is no longer a possibility, but that's the increase in Rent over what the \$250,000.

Councilmember Sutton: Okay, on this what we've got in our budget is \$356,000 and on this other sheet is \$357,132. I guess, that's probably more reflective, the one, the \$357,000 is more reflective of where you need to be?

Sam Elder: The utilities, using the prediction that Vectren's charges will be doubling, this will cover the amount that exceeds the \$85,000 cap, the leaser will pay.

Councilmember Sutton: Okay. How much parking will you have at this new facility?

Councilmember Hoy: If you'll...if you want to go back to Utilities, excuse me, just a second and the Rent. If you'll look at that chart we gave you. The subtotal at the top is \$341,732, and then you have add ons of \$15,400, which give you your \$357,132, which is a little different than what is in the budget, but it's (inaudible). Then the parking, there is quite a bit of parking there. We feel that that will work well. The other parking is for at the City Garage for staff.

Sam Elder: That's what we figured on.

Councilmember Hoy: Yeah, that's what we figured that rent would be so that they do have a place to park and it's only a block away. Which is actually closer than the lower 40 is right now.

Councilmember Sutton: How much parking is there on site.

Sam Elder: 61.

Councilmember Hoy: 61 spaces.

Councilmember Sutton: Is that, are those spaces going to be used by staff or is that for clients? Or what's the—

Sam Elder: Primarily we were concerned with the clients. The staff will not have any parking spaces until we, you know, the clients are all served, there will always be enough for the clients. This is one of our main concerns for this building is we have a large WIC Clinic, you know, in the Health Department, and you see some of the mothers with two and three preschoolers carrying some and dragging the others coming up in bad weather from that back lot. A lot of them we have a problem with no shows in that clinic, and we don't get expense money on no shows. You know, we can sign 'em up for WIC, that's the Department of Agriculture Surplus Food Program we have approximately 3,500 children enrolled in that. If they don't come get their vouchers, then they don't count 'em in paying our overhead. In other words, we'd have a reduction.

Councilmember Sutton: Well, since we just did receive this, I am still kind of trying to digest everything through here. It's got quite a few things on here, so just trying to ask as many questions as kind of come to mind here initially. The other staff parking where you've got, it comes up to like 12, what is that?

Sam Elder: Actually, we had figured the city charges \$50 per space per month for using that parking garage, and on the roof it's just \$45. But, it's \$50 a month for space, and in that area there is not hardly any parking.

Councilmember Sutton: So, are—

Sam Elder: We may not need, you know, off street parking.

Councilmember Sutton: So, is this request saying, basically, that we will pay for the employees parking costs?

Sam Elder: Well, we furnish it here, Mr. Sutton. You know, it's in the back lot, and we would like to see that...we're presenting it to you. You know, it's your call whether it's allowed or not.

Councilmember Sutton: Okay.

Sam Elder: We feel that it's important that they do have a place to park.

Councilmember Tornatta: They don't do that in other cities, though, I mean, that's, I don't believe that's going to go. I mean, they don't worry about that in New York, they don't worry about that in Indianapolis, just because, I guess, they could find a place to park, they gotta walk a little bit, but that's not, that's not an issue that I want to take up on. Paying for parking.

Councilmember Hoy: Well, if you, if you park downtown on the street, your tires get marked and you have to move every two hours, so we, the reason we put this in is we didn't want these all day employees having to go out every two hours and move their car. They do have free parking in the lower 40, which we have afforded, and we felt that this would be helpful to them. The other thing that we may be able to strike with the city since they own the garage and they are putting in 15% of the budget, they might, they might even cut us some spaces, because I'm not sure that lot is even full, you know, during the day.

Councilmember Tornatta: I mean, if they'd cut the spaces, then that would be, I think, that would be an option, but if they wouldn't, I think, that at some point you are going to have somebody come back and say well, why wouldn't you pay for our parking? Why can't you pay for our parking? I think that is getting into a big mess.

Councilmember Hoy: Well, we do pay for it. In this lot out here we pay for that, we pay for maintenance, we pay for everything for that. I have a spot out here that the county pays for, and so do all of us do, even though I use it part time, it's my spot. It's assigned to me and the county, in essence, pays for that. I really don't see any difference here. These

are county employees who are going to be there all day. It's just a matter of handling a difficulty that we encounter with this whole move. We didn't want to give them a reduction in...it would be a reduction in their wage if they had to cover that.

Councilmember Sutton: What's the total number of staff members that you have, Sam? How many do you have?

Sam Elder: At the present time we have 68. We should be counting the outlying.

Unidentified: (Inaudible. Not at mike.)

Sam Elder: The...see we've got clinics in other places besides here in the 85, but, I think, it's safe to say that here in the building that we have 60 in the high 60's.

Councilmember Sutton: The intent is to bring everyone under one roof.

Sam Elder: Eventually this was the master plan. You know, the state and the feds used to want you to scatter everything, and now they feel that it should be centralized. I think, that the back parking lot here is an excellent fringe benefit to all the employees. You know, like Phil had said is you pay for it now. I don't have any idea what it figures out because I don't know what, you know, the cost of it is. We do furnish parking that is not much further away than the city parking lot is.

Councilmember Hoy: Well, this also may be something we, you know, this has not been signed off on by the Commissioners, which we hope it will be soon, and that would give us the green light to perhaps negotiate with the city, but I did, I believe, I'm quoting you correctly, Mr. Winnecke, this is the cost of doing business. This particular cost we've got, if you'll look down the Salary Accounts we've got some very skilled people who are not exactly getting rich in these positions. We want to keep them. We want to keep those employees, so it seems to me a fair thing to do. In the whole scope of things, I haven't done the math on it, but if you, you know, take the \$12,000 and do the math, it's a small percentage of what we are really asking for here. Dr. Pulcini who chaired the committee, do you want to speak to that? Yes, please do.

President Bassemier: Please come to the mike, please.

Maria Del Rio: My name is Maria Del Rio Hoover. I'm currently the chairperson of the Vanderburgh County Board of Health. I'm a local physician here in Vanderburgh County also. I was a member of the search committee for the new building site along with Dr. Pulcini, who is a past chairman of the local Board of Health, and Mr. Bob Stayman who is an attorney and a member of our Health Department. So, we had two physicians and an attorney, Mr. Hoy and Sam and Dr. Heidingsfelder as part of this search committee. We spent a whole year looking at this, and I know the issue of the parking because we addressed it and talked about it at length. We looked at other buildings that had 80 parking spaces available that were there, we didn't have to go out and search for more. Those other buildings were more expensive in many other ways. So, we had to compare one thing with another in trying to be fiscally responsible to you and look at the needs that you all led me to see. You were looking for last year when I came before all of you. For example, Mr. Sutton, we looked and asked for a possibility of buying the building in the future because it made sense that you asked us last year, well, why are we renting and paying so much if we could possibly buy it? All of this...this building there is an option to buy in the future, if that is the wish of the County. So, we looked at a lot of options when we looked at the buildings. It is true that we designated a few parking spaces for the employees of the Health Department that are there all day, and that is mainly to give more parking spaces to our customers and our clients, and the people that use the Health Department, that we feel we are serving and we need to serve. This is taking them away from that parking space. They get there earlier than our clients. They would use up our easy parking spaces, and then our clients wouldn't have one. It is an added cost, but when you look at the number our cost per square foot of the entire building is a lot...it's

about \$9 versus \$16 and some cents that we are paying right now. One of the issues that we looked at is that we have a whole third floor and an extra 10,000 square feet of offices that will be available to the county should you need some extra space in all the moving that you are looking at in the future. That is part of the building and that is available for your use. We tried to make it flexible so that it would be cost effective, but at the same time, we looked at where we were going to. We wanted it to be centrally located. We heard from our community that they wanted us centrally located, easily accessible site, and at the same time we wanted something that wouldn't be outrageously expensive to you and that could serve the purpose that we want to do. It allows us to grow, but it also allows the county to have extra space. It is our building, it is your building, and there is 10,000 square feet of offices there that will be available. We already have it in the budget for the Utilities and everything else. So, it would be easy to move people into that office without any added cost to anybody in the county. So, based on all that we looked at and saw, and the fact that we felt we didn't need security because of the physician, it is a bank building there is a great deal of security. We are not there at night, so that is a cost that we think we might be able to defray, and the cost per square foot, we felt that we would like to bargain with the parking issue in view of all the other things that we were gaining with the building. So, we were well aware of the parking issue, but at the same time there was so much more to gain with this building and so much more to offer you and the community, that we felt it was the best way to go. Does that answer the question a little bit better?

Councilmember Hoy: In addition to that we did sit down with the County Assessor and that's...it is ...there will be no taxes on this because it's going to be leased by the county. Should we lease third floor space to other than non-profits, or to anyone, then taxes would be paid on that, but the rent income in that excess space would far exceed that and the county could realize if we rented the whole third floor \$30,000 a year income. We're not, you know, ready to move into that immediately, but that is a possibility. It's a very, very...if you'll look at, the other thing I'd call your attention to—

Councilmember Raben: While you're on the, can I interrupt a second?

Councilmember Hoy: Sure, go ahead.

Councilmember Raben: Back to the parking issue. That's probably what really makes it wise to have additional spots locked up—

Maria Del Rio: Right.

Councilmember Raben: —because should we ever decide to lease out the other 10,000 square feet, you know, that gives you back up parking there as well. So—

Maria Del Rio: Right. You can use it as a source of income, or you can use it for other county employees that you may need a temporary space for without having the added cost of renting from someone else. It's there and it's available.

Councilmember Hoy: We did look at, you know, you're not looking at that because we eliminated, we looked at new construction and it was considerably more, because the Health Department has some special requirements for the x-ray room and some other things that add to building costs that are not, you would not find in a normal office building. Labs and things like that, but if you will look at that...the department need uses and site considerations, those all, those all figured into the decision of this committee.

Councilmember Sutton: Phil, since this is not a Health Department building, obviously, right now, there would be some modifications required to the actual building.

Councilmember Hoy: They are included.

Councilmember Sutton: Is that reflected in the add ons? Is that what that figure is?

Councilmember Hoy: No, it's...those are—

Councilmember Sutton: Where do we find that figure to get the...actually modify it to the use that we—

Maria Del Rio: At the bottom—

Councilmember Sutton: —would need it for.

Maria Del Rio: —of the second sheet. We have asked the architect, David Wills, has been the architect that has been doing all this research with us for the past several years. We asked him to give us an estimate of everything that it could possibly cost us to renovate. He is the one that was part of the study initially to look at what our needs would be. So, he knows more than anyone what specific needs we have. We also asked him that we didn't want it to look like a bank that is turned into a Health Department. I live in a room in a hospital that's a hospital room that's turned into an office, and it's not the best working condition in the world. So, we wanted our employees and our clients to feel like it is a Health Department, so it's not just a pretty fix up job. This is the total he gave us for the entire renovation, because the building already has several things that we wouldn't have to redo. Plus, his cost, that includes his fees and everything else. It does not include moving fees, but it does include his costs. The owner is going to, or the seller is going to give us an allowance of \$450,000, so the total cost to Vanderburgh County for remodeling would be \$598,215 versus a little over \$1.5 million in the other building. I didn't think you wanted to take out that kind of money right now. Just for remodeling. We would literally be rebuilding a building that belonged to somebody else.

Councilmember Sutton: Now, where is that reflected in our—

Maria Del Rio: At the very bottom, Allowance for Renovation—

Councilmember Sutton: —what, now just a second—

Maria Del Rio: —Construction.

Councilmember Sutton: —yeah, I see it on here. What, where are we in what you've got here before us that we are going to cost out.

Maria Del Rio: That is the...that is the money that we have in a separate fund that Ms. Crouch was alluding to. That was our saving money from moving and renovation that we have about \$800,000 or \$900,000 for. That you took...we put it in the budget as an added line item, but it has to be taken out because we have that money available separately. So, it will be taken out of a line item in the budget.

Councilmember Tornatta: 839?

Councilmember Sutton: Okay, 4112?

Maria Del Rio: Right. Right. That was taken out because we have that money in a separate fund already, so.

Councilmember Hoy: You can zero that.

Maria Del Rio: Right. Correct. It's not a line item in the budget.

President Bassemier: Mr. Wortman.

Councilmember Wortman: Okay. In reference to the Utilities, is the building energy efficient in any way? I am referencing to the heating, the electrical.

Maria Del Rio: No, it is..it has whatever it has from whatever years...we looked at the utility cost for the past few years, and it averaged about what \$70,000 give or take? So, he gave us a stipend of he will pay up to \$85,000. So, it's a little more than what they paid now, but what Sam is alluding to is that we, our energy bills may go up because of the cost of energy and so he's put in the budget more in case the costs go up.

Councilmember Wortman: I was going to say, if you could check with the utility company, which is the local power company here, Vectren, that they might, you know, if you change the lighting or something you might be on an energy efficient plan, see, heating, too.

Maria Del Rio: One of the things that we are looking at, depending on how much money we have is to work with the owner in seeing if we could get something more energy efficient and get those utilities down. It behooves him and us, because it would be lower for him.

Councilmember Wortman: Then next thing, like these employees now, if you got 60 or 80, what percentage is out in the field during the day would you say? A lot of them are not in the office, I'm sure.

Sam Elder: There's a full third that are (Inaudible. Not at mike.)

President Bassemier: Sam—

Councilmember Wortman: Then when the office is empty, they will turn out the lights and all that until they come back.

Maria Del Rio: Yeah. Oh, yeah. We are going to be pretty good about that. Hopefully, if the rates go up, there is nothing we can do about it, but we will try to be energy efficient as far as turning off the lights and lowering the air conditioning when we need to.

Councilmember Hoy: We call it the Darmstadt plan.

Councilmember Wortman: Thank you.

President Bassemier: We need to change the tape.

(TAPE CHANGE)

President Bassemier: I think Mr. Winnecke's got a couple of questions.

Councilmember Winnecke: Either Sam or Dr. Hoover. What's, what kind of—

President Bassemier: Come, come to the mike. Who do you want, Lloyd?

Councilmember Winnecke: Whomever.

President Bassemier: Okay.

Councilmember Winnecke: What kind of time frame are you looking at once this gets approved? Assuming it's approved all down the line.

Maria Del Rio: Well—

Councilmember Winnecke: What's your best guess for timing?

Maria Del Rio: We're thinking positively today, and after our board meeting we designated the current committee which includes an attorney to start working on a contract and start working on, with Mr. Mazzier on a contract that we could present to the County Commissioners. So, that if you approve the budget, we hope to go before the County

Commissioners after, I think on the 20th when they meet, answer any questions they have and by then maybe have a tentative contract that's agreeable to everybody for them to look and then add or subtract to it as they see fit. As soon as the contract is signed, the architect says that it will take six to nine months to remodel the building. It just depends on how much we can sit there and bang on everybody to get them to do it quickly.

Councilmember Tornatta: Alright. Mr. President. I was just going to say, obviously, in here you had nothing in there about the possibility of a swap out for parking spaces for the upper floor, so I apologize on sounding a little smug on the parking spaces, however, I foresee problems with that if we don't have any reason why we made a decision on that. Knowing this, that makes a little bit more sense to me how we could trade some spots.

Maria Del Rio: I appreciate that. That's why I wanted to step up and tell you. Since I was part of the committee we thought the same way you did—

Councilmember Tornatta: Uh-huh.

Maria Del Rio: —and everything that you said was discussed at the committee meeting. So, we made up a knowledgeable decision to go this way for the reasons I explained.

Councilmember Tornatta: Okay.

Maria Del Rio: So, I just wanted to make that clear to you also.

President Bassemier: Thank you, ma'am. Next, the Evansville Vanderburgh Airport.

AIRPORT AUTHORITY

President Bassemier: Page 149. Before Mr. Working gets, gets up here, I would kind of like to recognize two board members, hard working board members. The President of the Airport Board, Mr. Ossenberg, and Mr. Farmer there. I've worked with 'em and they are very, very dedicated people, and thank you for your hard work. Mr. Working would you please identify yourself for the record.

Bob Working: Sure, good morning, Bob Working, Airport Manager, Evansville Regional. It is certainly my pleasure to be here today to present and view with you the 2002 Airport Operating Budget. As you mentioned I do have Mr. Ossenberg and Mr. Farmer with me, also Gene Olsen my Assistant Airport Manager and Tess Long our Administrative Assistant. The Airport has amended the 2002 Operating Budget from what you currently have before you. That change the board made to reflect a new position within our Airport Safety Department. This position is still being developed at this time, but believe the title will be considered Director of Training. Mr. Farmer is here as Chair of Personnel and would be happy to address the issue also. Also, I guess, as a forewarning to you, I'll probably be coming to you immediately after the budget process for an additional appropriation for this year's budget because of one person in our Safety Department that has become disabled and we need to replace that position before he is able to completely retire. If you'll indulge me, I will try to read off these line item changes for you. Again, this is page 149, is that correct? Under Salaries and Wages, Account 1100-2140, that new figure should be \$1,861,118. Under Account 1900, FICA, the adjustment would be \$156,807. The next line 1910, PERF, the new figure \$147,177, which amends Personal Services total then to \$2,358,742.

Councilmember Sutton: Mr. Working, do you have a breakout detail on 1100-2140, and 1200-2140?

Bob Working: That should have been provided you—

Councilmember Sutton: Okay.

Bob Working: –in your..you should have a copy of Ordinance number 170–

Councilmember Sutton: Okay, it should be back here? That's okay. Okay, I'm with it. Okay.

Bob Working: Account 2300, Uniforms, amended figure \$21,800. That then revised Budget Class 52, Supplies, to \$299,800. Account 3000, Bond and Insurance, amended to \$606,000. Account 3310, Training, revised figure \$12,000.

Councilmember Raben: Excuse me, Bob, what was the figure before Training?

Bob Working: Before Training? \$606,000.

Councilmember Tornatta: And what was Training?

Bob Working: Training \$12,000.

Councilmember Raben: And \$606,000 on Insurance? Alright, thank you.

Councilmember Sutton: The \$606,000 that was for, what?

President Bassemier: Bond and Insurance.

Bob Working: Yeah, Health Insurance for full time positions.

Councilmember Sutton: Oh, okay. I see it now.

Bob Working: This would take your total Budget Class 53, Other Services and Supplies, to a revised total of \$1,616,500. Then under Account 4250, Miscellaneous Equipment, we are revising that figure to \$117,000. Then that sub-total under that Budget Class 54, Capital Outlay, would be \$117,000. Bringing the total revised Airport Budget amount to \$4,392,042. Again, in essence, all those changes are really reflective of the one position. We are adding that position...at first it was requested by our union back earlier in the budget, and we really didn't care to take those steps, but in retrospect in looking back at it we realize that we have three shifts out at the Airport in our Safety Department. Captains are responsible for training the people within the shifts. In the past we've had some situations and instances come up for training on each of the particular shifts, may not be at the same level, but with the same emphasis in various areas. We've also had incidents where the FAA comes in and performs an audit of training and that Captain may be off that day. His training records are locked up or whatever. We had difficulty getting to this, by bringing in a person for this position, we see it as an administrative position where they would be operating with all three shifts, and seeing that training is put on a uniform standard. It would also be that person's responsibility to make sure that the training records are kept in a uniform manner. We feel that we would just have a better operation in total. Some times I will ask a training officer if he has accomplished a task or done something, and he may respond that he really wasn't aware of that because his particular Captain may not have informed him of that. By having one training officer conducting training for all members within the department, we feel that we'll have a better uniformly trained department. Also, when we do have changes, we'll have one person we can make those changes to and it's there responsibility to make sure that that goes to all parties too. So, in view of that the board recommended that we go ahead and amend the budget and include the position. Oh, I guess, I would also bring up too, in general terms, that each year the Airport is self sufficient and that we are generating revenues and do not require county funds to operate. Each year we do present the budget to the board and is also presented to the airlines. That was done this past month, and I have received approval from the airlines in our budget and they are looking at increases of about 15% in rental rate and landing fees. I think that's right, but they have underwritten our budget before these amendments were made. I've notified them of the change of this amendment, and I do not anticipate any objections from them in seeing the revisions.

Councilmember Hoy: Since the famous strike has been settled—

Bob Working: Oh, I'm glad you mentioned that.

Councilmember Hoy: —how many flights a day are we seeing now?

Bob Working: I am pleased to report that Evansville was slow in getting our jets back, Comair back, in the service to the community. They settled the strike July 2nd, we did not get our first flight back until July 17th, but I am pleased to report that as of today all six flights to Cincinnati with Comair have been returned. I would say that while we were a little slow getting that first, that first flight back in the air, we are ahead of many communities that Comair serves. There are some communities that will not see a return to their full service until the end of the year. It's also my understanding that there are some communities that will never see a return to service to the level that they had prior to the strike. So, I felt very pleased that the Airport has been able to recoup that. Also, I guess, as we talked, the service I was very pleased in June of this year Northwest Airlink upgraded two of their flights to Detroit with Canada Air regional jet service. Northwest Airlink I would just to give mention, while we at the Airport have seen the downturn in the economy, and it has affected us and our travel this year is down about 7 1/2% year-to-date over last year. Northwest Airlink's service is up 88%, I believe that is correct. They have done a tremendous job of growing within the community. Then I would also say that I am pleased to report that American Eagle has announced that they are going to add an additional flight to Chicago effective September 15th, so we will have six jet flights to Chicago, six jet flights to Cincinnati, and two to Detroit. For a total of 14 flights a day of about 35 daily departures.

Councilmember Sutton: Councilman, was your question how many flights per day we are doing?

Bob Working: I would say about 35 flights a day.

Councilmember Raben: Do we have jet service back to Atlanta now?

Bob Working: No, we don't. That's an unfortunate situation. One of the things we find our community having to deal with is that the regional jet is such a desirable aircraft that, and Delta has acquired both Comair and ASA. They now own those airlines in total, and I know that last year when Delta completed the purchase of both those airlines the first thing they said was we don't need two workforces in Evansville. Then ASA's personnel were laid off, or transferred. ASA took over total operation in Wichita, and Comair took over total operation in Evansville. Delta we have seen is utilizing the regional jets to replace older DC-9 type equipment in markets where Delta has historically been. I know several, I think, at least two of our flights that we had to Atlanta in jet have been, were moved to Ft. Wayne where they had DC-9 service with Delta, and Delta has pulled out of Ft. Wayne in totality. They are just served by regionals now.

President Bassemier: Mr. Tornatta.

Councilmember Tornatta: Bob—

Bob Working: Regionals, I'm sorry.

Councilmember Tornatta: Once again, Suzanne, or Bob I don't know who gives this. If we can have some revenues on, if that is available for us, just to look at, to have an understanding of how the budget works.

Bob Working: Be more than happy to. I can, again, I guess, I would just say that the Airport is self sustaining—

Councilmember Tornatta: Right.

Bob Working: –and we operate under the concept of the single cash drawer in that we take all the revenues from every source other than the airlines and then develop the budget and then the difference between those two are agreed to and paid by the airlines. Not only covers our budget 100%, but they also provide us a 25% or 90 day balance of excess funds. So, the point, I guess, that I'm trying to make is with a budget of \$4,300,000 the Airport is generating roughly \$4,300,000 and then we have about \$1 million in our General Fund–

Councilmember Tornatta: Okay.

Bob Working: –as an operating balance.

Councilmember Tornatta: I guess I'm just trying to see how things work–

Bob Working: Sure.

Councilmember Tornatta: –'cause you see expenses but you don't ever see, especially on a self sufficient offices how they are able to generate and how they are generating their income.

Bob Working: I can tell you in very generic terms, we get \$1 million from the car rentals, \$1 million from the airlines, \$1 million from the parking lot, \$1 million from everyone else. I mean, from rent form tenants, cash lease on the farm . We've developed a farm trade zone this year. I've seen that completed. We've selected an operator and we are working very diligently now to get business into there. Without giving you the details, I'm saying in general terms that's about what we're looking at.

Councilmember Tornatta: Okay.

Councilmember Sutton: Does the FFA, does the FAA provide any subsidy or assistance to us?

Bob Working: Well, I guess, what I would say is that when you fly out of Evansville, you pay an 8% ticket tax for whatever the cost of that ticket is. That goes into the Federal government into what's called an Aviation Trust Fund. The Airport receives monies back through the Trust Fund for capital improvements. Just in the last year, this last budget year, Congress made great strides in increasing that. The Airport would normally receive about \$1 million a year in what we call enplanement monies or a rebate of a portion of that 8% ticket tax that's based on our passenger levels. This year that figure doubled, so we are looking at about \$2 million, well, in excess of \$2 million. That money is used for capital improvements. I would say that we'll be commencing, hopefully, between now and the end of September with about a \$2 million grading and drainage project that will be the initiation of the extension of the north-south runway, which was our last element in our now current master plan. The nice thing that, I guess, I would say is that entire development, it appears, at this point in time will be funded through the FAA and it will not require any borrowing on the Airport's part or any additional revenues from the airlines. Many airports institute a, what they call a passenger facility charge, and they can charge up to \$3 per passenger. Which can be used for capital improvements and so forth. We have not done that in the past to try and keep our rates and charges as competitive as, as competitively low as we can in comparison with larger airports, Louisville, Nashville, Indianapolis and so forth. So, that's...we are looking at being able to complete that project without requiring any property tax funds and doing it with revenues that will come from the Federal government.

President Bassemier: Mr. Working, you gave me an excellent handout sheet on the revenues. Where it's all coming from. I've got a copy of it. I'll give Troy...I mean, it's coming in from everywhere, gasoline tax, ticket tax, it comes...so, I'll get that to him, Mr. Working, it's an excellent...tells the whole operation, where it's all coming from. It's an excellent handout sheet. Anybody else got any questions for Mr. Working?

Councilmember Wortman: Mr. Working, how's the freight zone out there doing? Is that—

Bob Working: Freight?

Councilmember Wortman: Yeah.

Bob Working: Well, that's what we're talking about, or I was talking about in our foreign trade zone. One of the down sides I would say in commercial aviation in communities our size, we've seen a great really benefit since airline deregulation and that we have more flights now than we ever had. We have more competition with major airlines than we ever had, but the problem is, is that the size aircraft is much smaller. Consequently, there is not a need or desire by those carriers to haul air freight. So, most our freight that we do have is coming in under a charter type basis. Tri State Aero is handling that. The foreign trade zone, we are hoping, will become the hinge pin for the development of their cargo. Which would be separate from what is historically coming in the belly of the aircraft that are carrying passengers. So, over the last 25 years we've seen our air cargo continue to diminish, but we are hopeful that, well, first of all, I think, the demand may have not diminished as much, but we don't get it reported because it's ending up over at Tri State and we're not getting records on that. I'm hopeful that we'll see a turn around on that.

Councilmember Wortman: How about, is there any competition from the up in Lawrenceville, Illinois that Georgetown Field. Remember, they got into that at one time.

Bob Working: Lawrenceville has a foreign trade zone and they have an old base there that has a tremendous, it's a tremendous asset for that community. Unfortunately, I don't think they have ever been able to capitalize on it. I think, the field is basically empty and they are not drawing it in. Toyota, you know, has been a big help to our community. AK Steel has also. So, we see the possibilities and the potential for air cargo increasing. We certainly see it coming in over the road, but we would like to see some of it coming in by air. We are going to be working very hard with that. We've got a company down in Memphis, we've entered into a business arrangement with Centrepôt that's going to operate our foreign trade zone. Certainly, we are trying to focus more on meeting those demands.

Councilmember Wortman: You don't have no major expenditures outside of the extension of the runway? Like your runways presently are okay? Everything else out there?

Bob Working: Well, our capital improvement program, we have, you know, it continues to go along, but it is self sufficient in that we have a healthy balance in our Cumulative Building Fund for capital projects, and, again, over the next five years looking at sources of revenues and uses or expenditures, we feel that we'll be able to maintain the balance that we have now and still be able to extend the runway, buy some snow removal equipment, get the pavement upgraded. So, things are looking very well from that end.

Councilmember Wortman: Thank you. Thank you. Thank you.

President Bassemier: Thank you, Mr. Working.

Bob Working: Thank you.

President Bassemier: Okay, you want to—

(TAPE CHANGE)

ARMSTRONG TOWNSHIP ASSESSOR & REASSESSMENT

President Bassemier: First one is Armstrong Township Assessor.

Councilmember Raben: Mr. President, I did speak with Joyce and Randy Kron. They had

funeral they had to attend this morning, so they won't be present. But I can tell you there's not a whole lot in their budget and I might go ahead and mention now it's going to my recommendation that throughout the entire Assessors' budgets that we remove the Extra Help requests, any Training, Travel/Mileage, Computers, Software or Hardware, and we'll reinsert those figures back in the Reassessment budgets this fall. So that will be my intention or my recommendation with all their budgets that we just do the same throughout.

President Bassemier: Anybody got any questions of Jim on that?

CENTER TOWNSHIP ASSESSOR & REASSESSMENT

President Bassemier: Okay, we'll go to Center Township Assessor.

Rebecca Galey: Rebecca Galey, Center Township Assessor Chief Deputy.

President Bassemier: Have you got anything you want to tell us?

Rebecca Galey: Nothing's changed.

President Bassemier: Nothing's changed. Any questions? Okay, I guess that's it.

Rebecca Galey: Thank you.

GERMAN TOWNSHIP ASSESSOR & REASSESSMENT

President Bassemier: German Township Assessor, 57.

Tim Schaefer: Tim Schaefer, German Township Assessor.

President Bassemier: Tim, anything you'd like to tell us? Anything we should be aware of?

Tim Schaefer: No, I don't think there's any here.

Councilmember Tornatta: Tim, the Chief Deputy, is that some type of step or I don't...

Tim Schaefer: She had the raise up...we went through the Job Study and she got raised to the same salary or the same step as the rest of the Chief Deputies and so it looks like it's a step, but it's not. It's already been taken care of.

Councilmember Tornatta: So Job Study, and the same thing for the Real Estate Deputy?

Tim Schaefer: Correct.

Councilmember Tornatta: Okay.

President Bassemier: Jim, do you want to comment on any...

Councilmember Raben: Mr. President...

Tim Deisher: There is a step increase on the Chief Deputy.

President Bassemier: Okay, thank you sir. Anymore questions?

KNIGHT TOWNSHIP ASSESSOR & REASSESSMENT

President Bassemier: Okay, Knight Township. Thank you, sir. Page 59.

Al Folz: Al Folz, Knight Township Assessor.

President Bassemier: Thank you, sir.

Al Folz: Let's see, on the regular budget the only big change we have here is in Extra Help, \$20,000. That's exactly what you've given me so far this year. Let's see...that's the —

President Bassemier: That's the meat of it.

Al Folz: That's the lead item, the rest of it is basically the same.

President Bassemier: Okay, any questions? Thank you, Mr. Folz.

Al Folz: Are you going to go through the Reassessment budget or — I couldn't hear what you said a while ago, Jim, about...

Councilmember Raben: Okay, well, the point I was making that it's not only going to be my recommendation, but I think probably most of this Council would support the idea of moving any Extra Help requests, Travel/Mileage, Training, Computer Software/Hardware, out of our General Fund budgets and inserting those in Reassessment.

Al Folz: Okay. So it's not necessary to go through the Reassessment budget then?

Councilmember Raben: We can, Mr. President, but again, we've done this in the past. We don't have to set in a Reassessment budgets during our budget session. We can come back, you know, I would recommend we come back in October or November and put those budgets in place. During the break I did tell a few of the Assessors that I do understand that for the remainder of this year that they are going to need some Reassessment monies and we'll come back in September and insert monies for the remainder of this year and then follow up in late fall with our Reassessment budgets for 2002.

Al Folz: Okay. Thank you, Councilman.

PERRY TOWNSHIP ASSESSOR & REASSESSMENT

President Bassemier: Perry Township Assessor.

Glen Koob: Good morning. Glen Koob, Perry Township Assessor.

President Bassemier: Page 62, everyone. Anything you want to point out?

Glen Koob: Yes. Did everyone get the rationale sheet that Sandie sent out? That pretty much says it all about my position. The only thing I don't have on there, in 1994 when I was switched from Chief Deputy to Assessor, I did get what the other Assessors were making. It went from a part-time office to a full-time office. I did get that. That's the last major increase I've received. The other thing is, is that in 1995 when you switched that, I was making \$5,600 and something more than my Chief Deputy and with this years' salary, I'll be making \$917 more than she is. So she is receiving and that's the case in other offices with Chief Deputies also. Anyway, that's the reason why that my salary is like that. Also, my Chief Deputy does get a step raise. I'll be here 25 years October the 4th of 2001. She will be here 20 years. She was here 20 years in July, actually, but it goes in effect next year. Other than that, oh, the other thing I've done in here is I've put that, remember the \$500 we went through because they were Level II's? I put that in this budget line item. So if it looks like it's \$500 over, it is. That's what I did, put that \$500 included it. Because, you know, we didn't have that meeting yet and I didn't know what you were going to do with it, so I just put the \$500 that they would receive for Level II in with their salary.

Councilmember Winnecke: Which ones would that affect?

Glen Koob: That would affect, do you want the numbers or the – okay, it would affect 1120-1140, 1130 and 1140. It would affect the Chief Deputy, the Real Estate Deputy and the First Deputy.

Councilmember Winnecke: Okay.

Glen Koob: And let's see what else. Are there any questions on that so far?

President Bassemier: Any questions?

Glen Koob: No? Okay, the other thing is the Travel/Mileage. We've increase that by I think it's \$300 for verifying sales disclosure forms. The other thing, I don't know if you want me to put this in or if you just want me to talk about the Reassessment or whatever, but the other thing we have to do, we were talking about the law changes and the way we're doing the different assessing system. Well now, we have to go out and re-grade everything because of the fact that on residential, the grade and condition, the grade has changed because the grading system has changed. They've dropped some of the grades so we have to consolidate some of the grades we have. The condition now has to be instead of according to the condition of the house that were assessing, it has to be according to the condition of the house that's in that neighborhood, which is just the way it's got to be. Okay, and in commercial, it's going to be the condition of the commercial building to like structures of similar age and utility. It's not going to be how the building sits, the condition it sits in as it sits there. So that's what we're going to have to change. Those are just two things we're going to have to go back on and check is the grade and condition of these buildings which we didn't do a couple of years ago when our field people went out. They just did measuring and things to that effect. Okay, I just wanted to put that in so you would know that that's another thing. We did get our manual about three weeks ago finally, so we are progressing. Our computer system is progressing as far as I know. Let's see, back to the rationale, Travel & Mileage, that's why I put that in for verifying sales disclosures. Okay, Communications, we increased that line item for a new cable modem for the GIS system that would be faster and I checked with the Internet or the cable company and it will be, if we purchase the modem it will be \$29.95 a month, \$190 one-time purchase price. If we do not, the government price is \$39.95 each month. So we figured it would be cheaper to purchase it and have them install it. That's the installing charge and everything, that \$190. And what that is, we talked with Insight and it's a cable modem. When we get GIS and things that will come across faster and we checked with just off the top of the head pricing with Computer Services: for a T1 line or fiber optics it's going to be about \$15,000, I think, a year. So we thought that cable modem would be a lot cheaper. I think I put in \$800 a year for that, so that's quite a bit different. And this, one thing in the Reassessment I asked for, I didn't know where to put it so I put it in Reassessment, it's that – I believe I did...let me check – is the Arc press. Let me get my paper for that. And I know we're not talking about that but maybe I need to move that to my regular budget. I got a letter from the County Assessor that says please include \$1,400 for Arc press in your Reassessment appropriations and basically, this is the reason why: if I don't have it, that's the copy I'm going to get. She sent me a copy of this, that they made it. So if I don't have the Arc press software, this is what the 8 ½ by 11 copy is going to look like. And as you can see, you can't see anything. It doesn't give you any figures or anything. So that's the reason why I put in the \$1,400 for the Arc press software.

President Bassemier: Anybody else?

Glen Koob: Any other questions?

President Bassemier: Jim? Thank you, Glen.

Glen Koob: Thank you.

Glen Koob: Do we need to find out from the different Assessors where the \$500 or \$250 is coming out, on what budgets, or do we have that?

Councilmember Raben: We've got that. We voted on it last month.

Councilmember Tornatta: I understand, but it's like they put that into their salary and you put it in a separate line item.

Councilmember Raben: And we'll have to make that adjustment.

Councilmember Tornatta: Okay, but we've got all that information, I guess. Okay.

PIGEON TOWNSHIP ASSESSOR & REASSESSMENT

President Bassemier: We'll move on now. Pigeon Township Assessor, page 64. Hello, Mr. Hatfield.

Councilmember Hoy: To echo Mr. Wortman. We're in God's country right now.

Paul Hatfield: Paul Hatfield, Pigeon Township Assessor.

President Bassemier: Thank you, sir.

Paul Hatfield: There's one thing I want to put out to you to start with. In both budgets I have got these three items in both budgets because I didn't know which way you wanted to flip it. Those line items are 1150-3160 Radio/Pagers, 1150-3370 Computers, 1150-3372 Computer Software, they're in both budgets. But now since I've heard what Mr. Raben had to say, you can take it out of the regular budget because he's going to put it in the Reassessment budget. But just make sure I get it. Now let me point something out to you.

Councilmember Winnecke: Paul, excuse me. Could you repeat the list again so we can mark them off?

Paul Hatfield: You guys...1150-3160 Radio/Pagers...I don't want to go too fast for you...1150-3370 Computers...1150-3372 Computer Software. You want the amounts?

(Inaudible – several speaking at once)

Councilmember Winnecke: Thank you.

Councilmember Tornatta: Did you put training in there, Paul?

Paul Hatfield: Printing?

Councilmember Tornatta: Training.

Paul Hatfield: No, the printing is where it should be. I'm talking about these three items. Good God, these three items are in are both budgets. Knock them out of one and put it in the other one.

President Bassemier: No-brainer, right?

Paul Hatfield: As far as I'm concerned. I don't know about you folks.

Councilmember Tornatta: Did you go through 3310 Training? Did you put it in the other budget as well?

Paul Hatfield: No, I didn't know that at the time.

Councilmember Tornatta: Alright, well –

Paul Hatfield: I'm letting him take care of that.

Councilmember Tornatta: Okay.

Paul Hatfield: You know what, let me say something to you guys right now –

President Bassemier: Troy, did you have to get him started?

Paul Hatfield: And I mean this very sincerely, if any one of you folks would ever come to the office before this stuff happens, you would know this beforehand. Anybody, and then you can take the word back. I don't see any of you guys. Any time? Now what's important here on the regular budget is that with the total \$429,332, 92.6% of that is in salaries, 7.4% is in operating expenses. Now by taking out the items which I have just explained to you, then the operating expense totals would be 3.9% increase over 2001. In answer to your question previously, the \$500, I have included it in the salary schedules and that, as I understand it, would have to come out of the salary schedules and put in a separate line. Correct? Well, you guys take care of that. Now the budget per se, I don't think really I shouldn't have to say much more than to say that the operating expense is almost identical percentage-wise as last year. I know you've got a problem in cutting the budget, so I'll help you on the – well, the Reassessment budget doesn't come out of the regular fund, does it?

Councilmember Wortman: No.

Paul Hatfield: Huh?

Councilmember Wortman: No.

Paul Hatfield: Fine, I won't say anything then.

Councilmember Wortman: Good.

Councilmember Sutton: Any thoughts on Extra Help, Paul?

Paul Hatfield: Excuse me?

Councilmember Sutton: Any thoughts on Extra Help? You're requesting \$15,000.

Paul Hatfield: All I'm spending in this next budget is what I'm spending this year. I've got one man and that's what it costs, three days a week plus his mileage. Why, do you have a question on that?

Councilmember Sutton: Well, last year we did \$6,200, but right now through –

Paul Hatfield: Yeah, you cut that – no, no, let's go back and get the facts straight. I asked for \$12,500 and you guys cut it to \$6,200.

Councilmember Sutton: Okay, that's what I said.

Paul Hatfield: And I had to come back and get more money. If you'd have let me alone to start with, we might have got by.

Councilmember Sutton: Okay, now what I was going to say before you cut me off was –

Paul Hatfield: Well, I'm just giving you the facts.

Councilmember Sutton: Okay, the facts are, you got \$6,200 last year and right now,

through the end of June, you've spent a little bit over \$9,700, so my question was going to be at the rate that you're going, is that where you based the \$15,000 figure?

Paul Hatfield: Yes, that what will take us to the end of the year. I'm talking about – which, what we've got now and which you've already given me, that will take us to the end of the year. I may have to cut him down to two days, but the \$15,000, you've got to leave it in there, otherwise, I'll just have to come back. And I don't want to come back. You guys are not pretty. You're ugly.

Sandie Deig: Thank you, Paul.

Councilmember Hoy: Takes one to know one.

Paul Hatfield: You got that right. I admit I'm ugly. Every morning when I shave I say, –

Councilmember Winnecke: Yeah, but you're prettier now.

Paul Hatfield: No, I'm not.

Councilmember Sutton: You're smiling.

Paul Hatfield: No, I'm not.

Councilmember Wortman: Now Paul, I've been down at your office. I come to the Christmas party and got something to eat.

Paul Hatfield: Oh, maybe – you didn't bring anything.

Councilmember Hoy: Yeah, he brought his Darmstadt appetite.

Paul Hatfield: You don't return phone calls.

Councilmember Wortman: I know, but I did come down –

(Inaudible – several speaking at once)

Councilmember Wortman: Right, right.

Paul Hatfield: And you still didn't bring anything.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Paul, thank you. Mr. President, let's proceed.

Paul Hatfield: You guys come down and see me sometime.

Councilmember Sutton: He needs a hug, guys.

(Inaudible – several speaking at once)

Paul Hatfield: I've got to get it on record, you guys are saying that a three percent raise, you really ought to consider four percent. You really should do it. Just look at the city. Consider four percent. It won't kill you. You can find the money to cut this budget down eight million somewhere else. In fact, you want help, come to me. I'll help you.

Councilmember Hoy: I did come down when I hit your purple car.

Councilmember Sutton: Glen, before he gets away –

Councilmember Hoy: I came to your office when I hit your purple car.

Councilmember Sutton: Glen, before he gets away, make sure he gets that hug before he takes off.

(Inaudible – several speaking at once)

SCOTT TOWNSHIP ASSESSOR & REASSESSMENT

President Bassemier: We'll go to Scott Township Assessor, page 66.

Councilmember Raben: Well, I say we give them everything.

Councilmember Raben: Mr. President, there's really nothing here to address.

Councilmember Wortman: No, they're very conservative in that part of the town.

Councilmember Raben: The same goes, Ed, there will be cuts that will go to Reassessment.

UNION TOWNSHIP ASSESSOR & REASSESSMENT

President Bassemier: Okay, Union Township Assessor.

Councilmember Raben: Union, again, that's a low budget office that they always do a great job doing what they do with what little they get. But there may be an adjustment or two in that one that will go to Reassessment as well.

COUNTY ASSESSOR & REASSESSMENT PROPERTY TAX BOARD OF APPEALS & REASSESSMENT SALES DISCLOSURE FUND

President Bassemier: Okay, County Assessor.

Councilmember Sutton: Any compliments you want to give us, you can just get those out of the way just to start, since we're all ugly.

President Bassemier: That's page 49.

Cheryl Musgrave: I'm just not going to be as entertaining as Pigeon, I'm sorry. Cheryl Musgrave, County Assessor. I almost feel guilty saying all this since it's so late and I know we all want to go to lunch, but I do want to start out by saying a few words about the performance of the office over the past year. Tammy is going to pass out a document to talk about our major occupation which is the handling of appeals. Our office wins 94% of our appeals, 94%. The rest of the state offices only win 40% or less of their appeals. That means that the Auditor doesn't have to set aside this big pot of money to refund money back. It means that you collect and are able to distribute the money that we raise in taxes here. I know that several offices over the years have come to Council and talk about how they're self-funding. Our other major part of our office is inheritance tax. Our office is also self-funding in inheritance tax. This year the report that we got, we collected right at eight million dollars in inheritance tax. The county gets to keep 8% of that, looking at right around \$640,000. That's more than enough to fund my budget. So as you're thinking about copy fees and other offices and so forth, my office does collect all the money that it needs to run itself in inheritance tax and returns some as well.

Councilmember Hoy: Excuse me, does the state – I assume the state gets the rest of that?

Cheryl Musgrave: Yeah, they put it in their General Fund and spend it –

Councilmember Hoy: There is a black hole in Indianapolis.

Cheryl Musgrave: There you go. But speaking about that, there have been concerns about the future of inheritance tax. Maybe in the next three or five years we won't be collecting this level of revenue, but we have been for several years.

Councilmember Hoy: Yeah, I'm just a little tired of building stadiums for Indianapolis and things like that out of my taxes.

Cheryl Musgrave: Yeah, I want some stuff for down here. I want I-69. Well anyway, the other major occupation of my office has been working on the GIS project. That has been going extremely well. Our schedule of events and deliverables has been described as being on a private sector schedule as opposed to a government schedule. We've moved quickly. Our ortho photo is here for those of you who are interested in using it, seeing it, testing it. It's up on the website at the library right now on a test basis. We haven't announced it to the whole world. We want folks to go and look at it and tell us what they think should be changed. So go to the library's website and you'll be able to see the ortho photo there. The library has added some of their own information to it as well. But it's useful, people are giving us good feedback right now. Just to tell you a little bit about how GIS has been used because I know that some of you are such big fans of GIS, you can hardly wait for me to come and ask you for money for it. The state EPA office did make major use of it in mapping out the lead problem in the Jacobsville neighborhood, that was an impressive effort. The city parks used it at the City Council meeting last week to show the maps of proposed sites for the new soccer fields for the parks department. They have also been using the library site big time, because it's available on the Internet, available 24 hours a day. It was a resource, they were just so excited about being able to use that for it. The Freedom Festival used it to map out the flight box for the angels and also to do the disaster planning for that. The city has used it for DMD in multiple ways. The master planners are using it to map out the changes for downtown. Hopefully, they'll be able to find a place for that new jail. They should be able to. But not least, the Assessors are using it. We are not using it in a little way. We expect our first parcels to be loaded up on the system this week. The consultant is downstairs waiting for me to come down so that we can start with the 10,000 Pigeon parcels that are done. But we use it now to inspect sites before we go out there to visit them. We use it to measure parking lots that are too big to measure for the first time on-site or to proof measurements. We're beginning the process of auditing the size of parcels that the map says they are as opposed to what our records say they are. So that process is all beginning. Now to my budget. But I do thank you for the support that you've given me. Without your Training and Travel money, that 94% win rate in the appeals might be different and you might have less money at your disposal to disperse to the various entities. So, the changes on it reflect the challenge of this upcoming reassessment but the Assessors have already made some very responsible decisions that I want you to know about. They have decided to, first of all, do the Reassessment in-house. Not every county does this. Some counties are spending a million, more than a million to contract that job out. Our Assessors are doing that job for you. I hope you'll keep that in mind when you're granting their budgets for part-time help for Travel. They're the job for you at a considerable savings. We've also chosen to retain the same software for this reassessment that we used for the last one. Again, a considerable savings is being put into that, those two changes by themselves. We will need increased training this year. We will need increased software in computers as you've seen and those are reflected in my budget. I've asked for, and I've shared a chart like this with some and I'll give it to the finance chairman, there are some places where you can zero out and move it because I've asked for duplicate in various line items just like Paul did, whether you wanted it Reassessment or the General. So I asked for it in both places. I know that you're not ready to go over the Reassessment appropriation requests at this time, that you want to put that off, but I do want to bring up that I've asked for in the Reassessment fund in line item 3540 \$50,000. I'd like for you to change the ProVal support payments, that's our assessing software payments, to my line item from the Commissioners. The Assessors encountered a multiple week delay this year because the software support was not paid on time and our vendor withheld needed information to continue our work. I would like that to be put on my budget so that that responsibility becomes mine and I will make those payments on time. I will ask for another change that I want to give you forewarning about now. In Contractual Services 3530 in my

Reassessment budget, I will ask that the GIS department be moved to that line item, the 50% that the county funds. I'd like for this to be on the Reassessment. It's an appropriate place for it. So right now, I have \$20,000 in that line, I will ask for an additional \$137,500 making for a total of \$157,500.

Councilmember Tornatta: Cheryl, you have \$2,500 in that line item.

Cheryl Musgrave: In the Reassessment fund. You're looking at General or Reassessment?

Councilmember Tornatta: In General.

Cheryl Musgrave: I think those are the major changes. There is a new fund, the Sales Disclosure fund and I have made an appropriation request in that for the only two items that it can be used for, Training and Computers. So the Assessors now have a third fund at their disposal for Training and Computers and I've made an appropriation request in that. I do hope to bring back to IAAO classes to the county. We had these same classes a couple of years ago. Not everyone was able to attend those classes and we've had new staff members come on board since then and now the rubber is beginning to hit the road with the reassessment and this training needs to be repeated and expanded for those who weren't able to attend. Do you have any questions about specific line items?

Councilmember Sutton: Line item 4220 Office Machines, that's on your regular budget, I'm on page 51...

Cheryl Musgrave: \$5,000?

Councilmember Sutton: Yeah, did you include that in kind of what you're, in your description there?

Cheryl Musgrave: No. It is in my budget rationale. Do you all get these? Okay. That is for kind of a preventative...our printer, our main printer for documents and so forth was purchased in 1995, and that's to replace that one. If you'd rather that I came back once that entirely died and ask you for the money, that's fine. But I expect that, you know, it's not going to last forever and next year it will be eight years old. So that's what that's about.

Councilmember Sutton: So is this like some high end type of printer that can handle a lot of – generate a lot of volume?

Cheryl Musgrave: The printer, when they bought it new, it was like \$8,000. All the Assessors got the same kind, and they've come down in price since then, so it's more or less the same kind eight years later. They have different numbers and different so forth, but it would do the same thing as the one we have now does. The other \$5,000 is for a projector. We have been borrowing a projector from the public library when we show the computer on the wall. I've done it here a few times for you, so we'd like to buy our own rather than continue to use public library's.

Councilmember Sutton: Is that one of those projectors like you do for presentations, those kind of projectors?

Cheryl Musgrave: Right.

Councilmember Sutton: Are you due for a step increase, I guess, this year on yours?

Cheryl Musgrave: For me, personally?

Councilmember Sutton: Yeah.

Cheryl Musgrave: I don't get step increases. It's increased with the three percent and for the thousand dollars for the level II and I understand you've decided to take that thousand dollars out and put it somewhere else and so a couple line items will change due to that.

Councilmember Sutton: Okay, thank you.

Cheryl Musgrave: Are there any other questions?

Councilmember Raben: We can move on, I believe. I will say this, this is another budget that I believe we can put entirely in Reassessment, don't you?

Cheryl Musgrave: Which one?

Councilmember Raben: The Board of Appeal.

Cheryl Musgrave: Yeah, that's fine with me. I have asked for Board of Appeal/General and Reassessment, so we'd have to merge the two.

Councilmember Raben: This is a small budget, but it's not a problem to transfer this entire amount into Reassessment.

Councilmember Wortman: Ms. Musgrave, line item 4210 Office Furniture, what's that going to be, \$1,500? I notice you've got Office Furniture in your General budget and then —

Cheryl Musgrave: Like Mrs. Cunningham, I also loaned the county furniture and equipment of my own for my own office's use. I can't ask my employees to do the same thing and some of them are using the most incongruous groupings of leftover tables that we've scrounged out of the basement and it simply is not suitable for the tasks that they have to perform. And so two people in particular need new desk arrangements and some new filing ability.

Councilmember Wortman: And that would apply to this Board of Appeals?

Cheryl Musgrave: The two that I'm talking about are the hearing officer for the board and his support person for that effort.

Councilmember Winnecke: Curt, they have been very creative with how they use furniture there. They need it.

Cheryl Musgrave: Come on down.

Councilmember Wortman: Yeah, Reassessment now, Ms. Musgrave, you won't have a lot to do till the Assessors start turning things in, is that right?

Cheryl Musgrave: The appeals part won't happen in a dramatic way, but there is some land valuation work that the board has to do and I will be hiring a contractor to help the board do land valuing. So there are some things that I have to coordinate in advance and set in motion and then you're right, I wait for the Assessors to finish their work. And then we'll look forward to the tens of thousands of appeals that I think will occur.

President Bassemier: We're going to change the tape.

(TAPE CHANGE)

Cheryl Musgrave: Are you going to move on to the Sales Disclosure Fund?

Councilmember Raben: We can.

Cheryl Musgrave: Line item 3310 I submitted \$20,000.

President Bassemier: One eighty-five. Sorry, Cheryl.

Cheryl Musgrave: You should reduce that line to \$10,000. My appropriations totaled more than the projected fund balance, so this is to put it in line with that.

Councilmember Raben: Reduce \$10,000 in that first line item.

Cheryl Musgrave: 3310 where I have \$20,000 please reduce that to \$10,000.

President Bassemier: Okay, anybody else?

Councilmember Raben: No.

President Bassemier: Thank you, Cheryl. Appreciate it. Cheryl, I'm sorry.

Jeff Ahlers: I was going to ask you on that Sales Disclosure Fund is that something that is just already being created by operation or do we need an ordinance on that to create that?

Cheryl Musgrave: The legislature this past year created it by statute.

Jeff Ahlers: I saw that there was a statute, but sometimes when we have those it will say the fiscal body shall create a fund and we pass some kind of an ordinance.

Cheryl Musgrave: You'll have to double-check with the Auditor, Ms. Crouch. She did research it and has had numerous conversations with the State Board of Accounts about it. I don't remember her bringing up a point like that though.

Jeff Ahlers: That's fine. Well, I can talk to her. I just didn't know if there was any tidying up of paperwork we needed to do.

COUNTY COUNCIL

President Bassemier: Okay, last County Council, 126.

Sandie Deig: Mr. VanCleave is here to explain the computers.

President Bassemier: Okay. Tim VanCleave, he is going to talk about our computer request. I understand he helped the judges with this request so you are the expert in this field. We heard you the other night and you did a good job.

Tim VanCleave: Thank you. Tim VanCleave, Computer Services. I do serve as the court's consultant for the County Clerk, and Superior and Circuit Court and the Prosecutor's Office. When we did present this the other day, Mr. Raben, you did ask for some information regarding the upgrade. I did bring some copies of what the vendor has sent to me with regards to that. I don't know if that is pertinent at this time. If you would like them I have them here.

Councilmember Raben: You can go ahead and pass them out. Tim, as far as the request goes the request that is proposed or in our budgets is in the amount of \$681,000. I guess I'm looking for my sheet actually as I speak, but I guess the County Clerk had prepared a sheet that drops that sum down significantly based on some...I don't know if your input was part of that or not, but it was her projections on what was actually needed and she also addressed the number of terminals that were requested and didn't really set a figure on numbers needed, but said that she did not think all 50 terminals would be necessary. Did you have much input on that at all? So I guess what I am asking for are those figures fairly accurate?

Tim VanCleave: I believe so. The document that I have from the County Clerk I thought was in the neighborhood of \$708,000, but they may have altered that since the document that I had seen.

Councilmember Raben: Okay. We're obviously talking about two different documents then. I don't know where I put my copy of it. Okay, well I obviously don't have it with me right now or if I do I wouldn't know where to begin to look. But go ahead and present to us what you planned to present.

Tim VanCleave: The initial figures that were presented was partially a very large list of items that are needed by the courts for their operations over the next two years. In working with them and going on some past information that had been discussed three years ago when they started their project was that one of the things they wanted to try to avoid, both the Council, I believe, the Commissioners, as well as the courts to avoid having to come to Council for a lump sum when it was time to replace everything. To try to avoid another very large multimillion dollar project especially when it came to upgrading hardware. So part of the goal was to break that cost over two or three years. Part of that presentation is what we have done within the document that I assume was presented to you as the Council. The particular technology budget that I have here in front of me has \$255,400 slated for desktop environment and that includes hardware, replacing some of the equipment that is starting to fail, budgeting some money to repair equipment that may fail since it is not being replaced and some new printers and some other desktop environment equipment. Along with the Prosecutor's request yesterday another line item is for the new record's management system access that is presently covered under a site license that will not be covered under the new site license starting in 2002 so some money has been appropriated to maintain that ability with the probation officers primarily. There is a need for upgrade to support the new version of the application. A data base engine upgrade and potentially a data base server upgrade. There has been money budgeted to bring trainers in from the software vendor because many of the new staff members have not had a good opportunity to learn the software in the way it should be used. They have been instructed with the old fashioned on the job training and in some cases that causes some of the problems that they do have because they are learning bad habits. There is a line item for probation data conversion which is a carryover from the project. The original contract that was created with the vendor as part of that project only had a estimated value and was not a fixed value to cover the entire probation or all data conversion out of the old court system and probation system. That was a contractual obligation that if more work needed to be done beyond that point that it would be a billable item. The money had not been appropriated up and through last year and that's what this line item is for is to convert the probation data out of the old system into the new system. There is a line item for a link to the Sheriff's jail management system which they are in the process of replacing as part of the records management system, I do believe to help pass custody information between their package and the Courtview package to help the judges know who is in custody and who needs to be addressed in a more timely fashion. That came out of the hearings with the consultant who was evaluating the need for the new jail last year. The internet module which is opening...providing the tool to present data, court data, on the internet. Now obviously there are other statutory requirements, but without the funding in place having all the judges agree to put the data out there is moot because even if they agree and we don't have the funding to do it then it is a project that can't be pursued. There is a document imaging line item for the County Clerk's Office to try to help manage her order books. This would not be necessarily a tie into the existing Courtview application. In the extended budget she does address that or the courts would like to address that, I believe, in a 2003 budget. So that is the budget as I know that was presented at \$708,400.

President Bassemier: Any questions? Thank you, sir. That covers us. Anybody got any questions?

Councilmember Winnecke: No, but I would like to bring something up if we're done.
President Bassemier: Okay.

Councilmember Winnecke: Are we done?

President Bassemier: Well, I'll tell you what. I guess we...oh, I'm sorry, Sandie.

Sandie Deig: I would just like to say that the secretary's salary is not (inaudible, mike not on). Sarah really makes \$29,266 this year. In January County Council approved an additional appropriation to make her a full-time employee, so it kind of looks like she is getting a \$16,000 raise and she is not.

President Bassemier: Okay.

Sandie Deig: Okay, and then mine is due to the 11 years' longevity step increase.

President Bassemier: I guess something else we better address, you know, Bev Oswald mentioned about that director, so I am open for suggestions. I have talked to two people that is interested in serving with that board. I've got one resume and as mentioned earlier we only knew about this last week. We just got the letter last week, so I don't know what you all pleasure is. Should we make some mention to maybe hold it next month at our regular hearing or what do all want to do? It's too soon, but I would like to have some help on this and maybe, Phil, you and I can work on this trying to help find this and suggestions from everybody else. Like I said, I only have two people that have shown an interest so far and I think it is just too early. What do you think, Phil?

Councilmember Hoy: Well, actually while I have sat in a couple of times, Mr. Raben is the liaison there.

President Bassemier: I knew that. I didn't know if...I guess they didn't want politics to play a role in this and I know Jim was the liaison, so I was trying to get somebody on the opposite side here. So anyway, it is my recommendation but the statute states that it has got to be...let me find it here. It says:

"The County Council by majority vote shall appoint two" --

of course there is only one vacation,

"the Commission at least one and must be engaged in the hotel or motel business in the county."

So it just can't be anybody. It's got to be somebody that is tied in that works, or manages, or owns a hotel. So they're wanting to appoint their director next Wednesday, I understand by what she has told us, so I tell you what it is kind of a rush. Like I said, I've interviewed or I've got a resume and I've talked to one in person. The other one I talked to over the phone and I don't know if anybody has got anybody else interested. It's just too fast for me I think and maybe we ought to wait until next month. We have to have a special meeting if we're going to do this before next Wednesday. I understand we have to advertise 48 hours in advance on a special meeting, so help me here. What do you all want to do?

Councilmember Raben: Mr. President, I think we ought to go ahead and do it before Tuesday's meeting. In fairness to the board because, you know, one they do have obviously two or three people that they've looked at and I don't know the time frame on what they need to do, but in the event that they may lose that would be beneficial to the county I think it would be most beneficial to them if we Tuesday made our appointment to their board so they do have a quorum for their Wednesday meeting.

Councilmember Wortman: Yeah, what do you say about just calling a special meeting at 11:00 or 11:30 next Tuesday before the budget session?

President Bassemier: Is that okay with everybody?

Councilmember Winnecke: Or maybe 11:45. I don't think it will take a long time.

President Bassemier: Okay.

Councilmember Winnecke: I would make that motion actually. I think it's important. I thought...I really do believe that board and the people who are committed to that organization have worked hard to get them to this position and I think, you know, Bev was very articulate in her request. They would like this body to make that appointment prior to their selection and I think we should oblige them and I would make the discussion before the motion.

President Bassemier: Well, to add that though in all fairness to them, this would be all fairness to the person we put on that board, I've got two candidates and maybe somebody else had got some...don't you think we ought to do a little research on who our appointment is going to be? I can give you the one I've got. I have nothing in writing yet, but I know he is very interested so I know they need to make their decision, but we want to make our choice for that person on that board. I know we want to help them, but in the same token we want to put the person we want on that board. So do we want to rush this? Maybe Royce has got somebody who is interested in it. You know, I just got two people and we just got this vacancy last week.

Councilmember Sutton: This has come up so soon.

President Bassemier: That's what I am saying.

Councilmember Sutton: I can't just pull something out of my hat or something.

President Bassemier: I know they've got to make that appointment.

Councilmember Winnecke: You know, in all fairness we make multiple board appointments every year and we don't go through a search process if that's what you're suggesting. Maybe I am reading too much into it. But if we have two people who have expressed interest in it, you know.

President Bassemier: Well, I just...of all fairness, I mean, you know, this is the first time I have been president, so I am just trying to be fair with the other people that might be interested so we can come up...they're search for a top candidate. I think we should search for a top candidate.

Councilmember Tornatta: I second your motion.

President Bassemier: Okay, so what's the motion, Jim?

Councilmember Winnecke: The motion was to have a special meeting prior to our budget session next Wednesday to open at 11:45.

President Bassemier: Okay, I've got a second. Any more discussion on this?

Councilmember Wortman: Anybody that would have a person in mind could present it then?

President Bassemier: Yeah, and let me ask you. Let me ask the attorney on this. Is this...did I make a recommendation and you all vote on it. Is this the president's recommendation? I'm just asking how we have done it in the past.

Jeff Ahlers: The statute just refers that it is just a majority vote of Council, so you can just take a motion like you would on anything else from the floor.

Councilmember Wortman: You know, like if somebody here started the meeting off says

I recommend John Jones and then you add any more recommendations like you do for anything else and if you've got no more you close the nominations and then you vote on them once. Whoever gets the most votes.

Councilmember Hoy: Generally at the beginning of the year the president makes that list for us for all those appointments.

Jeff Ahlers: This particular instance the Alcoholic Beverage Commission and the Convention Bureau are the two that require a majority vote. Like liaisons and committee assignments sometimes the president makes those, but these are two that by statute require a majority vote at Council so it would be handled like any other Council business where you have a motion from the floor and a vote. I'm just trying to remember in the past the president always would address the ones who are interested and then we would vote on it.

President Bassemier: So my question is can I make my recommendation and you all vote on it whether you are for it or against it? Is that legal...I guess that's legal. Can I make that motion?

Jeff Ahlers: Sure you can.

President Bassemier: My recommendation.

Councilmember Hoy: You can make that recommendation. Sure that's normally the way it is done.

President Bassemier: I thought I could, so I just wanted to make sure. If anybody else in the next few days of all fairness has got somebody with that job description let me know and I'll get all the information I can. Jim, with your help and everybody else's help we'll come up with a top candidate.

Jeff Ahlers: You've got a motion and a second to have an 11:45 Tuesday special meeting.

President Bassemier: Anymore discussion? Roll call vote, please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

Thank you. Do I have a motion to adjourn?

Councilmember Tornatta: So moved.

(Meeting recessed at 11:47 p.m.)

VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL
BUDGET HEARINGS
AUGUST 14, 2001

The Vanderburgh County Council met in session this 14th day of August, 2001 in Room 301 of the Civic Center Complex. The meeting was officially opened by President Ed Bassemier at 12:00 p.m.

President Bassemier: I want to welcome everyone to the 2001 August 14th budget hearings. Roll call vote please or roll call attendance, please.

COUNCILMEMBER	PRESENT	ABSENT
Councilmember Tornatta	X	
Councilmember Sutton	X	
Councilmember Wortman	X	
Councilmember Hoy	X	
Councilmember Raben	X	
Councilmember Winnecke	X	
President Bassemier	X	

President Bassemier: Would everyone please stand for the Pledge of Allegiance?

(Pledge of Allegiance was given.)

President Bassemier: As you all know, all the departments had a chance last week to present their budget and we took everything under advisement. We’ve researched and done all we could and now it is up to us to make the cuts. As you know, if we don’t make those cuts the state will make them for us. Does anybody...Suzanne, do you have anything to say before we start?

Suzanne Crouch: Good luck.

President Bassemier: Good luck. Okay. I will turn everything over now to the Finance Chairman. Mr. Raben, would you go ahead and start the budget cuts?

TREASURER’S OFFICE

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Mr. President. First on the agenda is page 11, the Treasurer’s Office. How we have handled this meeting in the past, all 100 accounts which are salary, Insurance, FICA, PERF we’ll make the final adjustments on those at our September the 5th meeting. The first on the Treasurer’s...adjustment on the Treasurer’s Office would be account 1990. I move that be set in at zero. 3410 Printing \$50,000. Excuse me, Mr. President. Let’s back up. 2700–

President Bassemier: Jim, give the pages as we go, would you?

Councilmember Raben: Okay, this is page 12. 2700 \$4,000 and 4220 \$12,000. All other accounts as they are listed and I make that in the form of a motion.

Councilmember Winnecke: Second.

President Bassemier: I have a second by Mr. Hoy.

Suzanne Crouch: He seconded it.

President Bassemier: Oh, he seconded it? Okay. Can I have a roll call vote please?

Councilmember Wortman: Discussion?

President Bassemier: Oh, okay.

Councilmember Wortman: Mr. President, thank you. Mr. Raben in reference to 1920, top of page number 12, did you mention insurance in your (inaudible) did you?

Councilmember Raben: Yes, Mr. President, I did.

President Bassemier: Anybody else? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

1990	Extra Help	\$0.00
2700	Other Supplies	\$4,000.00
3410	Printing	\$50,000.00
4220	Office Machines	\$12,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

President Bassemier: Okay, Jim.

LEVEE AUTHORITY

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Mr. President. Again, all 100 accounts salary, FICA, PERF, Insurance final adjustments will be made on September 5th. All 2000, 3000 and 4000 accounts I move that they be approved as they are listed and I make that in the form of a motion.

Councilmember Winnecke: What budget are you on?

Councilmember Raben: Excuse me, Levee Authority on page 191.

President Bassemier: Okay, I was going to say.

Councilmember Winnecke: Second.

President Bassemier: I have a second. Any discussion on that? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

WEIGHTS & MEASURES

President Bassemier: Okay, Weights & Measures, page 88. Jim, I helped you out a little bit there.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Mr. President. Again, all 100 accounts including FICA, PERF and Insurance will be set in at our September the 5th meeting. Account 3410 I'll move that be set in at \$1,500. All other accounts as they are listed and I make that in the form of a motion.

Councilmember Sutton: Second.

President Bassemier: Second by Mr. Sutton. Any discussion? Okay, roll call vote.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

3410	Printing	\$1,500.00
------	----------	------------

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

COUNTY COMMISSION

President Bassemier: Okay, County Commission page 82.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Mr. President. Page 82 starting with line 1130-1300 Assistant County Attorney zero. All other 100 accounts as they are listed. Excuse me, all other 100 accounts will be set in September 5th including FICA, PERF and Insurance. Let's move to account 3000 to be set in at \$570,000; 3050 \$1,000,500; 3120 \$247,000; 3130 \$20,000; 3140 \$210,000; 3170 zero; 3280 \$15,000; 3310 zero; 3312 zero and I will give an explanation for that. Later on we're going to move that line into Reassessment. 3471 \$10,000...excuse me, \$1,000; 3500 we need to add \$1,524 for a total of \$34,808. 3530 \$3,000; 3600 \$2,246,491; 3750 the correct figure should be \$96,145. 3850 the correct figure is \$374,186. 3860 should...excuse me one second here, should be \$844,478. 3890 should be set in at \$601,663. The balance of that is in the 911 budget. And, Mr. President, I'll move that all other accounts be adopted as they are listed.

President Bassemier: Jim, before we get a second on that would you address 3050 Patient Inmate Care again?

Councilmember Raben: 3050 was set in at \$1,500,000.

President Bassemier: Okay, thank you. Do I have a second on that?

Councilmember Winnecke: Second.

President Bassemier: Okay, I have a second. Roll call vote please. Any discussion, I'm sorry? Wait a minute, Dave.

Councilmember Winnecke: David.

David Mosby: Well, there are a couple of them I think Catherine wants to speak to, too, but the one that I wanted to speak to was the Secretary's position in the Commissioners' office. We were here earlier in the year and asked for that position and were asked to come back at budget hearings and now that I am asking that position be set in and the reason why and I would be glad to answer any question, but as you know we have taken over the Old

Courthouse. I mean, Tammy is Superintendent of Buildings and is the only person that we have in that office besides the three of us. Tammy cannot continue to try to run the Courthouse, deal with the bookings over there, be over there three or four hours a day and we try to maintain an office. I mean, I would challenge anybody in county government to run without a secretary. Take and eliminate every secretary in every office and let them run with an administrative assistant and a department head and that's basically what we're doing. So somewhere along the line we're going to have to have a secretary. We're borrowing people from everybody up and down the line. Now this week we've got Tammy on vacation so we're borrowing somebody all week long. I've got my daughter sitting over there right now answering phones and she don't even work for this county, but I mean she has to sit over there and answer phones because I don't have anybody. I mean, we can hang a sign on the door that says temporarily closed due to lack of funding or whatever. I mean, but this is not the way to run county government. I've had people call me and say I get voice mail. Well, you're going to get voice mail when you don't have a secretary. I mean, Tammy cannot be in the office, go to lunch, be at the Courthouse, and be everywhere else she needs to be. Sarah comes over and Sarah does a fine job. Sarah is...she's got comp time coming. She's got personal days. She's got vacation. It's not her fault she is gone and she has a right to do that. Now she has been tied up in budget hearings for what, three or four weeks? We can't use Sarah. Tammy has got the right to take a vacation, so do you close the office? I mean, do you say we're out of business for a week or two or what?

Councilmember Tornatta: I think...I mean, I agree with everything you've said. I don't think we're voting on anything to do with that position right now. I believe that is coming the 5th, is that correct?

Councilmember Raben: No.

David Mosby: The actual line item—

Councilmember Raben: David and I spoke about this just a few hours ago by phone. But there is two problems. The first problem is there was never a budget request for a secretary.

David Mosby: Well, I requested that—

Councilmember Raben: There is no request in the budget for a secretary, so we're not actually eliminating or cutting anything.

David Mosby: Oh, I know. It's just put in at zero and I am here pitching to tell you why we need it.

Councilmember Raben: But what we have or will approve in just a few minutes if the vote carries we are approving \$15,000 in Extra Help. So—

David Mosby: In other words—

Councilmember Raben: —this money is for next year. I think you've got somewhere in the neighborhood of probably \$12,000 to \$14,000 available for extra help for that purpose for the remainder of the year. And I don't...well, just a moment.

David Mosby: Okay.

Councilmember Raben: I don't argue the need. I think at some point in time this body does need to address the fact that they need a full-time secretary in that office, but it is tough to do that at budget time when there wasn't even a request for it.

David Mosby: And that is why I am asking you to amend it now because it is going to be harder to address it down the line. I understand we have part-time money and part-time

money is fine. You can find somebody that possibly wants to come up here and work six or eight or ten weeks for \$6 an hour or \$6.50 an hour. That person is not going to stay with you and you're not going to get somebody trained in a position as you need. Now the thing that we've got coming before we've got a lot of work to do at the Old Courthouse. We need to get a grant writer on board. That grant writer can save you people a whole lot of money. If we start getting grants and we start matching money off and getting dollar for dollar and somebody is going to have to help this grant writer. I can't sit there and do her secretarial work. Tammy don't have the time, so if we lose one grant for \$50,000 we've lost a whole lot of money. You let that slip through the cracks it's your own fault. Now, you're also going to have a lot of paperwork coming forward with that position. You're going to start the jail project. That's going to be a ton of paperwork. There is going to be work to be done there every day. I don't know who you want to do it. Tammy can't do it. I'm not going to be here every day. I can't be. Somebody has got to pick up the slack. I can't keep borrowing people, people that know nothing. You can't train somebody for six weeks and lose them and try to train somebody else when you are dealing with a \$40 million project. Same as you can't do it with that Old Courthouse. If we want to run county government efficient then we need to pay the price. Now if we want to tell the taxpayer that, no, we can't afford \$25,000 so you're going to lose then we need to tell the taxpayer that. If we're hurting that bad that we're going to let something like this slip through the cracks over \$25,000 then that's what we need to tell the taxpayer. We're in that bad of shape that we can't afford it.

President Bassemier: Okay, thank you, Mr. Mosby.

David Mosby: Thank you.

President Bassemier: I'll tell you, this week everybody had a chance last week to address this. Just today, unless you've got some troubles with some numbers, we're just going to go ahead and go on with the budget.

Catherine Fanello: But I'm just going to make one comment about what Commissioner Mosby just said. I believe, Councilman Raben, being very honest—

President Bassemier: I tell you with all fairness, David couldn't be here last week, I don't think. I just...we're going to go on with it.

Catherine Fanello: Well, I'm just going to say that Councilman Raben did promise me an assistant attorney and a person for our office at budget time.

President Bassemier: Okay, we always got to remember...I don't...it's kind of hard to believe that he said that because he is only—

Catherine Fanello: Councilman Raben, did you not say that in my office?

Councilmember Raben: Catherine, I—

President Bassemier: —we're all only one vote. He said he would probably try to do the best for you.

Councilmember Raben: I might have said at some point in time I would entertain it.

Catherine Fanello: You said at budget time.

Councilmember Raben: I never promised. I never promised it.

Catherine Fanello: We can get a bible out, but you said at budget time.

Councilmember Raben: Well,--

President Bassemier: Okay, let's go on. I've got a motion and a second.

Councilmember Raben: Well, I say this as recent as Monday when you and I spoke you were aware of this.

Catherine Fanello: I know and that's why I called.

Councilmember Raben: And you told me you weren't surprised by the attorney.

Catherine Fanello: No, I'm not surprised by it.

Councilmember Raben: Right.

Catherine Fanello: I'm not surprised by anything around here. I've learned that in the past six months.

President Bassemier: Like I said, you all had your chance and everybody had their chance.

Councilmember Hoy: Point of order, Mr. President.

President Bassemier: I'm trying to say this in a nice way. If there is a problem with the numbers—

Catherine Fanello: Yes, I do have a problem with just a couple of the numbers.

President Bassemier: —just correct the number.

Councilmember Hoy: Point of order is that my instructions were to do my negotiations with my assignments outside of this meeting and I don't want us to get to the point of trying to negotiate on the floor today.

President Bassemier: Thank you, sir.

Councilmember Hoy: That's our procedure. I think they need help. I think we can address that, but I'm concerned that we would get into this sort of negotiation. If we do it with one office we have to do it with everyone and I think that might be bad practice. I'm not against getting them a secretary, but just don't want to debate it today.

President Bassemier: Right. Okay, I have a motion and a second. Any discussion by Councilmembers?

Councilmember Winnecke: I think, didn't the Commissioner have a question about the numbers?

Catherine Fanello: I've got a question about a couple of the numbers.

Councilmember Winnecke: Just the numbers?

Catherine Fanello: For clarification.

President Bassemier: Okay. You have the floor, dear.

Catherine Fanello: On the first one, the Bond and Insurance. Well, that one is fine. I guess Dennis Feldhaus had told me there would be probably about a 15 percent increase so we might have to come back for that.

Councilmember Winnecke: What was that, I'm sorry?

Catherine Fanello: 3000. Patient/Inmate Care, we have spent in '99 \$1.8 million. We've

spent in 2000 \$1.9 million. I don't know how it makes sense to set it in at \$1.5 when we know we're going to spend more than that. That's a false impression.

Councilmember Winnecke: In fact some of those...some of our expenses that we've incurred this year came from 1999, so this year's actuals maybe slightly inflated due to old expenses that came in from Deaconess Hospital.

Catherine Fanello: For '99 and 2000? I'm looking at '99 expenditures and 2000 expenditures, so you're saying—

Councilmember Winnecke: I'm saying this year's expense...we've paid bills this year that were actually...that actually occurred and should have been paid for in 1999 and came in late so I'm saying this year's year-to-date actuals might be higher than they normally would.

Catherine Fanello: Okay.

President Bassemier: Mr. Hoy.

Catherine Fanello: These were just based on an estimate from Bart O'Connor over in Juvenile, the \$1.9. That's where that came from.

Councilmember Hoy: No. You're quite correct. We will spend this much. Our problem is this. We have to stay under a state cap and every year this has been, at least every year I have been sitting here which has been nine years, okay, but this is an account where we can trim an amount off at budget time and then when it is needed we'll put it in next year out of the excess money we have. The problem is for...I didn't invent this budget system, the state did.

Catherine Fanello: Well, and I understand what you're saying because I worked in the Controller's Office for almost four years and I understand what you're saying. I'm an accountant and CPA and all that, but when you give a false impression about how much money should be put in the budget basically you're lying to the public because we know we're going to spend it next year, but yet you're not putting it in this year. I mean, I just don't agree with that theory. I understand what you're saying.

Councilmember Hoy: I wish you would have let this alone because I resent you accusing me of lying to the public. I've never lied to the public about this. Every year when we've discussed this for nine years, and this is the ninth year, we've said the same thing. We have said to the public we will put this in later. Probably during this whole process we will say to other people we will put this in later because we have to.

Catherine Fanello: I understand. I'm just saying I don't agree with—

Councilmember Hoy: Let me finish.

Catherine Fanello: —the theory of this.

Councilmember Hoy: This is our forum and I'm going to finish. I didn't set up the State Board of Accounts' processes. They did. As a Councilman and all the rest of us we have to abide by those. We have chopped this budget. We've done the best we can. We have moved things. We had a lot laid on our plates and I think that we have, all of us across the aisle, both parties, worked hard. This is not a problem with adding it later.

Catherine Fanello: That's fine.

Councilmember Hoy: There are two reporters sitting here who can quote me, record me or whatever they want to do that I told the truth that this is how we're going to handle it. It's not a false impression, it's just reality.

President Bassemier: Okay, let's move on.

Catherine Fanello: On the Examination of Records I believe that is 3280, Suzanne had said that could actually be set in at \$10,000.

Councilmember Raben: What page is that?

Catherine Fanello: You set it in at \$15,000, but it could actually be \$10,000. On 3530 Contractual Service that is an actual contract for \$5,000.

Councilmember Winnecke: Which one?

Catherine Fanello: 3530. And I don't have it in front of me, but it has to do with something with BFI, but that is actually \$4,000 or \$5,000.

Councilmember Raben: I think...is that...I didn't bring all my entire stack of papers that are 100 pounds, but I think part of these out of this account did we not transfer a couple of thousand dollars back in April or May into Public Defender's Office? Was some of this—

Catherine Fanello: Oh, you may.

Councilmember Raben: I think some of this \$5,000 was an old contract.

Catherine Fanello: I know I just signed a claim a couple of weeks ago taking something out of that account for—

Councilmember Raben: And I think it went into the Public Defender's Office, so that is where that \$2,000 would have come from.

Catherine Fanello: Okay, but I'll pull the contract for you, but I signed something a few weeks ago that was for \$5,000. Then on the rent I just need to know why you changed that so I can make notes in mine of what the difference is.

Councilmember Raben: Again, I think this again pertains to the Public Defender's Office. This rent was based on last year's figures which we've separated Public Defender's for the purpose of recouping money.

Catherine Fanello: I think I already took it out though whenever I did this.

Councilmember Raben: You can double-check it. We can always appropriate more.

Catherine Fanello: And then Contractual Computer I need to know what you're taking out of there so I can make notes of that.

Councilmember Raben: Again, I think it's the...I think approximately \$25,000 was put in Public or accounted for the Public Defender's Office and like \$23,000 and some change is part of the 911. Again, not planning on having to dig through files I didn't carry a lot of that up here.

Catherine Fanello: I just needed to know so I could make—

Councilmember Raben: I think the Central Dispatch figure I have is \$23,818 and approximately \$25,000 for the Public Defender's Office.

Catherine Fanello: That's it.

President Bassemier: Thank you, ma'am. Okay, Jim.

Suzanne Crouch: Will you amend your motion on the \$10,000?

Councilmember Raben: And I will. Mr. President, I would like to amend my motion for 3280 to be set in at \$10,000.

President Bassemier: Who seconded?

Councilmember Winnecke: I'll amend the second.

President Bassemier: Okay. Roll call vote.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

1130-1300	Assistant Co. Attorney	\$0.00
3000	Bond & Insurance	\$570,000.00
3050	Patient/inmate Care	\$1,500,000.00
3120	Postage/freight	\$247,000.00
3130	Travel/mileage	\$20,000.00
3140	Telephone	\$210,000.00
3170	Depositions	\$500.00
3280	Examination of Records	\$10,000.00
3310	Training	\$0.00
3312	Gis Consultant	\$0.00
3471	Abstracts	\$1,000.00
3500	Human Relations	\$34,808.00

(Table continued next page)

3530	Contractual Svcs.	\$3,000.00
3600	Rent	\$2,246,491.00
3750	Purchasing Dept.	\$96,145.00
3850	Building Commission	\$374,186.00
3860	Contractual Computer	\$844,478.00
3890	Central Dispatch	\$601,663.00

(Motion carried 6-1/Councilmember Sutton opposed)

Councilmember Raben: Mr. President?

President Bassemier: Yes, sir.

Councilmember Raben: I would like to say one thing before we carry on. Mr. Hoy mentioned this and I would like to hit on one more time. Most of these cuts or a lot of these cuts proposed today were proposed by seven members of this board. I mean, these aren't my cuts or the Republicans' cuts. They're not the Democrats' cuts. They're cuts that were all brought to the table by each and every one of us and in terms of cuts and I've been a party to this board for the last 11 years and have served as Finance Chairman for three or four of those years or maybe more, but never before have I or do I recall having all seven members really take an active role in cutting the budget, so I mean I think that is a compliment to everybody and Mr. Hoy brought it up and I just wanted to kind of echo what he was saying.

Councilmember Sutton: Mr. President, I just want to add Jim has done a great job in working through the budgets. I think he has gone to great lengths in getting the perspective of all the Councilmembers and none of the budget adjustments, as I call them, are going to be met favorably all across the board, but it's just the reality is Jim is the finance guy so he is going to catch the brunt of it, but I think he when he is speaking he is speaking on behalf of conversations that represent discussions with all the Councilmembers and nearly every department head that is going to be reflected in the budget here. So just in terms of my particular vote on the last one I was in favor of just about everything, but not everything in that one, so I felt that I needed to represent that, but I think that Jim has done an outstanding job.

President Bassemier: We know there will be some adjustments down the road. We don't have that crystal ball to say, hey, what is everybody going to spend next year to the penny or whatever. We're just trying to use some educated guesses here and do the best we can. Thank you. We're not picking on any one department. Thank you everyone here on this.

COUNTY COMMISSION / CCD (Continued on page 70)

President Bassemier: Okay, Jim. Drainage Board.

Councilmember Raben: Well, do we want to take 141, Mr. President?

President Bassemier: Oh, I'm sorry, 141 yes.

Councilmember Raben: On this one we're putting the cart before the horse on one budget, but on page 141 account 1300-4050 Courthouse Computer System. I would like for that line to read Courts Computer System, it does read that now, and I would like to set in \$350,000. Then we've got the Discovery Lodge at \$1,000,000; Motor Vehicles at \$125,000 and St. George/Oak Hill Intersection at \$500,000. I would like to move approval.

President Bassemier: Do I have a second? Mr. Hoy second. Any discussion? Roll call

vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

1300-4050	Courts Computer System	\$350,000.00
-----------	------------------------	--------------

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

DRAINAGE BOARD

Councilmember Raben: Okay, now we have Drainage Board on page 79. Mr. President, I'll move approval as listed. Yeah, as listed.

Councilmember Tornatta: Second.

President Bassemier: Any discussion on it? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

RIVERBOAT

President Bassemier: Okay, Riverboat 129.

Councilmember Raben: Mr. President, I'll move approval as listed.

President Bassemier: Do I have a second?

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: I have a second. Any discussion? Okay, roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Let me get to the page there. I'm a little slow.

Councilmember Raben: Page 129.

Councilmember Sutton: Okay, 129. I know we're in the process of doing this. One thing I did recommend and we can go back and maybe take a look at it. At some point in time I spoke with Commissioner Fanello about this and really would like to see that Economic Development at \$1,000,000 and maybe Infrastructure/Drainage at \$250,000. That is something I had spoke with her, but given where we are right now and what we have on the floor, yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

CONVENTION CENTER OPERATING FUND

President Bassemier: Okay, the Convention Center Operating Fund, page 190.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Mr. President. Line 3203—

President Bassemier: Okay, 190.

Councilmember Raben: Page 190, account 3203 be set in at \$175,000. 3205 \$80,000 and 3530 zero. I make that in the form of a motion.

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: Mr. Wortman second. Any discussion? Roll call vote please?

Councilmember Tornatta: Hold on. What is set in at zero? What was set in at zero?

Councilmember Raben: That Contractual Services.

Teri Lukeman: Are you ready?

President Bassemier: Troy, is that it?

Councilmember Tornatta: Did on the utility side did we say we were going to be jostling around with that or how did we come up with the 80 and then the other thing was what were the contractual services?

Councilmember Raben: Troy, I'll tell you what we can do and I had forgotten that we were able to cut the 80 late, okay?

Councilmember Tornatta: Okay.

Councilmember Raben: Originally we had to cut \$45,000 out of this budget.

Councilmember Tornatta: Right, okay.

Councilmember Raben: So we can actually go in and set those utilities back in at a higher figure. What does the board think, \$100,000?

Councilmember Hoy: On which one, on gas?

Councilmember Tornatta: Well, it's—

Councilmember Winnecke: What did you put it on? I would just like to leave it as it is listed.

Councilmember Raben: Just leave them all?

President Bassemier: Yeah, we can. We don't know.

Councilmember Raben: Let's, Mr. President, I'll move to amend my motion that page 190 Convention Center Operating Fund be all accounts with the exception of 3530 which will be set in at zero all accounts be approved as they are listed.

Suzanne Crouch: Curt seconded.

President Bassemier: Curt, he amended that.

Councilmember Wortman: Okay, now you're going to leave the 3203 at \$180,000. You're going to leave 3205 at \$120,000?

Councilmember Raben: Uh-huh. If you recall, Mr. Wortman, we had to initially cut \$45,000 out of this budget. Then there was the late cut of \$80,000 that really more than offsets what we initially had to take out. So this is fine doing what we are doing.

Councilmember Winnecke: I did have a question. I'm sorry. I was tardy when we went over this budget last week. What is in the Contractual Services line item?

Councilmember Raben: Catherine may want to answer for that.

Catherine Fanello: That was originally put in there, but everything is paid out of the \$1,000,000 Center Operating Fund. I think that was put in there initially, but it is not needed in that fund.

Councilmember Winnecke: Okay.

President Bassemier: Curt, do you accept the amendment?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

President Bassemier: Roll call vote.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

THE CENTRE

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Mr. President, page 116, The Centre. Again, all 1000 accounts including FICA, PERF and Insurance will be adjusted and set in at our September 5th meeting. Page 117, Food Services line 3798 to be set in at \$400,000. All other accounts as they are listed and I make that in the form of a motion.

Councilmember Hoy: Second.

President Bassemier: I have a second. Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

3798	Food Services	\$400,000.00
------	---------------	--------------

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

President Bassemier: Okay, Superintendent of County Buildings, page 95. Hold on a second, Jim, she wants to change the tape.

(TAPE CHANGE)

Councilmember Hoy: We have an opportunity to do the right thing, I believe, and not increase taxes to help take care of the Old Courthouse, which I want to take care of and I think most of you do. We have an excess amount of money in Cumulative Bridge and I believe the Auditor said we could shift a nickel of that, it's 15 cents, is it not, the Cum Bridge?

Suzanne Crouch: That's correct. It's set in at 15 cents.

Councilmember Hoy: Fifteen cents, and ten cents would cover our bridges.

Suzanne Crouch: At this point in time, yes, adequately.

Councilmember Hoy: So to get that changed, we could set up a cumulative courthouse fund which would provide money for the Old Courthouse not only now, but in the future, because a lot of work has to be done to it. And what I would like, and I believe our counsel will tell me if I am out of order, I would like to move that this body overture our state legislators to get that accomplished in the next short session so that we have a secure funding source for a building that I certainly want to see us maintain. So that's my motion.

Councilmember Tornatta: Second.

President Bassemier: Any discussion?

Jeff Ahlers: There's already a statute on that, right, that you're talking about?

Councilmember Hoy: That's what I'm told and they would have to – because we don't have home rule they have to vote. I mean, it has to go through the legislature so that that amount can come into a new fund for the Old Courthouse. We would have a new fund. We can't do it but we can ask them to do it.

Jeff Ahlers: Actually, the Commissioners will need to set up the one fund that I looked at, will need to establish an ordinance or take action to establish that fund.

Councilmember Hoy: All I'm asking this body to do is overture the legislature and if we want to overture the Commissioners, we can do that as well. I just think it's a good idea and it'll give a continuing support for that building rather than us doing crisis management when something falls apart.

President Bassemier: Yeah, I think it's a good idea and I want to thank Ms. Crouch for giving us that information and helping us out on this. We appreciate that information to us on that.

Suzanne Crouch: It was actually included in the Old Courthouse report, but thank you.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Mr. President, oh, that's right, we need to vote.

Councilmember Hoy: You've got a second from Mr. Tornatta.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

SUPERINTENDENT OF COUNTY BUILDINGS

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Mr. President, Superintendent of County Buildings, page 95. First I will move that all salaries, FICA, PERF & Insurance will be set in at our final meeting September the 5th. Line 1990 Extra Help to be set in at \$5,000; 2860 Building Supplies \$2,000; 3530 \$10,000, 3550 \$15,000; then account 4121, I would move that that be set in at zero and ask the County Commissioners to file a request for this year out of their CCD account for that \$600,000. All other accounts as they appear, Mr. President, and I'll make that in the form of a motion.

President Bassemier: Do I have a second?

Councilmember Sutton: Second.

President Bassemier: Second by Mr. Sutton. Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Councilmember Tornatta: Do we know what the priority list is on that CCD money, that that's definitely coming through? I mean, –

Councilmember Raben: That it's coming through? What do you mean?

Councilmember Sutton: Are you asking, Troy, do the Commissioners have a list of other priorities already earmarked for the –

Councilmember Tornatta: Right. I mean, I know we drew some numbers and I have been unable to touch base...

Councilmember Raben: There is about 1.1 million in CCD right now...maybe a little more than that.

Councilmember Hoy: Mr. Raben, you're talking about this years' funds, not next year's.

Councilmember Raben: Right.

Councilmember Hoy: So there's enough this year to cover it. We're not talking about touching the budget we just voted on.

Councilmember Tornatta: And there are no monies going toward anything this year, is that correct?

President Bassemier: Are you asking one of them –

Councilmember Tornatta: The Commissioners.

Councilmember Raben: Do you have any large capital projects that you had planned to earmark any CCD funds for?

President Bassemier: Come to the mike and address that, please. State your name. Dave, you want him to ask the question – do you understand the question?

David Mosby: Yeah, I understand the question but I'm not prepared to answer that. I mean,

I know what he's saying but I'm not going to stand here and give you a false impression and tell you what projects are one, two, three and four. I mean, I'm going to be honest with you. We've got several projects we're looking at, and yeah, we're going to spend a bunch of money of out there. So, I mean, to say that there's \$600,000 there, if you're asking me that, no, there's not. And I think you just took \$350,000 a minute ago.

Councilmember Raben: That's next year.

Catherine Fanello: But the estimated revenues for next year are only 1.5 million, so there's going to actually be 1,975,000 worth of requests. So really, I mean, you don't have enough next year. You're using this year's unappropriated balance.

Councilmember Raben: We're not using it up. I gave an estimate of 1.1, and there's probably a little more than that.

Catherine Fanello: So did you, on the computer project that the Sheriff and I guess is that all the 911, is that –

Councilmember Raben: No, that is not the Sheriff, that's the courts.

Catherine Fanello: That's the courts. No – okay, yeah, this one, but the other one that Eric Williams talked to you about, because I had thought that maybe some of that was coming from CCD money.

Councilmember Raben: No.

Catherine Fanello: Okay.

President Bassemier: Thank you. You okay, Troy? Got any more...

Councilmember Tornatta: That didn't really answer any of my questions, but...

Councilmember Hoy: I'll make a comment about the courthouse itself. I talked to one of the Commissioners, Commissioner Mourdock, and we do need to get the roof fixed. That building has two roofs: it has an interior roof, and I mentioned this before, and you have to get above that to see where the, see the daylight. So that's what this would be for, is to do that upper roof because we want to stop the damage.

Councilmember Tornatta: And there's also the –

Councilmember Hoy: The cupolas need –

Councilmember Tornatta: And one would do that at the same time or try to for cost savings, right.

Councilmember Hoy: It would be wise to do that at the same time, you're quite right.

Councilmember Tornatta: So would we not be over \$600,000, approaching 7 - \$800,000 and then –

(Inaudible Councilmen Tornatta and Hoy both speaking at once)

Councilmember Hoy: We may well be. All we are addressing – you're quite right – they're estimated at \$70,000 each by the architect, Mr. Fosse. I think there are four of them, so that's \$280,000 more.

Councilmember Tornatta: Should we not leave some type of monies in this account to offset what the Commissioners might fall short?

Councilmember Hoy: We may well want to do that. We need to see how the money is going to be spent. What my feeling is, and I'm only expressing my feeling at this point, is the Commissioners nor this Council asked for this headache of this Old Courthouse. With all due respect to the previous board, I was not made aware of holes in the roof. We were not asked and then all of the sudden we're not asked, we're given the building, which in my estimation puts an emergency on the Commissioner's desks and on our desks, which neither of us really cared to deal with, but I think this is one way to deal with it. And I'd be willing to be flexible on it, but I think that's where we find ourselves –

Councilmember Tornatta: I'm okay with that, but, you know, when you have a task that's been set before you, do you push it aside or do you tackle it? And I'm saying part of the tackling of this issue is if we do put some of it towards CCD money, we still might have to offset that with some money from General Fund.

Councilmember Hoy: We may well have to do that, you're quite right.

Councilmember Tornatta: And do we set that in here right now? And if we don't, it just goes into the unappropriated balance.

Councilmember Hoy: We could look at what we don't spend this year out of the General Fund and then perhaps look at that. What came in the Old Court – Mr. Mosby is at the podium, but I was at their meeting that night and he can comment on this – is that Mr. Fosse said that the envelope of the building has to be made secure and that is the roof. I don't remember, Mr. Mosby, who recommended doing the cupolas, but while you've got the scaffolding up, it would sort of make sense to do both those at the same time, would it not?

David Mosby: I think what Will had said that night is we most definitely had to do something with the roof right away and the windows. He said the windows need to be taken out, tight sealed, and put thermal panes in them and put them back.

Councilmember Hoy: Yeah, and one of the suggestions on the windows that – I might as well throw this into the public arena, I was speaking with some, you know, preservationists are on a continuum about this long and the ones who are the strictest preservationists don't even want those air conditioning units sitting outside. As a preservationist, that doesn't bother me as long as the building is cool, but it bothers them. So there you have it. But on the windows, I feel that the private sector ought to have a part in this and I was talking with these preservationists, and I haven't had a chance to share this with you and I apologize for that, Mr. Mosby, but I looked at them and I said, you know, you guys are always wanting to preserve something, I want to see your money. I was subtle, and I said, you know, if you'll adopt a window, I'll adopt a window. And I think that's one way to get the windows in because, as I recall, and again, correct me if I'm incorrect, they have to keep wooden windows to keep it historically correct, but they can put in double panes or something which will help with the energy cost, which definitely all of us are interested in.

David Mosby: I think that's what Will was –

Councilmember Hoy: Was that not pretty much it?

David Mosby: One thing I was going to tell you, and Troy was at the meeting last night, I believe he left before we might have discussed this, we had instructed Counselor Hayes to start looking at the formation of a board, whether it be the Friends of the Old Courthouse or whatever, as it used to be at the zoo, the Friends of the Zoo, to start looking at possibly some fund raising, but also to get a grant writer on board and then we have a group to go through and try to match money off and I guess prompted me to come up here. Even if you cut that \$600,000 down to \$400,000, if we can match \$400,000 off, we'll have \$800,000, so we can possibly do maybe the roof and the cupola, and then we just have to start working as you said on the windows. I think what the architects were saying that night, we're destroying the building more by it not being sealed tight, and the two things that

they expressed was, you know, get the roof fixed and get the windows fixed, and get some thermal panes in there to where the building is efficient and it's not going to get a lot of weather damage, which we're getting moisture and everything right now. Every morning, the guy that we've got for maintenance over there – by the way, we did hire a maintenance man, who has a license in heating and air and he's also pretty decent at plumbing, so he'll be able to buy Freon and try to keep our boilers going and our air conditioners running, which should save us some money. But every morning, he said he goes in and the first thing he has to do is about four or five different spots, go clean up all the plaster. And by one or two o'clock, some more has fell. So, I mean, that is our biggest problem over there and I would hate to see this line item cut to nothing for the sake that if we can come up with a grant writer and we can find the grants, we can try to match that off, and possibly make ourselves a lot of money. If it came down to \$100,000, we'll find it in the Commissioners' budget somewhere. I mean, if somebody said you need \$500,000 and we've got four, we'll help find it somewhere.

Councilmember Raben: And David, I don't think, you know, even at that point this body would not entertain and probably unanimously support an additional appropriation. But again, \$600,000 is what was requested, and we're not actually zeroing it out, we're just transferring it to another fund.

David Mosby: Well, I'm scared that fund ain't going to be able to hold it, though. With other projects that we're looking at, I mean, I can't stand here and commit to you, and I wouldn't, and somebody can say well, you know, he doesn't like the Old Courthouse. That's wrong. I've been over there I don't know how many times going through it, trying to look at things, but I'm not going to sit here and commit to you that if you came to me and said, you know, we need \$500,000 out of that fund, that I can give it to you because there's other projects outside of the Old Courthouse that need work, too. And we can't put all of our emphasis on that one project. I mean, there's probably things at Burdette Park that are going to need to be done. You know, that's a continuous deal, and we're a million dollars short on the O'Day Discovery Center out there today. I mean, we've got a million dollars that you just okayed in CCD, but nobody added any to it. So, I mean, there's another million dollars, but I would say if you at least leave \$400,000 in that budget, we can try to match it off. The other thing that worries me and I know it's a minute amount, but you took \$10,000 out of the Extra Help. I mean, we're in the process of trying to get somebody over there to keep that building clean every night and for \$5,000 a year, you know, you aren't going to get anybody to work very long. I mean, that's the problem we've got now and I hate to see you cut \$10,000 out of Extra Help, knowing that if we hire somebody and we just work them 20 hours a week or 25 hours a week to keep, I mean, just to keep everything clean, we've been fortunate enough to rent it for some wedding receptions. I mean, there's a continuous job keeping it clean, the paint is flaking off the walls. We have to go in every day and make sure that it is presentable as much as possible. There is some painting that we're going to have the maintenance man himself –

Councilmember Raben: And again, I don't think anybody on this board cares to see the condition of that building worsen. I mean, I think we all look forward to seeing it, you know, eventually become renovated and all the troubles that are there be fixed. But again, this again, this is a new budget, though. We really don't know what we're going to need and it is – it has put a strain on this body. You know, this budget request is \$875,000, you know, that's a budget we didn't have last year, the Centre's budget is bigger than ever. You know, that's a budget two years ago that we really didn't have. I mean, you know, there's a lot of new burdens that's been put on the General Fund, so just like with this one, I think we need to give it time. If we need extra next year, we'll just have to, we'll have to address it.

David Mosby: And believe me, after 13 years on the City Council, I understand where you're coming from. You get requests for \$175,000,000 and you only got 137. So, you know, somebody is going to lose out and I understand as much as anybody. The people coming into the Commissioners' Office every day asking for this and that, and you know, we're over here asking. And the best I can do is tell them, you know, we're trying, same

as you are. But just a couple of things I'll point out: the Extra Help, hopefully, you'll leave some in Contractual.

President Bassemier: You know, that's the first time anyone told us they understood us. I appreciate that, Dave. Okay, we've got a motion and a second –

Councilmember Hoy: I think we all, you know, this is a point where the Commissioners and the Council both understand the hot potato we were given and pitched to us and it's not an easy one to...

President Bassemier: Okay, roll call –

Councilmember Hoy: I will speak for myself since we're still in discussion. If Mr. Raben would accept an amendment to bump up that Extra Help at least some, because I think that's important, and then I can only promise one vote, but I will promise one vote to work with you on getting that roof taken care of in some manner. And if we can sit down and go over the projects you all have in mind, you know, and this one and see what we can balance out, that would be good. And we could do that cooperatively, I think.

David Mosby: I'll just say I'm here to work with you. I'm not here to argue. The only thing I'm trying to point out is the areas that I have noticed in the first six or seven months that are a problem. And I'm not here to be anybody's enemy and I hope we all get along and that's not the deal. And I'll work with Councilman Hoy and Councilman Raben any time. I called Councilman Raben early this morning and it's not that, you know, my phone won't reach his or he won't reach me, and I'm here to work with him. But these are just areas that I hate to see us do something and then all of the sudden we have the opportunity and we let it pass us by because we didn't look far enough into the future to be set up to do it. And these are the only things I'm trying to point out.

President Bassemier: Thank you, Mr. Mosby. Jim?

Councilmember Raben: Mr. President, at this time let's just let it stay where it's at.

President Bassemier: Okay. Now, any more discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: I'm going to go ahead and vote yes. I would hope for a change, but I will still keep my promise to you to work with you.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: No.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

1990	Extra Help	\$5,000.00
2860	Building Supplies	\$2,000.00
3530	Contractual Services	\$10,000.00
3550	Repairs to Bldg. & Grounds	\$15,000.00
4121	Roof Old Courthouse	\$0.00

(Motion carried 5-2/Councilmembers Tornatta & Winnecke opposed)

VETERANS ADMINISTRATION (Continued on page 31)

President Bassemier: Okay, Jim.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Veterans Administration, page 80. All salary lines including FICA, PERF & Insurance will be set in at our September the 5th meeting. Account 3310 Training be set in at zero, account 3600 Rent zero, all other accounts as they are listed and I make that in the form of a motion.

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: Second by Mr. Wortman. Any other discussion?

Councilmember Tornatta: I did find something out. Real quick, Mr. Raben, at the Veteran's Training Center, they do have new requirements for training of all staff. I did find that out. They haven't used that in the past because they haven't had to. Unless that's being set in the Commissioner's budget, then that would have to come out of their budget, but that is a mandatory training for the people in the Veteran's Office.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, did they give you an idea on how much –

Councilmember Tornatta: Well, he said that 2,000...he thought that that was a realistic number and I don't have any way of knowing how that would – what would be different with that. But he did say that for that training. So I think he's got, he's got he and at least one other that would have to go and it's, I thought he said two or three times a year. So that was the only thing that I had different from when we talked.

Councilmember Raben: Mr. President, I really don't have a major problem with setting that in at \$1,000 and we'll see...

President Bassemier: Curt seconded that. Curt, you going to amend that? Is that okay?

Councilmember Wortman: Yeah, I think it is mandatory that they do. I think that's right. So I'll go along with that.

Councilmember Raben: That's a compromise and if it runs into more, then add it, it won't be much and he can back and see us.

President Bassemier: Okay. Any more discussion?

Councilmember Tornatta: Thank you.

President Bassemier: Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

3310	Training	\$1,000.00
3600	Rent	\$0.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

BURDETTE PARK

Councilmember Raben: Mr. President, County Highway, Cum Bridge and Local Roads & Streets, as I mentioned earlier, we're going to postpone those until Thursday. So let's go to Burdette Park, page 118.

President Bassemier: Okay.

Councilmember Raben: And, Mr. President, we'll start off as saying all salary lines, FICA, PERF & Insurance will be set in at our final meeting September the 5th. The first account would be on page 18, line 1180-1450 Other Employees, I move that that be set in at \$433,500; 1190-1450 \$45,000; 1230-1450 zero; 2210 page 119 \$8,000; 2220 \$3,000; 2310 \$9,000; 2550 \$4,000; 2770 \$1,000; 3200 \$100,000; 3580 \$8,500; 3590 \$40,000; 4120 \$60,000; 4130 \$30,000; 4140 \$22,000, all other accounts as they listed and I make that in the form of a motion.

President Bassemier: Anybody have a second?

Councilmember Winnecke: Second.

President Bassemier: Second, Mr. Winnecke. Any discussion?

Councilmember Sutton: One more time on line item 4220, excuse me, no, 4140.

Councilmember Raben: 4140 \$22,000.

President Bassemier: Are you okay with it? Anybody else? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

1180-1450	Other Employees	\$433,500.00
1190-1450	Security	\$45,000.00
1230-1450	Maint/Carpenter	\$0.00
2210	Gas & Oil	\$8,000.00
2220	Tires & Tubes	\$3,000.00
2310	Laundry & Cleaning	\$9,000.00
2550	Sand & Gravel	\$4,000.00
2770	Medical Supplies	\$1,000.00
3200	Utilities	\$100,000.00
3580	Vehicle Repair	\$8,500.00
3590	Pool Operation	\$40,000.00
4120	Buildings	\$60,000.00
4130	Park & Playground	\$30,000.00
4140	Water Attractions	\$22,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION

President Bassemier: Okay, Jim. Cooperative Extension Service, page 74

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Mr. President, all 100 accounts including FICA, PERF & Insurance will be set in at our September the 5th meeting. Move down to account 2600 \$5,000; 2620 \$500; line 3130 \$6,000; line 3910 \$7,000. All other accounts as they appear and I make that in the form of a motion.

President Bassemier: Do I have a second?

Councilmember Winnecke: Second.

President Bassemier: Second Mr. Winnecke. Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

2600	Office Supplies	\$5,000.00
2620	Educational Material	\$500.00
3130	Travel/Mileage	\$6,000.00
3910	Vanderburgh Youth Program	\$7,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

LEGAL AID

President Bassemier: Okay, Legal Aid, page 123.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Mr. President. All salary lines including FICA, PERF & Insurance will be adjusted at our September the 5th meeting. On page 123 at the bottom, line 3130 be set in at \$1,000; 3140 \$2,000; 3250 \$1,600; and 3520 \$800; all other accounts as they are listed and I make that in the form of a motion.

Councilmember Sutton: Second.

President Bassemier: I have a second by Mr. Sutton. Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

3130	Travel/Mileage	\$1,000.00
3140	Telephone	\$2,000.00
3250	Law Books	\$1,600.00
3520	Equipment Repair	\$800.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

LEGAL AID/UNITED WAY

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Mr. President, page 194. All salary lines including FICA will be set in at September the 5th meeting. All two, three and four thousand accounts as they appear and I make that in the form of a motion.

Councilmember Sutton: Second.

President Bassemier: I have a second from Mr. Sutton. Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

CORONER

President Bassemier: Okay, the Coroner's office, page 34.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Mr. President, all salary lines including FICA, PERF & Insurance will be set in at our September the 5th meeting. Turn to page 35, account 2230 Garage & Motor be set in at \$800; 2740 \$1,000; 3130 \$500; 3190 \$6,000; 3200 \$8,000 and 3650 \$100,000; all other lines as they are listed and I make that in the form of a motion.

Councilmember Winnecke: Second.

President Bassemier: I have a second from Mr. Winnecke. Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

2230	Garage & Motor	\$800.00
2740	Chemicals	\$1,000.00
3130	Travel/Mileage	\$500.00
3190	Solid Waste Disposal	\$6,000.00
3200	Utilities	\$8,000.00
3650	Autopsies	\$100,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

911 EMERGENCY SERVICE

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Mr. President, 184 is the 911 Emergency Fund. On line 3890, you have a request for \$250,000, I'll move that that be approved along with two new account numbers. Account number 3891 Central Dispatch - Computer Services and we referred to this line back during the Commissioner's budget, and the amount is \$23,813. Then we need to establish account 3892 Central Dispatch Project 42 which we'll address tomorrow – I believe it's tomorrow – with the Sheriff's Department's budget. But that request is for \$516,000 – well, it's actually \$516,034. I make that in the form of a motion.

Councilmember Hoy: Second.

President Bassemier: I have a second Mr. Hoy. Any discussion on that? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

3891	Central Dispatch/ Computer Services	\$23,813.00
3892	Central Dispatch/ Project 42	\$516,034.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

LOCAL EMERGENCY PLANNING COMMISSION

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Local Emergency Planning on page 182. I will move approval of this as it is listed.

Councilmember Sutton: Second.

President Bassemier: I have a second by Mr. Sutton. Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

LOCAL DRUG FREE COMMUNITY

Councilmember Raben: Okay, page 183. Mr. President, I'll move approval of this budget as it is listed.

President Bassemier: Do I have a second?

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: Second by Mr. Wortman. Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

VETERANS ADMINISTRATION (Continued from page 23)

Councilmember Sutton: One thing, Mr. President, back on page 80 which was the Veterans budget –

President Bassemier: Page 80.

Councilmember Sutton: On line item 3930 which is page 80, was there no adjustment made there, Jim?

Councilmember Raben: 3930 Contractual? No sir.

President Bassemier: That's 3930?

Councilmember Sutton: Yeah 3930. For some reason I was thinking there –

Councilmember Raben: Royce, was that one we had discussed and looked –

Councilmember Sutton: Yeah, I think it was going to be zero on that one.

Councilmember Raben: Okay. And I may stand corrected on that one. Let me...I think I do recall discussing that. Mr. President, could I move that we re-open the Veterans Administration budget on page 80?

President Bassemier: Everybody agreeable?

Councilmember Hoy: Second. You need a 2/3's.

President Bassemier: Everybody in agreement with that, raise your right hand.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

President Bassemier: Okay, that's 2/3. Go ahead, Jim.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Mr. President, I need to amend one line on page 80, and that would be line 3930 Contractual Services and, Mr. Sutton, correct me if I'm wrong, but I think in the past this has been for janitorial services at the Old Coliseum. Now they are in the Old Courthouse and I guess we'll just see how it goes without it.

President Bassemier: Okay. Are you making that in the form of a motion?

Councilmember Winnecke: Second.

President Bassemier: Any more discussion on that? Okay, roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: The motion is to set 3930 in at zero?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

3930	Other Contractual	\$0.00
------	-------------------	--------

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

President Bassemier: That completed number one, the first day of budget hearings for this week. Do I have a motion to recess?

Councilmember Winnecke: So moved.

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: Everybody in favor say aye. We're adjourned.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

(Meeting recessed at 1:17 p.m.)

BUDGET HEARINGS

AUGUST 15, 2001

The Vanderburgh County Council met in session this 15th day of August, 2001 in Room 301 of the Civic Center Complex. The meeting was officially opened by President Ed Bassemier at 12:00 p.m.

Brad Ellsworth: The Vanderburgh County Council is now in session pursuant to adjournment.

President Bassemier: Thanks. I want to welcome everyone to the August 15, 2001 budget hearing. Attendance roll call, please.

COUNCILMEMBER	PRESENT	ABSENT
Councilmember Tornatta	X	
Councilmember Sutton	X	
Councilmember Wortman	X	
Councilmember Hoy	X	
Councilmember Raben	X	
Councilmember Winnecke	X	
President Bassemier	X	

President Bassemier: Would everyone please stand for the Pledge of Allegiance?

(Pledge of Allegiance was given.)

President Bassemier: Last week all the departments had the opportunity to present their budget. Now it's our turn this week to make the cuts we have to make. If we don't make them, the state will make them for us. There will be no arguments today. If we need to correct the numbers, we'll do that, but so I'm going to turn everything over to our Finance Chairman, Mr. Raben.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Mr. President, thank you. Before we get started, I wanted to give a total on yesterday's cuts, and they are \$1,728,070. That's one seven two eight zero seven zero.

FAMILY AND CHILDREN

Councilmember Raben: Okay, first is page 142 Family and Children. Mr. President, I will move, well, all salary lines, FICA, PERF, and Insurance will be set in at our September the 5th meeting. All other line items as they are listed, and make that in the form of a motion.

President Bassemier: Do I have a second?

Councilmember Hoy: Second.

President Bassemier: Seconded by Mr. Hoy. Any discussion? Roll call vote, please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

President Bassemier: Mr. Tornatta, you've got a question?

Councilmember Tornatta: I've got a request. I would like to see, at least have some time to digest some of these numbers before we get a chance to look at this. Why do we not get anything like this before? Before we come in here? I mean, we could talk about it until we are blue in the face, and those could be changed before we get in here. We don't have an idea to know. We're the governing body. We all should have the opportunity to at least formulate some of these numbers.

Councilmember Raben: What paper are you talking, are you speaking of?

Councilmember Tornatta: Well, this is a...this right here goes department by department of the lines, the cuts and where we are set in.

Councilmember Raben: Is this Tuesday, August...is this the Tuesday paper? Well, that's yesterday. That was yesterday.

Councilmember Tornatta: Exactly. Where's Wednesday's?

Councilmember Raben: Those are the cuts that we voted yesterday.

Councilmember Tornatta: Why do I not have that before I look at these budgets?

Councilmember Raben: Okay, well, Troy—

Councilmember Tornatta: Does that make sense?

Councilmember Raben: I guess, I mean, if you want it on paper form that's a different story, but you were told Monday, I did sit down with you and give you all the proposed cuts—

Councilmember Tornatta: You told me that those were going to be faxed over to me, and that has never happened.

Councilmember Raben: I told you you could call and get a faxed copy.

Councilmember Tornatta: I did call and have they been faxed to me, Sandie?

Sandie Deig: No, I just finished them.

Councilmember Raben: Okay.

Councilmember Tornatta: How do I, how do I know any of this information?

Councilmember Raben: Okay. Do you...let me say this and, again, I think, you're trying to get...I think you're way out of line on this. First of all the standard protocol in something like this is not necessarily that you would have anything in advance. Mr. Wortman may want to tell you how it was when he served as a minority member.

Councilmember Tornatta: Well, I mean, if it's political, just say political. That's fine. I mean, obviously, that's what it turns out to be. That's, that's, that's okay, and I'll, then I'll take it as that and understand.

Councilmember Hoy: I don't know that it's political. My understanding...I met with Mr. Raben Monday at 3:00 p.m.

Councilmember Tornatta: Okay.

Councilmember Hoy: And you met with Mr. Raben Monday evening. What he did was go over the same things with me that he went over with you, and I marked them.

Councilmember Tornatta: Right, and well—

Councilmember Hoy: Is what I did. So, I didn't, I mean, I assume that that's what Mr. Wortman had coming in to the meeting. Because my understanding was that this, and this is the first time this has happened since I've been a Councilman where the Finance Chairman sat down with both parties and went through every line with us. That's a new page for me.

Councilmember Tornatta: Jim, we didn't go through every line. Is that correct? You did tell me—

Councilmember Raben: The cuts.

Councilmember Tornatta: —you understand, that I'm saying that you did say that would be sent to me, and I could get those. I guess what I'm saying—

Councilmember Raben: We spent three hours going through these, Troy.

Councilmember Tornatta: —is I have a problem with that when you rattle this off, and I can't make a decision because it happens that we are going through this pretty quickly, then that's, to me that's a little bit of an issue that I should...I don't know why we're going back and forth, we're supposed to set this as a whole body.

President Bassemier: I'll tell you what I'll do for you, then. I know you're new, this is your first year and maybe we need to slow down a little bit. If you've got some numbers in front of you, and Jim makes the recommendation (inaudible) and we'll talk about it.

Councilmember Tornatta: How does that... I would just like to have those before the meeting. I mean, I think that makes all kind of sense. I've got the revenues which is very important to have before you look at budgets as well.

President Bassemier: I tell you, we're going to move on. There's a lot of things you get at the last minute that other departments hand us. (Inaudible) when you only have one day to work on some of this and we've been working night and day on this (inaudible) all of us have, so go ahead.

Councilmember Wortman: I think it's customary that every Councilman do his own cutting. I don't know why we have to rely on other people, you know. It's their responsibility to do your own cutting, whether it's you or me or anybody. When you do that, then we kind of come together and we try to cooperate and work with the majority. I've been a minority member probably longer than anybody here, and they worked with me at times and sometimes they didn't. But that didn't bother me. I did my own cuts, and if they recognized it, fine. If they didn't, fine, you know. But I didn't get mad or shrink up—

Councilmember Tornatta: If we worked out a cut—

Councilmember Wortman: —you do your own cuts.

Councilmember Tornatta: —and we found out it didn't get cut and that's a last minute thing, you understand that I would like to see where that was.

Councilmember Raben: If you had a cut, if you had a cut that I didn't propose, at any time you can make that proposal. You can offer to make that cut. I can amend a motion or you can make a motion, but to say that—

Councilmember Tornatta: But I like to go, I would like to know ahead of time where, you know, what you are talking about so I can come in here and say, okay, now this is where we had a problem, and talk to you on it, or bring it up on the floor. That's what I'm saying. To ask you why that happened differently than maybe we had talked about.

Councilmember Raben: Well, I'm, I'm ready to end discussion but—

Councilmember Tornatta: That's fine.

Councilmember Raben: —then Monday night for three hours was a total waste as far as I'm concerned. Okay, Mr. President—

President Bassemier: Let's move on.

PROSECUTOR

Councilmember Raben: Page 37. This the Prosecutor. All salary lines, FICA, PERF and Insurance will be set in at our September the 5th meeting. Page 39, excuse me, let's back up. Line 1250 1080 Part Time, excuse me, 12601080, Paralegal, be set in at zero. Page 39, line 3372 be set in at \$70,000. All other lines as they are listed, and I make that in the form of a motion.

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: Roll call vote, please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

1260-1080	Paralegal Secretary	\$0.00
3372	Computer Software	\$70,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

PROSECUTORS VICTIMS/WITNESS ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Councilmember Raben: Okay then page 46. I move that this budget be approved as listed.

President Bassemier: Do I have a second?

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: Do I have any discussion?

Councilmember Sutton: What page again?

Councilmember Winnecke: 46.

Councilmember Raben: 46.

Councilmember Sutton: Could you, what about IV-D?

Councilmember Raben: That's next.

Councilmember Sutton: Okay, we had 37 (inaudible) I'm sorry, the page order–

Councilmember Raben: Oh, okay. I was going by the agenda.

Councilmember Sutton: Okay.

Councilmember Raben: Page 46.

President Bassemier: Roll call.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

PROSECUTOR IV-D

Councilmember Raben: Okay, now page 41. Alright, first on page 42, accounts 1290 - 1081, 1300-1081, 1310-1081, 1320 -1081 and 1350-1081.

Unidentified: (Inaudible)

Councilmember Raben: I sure can. Starting with account 1290 -1081, 1300-1081, 1310-1081, 1320-1081 and 1350 -1081 be set in at zero. All others salary lines including FICA, PERF and Insurance will be adjusted at our September the 5th meeting. All other accounts as they are listed and I make that in the form of a motion.

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: (Inaudible)

Councilmember Sutton: Yes, did you say from 1290 -1081 to 1350 -1081?

Councilmember Raben: Yes, sir.

Councilmember Sutton: Okay. Yeah, I was really, really hoping that we could... I know last year, you know, we were able to, we were able to get one position in there, and was really hopeful that we could at least, I know there's five that were requested in Enforcement Officers. Really hoping that we could at least get, at least one, one position out of that given the nature of the backlog and the importance of this, of the whole Child Support area. The fact it handles so many families. I just really think that this should be an area of priority where we should be able to at least put the addable resources there in place. I mean, given where we are, just hate to see us going , going backwards there. I guess, I would request, there's a motion on the floor, request an amendment to that motion to include 1290-1081 at \$24,833 is what I would request.

President Bassemier: Anybody else then?

Councilmember Winnecke: The request was to put one back in? Is that what you said?

Councilmember Sutton: Correct. To put one back in.

Councilmember Raben: Royce, I appreciate your concerns, and I really do. It's my intent to, hopefully, escape this whole process without any additional employees and I'm going

to stick to my guns on that. Although, I would like to do that, but in an effort to make the tough cuts that we've got to do, I'm prepared to say no on this one.

President Bassemier: Anymore discussion? Roll call vote, please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

1290-1081	Enforcement Officer	\$0.00
1300-1081	Enforcement Officer	\$0.00
1310-1081	Enforcement Officer	\$0.00
1320-1081	Enforcement Officer	\$0.00
1350-1081	Enforcement Officer	\$0.00

(Motion carried 5-2/ Councilmembers Tornatta, Sutton opposed.)

President Bassemier: Okay, Jim.

PROSECUTOR PRETRIAL DIVERSION

Councilmember Raben: Alright. Page 178. Mr. President, I will move that this budget, the salary line, FICA, PERF and Insurance will be set in at our September the 5th meeting. Line 5595 as listed and I will make that in the form of a motion.

President Bassemier: Do I have a second?

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: Any discussion? Roll call vote, please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

PUBLIC DEFENDERS OFFICE

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Public Defenders office, page 91. The first cuts would start on page 92. Starting with 1810-1303–

President Bassemier: Jim, you want to put all the salaries and stuff?

Councilmember Raben: I will.

President Bassemier: Okay. I'm sorry.

Councilmember Raben: 1820-1303 and 1830-1303, be set in at zero. All other salary lines including FICA, PERF and Insurance will be in at our September the 5th meeting. Moving down to the other accounts, account 1810, oh, excuse me, 3120 set in at \$2,000, 3130 \$2,000, 3140 \$3,000, 3250 \$4,000, 3310 \$4,000, 3943 \$40,000, 4220, \$6,000. All other accounts as they are listed and I make that in the form of a motion.

Councilmember Hoy: Second.

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

Councilmember Sutton: Jim, one more time. On the last two, I didn't catch those.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, the last two were 3943–

Councilmember Sutton: Okay.

Councilmember Raben: –for \$40,000.

Councilmember Sutton: Okay.

Councilmember Raben: And 4220 for \$6,000.

Councilmember Sutton: Okay, I see it now.

Suzanne Crouch: Didn't you make a change on 3946 and 3947?

Councilmember Sutton: Right, that's—

Councilmember Raben: Oh, excuse me. You're correct.

President Bassemier: Yeah, I was going to say.

Councilmember Raben: Line 3946 should be set in at zero, and 3947 should be set in at \$60,000.

Councilmember Sutton: Right. Okay, thanks.

President Bassemier: Yeah, it's changed.

Councilmember Raben: \$60,000 instead of \$6,000.

Councilmember Sutton: Was there a second already to that motion?

Councilmember Raben: Yeah, I'll and I've amended my motion.

Councilmember Hoy: I'll accept that motion.

President Bassemier: Okay, thank you, sir. Everybody on the same page? Any discussion? Roll call vote, please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

1810-1303	Juv. Court Public Defender	\$0.00
1820-1303	Administrative Assistant	\$0.00
1830-1303	Full-Time Deputy Pub. Defender	\$0.00
3120	Postage/Freight	\$2,000.00
3130	Travel/Mileage	\$2,000.00
3140	Telephone	\$3,000.00
3250	Law Books	\$4,000.00
3310	Training	\$4,000.00
3943	Pauper Expense	\$40,000.00
3946	Pauper Appeals	\$0.00
3947	Pauper Transcripts	\$60,000.00
4220	Office Machines	\$6,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

Councilmember Hoy: Mr. President?

President Bassemier: Yes.

Councilmember Hoy: With your indulgence, may I have a minute?

President Bassemier: You sure can, sir.

Councilmember Hoy: In going over, this is one of my assignments, Public Defender, and in going over that budget we talked about law books, which is our favorite topic. What I would like to see us do, and I don't know who can do this, it's not my kind of thing, but I would help on it. I would like to see what would happen if we took all of the law books from everywhere and found out what it would cost to get those on CD Rom? Perhaps buy one hard set for the library and see if that would save us some money. When I talked with Mr. Owens about this budget, he wasn't sure but he made the suggestion that we might save some money on law books. They would just as soon use them on CD Rom. I don't know how we would go about doing that, but finding out who all uses these and, I know, that we've bought enough computers for the world since I've been sitting here. Except for Darmstadt, but seriously—

President Bassemier: Yeah, I would be scared—

Councilmember Hoy: —it's not a motion, but I was wondering if anybody has any suggestions how we could go about that and see if—

President Bassemier: Okay.

Councilmember Hoy: —I were sitting in one of those offices, and I'm not a great computer expert, but it would be nice to have that on a CD Rom, I know how to do that.

President Bassemier: Yeah. Phil, did you want to, did you want to kind of follow up on that?

Councilmember Hoy: Not really, but I would.

President Bassemier: It was your suggestion.

Councilmember Hoy: That's why I said if somebody else would do it. I was looking at Mr.,

I was looking at Curt Wortman. No, I will put that in motion if nobody objects on the Council. I would just like to see. We may not save a nickel. We may not save any money, but it's a possibility.

President Bassemier: Everybody in favor raise their right hand. Any suggestions to that suggestion? Phil, you got you a new job there, my friend.

Councilmember Hoy: Thanks a lot.

President Bassemier: If you need another one...

Councilmember Hoy: I'll never bring that up again.

Councilmember Sutton: Mr. President?

President Bassemier: Yes, sir.

Councilmember Sutton: Related to their budget, but really relates more to this year—

President Bassemier: Okay.

Councilmember Sutton: On line item 1790—

President Bassemier: What page are you on, sir?

Councilmember Sutton: I'm on page 92.

President Bassemier: 92, okay.

Councilmember Sutton: Line item 1790-1303, and then line item 1800-1303, both of those are Investigative \$25,000, I guess there isn't going to be...there isn't a need for those two positions? If we could have those dollars repealed back to the General Fund.

Councilmember Hoy: I can, I can explain that and I apologize for not, because I mentioned to you and I apologize, Councilman Sutton. We, sometime this year we transferred those, the Council did down to 3482 where you'll see instead of \$50,000, \$35,000. That gives the, that gave him more flexibility in hiring people. So, I'm sure that if there is a repeal there available Mr. Owens will do it. He's done it, he did it on a capital case, and he's very willing if there is some extra money there. That's really the same thing but a reduction and we made that shift.

Councilmember Sutton: Okay. Alright.

Councilmember Hoy: I had forgotten it when we had talked about this. My apologies.

Councilmember Sutton: Alright. Thank you. Just trying to look out for opportunities for us to capture dollars that might be out there.

President Bassemier: Thank you, Mr. Sutton. Mr. Raben.

COUNTY CLERK

Councilmember Raben: County Clerk's office, page 1.

President Bassemier: Page 1.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Mr. President, all salary lines including FICA, PERF and Insurance will be adjusted at our September the 5th meeting. Account 1970, zero.

President Bassemier: Jim, please give a page.

Councilmember Raben: Page 4, I'm sorry. Account 1970, zero. Page 5, 3603, \$50,000. All other accounts as they are listed and I make that in the form of a motion.

President Bassemier: Do I have a second?

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: Second by Mr. Wortman. Any discussion?

Councilmember Sutton: I was going to inquire—

President Bassemier: Mr. Sutton.

Councilmember Sutton: —about line item 1990.

President Bassemier: 1990, Extra Help.

Councilmember Sutton: I guess, since there was an adjustment made on line item 1970, is that..I was, I guess, anticipating there might have been some adjustment on 1990.

Councilmember Raben: Well, we're—

President Bassemier: Extra Help.

Councilmember Raben: We've, we've cut that temporary replacement completely out—

Councilmember Sutton: Okay.

Councilmember Raben: —I don't know that we can make any further adjustments on the other.

Councilmember Sutton: Okay.

President Bassemier: Nice try, Royce. Mr. Tornatta? Okay. Any more discussion? Roll call vote, please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Here.

Councilmember Sutton: Here?

Councilmember Wortman: I mean yes.

Teri Lukeman: Still just counts as one.

President Bassemier: You're tough.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Raben: Sure you are.

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

1970	Temporary Replacement	\$0.00
3603	Record Storage	\$50,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

COUNTY CLERK IV-D

Councilmember Raben: Okay, page 6. Mr. President, I'll move—

Councilmember Hoy: It's difficult to drive from Paradise down to Evansville and then keep things straight, isn't it?

President Bassemier: Alright, Jim. No, you're fine.

Councilmember Raben: Page 6, and I'll move that this budget be approved as listed.

President Bassemier: Who's the second? I'm sorry.

Councilmember Winnecke: I was.

President Bassemier: Mr. Winnecke. Any discussion? Roll call vote, please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

ELECTION OFFICE

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Mr. President, page 70, Election Office. I will move that the Salaries along with FICA and PERF will be finalized in our September the 5th meeting. All other accounts as they are listed and I make that in the form of a motion.

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: Seconded by Mr. Wortman. Any discussion? Roll call vote, please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

SHERIFF DEPARTMENT

Councilmember Raben: Okay, page 15, the Sheriff's. Moving all the way through to page 23. Line item 1750, Clothing Allowance, \$103,000. Line item 2210, \$90,000. 3370, \$150,000, and if everybody recalls yesterday we set the balance of that in the 911 budget, so...3725, zero, 4230, \$100,000, and, again, we yesterday approved \$125,000 in the CCD budget that takes care of all but \$25,000 of that request. Line 4290, \$20,000. I need to back up just a moment and go to, give me just one second to find the correct page. No, that's fine. Then along with this budget was a proposal for a \$900 step increase. It would

be my intent to September the 5th to set that in at a figure of \$700 and I make that in the form of a motion.

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: Second by Mr. Wortman.

Councilmember Tornatta: Did we correct the Process Servers?

Councilmember Raben: We'll do that September 5th.

Councilmember Tornatta: Okay.

President Bassemier: Roll call.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

1750	Clothing Allowance	\$103,000.00
2210	Gas & Oil	\$90,000.00
3370	Computer (Data Mgmt)	\$150,000.00
3725	Meth Lab Cleanup	\$0.00
4230	Motor Vehicles	\$100,000.00
4290	Vehicle Equipment	\$20,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

Councilmember Raben: Is that my mike, or?

President Bassemier: That's mine.

Councilmember Raben: Okay.

President Bassemier: We're having problems.

JAIL

Councilmember Raben: Page 27, Jail.

President Bassemier: Can we switch mikes? Can we switch mikes?

Councilmember Raben: Line, well the first would be page 29, and that would be line 1130-0339. I'm going to move that this be set in a zero, and be put back in the Misdemeanor Housing budget where it was at prior to this. Account 1130-0407, zero. 1520-1051, zero. Line 4230 at the bottom of page 30, zero. The Sheriff has offered to pay that out of his Commissary Account, which we are quite grateful of and thank you. With that I will move that all other accounts be approved as they are listed and I make that in the form of a motion.

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: I have a second by Mr. Wortman. Any discussion? Roll call vote, please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

1130-0339	Detention Officer	\$0.00
1130-0407	Emergency Med. Tech.	\$0.00
1520-1051	Detention Training Officer	\$0.00
4230	Motor Vehicles	\$0.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

SHERIFF MISDEMEANOR HOUSING

Councilmember Raben: Okay, page 181. Line 1370-2780, Detention Officer, should read \$28,936.

Councilmember Sutton: One more time.

Councilmember Raben: \$28,936. Line 1410-2780, zero. The remainder, if I...including FICA, PERF and Insurance will be adjusted at our September the 5th meeting. All other accounts as they are listed and I make that in the form of a motion.

Councilmember Sutton: Second.

President Bassemier: I have a second by Mr. Sutton. Any discussion? Roll call vote, please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

1370-2780	Detention Officer	\$28,936.00
1410-2780	Clerk Typist	\$0.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Community Corrections, page 101. Starting with page 103, account 1460-1361, zero. Moving down to account 1850, \$40,000. 1980, \$4,000. 2260, excuse me, 2260, \$180,000. 3600, \$36,000. 3721, \$8,000. Line 4230 and 4250, zero. All other accounts as they are listed and I make that in the form of a motion.

President Bassemier: Do I have a second?

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: Second by Mr. Wortman. Jim, do you, would you check 1980 on Other Pay? Did you say that stayed the same?

Councilmember Raben: 1980, \$2,000. Yeah, 1980 set in at \$2,000.

President Bassemier: Okay, you said, we need to amend that.

Councilmember Raben: Oh, okay.

President Bassemier: Yeah, you said \$4,000.

Councilmember Raben: I amend my motion for account 1980 on page 104 to be \$2,000, all other motions as—

Councilmember Wortman: I'll accept that.

Councilmember Raben: —they were made.

President Bassemier: Okay.

Councilmember Sutton: Jim, also on line 3600, did you say \$37,000 there? No, that's what it was.

President Bassemier: \$36,000.

Councilmember Raben: Line—

President Bassemier: Where we at?

Councilmember Sutton: 3600.

President Bassemier: \$36,000.

Suzanne Crouch: He set it in—

Councilmember Raben: Yeah, I set it in at \$36,000.

Councilmember Sutton: For some reason I had \$33,660 there, but I don't know what discussion we may have had. Did someone—

Councilmember Raben: Is it \$33,360, is that the correct figure?

Councilmember Sutton: \$36,000? Okay, alright. Thank you.

President Bassemier: Thank you. Anybody else? Roll call vote, please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

1460-1361	Correction Officer	\$0.00
1850	Union Overtime	\$40,000.00
1980	Other Pay	\$2,000.00
2260	Food	\$180,000.00
3600	Rent	\$36,000.00
3721	Probable Cause Urine Drops	\$8,000.00
4230	Motor Vehicles	\$0.00
4250	Miscellaneous Equipment	\$0.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

SHERIFF /VCCC MISDEMEANOR OFFENDER

Councilmember Raben: Okay, page 181, no wait, excuse me, 180.

President Bassemier: Okay, okay.

Councilmember Raben: Mr. President, can I come back to this budget? I've got a question on what I've done—

President Bassemier: Okay.

Councilmember Raben: —and it may take me a minute.

President Bassemier: Okay. Hold it, Jim, let's change the tape.

Councilmember Raben: Okay.

(TAPE CHANGE)

Councilmember Hoy: Nothing, just winds.

Councilmember Sutton: What is the tally? What is the tally up to this point?

Councilmember Hoy: I don't think anybody, I think we have lost track. You and I were doing well.

Councilmember Sutton: Something tells me that you were leaving.

Councilmember Hoy: No, I was working hard because it is difficult for a preacher to be behind a banker, you know what I mean? But, you are a deacon or elder or something, aren't you?

Councilmember Sutton: Deacon.

President Bassemier: What page did he say? What page did we go back to?

Teri Lukeman: Uh, 180.

Councilmember Sutton: That wouldn't put me too far behind.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, back to you, Mr. President. I was in question as to whether or not we needed to act on some changes that were made in this budget back in, sometime back. But, we will finalize those in September when we do the other salaries. So, all salaries, including FICA, PERF and Insurance will be set in at our September 5th meeting. All other lines as they are listed and I make that in the form of a motion.

Councilmember Hoy: Second.

President Bassemier: I have a second, Mr. Hoy. Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

DRUG & ALCOHOL DEFERRAL SERVICE

Councilmember Raben: Okay, page 114, Drug and Alcohol. Mr. President, I'll move that all salary lines, including FICA, PERF and Insurance will be adjusted at our September 5th meeting, all other lines as they are listed and I make that in the form of a motion.

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: Second by Mr. Wortman. Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

SUPERIOR COURT

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Superior Court, page 106 or starting at page 106 through 107, 108, 109, into 110, account 1805-1370, zero, all other salary lines including FICA, PERF and Insurance, will be adjusted at our September 5th meeting. Account 1990, \$500; 2270, \$8,500; 2600, \$25,000; 3310, \$4,000; 3410, \$6,500; 3520, \$11,000; 3720, \$2,500; 3903, \$70,000; and 4210, \$6,000. All other accounts as they are listed and I make that in the form of a motion.

President Bassemier: Do I have a second?

Councilmember Winnecke: Second.

President Bassemier: Second by Mr. Winnecke. Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

1805-1370	Reimbursement Clerk	\$0.00
1990	Extra Help	\$500.00
2270	Juror Meals/Lodging	\$8,500.00
2600	Office Supplies	\$25,000.00
3310	Training	\$4,000.00
3410	Printing	\$6,500.00
3520	Equipment Repair	\$11,000.00
3720	Lab Test	\$2,500.00
3903	Petit Jurors	\$70,000.00
4210	Office Furniture	\$6,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

Councilmember Raben: Mr. President, I need to go back and correct a few of the Prosecutor's budgets that were overlooked when we dealt with the Prosecutor. I think that was what Royce tried to say and I was paying more attention to the agenda than I was the book.

President Bassemier: Okay, we are going to go back to what page, 37?

Councilmember Sutton: Which budget?

Councilmember Raben: We are going to go back to page 44.

President Bassemier: Okay 44.

**PROSECUTORS FEES AND CHECK RECOVERY DIVISION
DRUG LAW ENFORCEMENT PROGRAM
STOP DOMESTIC VIOLENCE
ADULT PROTECTIVE SERVICES**

Councilmember Raben: Mr. President, just to simplify matters, my motion is going to include page 44, 45, 47 and 48.

President Bassemier: Do we need to read those in?

Councilmember Raben: We never approved them, we never voted on them. I am going

to move that-

Unidentified: (Inaudible).

Councilmember Raben: I can do that. I can do that starting with page 44, that is the Prosecutors Fees and Check Recovery Division, 45 is the Drug Law Enforcement Program, 47 is the Stop Domestic Violence and 48 is the Adult Protective Services. The motion is that all, any or all salary line including FICA, PERF and Insurance will be set in at our September 5th meeting. All other lines as they are listed and I make that in the form of a motion.

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: Second by Mr. Wortman. Any discussion? Okay, roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

SUPERIOR COURT SUPPLEMENTAL ADULT PROBATION

Councilmember Raben: Okay, page 176 Supplemental Adult Probation. I will move that all salary lines including FICA, PERF and Insurance will be adjusted at our September 5th meeting and all other lines as they are listed and I make that in the form of a motion.

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: Second by Mr. Wortman. Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

CIRCUIT COURT

Councilmember Raben: Circuit Court, page 97 through 98. I will move that all salary lines including FICA, PERF and Insurance will be set in at our September 5th meeting. I am looking for the number on that. Hold just one moment.

President Bassemier: (Inaudible, microphone not turned on)

Councilmember Raben: Okay, account 3530, should be set in at \$3,000; 3620, \$7,000 and 3903, \$50,000; all other lines as they are listed and I make in the form of a motion.

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: I have a second by Mr. Wortman. Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

3530	Contractual Services	\$3,000.00
3620	Copy Machine Lease	\$7,000.00
3903	Petit Jurors	\$50,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

CIRCUIT COURT SUPPLEMENTAL ADULT PROBATION

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Mr. President, page 173. I will move that all salary lines including FICA, PERF and Insurance will be set in at our September 5th meeting, all other lines as they are listed and I make that in the form of a motion.

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: Second from Mr. Wortman. Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

BOND ISSUE

Councilmember Raben: Okay, page 196, Bond Debt Payment. I will move approval that all items are approved as they are listed.

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: Second by Mr. Wortman. Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

COUNTY AUDITOR

Councilmember Raben: Okay, County Auditor, page 7. Yeah, I move this whole budget be set in at-

Councilmember Sutton: Curt, can handle it from there.

President Bassemier: Can I have a second, Curt?

Sandie Deig: Second, Curt.

Councilmember Sutton: You have to get with it.

Councilmember Wortman: There you go.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, first I will move that all salary lines including FICA, PERF and Insurance will be set in at our September 5th meeting. Starting with account 1020-3310 be set in at \$1,000; 3370, zero, with the intention of moving that to Reassessment; 3401, \$2,500; 3520, Equipment Repair \$2,500 and 4220, zero and again to move that to Reassessment. All other accounts as they are listed and I make that in the form of a

motion.

Councilmember Sutton: Second.

President Bassemier: Second by Mr. Sutton. Any discussion?

Suzanne Crouch: Could we address? We did zero out a line item that was done last week, do you all have that? Is that included in your motion, where we zeroed out a line item and set it a new one?

Councilmember Wortman: Page 7 at the bottom of the page?

Councilmember Raben: No.

Councilmember Sutton: No, 1140-1020.

Suzanne Crouch: We zeroed that out?

Councilmember Sutton: Yeah.

Suzanne Crouch: And then 1020-1260, Tax Mapping Supervisor for \$ 30,225. Do you address that now or will you address that at the September 5th meeting?

Councilmember Raben: We can address it in September or we can address it now, either one.

Councilmember Sutton: We can get a zero in, if?

Councilmember Raben: How does Curt say it, zero? I will amend my motion to include those.

Councilmember Hoy: Give us those again, will you?

Councilmember Raben: Line 1140-1020 and what was the other line?

Suzanne Crouch: 1020-1260.

Councilmember Raben: 1020-1260.

Suzanne Crouch: For \$30,225.

President Bassemier: Okay.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, who was the seconder?

Suzanne Crouch: Royce.

Councilmember Raben: Royce, do you amend your motion?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes, I do accept the...

President Bassemier: Okay, thank you, sir. Okay, any more discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

1140-1020	Tax Corrections/Settlement	\$0.00
1260-1020	Tax Mapping Supervisor	\$30,225.00
3310	Training	\$1,000.00
3370	Computer	\$0.00
3401	Microfilming/Scanning	\$2,500.00
3520	Equipment Repair	\$2,500.00
4220	Office Machines	\$0.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

Councilmember Raben: Mr. President, I will have a more precise figure but this will be real close, but today’s cuts represent about 1.4 million.

President Bassemier: How much?

Councilmember Raben: About 1.4 million.

President Bassemier: 1.4 million. Thank you sir. Okay, page 154?

Councilmember Hoy: Are we doing page 154?

Councilmember Raben: Okay, page 154, thank you, Phil, I was about to adjourn this thing.

Teri Lukeman: What department is that?

Councilmember Raben: Mr. President, this is Reassessment, I am going to move that nothing, on anything on the Reassessment budgets. We will take ample time to work on those and adjust those in the fall.

President Bassemier: Okay.

Councilmember Winnecke: So, you are going to leave it set in at zero?

Councilmember Raben: Yes, we will leave them as listed. This is one of those budgets, pertaining to Reassessment, that the funds are already in place and they really don't have to go through this process and set these in at any time.

Suzanne Crouch: Those line items that you zeroed out and said to put in Reassessment, are you going to move those in for those budgets or do you want us to file an additional for next year?

Councilmember Raben: No, no, what the intent is on the Reassessment budgets is in October or November to come back in and set all of those budgets in. We would like to and actually a couple of councilmen have suggested that we try to sit down one by one or maybe a couple at a time with the Assessors offices and try to work out their assessment budget and in the past what we have done on this Council in terms of establishing Reassessment budgets is that we have tried to set guidelines based upon the number of parcels, which tend to work pretty good. So, you know and then there is the other question or the other problem with Reassessment budgets is that in the past, some of the Assessors, not all of them, have asked for and yet to be successful in getting it, but they have asked for an incentive for their pay based on the number of parcels. You know again, we will have to work all of that out and that is certainly not the direction that I am looking for. But, I feel that they were elected to do the job at the salary that they earn and they should make do with that. But, we will adjust those in the fall.

President Bassemier: Okay. I have a motion to, Mr. Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: I want to see now before we forget it. Jim Raben has spent an outstanding amount of time coordinating with every member of this Council and I think that he should be acknowledged to that because he has really done a real job on that and I think he has spent a lot of time. A lot of people are running around out here in Vanderburgh County without tires or slick tires and that's why, because he is spending his time on government.

President Bassemier: Do you think that Tornatta's tire business has picked up, then?

Councilmember Sutton: He has a big enough family, I am pretty sure that if he is not there then somebody is going to pick it up.

Councilmember Winnecke: I am sure that Curt would buy two from Troy and two from Jim.

President Bassemier: Do I have a motion to recess until tomorrow?

Councilmember Wortman: So moved.

Councilmember Raben: Is it okay if I go ahead and invoice you for a few tires to make up for it?

Councilmember Hoy: I was checking your rolling stock.

(Meeting recessed at 12:58 p.m.)

VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL
BUDGET HEARINGS
AUGUST 16, 2001

The Vanderburgh County Council met in session this 16th day of August, 2001 in Room 301 of the Civic Center Complex. The meeting was officially opened by President Ed Bassemier at 12:08 p.m.

President Bassemier: I want to welcome everyone to the August 16, 2001 budget hearings. Roll call, please.

COUNCILMEMBER	PRESENT	ABSENT
Councilmember Tornatta	X	
Councilmember Sutton	X	
Councilmember Wortman	X	
Councilmember Hoy	X	
Councilmember Raben	X	
Councilmember Winnecke	X	
President Bassemier	X	

President Bassemier: Would everyone please stand for the Pledge of Allegiance?

(Pledge of Allegiance was given.)

President Bassemier: When it started last week, the County Council, we have given all the department heads a chance to present their budgets. We heard your arguments and your suggestions. So, now this week is our turn and we have to, we have to make some cuts. So, I don't want to hear any arguments today out of anyone. We are going to hear this from our Finance Chairman. I know what I'm not going to put up with today is any derogatory remarks. So, let's stay focused on the issues and we'll get this over with. I'm going to turn it over to our Finance Chairman, Mr. Raben.

Councilmember Hoy: Mr. President, I was conversing, this is good news. Mr. Raben and I were talking and we have some good news from our bonding folks, Crowe Chizek, which he has and I think Council needs to hear it. I just heard it and think it needs to be passed on, if you don't mind.

President Bassemier: Okay.

Councilmember Raben: It's really, I mean, I don't have to cover what was said yesterday, but Royce, or Lloyd or even Suzanne was part of the meeting, but we did have a refreshing meeting yesterday morning with Mike Claytor from Crowe Chizek and he had expressed that, you know, how financially sound and how far ahead of the game we were in this county and that we were fortunate to be in the shape we're in. I just thought I might share that with everyone. If any of these other gentleman would like to—

President Bassemier: Thank you, Jim. You know, there is probably more than sixty years experience with all of us together on this Council, so I know the last nine years we've been very fiscally sound. So, I would like to ask everyone, let's do our job and work through all this. Go ahead, Mr. Finance Chairman. Anybody else got...Mr. Sutton.

Councilmember Sutton: Nothing more that I can add really to it. I mean, I think it's just the early stages of...I was exploring our options and it's something I think that we owe ourselves and the public a chance to know where we stand in proceeding forward with what is going to be a very large project with this jail. We don't want to go into it with, you know, with our eyes closed on this thing. It's a pretty hefty project. One of the larger projects we

will have taken on. It's a very important project being it's been kind of put on a shelf for some thirty years. You know, with the meeting, with the information presented we are just kind of looking forward to additional things coming forward, information in terms of what our options may be in terms of financing this and just express my appreciation for Commissioner Fanello and the others that were instrumental in putting at least this initial meeting together, but there is more work to be done.

President Bassemier: Right. Thank you, Mr. Sutton. Mr. Wortman.

Councilmember Wortman: I think that's what happens when the Council is conservative and still tries to be practical. The end result is that is why we are strong financially. Thank you.

President Bassemier: Thank you.

CONVENTION AND VISITORS BUREAU & TOURISM CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Mr. President, page 186, Convention and Visitors. I have a list of several additions and some cuts that were just actually finalized effective this morning. So, starting with account, well, starting with account 3000 page 187, Bond and Insurance. The correct figure is \$7,700. 3140, \$24,500. 3380, \$5,500. 3530, \$119,000. 3601, \$25,500. Page 188, 3700 for \$31,870. 3792, \$74,000. 3797, \$11,000. 3994, \$25,000. Then we need to insert a new account number which is 4111, and the amount is \$213,984. That's \$213,984 and that account will read Improvements. Account 4111, Improvements. 4220, \$18,000. Okay, all salary lines, FICA, PERF and Insurance will be adjusted at our September the 5th meeting. All other 2000, 3000 and 4000 accounts as they were originally submitted. I make that in the form of a motion.

Councilmember Sutton: Second.

President Bassemier: Second, Mr. Sutton. Any discussion?

Councilmember Hoy: Question, on the new line 4111, Improvements, what does that include?

Councilmember Raben: Mr....if we turn to page 89 on the Tourism Capital Account we are reducing that line 4060...it's on page 189.

President Bassemier: Oh, 189. Yeah, Transportation.

Councilmember Raben: We're reducing that figure by that amount. It's the only line on that budget, 4060 on page 189.

Suzanne Crouch: Bond payment.

Councilmember Hoy: That's the bond payment on the Pagoda.

Suzanne Crouch: That's correct.

President Bassemier: Yeah.

Suzanne Crouch: No, Centre.

Councilmember Raben: Well, let's, Royce, would you, can I amend my motion to also include the Tourism Capital Improvement Fund on page 189, and we'll just set it in too and that will maybe clarify things better. That, this will pertain to account 4060, should read \$213,984.

Councilmember Sutton: I'll accept that amendment.

President Bassemier: Okay thank you, Mr. Sutton. Anymore discussion on that? Roll call vote, please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

CONVENTION & VISITORS BUREAU

3000	Bond & Insurance	\$7,700.00
3140	Telephone	\$24,500.00
3380	Photography/Blue Prints	\$5,500.00
3530	Contractual Services	\$119,000.00
3601	Rent-Show Place	\$25,500.00
3700	Dues & Subscriptions	\$31,870.00
3792	Customer Sales	\$74,000.00
3797	Research	\$11,000.00
3994	Special/Matching Grants	\$25,000.00
4111	Improvements	\$213,984.00
4220	Office Machines	\$18,000.00

TOURISM CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT

4060	Transportation Ctr/Pagoda	\$213,984.00
------	---------------------------	--------------

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

COUNTY RECORDER

Councilmember Raben: Okay, page 13, County Recorder. Okay, Mr. President, all salary

lines including FICA, PERF and Insurance will be set in at our September the 5th meeting. Line 1990, Extra Help, \$6,000. All other accounts as they are listed and I will make that in the form of a motion.

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: Second by Mr. Wortman. Any discussion? Roll call vote, please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

1990	Extra Help	\$6,000.00
------	------------	------------

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

COUNTY HIGHWAY

Councilmember Raben: Okay, page 130, County Highway. I'll move that all salary lines including FICA, PERF and Insurance will be set in at our September the 5th meeting. Line on page 133, line 1750, Clothing Allowance, \$41,000. Has everyone found that? 1990, Extra Help, zero. 2210, \$130,000. 2220, \$40,000. 2230, \$60,000. Is everybody still with me?

Councilmember Sutton: No, I didn't get that last one though, Jim.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, it's, I'll start back with the 2000 accounts. 2210 is \$130,000. 2220, \$40,000. 2230, \$60,000. 2300, \$21,000. 2530, \$60,000. 2550, \$55,000. That's 2550, \$55,000. 2560, Concrete, we are going to set in at zero and move that to the Cum Bridge Account. 2580, \$60,000. 2590, \$1,500. 3010, \$260,000. 3010, \$260,000. Page 135, account 3370, \$5,000. 3630, \$30,000. All other accounts as they are listed and I make that in the form of a motion. I might also add that these cuts were provided by the County Engineer and the Superintendent.

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: Second by Mr. Wortman. Any discussion?

David Mosby: Can I say something?

President Bassemier: Go ahead.

David Mosby: I think you made a \$300 error. You put the Paint Account in at \$1,500 and it should be \$1,800. We cut \$1,500 out of it.

President Bassemier: What item is that, Mr. Mosby?

David Mosby: 2590. I think you just made an error.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, you made, okay.

David Mosby: The line item is 2590.

Councilmember Raben: It should be \$1,800.

David Mosby: Instead of \$1,500.

Unidentified: (Not at mike.) Sorry about that.

Councilmember Raben: We ran through this pretty quick, so.

Unidentified: (Not at mike.) Yeah.

Councilmember Raben: No problem.

David Mosby: That's the only thing I caught.

Councilmember Raben: I would like to amend my motion for account 2590 to read \$1,800.

President Bassemier: Okay, you—

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: —Mr. Wortman.

Councilmember Wortman: The amendment is fine.

President Bassemier: Okay. Okay, any more discussion on it? Roll call vote, please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

1750	Clothing Allowance	\$41,000.00
1990	Extra Help	\$0.00
2210	Gas & Oil	\$130,000.00
2220	Tires & Tubes	\$40,000.00
2230	Garage & Motor	\$60,000.00
2300	Uniforms	\$21,000.00
2530	Bituminous Materials	\$60,000.00
2550	Sand & Gravel	\$55,000.00
2560	Concrete	\$0.00
2580	Calcium & Chloride	\$60,000.00
2590	Paint	\$1,800.00
3010	Other Insurance	\$260,000.00
3370	Computer (Data Mgmt)	\$5,000.00
3630	Equipment Lease & Rental	\$30,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

CUM BRIDGE

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Mr. President, Cum Bridge. Starting at page 136, all salary lines including FICA, PERF and Insurance will be adjusted at our September the 5th meeting. In the 2000 Accounts, we are going to add a line. The account number will be 2560, Concrete. 2560, Concrete, in the amount of \$22,000. I will move that all other lines as previously listed and I make that in the form of a motion.

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: Second by Mr. Wortman. Discussion? Roll call vote, please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

2560	Concrete	\$22,000.00
------	----------	-------------

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

LOCAL ROADS AND STREETS

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Local Road and Streets on page 51.

Councilmember Sutton: 151.

Councilmember Raben: 151, excuse me. Starting with line 3190, Solid Waste Disposal. Should read \$12,923. 4310, Road Equipment, \$210,000. \$210,000. All other accounts as they are listed and I make that in the form of a motion.

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: Second by Mr. Wortman. Discussion? Roll call vote, please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

3190	Solid Waste Disposal	\$12,923.00
4310	Road Equipment	\$210,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

Councilmember Raben: Mr. President?

President Bassemier: Yes, sir.

Councilmember Raben: Before we move on to Voters Registration, I guess, Councilman Hoy had started something, or had asked that I speak on something and I forgot to bring up another issue. If we can, I would like to go in and re-open the CCD budget? And remove something from that budget. So, I would like to make a motion to open the CCD account.

President Bassemier: Everybody in favor raise their right hand. Wanting to open the CCD Account. Okay, Mr. Raben.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

REOPEN CCD ACCOUNT (Continued from page 11)

Councilmember Raben: Okay. CCD Account is on 141. Mr. President, I had spoke with SCT this morning as to whether or not we could possibly get more bang for our buck, or a better deal should we purchase the Court System updates yet this year. They had mentioned that the contract that they are, or the quotes that they are using today, by year's end will be a year and a half old, about 18 months old. That, you know, we could look for the equipment and software, you know, basically, everything will go up probably significantly in 2002, because of the age of the, you know, price quotes that we are still using. So, what I would recommend that we do, would be on account 1300-4050, we previously set this at \$350,000. I would entertain that we set that in at zero, and would instruct our Executive Assistant, Sandie Deig, to work with the people at SCT and the Courts and the County Clerk and try to get that out for bid yet this year.

Unidentified: (Inaudible.)

Councilmember Raben: Out of the County General. Out of our unappropriated balance.

Councilmember Hoy: I second the motion, sir.

President Bassemier: I got a second by Mr. Hoy. Discussion, Mr. Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Understanding what we're trying to do here, I know we are trying to take advantage of any discounts that might be available by purchasing them a little earlier, but at the same time, I know software moves very rapidly in terms of updates and things of that nature, I mean, are we going to be in a situation where we purchase it this year, next year they come out with a new model and we're already behind the stick on this thing?

Councilmember Raben: That's, that's, I mean, that's always a possibility, but I don't know this particular package that they are looking at, I don't know that there would be any changes. They probably would simply just go out for bid this year and write a PO for it. They probably won't take delivery on it until next year.

Councilmember Sutton: I think it would be a good question for us to ask.

Councilmember Raben: That I can't--

Councilmember Sutton: When they intend to bring out their next update on the software, because the next thing you know, 18 months later they will be making a sale to us of well you need to get the latest and newest model on this when we've already just outlaid \$350,000--

Councilmember Raben: Right.

Councilmember Sutton: --or whatever the amount might be.

Councilmember Raben: Sandie, I think you could spearhead that, couldn't you? That we do get the newest, most up to date software package?

Councilmember Hoy: Mr. Sutton is right. This is the vestigial remains of the world Communist conspiracy.

Councilmember Sutton: Like that word.

Councilmember Hoy: What this...the other thing this does that I'm happy about. If you don't know the word vestigial I'll...I do know the definition, because I looked it up first. This does free up small (inaudible) which we think will be, is a good thing to do given some of the things we are facing, and we are able to do it.

President Bassemier: Anybody else? Okay, we have a motion and a second to roll call vote, please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

1300-4050	Courts Computer System	\$0.00
-----------	------------------------	--------

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

VOTERS REGISTRATION

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Voters Registration, page 72. Alright, I'll move that all salary lines including FICA, PERF and Insurance will be set in at our September the 5th meeting. All other accounts as they are listed and I make that in the form of a motion.

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: Second by Mr. Wortman. Discussion? Roll call vote, please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

AREA PLAN COMMISSION

Councilmember Raben: Okay, page 76, Area Plan. First I'll move that all salary lines including FICA, PERF and Insurance be adjusted at our September the 5th meeting. Turn to page 77 at the bottom, account 3610, Legal Services, \$40,000. The bottom of page 78, account 4250, Miscellaneous Equipment, \$10,000. All other accounts as they are listed and make that in the form of a motion.

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: Second by Mr. Wortman. Discussion? Roll call vote, please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

3610	Legal Services	\$40,000.00
4250	Miscellaneous Equipment	\$10,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

SURVEYOR / SURVEYOR CORONER PERPETUATION / SURVEYOR MAPS

Councilmember Raben: Okay, County Surveyor, page 32. We might along with this motion, Mr. President, I'm also going to, we'll take the perpetuation, the Surveyor's Perpetual Fund as well, which will be on page 179.

President Bassemier: Alright, sir.

Councilmember Raben: Yeah. Let's throw in the Map Fund as well.

President Bassemier: Okay.

Councilmember Raben: So, starting with page 32, I'll move that all salary lines including FICA, PERF and Insurance will be adjusted at our September the 5th meeting. All 2000 and 3000 accounts as they are listed. Page 179, page 179, all salary line including FICA will be set in at our September the 5th meeting. All other accounts as they are listed. Now to 153.

Councilmember Sutton: Is that the Perpetuation Fund or the Perpetual Fund?

President Bassemier: Both.

Councilmember Raben: Both, it's listed...that threw me too when I looked at that, I thought--

Councilmember Winnecke: It just keeps going and going--

Councilmember Sutton: Yeah. Continuously changing.

Unidentified: Like those little battery (inaudible)

Councilmember Raben: Page 153, all accounts as are listed and I make this in the form of a motion.

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: Second by Mr. Wortman. Discussion? Roll call vote, please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

HEALTH DEPARTMENT

Councilmember Raben: Alright, page 143, Health Department.

Councilmember Tornatta: Mr. Raben? Is there anything that can be set in the Reassessment from the Assessor's Office? Like the...anything in the Mapping, Office Supplies or anything? Can that be set over there?

Councilmember Raben: From which budget?

Councilmember Tornatta: From any of the reassessment budgets? I didn't...would they have anything to do with that?

Councilmember Raben: No. No. That's a—

Councilmember Tornatta: I didn't know if doing the maps would constitute any type of reassessment fee out of there.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, page 143 through 144 through 145 into 146 all salary lines including FICA, PERF and Insurance will be set in at our September the 5th meeting. All 2000 accounts, 3000 accounts as they are listed. Moving down to account 4112, one moment please, that's supposed to be, wasn't it, it should be set in at zero. All other

accounts as they are listed and I make that in the form of a motion.

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: I have a second by Mr. Wortman. Discussion?

Councilmember Hoy: Just a point, Mr. President, in case anybody wonders. We discussed this the other day, but 4112, those funds are already, as the Auditor will tell you, in the bank and designated for that. So, we don't need to vote.

President Bassemier: That is correct. Okay, anybody else? Roll call vote, please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

4112	Health Dept. 123 Main St.	\$0.00
------	---------------------------	--------

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

AIRPORT

Councilmember Raben: Okay, 149, Airport. I'll move all salary lines including FICA, PERF and Insurance will be set in September the 5th. Moving down to account 2300, Uniforms, the correct figure is \$21,800. Account 3000, the correct figure is \$606,000. 3310, \$12,000. 4250, \$17,000.

Councilmember Sutton: \$117,000 or \$17,000?

Councilmember Raben: \$117,000, excuse me. \$117,000. All other accounts as they are listed and I make that in the form of a motion.

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: I have a second by Mr. Wortman. Discussion? Roll call vote, please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

2300	Uniforms	\$21,800.00
3000	Bond & Insurance	\$606,000.00
3310	Training	\$12,000.00
4250	Miscellaneous Equipment	\$117,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

ARMSTRONG TOWNSHIP ASSESSOR (Continued on page 80)

Councilmember Raben: Okay, now we are getting into the Assessor budgets, and I had spoke yesterday that pertaining to the Reassessment budgets, we will address those the latter part of this year in terms of setting those in. I still would like to see us try to set down with them one by one or a couple at a time and try and resolve some equitable budgets to work with. I will start on page 53, Armstrong Assessor. All salary lines including FICA, PERF and Insurance will be adjusted at our September the 5th meeting. Account 1990, Extra Help, we can set in at zero, and that's with the intent of moving that to Reassessment. And 2600, Office Supplies, zero, and move that to Reassessment. All other accounts as they are listed and I make that in the form of a motion.

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: Second, Mr. Wortman. Discussion? Roll call vote, please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

1990	Extra Help	\$0.00
2600	Office Supplies	\$0.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

Councilmember Raben: As a matter of clarification I might ask our Auditor, do I need to go into the Assessment budgets, or will that take care of?

Suzanne Crouch: Are you zeroing, aren't you zeroing out the Reassessment budgets?

Councilmember Raben: Right.

Suzanne Crouch: So, you will need to make a motion to that effect. Then you will have to go and move these lines into—

Councilmember Raben: Okay.

Suzanne Crouch: —those budgets.

Councilmember Raben: Later, right.

Suzanne Crouch: You can do that September 5th, if you want.

ARMSTRONG ASSESSOR / REASSESSMENT

Councilmember Raben: Right, right. Okay. So, let's turn to page 158. This is Armstrong Assessor/ Reassessment. I'm going to move at this time that this budget be set in at zero.

Councilmember Sutton: Second.

President Bassemier: I have a second. Any discussion? Roll call vote, please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

CENTER TOWNSHIP ASSESSOR / REASSESSMENT

Councilmember Raben: Okay, page 55, Center Assessor. I'm going to move that all salary lines including FICA, PERF and Insurance will be set in at our September the 5th meeting. 1990, Extra Help, zero. 2600, Office Supplies, zero. 3130, Travel & Mileage, zero. 3310, Training, zero. On page 160, Center Assessor/ Reassessment, I'm going to move that this budget be set in at zero. All other lines on their standard budget, starting at page 55 as they are listed and I make that in the form of a motion.

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: I have a second by Mr. Wortman. Discussion? Roll call vote, please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

1990	Extra Help	\$0.00
2600	Office Supplies	\$0.00
3130	Travel & Mileage	\$0.00
3310	Training	\$0.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

Councilmember Tornatta: On the Armstrong budget, did we set the Travel & Mileage at zero? I didn't hear that.

Councilmember Raben: I believe so. No, we did not.

Councilmember Hoy: I move to re-open it.

Councilmember Raben: And I'll second.

REOPEN ARMSTRONG ASSESSOR (Continued from page 77)

President Bassemier: Okay.

Councilmember Hoy: We have to vote on it now.

Councilmember Raben: Yeah. We have to vote on it again.

President Bassemier: Vote on it again. Everybody in favor raise their right hand. Passes, thanks.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

President Bassemier: Thank you, Mr. Tornatta, for pointing that out.

Councilmember Raben: Mr. President, I'll move that 3130 be set in at zero, for the Armstrong Assessor's budget on page 53.

Councilmember Hoy: Second.

President Bassemier: I have a second. Discussion?

Councilmember Sutton: Training?

President Bassemier: I'm sorry.

Councilmember Sutton: Did you get the Training?

Councilmember Raben: I don't see any Training.

Councilmember Sutton: 33...oh, I'm sorry, no. I'm looking at the wrong one. I'm already, ready for the next one.

President Bassemier: Thanks for looking at it. Okay, any discussion? Roll call vote, please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

3130	Travel & Mileage	\$0.00
------	------------------	--------

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

Teri Lukeman: I would like to change the tape.

President Bassemier: We're going to change the tape.

(TAPE CHANGE)

GERMAN TOWNSHIP ASSESSOR / REASSESSMENT

Councilmember Raben: Alright, page 57, German Township Assessor. I will move all salary lines including FICA, PERF and Insurance will be set it at our September 5th meeting. Office Supplies, 2600, zero; 3130, Travel and Mileage, zero; and all other accounts as they are listed and I make that in form of a motion.

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: : Second, Mr. Wortman. Discussion? Roll call vote please.

Councilmember Tornatta: Hold it-

President Bassemier: Do you want to do Reassessment at the same time?

Councilmember Raben: Oh, excuse me, yes, 162, Reassessment. German Township Reassessment, I move that this budget set in at zero.

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: Okay, second. Any discussion? Okay. Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

2600	Office Supplies	\$0.00
3130	Travel/Mileage	\$0.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7 - 0)

KNIGHT TOWNSHIP ASSESSOR / REASSESSMENT

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Knight Township Assessor, page 59. All salary lines, including FICA, PERF and Insurance will adjusted at our September 5th meeting. Account 1990 Extra Help, zero; 2600, Office Supplies, zero; 3130, zero; 3310, zero; 4220, at the bottom, 4220, zero; all other accounts as they are listed and I make that in the form of a motion, excuse me, lets go to page 164, Knight Reassessment, in this motion, I move that this budget be set in at zero and all other accounts on the standard budget as they are listed and I make that in the form of a motion.

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: Second, Mr. Wortman. Discussion?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes, the Communications, does that not qualify for Reassessment or do we know what...

Councilmember Raben: On?

Councilmember Tornatta: What that has to do with? Communications.

President Bassemier: What page, Troy?

Councilmember Tornatta: Page 60, number 3141, Communications. I thought that had something to do with the linking up, computer system for?

Councilmember Raben: I am unsure. We could, we will just let it in there, that is fine.

President Bassemier: Okay, thank you, Troy. Mr. Wortman.

Councilmember Wortman: Mr. Raben is starting to get that zero down pretty pat.

President Bassemier: Yeah, he is doing a good job, isn't he? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

1990	Extra Help	\$0.00
2600	Office Supplies	\$0.00
3130	Travel/Mileage	\$0.00

(Table continued next page)

3310	Training	\$0.00
------	----------	--------

4220	Office Machines	\$0.00
------	-----------------	--------

(Motion unanimously approved 7 - 0)

PERRY TOWNSHIP ASSESSOR / REASSESSMENT

Councilmember Raben: Okay, page 62, Perry Township Assessor. All salary lines including FICA, PERF and Insurance will be adjusted at our September 5th meeting, account 1990, zero; 2600, zero; 3130, zero; 3310 on page 63, zero; all other accounts in this budget as they are listed. Now, page 166, Perry Township Assessor Reassessment, with this motion that this budget be set in at zero.

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: I have a second from Mr. Wortman. Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

1990	Extra Help	\$0.00
2600	Office Supplies	\$0.00
3130	Travel/Mileage	\$0.00
3310	Training	\$0.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7 - 0)

PIGEON TOWNSHIP ASSESSOR / REASSESSMENT

Councilmember Raben: Okay, page 64, Pigeon Township Assessor. Page 64, I move that all salary line items including FICA, PERF and Insurance to be adjusted at our September 5th meeting, 1990, zero; 2600, zero; page 65, 3130, zero; 3310, zero; 3370, zero; and 3372, zero and now 4210, zero; and 4220, zero. In this budget all other accounts a they are listed. Now, turn to page 68, 168, Pigeon Reassessment, I move that this budget be set in at zero.

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: I have a second from Mr. Wortman. Discussion? No discussion. Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

1990	Extra Help	\$0.00
2600	Office Supplies	\$0.00
3130	Travel/Mileage	\$0.00
3310	Training	\$0.00
3370	Computer (Data Mgmt)	\$0.00
3372	Computer Software	\$0.00
4210	Office Furniture	\$0.00
4220	Office Machines	\$0.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

SCOTT TOWNSHIP ASSESSOR / REASSESSMENT

Councilmember Raben: Okay, page 66, Scott. All salary lines including FICA, PERF and Insurance will be adjusted September 5th; 1990, zero; 2600, zero; 3310, zero;

Suzanne Crouch: 3130?

Councilmember Raben: Well, I am dyslexic. Yeah, 3130.

President Bassemier: Jim is just seeing if we are awake. Okay.

Councilmember Raben: 3130; 3371 on the top of page 67, zero; the bottom of page 67, 4220, zero; all other items on this budget as they are listed. Now, page 170, Scott Reassessment, this budget should be set in at zero.

Councilmember Hoy: Second.

President Bassemier: I have a second by Mr. Hoy. Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

1990	Extra Help	\$0.00
2600	Office Supplies	\$0.00
3130	Travel/Mileage	\$0.00
3371	Computer Hardware	\$0.00
4220	Office Machines	\$0.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7 - 0)

UNION TOWNSHIP ASSESSOR / REASSESSMENT

Councilmember Raben: Union Assessor, page 68. All salary lines including FICA, PERF and Insurance to be set in on September 5th, account 2600, zero; account 3130, zero; 3370, zero; all other accounts as they are listed. Now page 172, Union Township Reassessment, this budget should be set in at zero and I make that in the form of a motion.

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: Second by Wortman. Discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

Councilmember Hoy: Before we move on-

President Bassemier: Mr. Hoy.

Councilmember Hoy: Mr. Raben did you include 3310, Training?

Councilmember Raben: On what page?

Councilmember Hoy: On page 68. Is that to be in at zero or \$200?

Councilmember Raben: No, I did not. That one would certainly qualify and I can go back in.

Councilmember Hoy: I move to reopen.

Councilmember Raben: And I second.

President Bassemier: Okay, thank you sir. Everybody in favor, raise their right hand.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

Councilmember Raben: Okay, account 3310, Training. Excuse me, let's clarify Union Township Assessor, page 68, line 3310 should be set in at zero.

Councilmember Tornatta: The Communications have been \$800, \$800, \$400, is GIS qualified in the Reassessment Fees? Because that is \$2,000 right there, if we want it. I don't know. You said pass. That is fine if we don't want it, if we do, then that is two more thousand dollars out of three accounts.

Paul Hatfield: Well, you better cut their budget. You just cut out 3310 in Pigeon for \$2,000.

Councilmember Raben: He is talking about two different accounts.

Councilmember Tornatta: I am talking about two accounts.

Councilmember Raben: It is up to, as long as we are consistent with all of them.

Councilmember Tornatta: I think that is for what, GIS? That is a cable for-

Councilmember Raben: We have been consistent with all of them. We have not taken out of that account for any of them, have we?

Councilmember Tornatta: I don't think some of them have it in their account, that is what I was, so.

President Bassemier: Okay, Jim.

Councilmember Raben: I think that you seconded by motion, didn't you? Okay.

Councilmember Hoy: Um, um.

President Bassemier: Okay, any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

2600	Office Supplies	\$0.00
3130	Travel/Mileage	\$0.00
3370	Computer (Data Mgmt)	\$0.00
3310	Training	\$0.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

President Bassemier: Jim?

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Troy, Councilman Hoy just brought up a great suggestion. Rather than go in, you know, if that was the pleasure of this body and reopening each one of those budgets to pull out that small line, we can adjust those September 5th when we are already opening those budgets, so. Okay, County Assessor, page 49.

COUNTY ASSESSOR / REASSESSMENT

Councilmember Raben: All salary lines including FICA, PERF and Insurance will be set in on September 5th. Account 1990, zero; 2600, zero; page 50, account 3310, 3370, 3371, 3372, zero.

Councilmember Sutton: Jim?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Councilmember Sutton: Did you call that 3310 or did you call that 3130?

Councilmember Raben: Uh, 3310. But, I did skip 3130, let me clarify the entire motion. All salary lines including FICA, PERF and Insurance will be set in at our

September 5th meeting, 1990, Extra Help. zero; 2600, zero; 3130, zero; 3310, zero; 3370, zero; 3371, zero; 3372, zero; 3700, \$3,500; on page 51, account 4220, zero; and all other accounts as they are listed, page 155 --

Councilmember Wortman: Page 157.

Councilmember Raben: Page 155 is what I've got.

President Bassemier: Page 155.

Councilmember Wortman: It is, I'm sorry.

Councilmember Raben: County Assessor/Reassessment, zero.

Councilmember Hoy: Second.

President Bassemier: Second. Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

1990	Extra Help	\$0.00
2600	Office Supples	\$0.00
3130	Travel/Mileage	\$0.00
3310	Training	\$0.00

(Table continued next page)

3370	Computer (Data Mgmt)	\$0.00
3371	Computer Hardware	\$0.00
3372	Computer Software	\$0.00
3700	Dues/Subscriptions	\$3,500.00
4220	Office Machines	\$0.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

PROPERTY TAX ASSESSMENT BOARD OF APPEALS / REASSESSMENT

Councilmember Raben: Okay, page 52, Property Tax Assessment Board of Appeals.

I am going to move that this budget along with page 157, both be set in at zero and I make that in the form of a motion.

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: I have a second from Mr. Wortman. Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

SALES DISCLOSURE FEES

Councilmember Raben: Okay, page 185. This is the Sales Disclosure Account, starting with account 3310, the correct figure is \$10,000 3370 as it is listed and I make that in the form of a motion.

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: I have a second from Mr. Wortman. Discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

3310	Training	\$0.00
------	----------	--------

(Motion unanimously approved 7 - 0)

COUNTY COUNCIL

Councilmember Raben: Okay, the old County Council. Which one of these is mine, because I am going to zero out the other ones.

Councilmember Sutton: Well, you will never get a vote to pass it.

President Bassemier: Maybe we ought to reopen and get rid of him.

Councilmember Raben: Okay. Mr. President, I am going to move that all salary lines, including FICA, PERF and Insurance will be adjusted at our September 5th meeting.

(Inaudible)

Councilmember Raben: Not nearly enough, I can tell you that. Page 127, account 3460, \$17,000; 3461, zero and all other accounts as they are listed and I make that in the form of a motion.

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: I have a second from Mr. Wortman. Discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Second. Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes. Sandie, we are going to have to work on this budget. A five million dollar increase is way too much. You are buying too many pencils.

Sandie Deig: You guys use too many.

President Bassemier: Any discussion?

Teri Lukeman: I need to finish this. Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

3460	Consultant	\$17,000.00
3461	Court Technology	\$0.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7 - 0)

President Bassemier: Okay, that looks like about it. Thank you, Mr. Raben. I want to thank Sandie and Mrs. Crouch and Teri for all of your hard work and the rest of the Councilmembers and anybody got anything else to say? You did a fantastic job, Jim.

Councilmember Wortman: Jim did a remarkable job and I appreciate it.

Councilmember Winnecke: Mr. President.

President Bassemier: Mr. Winnecke.

Councilmember Winnecke: Just one little thing along those lines. Sarah and Sandie spent a lot of time above and beyond the call to try and crunch these numbers for us and provide information for all of us. Royce has something for one of them and I have something for the other from all of the Councilmembers for all of your hard work and the last two weeks.

Councilmember Sutton: Yes, we appreciate it.

President Bassemier: Sarah, I didn't forget you on this. I saw you over there. Just a little bonus.

Councilmember Hoy: It is a round trip to Darmstadt.

President Bassemier: You really have been helpful to me all week, too. I tell you what, I don't know how many times I bothered you and I really appreciate it. Thank you very much. I need a motion to adjourn.

Councilmember Wortman: So moved.

President Bassemier: Everybody in favor, raise your right hand.

Councilmember Sutton: Should we recess?

President Bassemier: Oh, no. Oh, recess? I am sorry. I am sorry we need to recess because we are coming back in September. Okay, make a motion to recess.

Councilmember Wortman: Okay, I will make a motion that we recess until September 5th.

President Bassemier: September 5.

Councilmember Wortman: September 5 at what time? At 12:00 noon.

Councilmember Hoy: I would like to put in an order for one of the pizzas to be vegetarian.

President Bassemier: Okay.

(Meeting recessed at 1:00 p.m.)

VANDEBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL

President Ed Bassemier

Vice President Lloyd Winnecke

Councilmember James Raben

Councilmember Phil Hoy

Councilmember Curt Wortman

Councilmember Royce Sutton

Councilmember Troy Tornatta

Recorded by Teri Lukeman. Transcribed by Teri Lukeman, Charlene Timmons, Madelyn Grayson, BJ Farrell & Todd Hochstetler.

**VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL
SPECIAL MEETING
AUGUST 14, 2001**

The Vanderburgh County Council met in special session the 14th day of August, 2001 in room 301 of the Civic Center Complex. The meeting was called to order at 11:59 a.m. by County Council President Ed Bassemier.

President Bassemier: I want to welcome everyone to the 2001, August 14th special meeting. Roll call please.

COUNCILMEMBER	PRESENT	ABSENT
Councilmember Tornatta	X	
Councilmember Sutton	X	
Councilmember Wortman	X	
Councilmember Hoy	X	
Councilmember Raben	X	
Councilmember Winnecke	X	
President Bassemier	X	

President Bassemier: As you know, we’re here today to vote on a candidate to the Evansville Convention & Visitors Board to fill the vacancy of Mr. Guier. You have information in front of you on both candidates. I need a motion for one of them.

Councilmember Winnecke: Mr. President?

President Bassemier: Mr. Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: I would make a motion that David Dunn be appointed to the Convention & Visitors Bureau.

Councilmember Raben: I’ll second that motion.

President Bassemier: Who seconded?

Councilmember Raben: I seconded.

President Bassemier: Okay, open for discussion. No discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: I have to say this. Prior to Mr. Dunn’s submission, and I didn’t know he was back in town, I had already pledged my vote to Christie Brooks, but in order to make it unanimous, I’ll vote for Mr. Dunn also.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

President Bassemier: Motion to adjourn?

Councilmember Wortman: So moved.

President Bassemier: Do I have a second?

Councilmember Winnecke: Second.

President Bassemier: We're adjourned.

(Meeting adjourned at 12:01 p.m.)

VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL

President Ed Bassemier

Vice President Lloyd Winnecke

Councilmember James Raben

Councilmember Phil Hoy

Councilmember Curt Wortman

Councilmember Royce Sutton

Councilmember Troy Tornatta

Recorded and transcribed by Teri Lukeman.

**VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL
MINUTES
SEPTEMBER 5, 2001**

The Vanderburgh County Council met in session the 5th day of September, 2001 in room 301 of the Civic Center Complex. The meeting was called to order at 3:37 p.m. by County Council President Ed Bassemier.

President Bassemier: Sheriff, you want to open the meeting, please? Open the meeting, Sheriff, please.

Brad Ellsworth: Oh yes, oh yes, oh yes, the Vanderburgh County Council is now in session pursuant to adjournment.

President Bassemier: I like to hear his voice. I want to welcome everybody to the September 5th, 2001 Vanderburgh County Council meeting. Attendance roll call please.

COUNCILMEMBER	PRESENT	ABSENT
Councilmember Tornatta	X	
Councilmember Sutton	X	
Councilmember Wortman	X	
Councilmember Hoy	X	
Councilmember Raben		X
Councilmember Winnecke	X	
President Bassemier	X	

President Bassemier: Would everyone please stand for the Pledge of Allegiance?

(Pledge of Allegiance was given)

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES
AUGUST 1, 2001 COUNTY COUNCIL REGULAR MEETING
& SPECIAL MEETING AUGUST 14, 2001**

President Bassemier: Okay, I need a motion to approve the regular meeting August 1st, 2001 and special meeting August 14, 2001. Do I have a motion?

Councilmember Hoy: So moved.

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: I have a second. Any discussion on that? Okay, roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

President Bassemier: Okay, we're going to get into our Appropriation Ordinance and we've got an assistant. Mr. Raben could not be here for the afternoon meeting. Mr. Wortman, would you take over please?

ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATION REQUESTS
--

COUNTY ASSESSOR

Councilmember Wortman: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We'll start right off, the County Assessor, 3530 Contractual Services, \$34,000. I make that in the form of a motion.

President Bassemier: Do I have a second?

Councilmember Hoy: Second.

President Bassemier: Mr. Hoy. I believe we're going to move pretty quick, don't you?

Councilmember Hoy: I'm just ready to buy the tobacco.

President Bassemier: Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

COUNTY ASSESSOR		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1090-3530	Contractual Services	34,000.00	34,000.00
Total		34,000.00	34,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

COMMISSIONERS

President Bassemier: Okay, Commissioners.

Councilmember Wortman: Okay, Mr. President, 1300-3130 Travel/Mileage, the County Commissioners, \$5,000. I make that in the form of a motion.

Councilmember Winnecke: Second.

President Bassemier: Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

COMMISSIONERS		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1300-3130	Travel/Mileage	5,000.00	5,000.00
Total		5,000.00	5,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS

President Bassemier: Okay, Mr. Wortman.

Councilmember Wortman: Okay, Community Corrections, 1361-1300-1361 Case Manager \$124; 1361-1950-1361 Educational Fund \$900; 1361-1850 Union Overtime \$20,000; makes a total of \$21,024. I make that in the form of a motion.

Councilmember Hoy: Second.

President Bassemier: I have a second from Mr. Hoy. Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1361-1300-1361	Case Manager	124.00	124.00
1361-1950-1361	Educational Fund	900.00	900.00
1361-1850	Union Overtime	20,000.00	20,000.00
Total		21,024.00	21,024.00

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

SUPERIOR COURT

President Bassemier: Okay, Mr. Wortman.

Councilmember Wortman: Okay, Mr. President, thank you. 1370-3994 Special Matching Grants for a total of \$7,234. I make that in the form of a motion.

Councilmember Hoy: Second.

President Bassemier: Second from Mr. Hoy. Any discussion? Roll Call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

SUPERIOR COURT		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1370-3994	Special/Matching Grants	7,234.00	7,234.00
Total		7,234.00	7,234.00

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

BURDETTE PARK

President Bassemier: Burdette Park.

Councilmember Wortman: Okay, thank you, Mr. President. Line item 1450-1180-1450 Other Employees, a total of \$60,000; 1450-1900 FICA, a total of \$4,590; a grand total of \$64,590. I make that in the form of a motion.

Councilmember Winnecke: Second.

President Bassemier: Second by Mr. Winnecke. Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

BURDETTE PARK		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1450-1180-1450	Other Employees	60,000.00	60,000.00
1450-1900	FICA	4,590.00	4,590.00
Total		64,590.00	64,590.00

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

COUNTY ASSESSOR/REASSESSMENT

Councilmember Wortman: Okay, now we get into the Reassessment Fund appropriation requests. We're going to defer these for one month. We'll start off with the County Assessor, 2492-1090-3370, \$14,000 deferred.

Cheryl Musgrave: May I make a comment on that?

President Bassemier: State your name please.

Cheryl Musgrave: Cheryl Musgrave, the County Assessor. That's the money to buy the server for the computers that's needed now. And I would ask that you take action on that now. I did give you a memo, you weren't here last month, Mr. Wortman, when I passed out the memo about that transfer, and that's for the Assessors, the remote access for the Assessors who are not in the building.

Councilmember Wortman: You can't wait until next month?

Cheryl Musgrave: I'd like to get the consultant under way to get that done.

Councilmember Wortman: You really don't have a whole lot to do, though, till the Assessors get their reassessment in, or am I wrong?

Cheryl Musgrave: The computer doesn't fall into that category. The computer is an every day item. They use it all the time and we're having trouble with it now. We are unable to get them the information that we customarily have been able to get to them. And this is part of what, well, it goes along with what Jim Raben was asking about ACS and the computers that we might need to buy. And I do have a memo about that.

Councilmember Wortman: Alright, I'll back up then and I'll change my motion on the request for the County Assessor for 2492-1090-3370 Computer (Data Mgmt) \$14,000. I make that in the form of a motion.

President Bassemier: Do I have a second?

Councilmember Winnecke: Second.

President Bassemier: Mr. Winnecke. Any discussion on that?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes. Cheryl, the information that you have, could you share that with us?

Cheryl Musgrave: Yes. This more particularly pertains to the request that Mr. Raben made for ACS to come and talk to you about working with the Assessors to get new computers, if necessary, due to ProVal's announcement that only a Pentium IV will handle the ProVal request. So this memo tells you that the GIS consultant has called a meeting for tomorrow with all the Assessors and anybody else who impacts with ProVal, to discuss and explore that acquisition.

President Bassemier: Okay, anybody else?

Councilmember Wortman: Is SCT here?

Alan Teeple: ACS is, sir.

Councilmember Wortman: Step forward please. Mr. Chairman, is that okay?

President Bassemier: That'd be fine.

Alan Teeple: An interesting opening in a meeting, to ACS, I'm the new –

President Bassemier: Could you state your name, sir? I'm sorry.

Alan Teeple: Alan Teeple, the new account executive for ACS here in Evansville.

President Bassemier: Welcome here, sir.

Alan Teeple: My first day here was yesterday and actually, on Saturday, I got Sandie's summons to the Council.

Councilmember Sutton: Welcome.

Alan Teeple: So an interesting welcome. And thank you. And it's good to be back in Indiana.

Councilmember Winnecke: You didn't have the Sheriff deliver it, did he?

Councilmember Hoy: I don't think Mrs. Deig knows we deputized her yet, but that's okay.

Alan Teeple: But I was asked to appear before you for your requests concerning where we're headed, where we're not headed, in relation to this project.

Paul Hatfield: Anybody got any questions? He's here.

Councilmember Winnecke: Thanks, Paul. We see him.

Councilmember Hoy: It was mentioned to us that we were going to have to shift all of our computers over to Pentium IV. Is that correct?

Alan Teeple: At this time, I mean, that's what I understand from the County Assessor and it's not all computers, it's as they relate to the County Assessors that perform the function of ProVal and GIS and help me on that one, Cheryl, please.

Cheryl Musgrave: With the Council's permission, I would like to go ahead and have this meeting with the Assessors and the GIS consultant and ACS tomorrow, and I would hope that our goal would be to specify computer equipment that is everything we need it to be for all the programs that we run and by whatever vendor offers us the best cost. And coordinate the purchases through ACS, perhaps put out a new bid, not work off the existing bid.

Alan Teeple: I guess some things that I wrote down when I first got this, some items that hopefully the Council has considered. Has the funding already been set aside for those computers and the server? Is the upgrade going to be SQL or Oracle, and that may be a discussion we're going to have tomorrow. The timing of it. Is this a project that is going to be done – because it does become a project for ACS – is this a project that is going to be done this fiscal year or this year, this calendar year? What's the timing of it? And what is the resource commitment that you expect from ACS? And where does it fit in relation to the Data Board of the priorities that are in the process of being set by the Data Board?

Cheryl Musgrave: And with Council's permission, I'll go ahead and work on those and report back to all of you or somebody that you designate. Would you like to designate somebody who will work with us on this?

President Bassemier: Mr. Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: If this is the case, do you need this money now or should we wait until you get everything in perspective before we do anything here?

Cheryl Musgrave: Well, his question was, is the funding in place for the servers and the computers. You've just approved part of the server and then the other \$14,000 request that you've had a second on, but you haven't voted on is the other half of the server. We'll come back to you either next month or the month after with the funding request for the computers that he's talking about. But the server I need no matter what, which is why I'm asking you to take action on that right now.

Councilmember Wortman: And this is the actual price now?

Cheryl Musgrave: Well, it's the upper end of the projected prices.

Councilmember Wortman: Because we don't want to over-fund it, you know.

Cheryl Musgrave: I'll give it back to you, if you want me to, if we've over-funded it.

Councilmember Winnecke: Mr. Chairman?

President Bassemier: I'm sorry. Mr. Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: I have a question about ACS's role in all of this and the procurement of new equipment. I think there's been some question raised by I think members of Council and officeholders alike about what your company's role is in terms of buying new equipment, servicing equipment that we buy through other vendors. How do you perceive that role going forward?

Alan Teeple: Well, I think in the current contract that this city/county is under, it's vague enough that it could almost be written in any form. The contract that we were at least discussing because the current contract, as you know, ends June 30th of 2002. The next contract, if that is going to occur, discusses those type of issues. I mean, as it exists today, we are advisors, we are consultants, we manage the projects that get established and try to do it within the current contract confines. And hopefully that answered your question, sir.

Councilmember Winnecke: No, not really. If the county wants to go out and find computers at X number of dollars that we don't buy through your company, does your company help one, with the installation and the maintenance of that equipment if we don't buy them through you?

Alan Teeple: We don't care who you buy your computers from. The thing that you truly need to be thinking about is those very issues. Is when you purchase a computer or a server, you need to also think about the maintenance and support and the timing. And say there were 60 computers that were needed for the Assessor's project. You need to think about how many hours are involved to set up 60 computers and then the support that's involved with those computers. And I think those are some of the issues that we're going to discuss in tomorrow's meeting or at least start discussing. I truly, I mean, ACS is not in the business of selling you computers. I mean, at other sites like Indianapolis, there is a pass through, and you may be familiar with that, up in Marion County, where they purchase the computers and then it's literally a pass through, that ACS up there is responsible for buying the computers or whatever they need, and then it is a pass through cost back to the city or the county.

Councilmember Winnecke: And I respect the fact that you just got to town, but I don't think I've gotten a clear answer yet.

Alan Teeple: Okay, then I'm not sure of the question you're asking, sir.

Councilmember Winnecke: If we go out and buy 60 computers for this reassessment and we don't buy them through your company, we buy them through somewhere else because the price is better, will your company, based on your understanding of the current contract, support the officeholders who have that equipment and to what extent will you support it?

Alan Teeple: Well, I think we're going to be required to support them. You would need to understand, and I started with that list, you're going to need to understand how it changes the priorities of the other projects. Say you wanted it done by the first of January 2002. What does that do to the other projects that are on the plate, because I have a limited amount of resources and time between now and the first of January. I don't know that it's the first of January project, but, I mean, it's that type of thing. Those are the kind of things that you need to think through and the, and I think Dave, I don't think he's arrived yet, but I think Dave has already started those kind of discussions with you all, that you need to be thinking about the enterprise as a whole and not the pieces of the enterprise. And that's where supposedly, we, as your computer services, provide that. But those kind of things need to be taken in account and there is a cost for that. And again, I don't know that. I am answering your question as much as I know with having been here a couple days and three weeks of transition.

Councilmember Winnecke: I appreciate that.

Alan Teeple: I am more than willing to, if and when Dave shows up, to yield the floor to him. But that's what I know as it is right now. And that's why I said in the beginning, these are the kind of questions that I would hope Cheryl and I are going to discuss in this meeting tomorrow of let's think about the ripple effect, the cascade effect, of if you put in a server, it involves X amount of hours of my people's time to get the server operational and I don't know that that's true and she may be throwing darts at me, but as I understand it, that's what would happen. And that those 60 computers that may need to be installed, they would need e-mail and Internet access and certain things connected and wiring maybe, if they're going to new locations. That all needs to be involved in a project that gets created.

Councilmember Winnecke: Let me ask you this. I think, based on some discussions last week, I think some officeholders are probably more technically oriented than others...I would be in that category. To what extent would your company be offering assistance in the assessment of what, in this case, the Township Assessors need for new equipment?

Alan Teeple: I would think that would be part of our charter. I know it is in other –

Councilmember Winnecke: I would think so. I guess I would like to hear someone say it.

Alan Teeple: Then I will say that, I mean, if you need it on record. I mean, I would say that. I think one of our jobs or missions or goals is to provide that assessment, consultant service to you, that may be out of the normal, I mean, thinking out of the box. I mean, one of the things that I have already thought of is the possibility of using Citrix rather than replacing the 60 computers. And again, that's a discussion that would need to be discussed with – but, I mean, those are the kind of things that I would hope we bring to the table, that we are your consultants, we are your advisors.

Councilmember Winnecke: How large is your team here now?

Alan Teeple: I'm sorry?

Councilmember Winnecke: How large is your team?

Alan Teeple: Fifteen, and that includes myself and the Administrative Assistant.

Councilmember Sutton: I guess one question I had and I guess you are going to spend some time since you haven't had a chance to evaluate the entire situation. And as we look at the whole prospect of completely changing out all of those computers and I think you may have alluded to it, has the possibility of upgrading any of those machines been explored rather than actually replacing all those?

Alan Teeple: I think that's a tomorrow issue and I'll –

Councilmember Sutton: Obviously, there will be a significant savings and if that is at all possible. So perhaps for ProVal, if an upgrade is possible, what type of upgrade would be most...could be used on the system.

Cheryl Musgrave: And I think that poor Alan doesn't know some of the history that we have had in the past and just not to put you on the spot, but some of the Assessors have felt some times that their computers were under specified, that they were forced to buy a machine that they knew wouldn't handle the job and they don't want that to happen again. And then not only were we forced to buy substandard pieces of equipment perhaps, but then we were told we had to buy it from a specific vendor or a specific company, and that if anybody went outside that, none of your staff would ever come to do any maintenance on it. We want to avoid that in the future.

Alan Teeple: Well, the only thing I can respond to on that one is, I mean, just like ProVal went to a version seven, there is no computer that you bought two years ago, I mean, think about it. When I had my XT in college, I felt that that was the most powerful computer that I would ever need. As software and the connectivity that has been required of computers, the power in computers has been more demanding. So, I mean, I don't know what was promised before and I apologize if it doesn't meet the needs, but I would hope that it met the needs for a couple of years because, I mean, truly, the demands you place on the computer today, three years from now, my guess is that computer doesn't meet your needs because of the evolution of software and just the demand of you as a user community. The demands that you demand of the speed and I want this website to immediately come up and I don't want a five second delay. And those of us that grew up, you know, I grew up programming in punch cards and, you know, dumb terminals, you know, we are leaps and bounds away from that. So I think we've got a smarter user community, too. But again, I would think and agree with Cheryl, I would hope one of my jobs or my staffs' job is to get you the best price, the best product, that will last as long as possible based on all those previous things that I said. And I hope that helps.

Councilmember Tornatta: Do you have an agenda that you want to try and achieve in your first weeks being in Evansville? I mean, do you have something that you're looking to achieve?

Alan Teeple: My first goal I would think is to figure out whether, first off, I am up here living in an apartment. I have not moved up here yet based on the contract, whether it's going to be renewed or not. So I would think that my first goal is to either figure out whether it's going to be rebid, renewed or we transition and I'll say that in an open Council. And we expressed that in the Data Board two weeks ago. So I think that's probably the first agenda item. The second, I think, to continue some of the things that Dave already has started and that is put a process in place downstairs that is more efficient to providing services to Evansville and Vanderburgh County, both from my background in up in Marion County and the other background that I have. And I think you've seen my resumé. At least the Data Board had. So I think those certainly are two major items –

Councilmember Tornatta: I think that we've talked about having some type of priority with the Data Board to figure out what type of events we want to try and work on, but I guess what I'd like to see, and I think some of the questions we're hitting on, is we'd like for you to have some type of objectives to go through and to meet some of these needs pretty quickly to find out where we're lacking, where we have been lacking in the past years and I found that out as well in being new to the Council, where the computer board might have been lacking in the last few years. And then try and step up that process because,

obviously, we're going to feel a lot better about your services if you take care of our people. And that's really why we have you here, why we want you to be here, to try and figure out what kind of things that you can do different that maybe the prior staff at the top was not doing. And then come through and make those things happen.

Alan Teeple: Well, I guess one of the things that will help me deliver some of those objectives is if the Data Board does set those kind of priorities. You know, we want these projects worked on in this order and not, I'm going to use the term helter-skelter, you know, not the first one that comes to the well or that's the loudest. So I think that that helps. I mean, we are here to serve you. But we're not here to prioritize what strategy you have in Evansville and Vanderburgh County. You need to tell us what your strategy is. I mean, that's part of the annual work plan and those kind of things that have to be worked through and worked on.

President Bassemier: Mr. Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Alan, actually, I don't know, Tim might be better suited to answer this but feel free, given his background, some of – not some of our – our Assessors are under a tight, tight time frame. What is your feel for how quickly we can get new equipment up and running in these offices?

Alan Teeple: I guess my statement to that is what I just said to Troy and that was are you, and the Data Board needs to decide, I have a limited amount of resources. Are you willing to commit more money so that I can get more resources to make this project happen in addition to the other projects that are currently going on? I mean, that's what it comes down to. What gets bumped if this becomes the number one priority? And that's true of any site I've ever been at.

Cheryl Musgrave: And I guess I would ask if we're going to fund new computers and their personnel resources don't exist within their company and they're unwilling to bring more staff in from other places, even for a price, they'll allow me to buy local resources to come and set the computers up and have them plug it in. Because like you said, I don't have the luxury of time and I will have to get this done in pretty rapid order if they don't move the statutory deadlines and it doesn't look good from the statutory deadlines. So he has limited resources, he has stuff already on his burners, then you have to allow me to bring in additional resources.

President Bassemier: Mr. Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes, I think one of our Assessors would like some time at the microphone and...

Paul Hatfield: Paul Hatfield, Pigeon Township Assessor. This is absolutely ludicrous. We've been sitting around here, we've been talking about it now for what, two months? I'm sitting down there. We're ready to go to work. I need ten computers and I don't care who in the hell sets them up. She just made a good point. A good point. If they don't want to, they don't think they've got enough money in their contract to do this, then we'll get it done. But let me remind you, we are the basis of your revenue. We are in a new reassessment period. It's not going to be easy. They're talking about a month, two months. He even mentioned in this calendar year. Good God, put your collective intelligence together. Go where your money is. And you're looking at it. If you appropriate the money for the computers today, I'll assure you I'll have them in here, we'll get them set up. I can go to work because the software for residential pricing will be in here this month. I can price. What you don't realize is really the big job in doing this reassessment as opposed to '95. A lot more to it. Right now, I'm working with other townships on land. That is a basis. You have to have that to begin with before you price unless you want to price the improvement and then come back and put the land in. That is not the way the train runs. All this has to be done and the time is of the essence. Quit talking about the Data Board. The Data Board does not earn you a penny. We do.

President Bassemier: I think some of these questions seem simple to you but I think they just, he's just been in here a couple of days, three days. I think we're just wanting to get it on record. That's all. Very simple.

Paul Hatfield: Ed, that, too, is ludicrous. He's only been here two days? Move it on.

President Bassemier: Well, that's right. He's new to me. That's the first time I've met him. Now let's move on. Mr. Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Oh, I was just going to say, Mr. Hatfield, let's let them have the meeting tomorrow and see where we come out of that meeting and see what our different points, you know, points are that we think we need to accomplish. If we don't have a good meeting, if we don't think there's any kind of headway made, then yeah, I agree with what you're saying. If he comes in with a different kind of work tactic and different kind of attitude than we've had in the past, then maybe this a doable situation. And I use the word doable.

Paul Hatfield: Well, let me add something here, the reason for all of this, and we're talking about computers with all the bells and whistles, is because we're trying to really put it all together, ProVal, GIS and possibly down the line CAMA. I want to tell you now, there is not an Assessor in Vanderburgh County at this point of the game that needs GIS to assess property. I sure don't. I've got the best maps in the world. But you see what the hold up is? And the hold up is trying to combine those two in a master computer at each desk and I don't need it. What I need is a computer because ours are full of memory, they're slow, they're outdated. I've got to go to work. Now other than that, I want a copy of the minutes of this meeting because when the State Tax Board gets on my butt on reassessment, I want to send them a copy of this. You understand what I'm saying to you? Now I'm telling you now –

Councilmember Tornatta: And I say let's –

Paul Hatfield: No, let me finish. What they're trying to do is, they're trying to shove five pounds of sausage in a one pound bag. I don't need five pounds. All I need is a pound. All I need now for somebody to say okay, get your computers. This is – I am absolutely astounded and I've been around this game for a long time.

President Bassemier: Okay, thank you, sir. Calm down. Mr. Hoy, you want to add something?

Councilmember Hoy: At this meeting tomorrow, I think we need to have some specific people there. I'm not volunteering. I'm going to be in Pennsylvania tomorrow –

President Bassemier: Yeah, I think Jim said he was going to make it and I think he –

Councilmember Hoy: But I think we need to know, to make sure that we have official representation there. We are the fiscal body, we do have to approve these expenditures and I don't want us to obstruct the progress of getting this job done.

President Bassemier: Cheryl, what time was the meeting, again?

Cheryl Musgrave: I think it's on the memo, 9:00?

President Bassemier: That's what I think it said.

Cheryl Musgrave: And I don't know, Sandie, are you available to attend?

President Bassemier: Will anybody volunteer? Can anybody...Mr. Wortman said he'd be glad to be there and do I have somebody else?

Councilmember Winnecke: I'm not going to volunteer. I may or may not show up, but I

have a statement when you're done.

President Bassemier: Okay, I've got one. I think, Troy, is that okay with you?

Councilmember Tornatta: I'm the same as Mr. Winnecke. I would love to be there. I've just got to make sure I can work out a schedule for it. I didn't know prior to now.

Councilmember Sutton: Is there a motion on the floor for the Assessor's appropriation? Isn't there a motion on the floor for the Assessor's appropriation? I think we're kind of getting off into some other areas. Why don't we deal with the Assessor's appropriation and –

President Bassemier: Yeah, I do have a motion and I do have a second for that \$14,000. Any more discussion on this? Let's go ahead and get this out of the way then. Okay, roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

COUNTY ASSESSOR		REQUESTED	APPROVED
2492-1090-3370	Computer (Data Mgmt)	14,000.00	14,000.00
Total		14,000.00	14,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

Teri Lukeman: May I change the tape?

President Bassemier: Change the tape please.

(Tape changed)

Cheryl Musgrave: – sometimes we tape our meetings and transcribe them, and if no member of Council can come, I know Mr. Wortman will be there, but we'd be happy to do that for you, again, so that you'd all be informed fully, if you'd like that.

President Bassemier: We appreciate that. Yeah, I don't want to commit. I'm not sure I can get off tomorrow or not, but I'll try to be there.

Cheryl Musgrave: I'll instruct them to run the tape.

Councilmember Hoy: I want to go back to that point. Mr. Wortman, you said you definitely could be there tomorrow?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes, sir. I'll just call in and tell them I won't show up for work.

Councilmember Hoy: I'm not going to say what's on my mind, okay? I know who your boss is. Who else are we going to have there? I'm concerned that we know that we have at least two people there before we leave this meeting. I am scheduled to go on the Farm Bureau Farm Tour and I'm leaving tonight for that, or else I would cancel something else and be here. But I think we need Council people there.

Councilmember Tornatta: Thursday?

Councilmember Sutton: What time?

Councilmember Tornatta: Nine?

Councilmember Hoy: I appreciate your offering of the minutes and all of that, but I think being present is much more important.

President Bassemier: Troy? Okay. Troy and Mr Wortman will be there tomorrow.

Councilmember Hoy: Mr. Winnecke said he would try to be there.

Councilmember Sutton: I might try to be there.

Paul Hatfield: I'll go for you guys.

Councilmember Sutton: That's all right.

Councilmember Hoy: I know you'll be there and I'm glad you're going to be there.

Councilmember Winnecke: Mr. President? I'd like to make a statement. I don't always agree with Mr. Hatfield...

President Bassemier: Is this one of these times?

Councilmember Winnecke: This is a time I agree with him. I think this meeting tomorrow is great, but the Township Assessors are clearly under a deadline. This is not going to facilitate. I think we should appropriate the money for the equipment request today and defer the remaining requests relating to the reassessment, the Township Assessors. They know what kind of equipment they need computer-wise to make this work.

Councilmember Hoy: Is that a motion?

Councilmember Sutton: Who called the meeting? Who is convening this meeting?

Councilmember Winnecke: From the head coordinator of GIS, Kathy McCarter, or the consultant, I guess I should say.

Cheryl Musgrave: Gosh, I don't whether to say anything or not because I never want to turn down money. I'd like to go ahead and have the meeting. We're going to take all the equipment lists, make sure we've counted the exact number, multiply it by an appropriate price, we'll come back to you next month with the amount of money we need. And you don't have an appropriation request for this on your desk today. It will be somewhere, gosh, a couple hundred thousand dollars, I assume. So although I appreciate the offer of the money today,...Curt, you sure you want to come tomorrow? So if we could go ahead and have the meeting...

Councilmember Winnecke: I guess I wasn't suggesting you not have the meeting. I just think that on part of the request we could move forward.

Councilmember Tornatta: Well, German, for instance, they don't have anything for computers. Would they not need a computer then? See, that's what, I wouldn't want to get in a position to give some computers and not others what they need.

Cheryl Musgrave: We'll replace all the ones that need to be replaced, trust me. I'm big on that point.

Councilmember Tornatta: I see what you're saying to get things started, but I'd hate to give it to one and then the others sit there and say, well, I didn't know we were going for the computers this time and they don't get theirs.

Councilmember Sutton: And keep in mind, too, we can if we need to, to stay within our time frame, we could meet. The President can always call a special meeting to make sure we stay on track. I mean, we don't have to wait.

President Bassemier: Mr. Finance Chairman, you want to move on?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes, sir. Thank you.

Councilmember Tornatta: You were doing so good, Curt.

PROPERTY TAX BOARD OF APPEALS/REASSESSMENT

Councilmember Wortman: Okay, Property Tax Board of Appeals 2492-1091-3530 Contractual Service, going to defer \$10,000. I make that in the form of a motion.

President Bassemier: Do I have a second?

Councilmember Winnecke: Second.

President Bassemier: I have a second by Mr. Winnecke. Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

PROPERTY TAX BD/REASSESSMENT		REQUESTED	APPROVED
2492-1091-3530	Contractual Services	10,000.00	
Total		10,000.00	Deferred

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

GERMAN ASSESS/REASSESSMENT
PERRY ASSESS/REASSESSMENT

KNIGHT ASSESS/REASSESSMENT
PIGEON ASSESS/REASSESSMENT

Councilmember Wortman: Okay, Mr. President, what I'm going to do here is take German Township and defer \$17,023; I'm going to take Knight Township and defer \$120,064; I'm going to take Perry Township Assessor and defer \$30,369; I'm going to take Pigeon Township Assessor and defer \$30,959, and then that's it. I make that in the form of a motion.

President Bassemier: Do I have a second?

Councilmember Hoy: I'll second that and then I'd like to comment on it.

President Bassemier: Okay, Mr. Hoy.

Councilmember Hoy: I'll second it. I still, I agree with Councilman Winnecke, but we need to move ahead on this and I would hope that following tomorrow's meeting and when we are aware of what we need, that this Council call a special meeting so we can move this project ahead and get things going. I won't ask that to be part of the motion, but I would hope that's what we do as a body unless you want to include that as part of the motion.

Councilmember Wortman: That will be fine, I can include that, Mr. Hoy.

Councilmember Hoy: That we call a special meeting and then I'll include it in my second.

President Bassemier: Okay, any more discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: No.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

GERMAN TOWNSHIP ASSESSOR		REQUESTED	APPROVED
2492-1120-1140	Field Coordinator	5,463.00	
2492-1120-1990	Extra Help	8,000.00	
2492-1120-1900	FICA	1,030.00	
2492-1120-2600	Office Supplies	215.00	
2492-1120-3130	Travel/Mileage	250.00	
2492-1120-3410	Printing	250.00	
2492-1120-3600	Rent	600.00	
2492-1120-1110	Assessor	1,000.00	
2492-1120-1910	PERF	215.00	
Total		17,023.00	Deferred

KNIGHT TOWNSHIP ASSESSOR		REQUESTED	APPROVED
2492-1130-1110	Assessor	7,000.00	
2492-1130-1120	Office Coordinator	8,115.00	
2492-1130-1900	FICA	4,982.00	
2492-1130-1910	PERF	1,512.00	
2492-1130-1920	Insurance	7,155.00	
2492-1130-1990	Extra Help	50,000.00	
2492-1130-2600	Office Supplies	3,000.00	
2492-1130-2710	Color Film	1,000.00	
2492-1130-3130	Travel/Mileage	4,000.00	
2492-1130-3310	Training	3,000.00	
2492-1130-3370	Computer (Data Mgmt)	10,000.00	
2492-1130-3372	Computer Software	1,800.00	
2492-1130-3390	Assessor's Plat Sheets	1,000.00	
2492-1130-3400	Printing Plat Sheets	3,000.00	
2492-1130-3410	Printing	5,000.00	
2492-1130-3520	Equipment Repair	1,500.00	
2492-1130-4220	Office Machines	8,000.00	
Total		120,064.00	Deferred

PERRY TOWNSHIP ASSESSOR		REQUESTED	APPROVED
2492-1140-1110	Assessor	2,051.00	
2492-1140-1900	FICA	1,290.00	
2492-1140-1910	PERF	103.00	
2492-1140-1930	Unemployment	125.00	

(Table continued next page)

2492-1140-1990	Extra Help	14,800.00	
2492-1140-2600	Office Supplies	250.00	
2492-1140-3130	Travel/Mileage	250.00	
2492-1140-3370	Computer (Data Mgmt)	2,600.00	
2492-1140-3372	Computer Software	1,400.00	
2492-1140-3390	Assessor Plat Sheets	2,000.00	
2492-1140-4220	Office Machines	5,500.00	
Total		30,369.00	Deferred

PIGEON TOWNSHIP ASSESSOR		REQUESTED	APPROVED
2492-1150-1120	Office Coordinator	7,491.00	
2492-1150-1900	FICA	574.00	
2492-1150-1910	PERF	394.00	
2492-1150-1920	Insurance	5,000.00	
2492-1150-2600	Office Supplies	3,000.00	
2492-1150-3310	Training	3,000.00	
2492-1150-3370	Computer (Data Mgmt)	8,000.00	
2492-1150-3372	Computer Software	3,500.00	
Total		30,959.00	Deferred

(Motion carried 5-1/Councilmember Winnecke opposed)

REPEAL REQUEST

COUNTY ASSESSOR

Councilmember Wortman: Okay, County Assessor, 1090-1920 Insurance, set it in at zero cause it's in the General Fund anyway. I make that in the form of a motion.

President Bassemier: Do I have a second?

Councilmember Hoy: Second.

President Bassemier: Who seconded? I'm sorry? Mr. Hoy? Any discussion on that? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

COUNTY ASSESSOR		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1090-1920	Insurance	34,000.00	0.00
Total		34,000.00	0.00

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

TRANSFER REQUESTS

- AUDITOR

COUNTY ASSESSOR

ELECTION OFFICE

WEIGHTS & MEASURES

COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS (2)
- PROSECUTOR IV-D

SCOTT TOWNSHIP ASSESSOR

AREA PLAN COMMISSION

SUPT. OF COUNTY BUILDINGS

Councilmember Wortman: Okay, now we get into the transfer requests and we've got the Auditor, transfer \$5,000 to Extra Help \$5,000; the Prosecutor from Lab Tests to Telephone \$1,500; County Assessor: Telephone \$1,000 to Contractual Service \$1,000; Scott Township Assessor: Other Supplies \$500 to Travel/Mileage \$500; Election Office: Contractual Service \$151 to PERF \$39, Office Supplies \$68, Postage & Freight \$44; Area Plan: Equipment Repair \$451 to Garage & Motor \$451; Weights & Measures: Training \$300 to Telephone \$300; turn to page 5, Superintendent of County Buildings: Utilities \$10,000 to Equipment Repair \$5,000, Building Supplies \$5,000; Community Corrections: Uniforms \$3,000 to Work Release Supplies \$3,000; Community Corrections: Other Pay \$4,000 to Union Overtime \$4,000; County Highway: Extra Help zero, Clothing Allowance, zero, Supervisor zero, Assistant Supervisor zero, Road Foreman zero, Road Foreman zero, Road Foreman zero; Cumulative Bridge: Assistant County Engineer zero; Superintendent zero. I make that in the form of a motion.

President Bassemier: Do I have a second?

Councilmember Tornatta: Family & Children Services as stated? Was that as it was written? Zeroes were flying, and I couldn't...

Councilmember Sutton: It wasn't in the motion, Family & Children.

Councilmember Hoy: Nor were the late transfers.

Councilmember Wortman: I'm sorry. I've got two more late transfers here. It's my mistake, I'm guilty. Two more late transfers, the County Commissioners: from Bond & Insurance \$8,057 to Secretary \$7,136, FICA \$546, and PERF \$375. And then the Public Defender: go from the Public Defender \$10,164.24 to Temporary Replacement \$10,164.24.

Councilmember Tornatta: Okay, I would like to take everything down to Community Corrections as one, if we can do that. And then I'd like to –

Councilmember Wortman: Down to Community Corrections?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yeah, County Highway, do it separately.

Councilmember Wortman: Okay, I'll retract my motion and then I'll stop at Community Corrections and omit –

President Bassemier: I tell you what, why don't we –

Councilmember Hoy: Why don't we start fresh and I'll take –

President Bassemier: We better start fresh and since you added –

Councilmember Hoy: – on the motion, because we've got a motion on the floor that goes through...

Councilmember Wortman: Start from the beginning?

President Bassemier: Yes.

Councilmember Wortman: Okay.

Councilmember Winnecke: With feeling.

Councilmember Wortman: Okay, transfer requests, the Auditor: Bookkeeper & Welfare \$5,000 to Extra Help \$5,000; Prosecutor IV-D: Lab Tests \$1,500 to Telephone \$1,500; County Assessor: Telephone \$1,000, Contractual Services \$1,000; Scott Township Assessor: Other Supplies \$500 to Travel/Mileage \$500; Election Office: from Contractual Services \$151 to PERF \$39, Office Supplies \$68, Postage & Freight \$44; the Area Plan: Equipment Repair \$451 to Garage & Motor \$451; Weights & Measures: Training \$300 to Telephone \$300. Turn the page, Superintendent of County Buildings: Utilities \$10,000 to Equipment Repair \$5,000, Building Supplies \$5,000; Community Corrections: Uniforms \$3,000 –

President Bassemier: Hold on, Curt. Did you want to – is that the one –

Councilmember Tornatta: No, through Community Corrections.

President Bassemier: Oh, okay.

Councilmember Wortman: Uniforms \$3,000 to Work Release Supplies \$3,000; Community Corrections: Other Pay \$4,000 to Union Overtime \$4,000. I make that in the form of a motion.

Councilmember Hoy: Second.

President Bassemier: Okay, I have a motion, I have a second from Mr. Hoy. Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

AUDITOR		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1020-1200-1020	Bookkeeper II/Welfare	5,000.00	5,000.00
To: 1020-1990	Extra Help	5,000.00	5,000.00

PROSECUTOR IV-D		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1081-3720	Lab Tests	1,500.00	1,500.00
To: 1081-3140	Telephone	1,500.00	1,500.00

COUNTY ASSESSOR		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1090-3140	Telephone	1,000.00	1,000.00
To: 1090-3530	Contractual Services	1,000.00	1,000.00

SCOTT TOWNSHIP ASSESSOR		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1160-2700	Other Supplies	500.00	500.00
To: 1160-3130	Travel/Mileage	500.00	500.00

ELECTION OFFICE		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1210-3530	Contractual Services	151.00	151.00
To: 1210-1910	PERF	39.00	39.00
1210-2600	Office Supplies	68.00	68.00
1210-3120	Postage & Freight	44.00	44.00

AREA PLAN COMMISSION		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1240-3520	Equipment Repair	451.00	451.00
To: 1240-2230	Garage & Motor	451.00	451.00

WEIGHTS & MEASURES		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1302-3310	Training	300.00	300.00
To: 1302-3140	Telephone	300.00	300.00

SUPERINTENDENT OF COUNTY BUILDINGS		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1310-3200	Utilities	10,000.00	10,000.00
To: 1310-3520	Equipment Repair	5,000.00	5,000.00
1310-2860	Building Supplies	5,000.00	5,000.00

COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1361-2300	Uniforms	3,000.00	3,000.00
To: 1361-2750	Work Release Supplies	3,000.00	3,000.00

COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS**REQUESTED****APPROVED**

From: 1361-1980	Other Pay	4,000.00	4,000.00
To: 1361-1850	Union Overtime	4,000.00	4,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

COUNTY HIGHWAY

Councilmember Wortman: Okay, County Highway, you want to take that separate? Extra Help zero, Clothing Allowance zero, to Supervisor zero, Assistant Supervisor zero, Road Foreman zero, Road Foreman zero, Road Foreman zero. I make that in the form of a motion.

President Bassemier: Do I have a second to get it in the floor?

Councilmember Winnecke: Second.

President Bassemier: I have a second from Mr. Winnecke.

Councilmember Tornatta: A little discussion here.

Ralph Kissinger: I was trying to understand what this is about. Ralph Kissinger, County Highway. Those transfer requests were made per the Job Study that was done approximately two months ago. I had no idea I had to make the paperwork and I just now got the paperwork in to Sandie last month. And I thought that was the formality that was to be done to get that taken care of. If I'm wrong...

Councilmember Sutton: What's, I mean, the motion itself, is there any particular reason, Curt, for the –

President Bassemier: I think it was set in for 2002 this morning.

Councilmember Tornatta: We don't...who would know that on the –

Sandie Deig: It was set in this morning.

President Bassemier: It was set in this morning for 2002.

Councilmember Wortman: On the budget process.

Councilmember Tornatta: Okay, but that doesn't go until 2002 or is that –

President Bassemier: Correct. Well, unless we change it right now. There's a motion and a second.

Councilmember Tornatta: Well, how does the Job Study work? If its been approved, does it not go in at that time?

Sandie Deig: No.

Councilmember Winnecke: No, the Council has to approve it after the Job Study action.

Councilmember Wortman: It's a recommendation only from the Job Study, the way I understand it. Am I right, my colleagues?

Councilmember Sutton: This is a 2001 request. I mean, the budget was 2002.

President Bassemier: That's right. But that salary, I know, today was set in for 2002.

Councilmember Tornatta: Right, so are in the practice of going with the Job Study recommendation?

President Bassemier: I voted for it this morning to put in the 2002. That's the recommendation.

Councilmember Tornatta: Okay, but I guess what I am saying is, it was recommended at this time, so it's 2001. So do we put it in at this time, after the recommendation?

President Bassemier: You can if you vote on it.

Councilmember Tornatta: Okay.

President Bassemier: I've got a motion to set it in at zero.

Councilmember Tornatta: Okay.

President Bassemier: Sandie, did you want to say something?

Sandie Deig: If you do approve it, it would not be for the amount that's in here, it would be prorated to the end of the year.

Councilmember Winnecke: These are annual salaries?

Sandie Deig: Yes.

Councilmember Sutton: What would that amount be? Any general idea on that prorated amount through the end of the year?

Sandie Deig: I'm just doing that right here. (Inaudible)

Councilmember Tornatta: So the vote is at this point to set it in at zero or that's the, that's the – okay.

Councilmember Hoy: They're annualized and we would really be looking at less than what's here. A couple thousand less.

President Bassemier: Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: No.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

(Motion fails 2-4/Councilmembers Tornatta, Sutton, Hoy and Winnecke opposed)

Councilmember Sutton: Motion fails.

(Inaudible – several speaking at once)

President Bassemier: Well, it's set in –

Councilmember Sutton: But we need to get a motion on the floor.

Councilmember Hoy: I move to reopen on this transfer.

Councilmember Sutton: Second.

President Bassemier: Got a motion and a second.

Councilmember Hoy: It takes two/thirds to reopen.

President Bassemier: Let's take a roll call. This is very important.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: No.

(Motion carried 4-2/Councilmembers Wortman & Bassemier opposed)

Councilmember Sutton: To open the account...

Suzanne Crouch: Four votes is two/thirds.

Councilmember Hoy: So, yeah, we are reopened. Now we can have a new motion if someone wishes to make it. I move that we grant this transfer with the figures prorated for the remainder of the year for County Highway.

Councilmember Sutton: Second.

President Bassemier: I have a motion and a second.

Suzanne Crouch: We need a dollar amount in the motion.

Sandie Deig: I've got it. You can take it from either one of those because you've got enough in either one of them.

Councilmember Hoy: From 2010-1990 Extra Help, the motion is we take \$2,602.80 and move that to 2010-1001 \$699.19; 2010-1002 \$442.19; 2010-1003 \$486.90; 2010-1004 \$486.90; 2010-1005 \$486.90. That's my motion.

Councilmember Sutton: Second.

President Bassemier: (Inaudible)

Councilmember Sutton: Well, I think it was already seconded, so...

President Bassemier: We have a motion and a second. (Inaudible) Okay, I understand it takes five votes for this to pass.

Councilmember Hoy: It takes two-thirds.

Suzanne Crouch: Five votes.

Councilmember Sutton: Wait a minute. Two-thirds is not five votes.

Councilmember Hoy: Takes five votes on a wage change.

Councilmember Sutton: Two-thirds of those present or those that are on the body?

Suzanne Crouch: It takes five votes.

Councilmember Hoy: It takes five no matter what. Two-thirds to reopen, five votes on a wage.

President Bassemier: Okay, roll call vote. Does everybody understand? Okay, it takes five votes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: No.

(Motion fails 4-2/Councilmembers Wortman & Bassemier opposed)

COUNTY HIGHWAY		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 2010-1990	Extra Help	4,000.00	0.00
2010-1750	Clothing Allowance	4,500.00	0.00
To: 2010-1001	Supervisor	2,500.00	0.00
2010-1002	Asst. Supervisor	1,500.00	0.00
2010-1003	Road Foreman	1,500.00	0.00
2010-1004	Road Foreman	1,500.00	0.00
2010-1005	Road Foreman	1,500.00	0.00

(No action taken on this request)

President Bassemier: It's set in at the first of the year, so...

Councilmember Sutton: Well, there's no action on that item that's on our agenda. There should be some action taken on that.

President Bassemier: (Inaudible).

Councilmember Sutton: Excuse me, Mr. President, there isn't any action taken on that if the first motion failed and the second motion failed, there is a request made before us and there isn't any action really taken on the item.

President Bassemier: Right. It didn't pass, so there's no action.

Councilmember Hoy: You had action on the item because what I did with my motion is to prorate these figures which were annualized figures and it didn't pass.

President Bassemier: That's right.

Councilmember Hoy: I wish it had, but it didn't.

President Bassemier: Yeah, that's right. It failed, so is that what you're asking? There's no changes. I mean, it stayed at what the Finance Chairman recommended.

Councilmember Tornatta: Okay.

CUMULATIVE BRIDGE

President Bassemier: Mr. Chairman?

Councilmember Wortman: Okay, let's move right on to Cumulative Bridge. Assistant County Engineer zero to Superintendent zero. Make that in the form of a motion.

President Bassemier: Do I have a second? Just to get it on the floor. It's not on the floor. Okay. Anybody want to make a motion to...

Councilmember Hoy: I move that we transfer from 2030-1100-2030 \$1,500 to 2030-1130-2030 \$1,500.

Councilmember Winnecke: That's another prorated figure, shouldn't it...

Sandie Deig: It would be 486.90.

Councilmember Hoy: \$486.90.

President Bassemier: Okay.

Councilmember Winnecke: Second.

President Bassemier: Second by Mr. Winnecke. Any discussion? Okay, roll call vote please. This takes five votes also, that's correct.

Councilmember Hoy: That's correct.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: No.

(Motion fails 4-2/Councilmembers Wortman & Bassemier opposed)

President Bassemier: Okay, that also did not pass.

CUMULATIVE BRIDGE		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 2030-1100-2030	Asst. County Engineer	1,500.00	0.00
To: 2030-1130-2030	Superintendent	1,500.00	0.00

(No action taken on this request)

FAMILY & CHILDREN

President Bassemier: Family & Children.

Councilmember Wortman: Okay, I make a motion that Family & Children from 2042-32500 Out of Foster Homes Placements \$350,000 to 2042-32540 Preservation Services \$350,000. I make that in the form of a motion.

Councilmember Winnecke: Second.

President Bassemier: Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

FAMILY & CHILDREN		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 2042-32500	Out of Home Foster Home Placements	350,000.00	350,000.00
To: 2042-32540	Preservation Services	350,000.00	350,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

Councilmember Wortman: Okay, Mr. Chairman, should I go over the County Commissioners transfer and Public Defenders?

President Bassemier: Yeah.

Councilmember Wortman: Okay, I'll go over that.

LATE TRANSFERS

**COMMISSIONERS
PUBLIC DEFENDER**

Councilmember Wortman: Okay, let's start out with the County Commissioners from department 1300, line item 3000 Bond & Insurance \$8,057 to Secretary \$7,136, 1900 FICA \$546, 1910 PERF \$375, makes a total of \$8,057. Now I'll take the next one, Public Defenders if it's okay, no objection. And 1303-1290 Public Defender \$10,164.24 to 1303-1970 Temporary Replacement \$10,164.24. I make those both in the form of a motion.

Councilmember Sutton: Yes. I mean second. And yes when that gets around to me.

President Bassemier: No doubt about that one. Okay, got a motion and a second. Any discussion please? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: You already got it. Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

COMMISSIONERS		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1300-3000	Bond & Insurance	8,057.00	8,057.00
To: 1300-1150-1300	Secretary	7,136.00	7,136.00
1300-1900	FICA	546.00	546.00
1300-1910	PERF	375.00	375.00

PUBLIC DEFENDER COMMISSION		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1303-1290-1303	Public Defender	10,164.24	10,164.24
To: 1303-1970	Temp. Replacement	10,164.24	10,164.24

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

President Bassemier: Okay, Mr. Wortman?

AMENDMENTS TO SALARY ORDINANCE

Councilmember Wortman: We’re going to get on the Salary Ordinance here. Okay, amendments to the Salary Ordinance as follows: 1361-1300 Case Manager as previously approved salary of \$32,376 for the current; 1361-1180 Clerk annual salary rate \$26,148; 1361-1290 Clerk annual salary rate \$25,681; and 136Z-1350 Case Manager annual salary \$36,297; 136Y-1180 Correction Officer Supervisor annual salary rate \$29,754. Now we’ll go to Burdette Park, amend the Salary Ordinance as previously approved 1450-1180 Other Employees. The Auditor, amend Salary Ordinance as transfer previously approved for 1020-1990 Extra Help. And then we go to the Sheriff, amend Salary Ordinance as follows: 1050-1130-0031 change position title from Corporal to Patrolman; 1050-1130-0034 change position title from Corporal to Patrolman; 1050-1130-0038 change position title from Corporal to Patrolman. And amend the Salary Ordinance as transfer previously approved for line item 1303-1970, it’s the Public Defender. Commissioners, amend Salary Ordinance as transfer previously approved. I make that in the form of a motion.

Councilmember Hoy: Second.

President Bassemier: I got a second by Mr. Hoy. Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

President Bassemier: Nothing under Old Business. Mr. Wortman?

NEW BUSINESS

Councilmember Wortman: Mr. President, in new business, line item number ten, the September filing date is September the 14th for the October meeting. Sandie has sent a memo to all the departments.

Sandie Deig: I will.

Councilmember Wortman: Or will. I'm sorry. Will.

President Bassemier: Okay.

Councilmember Wortman: And I don't have any other discussion on my end.

President Bassemier: Okay, do I have a motion to adjourn?

Councilmember Winnecke: So moved.

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: Everybody in favor say aye.

(All Councilmembers present voted aye)

President Bassemier: Opposed? Thank you.

(Meeting adjourned at 4:39 p.m.)

VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL

President Ed Bassemier

Vice President Lloyd Winnecke

ABSENT
Councilmember James Raben

Councilmember Phil Hoy

Councilmember Curt Wortman

Councilmember Royce Sutton

Councilmember Troy Tornatta

Recorded and transcribed by Teri Lukeman.

**VANDEBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL
FINAL BUDGET HEARING
SEPTEMBER 5, 2001**

The Vanderburgh County Council met in session this 5th day of September, 2001 in room 301 of the Civic Center Complex. The meeting was officially opened by President Ed Bassemier at 12:09 p.m.

President Bassemier: Sheriff, you want to open the meeting please?

Brad Ellsworth: Oh yes, oh yes, oh yes, the Vanderburgh County Council is now in session pursuant to adjournment.

President Bassemier: Thank you, sir. I want to welcome everyone to the September 5th, 2001 final 2002 budget hearing. Roll call please.

COUNCILMEMBER	PRESENT	ABSENT
Councilmember Tornatta	X	
Councilmember Sutton		X
Councilmember Wortman	X	
Councilmember Hoy	X	
Councilmember Raben	X	
Councilmember Winnecke	X	
President Bassemier	X	

President Bassemier: Would everyone please stand for the Pledge of Allegiance?

(Pledge of Allegiance was given)

APPROVAL OF BUDGET MINUTES FOR AUGUST 7, 8, 9, 14, 15, 16, 2001

President Bassemier: I need a motion for approval of budget minutes for August 7, 8, 9, 14, 15, 16, 2001. Can I have a motion please?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes, sir. I so approve.

President Bassemier: Do I have a second?

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

President Bassemier: As you know, this is the final budget hearing and the purpose is to complete adoption of our budget and establish the salaries and all employees' benefits and also to recommend to the state what would be the proposed tax rate. Today the chair will only recognize Councilmembers until after the Finance Chairman has completed his duties. At this time I am going to ask Councilman Raben, the Finance Chairman, to begin with the salary ordinance. Mr. Raben.

AMEND AND ADOPT SALARY ORDINANCE

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Mr. President, thank you. Let me start first with setting in some accounts and these would be on page 5 in your salary ordinance. First will be 1050-207 in the amount of \$22,130; 1050-208 \$22,130; 1050-209 \$26,752; 1050-210 \$29,266; 1050-215 \$27,801; 1050-216 \$24,328; 1050-217 \$23,201; 1050-218 \$24,328; 1050-231 \$23,201; 1050-232 \$22,130; 1051-338, that's 1051-338 \$25,511. Then 105.Q, Investigative Transcript \$27-

Suzanne Crouch: What page?

Councilmember Raben: I'm not looking at the actual book. The correct figure is \$27,904.

Teri Lukeman: What line item?

Councilmember Raben: That's 105.Q. Sounds like a radio station, don't it? It's \$27,904. And the three percent employee PERF to be paid by Vanderburgh County and that is subject to the County Commissioner's approval of the union contract effective January 1, 2002. All other county employees and including the Airport Authority receive a three percent wage increase in 2002. And I move that the Council accept the 2002 proposed Salary Ordinance with corrections and changes as printed with the following additional corrections. I'm going to start on page 10 of 26 under Voters Registration, and it's line, it's the first one, 1110. That should read C. Carrier; 1120 A. Bushrod. Then let's turn to page 12 of 26, at the top, it's account 1990, zero. Page 14 of 26, account 1550, that's P. Burress, and the amount is \$28,215. Then page 15 of 26 - is everybody still following? Okay. Account 1340 Bailiff, the correct figure is \$28,636; 1370 Bailiff is \$31,815; account 1480 Intake Probation Officer \$37,330; 1770 Small Claims Reporter \$35,526; 1801 Small Claims Reporter \$31,700. Then we will turn to page 17 of 26, and again, I'm simply going to - if you go to where it says section 105S, that should be deleted. If we can, let's go back. There is a typo and we do want to be clear on our actions today. But on page 14 of 26 I read 1550. That should read 1460. Should read 1460.

(Discussion was halted briefly to verify account number)

Councilmember Raben: Alright, Mr. President, we're still holding at 1460. Okay, now let's go back to page 17, 105.S should be deleted, 105.Q, under Sheriff Narcotics Control Grant, Investigative Transcript, which is a COMOT VI Step 3, should read D. Crane in the amount of \$27,904. And just above that on the same page, 1130 should read \$15,946. Now page 18 under County Highway, account 1001 Supervisor, should read R. Kissinger \$41,000; then 1002 Assistant Supervisor \$37,500; 1003 Road Crew Foreman, 1004 Road Crew Foreman, 1005 Road Crew Foreman, all in the amount of \$36,000. Now page 19 of 26 under Cum Bridge, account 1130 Superintendent should read \$36,000. Then on page 23 of 26 under Misdemeanor Offender, account 1110 which is a COMOT Union V Step 1, \$24,201; 1120 COMOT V Step 2, \$25,375. Just below that under Jail Misdemeanor Housing, you have account 1360 and 1370, those are both Detention Officers at a rate of \$28,363—

Councilmember Wortman: 936.

Councilmember Raben: – yes, \$28,936. With that, Mr. President, I'll move that all FICA and PERF to be adjusted accordingly. And I make that in the form of a motion.

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: I have a second by Mr. Winnecke. Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

President Bassemier: Okay, back to Mr. Raben.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Mr. President, I'll move that Exhibit A through H be approved as listed in the 2002 Salary Ordinance.

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: Second by Mr. Wortman. Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes. It passes.

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

DEPARTMENTAL BUDGET CHANGES

ELECTION OFFICE

President Bassemier: Mr. Raben.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Mr. President, now for our big green book. I'm going to start at page 70, which is the Election Office. If I could ever find my ink pen I'd sure feel better about this. I found it. I need it as a pointer. Okay, page 70, account 1160 should read \$39,250; 1170 \$49,000; 1180 \$65,300; 2280 \$15,450; page 71, account 3410 Printing \$65,775.

COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

Councilmember Raben: Then let's turn to page 83, account 1990, zero.

AUDITOR/REASSESSMENT

Councilmember Raben: Now turn to page 154. Just for clarification, I'm sure most everyone realizes what's going to happen through these. But if you recall, we took certain accounts out of the General Fund budget and moved them into Reassessment, so we're going to insert those. This doesn't have anything to do with the conversation that took place last Wednesday, you know, that we'll have to adjust as far as their additional monies that they're going to need. So 154, insert account - excuse me - we don't want to insert that. It's under account 1020-3371 Computer Hardware \$12,800; 1020-4220 \$20,000.

COUNTY ASSESSOR/REASSESSMENT

Councilmember Raben: Page 155, 1090-1990 Extra Help \$17,000; 1090-2600 \$4,000; 1090-3130 \$3,000; 1090-3310 \$15,000; 1090-3370 \$10,000; 1090-3371 \$2,000; 1090-3372 \$2,000; page 156, 1090-4210 zero; 1090-4220 \$10,000.

PROPERTY TAX BOARD OF APPEAL/REASSESSMENT

Councilmember Raben: Let's go to page 157, insert 1091-1180 Per Diem \$2,800; 1091-1900 FICA at \$521; 1091-1990 Extra Help \$4,000; then 1091-3130, it's another one we're going to insert, 1091-3130 Travel, \$1,000; 1091-3310 Training \$10,000; 1091-3370 \$6,000; 1091-3530 \$14,000.

ARMSTRONG ASSESSOR/REASSESSMENT

Councilmember Raben: Page 158, 1100-1110 zero; 1100-1990 \$13,600; 1100-2600 \$1,500; 1100-3130 \$750.

CENTER ASSESSOR/REASSESSMENT

Councilmember Raben: Now page 160, 1110-1990 \$5,000; 1110-2600 \$4,500; 1110-3130 \$2,000; 1110-3310 \$4,000.

GERMAN ASSESSOR/REASSESSMENT

Councilmember Raben: Page 162, 1120-1110 zero; 1120-2600 in the middle, 1120-2600 \$2,350; 1120-3130 \$1,400.

KNIGHT ASSESSOR/REASSESSMENT

Councilmember Raben: Page 164, 1130-1110 zero; 1130-2600 \$5,600; 1130-3130 \$4,000; 1130-3310 \$3,000. Page 165 at the bottom, 1130-4220 \$1,500.

PERRY ASSESSOR/REASSESSMENT

Councilmember Raben: Page 166, 1140-1110 zero; 1140-2600 \$3,000; 1140-3130 \$2,300; 1140-3310 \$1,000.

PIGEON ASSESSOR/REASSESSMENT

Councilmember Raben: Page 168. We're getting close here. At the top, 1150-1110 zero; 1150-1990 \$65,000; 1150-2600 \$7,000; 1150-3130 \$5,500; 1150-3310 \$5,000; 1150-3370 \$16,000. 169, at the top, 1150-3372 \$8,000. Then we need to insert 1150-4220 Office Machines \$1,000.

SCOTT ASSESSOR/REASSESSMENT

Councilmember Raben: Page 170, 1160-1110 zero; 1160-1990 \$17,100; 1160-2600 \$4,000; 1160-3130 \$3,100; at the bottom, 1160-3371 \$15,900. Then page 171, we need to insert 1160-4220 Office Machines \$1,000.

UNION ASSESSOR/REASSESSMENT

Councilmember Raben: Page 172, 1170-2600 \$300; then we need to insert 1170-3130 Travel/Mileage \$300; 1170-3310 Training \$700; 1170-3370 \$500. And, Mr. President, this motion – let me just do one other thing, on all other Reassessment lines, I move that they are to be set in at zero and I move that in all other budgets, the 2000, 3000 and 4000 accounts be adopted as previously approved by this body. And then I also need to list all of the different offices and departments and again, with that motion that all other Assessor/Reassessment budgets be set in at zero with the exception of the lines that I've just read.

2000, 3000 & 4,000 ACCOUNTS IN ALL OTHER BUDGETS

All other 2000, 3000 and 4000 accounts in all other budgets as previously adopted for the following, and I'm going to list them all: 911 Emergency Service, Airport Authority, Area Plan Commission, Armstrong Assessor, Armstrong Assessor/Reassessment, County Assessor, Assessor/Reassessment, Auditor, Auditor/Reassessment, Bond Issue, Burdette Park, Center Assessor, Center Assessor/Reassessment, Circuit Court, Circuit Court Supplemental Adult Probation, Clerk, Clerk IV-D, Commissioners, Commissioners/CCD, Convention Center Operating Fund, Convention & Visitors Center, Cooperative Extension, County Coroner, County Council, Cum Bridge, Draining Board, Drug & Alcohol Deferral, Election Office, Family & Children, German Assessor, German Assessor/Reassessment, Health Department, The Highway Department, Jail, Knight Assessor, Knight Assessor/Reassessment, Legal Aid, Legal Aid/United Way, Levee Distribution Tax, Local Drug Free Community, Local Emergency Planning Committee, Local Roads & Streets, Perry Assessor, Perry Assessor Reassessment, Pigeon Assessor, Pigeon Assessor/Reassessment, Property Tax Assessment Board of Appeal, Property Tax Assessment Board of Appeal/Reassessment, Prosecutor, Prosecutor IV-D, Prosecutor Check Recovery, Prosecutor Drug Law Enforcement, Prosecutor Victims/Witness Assistance Program, Prosecutor Stop Domestic Violence, Prosecutor Adult Protective Services, Prosecutor Pre-Trial Diversion, Public Defender Commission, Recorder, Riverboat, Sales Disclosure Fees, Scott Assessor, Scott Assessor/Reassessment, Sheriff, Sheriff/Community Corrections, Sheriff/Misdemeanor Housing, Sheriff/Misdemeanor Offender, Superior Court, Superior Court/Supplemental Adult Probation, Superintendent of County Buildings, Surveyor, Surveyor/Maps, Surveyor Corner Perpetuation, The Centre, Tourism Capital Improvement, County Treasurer, Union Assessor, Union Assessor/Reassessment, Veterans Administration, Voters Registration, Weights & Measures. Mr. President, I make that in the form of a motion.

Councilmember Hoy: Second.

President Bassemier: Mr. Hoy. Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

President Bassemier: Mr. Raben?

AMENDED INSURANCE DATA

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Mr. President, all Councilmen were given insurance data for 2002 and I'm going to move that the Council approve this 2002 insurance budget list.

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: I have a second from Mr. Wortman. Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes. That passes.

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

President Bassemier: Mr. Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Mr. President, have we voted on the last, the insurance data?

President Bassemier: Yes, it passed.

CONVENTION & VISITORS (Continued on page 10)

Councilmember Raben: No, I don't need to reopen that, but I am going to, just for clarification, go to page 186, Convention & Visitors Commission. At the top, 1110-3570 should be set in at \$30,000. Along with that, 1170-3570 \$40,000; the rest of this budget is part of the prior motion including the FICA & PERF that I earlier had stated will be adjusted accordingly. Mr. President, at this time I'll make that in the form of a motion.

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: Second Mr. Wortman. Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

ESTABLISH COUNTY TAX RATE

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Mr. President, next I'm going to move that the County Council set the county tax rate as deemed appropriate by the Indiana State Tax Commissioners following their review of our budget. And I'd like to make that in the form of a motion.

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: I have a second Mr. Wortman. Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

ESTABLISH CUM BRIDGE TAX RATE

Councilmember Raben: Mr. President, I'll move that we set the Cum Bridge tax rate at \$.15 per \$100 assessed valuation and I make that in the form of a motion.

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: I have a second from Mr. Wortman. Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

MOTION TO REOPEN

CONVENTION & VISITORS BUREAU (Continued from page 8)

Councilmember Raben: Mr. President, there was a question as to when we went back in and opened up 186. How did everyone understand my motion on 1110-3570?

Suzanne Crouch: I have it at \$30,000.

Councilmember Raben: I made the motion at 70, is there –

President Bassemier: No, I was going to question that, too. You made it at 30.

Councilmember Hoy: It should be at 70.

Suzanne Crouch: You can just correct it.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Mr. President, I'd like to move that we reopen page 186.

Councilmember Hoy: Second.

President Bassemier: Okay. Got a second to open it. Okay, any discussion?

Councilmember Wortman: What page?

President Bassemier: That's page 186, Convention & Visitors Department. Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Mr. President, account 1110-3570 \$70,000, and I make that in the form of a motion.

President Bassemier: Do I have a second?

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: Mr. Wortman second. Any discussion on that? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

President Bassemier: Okay, Mr. Raben, you got anything else you'd like to add?

Councilmember Raben: Well, Mr. President, I will not be present at our 3:30 meeting but I would like to ask the Councilmembers to – well, if everyone remembers, we had asked Computer Services to attend our meeting with regards to the discussion we had last week on the County Assessor's ProVal software that they're going to need to handle the Reassessment. So with that, I would just like to make sure that we ask the folks from Computer Services two or three things that I think are of great importance. Do you want me to stop?

Teri Lukeman: Please.

(Tape changed)

Councilmember Raben: – the equipment. And is our software package that we're looking at, is all of it going to be compatible with GIS, because we certainly have invested enough there that we don't need to buy equipment that will not intermingle with the GIS program. And the other, Mr. President, would be need to address with them, it's my understanding that they are to provide a service to maintain our system and some of the Assessors last week had expressed that they have been told by Computer Services that they will not maintain or work on equipment that does not come through them. I don't, it's my understanding that that's not what they're hired to do and I think we need to address that with them and I think we've got every right or this county has every right to go out and look for our best deal on the equipment and they should work with us however we need them to do because, again, that's what they're hired to do and it sounds to me as if there's another interest there that I don't think is part of their deal. And that's all I had to offer for this afternoon's meeting. Let me address our budget cuts. With the cuts that we've made, the total cuts should come to \$10,462,633. \$10,462,633. And of course, nothing is ever definite until the state signs off on it, but with this I would certainly hope that the tax rate would remain the same or go down slightly. So I'd like to thank everybody and I think everybody's done a great job and I'm glad it's over with.

President Bassemier: I'd like to echo that, too. Mr. Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Thank you, Mr. President. I have three brief comments. First of all, I laid a communication on your desks from the Public Defender. As you know, I'm the liaison to that department. We were concerned about how much money we were going to get back and we hope to see this check and when it comes, I'd like to know, Madam Auditor, okay? But he was very wise in waiting to submit that. It looks like we're going to get \$256,367.81 back from the state. That's good news because we were wondering just how much of that money was going to be available. Share that with you. On a negative note, I want to go on record as regards the Convention & Visitors Bureau. I have researched this and I wasn't real pleased that I was the only Councilman named in this memo, nor do I agree with their legal counsel which says we virtually have no control. Going back in our budget minutes, back to 1998, we were promised that major changes would not be made. The legal counsel says, well, that is not binding on them, and we have a wage going up to \$70,000. I voted yes on that wage because I think that we could have a legal problem if we did not. However, I feel as a Councilman, we're in the

same bind we were in a few years ago with a department that moved to Darmstadt without permission with high rent and we got caught in a bind on that. I felt that this appointment should not have been announced until after at least today or until after at least the state approved our budget. I voted yes because I don't want to get into a contract dispute. Secondly, I do not want to be negative towards the new person coming in. It may be a very fine person, but I do believe that this should have been done in a different order. The other comment that I have to make, in the communication from the Convention & Visitor's Bureau, it was said they are just like the Airport Board. They are not. But secondly, back in 1997, I have the minutes here where we made a change in the Airport Board's budget during budget hearings. We do have control over these budgets. The final remark I would make is from the Indiana Code which says thusly, "The commission," that's the Convention & Visitor's Bureau, "shall submit the budget to the County Council for its review and approval. No expenditure shall be made," shall be made, and that's the strongest legal word you can have. I believe counsel would agree with that. Shall is very strong. "It is pursuant to an appropriation made by the County Council in a manner provided by law and to the expenditures payable from the Tourism Capital Development Fund. The specific project for which the expenditure will be made has been a) recommended to the County Council by the Commission; and b) approved by the County Council." And my point simply is to enforce my feeling that this body still has control over that budget. And I want that in the public record and to express my unhappiness at the way the procedure took place. Moving from that, since my colleague, Mr. Sutton, who is our senior minority member, since he is not here, as the second senior member of the minority, I would like to express gratitude to everyone on this Council, particularly to the President and to the Finance Chairman. I cannot recall -- this is my ninth budget -- I cannot recall a year, any year that included all of us so well in this process. I think we've done very well and I think this body should be proud of itself and we probably have demonstrated that of all the bodies in this Council, we deliberate better than anybody else. Thank you.

President Bassemier: Thank you, Mr. Hoy. And I want to echo the same thing, and Mr. Raben and everybody. Mr. Wortman, you got something you'd like to say?

Councilmember Wortman: I've always got something to say. Yeah. I want to thank everybody, Mr. Hoy, and especially Jim Raben. He spent a lot of time here and he did real well. I don't want to brag at him too much because he's liable to want a raise and we don't want that to be out of line, see. But no, he did real good, and then Lloyd and then you, Mr. President, Mr. Bassemier, and Troy, and then, of course, Mr. Sutton, especially Sandie here, too. I don't know what we'd do without her.

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Councilmember Wortman: In plain words. Yeah.

Councilmember Raben: Sarah, too. We leave that out too often.

Councilmember Wortman: She's been a pretty good girl.

Councilmember Raben: But you're right. Thank you, Sandie and Sarah.

Councilmember Hoy: Well, she does live near Darmstadt, I believe. That probably has an effect.

Councilmember Wortman: Yeah, that makes (inaudible).

President Bassemier: Everybody needs to stick around to sign the Salary Ordinance, so do I have a motion to adjourn?

Councilmember Hoy: So moved.

Councilmember Winnecke: Second.

President Bassemier: Everybody in favor say aye.

(All Councilmembers present voted aye)

President Bassemier: Any opposed? We're adjourned.

(Meeting adjourned at 12:55 p.m.)

VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL

President Ed Bassemier

Vice President Lloyd Winnecke

Councilmember James Raben

Councilmember Phil Hoy

Councilmember Curt Wortman

ABSENT
Councilmember Royce Sutton

Councilmember Troy Tornatta

Recorded and transcribed by Teri Lukeman.

**VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL
MINUTES
OCTOBER 3, 2001**

The Vanderburgh County Council met in session the 3rd day of October, 2001 in room 301 of the Civic Center Complex. The meeting was called to order at 3:35 p.m. by County Council President Ed Bassemier.

President Bassemier: Sheriff, you want to open the meeting, please?

Brad Ellsworth: Oh yes, oh yes, oh yes, the Vanderburgh County Council is now in session pursuant to adjournment.

President Bassemier: Thank you, Sheriff. I want to welcome everybody to our October 3, 2001 County Council meeting. We need to take attendance roll call.

COUNCILMEMBER	PRESENT	ABSENT
Councilmember Tornatta	X	
Councilmember Sutton	X	
Councilmember Wortman	X	
Councilmember Hoy	X	
Councilmember Raben	X	
Councilmember Winnecke	X	
President Bassemier	X	

President Bassemier: Would everyone please stand for the Pledge of Allegiance?

(Pledge of Allegiance was given)

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FINAL BUDGET HEARING SEPTEMBER 5, 2001 REGULAR MEETING SEPTEMBER 5, 2001

President Bassemier: I need a motion to approve the final budget hearing September 5, 2001 and the regular meeting September 5th, 2001.

Councilmember Sutton: So moved.

President Bassemier: I have a motion.

Councilmember Raben: Second.

President Bassemier: Got a second. Roll call vote please – or everybody in favor say aye. We better move on.

(All Councilmembers voted aye)

President Bassemier: Anybody opposed?

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATION REQUESTS
--

President Bassemier: Okay, we'll get into the Appropriation Ordinance. I'll turn it over now to our finance chairman, Mr. Raben.

TREASURER

Councilmember Raben: Okay, thank you, Mr. President. First on the agenda is the Treasurer's Office, 1030-4220, that line needs to read 1030-3370 in the amount of \$1,987. I'll move approval.

Councilmember Hoy: Second.

President Bassemier: Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

TREASURER		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1030-4220	Office Machines	1,987.00	0.00
1030-3370	Computer (Data Mgmt)	0.00	1,987.00
Total		1,987.00	1,987.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

SHERIFF

President Bassemier: Mr. Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Sheriff, Gas & Oil in the amount of \$40,000. I'll move approval.

Councilmember Sutton: Second.

President Bassemier: Got a second, Mr. Sutton. Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

SHERIFF		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1050-2210	Gas & Oil	40,000.00	40,000.00
Total		40,000.00	40,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

JAIL (Two requests)

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Mr. President, 1051-1950 Teamster's Educational Fund \$3,928, then I'm going to skip down to 1051-2260 Food in the amount of \$65,000, and I'll move approval.

Councilmember Hoy: Second.

President Bassemier: Got a second from Mr. Hoy. Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Second. Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Fourth. Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Fifth. Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

JAIL		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1051-1950	Teamster's Ed. Fund	3,928.00	3,928.00
Total		3,928.00	3,928.00

JAIL		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1051-2260	Food	65,000.00	65,000.00
Total		65,000.00	65,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

SURVEYOR

President Bassemier: Okay, Mr. Raben, Surveyor?

Councilmember Raben: Surveyor, 1060-2210, 1060-2230, 1060-2600 for a total request of \$1,200. I'll move approval.

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: Second by Mr. Wortman. Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

SURVEYOR		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1060-2210	Gas & Oil	500.00	500.00
1060-2230	Garage & Motor	200.00	200.00
1060-2600	Office Supplies	500.00	500.00
Total		1,200.00	1,200.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

COUNTY ASSESSOR

President Bassemier: Okay, Mr. Raben.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, County Assessor, 1090-1972, 1090-1900, 1090-1910 be set in at – let’s go to the first line, the correct figure is \$253 and not 341.

President Bassemier: I’m sorry, sir.

Councilmember Raben: \$253.

President Bassemier: Thank you, sir.

Councilmember Raben: FICA \$20, PERF \$18, for a total request of \$291, and those figures reflect an effective date of 10/1, so...

Councilmember Winnecke: Second.

President Bassemier: Second by Mr. Winnecke. Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

COUNTY ASSESSOR		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1090-1972	Level II Certification	341.00	253.00
1090-1900	FICA	30.00	20.00
1090-1910	PERF	20.00	18.00
Total		391.00	291.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

PROPERTY TAX BOARD OF APPEALS

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Property Tax Board of Appeals, 1091-3130, move it be set in at zero.

Councilmember Sutton: Second.

President Bassemier: I have a second by Mr. Sutton. Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

PROP. TAX BD. OF APPEALS		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1091-3130	Travel/Mileage	1,500.00	0.00
Total		1,500.00	0.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

SUPERINTENDENT OF COUNTY BUILDINGS

Councilmember Raben: Superintendent of County Buildings, 1310-1750 Clothing Allowance in the amount of \$500. I'll move approval.

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: Second by Mr. Wortman. Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

SUPT. OF COUNTY BLDGS.		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1310-1750	Clothing Allowance	500.00	500.00
Total		500.00	500.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

CIRCUIT COURT

President Bassemier: Mr. Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Circuit Court, 1360-3260 Law Library Books in the amount of \$10,000. I'll move approval – well, I'll allow for questions.

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: Got a second from Mr. Wortman. Any discussion?

Carl Heldt: You asked me to come back with some numbers on print books vis-a-vis CD-Rom and Internet-type research. I have that. I have the law librarian in here if you want me to talk about it or I can just leave the numbers with you, whatever is your pleasure.

President Bassemier: Okay, state your name, sir.

Carl Heldt: Carl Heldt, Circuit Court Judge.

President Bassemier: Thank you, sir.

Councilmember Raben: If we've got just a moment, I'd like for him to pass that information out.

President Bassemier: Okay.

Carl Heldt: This is Helen Reed, the law librarian.

President Bassemier: Okay.

Helen Reed: Hello, and thank you for the opportunity to talk to you a little bit today about computerized legal research. As you know, most of what the law library currently receives is in print form. There are currently –

President Bassemier: Ma'am? I hate to interrupt you, but for the record, would you state your name.

Helen Reed: My name is Helen Reed, I am Vanderburgh County law librarian.

President Bassemier: Okay, thank you, ma'am.

Helen Reed: As I was saying, we get most of our research materials currently in print form and there are currently two commercially available alternatives to print. There is CD-Rom in which instead of sending a book in the mail, the publisher sends CD's in the mail at intervals. Those CD's expire, you get more CD's and there is the license, filling out how many people can use the CD at a time. Actually, the law library has had such materials. We had them from 1995 until 1998. We discontinued them because there were a lot of technical problems. We converted those subscriptions to on-line so we currently have some materials already in on-line format. What you have in front of you is one vendor's comparison costs. At the top you will see what we spent with that vendor for print in 2000, and then you will see what that vendor would charge for us to receive the equivalent on CD's, and then what that vendor would charge for the equivalent in on-line, in other words with some sort of telecommunications link. When you subscribe to library materials in on-line form, you don't really receive anything, what you do is pay rent in effect for the privilege of dialing into their database, their computers, and you pay depending on how many people use the system at a time, and also you pay on how much information you get access to. These are usually, we negotiate it annually. You'll see that there are additional charges if more than one user at a time makes use of the material and in addition to what you pay the vendor instead of what you were paying for the books, you also have to have computer equipment and I've given some estimates as to what that would cost per work station. At the very bottom of your handout you will see comparison figures from another library in the state of Indiana in Allen County. What they were currently getting in print from this same vendor, they chose to convert to on-line and they are currently paying \$42,000 a year. I'd be happy to answer questions if I can. I would emphasize, by the way, that we're talking about commercial products here. There are a lot of free services available over the Internet, unfortunately, they're very uneven in quality. They have large gaps in them. They're not always reliable, in fact, some have disclaimers saying you should not rely on this. And until the not-for-profit, the non-commercial services are better developed and more user-friendly, I think it would be unwise for a public institution to rely on them.

President Bassemier: Okay. Anybody got any questions?

Councilmember Raben: Mr. President, I certainly appreciate the information that's been gathered. I still would like us to look further in to whatever options are available that would be cost effective for us. And another idea, which this doesn't have anything to do with the action that's taking place today, but why wouldn't the Evansville-Vanderburgh County Library be responsible for funding this library?

Helen Reed: Are you talking about the public library system?

Councilmember Raben: Right.

Helen Reed: I don't know the full history behind that, but I do know that the law library is not considered a public library in the way that it is funded, in the same way as the Evansville-Vanderburgh County public library system is funded.

Councilmember Raben: Well, obviously, because we're funding it, but why can't it be? It is a public library.

Helen Reed: I don't know the answer to that.

Councilmember Raben: I mean, I would certainly think that's what we need to look at between now and maybe the end of the year, is possibly requesting that the library board look into taking over this. I mean, they can build big, beautiful magnificent buildings, surely they can fund this library.

Helen Reed: I can't speak for the administration of the public library system, but I do know that they already serve a pretty large percentage of business and legal research needs that are not met by the county law library. In other words, they get a great deal of what's called self-help, the kinds of things that people use if they are choosing for one reason or another to take care of their own legal needs. That's an area that the county law library has never got into at all. I refer people with those kinds of needs to the public library system on a daily basis and they have a significant chunk of their reference budget invested in that kind of resource.

Councilmember Raben: But again, I mean, I understand what you're saying there and I don't want to put novels in this library, either. But they need or I see no reason why they can't maintain this library. Why they can't foot the entire bill on it.

Helen Reed: I really can't speak to that. I have no authority to do so.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, thank you.

Councilmember Hoy: Question about the –

President Bassemier: Mr. Sutton.

Councilmember Hoy: I'm sorry, go ahead.

President Bassemier: Mr. Sutton and then we'll get you.

Councilmember Sutton: Miss Reed, I was going to ask you about the information that you prepared for us, and thanks for putting this together, it's helpful.

Helen Reed: You're welcome.

Councilmember Sutton: But just trying to get an idea of the sense, if you talk about on-line access or even looking at CD-Rom's, in that direction, are we talking about a number of vendors that provide this type of service or are we talking about one maybe exclusive vendor that's involved with this?

Helen Reed: The figures you have in front of you represent one vendor, the vendor that incidentally supplies most of what we currently get. Legal publishing, there are two or three dominant vendors and a few much smaller ones. What you see here is the cost comparison for one vendor. There is one other major vendor that would have similar alternatives available.

Councilmember Sutton: Are these Indiana based companies or –

Helen Reed: No, these are national.

Councilmember Sutton: Well, I guess, you know, when we look at trying to compare, you know, we're always looking for ways to try to be more efficient and at the same time, you know, we still do want to make sure that even in our quest for efficiency, that we're meeting a particular need in the best possible fashion and if this is a method that might be – I don't know, might be something that might be of interest to some individuals in moving to this direction, it does, this information that you gathered is worthwhile, but I think it is also worth a discussion with the public library system. They have bonding authority just like we do and –

Helen Reed: I should also mention –

Councilmember Sutton: – nice, new building, and would be a nice addition to their new building if they were interested.

Helen Reed: I should also mention that the picture is constantly changing and you'll notice that the figures on your sheet are from August of 2001. I get figures all the time from the sales representatives for the major vendors and I'm constantly evaluating whether we can afford to drop this or that subscription. In fact, we never add subscriptions anymore. All we do is drop. And that's something that I consider part of my job, to be constantly evaluating and trying to find the best value for the money.

Councilmember Sutton: Thank you.

President Bassemier: Thank you.

Helen Reed: You're welcome.

President Bassemier: Mr. Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Thank you, again, because this helps us immensely. My question is, since the making of law is a function of government, why doesn't the state government and the federal government or whoever else, make this available? I have problems understanding that. I know that's not a question that's fair, you know, to ask you because you're the librarian, you have to deal with these folks, but I've never understood, you know, we try to make all kinds of information available in this county free of charge to our constituents –

Helen Reed: And it's getting better all the time, too, I might add.

Councilmember Hoy: Thank you. We hope so. That's our aim. It just seems strange to me that our state government, etc. doesn't make this available, especially on-line since that's such a –

Helen Reed: There are currently movements in that direction in many states and indeed the state of Indiana has a very fine website with a lot of things available. The trouble with relying on that sort of thing is, for one thing, you can't get anything beyond say, 1998. Anything that happened prior to 1998, it's not going to be represented, by and large, on this date, website.

Councilmember Hoy: I'm sorry. I'm hearing a cell phone conversation along with yours, and I wish they would stop. Go ahead.

Helen Reed: The state of Indiana website is increasing and has many, many useful things. Unfortunately, they only date back to about 1998. So it's not possible to completely eliminate all of the Indiana print and rely only on the website at this time. In five years it may be a totally different picture.

Councilmember Hoy: Be a nice goal for them to set. That would be helpful to local

government.

Helen Reed: Well yes, and I can't speak to your question as to why it's that way. I think it has to do with the history of legal publishing nationwide and there are a couple of dominant vendors that basically charge whatever they want to.

Councilmember Hoy: Okay, thank you.

Helen Reed: You're welcome.

Carl Heldt: (Inaudible – comments not made from microphone)

President Bassemier: Certainly.

Carl Heldt: I'd like to point out that we are asking for a total of, I think \$40,000 for this year. I think that it's apparent that the law library has been very conscientious about being good stewards of the county's money. Back in 1995, you paid \$34,000, and it's gone from 35, to 36, to 37, and now it's at 40, and that's a seven-year span. I don't think that is an exploding cost. I really don't think we're asking for something that's way out of line. Secondly, it's the county's job, the county's duty and responsibility or whatever you think of it, to finance the judicial system, the judicial branch of government, and these are the tools of our trade. This is like paper and pencils to you people, and telephones, and we can't operate without law books. And so in that respect, I think the county does have a duty to contribute to the law books in the county. And I might also point out, once again, that the Vanderburgh County Law Library Foundation, which is composed of the attorneys in town that have contributed an excess of \$200,000 to the foundation, also contributes to these expenses. So I think it's a reasonable –

President Bassemier: I think the motion was positive, so we've got a motion and a second, so...anymore discussion? Thank you, ma'am. Thank you, your honor. Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

CIRCUIT COURT		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1360-3260	Law Library Books	10,000.00	10,000.00
Total		10,000.00	10,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

BURDETTE PARK

President Bassemier: Okay, Mr. Raben.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Mr. President, on this request, this is Burdette 1450-4120 Buildings in the amount of \$1,000,000. Let me first start with last week, Commissioner Fanello was asked to come back to this body and maybe set a priority as to whether or not they wanted us to fund the new O'Day Lodge at Burdette or possibly scale it back or save that money to use towards the Old Courthouse. And I think in their meeting Monday night two of the Commissioners stated that they find them both equal in terms of priority, which I don't feel one way or the other. I mean, I would tend to agree with them, that they both do carry a high priority. What they did do is approve for RFP's for grant writers, which I think is a step in the right direction. I'm certainly happy to hear that. But in terms of how we balance which project that maybe we should look at funding today and funding at a later date, based upon that, I don't think we want to look at funding the roof of the Old Courthouse this year or anytime in the near future until we allow their grant writer the opportunity to see what types of federal funds are available. At that point, hopefully, we're looking at a matching grant. So my motion, I guess, right now, is that for the 1450-4120 Buildings, that it would be set in at zero and would ask the Commissioners to file an appropriation out of CCD to begin this project.

President Bassemier: Okay, I'm going to get a motion on the floor and then we'll discuss it. Thank you, ma'am. Do I have a second? Mr. Wortman. Now we're open for discussion. Please state your name.

Catherine Fanello: Catherine Fanello, County Commissioner. And I agree with Councilman Raben. We certainly do want to find as much grant money as possible, but I think everyone here is aware that we probably won't see any grant money until 2003 and possibly 2004. And with the state of the economy, nationally and statewide, I don't know how much grant money is going to be available out there. Our only concern, Commissioner Mosby's and my concern, is the fact that the roof keeps falling in and our maintenance guy is going around every morning cleaning up things off the floor from the roof. So I don't know what kind of condition, since I'm not a building person or an architect, I don't know what that does to the building for us to wait an extended period of time and not repair something like that. Whatever we do with the Old Courthouse, and I think most of you know we're looking at possibly moving some government offices over there and whatever happens with the Old Courthouse, the fact remains that it is our responsibility and we have to do the upkeep and maintenance on it, so I just don't know what kind of situation we put ourselves in financially by waiting too long to repair something like that, if it's going to end up costing us more money, the longer we wait.

Councilmember Winnecke: How long is too long, do you think?

Catherine Fanello: And I would not even attempt to answer that question, like I said, since I don't know how those things affect buildings. I mean, we could certainly do some research and find out. Will Fosse was the one who was a major contributor to that committee and knows a lot about that kind of building, and he's the one that

really made the recommendation, I think, getting that fixed and the windows fixed. So I could certainly defer to him on that. But I wouldn't attempt to answer that question.

Councilmember Tornatta: I was going to say, as part of the committee, that's one of the first things we talked about getting fixed, was the roof, because that's going to cause, in turn, some other things, some other problems with the structure, having water and everything else inside there. And he was very adamant on getting that fixed. Then possibly doing something with the windows. You've got a Catch-22: if you don't do Burdette Park, then you waste some of your excavating and some of your site work; however, in my opinion, you're wasting just as many dollars by not putting a roof on this building with structural damage. So I think we need to consider that as well, because either way, you're talking about whether you waste site preparation of a half million dollars or whether you have a half million dollars worth of structural damage to a historic building. I think you have to consider that. And I think with architects saying that it should be done right away as priority one, I would not say that that's anything we can put off for a year and a half, two years.

President Bassemier: Mr. Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: This may be a question that's been asked before, but I was not here last week. I just got back in town. We still are discussing the Burdette proposal, a project that I would like to see completed. How much of this million dollars is construction cost, how much is equipment? Do you have a breakdown on that? You may have given that last week and if you did, I'm sorry.

Catherine Fanello: We didn't.

Steve Craig: Of the million dollars –

President Bassemier: Name?

Steve Craig: Steve Craig, Manager of Burdette Park. Just under \$500,000 is equipment and stuff that we need to furnish the building and make it functional for what we were going to use it for.

Councilmember Hoy: And that includes desks, furniture, computers...

Steve Craig: Everything. Playground, outside, inside, the lighting for the outside parking lots, the finishing of the paving, furnishing of the kitchens...

Councilmember Hoy: Well, I am just, again, you may have discussed this last week and I may be taking more of this Council's time than I should, but I see a million four in CCD and I don't know why we can't use that towards both these projects and that would give us – we could finish the building and then after the first of the year, we could take a good look at equipping it because it's going to be used for – Burdette is going to be used for summer use, so that would give us some time to take care of furnishings inside. And it seems like with that sum of money, we come real close to doing both of these except for, you know, the equipment that you need. And I don't want to shortchange you on equipment. Another thought that comes to me on equipment, when it comes to the computers is, when we replace, as I think we are going to, a whole lot of computers with the Assessors, those computers could well be used at Burdette and simply moved out there. I know that wouldn't do all your furnishings at Burdette, but it would still be a hunk. Speaking for myself, I'm just trying to make sure we manage all of what's been laid on our laps as well as we

can, with the funds that we have.

Councilmember Raben: To echo what Mr. Hoy just said and I certainly agree with him, there is 1.4 in the CCD right now and I think the early estimates on the courthouse roof were \$700,000 approximately, and given that and –

Catherine Fanello: Can I go through those numbers –

Councilmember Raben: – this project, you can just about pay for both of them out of that?

Catherine Fanello: Well, can I go through those numbers with you real quick, because I'm a little confused. Right now, we have \$1,454,859 unappropriated. I believe next year's estimated revenues as given by the Auditor were supposed to be 1.5 million. And is the 2001 budget 1.6 million?

Councilmember Raben: One point six –

Catherine Fanello: Okay, that leaves us with 1,354,859, and if we take a million away for Burdette Park or you want us to cut that a little bit, that leaves us with \$354,859 approximately, so that does not cover completely both projects unless we do cut some from Burdette Park. But I guess you're saying you want to deplete the CCD Fund completely.

Councilmember Raben: Right. And you know, again, this is your call –

Catherine Fanello: And once again, we're entering one of those situations where there's no money set aside for any emergency situation, just like there isn't right now, and the Old Courthouse, to me, is an emergency situation.

Councilmember Winnecke: What is the estimated construction time on the lodge?

Steve Craig: Six months, Lloyd.

Councilmember Hoy: My point there would be that since we are at the October meeting of this year, we only have, you know, a fourth of the year left and should we have an emergency, which we do, I think you're quite correct, in the courthouse, we don't know what we've got, but I think we've got an emergency there.

Catherine Fanello: But I'm just saying, you realize that next year there will be no money in CCD whatsoever.

Councilmember Sutton: Well, I think as we look at this, I mean, when you look at systems in any building and I, by no stretch of the margin am no expert or even claim to be, but if you don't have a good roof, obviously, it's going to have a tremendous affect upon other areas of a building and the discussions that we have had over the last several months is that we want to begin to look at that as usable, leasable space over there. In the condition that it's in, obviously, that's not going to be an option that we can pursue, so I think without question, we do need to move forward with getting that roof squared away. The lodge, I've been a big supporter of that and think it is a great project, and from a priority standpoint, I don't think they are both number ones. I think anytime you have a safety issue with a building, that becomes number one and I think the lodge, though it will have great use, I think we need to look at some other ways toward funding that. Now, Phil, I think you asked an interesting question in terms of how much is going to be used for what purpose

on the lodge. And I don't know if our forum and procedure will allow us to proceed forward on a project unless we have all the dollars up front on a project. We can't very well shortchange it, and looking at where we are from a financial health standpoint, I mean, I don't think we should, obviously, deplete the CCD Fund, but clearly we could pull the roof for the Old Courthouse out of the CCD Fund and then on Burdette Park, you know, I think we can use a combination. We've got, you know, we could use some from CCD. We have some in General, but I think our number one priority is we just need to get the roof. And if that means delaying or waiting on the Burdette Park, the lodge, I would think that would be the more prudent thing to do.

Councilmember Hoy: My opinion on this is maybe not popular, but it's my opinion, so it's mine and I'll claim it. I still feel that given the large amount we have in Cumulative Bridge, we could move some money over from the million dollars and do the Old Courthouse, leave the Cum Bridge Fund in good shape and then do the whole Burdette project, and it still wouldn't strip CCD, plus you'll have income from next year. I don't want to be misunderstood on Burdette. I don't want to not complete the construction. I'm just saying, well, if we did the construction and the furnishing later of desks and computers and that sort of thing and even playground, that could be done, I'm sure the price will go up and it seems to be going up on everything except gasoline right now, maybe later that will change. But that, to me, is another creative way to fund this and not get ourselves in a terrific financial bind.

Councilmember Sutton: What restrictions do we have on the Cum Bridge?

Catherine Fanello: I was just going to ask that question on the Cumulative Bridge.

Suzanne Crouch: Well, the Cumulative Bridge Fund, currently the monies within that fund cannot be moved to another fund, but I think what you're referencing is if a Cumulative Courthouse Building Fund was established, that would bring in monies in future years and then you could, in turn, cut the rate in Cum Bridge. I think that's what you're talking about.

Councilmember Hoy: Our lawyer gave us, you gave us some – if you would repeat that, I would appreciate it because that's why we have you here.

Jeff Ahlers: The Auditor is correct. I mean, what you can do is you have the Cum Fund that you create for the courthouse. You'd reduce, whatever percentage you set in there, you could reduce the Cum Bridge tax rate and therefore, you wouldn't be raising any taxes on the public, but yet effectively sort of putting money there. And that would work. But I don't think you can transfer any money out of Cum Bridge other than, I guess, there are some ways you could probably use some Cum Bridge money to do road work as it relates to so many hundred feet from a bridge and then maybe use some of your paving money, transfer, you could do maybe something like that. But otherwise, I think that what Mr. Hoy is talking about is correct.

Councilmember Hoy: No, I'd rather not do that. I'd rather do it the way that you have suggested it and perhaps to create a fund, you know, for future years for that building because it looks like it's going to be our building.

President Bassemier: Hold that thought.

(Tape changed)

President Bassemier: Okay, Ms. Fanello.

Catherine Fanello: And we did have John Stoll, our County Engineer, look at the Cumulative Bridge Fund, and he, I think, went five years out? Five years out on projects and it was – after looking at his spreadsheet and everything, it was our conclusion that we really couldn't cut that tax for the Cumulative Bridge no more than two cents and I personally don't feel like I'm going to pursue that avenue at this point with the Cumulative Bridge, because there were too many projects identified and then also leaving enough money in that fund for an emergency situation which I had asked John what the average dollars would be spent on in an emergency bridge situation. So, I mean, you never want to deplete any of your funds, you know, completely to zero because it just doesn't leave you, obviously, with any options or choices and so we did look at that and I personally am not in favor of cutting that tax and I don't believe Commissioner Mosby was either. And I believe Commissioner Mourdock is here. I don't know his feelings on that. But we did explore that.

Councilmember Hoy: And just to add since that's the case, then I think that what Councilman Sutton said is probably the correct way to go and that is you deal with the building with the roof caving in first. I hate to shortchange the park, but we didn't ask for this problem and we were not told in advance of this handing the building back to us. The organization that handled this building certainly gave us no warning as a Council or you, the Commissioners, neither one of us, any kind of warning that we were going to be facing this kind of a problem.

Catherine Fanello: And that's why I think, you know, we're in a situation here where first of all, you know, the two new Commissioners are trying to get a project completed that was started before with the Burdette Park, and then also being handed this building at the beginning of the year, which we did not know was coming our way. And you know, I can assure you that it's not ever my intent over the next three years to start projects that there's not adequate funding for. I just don't believe in that. You don't start a 2.8 million dollar building without the majority of your funding in place. With that in mind, I think these are just two things that need to be done and out of the way. There is sufficient money available in your funds to do it and I think you've set aside 2.7 million this year for the jail. Unfortunately, we do have an emergency situation with the courthouse and we need to get Burdette Park done, so I ask for you to look at some of your various areas there and pull some money from different funds to get both these projects done so that we can get them out of the way.

President Bassemier: Mr. Raben?

Councilmember Raben: You know, Mr. President, maybe this may be a helpful bit of information, but all along all I've ever heard discussed is replace the Old Courthouse roof. No one has ever really, to my knowledge, looked at the possibility of making some repairs to buy it a few more years. And let me recap on some of the discussion. As far as the Cum Courthouse, establishing a fund for that, the state statute requires that if we do that by August 1st of next year we can begin collecting the tax in 2003, and, Mr. President, I'd also like to state that it would be extremely irresponsible of this county to spend \$700,000 if there are repairs that can be made to buy us a little bit of time, only to find out that we could have had matching grant money to make those repairs. So to me, I think right now, you know, what the Commissioners need to look at is, Mr. Hoy's first suggestion was to construct the building, then we'll look at equipping it next year. Again, that's a project that's already begun and let's address the courthouse roof at a later date or once we really

know what we can and can't do and what needs to be done. There's really no clear clarification on any of that yet.

Councilmember Sutton: Jim, I think there are a lot of issues that we're having to try to juggle within one particular motion that's on the floor here and I think we are kind of trying to take on a little bit too much and maybe we'd be better served –

Councilmember Raben: I would clarify the motion, and the motion would be to set the General Fund request in at zero and ask the Commissioners to file an appropriation out of CCD.

President Bassemier: Catherine, one more comment and then we'll go ahead and vote on it. Do you have any more to say on this?

Catherine Fanello: I think I've pretty much made my opinions known.

President Bassemier: Okay, we've got a motion and a second to set that in at zero. Mr. Mourdock, I'm sorry, I didn't see you. Honored to have you here.

Richard Mourdock: Sure. Richard Mourdock, County Commissioner. I just wanted to kind of build on what Councilman Raben was saying a moment ago. And I appreciate, I think all of us have this uniform concern for the Old Courthouse. We all have a uniform concern to making sure we're doing the right thing in a budgetary sense. But let me just raise a couple of scenarios that I think are quite likely. Scenario number one is, if we commit to do the entire roof, what happens if it's a lot more than \$750,000? Because if we start down that road, at this point we really don't know what the total outside cost might be. Scenario number two, until we have a total plan for using the Old Courthouse, the construction of that Old Courthouse isn't necessarily always done from the top down. In other words, in this day and age, if we were to revitalize that courthouse, it may be that the easiest access to put an air conditioning system in to modernize that building, may be through the roof. And why would we put a new roof on in total now until we have that total plan put together? So I know it's not a good situation in looking at fixing half a roof, but I think it may be in a budgetary sense, a wise thing to consider.

Councilmember Sutton: Commissioner Mourdock, before you step away, let me ask you a couple of questions. So, I guess, when we talk about the roof on the Old Courthouse, from understanding you clearly, you're saying that it's better to wait, recognizing that we still have existing problems with that roof, to wait and not do anything?

Richard Mourdock: I think until we know what the total plan is, that is the better option.

Councilmember Tornatta: I think we have a total plan. I think that was presented to the Commissioners.

Richard Mourdock: We do not have a total plan. We don't have any kind of plan for the long-term use of that building. That's why, in fact, the Commission has acted to enact leases in the building that would be no longer than three years, so that if, in fact, as Catherine was saying, we do need to move offices over there, we would know who could come out, who could go in, at what time. I mean, that's part of the thing that's all in the process.

Councilmember Tornatta: There was not a priority list, I mean, did you miss that?

Richard Mourdock: What priority list are you talking about, Troy?

Councilmember Tornatta: When it was presented, the priority one was to fix the roof and that was what he said and that was the top priority in order to move on.

Richard Mourdock: (Inaudible)

Councilmember Tornatta: Correct, which you assigned to tell you what that building, what manner we needed to go about taking care of that building.

Richard Mourdock: The priority of that committee has not been adopted in any way by the Commission and I don't think we can, again, until we give this some more thought and balance. The whole idea of how that building is going to be utilized in the future, I think, is critical in looking at the funding. And let me go back, and again, I think Catherine is exactly right on when those grants might be available. I don't think you're going to see any in 2002, probably not in 2003, and what is it, if you were the company or you were the foundation that were to issue a grant of, let's pick a number, a million dollars for that building, what is it you want to see first and foremost? A plan. You know, they're not going to issue us any money until they understand how the dollars they invest are going to be used in the total rejuvenation of that building.

Councilmember Tornatta: And who do you recommend starting that (inaudible)?

Richard Mourdock: That's clearly a role of the County Commissioners to dictate what that plan will be.

Councilmember Sutton: Commissioner Mourdock, I guess I am inquiring because I'm hearing you saying that you agree with Commissioner Fanello that it's likely, it may be 2004 before any dollars, if grant dollars are out there, would be made available. If 2003, even 2003, I think any of us would have clear reservation about a structure that was having difficulties and a roof that was clearly faulty in waiting that long before we would address the problem. I mean, if it were this building here and we said we were going to wait a year and a half before we were to do something, even if we don't own this building, but I think clearly that would pose some problems. And recognizing too, any time you're dealing with an old structure, an estimate that you may get may not be, it may go under, it may go over, that's just the reality of dealing with an old structure and I think that's just what this is just part of what you have to deal with. But for us to, I guess, I just want to make sure I understand you clearly when you're suggesting that we just don't do anything with it. I guess that just gives me a little bit of reservation and concerns me, I guess.

Richard Mourdock: I did not say do not do anything with it. I was echoing what Councilman Raben said in the sense that we may be able to do something short-term, less than a full repair. That is my point. I'm not saying don't do anything. That's not my –

Councilmember Sutton: Well, but we get into this mode where we want to study, study, study when we know this roof is bad.

Richard Mourdock: I'm not saying study, study, study, either. I'm saying act, act, act, but act in less than what the full roof might be. If we – would we not be wiser to spend a quarter of a million dollars or \$200,000 to get the thing in a self-preserved state than we would be to do a full \$750,000 roof only to come back in a couple years and have to take part of that roof up to make the other modifications

to the building? And your comment about not wanting to go on and on with a leaking roof, I hate to say this, not a particular point of pride, but we've been doing that at the Community Corrections Center for some time and we know we're at least two to three years before we get that situation resolved with a new structure as well. Sometimes we just do what we have to do, unfortunately.

President Bassemier: Okay, we've got to move on. One more question by Mr. Hoy and then we'll vote on this.

Councilmember Hoy: Well, going back to what was reported to you all from the committee, and referring to what Mr. Tornatta said, their first step in preserving this building was to do the roof and the recommendation was to do the cupolas at the same time because when you put that scaffolding up, you may as well pay to do it once rather than do it twice. My second point about cutting through the roof for an air conditioner, I've already heard from people – people that are interested in preservation are on a continuum, and I think I'm somewhere here in the middle. Those air conditioning units sitting outside don't bother me. They do bother the preservationists who want it to look like it did when it was first constructed. So I don't think we're going to be putting in any air conditioning units upstairs on that roof or even cutting through. I would like – that's why I've wished for -- lets, as the architect said, let's secure the envelope of the building. That's, to me, structurally the first step. And I quite agree with you on a plan for use of that building. Those are two different plans. One is a plan to preserve the building to which Mr. Tornatta referred quite correctly. The other is a plan as to how we will use this building and that's not the most usable building in town. It's going to be a tougher plan to come up with because of the nature of the building, the high ceilings and we all know all this. So my difficulty here as a Councilman – and I'm trying desperately not to tell you, as Commissioners, how to do your job. My concern is the funding and to carefully work out a funding plan for both these projects. And if we have to do delay the park, I hate to do that, but if it means that that building is going to sustain severe damage, the Old Courthouse, then that has to come first. And I also, I might as well add my last point, this is not aimed at you sir, you just happen to be standing there, and that is, as a Councilman, I am real protective of that 2.7 million for the jail because, you know, of the amount of money I think we're going to need for all three projects and then I've committed publically since 1962 for a juvenile facility. And I hope to see that happen. I hope to see all three of those happen and I think we're going to need every cent of the money we put into that fund to accomplish that goal and that's why I don't want to touch it and look at some creative alternatives.

Councilmember Tornatta: Do we know how much that 2.7 is going to save us? And that's just a question, maybe Mr. Raben, you can answer at some point?

Councilmember Raben: I know what our bonding capacity is right now and if you add this year's and next year's 2.7 which we hope to have, you know, to the bonding capacity, that puts us, I think much nearer the goal. That's all I'm saying, I'm not talking about –

(Inaudible – several speaking at once)

Councilmember Raben: I don't have that information with me that was provided at one point in time.

(Inaudible – several speaking at once)

(President Bassemier gaveled discussion)

Councilmember Raben: Mr. President, just to make sure the motion is clear, the motion was – my motion was to set the General Fund request in at zero and ask that the Commissioners fund this out of CCD and again, with the statement that there is over 1.4 million dollars in that account, and there has been a lot of great discussion here and we can do both. It's up to them as to whether or not they want to do both. So that's my motion.

President Bassemier: Okay, we've got a motion and a second. Thank you, Mr. Mourdock. Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Let me understand your motion. Is your motion to set it at zero and does that include the recommendation to take the dollars out of CCD?

Councilmember Raben: Uh-huh.

Councilmember Sutton: Okay, I'm in favor of the first part of it but not in favor of the second part of it. No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes. That motion passes.

BURDETTE PARK		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1450-4120	Buildings	1,000,000.00	0.00
Total		1,000,000.00	0.00

(Motion carried 5-2/Councilmembers Tornatta & Sutton opposed)

COUNTY COUNCIL

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Mr. President, next is County Council, Courts Technology which is 1480-3461 for \$350,000. I move approval.

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: Got a second by Mr. Wortman. Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

COUNTY COUNCIL		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1480-3461	Court Technology	350,000.00	350,000.00
Total		350,000.00	350,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

RIVERBOAT

Councilmember Raben: Okay, next is Riverboat 1490-3110. Mr. President, I'm going to, and I'll address the reasoning after I make this motion, that this be set in at \$300,000.

President Bassemier: Motion to set in at \$300,000. Do I have a second?

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: Any discussion?

Councilmember Raben: Okay, and I do have some questions. I don't know if John Stoll is –

Catherine Fanello: Yes, John's here.

President Bassemier: Mr. Stoll, would you come up front, too, please? For the record, get your name on the...

John Stoll: John Stoll, County Engineer.

President Bassemier: Okay, thank you, sir.

Councilmember Raben: There was quite a bit of discussion on this matter last week and Commissioner Fanello and John had addressed some likelihoods for Economic Development and Infrastructure for the remainder of this year. One of the items was Pine Place and Heather Court. John, what is the likelihood that that would be bid out yet this year?

John Stoll: The project should be finished within the next month and the plan is to have it under contract so the money can be encumbered, so the consultant has already been told that, that's our plan. We want it to be able to be awarded before the end of the year.

Councilmember Raben: Another one was St. George and Oak Hill, and again, I'm hitting on these because I'm reflecting on the \$900,000 that are in those two accounts. One of them was the possibility of using \$50,000 for the design cost for St. George and Oak Hill Road which was in the amount, an estimated amount of \$50,000. Just a couple of things, there was a lot of accounts in there with sizable balances that the projects are still kind of out there hanging as to when they're going to start. For instance, Mt. Pleasant Road, which it's my understanding that we're waiting for the state to make the upgrades to the intersection there by the railroad, which that account had like a half million dollars in it for the last two years.

John Stoll: We've actually been waiting for the consultant, they've had the project for the past two years and we haven't seen them get the plans done. We're waiting on them to do the right-of-way acquisition, basically.

Councilmember Raben: I guess where I'm going with this and you just happen to be here as Councilman Hoy said earlier, my point with that is, is there are a lot of funds in other lines that we need to maybe transfer for now, transfer monies out of and re-appropriate next year. But you had also mentioned Elmridge and Congress. Now those funds were actually, are in your 2002 budget.

John Stoll: Right.

Councilmember Raben: And that was a quarter of a million of it. So, again, my point is, with the existing monies that are available today along with this request, my motion was that this be set in at \$300,000 and I would like to request that you would file a blue claim to make up the remainder through Economic Development and I'll give you that amount of \$389,900 and then the balance through Infrastructure for \$260,000.

Catherine Fanello: Well, Councilman Raben, I don't know how much you're looking at Economic Development, but I don't have that much in Economic Development because we have pledged \$60,600 to Jonathon Weinzapfel for the Economic Development district and that is going to be in formation with the other surrounding counties. We've pledged \$5,000 to Work Force Initiative –

Unidentified: Already have it.

Catherine Fanello: And you already have it.

Councilmember Raben: Yeah, that's already been paid.

Catherine Fanello: And \$50,000 to Graham Packaging as part of a contingency change order.

Councilmember Raben: That \$5,000 has already been paid.

Catherine Fanello: But I'm not going to transfer any money out of monies that have already been appropriated for projects because I think, you know, with two new Commissioners this year, we've been going through – let me finish – assessing what needs to be done and working with John Stoll and getting an idea of what hasn't been done in the past and what needs to be done. So the monies that are already there for projects, I'm not touching because we're going to move forward with those projects. You have left us no choice and if you're going to tie up our funds in Economic Development and Infrastructure, we can't move forward with any, you're telling me I can't move forward with any drainage projects this year from the money that was given to us for drainage this year in Infrastructure. You're taking that money, plus you're taking part of our Economic Development money.

Councilmember Raben: And again, let me back up. I'm not telling you transfer anything. Should you run into a need, you can always do that.

Catherine Fanello: I'm not robbing Peter to pay Paul. That is just not good financial management. But what I'm saying right now, is you've just now taken my Infrastructure money for this year, so I can't tell my County Engineer to move forward on drainage projects.

President Bassemier: Jim, are you – Mr. Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Again, my apologies. I had some notes that I picked up from last week. Ivy Meadow, is that part of this whole package?

Catherine Fanello: And I don't have my capital improvement. We handed those out at budget time. I don't have it in front of me.

Councilmember Hoy: The drainage at –

John Stoll: The drainage downstream from Ivy Meadow would be corrected through the St. George and Oak Hill project.

Councilmember Hoy: Through this project?

John Stoll: Yes.

Councilmember Hoy: And again, I think this is probably something that you all inherited and what I'm about to say will not change the situation, but I would like to speak to the future. I'm chairman of Soil & Water Conservation District and I have personally been out there, and I've looked at that situation. At some point, someone, somewhere should have raised the question about that whole subdivision anyway. It has to do with zoning and that is probably one of the worst pieces of zoning I've seen in my whole life because there's no way that you can take a pipe coming out of Ivy Meadow this big and put water into a pipe this big. I'm not an engineer, but I do understand that. And I've seen the mess out there that needs to

be cleaned up, and what we're doing is, you know, and I'm not blaming the current Commissioners, I'm just saying we're cleaning up a mess that should never have happened. And I think we need to exercise a whole lot more care in future zoning in this county, anyhow. Our population only grew four percent and we have sprawled and paved a whole lot more than that and it's costing us. I would bet you a month's salary before I retired, that if you did the math on this kind of thing, and I don't bet so don't take me up on it, but – never bought a lottery ticket, never been on the boat, one place where I'm consistent – but we will never, never get back from some of these projects, ever, what we've spent on them. And I know that's a speech, but I think it's an important one to get into the public arena, and that is that we have a lot of undeveloped land within the city limits that could be used for a lot of things, a lot of brown fields, a lot of housing land that ought to be used.

Catherine Fanello: And I just have one more comment. If you're going to tie up my Economic Development money, I guess I'm going to tell anybody coming to Vanderburgh County and the city of Evansville, that we can't offer them any type of incentive package, that I have nothing left in my Economic Development.

Councilmember Raben: No. With this motion, I'm basically stating, spend the monies that are in place today, the monies that are set aside in those accounts. Let's use those up. You can come back to us. If we run into a situation like that, come back to us. We'll be glad to look at it.

Catherine Fanello: But this never did happen before until this year.

President Bassemier: Am I correct on this, half a million dollars been sitting over there for two years, right?

Catherine Fanello: Well, I just got elected this year, and I can't answer –

President Bassemier: John, am I correct on that? Two years?

Councilmember Raben: Mr. President, even that is really not that big of an issue. Again, like John said, there are certain things that hold a project up. I mean, we've seen that in a lot of different projects. But to clarify something with Councilman Hoy on the St. George/Oak Hill: you do know that half million dollars is in the 2002 budget in CCD?

Suzanne Crouch: It's a quarter, isn't it?

Councilmember Raben: Is it a quarter? It's \$500,000.

Councilmember Hoy: That is in the budget?

Councilmember Raben: Yeah. Those funds are there to do that project.

Councilmember Hoy: I did not know that.

Councilmember Raben: Right.

Councilmember Hoy: I still leave my speech out there because –

President Bassemier: It sounded good, Phil.

Councilmember Raben: Well, I didn't want the audience to think that we had

eliminated that project.

Councilmember Hoy: I just came back from a trip that the Farm Bureau sent me on to look at farm preservation on the east coast and I wish everybody who is in leadership in this county could go there and see what they're doing to preserve farm land and to make sure that development takes place in a rational way, which I don't think we're doing right now in this city or county, and that's a statement I'll stand by anywhere.

President Bassemier: Okay, Mr. Winnecke. We still need to move on. I know we're –

Councilmember Winnecke: That's alright. I just have one quick question of John. On the Pine Place/Heather Court project, can any of that be spent out of – can we use any Cum Bridge money for that?

John Stoll: Very little. Most of it is storm sewers. There's one culvert in the project, but the rest of it is storm sewer.

Councilmember Winnecke: So some of it could be?

John Stoll: There's one box culvert that's going underneath Heather Court that could be bridge money, but the rest of it would be road money or Riverboat money as the case may be.

Councilmember Sutton: Commissioner Fanello, could you just refresh us? I know we did go over this last week, but what are our commitments right now in Economic Development?

Catherine Fanello: Right now I have commitments, and there's one commitment I have to ask about that's sitting out there, was for I-69 for \$100,000, and I don't think that that's been paid for and I'm not sure where that came from. I believe maybe Commissioner Jerrel in the past had committed that money. And if I add that on to the \$60,600 I've committed for the Economic Dev – or the commission has committed for the Economic Development district that Jonathon Weinzapfel spoke to us a couple of months ago, and then \$5,000 that's already been paid to Work Force Initiative but that's already been paid, \$50,000 we've set aside for change orders on the Graham Packaging deal in case there happens to be any change orders, that leaves me at \$338,152, then less this \$100,000 for the I-69, whatever that was committed for, would leave me at 238 in Economic Development.

Councilmember Sutton: Last week we were talking about some reimbursement dollars or something like that?

Catherine Fanello: Yeah, the state will be reimbursing us \$452,500 because we received one \$300,000 grant and we received one grant for \$152,500, but as I understand it and John can probably explain it better than me, he's worked with those types of grants before, they are reimbursable grants and I think that as a project proceeds, we file for reimbursements, and they do hold a certain percentage – yeah, we have to pay up front, and I think they hold a certain percentage back until the project is 100% completed.

Councilmember Raben: Catherine, a quick question on the I-69. Is this something other than what we set in every year at budget time?

Catherine Fanello: Yeah, this has nothing to do with that. This was notes I found for the Riverboat Economic Development line item.

Councilmember Raben: You don't know what it's for? It's just a note you found?

Catherine Fanello: Yeah. To me, I think I can go back and – I can go back and see where I found it, but there was a commitment for \$100,000.

(Tape Changed)

Catherine Fanello: – but that's the Voices for I-69, and this is something different. I was thinking this was \$100,000 talked about by Commissioner Jerrel in the prior year, and I can go back and pull my file and look at where that came from. But with that in mind, I don't know how much you were wanting us to take out of Economic Development, that would give us \$338,152, depending on what the \$100,000 is.

President Bassemier: Okay, let's move on. We've got a motion and a second. Okay, roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Jim, your \$300,000, what are you intending – what is your intentions on what you want it to pay for out of that \$300,000? We kind of got off track there a little bit.

Councilmember Winnecke: This is for the Graham Packaging.

Councilmember Raben: This is for Graham Packaging.

Councilmember Sutton: This is just totally the Graham? Okay.

Councilmember Raben: And I listed the amounts out of the other two accounts that they should file a blue claim for.

Councilmember Sutton: I'm going to vote no.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes. That passes five/two.

RIVERBOAT		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1490-3110	Economic Development	949,900.00	300,000.00
Total		949,900.00	300,000.00

(Motion carried 5-2/Councilmembers Tornatta & Sutton opposed)

SURVEYOR MAPS

Councilmember Raben: Okay, next we have the Surveyor’s 2420-3372 in the amount of \$4,000. I’ll move approval.

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: Okay. Got a motion and a second. Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

SURVEYOR MAPS		REQUESTED	APPROVED
2420-3372	Computer Software	4,000.00	4,000.00
Total		4,000.00	4,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

REASSESSMENT/COUNTY ASSESSOR

President Bassemier: Okay, now Reassessment.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, County Assessor, starting with 2492-1090-1110 zero; 2492-1090-1900 zero; 2492-1090-1910 PERF zero; Overtime zero. Mr. President, on the computer, I'm going to move that that be set in at \$250,000; Contractual Services zero; Maintenance Contract zero; Dues & Subscriptions zero; and Office Furniture zero. And then I've got some comments with this motion.

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: Okay, got it on the floor with the second. Okay, discussion?

Jeff Ahlers: What's the total, Jim?

Councilmember Raben: Well, the total would be \$250,000. Mr. President, as far as the Contractual Services, I would move that – or with this motion I would like to request that the Assessor come to us later this year and file a request for that. One thing about that request is it's for the director of GIS to kind of serve as the command center, I guess, for GIS, which is a person that is already in place. But there is a request in there for another new employee and this Council's position has been no new employees. And secondly, as far as the computers go, it's been brought to my attention that, now more than ever, there is an immediate need for these computers to get into the Assessor's Offices, that the software is almost at the point where they're ready to install it. So I would ask that we put it in high gear and make these purchases and I would ask that we would also, I guess, get the blessing for lack of a better word, or bring ACS into this to have them review the types of computers that we're looking at. And along with that cut from the request, it had also been brought to my attention that most of the equipment that was speced is equipment that was designed to run GIS and some of the Assessors have stated that they don't need, you know, if they've got ten computers in their office, all ten doesn't have to have all the bells and whistles to run GIS that, you know, they may just need six or eight computers that aren't quite as expensive but will run their Pro-Val, but not the GIS. So that was my thinking in reducing that figure.

Councilmember Sutton: Jim –

Councilmember Raben: That's a long...

Councilmember Sutton: I'll second, I guess, to get your motion on the floor...is that –

Councilmember Raben: Yeah, I think the motion, that is the end of my motion, yeah. I've said enough.

Councilmember Sutton: It was rather lengthy, so I'm just trying to get an idea, on the \$250,000, how many, did you break that down by the number of units? How do you get that figure?

Councilmember Raben: Two hundred and fifty thousand, that, I mean, honestly, that's a figure pulled out of the sky. I mean, it, that's a figure that, you know, is a reduction based on a conversation with some of the Assessors as to their needs. So, you know, we might find next month that we have to put some more money in that line, I'm not sure.

Councilmember Sutton: Okay.

Councilmember Raben: You know, again, there –

Councilmember Sutton: Well, I know we want to take advantage of at least some (inaudible) and ordering as much equipment up front in one batch as we possibly could so that we could save – just trying to get a feel here, if this will, in fact, cover and I guess I did have some questions last week about –

Councilmember Raben: Well, and that's (inaudible) because the estimates that we have now are for the four gig system which, don't get me wrong, we did request that we look into going with the best that we could to prevent this Council from looking at this again next year. So I don't really have those figures to gauge and plus on limited time, I don't know exactly how many of the cheaper or more economical computers we can use, but you know, you have to start somewhere. I mean –

Councilmember Sutton: Well, I mean, I don't necessarily have a problem with it. I was just trying to get an idea of what dollars were going to be used. I'm really not, I guess, when I asked questions last week, I'm really not of the assumption that every person involved with reassessment will need this exact same piece of equipment anyway. And there was some question about how much equipment we would actually need, how many units there really were and I think that information is going to be brought back to us today. But everyone having the Cadillac on their desk, I'm not quite sure if that's, you know, really agreeing with what you're saying. I'm really not sure that that's maybe a way that we need to go. Obviously, their units do need to be upgraded, I mean, there's no question about that.

Councilmember Raben: With what you're saying, I mean, do you support, are you okay with the \$250,000?

Councilmember Sutton: I just want to know what we're buying.

Councilmember Raben: I don't have those cost estimates. The only ones that were provided were for the better systems, so we have to start somewhere. And I know Mr. Hatfield is back there waving his arms.

Paul Hatfield: (Inaudible – comments not made from the microphone)

Councilmember Raben: You need to come to the mike.

Paul Hatfield: The reason I am walking gingerly, I broke both of my big toes. I'll let you know how later on. My name is Paul Hatfield, I am the Pigeon Township Assessor. In regard to your question, the \$250,000 now that has emanated from Mr. Raben is the whole ball of wax. What will be purchased will be done in a manner trying to find out what particular offices need what. He is correct in his statement that we don't need, in my office, eleven Cadillacs. What is urgently needed is computers to run ProVal. Now, let me give you some information in regard to that, which brings me up to what is connected to the purchase. The purchase of these computers is absolutely the most important thing that can be done tomorrow morning. And the reason for that is, that the software has already started to be installed in other Assessors Offices in the state of Indiana. The first one was installed day before yesterday in Hamilton County, Washington Township, five computers were given the new software in one day's time. That brings up another question that somebody is going to have to ask, namely ACT or someone, but they are going to have all of these, all the software into the computers by October 31st throughout the state of Indiana. You will be getting a letter telling you this probably tomorrow, no later than the day after. I would suggest that you, as soon as you get it, to respond to it because that is how you are going to be put in line for the installation, okay. But now we come to a problem which is equal to getting the computers ordered, the fact is, I'll stay, any Assessor who is here should stay, because with the 215, now I've got to slice it up. But what is important here is, is after we get the computers, and somebody said, well, we can't get but two delivered here overnight, maybe get overnight delivery. Let me tell you, with this many computers, with the computer industry retail what it is today, you find out where you want to buy them, what computers, and I'll lay you odds that they'll put them on a truck and get them in here probably in about two days. Give me the phone. But we have got to have a plan here as to when we get the computers. First of all they have to be set up, etcetera, etcetera, and that's where the computer software servers in this building is going to have to come to the front. Now I'm told that will take anywhere from two and a half to three hours to do this on each computer. You compute that out and I'll take a rough figure, and I'm not here with my notes and I wish I had them in front of me. Because you take, I'll take 60. Sixty times three

hours, that's 180, and if the person, if they work one week 37 ½ hours, you're talking about over a month's time. We don't have it. We don't have that much time to fool around with this. The second point is, if they can't assure this Council and we Assessors that you can get it done in X number of days, then I suggest we go to outside help. It's that important, because let me tell you, when ProVal sends people in to make the update and we aren't ready with the computers, they're not going to stick around. And I wouldn't either. So now have I given you the picture here? So now who the guy I want to hear from is whoever is in charge of computer services because that is the main question that has to be answered here, the time line. We've been fooling around with this thing for a damn year. It's about time we got off the dime.

President Bassemier: Calm down, Mr. Hatfield.

Councilmember Sutton: Paul?

Paul Hatfield: Yes?

Councilmember Sutton: The toes?

Paul Hatfield: Total of what?

Councilmember Sutton: The toes, the big toe. You said you were going to finish up with that.

Paul Hatfield: Well, I got into a fight in my sleep, threw a left, busted my hand, threw a right hand, and out of the bed I went, and I broke both big toes.

President Bassemier: Well, thank you, sir. We always appreciate your comments.

Paul Hatfield: (Inaudible – comments not made from the microphone)

President Bassemier: Okay, sir, state your name and your business.

Alan Teeple: Hi there. Alan Teeple, ACS. Why is it I'm always on the other side on his (inaudible). Two meetings, two times. Alright, let's, and Cheryl may want to jump in here at some point, but let's look at it from my point of view. In the money that has been proposed to the Council, that includes also contracting services with a local vendor, AME, to help do the setup. That is a true statement, because we had to go outside. Now, the other item, it is a true statement that ProVal is releasing their software in the state of Indiana; however, let's clarify something. It is the Beta release of the software. It is not the software. Let's underline that. Beta release. Do you understand what Beta release is? It means it's still in test.

Paul Hatfield: That's not true.

Alan Teeple: No, that's directly from their website today.

Paul Hatfield: I don't care about your website –

(President Bassemier gaveled the interruption)

Alan Teeple: Let me read for the record, sir, since I have the floor. A full Beta release version should be available in the fourth quarter of 2001. That's now. Initial installs of ProVal 7 will occur during the latter part of the first quarter of 2002.

President Bassemier: I'm sorry, Mr. Hatfield, sit down.

(President Bassemier gaveled Mr. Hatfield)

President Bassemier: Mr. Hatfield, please sit down.

Alan Teeple: A general release occurring thereafter. So just so we're aware of that, but what we have discussed with the County Assessor and the other Assessors is that we recognized in that meeting that occurred on September 6th, which was my first meeting on site, Troy, Lloyd and Curt were present there, and we recognized right at that point that the priority that was placed on this, and in the midst of the other priorities that we have going, we couldn't handle it and we recognized that, and said that we needed an outside vendor. That is part of the quote that you have in front of you. And there is a three or four hour time to install a new computer, that is Gartner standard. Can we do it a little faster? Maybe in some. Will some of them be a little slower? Yes. But that's the Gartner standard. So I think if there is a need and we want to do the Beta release, now having said all that, if we want the Beta release on-site here, then we have in place the request to get outside help to make this happen. And in the timely manner that Mr. Hatfield says he needs it. Any questions?

Councilmember Tornatta: Mr. Raben? We set Contractual Services in at zero. I mean, is that something we want to entertain looking into?

Councilmember Raben: I had stated to come back to us at a later point in the year, like December the first, for an appropriation request for 2002.

Councilmember Tornatta: Okay...

Councilmember Winnecke: Troy, what he is saying is, the \$250,000 includes the money that I think you're talking about for setup, is that where you're going?

Councilmember Tornatta: Okay. So computers and setup.

Alan Teeple: Yes.

Councilmember Tornatta: Okay. And what was the \$190,000 for Contractual Services, then?

Cheryl Musgrave: (Inaudible – comments not made from microphone)

President Bassemier: Okay, let's go one at a time.

Alan Teeple: It's separate from what we were discussing.

President Bassemier: I'm sorry. We've got you on the floor. Wait a minute. Are we through right now with him? You got a question? Okay, go ahead.

Councilmember Winnecke: I don't know whose, Alan, if this will be a question for Alan or Cheryl –

President Bassemier: Okay, ask the question and we'll go from there.

Councilmember Winnecke: For the \$250,000, what are we buying?

Alan Teeple: Based on what we've discussed, it would be the computers –

Councilmember Winnecke: How many and...

Alan Teeple: I think the number that we had arrived at was 69 computers. Now, the dollar figure that you have in front of you, I think is the dollar amount that was listed for Pentium IV's, and we have since, through discussion have said no, we really don't need Pentium IV's. The Pentium III's can meet the, through discussion between the County Assessor and my office, so it takes that dollar amount down.

Cheryl Musgrave: \$250,000 will cover it, 66-69 computers, we're going back and forth in continuous discussion with the Assessors, the vendors, the software vendors, Pentium IV's,

Pentium III's, but I want to assure you that Mr. Raben's motion is acceptable, the Assessors will work within that. It will cover the needs to work with SCT and their outside vendor, so we're fine with it.

President Bassemier: Your name.

Cheryl Musgrave: Are you wanting an answer to your question?

President Bassemier: Before you go any further, Cheryl, follow up with that with your name so she can get –

Cheryl Musgrave: I'm sorry. Cheryl Musgrave, County Assessor. I meant to say that.

Councilmember Winnecke: I thought at some point during this process, and this may date back to last month, I thought that ProVal, the new software, dictated that we have to buy Pentium IV's. Is that now not the case?

Cheryl Musgrave: Pentium IV's are now being manufactured and Pentium III's are not. So our choice is to go forward with a Pentium IV. A Pentium III is not an option.

Councilmember Winnecke: So we're buying 66 to 69?

Cheryl Musgrave: Correct.

President Bassemier: Thank you, Cheryl.

Alan Teeple: And Lloyd, that also includes the amount to have someone come in and spend the three or four hours under our guidance to get them to the locations and do the setups and all of that.

Councilmember Wortman: What is the price per unit and what kind of volume discount are we going to enjoy?

Alan Teeple: I believe the quote was \$125 a unit per install. That's, I'm pulling that off the top of my head and I should never do that.

Cheryl Musgrave: That is correct.

President Bassemier: That's pretty good.

Councilmember Raben: No, it was \$250 –

Councilmember Winnecke: Well, that was last week. Well, it was.

Councilmember Raben: I lost my head. I've been smelling too many pronto pups. All that grease is starting to affect my –

Councilmember Winnecke: What about the units themselves? Last week, the quote was \$3,100 a unit.

Alan Teeple: I don't have a revised...

Councilmember Raben: Okay, what I have is \$250 per, cost of installation and cascade work, workstation, software and user data filed, for a total of \$17,250.

Councilmember Winnecke: So what's our cost per unit? Not for the installation, but to buy the computer per unit?

Councilmember Raben: \$3,500 plus –

Councilmember Winnecke: See, last week, –

Councilmember Raben: You didn't allow me to finish. There's a lot of pluses here. Electric windows, door locks. I mean, there's three different size monitors. There's –

Councilmember Winnecke: I guess that's where I'm going. You know, –

Councilmember Raben: Here.

Councilmember Winnecke: I've got mine. But here's my question. I just brought a computer home three or four months ago. I didn't need to buy a keyboard, I didn't need to buy a monitor. We have to buy new hardware to support the new software. Do we, in fact, need new monitors and new keyboards in addition? Is that a way we can save, a place where we can save money?

Alan Teeple: I mean, the answer from my point of view is, the answer is yes. But I don't know that that is –

Councilmember Tornatta: Well, I think that's what –

Councilmember Sutton: What are you saying yes to?

Alan Teeple: Yes, I mean, do you need new keyboards and need new monitors with the PC's that you're buying, the answer is no, you do not. Yes, you can have a cost savings there unless those monitors are being used for something in addition to ProVal. And I will qualify that.

Councilmember Tornatta: Two points to that: one, we're trying to move also, think about moving these old products somewhere else and obviously, you can't do that without the monitors, so we'd kind of be stuck; the second part of that was we did ask, and I think you've been able to do that, which is get an inventory of what's out there and maybe because we have 69 boxes and units, total units, that maybe we can strip so many of them and do it that way, that would be obviously, a good option. But, I guess, that would be –

Alan Teeple: That's usually not the option that any computer services would offer you, would tell you to do, one, if you're intending to resell them, two if you're intending to cascade them. I mean, is that a way to save money? The answer is yes. That's certainly not a recommendation as an IT person that I would give you.

Councilmember Winnecke: I have another question.

Alan Teeple: And I have no stake in it as far as how much money we're going to –

Councilmember Tornatta: But I guess you could look at inventory lists and say really, for what you're going to save, this really isn't going to help you out or it is going to help you out quite a bit if you want to do, because you're going to get rid of these computers and these would be okay.

Alan Teeple: Sure.

Councilmember Winnecke: If my math is right, we're going to pay \$3,498 per unit. Last week it was \$3,100 a unit, and we talked – I'm not arguing that we don't need it. We have to go forward. Mr. Hatfield is right, I agree with all that. I just want to know who is negotiating this deal and why do we – do we have to pay \$3,498 per unit? To me, that does not sound like any kind of volume discount.

Councilmember Tornatta: I agree with that.

Alan Teeple: I did the inventory, I did not go out and get your price quotes.

Councilmember Winnecke: I understand that.

Alan Teeple: Or the price quotes for what you're seeing in front of you, so I can't speak to that.

Councilmember Winnecke: Cheryl, is Kathy here?

Cheryl Musgrave: No, she's not. If you'll let me take the floor. This is a little bit like your discussion about the roofing at the Old Courthouse. Do you fix it with slate, do you fix it with these other products.

Councilmember Winnecke: I don't think it's anything like that.

Cheryl Musgrave: Sure it is.

Councilmember Winnecke: I just want to know if it's a volume discount.

Cheryl Musgrave: It will be a volume discount. We will work very closely with Mr. Teeple, his staff, the Assessors. We will work within the number that Mr. Raben has proposed. If you'd like to serve on a committee and get more involved in every last detail, we'd love to have you. We enjoy Council's participation and we, too, will be good stewards of the taxpayers' money.

President Bassemier: Thank you, Cheryl.

Councilmember Sutton: Well, again, Cheryl, since you're there, as it's proposed, I mean, are you intending to move forward with buying the exact same unit, type of machine, all of the features for everyone as it's proposed here?

Cheryl Musgrave: We will have another meeting with all the Assessors, again, go over everyone's inventory, go over their requirements, we will reach an agreement, and we will all go forward as a unit. Can I tell you what that is going to be exactly, in every little jot and tittle today, no. But I can tell you we'll work within the budget that you have set here.

Councilmember Sutton: Well, but my question and I think you've answered it, will every one of these units be the same?

Cheryl Musgrave: It would be better for every one of the units to be the same. It's better from an administrative point of view, from Mr. Teeple's, it's better within the offices, then you go from machine to machine to machine. You're dealing with exactly the same machine. It's a lot less confusing, a lot less difficult to keep track of upgrades and parts and that sort of thing. So we think it would be better and the Assessors and I have discussed that. Whether or not we're going to replace every last computer, probably not, so...

President Bassemier: Okay, we've got a motion, we've got a second. Okay, and our Assessor has agreed to that recommendation, so roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: I would, obviously, this is going to move very swiftly. I would like for us to get a report next month that shows what equipment was, in fact, ordered and where those pieces of equipment, what offices received what equipment, and who, specifically, is going to be using that equipment. And we don't want to delay this, we need to move forward with it, but at the same time this is a rather large purchase and there's a lot of things going on, a lot of things to factor in and quite often we make decisions and we

don't follow up. So I'd like to at least get some follow up on this whole matter. Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: I agree with Mr. Sutton. I'd like to see that and I'll vote yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: I'm going to go one step further. I'd like for us to have next month a breakdown of what we're paying per unit. I'd like a breakdown of what we're paying per spec on these units because, quite frankly, I think \$3,498 is too much to pay per unit, but I understand the importance of moving the project forward and I vote yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

REASSESSMENT/COUNTY ASSESSOR		REQUESTED	APPROVED
2492-1090-1110	Assessor	4,000.00	0.00
2492-1090-1900	FICA	383.00	0.00
2492-1090-1910	PERF	250.00	0.00
2492-1090-1300	Overtime	1,000.00	0.00
2492-1090-3370	Computer (Data Mgmt)	320,000.00	250,000.00
2492-1090-3530	Contractual Services	190,000.00	0.00

(Table continued next page)

2492-1090-3540	Maintenance Contract	50,000.00	0.00
2492-1090-3700	Dues & Subscriptions	1,000.00	0.00
2492-1090-4210	Office Furniture	3,500.00	0.00
Total		570,133.00	250,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

REASSESSMENT/PTBOA (Two requests)

President Bassemier: Okay, Jim, let's move on.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Property Tax Board of Appeals, Office Supplies, I move that that be set in at zero and let's skip down to the next Property Tax Board of Appeals, Contractual Services in the amount of \$10,000. I'll move approval.

President Bassemier: Do I have a second?

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

REASSESSMENT/PTBOA		REQUESTED	APPROVED
2492-1091-2600	Office Supplies	1,500.00	0.00
Total		1,500.00	0.00

REASSESSMENT/PTBOA		REQUESTED	APPROVED
2492-1091-3530	Contractual Services	10,000.00	10,000.00
Total		10,000.00	10,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

REASSESSMENT/CENTER TWP. ASSESSOR

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Center Assessor, account 2492-1110-3130, \$1000; account 3310 Training \$2,000; 3370 Computers zero; 3371 Computer Hardware zero; 3372 Computer Software zero, for a total request of \$3,000. I'll move approval.

President Bassemier: Do I have a second?

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: Second by Mr. Wortman. Discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

REASSESSMENT/CENTER TWP. ASSESSOR		REQUESTED	APPROVED
2492-1110-3130	Travel/Mileage	1,000.00	1,000.00
2492-1110-3310	Training	2,000.00	2,000.00
2492-1110-3370	Computer (Data Mgmt)	23,500.00	0.00
2492-1110-3371	Computer Hardware	4,000.00	0.00
2492-1110-3372	Software	5,000.00	0.00
Total		35,500.00	3,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

REASSESSMENT/GERMAN TWP. ASSESSOR

Councilmember Raben: Okay, German Township Assessor, 2492-1120-1140 Field Coordinator, the correct amount should be \$5,058, which that would prorate that salary effective 10/8; 1990 Extra Help \$4,000; 1900 FICA \$693; 2600 Office Supplies \$215; 3130 Travel & Mileage \$250; 3410 Printing \$250; 3600 Rent \$600; 1110 Assessor zero; and 1910 PERF \$266; for a total of \$11,332 and I'll move approval.

President Bassemier: Got a second?

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: Second by Mr. Wortman. Discussion?

Councilmember Sutton: Jim, the last one, PERF 266, for a total of...

Councilmember Raben: 11,332.

Councilmember Sutton: Thank you.

President Bassemier: Okay, roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

REASSESSMENT/GERMAN TWP. ASSESSOR		REQUESTED	APPROVED
2492-1120-1140	Field Coordinator	5,463.00	5,058.00
2492-1120-1990	Extra Help	8,000.00	4,000.00
2492-1120-1900	FICA	1,030.00	693.00
2492-1120-2600	Office Supplies	215.00	215.00

(Table continued next page)

2492-1120-3130	Travel/Mileage	250.00	250.00
2492-1120-3410	Printing	250.00	250.00
2492-1120-3600	Rent	600.00	600.00
2492-1120-1110	Assessor	1,000.00	0.00
2492-1120-1910	PERF	215.00	266.00
Total		17,023.00	11,332.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

REASSESSMENT/KNIGHT TWP. ASSESSOR

President Bassemier: Knight Assessor.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Knight Assessor. 2492-1130-1110 Assessor zero; 1120 Office Coordinator \$5,058; 1900 FICA \$2,300; 1910 PERF \$266; 1920 Insurance \$2,810; 1990 Extra Help \$15,000; 2600 Office Supplies \$1,000; 2710 Color Film, I would like that, if we can, maybe next year to set those in to read disks for digital cameras, in the amount of \$1,000; 3130 Travel/Mileage \$1,000; 3310 \$1,000; 3370 Computer zero; 3372 Software zero; 3390 Plat Sheets \$1,000; 3400 Printing of Plat Sheets \$1,000; 3410 Printing \$1,500; 3520 Equipment Repair \$500; 4220 Office Machines zero, for a total request of \$32,669, and I'll move approval.

(Actual total is \$33,434)

President Bassemier: Do I have a second?

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: Second, Mr. Wortman. Discussion?

Councilmember Sutton: Jim? Was there one that you missed? Maybe not. On Travel/Mileage, what did you place in there?

Councilmember Raben: \$1,000.

Councilmember Sutton: Okay, thank you.

President Bassemier: Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

REASSESSMENT/KNIGHT TWP. ASSESSOR		REQUESTED	APPROVED
2492-1130-1110	Assessor	7,000.00	0.00
2492-1130-1120	Office Coordinator	8,115.00	5,058.00
2492-1130-1900	FICA	4,982.00	2,300.00
2492-1130-1910	PERF	1,512.00	266.00
2492-1130-1920	Insurance	7,155.00	2,810.00
2492-1130-1990	Extra Help	50,000.00	15,000.00
2492-1130-2600	Office Supplies	3,000.00	1,000.00
2492-1130-2710	Color Film	1,000.00	1,000.00

2492-1130-3130	Travel/Mileage	4,000.00	1,000.00
2492-1130-3310	Training	3,000.00	1,000.00
2492-1130-3370	Computer (Data Mgmt)	25,000.00	0.00
2492-1130-3372	Computer Software	1,800.00	0.00
2492-1130-3390	Assessor's Plat Sheets	1,000.00	1,000.00
2492-1130-3400	Printing Plat Sheets	3,000.00	1,000.00
2492-1130-3410	Printing	5,000.00	1,500.00
2492-1130-3520	Equipment Repair	1,500.00	500.00
2492-1130-4220	Office Machines	8,000.00	0.00
Total		135,064.00	33,434.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

REASSESSMENT/PERRY TWP. ASSESSOR

President Bassemier: Okay, Jim, Perry.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Perry Assessor 1110 zero; 1900 FICA \$765; 1910 PERF zero; Unemployment 1930 zero; 1990 Extra Help \$10,000; 2600 Office Supplies \$250; 3130 Travel/Mileage \$250; 3370 Computer zero; 3372 Software zero; 3390 Plat Sheets \$1,000; 4220 Office Machines zero, for a total of \$12,265 and I'll move approval.

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: Second, Mr. Wortman. Discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes,

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

REASSESSMENT/PERRY TWP. ASSESSOR		REQUESTED	APPROVED
2492-1140-1110	Assessor	2,051.00	0.00
2492-1140-1900	FICA	1,290.00	765.00
2492-1140-1910	PERF	103.00	0.00
2492-1140-1930	Unemployment	125.00	0.00
2492-1140-1990	Extra Help	14,800.00	10,000.00
2492-1140-2600	Office Supplies	250.00	250.00
2492-1140-3130	Travel/Mileage	250.00	250.00
2492-1140-3370	Computer (Data Mgmt)	2,600.00	0.00
2492-1140-3372	Computer Software	1,400.00	0.00
2492-1140-3390	Assessor Plat Sheets	2,000.00	1,000.00
2492-1140-4220	Office Machines	5,500.00	0.00
Total		30,369.00	12,265.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

REASSESSMENT/PIGEON TWP. ASSESSOR

President Bassemier: Pigeon Township.

Councilmember Raben: Pigeon Assessor, line 1120 Office Coordinator zero; 1900 FICA \$530; 1910 PERF zero; 1920 Insurance zero; 2600 Office Supplies \$1,000; 3310 Training \$1,000; Computers 3370 zero; and Software zero; I would like to insert a line 1990 Extra Help for \$6,900, for a total request of \$9,430 and I'll move approval.

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: Second, Mr. Wortman. Discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

REASSESSMENT/PIGEON TWP. ASSESSOR		REQUESTED	APPROVED
2492-1150-1120	Office Coordinator	7,491.00	0.00
2492-1150-1900	FICA	574.00	530.00
2492-1150-1910	PERF	394.00	0.00
2492-1150-1920	Insurance	5,000.00	0.00
2492-1150-2600	Office Supplies	3,000.00	1,000.00
2492-1150-3310	Training	3,000.00	1,000.00
2492-1150-3370	Computer (Data Mgmt)	8,000.00	0.00
2492-1150-3372	Computer Software	3,500.00	0.00
2492-1150-1990	Extra Help	0.00	6,900.00
Total		30,959.00	9,430.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

REASSESSMENT/SCOTT TWP. ASSESSOR

President Bassemier: Scott.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Scott, 1110 zero; 1990 \$230; 1910 zero; – excuse me. Mr. President, let me back up to FICA, I think I read as 1990, it’s 1900 FICA \$230; 1910 PERF at zero; 1990 Extra Help \$3,000; 2600 Office Supplies \$500; 3130 Travel/Mileage \$500; 3370 zero; 3372 zero; 3390 \$1,000; 4220 zero, for a total of \$5,230 and I’ll move approval.

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

REASSESSMENT/SCOTT TWP. ASSESSOR		REQUESTED	APPROVED
2492-1160-1110	Assessor	800.00	0.00
2492-1160-1900	FICA	75.00	230.00
2492-1160-1910	PERF	30.00	0.00
2492-1160-1990	Extra Help	3,500.00	3,000.00
2492-1160-2600	Office Supplies	500.00	500.00
2492-1160-3130	Travel/Mileage	500.00	500.00
2492-1160-3370	Computer (Data Mgmt)	2,600.00	0.00
2492-1160-3372	Computer Software	1,400.00	0.00
2492-1160-3390	Assessor Plat Sheets	2,000.00	1,000.00
2492-1160-4220	Office Machines	5,500.00	0.00
Total		16,905.00	5,230.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

SHERIFF/MISDEMEANOR HOUSING

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Sheriff/Misdemeanor Housing, account 2780-1950 in the amount of \$186. I'll move approval.

Councilmember Hoy: Second.

Councilmember Raben: Mr...

President Bassemier: Who seconded it? I'm sorry. Okay, discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

SHERIFF/MISDEMEANOR HOUSING		REQUESTED	APPROVED
2780-1950	Teamster's Ed. Fund	186.00	186.00
Total		186.00	186.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

LOCAL EMERGENCY PLANNING COMMISSION

Councilmember Raben: Mr. President, Local Emergency Planning Commission, account 2861-3370 Computer management, I would move that this be deferred at this point pending ACS's examination of that request.

President Bassemier: Okay, I have a second on that?

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: Second, Mr. Wortman. Discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

LEPC		REQUESTED	APPROVED
2861-3370	Computer (Data Mgmt)	2,500.00	
Total		2,500.00	Deferred

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

GENERAL FUND REPEAL REQUEST

SHERIFF/COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS

President Bassemier: Okay, Jim, Repeal.

Councilmember Raben: I don't, is there anyone here from LEPC?

Councilmember Hoy: No, I belong to that board, but deferral is fine.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Sheriff/Community Corrections 1361-1630-1361 Medical Educator \$7,500. I'll move approval.

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: Second, Mr. Wortman. Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

SHERIFF/COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1361-1630-1361	Medical Educator	7,500.00	7,500.00
Total		7,500.00	7,500.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

President Bassemier: Transfers.

Teri Lukeman: Before you start, can we change the tape?

President Bassemier: Hold on a second, Jim, I'm sorry. We're going to change the tape real quick.

(Tape Changed)

President Bassemier: Okay, Mr. Raben.

TRANSFER REQUESTS

CLERK PROSECUTOR SUPT. OF CO. BLDGS THE CENTRE CUMULATIVE BRIDGE	SHERIFF VOTER REGISTRATION SHERIFF/COM. CORRECT.(2) FAMILY & CHILD. SERVICES *KNIGHT TWP. ASSESSOR	CORONER TREASURER SUPERIOR COURT COUNTY HIGHWAY *COUNTY COUNCIL
---	---	--

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Mr. President, we have two late transfers, one, Knight Township Assessor and County Council, and you have those on your desks. Starting with the Clerk, she’s requesting \$450 be transferred out of 1010-1600-1010 into account 1010-1170-1010. I’m going to ask that this be deferred. That needs to go before the Job Study. All other transfers as they are listed including the late transfers, and I’ll make that in the form of a motion.

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: Got a second from Mr. Wortman. Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

CLERK		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1010-1600-1010	Asst. Chief Dep/Sup Ct	450.00	
To: 1010-1170-1010	Circuit Ct Clerk/Archives	450.00	Deferred

SHERIFF		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1050-1130-0038	Corporal	5,923.00	5,923.00

To: 1050-1130-0001	Chief Deputy	260.00	260.00
1050-1130-0004	Lieutenant	3,955.00	3,955.00
1050-1130-0006	Lieutenant	938.00	938.00
1050-1130-0114	Chief Deputy	770.00	770.00

CORONER		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1070-2230	Garage & Motor	500.00	500.00
1070-2710	Color Film	500.00	500.00
1070-3130	Mileage	1,000.00	1,000.00
1070-2210	Gas & Oil	200.00	200.00
1070-2740	Chemicals	350.00	350.00
1070-3540	Maintenance Control	550.00	550.00
To: 1070-2700	Other Supplies	500.00	500.00
1070-2410	Body Transport	1,500.00	1,500.00
1070-3160	Radio/Pagers	400.00	400.00
1070-3530	Contractual Services	700.00	700.00

PROSECUTOR		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1080-1140-1080	Deputy	3,500.00	3,500.00
1080-1990	Extra Help	3,500.00	3,500.00

VOTER REGISTRATION		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1220-3370	Computer (Data Mgmt)	100.00	100.00
To: 1220-3520	Equip. & Maint. Repair	100.00	100.00

TREASURER		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1030-1250-1030	Counter & Posting Clerk	3,000.00	3,000.00
1030-2700	Other Supplies	778.00	778.00
To: 1030-1970	Temporary Replacement	3,000.00	3,000.00
1030-4220	Office Machines	778.00	778.00

SUPT. OF CO. BUILDINGS		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1310-1110-1310	Supt. Of Co. Bldgs.	113.00	113.00
To: 1310-1120-1310	Carpenter	113.00	113.00

SHERIFF/COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1361-1630-1361	Medical Educator	2,116.00	2,116.00
To: 1361-1140-1361	Clerk	107.00	107.00
1361-1150-1361	Clerk	90.00	90.00

1361-1160-1361	Case Manager	114.00	114.00
1361-1170-1361	Case Manger	120.00	120.00
1361-1560-1361	Case Manager	120.00	120.00
1361-1550-1361	Cook	365.00	365.00
1361-1800-1361	Shift Differential	1,200.00	1,200.00

SHERIFF/COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1361-1180-1361	Clerk	102.00	102.00
To: 1361-1980	Other Pay	102.00	102.00

SUPERIOR COURT		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1370-3010	Other Insurance	5,830.00	5,830.00
To: 1370-3250	Law Books	5,830.00	5,830.00

THE CENTRE		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1440-1140-1440	Custodian	463.00	463.00
To: 1440-1130-1440	Lead Man	115.00	115.00
1440-1160-1440	Maintenance	124.00	124.00
1440-1150-1440	Custodian	112.00	112.00
1440-1170-1440	Custodian	112.00	112.00

FAMILY & CHILDREN SERVICES		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 2042-32500	Out of Home Placements/ Foster Homes	120,000.00	120,000.00
2042-32550	Misc. Cost of Wards	12,000.00	12,000.00

(Table continued next page)

2042-32600	Adoption Services	130,000.00	130,000.00
To: 2042-32520	Out of Home Placements/ Institutions	250,000.00	250,000.00
2042-32530	Independent Living for Wards	12,000.00	12,000.00

COUNTY HIGHWAY		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 2010-2210	Gas & Oil	50,000.00	50,000.00
2010-3630	Equip. Lease & Rental	50,000.00	50,000.00
To: 2010-2530	Bituminous Materials	100,000.00	100,000.00

CUMULATIVE BRIDGE		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 2030-4344	McCutchan Rd. Bridge	60,000.00	60,000.00
2030-4391	Boyle Lane Bridge	40,000.00	40,000.00
2030-4401	Broadway Ave. Bridge	9,000.00	9,000.00

2030-4720	Roesner Rd. Culvert	84,000.00	84,000.00
To: 2030-3930	Other Contractual	193,000.00	193,000.00

*LATE TRANSFER REQUESTS

KNIGHT TWP. ASSESSOR		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From:1130-1150-1130	Deputy Assessor/ Mobile Home	4,800.00	4,800.00
To: 1130-1972	Level II Certification	193.00	193.00
1130-1990	Extra Help	4,607.00	4,607.00

COUNTY COUNCIL		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1480-1920	Insurance	250.00	250.00
To: 1480-3550	Repairs to bldg. & grounds	250.00	250.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

AMENDMENTS TO SALARY ORDINANCE

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Mr. President, as far as the amendments to the Salary Ordinance, we have a lot of them today and our Council Executive Secretary was nice enough to type these up where they could be passed out to each and every one of us and I would move that these be made part of our minutes and rather than read through them all, I'm going to ask that we accept this as listed.

Councilmember Sutton: You getting lazy on us?

Councilmember Raben: Yes, I am.

President Bassemier: Can I have a second?

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: Everybody in favor raise their right hand.

Councilmember Winnecke: Can we have a chance to read them first?

Councilmember Raben: Everything we voted on –

Councilmember Sutton: Just make him suffer a little bit.

Teri Lukeman: Who was the seconder?

President Bassemier: Who seconded that?

Councilmember Wortman: I did.

President Bassemier: Yeah, Mr. Wortman did. Okay, everybody in favor, raise their right hand. Let the record show the vote was unanimous.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

MILITARY LEAVE

Councilmember Raben: Well, I'll address this under Old Business, Mr. President, and I was shocked that I just looked up and saw that they were gone, but the Sheriff's Department had asked or has served notice to our office that they've already had a few individuals who had been pulled from their line of duty here to share in the responsibility as reservists and the question was asked by the Sheriff's Department and I think they must have forgot about it, but had asked that we address a few questions that they had on the floor today, so I'm going to do that. One of them was longevity with when they do leave or get called in to duty, longevity does continue. And in accordance with the current law, when they return from duty, they're entitled to be reinstated to their former position or to a compatible one, okay. So then the other question was in terms of health insurance, it is in our county's ordinance that we do continue to pay the employer share of their insurance and any vacation time that has been earned, it is required by the officeholder or the department head to pay that out of their salary line should the employee request it. So that does address those issues that they have. And everything pretty well works in favor of the employee which, in this case, it really should so...

APPOINTMENT TO PROPERTY TAX ASSESSMENT BOARD OF APPEALS
--

Councilmember Tornatta: Mr. President? I'd like to call Cheryl Musgrave up if we could. And what this is referencing to is, we kind of touched on it last week that we had somebody on the appeals board that was from out of the county because we could not find anybody at the time that would have served on the board with a Level II accreditation. We now have a recommendation from Ms. Musgrave and she's going to go over that now. But I think we ought to consider that. That would take all the, I guess, some of the expense out of using our money to subsidize that person coming from out of county.

Cheryl Musgrave: President Bassemier and members of Council, I would like to request now, that you appoint Mr. Khristian Seger, a level two assessor, to the Vanderburgh County Property Tax Board of Appeals, Assessment Board of Appeals on Friday, upon the resignation of Ms. Peggy Pfister. Ms. Pfister is currently the president of the local board and has offered her resignation after Thursday's meeting. She's done an absolutely wonderful job for the board, pulled us out of some of situations that could have been difficult. She brought many years of experience to it. The fortunate part for the county is that the law is a little bit more relaxed than it was in January. After the legislative session, they relaxed the requirements a little bit and I think it was April or May, Mr. Seger became available for appointment to the board, a Vanderburgh County resident, a republican and a level II, which is what Mrs. Pfister is on the board. So I am very pleased to tell you that we can now fill that slot with a Vanderburgh County resident and I would ask you to make that appointment effective on Friday. And on Friday I will deliver to Mrs. Deig, the resignation of Mrs. Pfister.

Councilmember Sutton: Cheryl, since you kind of – well, I guess I kind of started this discussion a little bit last week, I guess, and brought the letter for you – you can do the –

Councilmember Tornatta: I just would make a motion that we accept the resignation of Peggy Pfister and accept the appointment of Khristian Seger to the Vanderburgh

County Property Tax Board.

Jeff Ahlers: Both of them effective Friday, October 5th?

Councilmember Tornatta: Both effective Friday, October 5th, 2001.

Councilmember Sutton: Second.

President Bassemier: Second by Mr. Hoy. Everybody in favor raise your right hand.

Jeff Ahlers: Let the record show it was unanimous, passed.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

Cheryl Musgrave: I appreciate it.

**PYROTEK
PRELIMINARY RESOLUTION FOR PROPERTY TAX ABATEMENT FOR
REDEVELOPMENT OF PROPERTY AND THE ACQUISITION AND
INSTALLATION OF NEW MANUFACTURING EQUIPMENT LOCATED AT
14828 FOUNDATION AVENUE**

President Bassemier: Last and final, new business. We need a motion, this is a preliminary resolution, property tax abatement for the development for rehabilitation for property and the acquisition and installation of new manufacturing equipment located at 14828 Foundation Avenue, Pyrotek, Incorporated. Do we have – state your name, sir.

Charles Compton: Mr. President, members of the Council, my name is Charles Compton, I'm a partner with Ziemer, Stayman, Weitzel & Shoulders. We represent Pyrotek. With me is David Coon, who is a regional manager from Pyrotek. There are also representatives from the Department of Metropolitan Development with us. There was a representative from the Metropolitan Chamber of Commerce who had to leave. Pyrotek is an existing citizen of Vanderburgh County. They are an industry involved in the manufacture and production of seals and gaskets and related products for transporting aluminum and also in connection with the purification of aluminum. Mr. Coon can talk to you a little bit more about the specific process that Pyrotek is involved in. They are currently located in the facility at 107 West Maryland. That facility is too small for their continued operations and they are looking to relocate so they can expand their business. As companies do when they are in need of relocating, they have investigated alternatives. They are looking at alternatives in Vanderburgh County as well as other counties, have looked at alternatives in Warrick County and have received a proposal from Warrick County for a new facility that would include tax abatement. They are currently looking at a facility as well, a potential investment in the Vanderburgh Industrial Park that would entail investment of 2.5 to 2.7 million dollars. In connection with that proposal, they would seek an abatement of ten years which the Department of Metropolitan Development ran the numbers and the total property tax abatement from that investment would be approximately \$250,000 over that ten year period where it comes down to about \$25,000 per year. Currently they have 17 employees. In the next five years if this project can go forward, they will add 11 to 12 new employees. As I indicated, they are an existing corporate citizen but looking to expand and hoping to expand in Vanderburgh County. Their current payroll is \$800,000 per year. Next year it will be \$950,000 per year and by 2011, the estimated payroll is

in the 1.5 to 2 million dollar range. Hopefully, the Council will find the relative scope of the investment compared to the reward and the opportunity to maintain and retain this industry in Vanderburgh County an acceptable investment. With that, I'll turn it over to David Coon, who could discuss the specific operations of the company and address any specific questions that you may have.

President Bassemier: State your name, sir, for the record.

David Coon: My name is David Coon, spelled C-O-O-N. I'm the regional manager for Pyrotek in Evansville. I want to thank you, Mr. President, the committee for allowing me to spend this time with you today. I'll tell you a little bit more about Pyrotek. Pyrotek is a 45 year old company. It is a privately owned \$135,000,000 corporation. Pyrotek had its beginning in 1956 in Spokane, Washington in the garage of our current owner. Pyrotek is now, in 2001, an international company with plants and warehouses in 27 countries. The state of Indiana has two facilities, one here in Evansville, which we purchased in 1993, which was a 40,000 square foot facility on Maryland Street as Charles mentioned to you. It only has 30,000 square feet that's usable for us and in 1999 Pyrotek built a new facility in Columbia City which is a 50,000 square foot plant and warehouse. Pyrotek serves the aluminum smelting and foundry market and there is a heavy concentration of this market in the area, makes it attractive to Pyrotek. Evansville's current facilities are inadequate to support future growth plans. It will not support its current business in a safe and efficient manner; therefore, a new location is inevitable. Warrick County is being considered because it is in close proximity to a major account, Alcoa Warrick, and also to a future account, AK Steel. Warrick County has offered Pyrotek a tax abatement of seven years on a proposed project of 1.7 million dollars. In addition, they are offering free sewer taps, \$750 in educational help for each new employee we bring into the business, and they are offering IRV support. We have subsequently offered to purchase a building that will be built in the VIP. The offer is contingent upon receiving tax abatement from Vanderburgh County. We are proposing to invest in a new facility that we can expand as our business grows. This requires a more significant investment and abatement helps make this happen. We will give back to Vanderburgh County \$796,000 in payroll in 2001, \$959,000 in payroll in 2002, and by 2011 we project the payroll to be 1.5 to 2 million dollars. We will build a project that is worth over two and a half million dollars. We will purchase new equipment for that plant in excess of \$250,000. We will pay to Vanderburgh, even with a ten year tax abatement, \$341,000 in taxes or more than that in ten years. And Pyrotek will pledge itself to contribute to the social well being of the county by being actively involved in this county. Do you have any questions that you would like to ask me at this time?

President Bassemier: Any questions?

Councilmember Hoy: On your benefits package you include a 401(k) according to this document here, is that correct?

David Coon: Correct, with 40 cents on the dollar match from the company after they've been with the company one year.

Councilmember Hoy: They're with you a year and you match every dollar they put in with 40 cents?

David Coon: Up to six percent of what they contribute.

Councilmember Hoy: Okay. Profit sharing, what's included in that?

David Coon: Profit sharing is a percentage that's only held in escrow by our current owners and it's based on the profitability of the company from year to year. And it's based upon your salary as well.

Councilmember Hoy: On dental and health, how much does the company pay, where are the percentages or the...

David Coon: This year we're paying all but ten percent, next year we'll pay all but 20 percent and it'll max out at 30 percent in 2003. The employee will be obligated to pay 30 percent of the cost.

Councilmember Hoy: And the life insurance goes with that health plan, right?

David Coon: Yes, up to \$50,000.

Councilmember Hoy: Prescription drug plan is included in that?

David Coon: Yes.

Councilmember Hoy: Can you comment on that?

David Coon: It's based on, it's a Blue Cross/Blue Shield type of program. It's based on a discount price on the drugs plus a mail-in plan that the employee will pay no more than \$18 in three months for any priced drug that they may have to be on, on a repetitive basis.

Councilmember Hoy: Yeah, okay.

President Bassemier: Is that it, Mr. Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: You will be in the airport revitalization zone as well?

David Coon: Yes sir.

Councilmember Hoy: What are the – can somebody answer that question as to what the benefits of that –

David Coon: My understanding is there is inventory tax abatement for reduction.

Councilmember Hoy: That's for the whole inventory?

David Coon: Correct.

Councilmember Hoy: Not something you get in Warrick County then?

David Coon: That will not be included in Warrick.

Councilmember Hoy: Yeah. Thank you.

David Coon: You're welcome.

Councilmember Winnecke: How many employees do you have now?

David Coon: We actually have hired one more employee that is based on those figures. We have 18 employees, 16 of which are in Vanderburgh County and two

are in eastern Tennessee.

Councilmember Winnecke: And then just so I, I'm never really clear on these numbers on these applications, so when the project is complete, you'll have four full-time additional employees and two part-time, and over five years you project ten full-time and two part-time in addition to what you have?

David Coon: Yes, in a five to ten year period, it should be the five to ten year period on 12 employees, additional. Now that's on to the 18, so making a total of 30. We hope to be at 30 employees within a ten year time period.

Councilmember Winnecke: That's what I was getting at. And I guess my other question, if we don't grant this, are you going to Warrick County?

David Coon: I'll probably be forced to by our owners, since we have the tax abatement there.

Councilmember Winnecke: They haven't voted on it, though.

David Coon: Yes, they have. They have passed it. Everything I shared with you in Warrick has already been approved.

Councilmember Raben: But no inventory?

David Coon: But not on inventory.

Councilmember Raben: Right, which is important. I might ask, is this building built now, it's a spec building, I assume?

Ken Newcomb: My name is Ken Newcomb. I'm vice-president of Tucker Commercial Services. That was a spec building that was built in the Vanderburgh Industrial Park. It is currently about 75% complete. That was one of the issues with Mr. Coon being able to locate in Vanderburgh County in a somewhat immediate time-frame. We can actually have him under roof and under way in a short period of time.

Councilmember Winnecke: How long?

Ken Newcomb: (Inaudible - comments not made from microphone) on complete out there and move in.

David Coon: Probably what we should say is that there is a shell that's being considered to be purchased and then if we proceed and purchase the shell, then we will be farming out the build-outs, which will be another \$800,000 to a million, which will not be started until we buy the building, of course. So what we're looking at right now is a 1.7 million dollar shell to purchase as soon as we can obtain tax abatement and then as soon as that is concluded, then we'll start build-outs, which will amount to 800 to a million dollars, \$800,000 to a million dollars.

Councilmember Winnecke: In terms of transportation, do you need rail or anything?

David Coon: Not at this point.

President Bassemier: Now what did the board, sir, DMD, what was the vote on that? Did they approve this, DMD?

David Coon: All but one.

President Bassemier: Metropolitan Development, did they approve this?

David Coon: Metropolitan Development was unanimous.

(Inaudible – several speaking at once)

Michael Osborne: Michael Osborne, Metropolitan Development. No, we didn't have to vote on anything, but Friday, the Redevelopment Commission for the county met. They unanimously approved the application. I think you should have received a signed copy of that in the mail.

Councilmember Raben: This is just preliminary. You're not asking us to vote on this today, correct?

Michael Osborne: It will be a two-step process. We submitted this now to start the process.

President Bassemier: This is preliminary, so we have to vote on it.

Jeff Ahlers: Yeah, Jim, this is initial preliminary, you know, the first reading, so unless you table it, it would take four votes to pass it today. They would have to then come back next month and it would have to get at least four votes again or it would fail. If you're not ready to vote today, you can table it. But technically, I think it's here for a vote.

Charles Compton: We would request that a vote be taken today in terms of the necessity for timing of the company allowing to know where they go given the time line for Council's schedule, we would ask the preliminary vote occur today. Then schedule for final vote at the November meeting. We would certainly appear before a committee or answer any questions that the Council would have in the interim regarding the specific facility. The investment that is being contemplated in Warrick is about a million dollars, I believe, less investment. If the Warrick facility goes forward it's 1.7?

David Coon: They said if we would have had a two million dollar project, they would have given us ten years, but we have a 1.7 –

Charles Compton: So it's about a 1.7 million dollar investment in Warrick. If we go with this particular investment, it would be 2.7 million dollars, so a significantly greater investment in Vanderburgh County. One of the, perhaps, justifications for a bit of a disparity in terms of the relative incentives that have been offered between the two.

Councilmember Sutton: Can you give me an idea of what these new positions that you would like to bring on if you're able to move forward, what type of skill level are we talking about here for these positions? What are you essentially looking for?

David Coon: I can share most of it with you.

Councilmember Sutton: I mean, you don't have to go down through each one. If you can just give me a general idea.

David Coon: There will be three direct laborers and their average salary is \$10.66

an hour right now. And there would be one professional person with a salary around \$60,000.

Councilmember Sutton: And your relative skill level that's required for your workforce right now outside of maybe the office or professional ranks, what is the relative skill level that you require?

David Coon: There's a skill that's developed. Most of it's in the sewing area, but we wouldn't be hiring anyone in there in that area. We'll be bringing, my understanding, two employees from West Virginia who know the process, who have the skilled labor, and then we would be hiring one indirect and another person to work that. It would not be a highly skilled job.

Councilmember Sutton: Is there anyone else here locally that does what you do? Any other company?

David Coon: No sir.

Councilmember Raben: (Inaudible – microphone not turned on)

David Coon: No, we service that. We service the aluminum smelters with various alloy components. It's a multi-faceted product. What we do in Evansville is a sewn product which we encapsulate an insulating material inside of a fiberglass, high temperature fiberglass to act as seals and gaskets for transporting aluminum. Now in our industry, there is competition here. If you're talking about the new business coming in, no. Our current business, yes. It's highly competitive.

Councilmember Raben: So the materials that you're using come from Alcoa?

David Coon: No, they go to Alcoa.

Councilmember Raben: They go to Alcoa.

David Coon: We sell to Alcoa, Alcan, Sebree.

Councilmember Wortman: I make a motion we approve the tax abatement.

Councilmember Winnecke: Second.

President Bassemier: Okay, any more discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: I'm interested in hearing more for next time. If I'm of the understanding that we're just approving it to vote on it next time. Is that correct? So I'll vote yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: I'm going to, I usually vote no on tax abatements and I may on this one, but I want to hear more so I'll say yes today.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes. It passes, see you next month.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

President Bassemier: Need a motion to adjourn.

Councilmember Winnecke: So moved.

Councilmember Raben: Second.

President Bassemier: Adjourned.

(Meeting adjourned at 5:45 p.m.)

VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL

President Ed Bassemier

Vice President Lloyd Winnecke

Councilmember James Raben

Councilmember Phil Hoy

Councilmember Curt Wortman

Councilmember Royce Sutton

Councilmember Troy Tornatta

Recorded and transcribed by Teri Lukeman.

VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL
MINUTES
NOVEMBER 7, 2001

The Vanderburgh County Council met in session this 7th day of November, 2001 in room 301 of the Civic Center Complex. The meeting was called to order at 3:35 p.m. by County Council President, Ed Bassemier.

President Bassemier: Sheriff , you want to open the meeting, please?

Brad Ellsworth: Oh yes, oh yes, oh yes, the Vanderburgh County Council is now in session pursuant to adjournment.

President Bassemier: I would like to welcome everyone to the November 7, 2001 County Council meeting. Attendance roll call, please.

COUNCILMEMBER	PRESENT	ABSENT
Councilmember Tornatta		
Councilmember Sutton		
Councilmember Wortman		
Councilmember Hoy		
Councilmember Raben		
Councilmember Winnecke		
President Bassemier		

President Bassemier: Would everyone please stand for the Pledge of Allegiance?

(Pledge of Allegiance was given)

APPROVAL OF MINUTES
REGULAR MEETING OCTOBER 3, 2001

President Bassemier: I need a motion to approve the minutes of October 3, 2001.

Councilmember Wortman: I make a motion for approval.

President Bassemier: Do I have a second?

Councilmember Winnecke: Second.

President Bassemier: Any discussion? Everybody in favor say aye.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATION REQUESTS

President Bassemier: Okay, we'll move into the appropriation ordinance. I'm going to turn it over to our Finance Chairman, Mr. Raben.

JAIL

Councilmember Raben: Okay. First on the agenda is the jail 1051-3530, Contractual Services in the amount of \$3,500. I'll move approval.

Councilmember Hoy: Second.

President Bassemier: Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

JAIL		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1051-3530	Contractual Services	\$3,500.00	\$3,500.00
Total		\$3,500.00	\$3,500.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

COMMISSIONERS (Four requests)

President Bassemier: Commissioners.

Councilmember Raben: Okay. County Commissioners 1300-1930, Unemployment, \$10,000. 1300-3040, Soil & Water, zero, and Councilman Hoy addressed that issue last month, last week. 1300-3050, Patient/Inmate Care, \$150,000. 1300-3610, Legal Services, \$10,000. 1300-3130, Travel/Mileage, \$5,000, and I make that in the form of a motion.

President Bassemier: Do I have a second?

Councilmember Winnecke: Second.

President Bassemier: Second by Mr. Winnecke. Any discussion? Mr. Sutton.

Councilmember Sutton: Yeah, I was going to ask, Jim, on that Patient/Inmate Care, I know there was some discussion about that last week about some of the delays in the billing. I didn't know if there had been any resolution there?

Councilmember Raben: That's, that's still what my intent is that we actually...the bills for December don't even come to us until January, and if we would appropriate \$400,000, the only way you can encumber money from that account is with a bill. So, we are not going to have a bill anyway. So, and I did speak with Judge Trockman, and he said that at the

most we will probably need \$50,000 maybe \$100,000 at year end, so I kind of cushioned it at \$150,000, so.

President Bassemier: Okay. Anybody else?

Councilmember Sutton: I didn't know if the Commissioners were speaking to it or.

President Bassemier: Okay.

Councilmember Sutton: Okay.

Catherine Fanello: Did you all receive the memo I sent you?

President Bassemier: Ma'am, can you state your name, please?

Catherine Fanello: Catherine Fanello, County Commissioner.

President Bassemier: Thank you, ma'am. Any comments for the—

Catherine Fanello: It will be significantly more than \$50,000 or \$100,000. I mean, speaking with Bart O'Connor last week, he told us \$400,000 probably wasn't even enough. So, I mean, there will be bills in excess of that. But, I mean, the way you would hold those funds is to encumber them on a purchase order, and approximate to whom they would be paid to.

Councilmember Raben: Well, I think, you have to either have a contract or an invoice, don't you?

Catherine Fanello: No, you don't.

Councilmember Raben: For that account?

Catherine Fanello: Not according to the State Board of Accounts Manual for Auditors. If that's true, I've never read anything to that effect. If you have a bill that you're anticipating coming, then you are supposed to encumber it on a purchase order. I mean, that's just rule of thumb. I mean, you're not supposed to pay next year's, this year's bills out of next year's budget.

Councilmember Raben: Again, we're not actually going to see those bills until 2002.

Catherine Fanello: I know, but they're bills for this year.

Councilmember Raben: Right. Okay, the motion stands.

Councilmember Sutton: So how do we come up with the \$150,000, I guess, is maybe what I'm trying to get?

Catherine Fanello: I don't know, because, I mean, if you see the figures I have, and they are, in 1999 we paid \$738,000 worth of bills, or in 2000 we paid \$738,000 worth of bills that were actually for 1999. In 2001, I think, we paid about \$560 some thousand, somewhere around there.

Councilmember Raben: That's probably been the history of this account from day one—

Catherine Fanello: Yeah, for years.

Councilmember Raben: —that, that the first quarter of the new year, you know, you're faced with a lot of bills, but that's just the manner in which they come in. Back to the \$150,000, you know, again, Judge Trockman told me we may see bills payable yet this year where they would need an additional \$50,000, he said, you know, play it safe, say \$100,000 and

I’ve even taken it one step further and set in \$150,000. So, I’ve left a cushion there, so.

President Bassemier: Thank you, Catherine. Any more discussion? We have a motion and a second. Roll call vote, please.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

COMMISSIONERS		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1300-1930	Unemployment	\$10,000.00	\$10,000.00
1300-3040	Soil & Water	\$2,000.00	\$0.00
1300-3050	Patient/Inmate Care	\$400,000.00	\$150,000.00
1300-3610	Legal Services	\$10,000.00	\$10,000.00
1300-3130	Travel/Mileage	\$5,000.00	\$5,000.00
Total		\$427,000.00	\$175,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

President Bassemier: Commissioners again.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Mr. President, I’ll just lump these three together.

President Bassemier: Okay.

Councilmember Raben: We’ve got 1300-3021, Hillcrest-Washington, \$39,996. 1300-3120, Postage/Freight, \$50,000. 1300-3760, Occu-Med, \$9660. I’ll move approval of all three items.

Councilmember Sutton: Second.

President Bassemier: Second by who? Mr. Sutton. Any discussion? Roll call vote, please.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

COMMISSIONERS		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1300-3021	Hillcrest-Washington	\$39,996.00	\$39,996.00
1300-3120	Postage/Freight	\$50,000.00	\$50,000.00
1300-3760	Occu-Med	\$9,660.00	\$9,660.00
Total		\$99,656.00	\$99,656.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

SUPERINTENDENT OF COUNTY BUILDINGS

President Bassemier: Superintendent of County Buildings.

Councilmember Raben: Okay. 1310-4120 and 1310-2210, for a total request of \$70,700. I'll move approval.

President Bassemier: Do I have a second, please?

Councilmember Hoy: Second.

President Bassemier: Mr. Hoy. Any discussion? Roll call vote, please.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

SUPERINTENDENT OF CO. BUILDINGS		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1310-4120	Buildings	\$70,580.00	\$70,580.00
1310-2210	Gas & Oil	\$120.00	\$120.00
Total		\$70,700.00	\$70,700.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

SUPERIOR COURT

President Bassemier: Jim.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Superior Court. 1370-2270,1370-3410, 1370-3790 for a total request of \$3,500. I'll move approval.

Councilmember Sutton: Second.

President Bassemier: Second by Mr. Sutton. Any discussion? Roll call vote, please.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

SUPERIOR COURT		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1370-2270	Juror Meals/Lodging	\$1,500.00	\$1,500.00
1370-3410	Printing	\$1,000.00	\$1,000.00
1370-3790	Professional Services	\$1,000.00	\$1,000.00
Total		\$3,500.00	\$3,500.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

COUNTY COUNCIL

President Bassemier: County Council.

Councilmember Raben: 1480-3460 in the amount of \$4,700. I'll move approval.

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: Second by Mr. Wortman. Any discussion? Roll call vote, please.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

COUNTY COUNCIL		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1480-3460	Consultant	\$4,700.00	\$4,700.00
Total		\$4,700.00	\$4,700.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

CUM BRIDGE

President Bassemier: Cum Bridge.

Councilmember Raben: Okay. 2030-4404, University Parkway Bridge, in the amount of \$55,000. I'll move approval.

Councilmember Hoy: Second.

President Bassemier: I'm sorry, I didn't hear the second. Mr. Hoy. Any discussion? Roll call vote, please.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

CUM BRIDGE		REQUESTED	APPROVED
2030-4404	University Parkway Bridge #2200	\$55,000.00	\$55,000.00
Total		\$55,000.00	\$55,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

CCD/COMMISSIONERS

President Bassemier: Mr. Raben.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Mr. President, next under the CCD, we have three requests, there was quite a bit of discussion on this last week, so I'm going to move ahead with it. 2031-1300-4933, 2031-1300-4932, and 2031-1300-4931, I would move that those be set in at zero. We do have a new financial statement in front of us. I would request that those projects be paid out of Local Roads & Streets, where there is a balance of almost \$1.7 million, so.

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: I have a second by Mr. Wortman. Any discussion on that?

Councilmember Sutton: Jim, did you, I think there was in our discussion last week, there was some questions about the type of projects that those are and whether you can actually use Local Roads & Streets for the whole substance of those projects. What did you find out further on that from John in terms of what restrictions we may have on those? I guess, from our discussion I took from last week, we couldn't take it all, but there may be some of it that we can take for Local Roads & Streets.

Councilmember Raben: The discussion that I may have raised, Royce, pertained to what of this could be paid out of the Cum Bridge Fund. He had stated that there was a small amount, or I don't recall the figures, some culvert work on the Pine Place and Heather Court Project, but, again, he can, or, he can break that up however he wants and pay it out of those appropriate accounts, so.

Councilmember Sutton: Well, I think my question was that did we find out any further on the restrictions based on the type of projects that they are? Whether they could be used, or taken out of any other source? I guess that was my question.

Councilmember Raben: I actually don't remember that part of the conversation. I mean, I don't recall that there was a question on whether or not it would apply to Local Roads & Streets. I mean, does anyone else?

President Bassemier: Mr. Stoll want to?

Councilmember Sutton: I guess, I just want to be comfortable. You know, if we're going to use this that we are okay. Is John?

President Bassemier: John, you want to come forward, please?

Councilmember Sutton: Yeah.

President Bassemier: I kind of remember, John, state your name first. I kind of remember a little bit about that. Something could not be taken out.

John Stoll: John Stoll, County Engineer. I don't know of any restrictions that would prevent the use of Road & Street money on the design of the St. George and Oak Hill Project. Like Councilman Raben said, there is a culvert in Pine Place and Heather Court Project that could be taken out of the Cum Bridge Fund, but the bulk of that one couldn't be taken out of Cum Bridge. I believe the last estimate we received on that project was about \$416,000, and about \$93,000, I believe, was the estimate on the culvert. So, to the best of my knowledge, the Road & Street Funds could be used for that.

Councilmember Sutton: Good, okay.

Councilmember Hoy: And you could use how much out of the Cum Bridge?

John Stoll: \$93,000 for the Pine Place and Heather Court Project.

Councilmember Hoy: Because that's culvert work, right?

John Stoll: Right. The rest of it's storm sewer and you couldn't use Bridge money—

Councilmember Hoy: Yeah.

John Stoll: —for it.

Councilmember Hoy: Yeah. Yeah.

Councilmember Sutton: We've got more in Cum Bridge than we've got in Local Roads & Streets.

Councilmember Hoy: Could we not take that portion out of Cum Bridge then—

Councilmember Sutton: Right.

Councilmember Hoy: —for the culvert, and the rest out of LR & S?

John Stoll: I suppose we could.

Councilmember Sutton: Yeah.

Councilmember Hoy: That would be, make sense to me.

Councilmember Sutton: Yeah. Jim, you made the motion, I didn't know if you—

Councilmember Raben: The motion was to set those three lines in at zero—

Councilmember Sutton: Okay.

Councilmember Raben: —and simply request that they use Local Roads & Streets and Cum Bridge if applicable in that one instance, so. That's the motion.

President Bassemier: Is everybody clear on that? Mr. Tornatta.

Councilmember Tornatta: I had a question for Commissioner President Mosby.

President Bassemier: Mr. Mosby. Please state your name, sir.

David Mosby: Commissioner Mosby.

Councilmember Tornatta: Anything planned on the funds off of the Local Roads & Streets? I mean, are, is there anything that we are worried about in the near future having to take care of that we, if we deplete this fund we would be in some sort of a bind in that area?

David Mosby: There is several projects that we're looking at right now that could come out of Local Roads & Streets. That's one of the reasons we didn't take it out of there. I had a conversation with John the other day, and it's like he said, if we wanted to we could probably take paving money out and spend the whole \$1.7 million. If that's what we wanted to do. I mean, it's not what we want to do, because there are other street projects and road projects that I've been talked to about that we're looking at right now that I've had John look at and Ralph look at. We're not ready to bid them, but we probably are going to be ready to get some consultants on board or architects to start some of these projects.

Councilmember Tornatta: If I'm not mistaken, your job is to do contracts, is that right? I mean is, set up contracts and do things, have projects ready and then contract them out. Is that correct?

David Mosby: Depends on who you talk to.

Councilmember Tornatta: Then in doing that—

David Mosby: I'm sorry.

Councilmember Tornatta: —in doing that, if you have a list of things that you're looking to accomplish, then you would make a decision to take something out of one group and put it in another to achieve some of the projects that you want to further the community. Is that correct?

David Mosby: Right. I mean, there is continuously problems coming in the Commissioners office everyday. I'm not sure there's a day go by that I don't call John or Ralph about something. A lot of these projects are projects that we're not capable of doing through the

garage.

Councilmember Tornatta: Right.

David Mosby: We've tried to do a lot of them through the garage, and we're doing a whole lot more than we used to, but, I mean, there's projects come in everyday, and some of them might come in today or tomorrow that are a lot more important than what we've got. Then we start, you know, trying to take funds from certain places to do these jobs. That's why we've elected to take these three projects out of Local Roads & Streets so that, or out of CCD—

Councilmember Tornatta: CCD.

David Mosby: —so we can hold the \$1.7 million, which is not a lot of money when you start bidding some of these projects. I mean, you know, you can get one or two projects and \$500,000, \$600,000 a piece and you ain't got much money left. I mean, I'm not out for breaking all these funds.

Councilmember Tornatta: Right.

David Mosby: It's like John was talking, we were talking the other day, I mean, with Highway money and that we don't know how far our paving money is going to go, and we could probably spend the whole \$1.7 million just on paving if we wanted to. I mean, and that's a fund where we get paving out of every once in a while.

Councilmember Tornatta: Right. So, that comes back to question number one, that's the reason, you do have some other ideas in mind—

David Mosby: Right. Yeah, I mean, oh, there's other plans out there. I mean, I'll tell you one, and I've talked to John numerous times, USI, Schutte Road. That is a major problem out there where the road narrows down—

Councilmember Tornatta: I agree.

David Mosby: —there going into the Lloyd Expressway. You've got a left turn lane and a right turn lane, and traffic is bottle necking for about three blocks back through there—

Councilmember Tornatta: Right.

David Mosby: —because there is not a straight lane. So, if people aren't turning left or turning right, the people trying to go straight are clogged up. Then once they get up there and they move forward, people left and right, it's just a bad situation. It's a project we're looking at right now—

Councilmember Tornatta: Right.

David Mosby: —today, very seriously.

Councilmember Raben: Which, explain that to me again, this is at USI and Schutte Road—

David Mosby: Schutte Road and the Lloyd Expressway. We're on the south side of the Lloyd there at Schutte where the proposed rezoning is. That's been part of the discussion with the rezoning, that the traffic is so bad there, and if you go all the way back to where that little bridge culvert is, we would like to extend that culvert and widen that and widen it all the way up to the Lloyd. I'm not going to say it's going to cost the county a lot of money. You know, we can get a hold of Jerry Russell and Dale Lucas and them up in Vincennes district and, hopefully, get some help from the State on this. You know, if they don't want to do it, maybe at least give us (inaudible) to do it.

Councilmember Hoy: Mr. President—

David Mosby: I mean, we'll do everything we can to spend their money before we spend ours.

President Bassemier: Mr. Hoy.

Councilmember Hoy: Yes, I want to speak to a couple of issues here. I'm real familiar with St. George/Oak Hill, and I just don't have any problem using Local Roads & Streets for that because I know it's a drainage problem, but it is also a roads and streets problem because of the huge amount of drainage that we've got going over those roads. The other thing I would comment on is, and that's in your hands as Commissioners, is zoning. I've had another call from a lot of constituents out on the west side. We still haven't done anything to alleviate the safety problem at Upper Mount Vernon and Red Bank. I've been out there. That traffic is stacking up all the way up Red Bank around both of those right angle turns and up the hill now. My speech, as you know, has been we've got to watch zoning because you've got all those old roads out there that are built on the curves, built on right angles, and we don't have the money to straighten out Red Bank on both sides. We just do not. We're talking about a lot of money. I think what we are talking about here is also tying in with zoning. So, I would encourage you all... I know you are going to get a lot of pressure on zoning as Commissioners.

David Mosby: Well, let me clarify one thing. This project does not hinge on a zoning. This project is a problem today.

Councilmember Hoy: I know that.

David Mosby: Without zoning that piece of property, if you would drive out there, it's a problem today, tomorrow and the next day.

Councilmember Hoy: I drive out there. I've driven out there.

David Mosby: So, this has got nothing to do with zoning, but John will address the—

Councilmember Hoy: It has to do with previous zonings that you've inherited some of them.

David Mosby: Yeah, I mean the corner's not been zoned yet. I mean, but the college is growing. And there is no way of stopping the college from growing. I wouldn't want to stop the college from growing.

Councilmember Hoy: No, but you can stop the commercial. You can stop the development and just let the university grow, which is fine, and address that, but if there's a gas station there or if there's any kind of commercial there, we're going to have the same problem at Schutte that we have at Red Bank. I'm just sitting here saying as a Councilman, the taxes that are going to come in from that will never, ever pay for this infrastructure cost that is going to be down the road. You've got a problem already, a safety problem at which the County Engineer and I have talked about, and I think he's talked with you all about that intersection at Red Bank and Upper Mount Vernon. I'm getting calls again. We've got petitions with umpteen signatures on them because that's not a future problem, that's a present problem. Every time we do one of these zonings, this is what's going to happen to us because those roads were not laid out for the kind of culture and society in which we now live. That's not going to be an easy answer, but the other side and the last part of my speech is, as I look around the city I see vacant retail all over the city. I figure if some firms want to do business here, and they really want to do business here, they can go into an old building. We'll go there. We all have cars. All those students have cars. All God's children got cars.

President Bassemier: Thank you, Mr. Hoy. Anybody else? Thank you, gentlemen. I have a motion and a second. Roll call vote, please.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: No.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: It’s kind of six of one, half a dozen of another, but I guess my other concern is as we keep pulling out of different funds and all, the request here is have it at zero. I’m going to go ahead and vote yes for this, but really would like for us to get together and come up with an idea of what we specifically want to do on these different projects.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

CCD/COMMISSIONERS		REQUESTED	APPROVED
2031-1300-4933	Pine Pl-Heather Ct	\$215,000.00	\$0.00
2031-1300-4932	Elmridge-Congress	\$25,000.00	\$0.00
2031-1300-4931	St. George-Oak Hill	\$70,000.00	\$0.00
Total		\$310,000.00	\$0.00

(Motion carried 6-1/ Councilmember Tornatta opposed)

REASSESSMENT/PIGEON TOWNSHIP ASSESSOR

President Bassemier: Okay, Pigeon Assessor.

Councilmember Raben: Okay. 2492-1150-4220 in the amount of \$5,162. I’ll move approval.

Councilmember Winnecke: Second.

President Bassemier: I’ve got a second by Mr. Winnecke. Any discussion? Roll call vote, please.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

REASSESSMENT/PIGEON ASSESSOR		REQUESTED	APPROVED
2492-1150-4220	Office Machines	\$5,162.00	\$5,162.00
Total		\$5,162.00	\$5,162.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

REASSESSMENT/UNION TOWNSHIP ASSESSOR

President Bassemier: Union Township Assessor.

Councilmember Raben: Okay. 2492-1170-1900, 2492-1170-1990, 2492-1170-3390, 2492-1170-4210 for a total request of \$3,430. I'll move approval.

Councilmember Winnecke: Second.

President Bassemier: I'm sorry.

Councilmember Winnecke: Second.

President Bassemier: Second by Mr. Winnecke. Any discussion? Roll call vote, please.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

REASSESSMENT/UNION ASSESSOR		REQUESTED	APPROVED
2492-1170-1900	FICA	\$80.00	\$80.00
2492-1170-1990	Extra Help	\$1,000.00	\$1,000.00
2492-1170-3390	Assessor’s Plat Sheets	\$350.00	\$350.00
2492-1170-4210	Office Furniture	\$2,000.00	\$2,000.00
Total		\$3,430.00	\$3,430.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

LOCAL EMERGENCY PLAN COMMISSION

President Bassemier: Mr. Raben.

Councilmember Raben: Okay. LEPC, 2861-3370, Computer Data Management, \$2,500. I’ll move approval.

Councilmember Sutton: Second.

President Bassemier: I’ve got a second by Mr. Sutton. Any discussion? Roll call vote, please.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

LEPC		REQUESTED	APPROVED
2861-3370	Computer (Data Mgmt.)	\$2,500.00	\$2,500.00
Total		\$2,500.00	\$2,500.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

President Bassemier: Now we roll.

TRANSFER REQUESTS

CLERK	RECORDER	COUNTY ASSESSOR
GERMAN TWP. ASSESSOR	PIGEON TWP ASSESSOR	PUBLIC DEFENDER (2)
SUPT. OF CO. BLDGS	THE CENTRE	LEGAL AID
CUMULATIVE BRIDGE	FAMILY & CHILD. SVCS	CIRCUIT COURT AP
CONVENTION/VISITORS	*VOTER REGISTRATION	*DRUG & ALCOHOL
*THE CENTRE	*CUMULATIVE BRIDGE	

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Mr. President, on the transfers, the request for the Clerk’s office has been withdrawn pending Job Study’s review. We do have some late transfers that are before you, so with all that in mind, I’m going to move that all transfers be accepted as they are submitted, with the exclusion of the Clerk’s, that being withdrawn. I’ll make that in the form of a motion.

Councilmember Hoy: Second.

President Bassemier: Second by Mr. Hoy. Any discussion on the transfer?

Councilmember Sutton: Yeah. Can you just give us a second since we have a new one?

President Bassemier: That would be fine, sir. We’ll take a few, few minutes.

Councilmember Sutton: Okay.

Councilmember Wortman: Mr. Chairman?

President Bassemier: Mr. Wortman.

Councilmember Wortman: On page four, Superintendent of County Buildings transfer, Promotional and Advertising, Equipment Repair and Office Supplies, I was wondering if they couldn’t get them desks down there in the basement? Office Supplies I’ve got a problem with that.

President Bassemier: Okay, who would you like to address that to? Catherine?

Councilmember Raben: Superintendent of County Buildings.

President Bassemier: Mr. Mosby, would you or Catherine, either one. Mr. Wortman, he has a question for you.

Catherine Fanello: I don’t know if there is a desk available. What we are trying to do is to make the office look professional and get a nice work place together. I don’t know if there is one there, I do, but we need, not only do we need a desk, but we need a computer work station as well. That’s not all, that whole \$2,500 is not all for that.

Councilmember Wortman: Yeah, well, I was wondering, there was supposed to be some desks down there last time I looked, see. That’s what I was wondering. Then the Office Supplies, what’s that all for?

Catherine Fanello: Those are office supplies for Tammy and for the, I believe, some for the Old Courthouse too. That's under her budget. Tammy's budget.

Councilmember Wortman: What kind—

Catherine Fanello: Superintendent budget.

Councilmember Wortman: What kind of office supplies?

Catherine Fanello: Well, I think that is to also cover part of the computer equipment being purchased as well. Small office supplies, and furniture, so, paper, pens, whatever she uses in her office. She could probably better attest to that than I can.

Councilmember Wortman: She don't have none of that now?

Catherine Fanello: Well, yeah, but we do run out of it.

Councilmember Wortman: Thank you.

Catherine Fanello: Okay.

President Bassemier: Has everybody had a chance to look at it? Ready to roll?

Councilmember Sutton: What is Accrued Payments? I'm looking at Cum Bridge, it's the last—

Sandie Deig: (Inaudible. Mike not on.)

Councilmember Sutton: Okay. Got my answer.

President Bassemier: Okay. I have a motion and a second on transfers. Any more discussion? Roll call vote, please.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: I'm going to vote no, due to the Superintendent of County Buildings, because there's probably some desks down there, and \$5,500 is quite a bit of savings if there's desks down there. So, I'm going to vote no on this whole thing.

President Bassemier: Okay.

David Mosby: He must be confused. It's not \$5,500, it's only \$2,500. Equipment Repairs at the garage \$5,500. If that's what you are looking at. I think, that \$5,500—

Councilmember Wortman: Okay.

David Mosby: —that's the garage to repair the boiler.

Councilmember Wortman: Okay, this is repair the boiler down out there?

David Mosby: That \$5,500 is Equipment Repairs.

Councilmember Wortman: Okay, now that boiler was just put in.

David Mosby: They’ve got to put...John...I’m trying to think, there’s something to do with some flush knobs that they have to put on that. Tri-State, that was not included in the bid when they put the boiler in. If they don’t do that and they don’t flush the boiler routinely then it’s going to end up like the Old Courthouse. I mean, it gets corroded and it starts leaking.

Councilmember Wortman: I see.

David Mosby: So what they’re...it was not bid out and they had to buy the equipment to do it and Tri-State’s going to go back out and put them on so we can preserve the boiler.

Councilmember Wortman: Okay. Thank you.

President Bassemier: Thank you, Mr. Mosby, for clarifying that. Okay.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

CLERK		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1010-1590-1010	Ticket Clerk Misd/ Traffic	\$2,790.00	Withdrawn
To: 1010-1250-1010	Cashier/Misdemeanor	\$1,700.00	Withdrawn
1010-1170-1010	Circuit Ct. Clerk/Archives	\$1,090.00	Withdrawn

RECORDER		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1040-1160-1040	Microfilm Technician	\$500.00	\$500.00
To: 1040-1190-1040	Deed Deputy	\$500.00	\$500.00

COUNTY ASSESSOR		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1090-3700	Dues & Subscriptions	\$800.00	\$800.00
To: 1090-2600	Office Supplies	\$600.00	\$600.00
1090-3130	Travel/ Mileage	\$200.00	\$200.00

GERMAN TWP. ASSESSOR		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1120-3410	Printing	\$100.00	\$100.00
To: 1120-3130	Travel/ Mileage	\$100.00	\$100.00

PIGEON TWP. ASSESSOR		REQUESTED	APPROVED
----------------------	--	-----------	----------

From: 1150-3410	Printing	\$1,000.00	\$1,000.00
To: 1150-2600	Office Supplies	\$1,000.00	\$1,000.00

PUBLIC DEFENDER AGENCY		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1303-3947	Pauper Transcripts	\$1,000.00	\$1,000.00
To: 1303-3250	Law Books	\$1,000.00	\$1,000.00

PUBLIC DEFENDER AGENCY		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1303-1760-1303	Secretary	\$2,400.00	\$2,400.00
1303-1780-1303	Paralegal	\$100.00	\$100.00
To: 1303-1770-1303	Paralegal	\$2,500.00	\$2,500.00

SUPERINTENDENT OF COUNTY BUILDINGS		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1310-3791	Promotional	\$7,509.00	\$7,509.00
1310-3440	Advertising	\$500.00	\$500.00
To: 1310-3520	Equipment Repair	\$5,500.00	\$5,500.00
1310-2600	Office Supplies	\$2,509.00	\$2,509.00

THE CENTRE		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1440-1140-1440	Custodian	\$10,000.00	\$10,000.00
To: 1440-1850	Union Overtime	\$10,000.00	\$10,000.00

LEGAL AID		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1460-3000	Bonds & Insurance	\$240.00	\$240.00
1460-3680	Malpractice Insurance	\$594.00	\$594.00
1460-3700	Dues & Subscriptions	\$68.00	\$68.00
1460-3010	Other Insurance	\$237.00	\$237.00
1460-3140	Telephone	\$249.00	\$249.00
To: 1460-3540	Maintenance Contract	\$1,388.00	\$1,388.00

CUMULATIVE BRIDGE		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 2030-1100-2030	Asst. County Engineer	\$1,200.00	\$1,200.00
To: 2030-1990	Extra Help	\$1,200.00	\$1,200.00

FAMILY & CHILDREN SERVICES		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 2042-32550	Misc. Costs of Wards	\$15,000.00	\$15,000.00
To: 2042-32510	Out of Home Placement Therap. Foster Homes	\$15,000.00	\$15,000.00

CIRCUIT COURT SUPP. ADULT PROBATION		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 2600-3530	Cont. Services	\$4,000.00	\$4,000.00
To: 2600-2720	Lab Supplies	\$3,000.00	\$3,000.00
2600-3130	Travel/ Mileage	\$1,000.00	\$1,000.00

CONVENTION & VISITORS BUREAU**REQUESTED APPROVED**

From: 3570-3450	Yellow Pages	\$16,000.00	\$16,000.00
To: 3570-3792	Customer Sales	\$3,500.00	\$3,500.00
3570-3130	Travel/ Mileage	\$2,000.00	\$2,000.00
3570-3610	Legal Services	\$10,500.00	\$10,500.00

LATE TRANSFER REQUESTS*VOTER REGISTRATION****REQUESTED APPROVED**

From: 1220-2700	Other Supplies	\$1,132.16	\$1,132.16
To: 1220-3370	Computer	\$1,132.16	\$1,132.16

DRUG & ALCOHOL DEFERRAL SERVICE**REQUESTED APPROVED**

From: 1371-3770	Treatment Cost	\$500.00	\$500.00
To: 1371-2600	Office Supplies	\$500.00	\$500.00

THE CENTRE**REQUESTED APPROVED**

From: 1440-3536	Operating Account	\$5,329.00	\$5,329.00
To: 1440-4250	Misc. Equipment	\$5,329.00	\$5,329.00

CUMULATIVE BRIDGE**REQUESTED APPROVED**

From: 2030-1130-2030	Superintendent	\$1,353.00	\$1,353.00
To: 2030-1971	Accrued Payments	\$1,353.00	\$1,353.00

(Motion carried 6-1/ Councilmember Wortman opposed)

AMENDMENTS TO SALARY ORDINANCE & DISCUSSION OF SHERIFF/CIVILIAN UNION EMPLOYEES PERF

President Bassemier: Okay, we move into amendments to the salary ordinance.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Mr. President, first is Union Township. I'll move that we amend salary line 2492-1170-1990, Extra Help, as previously adopted. Recorder's office, salary line 1040-1190, Deed Deputy, as transfer previously adopted. Public Defender, salary line 1040-1170, Paralegal, as the transfer previously adopted. Cum Bridge, salary line 2030-1990, Extra Help and salary line 2030-1971, Accrued Termination, as previously adopted in the transfer. The Centre, salary line 1440-1850, Union Overtime, as previously adopted. Then one other matter, during the, our recent budget hearings the Council voted to pay the PERF for the Sheriff civilian employees in lieu of the three percent wage increase. That was subject to the Commissioner's approval of the 2002 contract. The County Commissioners signed the union contract for the civilian employees during the month of October. So, with that, I move to continue paying the full four percent for the 2001 wage increase for October, November and December, and not pay the PERF during that, these last three months. The point in doing that is to keep the continuity between what we've done in prior contracts. So, again, this is just making a clarification on what, how these people need to be paid for the last three months. So, they will continue to be paid as they have for the remainder of this year and then go on the new program in 2002.

President Bassemier: Do I have a second?

Councilmember Winnecke: Second.

President Bassemier: I have a second by Mr. Winnecke. Any discussion? Roll call vote, please.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: I don't have a copy of that. I mean, it would be helpful. I know, Jim, it's quite a bit of information gathered at the last moment there, but that would be helpful if we could get that, a copy of that work there, on the salary adjustments and all.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, again, I don't know if the Commissioners maybe want to address this, or somebody from the Sheriff's office. But, again, the 2002 contract states that we will pay their PERF like we did with some other union employees a few years back. That we would pay the PERF in lieu of the three percent wage increase. What we are doing is just making the determination as to how we pay them for the remainder of this year. They signed that contract last month. So, we're just stating that we'll continue to pay the four percent wage increase over last year, for the remainder of this year, and begin to pay their PERF in lieu of the three percent next year.

Councilmember Sutton: I'm fine with that, Jim. I just wanted, just a copy of what is the action that we are proposing or are trying to take—

President Bassemier: Okay.

Councilmember Sutton: —then, so. Yes. My vote.

President Bassemier: Okay, thank you, sir.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

<p style="text-align: center;">PYROTEK CONFIRMING RESOLUTION FOR PROPERTY TAX ABATEMENT ON PROPERTY LOCATED AT 14828 FOUNDATION AVENUE</p>

President Bassemier: Okay, we are going to get into old business. This is a mouthful here, so everybody bear with me. I need a motion confirming resolution of the Vanderburgh

County Council confirming the declaration of an economic revitalization area for property tax abatements for redevelopment or rehabilitation of property and acquisition and installation of new manufacturing equipment on property located at 14828 Foundation Avenue. I need a motion.

Councilmember Winnecke: So moved.

President Bassemier: Do I have a second?

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: Second by Mr. Wortman. Any discussion on that? This is second reading?

Unidentified: Yes.

President Bassemier: No discussion? Roll call vote.

Councilmember Sutton: Hold on.

President Bassemier: Oh, I'm sorry.

Jeff Ahlers: And the final reading.

President Bassemier: And the final reading.

Councilmember Tornatta: Is there a business associated with that?

Councilmember Winnecke: Pyrotek.

Councilmember Tornatta: Pyrotek. Okay. Alright. The address threw me.

President Bassemier: Do you want to add anything to that Mr. Tornatta? I guess not. Roll call vote.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: No.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes. That passes 6-1. Congratulations, people

(Motion carried 6-1/ Councilmember Hoy opposed)

(Discussion continued same page)

APPOINTMENT OF AL UMBACH TO ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
--

President Bassemier: Okay under new business, I would like to recommend a board appointment for the Vanderburgh County Economic Development Commission. Mr. Umbach, he's served on that board. He's done a good job, and I would like to have you all's blessing. Do I have a, I guess—

Jeff Ahlers: I think on that one, don't we need to...you might want to go ahead and make a motion and pass it.

President Bassemier: Okay, can I have a motion to? Do I have a—

Councilmember Winnecke: So moved.

President Bassemier: So moved. Thank you. Everybody in favor, please raise their right hand. Thank you. He is a good accountant.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

PYROTEK TAX ABATEMENT ISSUE (CONTINUED)
--

Councilmember Tornatta: I have a question.

President Bassemier: Yeah?

Councilmember Tornatta: On the old business. Was there an amount of time on that abatement? I mean, was there a time?

President Bassemier: Is anybody?

Unidentified: (Inaudible. Not at mike.)

President Bassemier: Yeah, ten years, isn't it?

Unidentified: Yes.

President Bassemier: Yeah, that's what, yeah.

Councilmember Tornatta: I—

President Bassemier: You got it in your packet. I probably—

Councilmember Raben: Of course, all of those are subject to their compliance review.

President Bassemier: Right.

Councilmember Raben: So, they will be back in next year for a compliance review.

Councilmember Tornatta: Is that—

Councilmember Raben: And that's—

Councilmember Tornatta: Well, okay. I guess, I guess the, I would have liked to have had the amount of time on the old business, because that is a negotiable item. Is that correct?

President Bassemier: Well, right now we'd be out of order if we did. I mean, we can ask some questions but as far as being a vote and approved.

Councilmember Tornatta: It is a revitalization area, but it gives no inference to the amount of time for the tax abatement. Which I don't know why it wouldn't clearly be stated in this packet.

Councilmember Winnecke: At our last...last month it was discussed as a ten year period. As Jim said, each year when it's reviewed, or next year when it's reviewed, we can change the terms.

President Bassemier: On the compliance.

Jeff Ahlers: Well, only...I mean, that would be if they weren't in compliance. I mean.

Councilmember Hoy: That's right. You can't...if they hire as many employees at the rates they say, etcetera, then you can't revoke it. You can only revoke it if they don't meet it. We're not very good at revoking. I mean, Azteca promised us 175 jobs, and got it reduced to 145 because our work ethic is so wonderful here and we never revoked that one. So, if you're thinking about revocation if they don't make it, good luck.

Councilmember Tornatta: Well, I guess, I would like to see us develop a little bit more of a guideline by which we do that and all. How many years and what have you, because the way I look at it, we give one outfit a ten year abatement inside the VIP park, and they are, they look to be a lot bigger institution there at that anchor. Then we give the same to a smaller individual and I don't believe that you are talking apples to apples.

Councilmember Hoy: Well, we have—

President Bassemier: Let's change the tape.

(Tape Changed)

Councilmember Hoy: Well, we for a long time have been discussing guidelines on abatements, Councilman Tornatta, and so has the City Council. I haven't seen much movement on it. I did contact Councilman Melcher on the City Council, who tells me that perhaps some guidelines are going to come our way. This is an issue I have been raising for, and I'm in my ninth year of raising this issue. I do think we need some guidelines.

Councilmember Sutton: Just as maybe a point of clarification on this—

Councilmember Hoy: I mean, we have some guidelines, but we really, we really need to tighten them up.

Councilmember Sutton: Just as a point of clarification, the previous motion that we took, it didn't set in an abatement. What it did was just to designate the area as...the area has to be designated as an area for revitalization. That's essentially what that action did. It didn't set in an abatement or a number of years for an abatement. I don't know if you guys have that in your packet. Kind of pour over that a little bit. So, we didn't set in an abatement, but it's the precursors to the steps that kind of lead up to abatement. The area of 14828 Fountain Avenue had to be designated as an area for economic revitalization before we could even get to the abatement process, so.

Charles Compton: President Bassemier, Charles Compton with Ziemer Stayman Weitzel and Shoulders. We represent Pyrotek, Inc. It was our understanding and anticipation that the action today would be confirming the area as well as approving the statement of benefits for the particular project that was discussed at the October meeting as well as a

ten year abatement period for that area. If we need, if there needs to be technical clarification for that particular procedure we would certainly welcome that procedure being undertaken and the action clarified to make sure that we don't have an issue down the road regarding whether or not this specific statement of benefits was approved, or the abatement.

Councilmember Tornatta: Right, and at this time I'm not, I'm not in favor, and I've made that vocal to them. I'm not in favor of any, anywhere close to a ten year abatement. That's not what I read out of this, what we passed. Revitalization, it had no abatement attached to it. Although, it's what your, your client's requested—

Charles Compton: Right.

Councilmember Tornatta: —it's not necessarily what I will vote. I am in favor of working with your clients, but not to that extent.

Charles Compton: Sure. I think, and, Jeff, correct me here if I'm wrong, but the technical procedure for tax abatement is first of all the area must be declared as a revitalization area, and that's a two step process. There is a preliminary resolution adopting as an area, and then there is a confirming resolution. Typically, in connection with the adoption of the confirming resolution there has been a specific project that, that created the impetus for declaring the area to be a revitalization area, and that's the adoption of the confirming resolution that's part and parcel with that. The approval of the particular statement of benefits and the clarification of the abatement period that goes on with that. If all we have is simply the confirmation that that's an area, but not approval for the particular project that has been proposed or a clarification of the timing for the abatement, then we would need to have Council action to confirm, or not really confirm, but to adopt this particular project that we talked about.

Councilmember Tornatta: We approved to bring it back. If we approved to bring it back—

Councilmember Hoy: Legal counsel, what's your, what's your view?

Jeff Ahlers: I believe that Mr. Compton stated it correctly. I mean, this is just declaring an economic revitalization area for the tax abatement. If I'm not mistaken, I wish DMD was still here, because—

Unidentified: (Inaudible. Not at mike.)

Jeff Ahlers: Oh, okay. Well, then maybe we need to bring him up here. I think, there will be a...subsequently you will bring something before us in terms of the term of the abatement, is that correct?

President Bassemier: State your name, sir.

Jeff Ahlers: It's not just a standard ten years, right?

Michael Osborne: Michael Osborne, Executive Director of Metro Development. Let me pull what you are voting on.

Jeff Ahlers: It's the confirming resolution on Pyrotek—

Michael Osborne: Confirming resolution—

Jeff Ahlers: —and Mr. Tornatta's question was concerning the length of the abatement.

Michael Osborne: Well, the previous—

Councilmember Winnecke: The preliminary resolution—

Michael Osborne: –the preliminary resolution said ten years.

Councilmember Winnecke: It was on page two, section five from last month.

President Bassemier: What we voted on last time.

Councilmember Winnecke: Right.

Jeff Ahlers: Yeah, okay. So, that's already been determined by Council in the preliminary resolution. We are just confirming that now.

Michael Osborne: Yes. Then on an annual basis the company will file the appropriate reports to show that they have met the requirements of the abatement, and you will assess that. So, if they don't meet the requirements, they could lose the abatement.

Councilmember Hoy: But in essence, we just voted a ten year abatement.

Michael Osborne: Yeah.

Councilmember Tornatta: In, in last week's, or last week's–

President Bassemier: Last month.

Councilmember Tornatta: –last month, right. We talked about, we talked about getting them back to talk about some of these issues, and hurried that along. So, it was not an understanding that that would, that they had an abatement. That was a first vote on an abatement. That was just to hear, because we didn't have packets, we didn't have anything from–

Michael Osborne: I mean, I would certainly defer to legal counsel in terms of the intricacies of the procedure.

Jeff Ahlers: Well, actually, in...maybe you and I need to get together. I've been through this...there's been, I guess, some turn over throughout the years, and, I guess, we've gone round...round and round on this point, but actually there is a resolution that delegates to DMD all this responsibility. In fact, even you have your own lawyer, and your lawyer is supposed to take care of the paperwork, prepare and your office to present these to Council. So, it's really, technically, not our function in terms of having the ability and manpower to investigate–

Michael Osborne: Oh, no. I'm just–

Jeff Ahlers: –you know, run around and investigate all the abatements. So, I guess, what I'm telling you is, is that, you know, in terms of the legality and appropriateness, you know, the Council relies, you know, on the expertise of DMD to make recommendations. I don't know if you've got that resolution, but there is like a four page resolution that sets out the length of abatements, the process that undergoes, and DMD is to...and if they need legal counsel, they've got their own, is to escort that process through.

Michael Osborne: No, I was just suggesting that I didn't want to pretend to be answering legal questions today for you, and would defer to you, you know, in terms of providing legal advice to the Council.

President Bassemier: Right. Mr. Hoy.

Councilmember Hoy: I have a comment on that, not on that part of it, Mr. Osborne, but just on the whole project in general. I am Chairman of the Soil and Water Conservation District, and I received three complaints about the silt fences being down on the whole development, and there is mud everywhere, there is sediment everywhere. So, I personally drove out there, and sure enough, silt fences are down everywhere, mud is

everywhere. It is not in compliance, and I may as well use this public forum to announce that I have, as Chairman of that board, issued a formal complaint against that whole development. Because it is in violation, serious violation of our Erosion Ordinance that this county and city and Darmstadt, by the way, Mr. Wortman, adopted. This bothers me greatly that we are bringing in firms that tell us, you know, they are the most wonderful thing since sliced bread, and I see the mess I see out there. The mess of mud. It is not in good shape. I just make that comment to get it on public record, and hope that message will get carried to the proper people.

Charles Compton: With deference to Councilman Hoy and the observation he made, I would just like to clarify that Pyrotek is not the title holder of that property, has not had anything to do with the current state of construction or work at that particular site or the facility in general. So, hopefully—

Councilmember Hoy: It's a spec building, and I know that.

Charles Compton: I understand.

Councilmember Hoy: Two other buildings aren't exactly spec buildings. It's just a general comment.

Jeff Ahlers: Moving forward from here, I would suggest in the future that DMD with a confirming resolution either include in there the language that appears to be much more detailed in the preliminary resolution, so that they have that work attached to it, the preliminary resolution. That way maybe it will avoid any confusion in the future.

Councilmember Tornatta: I just, I'm not in favor of a ten year tax abatement, and I apologize to the taxpayers for that, because that's, that's not at all what I have in mind for that particular property. So, if we can't go against it, at least that is where I stand.

Councilmember Wortman: I think in the last few years we've been relaxed in the Council getting information detailed out. I think this is really got us confused to a certain extent. I think that if more preparation would go into it from DMD, if you would do that, or get somebody up here to make sure. Because we've had some problems here all along for the last maybe three or four years.

Michael Osborne: Yeah, and certainly, and I would, I would echo the concern being newer to the community, I know we are working on trying to update and revise the procedures and the format for the city tax abatement. I don't want to overstep my bounds, but certainly if you are interested, I mean, we can do the same thing for you. I think we need to be a little more proactive and a little more investigatory and not just simply process paperwork for you. I would be more than happy to do that.

President Bassemier: Thank you.

Michael Osborne: Thank you.

Councilmember Hoy: Correct me if I'm incorrect, and, Mr. Osborne, you are new and I know that, you haven't been here very long, but I believe that we have an agreement with your office to actually do this for the county. That's, we did not create a, you know, separate entity, because it didn't seem to make sense to do that. So, there is probably paperwork in place that—

Michael Osborne: Yeah.

Councilmember Hoy: —and I realize you are new.

Michael Osborne: I mean, in terms of updating that—

Councilmember Hoy: Yeah.

Michael Osborne: –I mean, I don't presume not having had any detailed discussion or direction from you all, I didn't want to presume to sort of be updating or suggesting changes for you based on whatever conversations I've had, or what we are doing with the city policy or the city process. Again, I would be more than open to any kind of–

Councilmember Hoy: I think that may be a Commissioners call anyway.

Jeff Ahlers: No, this particular resolution is from our body. Do you have a copy of it? If not, I can send you one. I know I've given it from time to time to Council members, and maybe you should take a look at it and see if you think that is still an appropriate way to proceed. Maybe the Councilmen can also decide if they want any changes, but otherwise, that was the resolution that I was referring to that delegated to, you know, your office these responsibilities.

Michael Osborne: Yeah, I do. I do have a copy of the city and county ordinances.

Jeff Ahlers: Okay.

Councilmember Hoy: I would like to request, I don't want to put a motion on the floor, but if you would present similar work to this body–

Michael Osborne: Sure.

Councilmember Hoy: –so we can look at it, that would be, I think, real helpful.

Michael Osborne: I would be glad to.

Jeff Ahlers: Would give me a copy of the city's, your agreement with the city too?

Michael Osborne: Okay.

Jeff Ahlers: Okay. Great.

Charles Compton: Charles Compton once again. Just to confirm, because inevitably I know I'm going to have a telephone conversation with our client at some point, and I want to make sure that I can inform them exactly what transpired. Jeff, are you comfortable that sufficient action has been taken by the Council to approve in final form this particular abatement for this particular project that was submitted for the statement of benefits, and that it be ten years?

Jeff Ahlers: Well, yeah, the confirming resolution confirmed the preliminary resolution that sets it out for ten years, and the vote passed, what 6-1, so.

Charles Compton: You know–

Jeff Ahlers: There's not been, if your question–

Charles Compton: Right.

Jeff Ahlers: –there's not been a motion to revote, nor do I know that you can revote–

Charles Compton: Okay, I just want–

Jeff Ahlers: –once the toothpaste is out of the tube, it's, you know.

Charles Compton: I understand, and it's not Pyrotek's desire to have toothpaste out of the tube be a basic, the basis for the abatement. So, I just wanted to make sure that everyone is fine, and–

Unidentified: Can you be quoted on that?

Jeff Ahlers: I'd rather not.

President Bassemier: (Inaudible. Mike not on.) last month, and we did give everyone an opportunity today to ask questions. I called—

Councilmember Tornatta: We did not discuss it in length.

President Bassemier: Last month.

Councilmember Tornatta: No, we did not. We pushed it through. That's fine, and, and yeah, I'm just saying we're going from this sheet, it wasn't on there and, yeah, I would say that I made a mistake in not having that other sheet.

President Bassemier: (Inaudible. Mike not on.) and before I called the vote today, I did ask twice is there any discussion, to make sure everybody was clear. I didn't get any discussion until after the vote did pass. Thank you folks. I'm going to move on to new business on page—

Jeff Ahlers: Oh, I just wanted...oh, okay that's what I was going to have you clarify for the record.

President Bassemier: (Inaudible. Mike not on.)

Jeff Ahlers: It was a hand vote, so I told him since the record can't see hands, that he might want to clarify for the record.

<p style="text-align: center;">AMERIQUEL GROUP, LLC 18200 US HIGHWAY 41 NORTH PRELIMINARY RESOLUTION/PROPERTY TAX ABATEMENT</p>
--

President Bassemier: Okay, we're going to (B) in new business. This is a preliminary now, resolution/property tax abatement for division of Ameriquel Group LLC, 18200 US Highway 41 North. Do I have a motion?

Councilmember Wortman: I have made a motion we approve that preliminary resolution for property tax abatement—

Councilmember Winnecke: I think we have representatives of the company here.

Councilmember Raben: We need a second for discussion.

President Bassemier: Motion to approve, do I have a second before we discuss it?

Councilmember Winnecke: Second.

President Bassemier: I have a second by Mr. Winnecke. Any discussion? We've got plenty of time.

Councilmember Sutton: Well, I think I'll jump right on out there.

President Bassemier: Thank you, Mr. Sutton.

Councilmember Sutton: Now the anticipated costs to add all of this new warehouse space for you guys is, if I'm correct, \$2.9 million is what you are looking at.

Marco DeLucio: Marco DeLucio, yes, \$2.9 million, Councilman Sutton.

Councilmember Sutton: Okay, and you are anticipating adding, I think I saw 14 new employees somewhere along that line.

Marco DeLucio: Well, 14 immediately, and 35 over a five year period.

Councilmember Sutton: Okay. Can you break that down for us, you know, how many of those are senior level management type of positions, which one's are your entry level positions? Do you have some type of breakdown that shows what that may be?

Marco DeLucio: I don't have a breakdown. One second. What we, I don't know that we had them broken down, Councilman Sutton.

Councilmember Sutton: Well, you can give me a guesstimate, that would be fine.

Marco DeLucio: We do have it broken down from...we're showing the wage rate from \$9.00 to \$17.28 an hour. Are you looking for whether or not they are managers or?

Councilmember Sutton: Right, I want to know what kind of positions those 14 may be?

Marco DeLucio: You need to tell them your name.

Tim Brauer: Tim Brauer with, Chief Operating Officer of Ameriqua. Those jobs would be factory jobs, including factory supervision, salaried supervision.

Councilmember Sutton: Okay. When are you guys wanting to start this project?

Marco DeLucio: Well, we thought when we originally did this...this area has already been designated as a revitalization area, but we would have had to complete the project by March the 1st, we don't think we will be done by March the 1st. We anticipate starting approximately then, so I would suspect the construction period is several months, so maybe by the last quarter of next year that we would be finished. Is that fair enough?

Councilmember Sutton: Any particular reason why you guys are requesting ten years as opposed to five or seven? What was maybe the thought process there?

Marco DeLucio: I think the thought process behind that was, quite frankly, Councilman Sutton, is that Ameriqua has been before this Council on several occasions since 1997, since 1987 when it first started, and I think, I perceive a partnership between the county and Ameriqua. Ameriqua has each time that its sought tax abatement, has projected the number of employees and projected the spending, and it's exceeded those at every step of the way. We perceive that we've used the savings, not only in our operations, but we've reinvested that savings, so to speak, back into the project each time. Continually, since 1987 when it first opened its doors, expanded in 1991 and again in 1996, and 1988, 1998, 1999 and 2000, and here we are expanding again. So, it's continually to reinvest whatever savings I think it gets, back into the facilities and back into the equipment out there, and creating additional jobs.

Councilmember Sutton: What do you anticipate as you look at..if this, if you move forward with this project, add the additional space, how much will this add to the Ameriqua bottom line? I mean, how much will it improve your company? How much more money will Ameriqua make as a result of this abatement?

Marco DeLucio: I can let the business people tell you about that, but I can tell you what the purpose of this is, there is additional business out there to be had. What we are doing here is a conditioned warehouse about 30,000 square feet, and 11,000 is cold storage and a processing facility. That type of a space is what's needed in order to track the new business that they are after. I would hope that they believe that that is going to substantially increase their bottom line, and that they'll be able to make some money as a result of expanding the project out there. I don't know, Tim or Randy, do you have any idea, is there any?

Councilmember Sutton: Well, I know you guys have run the pro formas and everything, you know, got projections of when this thing is going to break even, or how much money you

are going to make, so let's hear what you got.

Tim Brauer: Well really, like Marco said, this project is one, primarily, we've got it for freezer and conditioned storage space. Something we haven't had in the past which has prohibited us from pursuing certain projects as a result of that. We use some off-site storage space in the vicinity, which is not always terribly efficient, so it might have caused us not to get projects in the future. We don't have any specific, we've got quotes outstanding with a number of different companies for new business prospects that this would be very beneficial for. We certainly hope to make money on those. Every one of them varies in its scope.

Marco DeLucio: I think what I understood when I was talking to Tim and Randy about this before the meeting, is that this is kind of speculative. They don't have set business that is going to come in. They are building it in hopes that they will come. They are out there, they've got quotes out, and hope that they are able to build the space that that business will come in. At what level, we don't know.

Councilmember Sutton: Well, I guess, I was trying to look, I was wanting to hear some projections, I guess, is maybe what I was...and I know projections are just that. You don't know if that will...they could be below, they could be above, but you don't build a space unless you make some assumptions about how that space may benefit you.

Marco DeLucio: I think that if they hire, get all 35 employees and are able to secure the business, I think, Tim was just saying, you know, half a million dollars worth of business.

Councilmember Sutton: This abatement request that we are looking at here today, as it is, as it is proposed, over the course of ten years, how much will that, what value will that bring to the company? How much of a savings will that be?

Marco DeLucio: They've got a \$3 million project, and assuming...Steve you might be able to help me on this...assuming 10% tax rate out there, about \$10 per hundred, probably? So, that—

Unidentified: (Inaudible. Not at mike.)

Marco DeLucio: —we did a calculation on that.

Unidentified: (Inaudible. Not at mike.) Was like \$40,000 a year in taxes.

Marco DeLucio: I'm talking about just for this addition. This \$3 million.

Unidentified: Oh, just the \$3 million? (Inaudible.)

Marco DeLucio: Probably about \$21,000, a savings of \$21,000 over the ten year—

Unidentified: (Inaudible)

Marco DeLucio: —for the first year. It gradually decreases after that.

Councilmember Winnecke: What did you say that number was, Marco?

Marco DeLucio: About \$21,000 for the first year.

Councilmember Winnecke: And what is the projection over the life of the abatement?

Marco DeLucio: Well, if it's \$21,000 the first year that's abated, that would be 100% of the tax—

Councilmember Winnecke: Right.

Marco DeLucio: –so, multiply that by ten, \$210,000–

Councilmember Sutton: 210–

Marco DeLucio: –and divide it by about a half, is about what it would amount to–

Councilmember Sutton: That's 105.

Marco DeLucio: –so roughly \$100,000. (Inaudible. Comments made away from the mike.) Okay, Steve said let's revise that a little bit, he said the new structure would be about \$30,000 per year, so you multiply that by ten years, that would be \$30,000 and we always believe that you save about half over the life of that. So, \$150,000.

President Bassemier: Steve, for the record, I'm sorry, sir, state your name and who you are.

Steve Folz: Steve Folz with Harding Shymanski.

President Bassemier: Okay.

Steve Folz: That \$30,000 is improvements alone, that does not include the increase in the land value that is currently probably at \$495 an acre, which going to primary land will go to about \$10,000 an acre.

President Bassemier: (Inaudible. Mike not on.) Royce, you got any more questions?

Councilmember Sutton: I think I've got my question answered. Just to make sure, I will say this back to you to make sure I'm on track, so approximately \$30,000 per year in the abatement, and then in the course over the ten years will give you...can I have that figure again?

Marco DeLucio: It's not...it will be \$30,000 the first year–

Councilmember Sutton: The first year.

Mike Shoulders: –and then, you know, Councilman Sutton, that ratchets down, and by year ten you are paying almost that whole \$30,000–

Councilmember Sutton: Okay.

Marco DeLucio: –so what we did was take that \$30,000, multiply it by ten and divide it by two–

Councilmember Sutton: Okay.

Marco DeLucio: –that would result in approximately \$150,000 in property tax savings that Ameriquel would realize over the ten year abatement period.

President Bassemier: Does that answer your question?

Councilmember Sutton: That hits everything. Thank you.

President Bassemier: (Inaudible. Mike not on.)

Councilmember Hoy: I have a question.

President Bassemier: Okay, I'm sorry. Mr. Hoy.

Councilmember Hoy: Who's your parent company? Parent company of Ameriquel?

President Bassemier: Sir, state your name.

Randall Stuckmeyer: I'm Randy Stuckmeyer. Randall Stuckmeyer. I'm President, Chief Executive Officer of the Ameriqua Group.

President Bassemier: Thank you, sir.

Randall Stuckmeyer: It's owned by, partially owned, or majority controlled by Ameriqua Holdings, which is part of Black Beauty Resources.

Councilmember Hoy: Okay, that was my information, but I wasn't sure that that was still the case. Thank you.

President Bassemier: Thank you, Mr. Hoy. Okay, any other questions? We have a motion and a second. First reading.

Councilmember Sutton: I'm sorry. One more question. I'm sorry.

President Bassemier: That's okay, sir.

Councilmember Sutton: I know we've got a, they do have an abatement right now. Where are we in the process on the, how much more time do you have left on the present abatement?

Marco DeLucio: There was an abatement in 1987, and I think that that has now expired on the real estate. There was abatement again in 1996, excuse me, the 1996 abatement was for Ameriqua's facility on Morgan Avenue, and that is still in effect, but that has no impact here in the county. Last year, so it was just the year 2000, we received an abatement from the Council last year on an 80,000 square foot warehouse facility that was added on out there. I'm not sure that that was....when was, when was your facility completed out there, Randy?

Randall Stuckmeyer: October.

Marco DeLucio: I'm not sure that that's probably kicked in yet, so we are probably at nine or ten years, just at the outset of that abatement.

President Bassemier: Okay.

Councilmember Hoy: One of my problems with this average wage, I did the math on it, and I realize that you are working more than a 40 hour week, because I'm familiar with employees who are working a lot longer hours at the present time, but on a 40 hour week, puts that wage at a little less than \$25,000. Median income in this county is around \$40,000, and if you are at 80% of median income, which is \$32,000, then you are barely at the level for affordable housing. I just sat through a meeting yesterday morning about affordable housing, and what's going to happen between now and 2005 is that the persons able to buy affordable housing is going to decrease in this county. So, I am concerned about wage levels, even though this is better than a lot of wage levels we looked at, in fact, better than the wage level we just approved. This is where I have problems because all of these abatements that come before us are way out there, there is no public transportation, and we're expecting these employees to buy houses, to buy cars. Average cost for a second car is \$6,000 a year. I read all this stuff, maybe I shouldn't read it, but I do all this math, and I'm looking at human beings who live here, who can't live in multi-million dollar mansions. These are the folks who create that work force. Who create that kind of income. That bothers me a little bit that we are going to probably vote abatement, which I probably will vote against since I no longer have a conflict of interest, since I'm retired. I think, those are things we need to be looking at, and as we see the expense of holding a job, which involves, you know, transportation, and there is no public transportation to any of these sites. Perhaps there should be, but there isn't. Thank you.

President Bassemier: Mr. Wortman.

Councilmember Wortman: Yes, I hope this results, possibly since we won't give up on these meals up there to help with the inmates here in the jail. I hope the Sheriff here, we can get that through one of these days. Then also, they have been very successful, and, of course—

Councilmember Sutton: Do you want those meals dropped from the air, or what?

Councilmember Wortman: —yeah, I could do that too. They have been successful due to the fact that they are out in the promised land, and so far everybody has been doing pretty good out there.

Marco DeLucio: I'd only conclude, you know, the wages, you are correct, it's \$25,000 a year. There are fairly good benefits out there that are involved with health insurance and that I think adds something to the package. It is, probably, as good as, if not better than, most of the, and I've done several of these abatements and sat out in the audience and listened to them, and I think it's a good wage. It isn't, you know, it isn't \$50,000 a year, but it is a good, livable wage.

Councilmember Hoy: Does anybody in this room live on that? On \$25,000 a year perhaps?

Catherine Fanello: I have ever since I got elected.

Councilmember Hoy: Yeah, but you're at a part time job.

Marco DeLucio: By the way, I think...I had Mr. Folz do some calculations, Councilman Sutton, and we were giving you a ball park. He's come up with a calculation of \$131,000 that that would save, if that helps put the pencil to the paper a little closer.

Councilmember Sutton: Thank you.

President Bassemier: (Inaudible. Mike not on.) There are a lot of people living on a lot less than what you are offering.

Marco DeLucio: I don't, I'm not embarrassed by the salaries that are paid out there.

Councilmember Hoy: I'm embarrassed by the fact that 45%-50% of the clients in the food pantries in this county have jobs. There is something wrong with that equation. That's not just in this county, it's in other counties as well, and if I'm looking at the statistics that Mr. Osmund presented to us on housing, by the year 2005, what we are going to do is ask the private sector and the public sector to put together money so we can redo old houses so we can house people who don't get paid enough money. We are going to, you know, we are going to pay one way or the other. It's just like when I pay my health insurance premium, I know that I'm subsidizing the person who's company, and you do give health insurance and I appreciate that, your benefits are very good, and I commend you on that. Your wage scale, as I've said, is better than many we've seen, but I'm looking and saying, you know, this is what we are asking people to do, and then on the other side we criticize every working mother who leaves her children at a day care center. You know, we just can't have it both ways. We just can't. I perhaps reached a point in my life when I have to raise these kind of questions, and certainly not just for your client. In fact, your client is a good client, they are very generous and they pay better than others, but it's still, it's still below what people are going to need to make it in this county. People make it anyway, but it's not easy.

President Bassemier: Thank you, sir. Any more questions?

Councilmember Raben: I might just add a few comments. One thing about Ameriquel, they are an environmentally friendly corporate partner and they do offer a clean, safe work environment. You're right, they might not be \$40,000 a year jobs, but they are a move for

the better for a whole lot of people in this county that are dealing in or working in worse jobs, and not near as nice an environment. So, that's all I've got to say.

Marco DeLucio: And I think that's a plus. It is a locally owned company, and they've expanded locally and bought companies and brought them to Evansville and created opportunities here. While, you know, yes there will be \$131,000 in tax savings, conversely there will be in excess of \$131,000 in taxes paid during that period of time as well. Before it kicks in, in full.

President Bassemier: Okay, we've got a motion and a second. Roll call vote, please.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: I would just like to say that I think the county has been generous in tax abatements and the city as well, but I think that at some point, you know, if you're doing that well and you do it on your own, and so I vote no.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Well, and I've given a lot of thought to this, and just trying to go over what might be the most appropriate action to take, and just kind of wrote down a few words, and I think that abatement is an economic development tool, and Ameriqua, a locally owned business, has prospered from the abatement tool, and I'm convinced that this is a viable project, there is a lot of good jobs that are added, good wage, but I feel like the project will proceed, you know, with or without abatement. I think this Council has, I think this is a clear example of what should take place as a tool. We granted abatement on three different other requests, and I think on this particular request I don't really feel comfortable in voting for it, because we have been rather generous in the past. So, I do vote no.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: No.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes, with a couple other comments. As we look at tax abatements and we look at what the city and county do to lure new business, to my knowledge, I don't think we ever spent a lot of money on infrastructure and what have you for the initial project, and just another quick number to add, in five years they have increased their employment 367. You know, again, they're not the highest paid jobs in the county, but there is a hell of a lot worse out there, and this is a step for the better for a whole lot of people. So, I vote yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes. So, that passes 4-3.

Marco DeLucio: Thank you very much.

President Bassemier: Thank you.

(Motion carried 4-3/Councilmembers Tornatta, Sutton and Hoy opposed)

**DECEMBER FILING DATE SET
FOR JANUARY 2002 COUNTY COUNCIL MEETING**

President Bassemier: Okay, we'll move to © we need to set the December filing date for January 2002 County Council meeting. I think the, the day was December 6th. Can I have everybody's approval on that? Remember next month is Christmas, and you all think about me, okay? Okay, thank you. Everybody in favor raise their right hand please. That passes seven, zero. Sandie, would you please make a memo to all the departmental heads, December 6th for the filing date?

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

Sandie Deig: (Inaudible. Mike not on.)

**GARY HECK
WELFARE TO WORK**

President Bassemier: Thank you ma'am. Okay, do we have a Mr. Heck out there? Welfare-to-Work? I know he's called me.

Gary Heck: We do have him.

President Bassemier: Okay.

Councilmember Tornatta: You still looking for that one penny?

President Bassemier: Before you start, sir, before you give them your name, we would like to change the tape.

(Tape Changed)

Gary Heck: Do you want me to repeat?

Councilmember Tornatta: Nah, that's okay.

Gary Heck: It's \$124,871.01.

Councilmember Tornatta: And one penny, okay.

President Bassemier: Okay, we are ready for you to state your name and your occupation and whatever.

Gary Heck: My name is Gary Heck, Lieberman and Associates and we administer the Welfare to Work Gatekeeper Program for Vanderburgh County.

President Bassemier: Thank you, sir.

Gary Heck: We, I was here on July 3 to ask for the re-authorization of some money that had lapsed and was told at that time that we had enough money that was in the appropriation amount, that I could come back before November 15 to request it again. So, I am here. We have spent, of the \$1.2 million that we started the year with in either appropriations or the \$500,000 in new monies, we are down to just a little over \$600,000 now. So, we have spent about 52%, there is about 48% left and we really will need this money. This is for the working poor, this isn't welfare, but this is for folks who, Councilman Hoy has a warm heart, warm spot in his heart about, about folks who can hardly get by, that's what this is for. So, I am here to ask for \$124,871.01 be re-appropriated back to the Gatekeeper Program. I will be

happy to answer any questions.

President Bassemier: Any discussion on this? Finance Chairman, Mr. Raben.

Councilmember Raben: Mr. Heck, have you, because this does come out of the Welfare to Work Riverboat fund-

Gary Heck: That's correct.

Councilmember Raben: Have you addressed this with the Commissioners? I mean, this-

Gary Heck: They told me that I had to come to you to ask for it and that the money is in the General Fund and that is why I came July 3rd and that's why I am here today.

Councilmember Raben: Okay.

Gary Heck: I don't think they had any control over it in the sense that-

Councilmember Raben: So, you are asking for an appropriation?

Gary Heck: I don't want to speak for them, but that is why I am here.

Councilmember Raben: Of course, we can't appropriate anything today without a request one way or the other. But, are you requesting these funds out of General Fund or Riverboat monies?

Gary Heck: Out of General Fund. Well, I was told that they lapsed from the Welfare to Work and they are in the General Fund now and the only way that they could get put back into the Gatekeeper Program is by this group to do that. Now, if I am mistaken, then-

Councilmember Hoy: Lapsed from 2000.

Gary Heck: They had lapsed from 2000.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, if you are requesting it out of General Fund, what you need to do is file an appropriation before the 15th of this month. Now, I am not telling you, you will or won't get it. But, that's how we need to address your concern is file an appropriation request with our Executive Assistant, Secretary or whatever.

Sandie Deig: Commissioners.

Councilmember Raben: Again this is, that's right, they administer that program.

Gary Heck: All I want to say is that I called the Commissioners office and asked what I needed to do to come and see you again.

Councilmember Raben: Well, they need to file an appropriation before the 15th of this month and we will address it in December.

Catherine Fanello: If Gary-

President Bassemier: State your name please.

Catherine Fanello: Catherine Fanello, County Commissioner. If Gary misunderstood, it was after the 15th of October when we spoke, but I had planned on filing the request for him, but it was the money that lapsed at the end of 2000. It's Riverboat money that went back into the, your Riverboat money is in the General Fund, so it makes no difference whether you call it Riverboat or General Fund, it's there in the General Fund. So, that's what he is referring to.

Councilmember Raben: Okay.

Catherine Fanello: We will file the request, but when we talked about it, it was already after the 15th.

Councilmember Hoy: To be clear, Commissioner, and that's what I said awhile ago, this was money that was not spent in 2000.

Catherine Fanello: Exactly, lapsed and didn't get encumbered on a P.O.

President Bassemier: Anybody got any questions for Mr. Heck? You didn't waste your time today. After they file it, you'll be here, we will, you will come back to us anyway. So you didn't waste your time.

Gary Heck: I never consider it a waste of time to come and visit with you. But, when will I know that it will be on the agenda again?

Councilmember Sutton: It has to be filed before November 15th to get on the agenda-

Gary Heck: That gives us a week and a day? So, they have to do it next week, and they are not meeting next week?

Councilmember Winnecke: They don't need to meet to file the appropriation. They just need to fill out a piece of paper.

Gary Heck: Well, I am done then and I will be back when it is on the agenda.

President Bassemier: Okay.

Councilmember Winnecke: Thanks, Gary. December 5th it will be on the, the December 5th agenda.

Gary Heck: Thank you.

JAIL CONTRACT DISCUSSION

President Bassemier: Okay, we are going to address the jail contract discussion. Mr. Raben, do you want to address that issue?

Councilmember Raben: Mr. President, I can do that, sure. Last week, as everyone recalls, there was a great deal of discussion as to the validity of the recent contracts for engineering and architects and construction management signed by the Commissioners. I did formally ask our counsel, Jeff Ahlers, to formally write me a

written statement on, based on the opinion that he had already verbally given us last week. He has done that and to my knowledge, does everybody have a copy of this now? Or could we pass it out?

Jeff Ahlers: They may not, but I have some extra copies. Who needs one?

Councilmember Sutton: What's this, is this something new?

President Bassemier: Uh, last month-

Councilmember Raben: Before we get toothpaste out of the tube, here. Also, this just came today and I assume that everyone was given a copy, there is actually a written statement from the Commissioner's attorney Phil Hayes, he wasn't, he didn't have real clarification on how a recent vote was taken during a Commission meeting, and he does answer that. And in short, what I gather from his letter, he concurs with much of what our Council attorney has been telling us for the last week. So, with this what I would like to do is pass a resolution today and if you would like we can give our counsel an opportunity to read the resolution before you and then I will make a motion on passing it.

President Bassemier: Everybody has got a copy? Okay, do you want to take some time to read it.

Councilmember Sutton: Hold on.

President Bassemier: I am not going to do anything.

Councilmember Sutton: Why couldn't we have gotten this earlier? I mean, we are getting ready to read a resolution, there is a letter here.

Councilmember Raben: I just requested it Monday.

Councilmember Sutton: We haven't had any discussion about this, so obviously an issue that we are all pretty concerned about.

Councilmember Raben: Well, Royce, I just actually requested a written letter stating what the concerns were that we addressed last week.

Councilmember Tornatta: Well, then we wouldn't have any problem voting on this next month?

Councilmember Raben: I would have a problem with it, yes.

Councilmember Tornatta: I just got this.

Councilmember Raben: Well, again, I guess I didn't even have to give it to you.

Councilmember Tornatta: Well, that's good.

Councilmember Raben: It is a letter written to me based upon my request.

Councilmember Tornatta: You know, you want, everybody wants communication and then we have this stuff plopped on our desk like that and you don't have to do those things.

Councilmember Raben: Well no, again --

Councilmember Tornatta: That's the way this whole thing has been and we have to have a stinking meeting on the 20th, to get through things that we have no reason to go through. They haven't had one time, when they had a, they went through the \$42 million project over there across the street and the Council wasn't big into getting into their contracts and our job is to fund it. We are not to be the contract writers or the contract interpreters or anything of that nature, and I think that is what their job is, and in the past it hadn't been done, and now all of sudden we are contract worthy, is that it?

Councilmember Raben: Again, what I meant with that statement, this letter is just answering what I asked him to do. Again, he could have wrote a letter to each and every one of you between last Wednesday and today. But, again, I raised the questions and he returned the information that I requested that he provide. I did ask him to prepare a resolution which he can read and we can or can't vote on it today, but Mr. Ahlers, would you read the resolution?

Councilmember Sutton: Where is this on the agenda? I mean, I am trying to find this resolution.

President Bassemier: Jail contract discussion.

Councilmember Sutton: Well, I mean, if we are going to have a resolution, a resolution would appear on the agenda. A resolution is an action item. The jail discussion, which is under New Business (F) says a discussion, it does not say a resolution. I think that anytime we would legally advertise a meeting and post it on that door out there, if we are going to take action, one the public needs to know about it, but sitting here as representative on this, by an elected representative, surely if I am going to vote on something or if there is an action taken I should know in advance of the meeting.

Councilmember Raben: We overture the Commissioners or pass resolutions periodically in this Council without anything on the agenda.

Councilmember Sutton: Well, we are talking about taking an action and there is no, the letter that has been responded to that is dated today, I don't know when this resolution was drawn up.

Councilmember Raben: Today.

Councilmember Sutton: All of the items that we have acted on today, we had those in advance in our packet and I think that some of the points that I was making earlier, on some of the other things, that I want to be able to see things before we vote them and now you are wanting to bring a resolution on the floor for consideration and action and we haven't even, we had a discussion but this resolution has never appeared before us before today.

Councilmember Winnecke: In defense of Mr. Raben, and your point, Royce, we have passed numerous resolutions and I couldn't sit here and tick them off for you, but I know that we have passed resolutions in the last year and a half in my time on the Council that were not advertised. They came up as a result of discussion. We didn't even have them in writing.

Councilmember Sutton: And I am, I understand that but we had this discussion a

week ago about this. If a resolution was to be written as a result of that discussion, I mean, there is ample time to have prepared this for our review.

Jeff Ahlers: I think this issue is, as I understand it, when Mr. Raben made the request to me, Mr. Sutton, was that as a result of a motion that was made and passed by the County Commissioners on Monday night, which that wasn't advertised either in response to your question that motion and resolutions, I mean if it is not for an appropriation of money or if it is not an ordinance, you know, there is not a problem with it being published as long as the meeting is noticed and it is an open door meeting.

Councilmember Tornatta: And that was-

Jeff Ahlers: I think that Mr. Raben, as I recall, when he called me and asked me to do this was, I guess the first time that we talked was sometime yesterday after he found out the action that the County Commissioners had taken.

Councilmember Tornatta: What action did they take?

Jeff Ahlers: They passed a motion to approve the United Consulting and Shireman contracts again without being subject to County Council approval.

Councilmember Tornatta: Everything they do is subject to County Council.

Jeff Ahlers: I am not going to argue with you.

Councilmember Tornatta: Well that is redundant.

Jeff Ahlers: I am telling you what the motion was.

Councilmember Tornatta: That is a redundancy and they said for clarification.

Jeff Ahlers: I am not going to argue with you.

Councilmember Tornatta: Well, then don't say anything. Because-

Jeff Ahlers: He asked me for a legal question, and Mr. Sutton, I was responding to him, and there is no need for you and I to argue. I am responding to his legal question about whether or not you can pass a resolution and the answer is yes.

Councilmember Tornatta: Don't (inaudible) the County Commissioners-

Jeff Ahlers: And when you asked about, hey, you asked why and you just got it. Okay, they took action Monday night. We are not clairvoyant. A week ago, how would we have known what action they would take Monday night?

Councilmember Tornatta: Right, but if you would, if you would have paid attention to detail, they clarified, from the County Council, showed a concern, they clarified that and was not instituted as a motion. That's how that worked and I was there at the meeting.

Jeff Ahlers: Well, how is the word motion used?

Councilmember Tornatta: The word was extracted. Catherine, if you or David would want to come up?

Jeff Ahlers: Well, why don't we hold on just a second. Just so that we know who is on first, do you want to get the resolution on the floor and get a motion and a second and then a discussion? I don't want to get into an argument, you guys can argue the merits of this.

President Bassemier: Let's get a motion.

Councilmember Raben: Mr. President, I am going to move that the Vanderburgh County Council hereby makes a motion that it is a written determination that the funds that are not appropriated for the reported contracts approved by the Vanderburgh County Commissioners with United Consulting Engineers architects and with James L. Shireman, Inc., without an approval or an appropriation by the Vanderburgh County Council, that the said contract shall be and are hereby considered void and cancelled.

President Bassemier: Is that a legal motion with the resolution?

Jeff Ahlers: The resolution is in writing so what he is doing is moving that the resolution that he just referred to be passed. Is there a second?

President Bassemier: Okay, do I have a second on that?

Councilmember Winnecke: Second.

President Bassemier: Second by Mr. Winnecke. Okay, now we are open for discussion, we will take one at a time. And we will just try to keep this as calm as we can.

Councilmember Hoy: Mr. Mosby is at the microphone and I wasn't there Monday night. I would like to know what was passed Monday night because I don't know.

David Mosby: Excuse me, I originally made the motion but I can't, so I had to defer to Commissioner Fanello. But the motion that I made and I brought it up under discussion after counselor Ahlers, last week at this meeting, said that the motion was not clear and it was subject to Council approval of funding. I went back and made a motion Monday night that we accept the contracts under Title 36 of the law that Tom Pittman gave you last week. That is all that I made a motion on and it passed. You know, I guess my question here is and I can see right now that I guess Councilman Raben is wanting to stall this whole project, you pass this motion, you pass this resolution tonight, we are at a standstill.

Councilmember Raben: We are, but we do have a meeting set up for the 20th.

David Mosby: We won't have a meeting on the 20th because we will not have a consultant and a engineer on board and I am not asking them to come back down here and spend their money and time if you are not going to pay them.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, again --

David Mosby: It's simple. You have a meeting and you want them to come down here and clear things up, and you want to move the project along, but you don't want to fund it.

Councilmember Raben: Okay.

David Mosby: And I talked with Mike Shoulders today on the phone and never once did this Council negotiate any contract with Veazy, Parrott and Shoulders on a \$42 million project. They didn't even ask him a question. I talked with Scott Veazy and Mike Shoulders.

Councilmember Raben: Were there funds appropriated to him prior to the bond proceeds?

David Mosby: I don't know, you tell me.

Councilmember Raben: I don't believe that there was.

David Mosby: So, you don't think that the funds were appropriated on that one either? Same as they are not on this one?

Councilmember Raben: I don't --

David Mosby: But you didn't question that one but you want to question this one.

Councilmember Raben: Again, in effect, what you are doing as the Commissioners, you are asking us to appropriate funds this month or next month which in essence, should we appropriate the funds that are requested, we are more or less ratifying that contract. Am I correct?

Jeff Ahlers: It could be interpreted that way because it is all written as one big contract as opposed to being broken down.

Councilmember Raben: There are issues that we have addressed and again, Jeff addresses in this letter that we do not go along with in that contract. You will have between now and the 20th -

David Mosby: Why all of sudden are you negotiating the contracts? I mean where did this come from? You have never negotiated a contract before.

Councilmember Raben: But, we are concerned about how one sided this contract is. I mean we are here to protect the Council, we are the fiscal body, this contract amount is \$3.2 million and we are responsible for that \$3.2 million. If we have concerns that are in that contract on where it leaves and how wide open it leaves this county, yeah, I think we play a role in it right now.

Councilmember Tornatta: We can decide to fund or not to fund-

President Bassemier: (Inaudible). We are going to go one at a time.

Councilmember Winnecke: Are you finished?

Councilmember Raben: Well, I am. How I would like to see this, is this contract be broken into phases. Let's have phase one and we'll appropriate the \$600,000 that you are requesting, if it's broke down in phases.

David Mosby: What do you mean phases?

Councilmember Raben: Phases through the project. Phase one is the design work, phase two may be something else, three and four and so on. That way we can appropriate the monies that you are requesting, the \$600,000, we can appropriate

that for phase one.

David Mosby: That is all that we have asked you to do.

Councilmember Raben: That's not in your contract. It's not broken into phases, is it?

David Mosby: No. All I have asked you to do is appropriate \$610,000 to cover their services through the end of the year.

Councilmember Raben: I don't have a problem with that. If we-

David Mosby: I am not asking you if you have \$3.2 million.

Councilmember Raben: If you can address our concerns between now and the end of this month, again, I am excited about this moving as you are. But, I want a contract that I think is in the best interest of the taxpayers.

David Mosby: And I would tend to say that after all of the time that we have spent on that contract and the one on one discussion, I don't believe you got that much time. One on one discussion that's went through this contract. I am not willing for you to rip it apart, no, if that is what you are asking, sorry.

President Bassemier: Okay, Mr. Winnecke.

Councilmember Winnecke: I personally am not in favor of the Council getting into the business of negotiating contracts either. That is your role. I do concur with Jim and the fact that we, I think, I am personally concerned about the fiscal terms of the contract. How it is structured beyond that is your business and what I feel beyond the fiscal parts of the contract are moot. I would like to see some of the fiscal parts of the contract cleaned up to meet our, to satisfy us. I think, I don't know if broken down in phases, I don't know what the correct terminology is, but I think that the terms of the contract, that is how the money is paid out and the timing of the payment can be cleaned up to meet our satisfaction so that when we meet on the 20th, we can hammer that out and still have an appropriation in the amount of the six hundred some odd thousand dollars to come before us and approve the first part of December. And I don't think this thing can miss a beat.

President Bassemier: Mr. Hoy.

Councilmember Hoy: Going back to the issue of the Centre. We voted a certain amount on the bond issue and that included a certain amount for the architect. That amount was not 10% of that contract and what bothers me about what I have read so far is that if you combine the contract with United Consulting Engineers and Shireman, you are pretty much at \$5,000,000. Should we go to \$50,000,000 and that's still not settled yet, that is 10% of that contract and that is a considerably higher percent that we had on the building over here. So, that part bothers me. The second part that bothers me is I think that United Consulting and the firm that they are working with, DLZ I believe, is it not?

David Mosby: DLZ, yes.

Councilmember Hoy: Yes, I think that they are perfectly capable along with a top flight construction firm, such as we had on this building over here, I think that they are perfectly capable of doing this without Shireman. And I think that's 1.6 that I

would just as soon see us not spend which would make, certainly the contract much more palatable to me and my mood right now is for us to go ahead without meeting on the 21st, is it?

President Bassemier: The 20th.

Councilmember Hoy: The 20th and you know, hammer out some of these details. You are quite right as a Commissioner and this happened with the previous Commissioners, you write the contract. We are the checks and balances and that's the only part that I am interested in is being the checks and balance in terms of how much we are paying these firms. I listen to all of the discussion about the Centre and I have heard similar remarks made that there was special considerations connected with that sort of building and indeed there were. Such things as wiring, acoustics and so on and there are special considerations with the construction of a jail. But, we are dealing with a company that has a great deal of experience. Some of these jails, as you know, everybody knows who has looked at all of this paperwork or actually bringing, you know, preconstructed cells in and linking them together. I am not sure that is what we need to do, Mr. Mosby, I am not saying that, but I think that \$5,000,000 is too much, it's too much money for this kind of contract. That's my reluctance with the contract but I also have reluctance including a construction manager with it when I think that you have a top flight company in United and DLZ and I think that we will contract with the top flight construction firm. It seems to me those two, and I know that I am repeating myself, but I am trying to get my thoughts here because I had seen none of this until this afternoon, okay. Nothing and so I don't want to act unreluctant to act in a hasty way today but it seems to me that there is enough talent in those three, whoever the contract would be, in those three companies to bring this about without the cost of.

David Mosby: I think that you answered one of your questions yourself when you said that there is a difference between the buildings and jail as a specialty. A lot more of a specialty than the auditorium. It is a lot tougher. If you look at the wages or I won't say the wages, the percentages of service on jail projects. United and DLZ are not at the top. I think that the top is about 11.5.

Councilmember Hoy: It is?

David Mosby: We are at 10.4 or something.

Councilmember Hoy: I would object to that too, of course.

David Mosby: I guess what I am hearing here is that the Council thinks we are trying to waste money. I mean we are not trying to waste money, we are trying to save money. We are trying to get as much money out of this project as possible, we are trying to get as much mileage out of it. I mean, we want to see the best jail built for the dollar and we want to see built what we need built and not what we can afford. We are not trying to waste any money. As far as the CM, you can go and talk to some of the architects and consultants around and that is what I did, all of them advised me to use a CM and one of them even told me that if you go to USI, the last two projects they've did, they put a CM on because they come in underbid and under time and he said that your CM will protect you. He said that they will make sure that you get the best bid and they will be out there ramroding the job. He said, if you go out and talk to USI, he said, ask them if they would ever do another job without a CM and they've got (inaudible), will tell you who the CM is.

Councilmember Raben: Has anybody given you any projections on what the

savings may be with a CM?

Unidentified: I thought that I was next.

David Mosby: Possibility of 5%. That didn't come from our CM.

Councilmember Raben: When you say possibility, is that?

David Mosby: There could be more.

Councilmember Raben: I mean, it would need to be more because you're talking in excess of 4% of the overall project that you are going to pay him. So, he would have to save 5% for your head-

David Mosby: I am referring to 5% over and above what we are paying here, that we ought to be able to save 5% over his salary. That is what a couple of architects and consultants told me. Not our architect and consultant and not our CM.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, can I, are you finished, Mr. Hoy? Oh, Royce.

Councilmember Hoy: Mr. Sutton is next.

Councilmember Sutton: I don't think that there is any question on anybody's part, I don't think there is in this room, that we understand that we are the fiscal body and in that role, we provide the funding for contracts, offices, what have you here for the county. I think the area where there is some question, is the action that was taken on the County Commissioners, in your meeting. The action that you guys took as we kind of went through it last week and talked about it was that those agreements, those contracts, were contingent upon County Council funding. That's what I took to be the understanding, if there is something different that occurred with that or if there is another understanding, I would like to hear that. I have a couple of other questions that I want to ask too, but that seems to be the area of hang up here.

President Bassemier: (Inaudible)

David Mosby: The contracts were not approved subject to Council's funding and that is what Mr. Ahlers asked for us to clear up so that we knew whether we had a contract or not. We passed the contracts, we accepted the contracts from United/DLZ and Shireman, that's what we did. We accepted them contracts and signed them. Now, whether we pay for those contracts out of bond proceeds, whether we pay for them out of the \$2.7 million set aside, you know, that's up to you, but he asked me to clarify my motion and I did. Because, what happened the first time was, I made the motion, Commissioner Mourdock said that he didn't think it was acceptable and after making the original motion, I tacked an amendment on the end of it that just said that if this is not legal then we will do it subject to Council approval. The only thing that I am trying to do here is move forward. You know, we all know that this project has to be done and we all know that this project is sitting on our plate and nobody wants to move. You know we went through this over in the Commissioners with Commissioner Mourdock. I mean one week he is not prepared he hasn't got his questions answered. The next week he wants to throw funding obstacles in front of you. You know, the public sees the project and they know it has to be done, we know it has to be done and all we're doing is just moving forward.

Councilmember Sutton: Okay, I think that's an area, I think we, there wasn't maybe

some clarification, you have clarified that and I guess where I am wanting to go next, I am kind of looking through the information here and the resolution that is before us that we are considering even right now is asking that a vote would be taken by this body that would rescind those contracts. Now, Mr. Ahlers, you are the, you are the attorney for this body here and you have done the legal research but I guess in all my diggings through the Indiana Code, I am not aware of the Council have the ability to rescind any contract. Now, granted, we can by our actions, not provide funding for a contract, we can provide funding or we can go one way or the other, provide funding or not provide funding but as far as the ability to act as a body to rescind a contract, I really would like to see the citing that you are using to support that particular action. If you could help us out in the regard?

Jeff Ahlers: I gave that to you at the last meeting. The statute that I copied for you, it is Title 5-22-17-3 and -5 and I have provided you with a copy and Section 5 was highlighted for you and if you will notice the language in Section 5 tracks the language of this resolution saying that this is making the written determination that funds are not appropriated.

Councilmember Sutton: Okay, I've got that cite. So, you are, 5-22-17-5 and I will go ahead and read that since you cited that, "When the fiscal body of the governmental body makes a written determination that funds are not appropriated or otherwise available to support continuation of performance of a contract, a contract is considered cancelled. Determination by the fiscal body that funds are not appropriated or otherwise available to support the continuation of performance is final and conclusive." Now, so you are the attorney, and I am not going to pretend like I am one, where does it say that the County Council would void a contract, where does it say that? It talks about, but doesn't say the Council, County Council, takes that action.

Councilmember Raben: It says, fiscal body makes the determination.

Jeff Ahlers: We are the fiscal body, Mr. Sutton.

Councilmember Sutton: Yeah, but it doesn't say that the fiscal body, I guess as I am reading here.

Jeff Ahlers: It says when the fiscal body makes a written determination.

President Bassemier: (inaudible)

Jeff Ahlers: You can basically, because the statute is written for other political subdivisions as well, if it were the city, it would be the City Council, so you can basically, to make it make sense to you, where it says fiscal body, think in terms of putting the words County Council in there.

Councilmember Sutton: Right, right.

Jeff Ahlers: So, what this resolution does is just track that. Basically, what that statute does is makes, you know, contracts voidable where you've got a situation like this where the contract is for more money that we even have. You know, what I am saying. So, in other words, so that a county doesn't get into a situation where, you know, it essentially gives a safeguard on the checks and balances we have discussed a lot. In terms, so that the County Commissioners can't go out and enter into some large contract that, you know, could bankrupt the county or that you find is not in the best interest of the county or for whatever reason, these are just

examples, I am not accusing anybody of that. I am just saying that is the check and the balance to be able to say, this body can pull the plug in order to protect the county finances. So, that is what the statute is for is to place on notice cause what happens, for example, is if the County Commissioners have approved the Shireman and United Consulting contracts without the approval of this body or without an appropriation, what if those contractors go out and start doing their work? I suspect that, you know, there is potentially some issues and I don't want to get into them outside of an open door meeting discussing legal issues with respect to the county, I think that we all know what those are. So, if it is your intention at this time not to fund a contract as written or in the interim to protect the finances of the county until you get this worked out, for example, in a joint meeting, this is the mechanism that you can do that. Now, my telling you that there are other laws that may not apply to, there may be others, but clearly this statute, where I am telling you, tracks the language of the statute that I gave everybody at the meeting last week.

(Tape Change)

Councilmember Sutton: Now, I heard Commissioner Mosby cite a little bit earlier. Now, what were you referring to? What statute were you referring to? Do you have that with you? What does that say?

David Mosby: It's you know, we gave you, Tom Pittman, gave you a copy of it last week, but I guess to briefly read through it, it said when any public works or (Inaudible) perform the projects, board determines by 2/3 vote that it is expedient and in the best public interest to employ professional engineering, architectural or accounting services for the planning and financing of the public works and for the preparation of plans and specifications. Limitations and restrictions in the general statutes with respect to the con, of the contracts without an appropriation, therefore, payment of fees solely from the proceeds of the bonds or assessments when and if issued and payments of fees solely from a special fund or funds to be provided in the future do not apply to contracts for the professional services to the extent and such limitations and restrictions might otherwise prevent the payment of fees.

Councilmember Sutton: I mean, were you familiar with that? Did you? I mean, in relation to what we are kind of discussing here, I think you are the legal counsel, so, in relation to what, what he is citing, obviously there appears to be some issues with what the application might be from that particular statute in relation to what you said, maybe can you clarify that for us?

Jeff Ahlers: Yeah, and that is what my whole discussion was at the last meeting. I gave you a copy of that statute as well and discussed, you know, what I understood their interpretation at that time was, is that they felt that they didn't the County Council approval in order to be able to approve or enter into a contract. I don't believe that statute affects and it makes no logical sense for it to say, to read it in that broad of manner, if that's what you're asking me, as to whether it can be read that way, would mean that they could go out and sign a \$100,000,000 contract tomorrow when we don't have the money. And because there is a 2/3 vote and it happens to be for a public work, that you know the county goes bankrupt. I am just saying it can't be read that way. What it means is that it has a limited application and there is still the right of the County Council to make a contract voidable. We also discussed issues at the last meeting that some of the items in those contracts, for example, there is nothing in that statute that would in any way empower them to pass a contract for a construction manager. That is not one of those enumerated items. Not to mention, that in the United Consulting contract there are items that are unrelated to a county architectural or engineering fees, other services that are being

performed. Clearly, those would not fall within that statute as well.

Councilmember Sutton: I am not going to debate the merits of what the law should or shouldn't say but clearly, if you look at both statutes, I mean it appears to be that there is a, it appears to be a conflict there and whether we are the body to decide what that may be, I don't think that we have the ability to do that. I think that is something for the legislature to decide, but, you know, it does appear, from what you hear there that what those uses that allow you to move forward are clearly delineated there in that citing. So, I guess as we talk about this resolution, now has any work began on this contract whatsoever?

David Mosby: Yes, they have worked with the Judges and the Sheriff and they are doing a lot of the preliminary-

Councilmember Sutton: Have we received any invoices, anything? Are they asking us to pay anything?

David Mosby: All we are doing is, we are trying to set aside the money before the end of the year that we are going to incur in this year. No, they have not billed us and asked us for the money, we just signed the contract a week or two ago--

Councilmember Winnecke: But in fact , I'm sorry, go ahead.

David Mosby: Well, I am going to clear up some of what Mr. Ahlers said. We are not going to come over here and ask you to fund a \$100,000,000 project. I mean, just because we want to build a new sports arena or something, I am not going to go out and hire an engineer, a consultant, or whatever, but I think it is clear to everybody here, that we need to build a jail. You, in your February meeting I think of this year, set aside \$2.7 million which indicated to me at that time that you were interested in moving forward with the project. Now, from the muddying of the water that I am getting from the counselor, if you're not interested in moving forward, then we need to say so and I won't hire consultants, engineers, and architects to draw a jail. But, I mean I guess that is what you have to decide. You know I thought that we were going to build a jail.

Councilmember Sutton: Okay, one last question. What do we intend to do on the 20th? What is the purpose of that meeting?

David Mosby: You know if we don't have a contract and we are not moving forward we don't need to lay time lines out so I don't know what the purpose of the meeting is.

Councilmember Winnecke: I think I can-

Councilmember Sutton: I am asking Mr. Bassemier, he is the president.

President Bassemier: We set up a meeting before the Commissioners meeting, about being able to discuss all of the issues about contracts, and consultants, we were going to discuss all of this in detail and that is what it was all about when the meeting was set up. You all agreed to it, that we would have the meeting sometime in the near future. These gentlemen that were out here last week did not have enough time to express their feelings. So, we set up a meeting for them to meet and we still want to meet with them because there are a lot of financial questions. And that is why the meeting was set and I am sure that you all have some questions to ask them.

Councilmember Sutton: Well, I brought up the idea and Councilman Hoy put the motion on the floor and it did pass unanimously to hold that meeting. But, I guess you know, I guess that I am just concerned whether we are actually making any progress here. Are we truly wanting to hear, do we have questions that we want to ask? I think that is what the 20th was going to be about.

President Bassemier: I thought that this meeting, an open meeting, was very important and that is why we want these gentlemen back. But, I am at you alls, we can make a motion to cancel the meeting, that's your pleasure. But, I think we ought to keep the doors open and find out what is going on. Counselor, do you have anything to add to that?

Jeff Ahlers: I was going to respond also to Mr. Sutton in terms of legal. I did give you, I am not playing hide the ball, I want everybody to know that I am giving you both sides of it. I have given you a copy of the letter that Mr. Hayes, him and I had a discussion late yesterday, and he sent me a letter that I received maybe 45 minutes or an hour or something like that before I came over here. So, in terms of timing, Mr. Tornatta, I assure you, we all, and it is not uncommon in the legal business to have long nights and sometimes when clients ask you to do things, it is done at the last minute. But, I think that you will see from Mr. Hayes letter, I think wading through it, while I have not had a lot of time to study it, you will see that he agrees with 90% of what I say, there may be little nuances in the way that we interpret those statutes but I think now over the past week, from reading this letter, I am beginning to think he has come around to seeing things pretty close to what I have interpreted to you. Now, you know if you look at that, he recognizes it states in there that the contract would not be enforceable without an appropriation, so, you know recognizing it and the problem that we've had is that it has gone back and forth and back and forth, I will let you guys determine that.

David Mosby: Well-

Jeff Ahlers: I am just responding to what I am being asked to do. I don't have-

David Mosby: If you don't bond the project, then yeah, there is not a contract.

Councilmember Winnecke: Mr. President?

David Mosby: I totally agree.

President Bassemier: Okay, Troy, you okay with this?

Councilmember Tornatta: I give the floor to Mr. Winnecke.

Councilmember Winnecke: The glass is half full thinks that while the waters may be muddied, there is some light here. My biggest concern about this contract is on page 25 and 26, where it talks about the term, the compensation, when the professionals will be paid. I don't think that this thing has been slowed down by our actions, whatever action. If we pass this resolution and I personally will support the resolution, I think we can move forward and still meet and not miss a beat. Here is what I think, here are my concerns and that is, I think the portion of the contract talking about when the professionals will be paid, is vague, especially when it comes to this \$530,000 on the added value. What I would like to see done, I would like to see that clarified so that we lay out when the professionals will be paid and what work they will have done. Pay as they go, however you want to phase it. As I understand it, we are going to have a request for 600,000 some odd dollars for next

month. I am willing to approve that if we know what we have paid for. Just based on this, it says the work concluded in the basic services shall be carried out in the following five phases and invoiced accordingly. Schematic design, 15% of whole. I assume that is the first step. So, because that is the chronology of it, is that not the first step? So, if that is the first step, 15% of the \$3,080,000 is \$462,000. I would just like to see those things cleaned up.

David Mosby: The \$530,000 is the first step.

Councilmember Winnecke: But my point is, let's clarify in those parts of the contract what we are paying for, I think we can get that done before the 20th. You guys do it in that fashion, we can move on from the 20th. We can discuss all of the items that we talked about last week. How do we proceed with bonding? How do we proceed with all of the things to move this forward? I don't want to see this thing slow down and I think, I don't think it has to personally.

David Mosby: I don't think it has to either but we keep bouncing around and playing around with it and-

Councilmember Winnecke: I would hate to think that when the fiscal part of the government asks questions relating to money that were not taken, I think they should, I think those concerns should be taken at face value and not anything more than that.

President Bassemier: Who is next, Mr. Hoy?

Councilmember Raben: Go ahead and let Mr. Hoy go.

Councilmember Hoy: My understanding of the resolution that we passed for the meeting on the 20th was to have this thorough discussion and now we have something else laid on our desks as a result of your meeting Monday night and I haven't had a chance to scan Mr. Hayes letter and his next to the last paragraph says, "the contracts clearly are subject to appropriation by the County Council. There is now pending a request for a total of \$610,000 to be appropriated by the County Council from the funds on hand which have been earmarked for the jail product or project. It is my further understanding that of the County Commission that the joint meeting of the Commission and the Council on November 20th, will result in further plans as the respective bodies may agree for the appropriation of other funds, etc., and up to the issuance of bonds". So, I felt after last week we were looking towards the 20th and it sounds like to me that's what Mr. Hayes is saying in his opinion. I guess this was sent to you today. This was sent to you today, right?

Jeff Ahlers: Yes, I received it by fax shortly before the meeting.

Councilmember Hoy: So, he is saying, your attorney is saying that we still have to appropriate this money. Which is contrary to the law that you all have cited. I too think that we need to get beyond this. My other problem, I have two other problems with this whole process, one is, that if we stick to the \$35,000,000, we pay these folks \$5,000,000 then that figure is not going to be 10% it is going to be 14 1/4% that we pay to the architects. Well, if you pay them \$5,000,000 of \$35,000,000 that's 14 1/4% of the whole ball of wax.

David Mosby: You are not paying the whole \$5,000,000 to United/DLZ.

Councilmember Hoy: It doesn't matter, we are paying 14.25 to an architect and to a construction manager which is-

David Mosby: But, that is with any project that you have a CM.

Councilmember Hoy: It's too high and the second thing that I still don't see in this whole process is, I am still looking for a plan and whenever I spend my personal money on a house or a car or anything else, there is something laid out in front of me that I am purchasing and I still, I don't see that, I don't want to slow this thing down, I don't think any councilman does. I won't give you my poverty verses people who have money speech but I sat in drug court yesterday and what I saw was low income people. I have heard of other people with high incomes being arrested, I don't see them in jail, and I am really bothered by that. I don't see them facing the same thing that the poor face, you all know where I come from, from that persuasion and I just don't see a plan yet. I, you know if I had, we had a plan with the Centre, we had something laid out in front of us and we had a figure laid out there and we had a bonding amount laid out there. We don't have that right now and that bothers me.

President Bassemier: Thank you , Mr. Hoy.

Councilmember Hoy: I am not sure that this resolution is necessary since Mr. Hayes said what he did.

Catherine Fanello: Catherine Fanello, County Commissioner. Just to address, I perfectly understand and I think Councilman Winnecke probably said it best in that he would like some clarification on the payment process. Just to let you know, you are all invited any time to sit down with me to go over the research I did to look at the information that I received from the State Board of Tax Commissioners on similar projects across the state and just to address Councilman Hoy's concern about the percentages. These are well below what some other counties paid for even much less scope of a project, so, we are not outside the realm of, are the fees reasonable because they are very reasonable for the scope of the project that we are looking for. I just wanted to invite you to look at any of the information that I have. I would be more than happy to sit down and go over it with you but those things were addressed in the numerous meetings that I had with United and Shireman going over their fees and I feel comfortable with those based upon the other projects across the state. As far as a plan, you can't have that plan, Councilman Hoy, until we have people on board to prepare the plan. This is a much different project than any project that this county has ever faced. So, I think what we need to do is work together, build a consensus, you are going to send the wrong message to the public if you sign that resolution today. You really are. We need to wait until November 20th, have a joint meeting, get all of our questions on the table and talk about what we need to talk about, have the professionals here. But, we can't have the professionals here if I, we don't have a good feeling from you that you don't want to hire the professionals. So, I am asking you to work with us and let's work together and get this done. But, I think we need to wait until the November 20th meeting.

President Bassemier: We need to remember that by 6:00 we've got to be out of here.

Unidentified: Before 6:00.

President Bassemier: I am sorry, before 6:00.

Councilmember Tornatta: Can we put this resolution, we could even do it on the 20th if you wanted to do it, let us have a chance to look at it, the 20th is an advertised meeting, a joint session, we could look at this and maybe hash some of this stuff out at that meeting.

Councilmember Raben: Mr. President, just a couple of things. As far as United Consulting goes, this isn't about the firm whatsoever. I think that they are extremely qualified and will build us a fantastic jail and Jack Waldroup as of last Saturday told me that at any time he will come before us and give us complete updates on where they are at through the project and they want to include us in it. But, if you recall last week, and Royce you actually made mention of it, you know, this Council, we live and die by our sword. It has always been our posture that the funds have to be in place before the contracts are signed. What we do have now, is the County is bound by a contract or has signed a contract that is in violation of state law. We have a contract that is signed that is in violation and-

Councilmember Tornatta: Of what interpretation?

Councilmember Raben: No, the statute clearly states that you either appropriate the funds of which we don't have \$5,000,000 to appropriate right now. We may have January 1 but right now we can't, we can not even, we can't even get in compliance with that contract because we don't have the funds if we wanted to. If everything was fine with everybody in here we couldn't appropriate the funds today anyway because we don't have them. So, what we have to do to make things right is do what the statute states and that's in writing.

Councilmember Sutton: Well, Jim, if you-

President Bassemier: (Inaudible)

Councilmember Sutton: Well, I really think that this needs to be said. I think in support of what Councilmember Raben is trying to say, I mean, if we interpret the, if we look at the interpretation of a statute, we really don't have to take any action. We really don't need the resolution. If it's determined that the appropriate funds are not in place -

Councilmember Raben: Well, let me finish.

Councilmember Sutton: If they are not in place or whatever.

Councilmember Raben: Let me finish. United Consulting does have bills and they have done a lot of work in the last 6 - 8 months. That \$600,000 is reimbursement for a lot of up front expense. We do owe them money. The problem is, we can not accept the contract because we don't have \$5,000,000 put in place where they can draw \$600,000 from. So, again, back to my original point. If we can get this contract broke up in phases. Phase one would be the \$600,000 that we owe them and I think they are entitled to that. If I was them, I would want it before too much longer, too. I think all that we are doing here today is what the statute allows us to do and I think we are expressing our concerns that the Commissioners and United Consulting and Shireman can address between now and the 20th, come back to us and say hey, we can do this, we can do that. You know, I tell you, an old Zig Ziegler saying that I don't know if any of you is familiar with Zig Ziegler, but selling isn't selling until the other party says no. Then you start selling and that is where we are at today, in the negotiations.

President Bassemier: (Inaudible)

Councilmember Sutton: But, Ed, I think we haven't really, there is a couple of things here that we haven't really finished, I mean.

President Bassemier: Well, I have got a motion and a second

Unidentified: Call for the vote.

President Bassemier: I have a call for the question and there is one thing that I would like to add, I have been listening patiently, and I feel that we do need a new jail sooner or later. I knew that when I worked back in the county jail back in 1971 which was a long time ago (inaudible) I would just like to say that I am for this resolution and its protection. I do not feel like any contract should be signed without or approved without the approval by the County Council. That is our job.

Unidentified: I call for the question.

President Bassemier: Now, everybody had their turn.

Councilmember Sutton: I mean, I was cut off. Why is it that you need to go into a long speech? I mean if he's already called for the question.

President Bassemier: I am going to talk about ten minutes and I'm going finish this conversation, if you don't like it, you can walk out.

Councilmember Sutton: I am not going to walk out.

President Bassemier: I think that it is our job, we are the fiscal body and if we start approving, if we start letting other departmental heads approve contracts, why do they need us? So, we have a motion on the floor we have a second. If you are not in favor of this resolution, you can vote no. Roll call vote, please.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Everything that is asked and appropriated-

President Bassemier: This is a yes or no, we don't need any discussion, this is a yes or no.

Councilmember Tornatta: I deferred mine to Mr. Winnecke. So, he could talk because he wanted to get something out. All I am saying is that I am going to explain why I am going to vote no.

President Bassemier: The motion is a yes or no vote. This is a roll call vote, discussion is over, we've got to move on and get out of here in one minute. Roll call vote, please.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: No.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Tornatta: No privilege to speech.

Councilmember Sutton: I am just trying to understand here. I had my hand raised up for who knows how long. Councilman Raben was called on to speak and he spoke for whatever. I was courteous enough to allow him to go ahead and speak ahead of me. I waited my turn, I spoke, after I got done everybody got asked to answer the question and then you say we are ready for the vote and then we-

President Bassemier: We called for the question. We are in proper order here.

Councilmember Sutton: Right, he called for the question, but then we had additional discussion. I am just trying to understand what the procedure is here.

President Bassemier: I made it clear to everybody that I just wanted to say one thing and that is all that was said. So, we got a call and a motion and Mr. Wortman could only have the floor for one more word.

Councilmember Wortman: I haven't said a word.

President Bassemier Well, you called for the question, didn't you?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes, sir.

President Bassemier: (Inaudible)

Councilmember Sutton: I mean if you are telling me that my, I can't speak on an item, their next meeting starts, what time does the next meeting start?

President Bassemier: Right now.

Councilmember Sutton: Six o'clock or quarter till? What time do you guys start?

Unidentified: It starts at 6:00.

Councilmember Sutton: He called for the question but then we had additional discussion. When we were discussing I was still cut off. I am trying to understand. Am I not supposed to speak at this meeting?

President Bassemier: No. I tell you what, we have been discussing this since 5:00 or 5:10 and he called for the question and I thought you knew we have got to move on. We have a meeting on December 20th, so.

Councilmember Tornatta: Let's put this to December 20th,.

President Bassemier: Well, then just vote it down and if it's voted down, we will. But, we-

Councilmember Tornatta: You put this on our desk and then we're supposed to digest that and vote on it, right?

President Bassemier: Well, we have done it in the past and if you do not agree with it, vote no. You did and now it is Mr. Sutton's turn.

Councilmember Sutton: I think it is unnecessary, and I do vote no.

President Bassemier: Okay.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: I haven't said a word but I have been up here 23 years and we have never approved a contract without funding in place. I vote yes.

Councilmember Sutton: (Inaudible)

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: I really would, I am going to vote a yes or no but I would prefer to abstain because I think the mud here is worse than the mud I saw out in the Industrial Park. But, I also believe that we cannot legally approve a contract for money that we don't have and so I am going to vote yes. Because I think it is the legal thing to do and that does not mean that I want to impede the progress. I have voiced my opinion on other parts of it. So, I am going to give a yes even though I would have preferred that we waited until the 20th.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes and it passes 5-2.

(Motion carried 5-2/Councilmembers Tornatta and Sutton opposed)

President Bassemier: Do I have a motion to adjourn?

Councilmember Wortman: I make a motion that we adjourn this meeting as fast as we can.

President Bassemier: Do I have a second?

Councilmember Winnecke: Second.

President Bassemier: Everybody in favor, say aye.

Meeting adjourned at 5:45 p.m.

President Ed Bassemier

Vice President Lloyd Winnecke

Councilmember James Raben

Councilmember Phil Hoy

Councilmember Curt Wortman

Councilmember Royce Sutton

Councilmember Troy Tornatta

Recorded by Madelyn Grayson. Transcribed by Madelyn Grayson & BJ Farrell.

**JOINT MEETING OF THE
VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL
AND COMMISSIONERS
NOVEMBER 20, 2001**

The Vanderburgh County Council and Commissioners held a special joint meeting for discussion of and action on contracts and services for jail and construction projects on November 20, 2001 in room 301 of the Civic Center Complex. The meeting was called to order at 1:06 p.m. by County Council President Ed Bassemier.

Council President Ed Bassemier: Sheriff, if you want to open the meeting, please?

(Meeting opened by Sheriff Brad Ellsworth)

Council President Bassemier: Thank you, sir. Attendance roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Commissioner Mourdock?

Commissioner Mourdock: Here.

Teri Lukeman: Commissioner Fanello?

Commissioner Fanello: Here. Should I ask the question..we need to open our meeting, too. Don't we need to convene our meeting?

Phil Hayes: Yes, that would be appropriate.

Council President Bassemier: Okay, do you mind if we open ours?

Commissioner Fanello: You can go ahead and open yours.

Council President Bassemier: If that is the way that you guys want to do it, it is fine with me.

Teri Lukeman: Shall I call --

Council President Bassemier: Yeah, I tell you what, call the County Council people and then we will turn it over to them and let them call their people and we will have the Pledge of Allegiance.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Here.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Here.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Here.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Here.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Here.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Here.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

Council President Bassemier: Here. Okay, Mr. Mosby.

Commission President Mosby: I would like to call to order the special board meeting of the Vanderburgh County Commissioners on November 20th. Present today will be Commissioner Mourdock, Commissioner Fanello, Counselor Hayes and Commissioner Mosby along with Auditor Suzanne Crouch.

Council President Bassemier: Thank you, sir. Would everybody please stand for the Pledge of Allegiance?

(Pledge of Allegiance was given.)

Council President Bassemier: I would like to announce that the purpose of this meeting today is to address the design and construction management contracts for a new detention facility and find some common ground and move forward to the construction of a new jail. I guess we start a question and answer session. I will ask the Commissioners, you have a format that you like. Do you mind if we ask you some questions? How do you all like the, I am open to suggestions, to be fair to both parties.

Commission President Mosby: It doesn't matter to me.

Council President Bassemier: Okay. I will start out then. Are there any County Council members that would like to ask the Commissioners any questions to start it out? Please raise your hand and we will do it in an orderly fashion. Who would like to go first? Why, Mr. Winnecke, thank you sir.

Councilmember Winnecke: At the last Council meeting we had a number of issues relating to the financial aspects of the contract. Initially in the interest of paying the \$600,000 towards United and those bills, has the Commission negotiated at all with United to clean up the aspects of the contract that we raised questions about at our last meeting?

Commission President Mosby: Yes and I will answer that. Since the last meeting, I believe that I have had one meeting with Councilmember Raben and a couple of phone calls and some dialogue and Councilmember Raben referred me to Counselor Ahlers. So, in talking with Counselor Ahlers on the phone for about an hour and a half, he gave me specifically four or five things that he thought the Council was interested in and we did go back and we asked United to give us their fee structure and exactly what we came up with was United's fees for a \$30,000,000 for 2.55 along with 530 in the additional services for a total of 3.08. I also at the time asked United to give me fees on what they thought a \$40,000,000 project would come to and that figure came to 3.840. So, I told them to go on to a \$50,000,000 project which came out at 4.58. I believe that if you do the math on the numbers

that you will notice that the percentage comes down as the project goes up. I know it was stated here that they thought the fees would double but if you do the math on the percentages, as we go higher, instead of the 10.5% we actually come down to around 9%.

Councilmember Winnecke: So-

Commission President Mosby: So, the fees go down. Go ahead.

Councilmember Winnecke: A \$30,000,000 size, the price would be 3.08 million?

Commission President Mosby: Right.

Councilmember Winnecke: Uh, \$40,000,000 3.84?

Commission President Mosby: Right.

Councilmember Winnecke: And \$50,000,000 is 4.58?

Commission President Mosby: Right.

Councilmember Winnecke: What about the reimbursable expenses for them and the construction manager. How would their fees coincide?

Commission President Mosby: We didn't discuss the CM. But, the reimbursables are still capped at 190. So, and that was in the letter that Counselor Ahlers got that I faxed to him on Friday. It does tell you in there, civil engineering, environmental and site survey and geotechnical is still an added expense at this time and we don't know what that will be. They did put an approximate figure in there at \$200,000, \$205,000 so if that will help you.

Councilmember Winnecke: Are these fees determined by, is it a flat fee structure or is it an hourly based on the amount of work they do. If it turns out to be a \$45,000,000 project is somewhere in between and how do they calculate that?

Commission President Mosby: The only thing that they gave me is that simply because of the early stages of the project, their best estimate is what these fees could total and they didn't tell me how to figure them because this is something that they do not deal with but it tells you that in the bottom of the letter that none of the reimbursable as well as the mark up in any, will be marked up in anyway by United and passed straight on to us. So, they didn't have an exact price because it is something that was out of realm and they don't deal with it, same as kitchen design. Security is in there, there is a question on security. It is covered and that is stated in the letter also that we gave to Counselor and it tells you the paragraph to look at.

Councilmember Winnecke: One of the other issues that we were talking about in our last meeting and then I will shut up after this and let someone else ask. Relating, you mentioned the kitchen expenses, the design and all of that, does the Commission have estimates yet on kitchen design, security, communication, etc, that is also part of the supporting services?

Commission President Mosby: No, we don't have a building yet. We don't have it designed.

Councilmember Winnecke: But, do you have an idea as to what the kitchen design is going to be?

Commission President Mosby: No. The kitchen design could change if you build just a jail or if you build a jail and community corrections or if you build all three. The kitchen could change depending on how big you build the building.

Councilmember Winnecke: I understand that. I guess I am just looking for a range.

Commission President Mosby: I really don't have a range and they just put in their letter that they thought approximately \$205,000 would get the rest of the designs that we would need and they included civil and environmental design, site survey and geotechnical.

Council President Bassemier: Do you want to go over it, Troy? Do you have any questions that you want to ask the Commissioners? Uh, Royce? Mr. Raben?

Councilmember Raben: I will wait just a little bit, I will wait to hear other questions and then I may follow up with some.

Council President Bassemier: Okay, Mr. Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: I want to wait a while.

Council President Bassemier: Okay.

Commission President Mosby: Everybody can't wait.

Council President Bassemier: Mr. Wortman, do you have any questions?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes and I don't know if it can be answered or not. I would like to have a kind of, you know we talked about the jail on a scale of 100 and the jail costing 20% and the operating costing 80%, I would like to have a projection of how much operating this jail is going to cost based upon so many beds and what have you because this really could affect us, this 80%. I am kind of concerned about that and the location. If we have a location, as they call it on the back forty here the fourteen acres. Would there be a walkway over? Or if you get another location, two or three miles away or blocks or what have you, you've got transportation problems involved. I would like to have a kind of projection on that if I could. Thank you.

Commissioner Fanello: You are quite correct, Mr. Wortman. And what we need to do once we all decide how far we are going to go with this project, then they can begin to work on what operating costs might be. But, until we have a consensus here of how much we are willing to spend on this project, I know that a \$35,000,000 budget is set but I don't know that is going to get us everything we need, but once we do that, then we can work on an operating budget.

Councilmember Wortman: I am referring more. I went to Owensboro with Mr. Bassemier and the Sheriff, Mr. Ellsworth, and they built a jail over there for \$9,200,000. If they can build that, was that 400 beds, Mr. Bassemier?

Council President Bassemier: That's 427 beds.

Councilmember Wortman: Now, if that's the case, we could build 3 jails over here at that price and having money left over.

Commission President Mosby: I think that if you look at the laws that you are dealing with in Kentucky and the laws that you dealing with in the state of Indiana, they are not the same.

Councilmember Wortman: Not the same?

Commissioner Fanello: The standards are different by which we have to build versus what Kentucky has to build and I think that Sheriff Ellsworth is probably familiar with a few of those but that is the big difference in cost that you see.

Council President Bassemier: Well, the engineer, to Mr. Wortman's defense, that \$9,200,000 was set on the price of what it would cost in Vanderburgh County, the \$9,200,000, actually they bought their facility for \$7,500,000, is that not right, Mr. Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: That is correct and when I went over, I asked the jail about what the variables would be and he gave those to me and even factoring in the variables, I came to the conclusion that we should be able to do what we need to do for \$35,000,000. They did have some cost savings, they do, they don't have to comply with the American Correctional Associations standards as we do in Indiana. They do comply with the American Jailers Association which applies in Kentucky but doesn't apply here. One of the examples that he gave us was on how you can figure the space. There they can figure that the beds are part of the you know space in this room and you have to exclude those and where the toilet facilities are here, so there are some differences. They also had some other cost savings in painting, excavation and they chose to use a construction manager but not a general contractor. The construction manager did the subcontracting. I asked them also about union versus non-union labor and virtually all the labor was union labor. They have a prevailing wage law also just as we do. They followed that. So, I felt like I filtered out as many of the cost variables as possible and when I went to look at the facility and I went to look at the financing and say, are we being unreasonable with \$35,000,000? I came away feeling that we were not being unreasonable with \$35,000,000. So, that was my impression and I was very much impressed with their control room and how they set things up and some very practical things that they did along the way. Which are things that I think we can look at. You know beyond just what we are talking about today.

Council President Bassemier: Okay-

Commissioner Fanello: With, I'm sorry.

Council President Bassemier: You want to answer.

Commissioner Fanello: I believe that David has something to say. With all due respect, Councilmember Hoy, I don't disagree with what you are saying, I am sure that you have done your homework on that. But, throughout the state of Indiana I have gathered some research on what our detention facilities have cost within the state of Indiana and based on my research and the information gathered from the State Board of Tax Commissioners on other similar projects across the state. We are not going to get what we need for \$35,000,000 and as far as the figure that you are quoting, I would have to see what they are basing that on and how they are

coming to their figures. So, at this point, I don't think it is fair to talk about those kinds of cost issues when I don't have anything in front of me to substantiate those kinds of costs.

Commission President Mosby: Councilman, I would just go further to answer that. Initially when this project started and we were interviewing architects and engineers, I can tell you that I sat down with Ed Hafer, Tom or Mike Farley, Tom Hickey, these guys are some of the biggest firms in the state of Indiana. We had, I think three firms out of the top ten, that bid this project and in sitting down and talking with them, everyone of them will give you the federal standards on the square footage of each inmate in a jail cell per bed and they will give you two different ways. They will give you a price per bed and they will show you the construction cost per square foot of what it cost to build a jail. In sitting down and talking with them and going over jails, community corrections and juvenile detentions, that is how we came up with an approximately \$50,000,000 figure. That was with three different firms. Mike Shoulders being involved too with one of the firms. So, really we had Shoulders, Hafer, Farley and Hickey all.

Council President Bassemier: Mr. Hoy.

Councilmember Hoy: My questions connect with what you just said and that is, it is the same question that I asked you in our last meeting. That is that I do not believe that this contract gives us much security on a number of things. One is, we don't have the scope, I would feel better if the scope were outlined. If they came back with the scope with a location, what the site would cost, and some other things like that, then we might look at a, we are not looking at any hard figures here, there is no figure mentioned in the contract and I want to know what we are getting for the money we are spending. I think that there are too many loopholes in this contract.

Council President Bassemier: I will let him address it.

Commission President Mosby: Councilman, the only thing that I can tell you is that the scope of service right now that United Consulting is dealing with is what we have passed in the Commissioner's meeting back on August 20 and what it says, and the motion was 650 on the jail 300 on community corrections, yeah and 650 expandable to a 1000 with 20 - 24 juvenile detention. That was the scope of the project and that is what we had asked United Consulting to look at and bring us back a price on.

Councilmember Hoy: And what is the price that they brought back?

Commission President Mosby: We haven't got it yet. We will probably have the figures within the next week or so. We might have had them today but they were asked not to come down here so, they are not here.

Councilmember Hoy: I feel that our meeting today is to iron out the things that are not in this contract that need to be there and-

Commission President Mosby: Well, that is in the contract.

Councilmember Hoy: There is not a figure there.

Commission President Mosby: There is a figure there on their fees.

Councilmember Hoy: That's all.

Commission President Mosby: Right.

Councilmember Hoy: If we stick with the \$35,000,000 as a Council, then their fees along with Shireman's are going to be in excess of 15% and that just seems high to me. I realize that you can get figures national averages, state averages, and I am interested in those only to a point. I was reading in the paper where the county northwest, Davis County, Indiana, is looking at between ten and twelve and a half million, I am very familiar with that county and the economics of that county and that is absolutely going to be a tax killer up there and I think that they are making a mistake on what they are spending and I just don't want us to do it. I don't see any caps on this and there are just too many, there are loopholes that you can drive a semi through.

Commissioner Fanello: Councilman Hoy, with all due respect again, throwing the phrases out that there are loopholes, that things are excessive. You have to have something to base that upon, there aren't loopholes in the contract. The contract is based on a \$30,000,000 construction cost, as far as saying that Shireman's fees are in excess, and that is the construction manager, that construction manager fee is not an added cost to the project. That is a fee that you are going to be paying to a general contractor, if you do not have a construction manager on the project. So, that fee is a cost whether or not it is Shireman or someone else. To further add, I invited any Councilmember to see the research that I had done on other contracts. I have sample contracts from other jail projects across the state, three folders worth of research here, and I have not had one Councilperson come to me except Troy Tornatta and sit down and ask that question. So, to throw those comments out, I think are unfair, unless you have something to substantiate them.

Councilmember Raben: Could I interrupt just one second?

Councilmember Hoy: Go ahead.

Councilmember Raben: Catherine, you stated that this contract is based on \$30,000,000. On page 11, which is 1.3.1.4, it states, "no fixed limit of construction costs shall be established as a condition of this agreement".

Commissioner Fanello: Go to page 1.1.1., 1.1.1.3, in order to begin work on the project the architect has been instructed-

Councilmember Winnecke: What page are you on?

Councilmember Raben: 1.1-

Commissioner Fanello: Page 3, 1.1.1.3, a total construction cost budget of \$30,000,000 . Now, if we go beyond what we, you know the scope that we are looking at here then yes, there is going to be a change in the contract, but the contract is set up that the owner approves every cost in excess of that. The contract is also set up that it can be terminated at any time at the pleasure of the owner.

Councilmember Hoy: Okay, my question then is, we would probably have to buy out his contract?

Commissioner Fanello: No, there is no buy out in the contract and I made sure of

that.

Commission President Mosby: The other thing that I will add because it was brought up too, if we terminate the contract, as the owner, and the question was asked I think by Counselor Ahlers and Councilman Raben had asked me the question, we do not have to start the project over. It says, "there is however a provision in this agreement for such a scenario". Paragraph 1.3.2.2. states that "should the agreement be terminated by the owner for cause, the license granted to the owner to use the drawings to construct the building is immediately replaced by a second license that allows the owner to use and reproduce the drawings". So, we do not have to start over and that is in the language of the contract. There is no liquidated damages, either.

Council President Bassemier: Mr. Winnecke.

Councilmember Winnecke: Mr. Wortman raised the point earlier and I think that we need to try and nail down. One of the purposes of today's meeting in my mind is to not decide that we are going to spend more than \$35,000,000 because frankly I don't think that anyone today can present all of the evidence to change where we are in that regard. You know there are so many variables out there, land cost, I would like for someone to address where the county is in terms of the site selection and what consideration, if any, has been given to use of the existing jail.

Commissioner Fanello: I believe the Sheriff.

Councilmember Winnecke: Whoever would like to answer that.

Commissioner Fanello: I was just going to say that the Sheriff is the one who has been working on the site selection process and I believe that he would be the best one to answer those questions, in my opinion.

Council President Bassemier: Sheriff, would you mind coming forward, please. I knew that we would get you in there somewhere. Please state your name sir for the record. Did you want to ask that question again, Mr. Winnecke?

Brad Ellsworth: Brad Ellsworth, Sheriff.

Councilmember Winnecke: Where are we on the site selection?

Brad Ellsworth: There hasn't been a real scientific method for site selection. My staff and I just over the course of the career have went out when, since five years ago when this all started again. We started looking for areas that might be suitable. Certainly the back forty was the first and most desirable place to do this because it was in close proximity to the Courthouse. We have enjoyed the luxury of having a tunnel from the current jail to the Courthouse and like I said, it has been a luxury that many other counties don't enjoy. However, with what we believe is the scope of this project, when we are talking about a 650 bed jail or 500 whichever. The large community correction center and the juvenile, it began to look like they were going to need more acreage than what was available. If not, also parking became a problem with the back forty. Not saying that it has been thrown out, that is certainly one of the areas that is still on the site selection. So, what we began to do was take the knowledge gained in this and use what other counties have done with remonstrations and site selection and stuff like that and we put some things on paper that were important to us; a) connectivity to the courts was going to be the

number one thing, within the city limits, distance away from any residential area that might be because we know when you try to put this in somebody's back yard or even close that we are going to run into problems, so we were very cognizant of that. We were looking for areas that already had utilities and sewer and those things, travel access to roads and major thoroughfares. We came up with approximately and this wasn't done alone, this was also done with, and I know probably that probably you all and the Commissioners received letters on the back of napkins and paper saying this would be a good site. I had everything, every vacant building in town as been suggested to me as a possible jail site. What we did was basically narrow this down to eighteen locations. Some out in the county and some in the city and that includes the industrial zone out on 57, that includes the sheriff's training center on Kansas Road, every abandoned K-Mart, the Sam's Club on Green River Road, the State Hospital grounds and we had about 18 that looked acceptable. When we went out and then drove around with the architect from United, showing them and Mr. Shireman to the 18 different locations that we thought at least had a chance of this. We were then able to narrow that again to, down to approximately six locations that are really what I would say is ideal, that would really work and that includes the back forty. The back forty would require a parking garage being built and when we are talking about \$35,000,000 and if you say the jail and everything, plus the cost of the parking garage, I don't see it happening. If you guys can work that magic, more power to you. So, we are down to probably a handful, I would say five locations. I am reluctant to name those off for the same reason that we talked about before because we talked about as soon as you name a site, does the price go up? I am going to leave that to the Commission and Council to talk about those locations. If they want to name the final three or the final four or five that is fine with me but that's in your alls wisdom about how to secure those lots, secure those buildings and that. So, that is kind of what we went through for the criteria on a site selection. That is not done yet and I don't know if it's gone so far, I think that there is some people contacting some of the owners of the top five to see if they are even willing to sell that. I don't know of anybody that's, that information has come in. So, I don't have a range of we've got a million dollar lot or we've got one donated. As far as the existing jail, it was constructed in 1969 and it has served its purpose well and I think that they have done a wonderful job over thirty years in that facility. It is what they called a linear design, it's a 1930's and 40's design. It is extremely hard to supervise and we have talked about that a whole lot and that is why we see so many broken jaws and fights and things that go on because it is the old out of sight, out of mind. If they are behind a metal door, what goes on one side of the door is their business and what's out in the hallway is our business. You don't have, you can't hire enough staff to be in our cells, because they are so in the, they are ten man cells and we couldn't do that. During the PMSI study and we started bringing the standards back in, the DOC standards that are set, we have to follow, they said that if you knock a brick out of the wall and try to remodel the old jail, you will have to bring it up to current standards and that will reduce our beds from the current 268 down to approximately 125, if I remember correctly what they said. We have kicked around some of the things. My ideal situation is this is all on one campus and all, at least on one campus, if not under one roof, where it is much easier to manage and you can use the kitchens, the laundry and the like services to supply on. That is where you are going to save some of that money. Certainly the jail could be used for something but that's what we as a group have to decide what we are willing to do. Could you turn it into the Community Corrections Center? Probably could. You know, cut off the doors, open it up, release it and I know the jail, replace the jail elevator that breaks down unfortunately, usually on Christmas and I am the one that gets the call because all of the elevators are broken down and they can't visit and things like that.

You can turn it into that, but that's when we have to ask ourselves, is that what we want at the front gate of our government center, is the release and constant traffic of work release inmates out on Martin Luther King Blvd. Some of us have talked about that and it didn't seem like the ideal location. Could you turn it into a juvenile center? Absolutely could with some of the same things with the supervision, but, you are going to talk about having separate kitchens, separate supervisory staff and some of those things. The one thing that we are probably going to, if we do build this on an away site, is that we are going to need somewhere to stage for a secure area to stage inmates and the current court stays where it is at, is a place to stage inmates while they are waiting to appear in court. Certainly, that seems like the current jail could be incorporated into that. I don't know what the Building Authority, I think Chief Deputy Williams has had some conversation with Mr. Utley about at least the possibility of stripping out that building and turning it into office space and if my recollection, and I won't speak for him, but that's a pretty easily done thing, to turn that into office space. But that is, I don't know if that answers it but-

Councilmember Winnecke: I would just have follow up and I don't know if it's directed to-

Council President Bassemier: I'm sorry, Lloyd, let's change the tape.

(TAPE CHANGE)

Councilmember Winnecke: I don't know if it's directed to the Sheriff or the Commissioners, what is, in someone's mind, the time line for selecting the site?

Brad Ellsworth: I'll let you answer that.

Commission President Mosby: I'd say probably within the next three months. The first thing we've got to do is get a contract with the architect.

Council President Bassemier: I know according to contract, of course I imagine it's changed in you all's contract here, this February 2, 2002?

Commission President Mosby: Yeah, but that's changing every time we keep messing with this.

Council President Bassemier: That's right.

Commission President Mosby: The last time I had talked to the architects the February deal was pending, we thought we had a contract and we were moving forward and then all this came about, so... I mean, every time we walk in here we just lose a week or two or three.

Council President Bassemier: What we're doing here shouldn't slow us up on finding a land site, right? I mean, you guys are still working trying to find us a piece of ground.

Commission President Mosby: We're looking, yeah.

Council President Bassemier: I've got a couple of questions and then I'll work back over here. I agree with Mr. Wortman we do need to find a piece a ground. I mean I really don't think we can sign a contract, personally now, until we find a piece of ground. The Sheriff says you all have narrowed it down, I think Catherine you said

you've narrowed it down to five or six sites. Can you kind of give me an average cost of these five sites that it is going to cost the county? We've gave you a cap of \$35,000,000, this \$5,000,000 is going to go for the designs. Now what do you think the average of those five or six sites that you've talked to these people what is it going to average out? I know you can't give me an exact figure.

Commissioner Fanello: I haven't talked to anybody about cost and would have no idea. I mean that is for an appraiser to determine. Until people are even contacted if they're even willing to sell these properties or whatever we come down to the final two or three or whatever, I have no idea. It's not within my realm of expertise.

Commission President Mosby: I don't want there to be a misinterpretation here the way you said that. I don't think anybody's been contacted by the site-

Commissioner Fanello: No.

Commission President Mosby: When the Sheriff is referring to this, and I think what we are referring to, this is only something that we have only drove around and just looked at sites. Nobody has been contacted.

Council President Bassemier: I didn't know. I guess we ought to be getting onto it because if we're trying find a piece of ground we better be asking if it is for sale, right?

Councilmember Raben: Mr. President, I might jump in just a moment. Brad, I know you and I spoke a few weeks back about the possibility of your site selections and at that time you had asked me to keep them to myself with the understanding that as soon as I found out you were interested in a piece of my property I would immediately, what would happen to the price of that piece of property, but from talking with you, and you stated just a few moments ago, that your first choice would be the back 40. I know Commissioner Mosby, am I accurate when I say that would be your first pick?

Commission President Mosby: I said it publicly already.

Councilmember Raben: Okay.

Commissioner Fanello: And I would too, that is my first choice.

Councilmember Raben: I guess what concerns me with that is, and I tried to establish a meeting over a period of a couple of weeks with the Building Authority to begin that discussion, where this fits in with the downtown master plan, what kind of give and take the Building Authority has because they ultimately do have control of that property. That meeting was cancelled and I'm offering to do that again.

Commission President Mosby: I think that was the day we voided the contract.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, but again, I don't see how we can even consider other sites knowing going in that this is our number one choice if we haven't begun that dialogue with them. Brad, you mentioned parking garage. I don't think the county would have to include parking garage as part of this construction cost. There may be some other...I have some other ideas on that I addressed with Commissioner Mosby. Again, I think that's an important part of this conversation, site selection is very key. I think we need to have that meeting that I once tried to

establish that was cancelled. I'm asking again if I set it up, is it going to take place?

Commission President Mosby: If we have an architect on board and we move forward I would be more than happy to meet tomorrow. But I can't see jumping out of line here, I mean the first thing we have-

Councilmember Raben: Well again, site selection is key. I mean, that's everything right now. So we need to begin that dialogue with the appropriate figures.

Commissioner Fanello: But we have to have their involvement to help with that.

Councilmember Raben: Who the architect?

Commissioner Fanello: The architects.

Councilmember Raben: Well you have to know that the site that we're going to get the appropriate commitments from the mayor's office, from City Council, from the Building Authority, both of these bodies. I mean there is more involved in that back 40 than just-

Commissioner Fanello: I agree with that and I agree with what you said. You know, no it should be the number one site and we shouldn't pay attention to any others, but you have to have some contingency plans. If the back 40 is not going to work, it's not going to work. You've got to have the next two to go to.

Councilmember Raben: But again we have to get to the point where we understand that it is or isn't going to work before we even entertain other ones. I'm just saying once again that I will establish that communication that I once made the effort to communicate before it was cancelled.

Commission President Mosby: And I told you that I was willing to meet. The only thing I'm saying, and I guess I'm just saying the reverse of what you're saying, you're saying let's find out and have a dialogue with everybody. I'm saying let's let the professionals tell you that's even the site. I would hate to think we went through all that dialogue and had meetings with the Building Authority and everybody and we wasted everybody's time because the site is not even...

Commissioner Mourdock: Didn't we just hear, Brad, didn't you just say it's one of the five sites currently, it's one of the finalists?

Brad Ellsworth: The back 40?

Commissioner Mourdock: Yes.

Brad Ellsworth: As one of the desirable sites for it, yes.

Commissioner Mourdock: Yes, and that determination was made based on the drive through, through the windshield that you did with the architects?

Brad Ellsworth: Yes.

Commissioner Mourdock: Thank you.

Commission President Mosby: Has anybody measured that site? Do we know how

many acres we'll need?

Council President Bassemier: Go ahead Sheriff, you've got the floor.

Brad Ellsworth: I'll take responsibility for pleading with the Commission and the architect that, and we've had some talks about ten story... I guess what I was adamantly opposed to was saying, well let's just say the judges' parking lot, everybody is familiar with that, saying we're going to put this on the judges parking lot. What that would have required would be to make it basically a ten story jail. What that does if you select your site first and we say we want it right here and you're blocked by this much area and we go up ten stories, we've already talked about that of adding 100 people just to staff it which we are not going to be able to afford to do. So, what I begged for them to consider is let's draw or at least come up with a program on what we need and how this lays out to draw an efficient, and we talked about that in Owensboro, to lay it out so it's an efficient drawn building. Now, you can't do that if you're strapped to a block area or something like that. So, what they've said now is he thinks, Paul with DLZ thinks and United thinks he needs about nine acres, I think, was the minimum to do this entire project, if we're still doing three projects. We have to talk about future growth and we have to talk about if we're going to make this expandable. That's one of the things we talked about down there is leaving room for expansion. The other thing we just have to keep in our heads, and like I said connectivity to the courts is really important, but if we decide to build...I'm at 350 so I was 368 this morning, inmates in jail. If we have to displace 800 or 900, whatever the back 40 capacity is, we're talking about displacing that parking even during the construction period. So, I don't know how fast you can throw together a parking garage.

Councilmember Raben: Well then again I discussed that with Commissioner Mosby. That's part of getting this dialogue moving because you would, you would have to begin your parking garage to allow for construction to take place.

Brad Ellsworth: So if it takes two years to build a parking garage, that's two years before we can even start on the construction of the jail. Like I said I've got a lot of bailing wire and duct tape, but I don't know if I've got it to hold it together that long because we're hurting.

Councilmember Wortman: Mr. Ellsworth, you know a last resort I guess if there wouldn't be enough space out there, we could go (inaudible) and get that property. We could do that if we had to.

Brad Ellsworth: That's really not my area. I'm not sure. I mean that's your guys deal. I don't know anything about that stuff.

Councilmember Wortman: The other two potentials would be a parking garage out here where the judges and councilmembers and all park and across the street. That could be some more potential to help the overflow and the crowd at conventions and what have you. We going to get congested here one day. So I think all these things could come together then I think that's what we do. But to me, this is the logical place. Whether it's financially logical, I don't know. But this transportation can get to be a problem.

Brad Ellsworth: Like I said, connectivity to the courts is a luxury we've enjoyed and we'd like to keep it there if it is feasible and we can build the right thing back there and still stay connected to the courts. If not, it doesn't matter if we're one minute

away or ten, it's the same concerns for us. We're going to have to have a staging area, we're going to have to invest in the buses or the vans. You know, that's where we start talking about video arraignments and those types of things. But like I said, if it's a minute or it's ten minutes it's not going to matter to us that much. It is going to require the same staffing.

Councilmember Wortman: Let me ask you, we get back to the Davies County/Owensboro jail, how much additional building or adjustments could be made to meet the criteria of Vanderburgh County, \$9,200,000? Are we talking another \$1,000,000 or \$2,000,000 you think just to meet the requirements?

Brad Ellsworth: Councilman, I don't know. That sounds like an amazingly low price to me for what they got. I haven't researched how they did that. I've talked to some people and what people said doesn't matter here. I called around about prices of jails here in Indiana by that and they are more like what we're talking about here. I don't know. Like I said at the last meeting, I can't understand why if he can do it for \$9,000,000 why everybody in the United States doesn't do it. Lexington, Kentucky was a \$69,000,000 project. Why didn't they hire this guy you know? I mean, everybody is into saving money. I don't know.

Council President Bassemier: Mr. Hoy do you want to address that?

Councilmember Hoy: I asked him about Lexington and he referred to it as a horse barn, we know what Lexington is famous for. They have golf carts in that facility to drive around and they have probably more beds than they need. I'm not real interested in looking at a county, I mean I don't know all their politics in Lexington, I'm not sure I know all our politics in this county to be honest with you. I'm not totally impressed by what Lexington did just because they spent \$70,000,000. I frankly think they overspent it. In Owensboro I can tell you they used inexpensive blocks, concrete blocks, they used faceted blocks for the exterior instead of brick. It was very clean inside. The control room was absolutely incredibly well done and functioned beautifully. The jail does what a jail should do. It is certainly not fancy, on the other hand it is not filthy and it works very well. That's what I saw. I'm going to go back to another topic, and I know you are at the stand and I respect that.

Brad Ellsworth: I'll sit down.

Councilmember Hoy: You may want to stay there, I don't know, or stay on the front row. He rode with me and the next time I preach I'll invite all of you and you'll be amazed. I do that in twenty minutes, Brad. Going back to earlier questions with the Commissioners, and I've had this on my list for a long time, it would seem to me...what bothers me about the contract and this whole process is that there's not a real plan here. I don't see how we can fund a contract unless we know the site, we know what it is going to cost, and we have some sense of what this cost is going to be. There are open ends here. I'm not a lawyer, we have a lawyer sitting here and a lawyer sitting here and I'm sure other lawyers sitting here, I see the judges and they're all lawyers too and other lawyers, the Prosecutor is here and we can get that many opinions legally on this, but this assuming of \$30,000,000 just isn't hard enough language for me. I want to know before I build something, anything, I want to know what the cost is and I want to know what we are buying. With the Centre over here we knew the cost, we knew the size of the exhibition hall, we knew the size of the auditorium, we knew the size of the convention rooms, we knew all of these things and then a bond was let. We connected in this whole process, and this is my point, we connected with this whole process almost from the beginning with

the Building Authority. I get aggravated with the Building Authority occasionally I must admit, but they have maintained this building very well, they are maintaining the Centre very well. If that jail over there, where ever it is from here, could be used for Community Corrections and needs elevator repairs, that's their responsibility. That's why we pay rent here. (Inaudible comment from audience). I know, but they should. And I think that those of us who pay that rent should insist on that. We should insist on the elevator being fixed. I don't know how much money they have in the bank, but I know they have money in the bank.

Councilmember Sutton: Councilman Hoy I think today is an opportune time to follow up on what you are discussing here. I thought that was kind of the reason why we are meeting today. That is to lay out what that process is going to be. I think much of the confusion, discussion, dissension has centered around maybe a lack of communication or understanding from the bodies that are involved with this process about what ought to take place next, or what ought to take place first. I would like to hear from the President of our Council on what he believe that process ought to be. I'd like to hear from the President of the Commissioners on what they believe on what they think that process ought to be. Then I think we ought to engage in some discussion on the merits of how that ought to take place and why certain things should not take place. I think that would lay a very good format, a good foundation for us to really enter into some dialogue. We've kind of bounced all around a lot of different areas today, but we really haven't hit on the heart of the matter and that is what will the process be for getting this jail built? I think that's what we really need to hear.

Council President Bassemier: I think what we've done so far is productive. We've got to talk this out first. I don't even want to vote. I can give you my opinion, but I worked on a major project before and it was \$5,000,000. I know the first thing I had to do with it was find the ground. I had to get a piece of property and I had to get it zoned right, I had to get special permits, feasibility studies. I spent over \$100,000 of my own money to do this. I don't think we're at the point right now to be signing any contracts or anything because there's not enough...we do not have the land, we've got to start with the land. Going over this contract, change the subject a little bit, going over this contract a little bit I'm just curious, we've spent \$5,000,000 on the designs and we haven't even bought the land yet and I don't see anything in here that tells us what we're getting for our money. Maybe it's in here and I didn't see it, but I'm just kind of curious? On that \$30,000,000 is there any suggestion that we are going to get a 500 bed facility, or a jail? Or are we going to get a 225 bed facility that PMSI recommended? Are we going to get our 25 bed juvenile detention center with expansion to maybe 25 more? I don't know what we are getting for our \$30,000,000 and we haven't bought the land yet. So I think the first thing we need to do is, you know I'm only one vote and I'm here to get advice from you all, there are seven of us here on the Council and working with the three Commissioners, we all need to come to some, as I mentioned at first, a common ground of where do we start. I think that we do need to work together. Mr. Raben promised to meet with the Commissioners to find a location and get this started. I'm here for suggestions, I'm only one vote. I really feel like we can't do anything until we find out where we are going to build this facility and then with this language in this contract we need to make it concrete. We really do, this is an open end contract and this should be addressed.

Commission President Mosby: What's open end? I mean I'd love to address your questions because I've addressed Councilman Raben's -

Council President Bassemier: Well, first of all what are we getting for \$30,000,000? What size is the facility?

Commission President Mosby: The scope of service is in the contract if you'll read it. Scope of service, 650 bed jail expandable to 1,000, 300 community corrections-

Council President Bassemier: I don't know I didn't see that. Maybe I overlooked that 600 bed facility. I don't know, I could have overlooked it, but-

Commission President Mosby: The scope of service was named in the Commissioners' meeting, it's not in the contract itself. The \$30,000,000 is addressed in the contract. If the professionals had come down here today, or I'll say next week, they're going to tell you what you are going to get for \$30,000,000.

Council President Bassemier: Well I tell you what-

Commission President Mosby: Because you've based your contract on \$30,000,000 they are going to tell you what you'll get for \$30,000,000.

Council President Bassemier: Yeah I know they can tell me what I'm going to get, but I'd like to see it in writing what I'm going to get.

Commission President Mosby: Well once they come down here to present that to you it will be in writing. You were the one that asked that they not come down today.

Councilmember Sutton: I think my question was what will the process be?

Council President Bassemier: Yeah I know but this is an open meeting. We have to address these things.

Councilmember Sutton: I think that's where a lot of our contention has been. I mean we've got some other issues, I'm not saying there aren't others-

Council President Bassemier: Right.

Councilmember Sutton: I'm just wanting to hear from both bodies how they perceive this process will flow. You've indicated initially that you think we need to get the land, we need to get the ground. I guess I'm maybe wanting to hear the next, and I want to hear them respond to the same question. I want them to walk through that process, I want to hear them-

Council President Bassemier: Okay, let's try. You heard mine.

Councilmember Tornatta: I guess the one thing I wrote down is six one way a half a dozen another. Which way do we go first and does it matter? Do we, you know, let's find that common ground, much like Royce is saying, find the common ground. You want the property first, they'd like to have the person on board to go through and find the five properties or what have you, figure out if the jail is going to work on those properties and how it's going to be most efficient and possibly then throw out two. Possibly that's one way to narrow those possibilities down. What we're doing is we are isolating ourselves to go one certain way, who's got the control, who's got the red cape on? That's not what we're looking for here. We're looking to try to do each of these things that's on this wall in this room and it was supplied by the

Sheriff's office and that is to bring this group together. We've talked about a jail in Kentucky and we're not using that, we've talked about all different kinds of processes, we've spent \$5,000,000 that I really haven't seen us spend yet and in all this we really haven't gotten down to the point. We asked for some people to come in and give us some quality information and that was denied. Now, they are not here, they'll be here in a week, be here in a month, whenever we think we can get this process handled. But to this point we should have their rears in here today explaining to us what needs to be done, talk about some numbers, give us the low down and let us make our decisions from those people. We haven't done that.

Councilmember Hoy: Mr. President?

Council President Bassemier: I'm going to say that I disagree with that. We are not ready for them to come down here but we'll go over here-

Councilmember Tornatta: But you're wanting the information, they have the information.

Commissioner Fanello: How are you going, exactly, how are you going to get the information if you don't have the experts down here giving you the information?

Council President Bassemier: Well I'd like to think-

Commissioner Fanello: Listen, just for a minute.

Council President Bassemier: Okay, I'm sorry.

Commissioner Fanello: None of us sitting here at this table are bond counsel attorneys, none of us sitting here at this table are financial advisors who have the knowledge to issue a \$35,000,000 to \$50,000,000 bond. None of you can answer those questions. I can't answer that question and I know that none of you can either.

Council President Bassemier: Let me have the floor one more time. How do we know, how do they know what we want when we don't know what we want yet?

Councilmember Tornatta: We do know what we want.

Council President Bassemier: That's what we are here today for is to find out what we want so we can tell them, pass that along to them.

Councilmember Tornatta: We know what we want, we don't know what we can afford.

Commissioner Fanello: They were going to tell you what you were going to get for your money.

Councilmember Raben: Let me-

Council President Bassemier: Mr Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: I will yield to Mr. Raben and then I'd like to make a comment going back to what Mr. Sutton said. I think he's on the right track.

Council President Bassemier: Okay.

Councilmember Raben: First of all Mr. President, I think most of the questions today would not be addressed by the individuals that you instructed not to come down. And they do have a fee for that, it's like \$275 an hour.

Commission President Mosby: They were coming down free of charge.

Councilmember Raben: Okay.

Commission President Mosby: It wasn't costing us nothing.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Mr. Pittman was in here at our most recent Council meeting and the question was asked of him, when does the process begin? What is our next step? He made it very clear. We can't do anything until we get a drawing. We cannot begin any part of the process until we receive a drawing in our hands, so why would he need to be here? What's he, he's already made that clear.

Commissioner Fanello: He had a time line for the bond issue. Mike Claytor from Crowe Chizek had budgets to present to give you some information about what his project-

Councilmember Raben: He had a time line? He said...that was the question asked of him, he couldn't-

Commissioner Fanello: Well there are things that can be accomplished before the land is purchased. There are things that we can be doing right now. You guys are not listening. There are things that need to be accomplished right now. There are several things that need to work together. We don't need to just do one before you do number two. There are a lot of things that can happen simultaneously right now and we're not doing that.

(TAPE CHANGE)

Council President Bassemier: Thank you. Mr. Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes, uh, I don't believe that any of the discussion that we have had to this point has been immaterial. This is a public meeting, this jail belongs to the public. It is not my jail, it's not the Council's jail, it's not the Commissioners jail, it's not the Sheriff's jail and that is one objection I had to Owensboro, by the way, they put the Sheriff's name on the jail and I know you are not asking for that. I am not implying that, the Ellsworth Memorial Jail, no. It would probably be the next sheriff, yeah. But, going back, I think Councilman Sutton pinpointed exactly what I thought we should be doing during this meeting and that is we should mutually agree on a process, I would think that in addition to a site on that process we should include a delegated group, perhaps to discuss issues that we may have with the Building Authority. Presently, I don't know how much money they have in the bank to do things. I know that they collect rent and I know that when this fountain was built out here which is the air conditioner for this building, it was a million dollars and they paid cash. I know that when we bought the lot across the street for parking which is where that parking garage down there on Sycamore should have been put, that was a stupid mistake because it would have served the Victory and the Centre and this building, all three, and it would have made sense, it made too much sense I guess. But, we own that and we paid cash for that. They have some money. They

are a player in this and they manage buildings well, the rent is not cheap, but they manage well. I will agree with the Sheriff, I don't think that they have done as well with the jail as they should have done but I think in the process and going back to your point Councilman Sutton, that is what we need to do today. We are not here to write contracts and we are here to set a process and I think that is what we need to do. I would say that step one perhaps is to talk with the Building Authority and to see if this site is feasible or if we need to acquire more property. The downtown master plan has been mentioned and I will soon be 65 years old, I don't know how many of those master plans I have seen in my lifetime and how much money has been wasted. We've gone to round lights and I don't want to go into all of that but you know there is not going to be a central park sitting back here and this building is still going to be sitting here and they are not going to cut a road through the middle of this building and we all know that. That's just not going to happen and those suggestions are absolutely laughable, they didn't even include the jail in that plan at all. So, you know I am not going to even (inaudible) with much more time that what I have spent. But, I would say let's go to the Building Authority, let's look at a site, let's look at specifics about how many beds, how many bed, how many beds, do we want the whole thing together or does it make sense to perhaps separate the juveniles someplace else, I don't know. Then, lay out the plan, get a bonding issue going, we can't fund this without a bond, we may well have to go to the Building Authority or someplace else because of the limitations of our bonding capacity, you know, and have some stuff in here that is much more precise and explicit than what I see. Because what I see here is too much of a blank check period. But, if we set this process up I think we can get from this point to where we build this thing and get on with our lives.

Council President Bassemier: Okay, in all fairness, I have to go back, let's let the Commissioners, you want to comment to that? And then we will go back to the next one.

Commission President Mosby: Councilmember Hoy, I have listened to you, I have listened to Councilmember Bassemier and everybody gets talking about picking a site and then I hear you say later on in the sentence of the paragraph that we have got to know what we want so that we can get a site. Well, there is one way to know what we are going to get or what we want or what we need or what it's going to look like and that is with an architect and until we get a contract and we know what we want and we did vote at one point, we had all of the judges in the Commissioners meeting, we had juvenile and we have had everybody in and we voted to do 650 expandable to 1,000, 20 to 24 in juvenile detention and 30 in community corrections. Now, whether we get all of that for \$35,000,000. That is what the architects have to answer. That is what, they are going to tell us once they've drawn a, drew the design and the CM will work with them and they will give us a price on what that will cost and then they will give us a price on what we can get. The one thing that I keep hearing you say is, let's get a site. I am going to back the Sheriff, the site is not going to drive the jail. That is exactly what you are saying. You know, let's go buy the judges parking lot and end up building it ten stories high because it is not big enough and that is what you are sitting there saying. You keep saying, let's get a site, let's deal with the Building Authority, let's do this. You know, I don't want the site to drive the jail. I want to be sure that I have enough land when I decide to build it, you know, Commissioner Mourdock would say that it is like building a house, I guess you would buy a lot 30x30.

Councilmember Hoy: I don't think I mentioned ten stories.

Commission President Mosby: And try to put a ten thousand square foot house on it.

Councilmember Hoy: Or anything like that. I do like my own words used and not words substituted in my long speeches.

Councilmember Sutton: I think I was the one-

Council President Bassemier: Oh, I am sorry Royce, I will get back, I'll go this way, Mr. Winnecke was next.

Councilmember Sutton: I think I was the one who originally had the floor.

Council President Bassemier: Well, you asked everybody's opinion.

Councilmember Sutton: I asked your opinion and I asked them to give their opinion-

Council President Bassemier: Well, you got Hoy's, now.

Councilmember Sutton: Well, I mean, they never really, I mean, you gave your perspective on what the process would be. They never got a chance to respond on what, and he was responding to Phil, he wasn't really responding to-

Council President Bassemier: Well, okay then back to Mr. Mosby. Well, what do you want to do?

Commission President Mosby: Well, the first thing that I would like to do is get beyond this meeting and get a contract signed. All we have asked is to fund, we have not asked to fund \$5,000,000 and I don't know where it keeps coming up that we want to spend \$5,000,000. We asked funding of \$600,000 through the end of the year to pay for the services that have been rendered or will be rendered through the end of this con-, through the end of this calendar year. Now, it is also in the letter that we sent Counselor Ahlers and I talked to Councilmember Raben, that fees do not have to be paid up front. Fees will be billed in phases and they will be billed as the work is done and they can be billed monthly or quarterly. So, it is not like we are spending \$5,000,000 up front and paying for something that we are not getting. And if we terminate the contract, that is going to be over. So, the first thing we are going to have to do. We need to get an architect on board, get a contract signed, fund the \$600,000 until the end of the year. Then let's move forward and get the architects to tell us that the site we are looking at is capable of handling the building that they are going to design. Not to be, we don't want the building site to be driven, I don't want the building site driven. We will look at the fact that we want to build 650 to 1,000 beds, 300 and 20-24, they come in, they will tell us in approximately a week, or two or three what we can get for the \$35,000,000, \$30,000,000 after the fees and what it would cost to build that. Now, these are the things that gotta be done. I mean we have gotta have somebody on board. I talked to Tom Pitman, you are not going to go out for bonds, you can start some processes, but he said you're not going to go out for bonds until you have at least a preliminary plan or some specs approved and they have to be done with a contract, with an architect. You can't go out and just do a bond without having all of this done, so, I mean, unless we're going to get an architect and unless we are going to get some money appropriated, you know, I am not into stiffing these architects and that's about what it looks like. You know it looks like, it looks like we want to stiff the architect here. You know and I am not going to be a part of that. You know, if we can't get money

approved, then we will tell the architect to halt, you know stop, because we don't have anybody that wants to pay you. I mean, these people have done a lot of work, they've got money invested up front already that, you know, they have more or less did it, what I would call gentlemen, and it's call gentleman's agreement. And I would think that everybody in this room has been a part of that at one time or another but you know it is time that we step up to the plate. We put our money where our mouth is and we say we are going to move forward. You could take a vote today. If you don't want to fund it and you don't want to bond this project, take a vote and we will stop and we won't even build a jail.

Council President Bassemier: We couldn't do that today.

Commission President Mosby: Well, no we couldn't but, on April 4th we voted or you voted, I didn't, but you voted on April 4th, that you were willing to spend \$35,000,000 to do a jail and in that resolution it says either for the remodeling or building of juvenile, community corrections and jail. Everybody wants to know where we get the impression that money is in place, that right there tells me that there was \$35,000,000 voted on in this council. You also set 2.7 million aside February 7th, so people want to misconstrue how do you think you have money available to start an architect and then to pay for a contract that is how you do it. You know I take that as a gentleman's agreement thinking that you people set 2.7 million aside to pay for costs towards this jail and that you are willing to do a \$35,000,000 bond. If I misinterpreted that then I need for you to tell me so. I need for every councilman here to vote and tell me that they made a mistake that day.

Council President Bassemier: No, I don't think that we made a mistake, we voted for \$35,000,000 for a 500 bed facility whatever. We would like to see that \$35,000,000 but according to what we have seen so far, we haven't seen that in writing. I won't take the floor. Mr. Mourdock, I need to ask you your opinion, let's get another Commissioners opinion on your wish list. Mine was land, Mr. Mosby was that we need to hire an architect, is that right? Mr. Mourdock, what is your opinion on this? You are awfully quiet over there.

Commissioner Mourdock: It is not like me, is it? First of all, I agree with what Royce said and what Phil said a moment ago. I think the purpose of this meeting ought to be to define what the process is. And the process is what I think that the first objective of this meeting ought to be and I say that in contract to land or architect or anything else. It's gotta be the process. Obviously, the people on the Council aren't comfortable with where we are with the process. The people on the Commission, the majority of the Commission aren't comfortable with where the people on the Council are. Until we reach some sort of consensus as to how we go forward with this thing in toto, why are we going forward at all? Because this isn't the first, or isn't the last of these sessions, it's just the first of many of them because this is going to be head-butting from now until the cows come home. We have to have some sort of process in place that deals with each one of these issues. Phil said something a few moments ago, and I think I know what he meant, but I am not sure. He said something about having, you didn't use the word teams, but task force or something, maybe that is something that needs to happen between members of the commission and members of the council so that the land issue is dealt with. Maybe that is what needs to happen between selective members of the council and with the architects agreement. We need a plan, we need a plan. I am continually befuddled by the fact, as David said, on April was it 4th, is when the vote was taken here on the \$35,000,000? If this Council voted \$35,000,000 and it did and everything it has done since then has said \$35,000,000 it seems to me with the

words that have come back from architects that apparently that can't build a 650 bed jail plus a 300 bed community corrections plus a 24 bed juvenile, it is time to start setting some things aside to meet the budget. The first issue is what's the budget and you have told us that. And we have to deal with that reality. And until we have the process in place to look at each one of these issues, we have nowhere to go.

Council President Bassemier: Thank you, Mr. Mourdock.. Mr. Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: I would propose that we move forward with a two prong approach to get this process going and it addresses the question Royce raises and Phil and Richard and David. First, I agree with Commissioner Mosby, we need to set aside, we need to set the wheels in motion to fund the \$610,000 that is owed the architect. But, I think that we need to do two things and proceed in two prongs. First, is to renegotiate the contract in phases, the first phase being, so that they can be compensated for the money that you feel they are owed. The second phase, that they be compensated for the land selection process, the third phase you would have to outline beyond that, that is beyond my knowledge. While that is going on I think we should instruct the bond counsel and we work in conjunction with your body and our body to start the process. If we need to pass a resolution to officially get the bond work going, let's do that. But, I think that there are two prongs, two ways we can go, two avenues to proceed at the same time to get everyone's concerns taken care of and not delay this project.

Council President Bassemier: Hold it, Catherine, Dave, do you want to address that?

Commissioner Fanello: Do you want to go first.

Commission President Mosby: I will address it because it is one of Counselor Ahlers questions, he referred to phases and the answer that they give is that yes it does. The service architect provides typically for a following series of phases. Services from schematic design through construction. For reference we list in here again, schematic, 15%; design and development, 20. We got the phases. I mean and they are going to build by phases and I don't understand what you are saying this is a phase.

Councilmember Winnecke: There is no phase, honestly for, that I see for the initial \$610,000. I am just throwing something out to try and get this thing forward.

Commission President Mosby: Well, the \$610,0000, if I'm right, correct me, or if I'm wrong, correct me, but that is the basic services part of this contract, the \$500,000 plus.

Commissioner Mourdock: But, I think what Lloyd is saying-

Commission President Mosby: That is the first thing that you have to do, that is the first 15% of the start of the deal here.

Commissioner Mourdock: But, I think what Lloyd is saying by phases, and correct me, but I think what you are saying is that you have a payment certain for this amount of work, period, and conceivably you could stop there. It is likely that you will go on to the second phase and there is a set payment for that phase. Then there is a third phase, so is that what you are envisioning?

Commission President Mosby: Okay, then Craig has wrote in here, we will provide the Commissioners with a proposed time line for invoicing through the duration of the project, just for such planning purposes at the completion of phase that there is a time period for the owner review so in effect the payment of fees take place phase after phase.

Councilmember Winnecke: I think that is fine. I mean, in my mind that is fine as long as the first phase to me, to set the language in place so that they are compensated for that money, I think that should be the first phase of the contract. They've clearly provided the program for the county and they should be compensated for that and the second phase should be, in my opinion, is selection of the site.

Commission President Mosby: It says design development, but okay.

Councilmember Winnecke: It seems like, you know the consensus is, selection of a site is critical. So, let's make that the second phase of the contract. They're paid "x" number of dollars to be compensated for or to help select the site and then we go on.

Councilmember Sutton: Councilman, let me clearly understand what you are saying. So, you are saying three separate contracts or a contract that separates it into three phases?

Councilmember Winnecke: I don't have a personal preference as to how it is done. Just so it is spelled out in clear language what each step is and what they're being compensated for and what services they're providing.

Commission President Mosby: Okay, in the second phase that you are talking about I guess on site, United will be involved in telling us, yes this is a site and yes the building will fit the site but that is where Bernardin Lochmueller comes in for the \$15,000, they do the site surveys.

Councilmember Winnecke: That needs-

Commission President Mosby: It's in here.

Councilmember Winnecke: It just needs to be spelled out.

Commission President Mosby: Okay, site survey, \$15,000 and it is spelled out in the contract and that is listed as one of the additional fees outside of United's scope. So, I mean it is all in there and that's why I say, they don't actually have site listed in here because they do the basic services, which they call 15% and then they went on to design/development and then contract documents and then to bidding and then construction. This site is done by Bernardin.

Councilmember Sutton: Can I ask us a question? This is the Council.

Council President Bassemier: Yes.

Councilmember Sutton: You know I think that we have kind of heard about what options we are working with for the \$35,000,000 perimeter. I mean, are we prepared as a Council, to look at something different than what PMSI recommended to us on what the complex ought to include. I mean, obviously, that has to be

something that we have to factor in before we really proceed too far into this process. If we got the whole, the entire pie, you know that would be fantastic, if we could get that, but based upon what this Council has set as a cap are we prepared to take less than what we may have ultimately wanted in this process? I think we really have to at least ask ourselves that question and go into this with our eyes open knowing that is a possibility.

Council President Bassemier: That's a good point, Mr. Sutton. But, we are not at that point yet. We have to find out before-

Commissioner Fanello: Councilmember Bassemier, I'm sorry, I was going to comment that I think that is an excellent point and couldn't be more well said, that's a lot of the heart of the matter right here. You said \$35,000,000 budget earlier this year but no one really had a basis for the \$35,000,000. Now if we are going to build what this county needs it may go beyond \$35,000,000 and what we have to decide, which you have to decide and you have to decide it very quickly, is am I building for today or am I building for the future? Personally, I am not going to sign my name to any project that builds for today and doesn't build for the future. So, I think his is a question that has to be answered as it is the whole crux of the matter.

Council President Bassemier: But, we are not ready here today to answer that.

Commissioner Fanello: Well, you may not be able to answer today but you should be-

Councilmember Sutton: I am not saying that we answer the question, I am saying to be prepared when we get to that point to consider that. We may get all or we may get less.

Council President Bassemier: Oh, I am sure that we are prepared, whatever we have to do to get us a new jail because we need it. Mr. Mourdock?

Commissioner Mourdock: Can I clarify something that was said there. Catherine just said that the \$35,000,000 was not to, she didn't use this word but it was sort of pulled out of the air. It is my understanding, and I am asking any Councilmember to clarify this, but the \$35,000,000 was determined based upon the revenues that you thought you could set aside, is that correct? So, that it was not just, not raise taxes.

Commissioner Fanello: And you just clarified my point right there, we are only thinking about today and not tomorrow.

Commissioner Mourdock: No, we are thinking about it fiscally and in a responsible way, which is the Council's function, Catherine. That's what the constitution says.

Commissioner Fanello: Exactly, and I commend them for that and I respect them for that but the decision has to be made. Are we going to go beyond that so that we can build for the future. I mean, we are going to waste more money in the long run building for today and not thinking about tomorrow. So, what's the point?

Councilmember Raben: Could I? I am going to try to put that in the common ordinary business sense, okay? I have been involved in two construction projects in the last ten months, I have two ongoing right now and in the private sector, you don't necessarily build for the ten or twenty year or thirty year projected future. You

build what will accommodate the business that you have today expandable with what you will need five or ten years from now. So, when we address a 650 bed facility, the Sheriff said that we have 360 in there today, I don't think and God bless us if we do fill that thing up in the next five years, if we double our capacity in the next five years there is a bigger problem than what we are discussing here today. So, if the amount of money that we are able to spend brings us 450 or 500 beds, that should accommodate our needs if our system works together like it should accommodate our needs for the next five or ten years. It should, the facility should be expandable for more beds than that but the worst thing we could do is build a jail that 200 beds sat vacant for the next ten years or we will fill them up. The alternative isn't good either way that you look at it. But, I am going to hit on just a few points, Mr. President, that have been brought up. First of all, Mr. Hoy stated that part of our plan of how we begin this process is number one thing was site selection. Number two should be the bonding and what have you. I mentioned thirty days ago that before we can begin that process we must establish an authority. Where are you at establishing an authority?

Commissioner Fanello: I agree with that and there is a time line that Tom Pittman, the bond counsel attorney has for doing that. There is specific steps we take and that would have been presented today had he been here and I will get it to you within the next couple of days.

Councilmember Raben: Okay.

Commissioner Fanello: Those are things that he has to work on, not just us.

Councilmember Hoy: He is joint bond counsel to both bodies.

Commissioner Fanello: Yes.

Councilmember Hoy: And the bonding, we do have to vote on the bond as a Council, that is part of our responsibility.

Commissioner Fanello: Yes, yes.

Councilmember Raben: As far as the \$650,000, have you as of today received an invoice or itemized statement for that \$650?

Commissioner Fanello: I'm going to go back to your question about the building corporation. I believe he has it on the time line, the draft that I saw, to happen within the next three to four weeks.

Councilmember Raben: Okay.

Commissioner Fanello: On the draft, invoice-

Councilmember Raben: And what in that, I mean, since you have seen that, what are they, are you planning to establish a jail authority or use the existing building authority, what's the plans on that.

Commissioner Fanello: I believe that the plan is to establish a jail authority.

Councilmember Raben: Okay.

Council President Bassemier: Hold it, we need to change the tape.

(TAPE CHANGE)

Councilmember Raben: Do we have a itemized statement on that?

Commission President Mosby: They were supposed to be sending one down. When I talked to Craig Burgess last Thursday or Friday he was going to get us an invoice in here the first of the week.

Councilmember Raben: And that would be expected with any bill.

Commission President Mosby: They totally agree. We asked them to let us know what they thought we were going to incur before the end of the year because we would like to budget and pay for what we incur and they said we'll get you...and they just said approximately \$610,000. They said we will get you an invoice on that. That invoice should be coming down and it might be over there, I don't know, I didn't ask Tammy or Patty today.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, if nobody objects, I'm going to hit on one other point. Brad, had mentioned that someone had stated to you that this facility that we would need would need approximately nine acres, was that correct?

Sherif Ellsworth: I think that's what they said--

Councilmember Raben: The source of that was whom?

Sherif Ellsworth: --for what he's designing.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, I might mention this, again the back forty has been brought up a hundred times today. Through a conversation 30 or 45 days ago with Steve Utley, I don't know if Steve is in the crowd today. Steve did you not tell me the back forty was anywhere from 11 to 14 acres.

Council President Bassemier: Mr. Utley, come on up here.

Councilmember Raben: That's okay, I'll just quote him on that then. The back forty is 11 to 14 acres of asphalt so think that site would be okay for the facility that we're talking about needing. Again, I'll stop at any point but I've kind of waited on some other questions within the contract. Does anybody care if I proceed.

Council President Bassemier: Go ahead Jim, you've got the floor.

Councilmember Raben: I look across the room if another Council person or Commissioner wants the floor I'll stop.

Commission President Mosby: The only thing I was going to do was address a couple points you made a minute ago.

Council President Bassemier: Go ahead, Mr. Mosby.

Commission President Mosby: When you were talking about 450 beds, I mean, I will go back to the fact that we had 419 in the jail at one time, no 428. If for 35 million, and I'll just be honest with everybody up here, if for 35 million all I'm going to get is

450 or 500 bed jail then I don't see us moving forward with that project. You're going to accomplish two things. The day we open it, you can break ground on the next one. So you can have a ribbon cutting and a ground breaking because you're not going to build a 500 bed jail and not have it full within the first year. I looked at the PMSI study and they kept referring to 1999. That jail is not going to open in 1999, that's gone. We're going to open in 2005 maybe. So let's look 6 years beyond what PMSI was talking about. When we knew we had 428 in there, I think you're kidding yourself if you think 500 beds is going to hold us. And if we don't build additional Community Corrections, then people are going to end up in the jail. Now that's what I heard the judges tell me in a Commissioners meeting. You can't put them in Community Corrections and then build some beds in the jail.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, I think I was clear on the fact that I stated that it may only be good for the next five or ten years but that's the median designing a jail that's expandable.

Commission President Mosby: You were talking—

Councilmember Raben: To build for those needs—

Commission President Mosby: You were talking about a building for your business, well you probably have that luxury of going out and looking at what you need. Right now we've got a Federal Judge over there telling us that we better build something. We don't have the luxury of just—

Councilmember Raben: We're not under any court order.

Commission President Mosby: We're not under court order, you're right, not yet. I mean, you could be at some point in time. We don't have the luxury of just saying this is what we want. I mean, we're all sitting here building a jail because we know we have to do it. We know what we've had in there and we know what we got in Community Corrections and we know what we got on the waiting list. We know what we got on ankle bracelets. Add it all up and it will tell you what you need.

Councilmember Raben: The pending suit has nothing at all to do with any of the discussion of the new jail. Again, we're not under any court order.

Commission President Mosby: I didn't say we were.

Councilmember Raben: That discussion shouldn't even come up because that carries no clout with the actions that this—

Commission President Mosby: Just before we get there.

Councilmember Raben: Council's taken.

Council President Bassemier: I think Mr. Raben has got a couple more points.

Councilmember Raben: I was going to address a few contract issues and I didn't want to be redundant and I wanted to find out if anybody else was going to hit on these items first. In terms of reimbursable expenses, one concern that I also have on page...on exhibit A page one of two. They discuss mileage will be reimbursed and per diem to be reimbursed and then other items such as overnight lodging. Are those items not part of the 3 million dollar contract?

Commissioner Fanello: No, and they weren't in the Centre's contract either. Reimbursable's are never a part of the fee. There's always a small amount set aside for reimbursable expenses in architectural contract. These are capped at \$190,000.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, I might also...what is the connection with...I'm unclear as to United and DLZ. DLZ is what?

Commissioner Fanello: DLZ is also one of the top rated jail firms in the country. They're a team. As was when Ed Hafer presented his proposal and he was teamed up with Jacob Facilities.

Councilmember Raben: Are they part of the 3 million dollars?

Commissioner Fanello: Yes, there is no extra fee for DLZ. This is all one team fee.

Councilmember Raben: Okay.

Councilmember Hoy: Except for the construction manager. That's--

Commissioner Fanello: Except for the construction manager, which you would be paying that fee to a general contractor anyway. So that's not an additional cost in the project. I just want that to be clear. The construction managers fee is not an additional cost of the project. It is a fee that you would be paying through a general contractor to do a lump sum bid. We're paying someone to do it who can break it down and get us a less expensive bid. I want that to be made clear.

Councilmember Hoy: We'll have to differ there because I think it'll cost us more alone.

Commissioner Fanello: We'll I'm going to differ with you on that, it's not.

Commission President Mosby: Counselor Hoy, you just said they told you that in Kentucky this morning. You said that they just told you this morning in Kentucky that they didn't use a General they used a CM. That's what the CM is. A CM takes the place of your General. You save the additional percentage that the General normally gets and the CM will go out and do your bidding for you. You just said that they did it in Kentucky.

Councilmember Hoy: That's exactly what they did do and I'm concerned that we might also get some other fees with the contractor. When that comes down that's the part that bothers me.

Commissioner Fanello: I want to address one thing that you brought up last week. I think you made the comment and correct me if I'm wrong, something about the architect also serving as the construction manager or you felt like the architect could do what the construction manager would do, is that--

Councilmember Hoy: What I said was that...as on the Centre, over here, we had a local architect that's why we didn't have travel expense because we had a local architect.

Commissioner Fanello: But you still had other reimbursable expenses, postage, things like that.

Councilmember Hoy: Yeah, but there wasn't any travel from Indianapolis or any place else. What I said was that if United and DLZ combined are as good as I think they are, and I believe they're a good firm. That's not what we're debating here at all. If there were a General Contractor, you know, you would not need a Construction Manager. We were not told last week that there would not be a General Contractor. Now, we're being told that today and this points up one of the problems in this process. We need to get this aired out. If we're going to have a Construction Manager and that person then is going to sublet everything that sets a different line item but we have not been told that until today and—

Commissioner Fanello: Well, you can't have both. You can't have a General Contractor and a Construction Manager.

Councilmember Hoy: Well, some people have had them.

Commissioner Mourdock: Sure you can. More often than not.

Councilmember Hoy: More often than not, that's the case. It is done.

Commissioner Fanello: In that case I would agree with you, that you're spending more money than you need to.

Councilmember Hoy: That's my point about clarity. We don't...we've not achieved clarity and we're sitting here, in this meeting, trying to achieve clarity which is not easy. But that helps. If we're going to have a Construction Manager and not a General Contractor then I want that on record.

Councilmember Raben: I've got one last point. Well, I may have others but I'll stop at this point. This is one that I over looked as I've reviewed the contract a week or two weeks ago. I've just picked this up over the weekend. On page 23, under item six. Expense for professional liability insurance exclusively to this project. Is that standard? I might ask the legal Counsel. Is that standard in a project?

Commissioner Fanello: First of all, I'm going to answer that question. That is only if we want excess coverage other than what they're providing. They have provided their insurance sheets that are attached to the contracts. If we desire anything in excess of that—

Councilmember Raben: I saw that. There's two million dollars in limited liability.

Commissioner Fanello: Yeah, if we desire anything in excess of that then they would have to charge us for it. We're not desiring anything in excess of that.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, well it doesn't state excess. That needs to be stated because as I look at it, it's as if we're expected to pay a bill of \$57,000.

Commissioner Fanello: Well, no, that's incorrect.

Councilmember Raben: That's something in the contract that needs to be corrected. I might ask, have either of the commissioners spoke with Dennis Feldhaus as to whether or not he thinks two million dollars is enough liability for this project?

Commissioner Fanello: From what I understand, that's standard. Anybody can correct me if I'm wrong.

Phil Hayes: The Centre was one million.

Commissioner Fanello: The Centre was one million dollars as Counselor Hayes informs me.

Councilmember Tornatta: Yeah, I respect Commissioner Mourdock's opinion and I guess I'm kind of wanting to hear what are some of things that were holding you up and are still holding you up with signing a contract for this process?

Commissioner Mourdock: I guess the easiest way to begin that is what I was saying before, Troy. I want to make sure there is a full process in place and I don't have that sense right now. You know, like Commissioner, I'm sorry, like Councilman Hoy, I just heard a moment ago for the first time that the Construction Manager is going to work in place of the General Contractor. That's not the predominant way it can work. It can work that way. I want to make sure and I think it is mandatory under the oath that each one of us took when we became officials of this county that we have a process in place that everybody knows what's going on here. The Council has its duties to deal with the financial matters. I think you're totally inbounds to ask the questions that are being asked here about this contract. Certainly the Commission has the choice of selecting who the contractor will be and who the Construction Manager will be. But I think to work through that contract in great details, I said before, with some team that's made up of members of this Council plus members of the Commission. I think that's the good way to get this thing started and move it forward. I think having some team look at the various sites together again, meaning people from this Council and people from the Commission and people from the Sheriff's office. I think that's pretty darn important. I hear we don't want to put five names of possible sites out there because the price will go up and I'll argue the opposite. If you put five sites out there and all those people want to sell the competition is going to bring the price down. There's no problem in putting the word out there early. We've got to get some public discussion on this anyway. So, I just want to see a whole series of steps that take place that makes sure that everybody is informed and everybody knows what's going on. I'll go back also to the comments about the 35 million dollar limit. I think the Council has acted in good faith in establishing that limit and I think the Commission needs to act as quickly as it can and I think this is what Royce was saying as well. To find out what we can get with that 35 million. If we just said, kind of slipping from where we are right now, if we just said to the architect how many beds can you build us for 35 million and if, in theory, he came back and said a thousand and we'd say okay good, then we know we have room for Community Corrections because we don't need a thousand bed jail. Instead of building something and then wacking away at it and cutting it to make it fit, I think we ought to be going the other way. Start out with what we're mandated or could be mandated and to do by a federal judge. The judge doesn't care about Community Corrections, the judge doesn't care about juvenile. The only thing we're looking at potentially as an order is the jail. I think we ought to start with our budget and look at that jail on its own to see how many beds 35 million dollars will buy us. If in fact 35 million will only buy us 400 beds then I think we've got another issue before us. But we don't know that.

Councilmember Tornatta: Alright, two questions back to you. Do you have a full process plan that you would like to implement? The second part of that is, you mentioned the 35 million dollars and how it was fiscally right. Are we saying that we will never look at enhancing the process by which we run our county and if that does mean that we have to raise taxes at some point? Are we not willing to do that to try and give people the benefits that they need in this county? I think too many times

we worry about our big record. I don't think anybody is going to throw a plaque on the wall that says that the County Council kept taxes this certain rate, of course the county didn't go anywhere necessarily and we aren't providing some of the same services because we're cutting back to try and maintain that tax level. Those are questions that I've always wanted to know. Just being on a year, I want to know are we maintaining a tax basis so we can be proud of our seven, eight, or nine years that we held it at that level or are we saying that we have to look also at the benefits of living in this county for the people that live here?

Commissioner Mourdock: Well, to answer the second question first, that's the Council's question to answer. You know, I know the Council, certainly its present makeup right now does take a lot of pride in making sure that the taxes have not gone up. Now, if the Council changes its mind on that, they're free to do that. I think, and I've said this once before at that microphone, we could look at the old courthouse and probably poll this community and people would be able to say, and willing to say, yeah I'm willing to see my taxes go up to redo the old courthouse to some degree. I don't think you'll see that with the jail. You know, most people in this community still believe, throw them in and throw away the key and that's what they understand about the jail and unfortunately, unfortunately, I think the (inaudible) heads that the Commission and Council have been at over the recent months with this have only made that situation worse because I think people are frustrated about reading this and they don't care. I think there is a sales job by every one of us in this room to make sure people understand why we need a jail. As far as the first question, do I have a plan? Give me an hour at sitting at this laptop and I could give you a real good plan as far as the various components that I think need to be dealt with multilaterally here with members of the Council and members of the Commission. If we don't do this together it isn't going to happen. You know, we're acting like we're the Taliban versus the good guys. We're having a little war here and there's nothing being resolved.

Councilmember Tornatta: I agree. I think what Mr. Sutton brought up is that, you know, maybe it's as simple as doing what he said. Fill out the flow chart, facilitate the ideas and pull them out, maybe that's what we need, a facilitator, we sat through a meeting that showed that. Sue Ellsperman pointed out that facilitation sometimes brings the best of both worlds to all parties.

Commissioner Mourdock: Steve Utley and I just yesterday were speaking of that same thing. We both used that name. We are back to the point, and I hate to say it this way, but back to the point where Sue Ellsperman can come in with this group if we all put our minds to it and we could work through this thing, I think in two or three sessions.

Councilmember Tornatta: One other thing. I know we've been back and forth to one another. Mr. Raben, and Mr. Winnecke have given valid points on some things in the contract. I think that one thing that Ms. Fanello has done is really worked diligently along with Commissioner Mosby on trying to go through the contract in doing their (inaudible) to get the best contract for this county. I think at times we forget that they are trying to make themselves come away from this project with all the I's dotted and T's crossed and make things as palatable for the county as well as...they have to answer for that particular institution.

Commissioner Mourdock: There is one thing that everyone of us as politicians believes in. There is one thing that everyone of us as a politician works towards and that's to make ourselves look good and that's just the way the system works. I don't

believe that Catherine and David have done anything that they think deliberately would make themselves look bad. Nor do I think that of any member of the Council. The fact is, we all look bad if we're not communicating the way this process should be working.

Council President Bassemier: Good point Mr. Mourdock.

Commission President Mosby: I could only say that over the last 10 or twelve days that I have tried to communicate with the Council and with Counselor Ahlers, I mean, I've met with Councilman Raben, two or three times along with Jack Waldroup from United and I've had conversation with him. I've answered every question that I know they've presented to me. I've still got all the answers today of the questions that Councilman Raben wrote down and the ones that Counselor Ahlers had. So everyone of them questions are answered. To me, I've taken that line to try and communicate. I was hoping at this meeting we'd be further than what we are. I thought by answering them questions and getting them cleared up and you know, what the caps could be on a 30, 40, 50 million dollar jail. I was hoping that would get us beyond this and we'd have the professionals standing here today telling us what we could probably get for 35 million and what it would take to get this, this, and this and a time line of where we need to go from here. That was my whole intent. My whole intent was to have this project move further along than what it is.

Commissioner Fanello: Right, and I would just like to—

Councilmember Sutton: Why not bring them in? Why not—

Commissioner Fanello: Exactly.

Commission President Mosby: I was told it's too—

Councilmember Sutton: I mean, I know what's taken place today but that's history, we're already into this. If that's what is...you guys would like to...the county, not just the Commissioners and Council, but this county to hear from that perspective. I think we need to hear that. I think there's some real valid credence to the whole idea of having some type of facilitated issue. It's very obvious to me, I say here to the question I asked some 45 minutes ago and I heard four or five different perspectives on what the process was going to be. Some of them was similar, some were different. It's very clear that there's not a consensus on what that process ought to be and the merits of why that ought to take place that way. If this is the way we're going we really aren't going anywhere. So people may have some good ideas and have some good justification for that, but the reality is, it's not going anywhere. I think...I would hope that before we leave this meeting today that we leave away with some type of understanding or agreement that we're going to sit down as two bodies and any others who may be interested and work through what that process is going to be and get this thing going. Put it on a time schedule of when these processes, when these things are going to occur and what those things need to be because I hear a lot of discussion, a lot of good dialogue, a lot of good ideas thrown out there, but it doesn't amount to a hill of beans if you aren't going to do anything.

Council President Bassemier: Good point Mr. Sutton. Mr. Mosby, would you want to set up some kind of, I don't know, some kind of a plan to meet with a couple Council members and your group kind of meet in the next few days or whatever?

Would that be—

Commission President Mosby: Are you talking about bringing the professionals?

Council President Bassemier: Yeah, that too.

Commission President Mosby: I was going to answer Councilman Sutton's question here. I thought that was the intent of this meeting as I said a minute ago. That's why I worked with Councilman Raben and Counselor Ahlers. I tried to present you, Mr. President, with an agenda last Tuesday or Wednesday. I took that agenda to your administrative assistant and gave it to her and said please get with President Bassemier and get me an answer. Now, that was to no avail on Wednesday, Thursday and Friday. I went back over to her office on Friday and she said she was meeting with you on Friday afternoon. She said I'll get you an answer. I finally called that office yesterday twice and got a return phone call from you at 2:30 to tell me not to bring the professionals down. I'll tell you, this is how the project is being stalled. I'm not arguing this with you.

Council President Bassemier: No, the project, to be honest with you, the project is not being stalled. I don't think we're at a point yet to bring these people in from Indianapolis.

Commission President Mosby: Well, that's why I dealt with Councilman Raben and met with him—

Council President Bassemier: I knew he was meeting with you too—

Commission President Mosby: —and tried to answer all the questions.

Council President Bassemier: I've been talking to Mr. Raben on your conversations.

(Inaudible) Several talking at the same time.

Commission President Mosby: What I was going to say is Councilman Raben had told me he would try to let me know by Monday's meeting if his questions were answered and the answers that I gave the counselor, if they were sufficient so that we could move forward in this meeting.

Councilmember Sutton: I'm just saying it doesn't solve—

Commission President Mosby: I'm ready to move it forward.

Councilmember Sutton: If that's what you want to do, I'd be interested in getting the information.

Commission President Mosby: I'll bring them down next week.

Councilmember Sutton: If that's what you want to do. I think we'd be agreeable to at least hearing what they have to say. I mean, it gives us a base of information to work with.

Commission President Mosby: As long as you can tell me that we're going to move forward on this contract and that you're willing to fund the 600,000 I'm willing to get them people in here. I don't want them coming in here and then we're going to stiff

them. That's not my way of dealing with people. So if we can't make a gentleman's agreement and we can't sign the dotted line, we've got a problem. You know, that's just the way I feel. If you're willing to say we'll fund the 600,000, we want to move forward, and we'll sign the contract, then we'll have Tom Pittman and we'll have Mike Claytor and we'll have Mark Shireman down here.

Council President Bassemier: Of course that has to come to a vote, but Mr. Mourdock we're just trying to set up something that—

Commissioner Mourdock: Respectfully, David I'll say that from the tenor of what I've picked up in this last hour and half or whatever it's been, I don't know that anybody in this room is going to be able give you what you've just asked for. I'm going to get back to what Councilman Sutton and what Troy said a minute ago as well. I mean, it seems to me that there are enough differences between the Council and the Commission on this. If we want this thing to go forward smoothly we've got to have some better basis of communication, consistently. Not just once, not just to get past the 636,000 dollars or whatever because I can see us going through, well okay we'll do that and then after that is paid we're right back here again on the next issue. That's not going to work for any of us. We've got to have something in place to keep this process moving not just for one check or one payment. Unless we do something as Royce was saying with the continuing process it seems to me we're setting ourselves up to fail.

Commission President Mosby: I've answered every question in the contract that they have brought forward.

Commissioner Mourdock: Understand, I'll give you credit for that David, I believe that's true.

Commission President Mosby: Okay, so what we're talking about here Commissioner is signing a contract and making the first payment. We don't have to make the second payment until we determine that the work is done and they present us with a bill.

Commissioner Mourdock: Well, as an issue of contracts I think, and I'm not the lawyer in the room obviously, but I think once you start down that road and sign that first payment you've essentially signed onto the whole contract.

Commission President Mosby: No, you can terminate the agreement at anytime by the owner.

Commissioner Mourdock: Finish the sentence, you read it before, you can terminate them for—

Council President Bassemier: Let's change the tape, I'm sorry.

(TAPE CHANGE)

Commissioner Mourdock: — state your issue than just what this contract is about. It is about this whole project and the people on the Council and this Commission want to make sure that the way this whole process is proceeding is part of a total plan that is seen from where we are today until we're ready to cut the ribbon and start making the operational payments after that ribbon is cut. And everybody has got to be comfortable with this thing, not just this piece of paper between us and

United and DLZ, or not just this piece of paper between us and Shireman. Its got to be the whole process.

Commission President Mosby: You know, and I guess, truthfully, I don't understand where the problem comes in with the contract. I mean, we've addressed everything in this contract that possibly can be addressed. If it's the fees, I didn't see anybody over there in the County Commissioner's chambers jumping up the night that you wanted to pay PMSI \$135 an hour or \$40,000 to sit and write an RFQ to get to the point of where we're at. We wrote that RFQ in that office over there free of charge. Didn't cost you one penny, didn't cost this Council one penny. Nobody said anything then.

Commissioner Mourdock: Good point, and you know why they didn't say it when we paid PMSI that money?

Commission President Mosby: I'm talking about the additional money to bring them back on board after the first of the year to write the RFQ that we wrote for nothing. You wanted to pay PMSI to write the RFQ to review, to interview them and to select an architect. We did it free of charge. I didn't hear anybody from this Council or anybody else over in that Commissioner's chambers saying hey, we need to see if this is excessive, we don't want to spend this amount of money. We're sitting here talking about a contract and everybody wants to pick it apart over 10,000 bucks.

Commissioner Mourdock: Let me use that as an example, David, and I don't – I think it's pretty well a waste of time to go into history, but I'm going to use one just for example because you brought it up. PMSI, when we wrote that contract, the much maligned contract for \$98,000, nobody in this Council complained about it. We didn't have people jumping up and down saying, why are you wasting \$100,000, because everybody had bought into the process. Half the people in this room had been involved with that process and they knew what was going on with it. And that's what you need to deal with. You're not dealing with necessarily facts, okay, you're dealing –

Commission President Mosby: But you –

Commissioner Mourdock: No. Listen to me, David. You're not dealing with facts, you're dealing with perceptions. Everybody in these chairs has a different perception of this whole project. Whether you like it or not, we have to deal with all those perceptions because we were all equally elected by the people of this county. We have to deal with everybody's perception. We do not have unicameral government. You know, it takes both branches here. And to make this process work, we've got to have both sides fully involved and engaged and committed and willing, and that's what we don't have right now.

Commission President Mosby: And I agree, but –

Council President Bassemier: Why don't we just go ahead and put all this down in the past and let's start fresh. What do you want to do from this point forward?

Commission President Mosby: Sign the contract.

Council President Bassemier: Do you want to meet, Catherine? Make a suggestion because –

Commissioner Fanello: First of all, Councilman Winnecke had two good suggestions. First of all, we need to get a contract signed. We need to get them paid and I think that they could probably provide an addendum like they said that would detail the phases and the payments that need to be made during those phases. I don't think that's a problem. They've said they're willing to do that. We need to get that established and done. We need to get our professionals here to tell us what are we getting for \$35,000,000 or \$30,000,000 construction costs. We need to get the budgets on the table, we need to get the time line from the bond counsel, all these things needs to happen simultaneously. So I'm going to ask Commissioner Mosby if we can get a contract in place and the Council moving on the \$610,000 appropriation, you know, can we get our experts down here to give us the information. We cannot do this on our own. You have to have the professionals involved. And we cannot do this without a contract. I mean, we are not smart enough and we have never built a jail before. We can't do this without having the professionals on board.

Council President Bassemier: You know, our counselor made a point, and I don't want to use you, could you put in that contract, what was it, that 650 beds or the 500 beds or the 250 on the – whatever, they're going to do, can that be in there? I mean, like we said, there's not enough information on this contract to –

Commissioner Fanello: That can be in there, but I think we need to ask the question first, what are we getting for \$30,000,000. If they can't build 650 beds for \$30,000,000, there's no need to put it in there. If they can only build 200 beds for –

Council President Bassemier: Well, whatever we start at but –

Commissioner Fanello: I'm just saying, let's get the budgets on the table. Let's get their estimates, let's get the information from the professionals like we should have had today, and we would be probably much farther along today if we'd had these people standing here giving us the information. But I think right now, you know, we need to have some kind of agreement that we're going to fund the \$610,000, and that we've got a contract in place to get these professionals to keep them working so that we can move forward. This can all happen simultaneously.

Council President Bassemier: Let me ask you, the counselor wants to say something, would you mind if our counselor wrote up something from the first stage to kind of protect us to see what we're getting for the \$650,000?

Commissioner Fanello: I would definitely mind because this is our county attorney for the County Commissioners, and the County Commissioners negotiate contracts.

Council President Bassemier: Well, if they could work together on this then, I mean, that's –

Commissioner Fanello: We've answered all of Counselor Ahlers questions and I don't think there's – unless, I'm sure President Mosby would like to say something.

Council President Bassemier: Have they answered all the questions, legally? I mean, to protect us?

Jeff Ahlers: Well, I guess the answer is – depends on how you define answer. Mr. Mosby and I had a cordial conversation and we talked for about an hour and he

responded to questions I had. At the end of the conversation I don't think either one of us agreed with each other. So, I mean, it depends on – I think they responded but I don't know that in terms of the issues that we raised, I think we've talked around it and I don't think, I guess as Mr. Mourdock said, that there's ever been a meeting of the minds as to what the real answer is for everybody to move forward. I guess one of the biggest concerns and as I hear everybody collectively saying, is that I think at the beginning when Mr. Mosby talked about that in the contract it had the scope and that we were going to get 650 beds and 225 community corrections was juvenile, then it was clarified that it was in the minutes, but not in the contract. And it seems to me that if that is the scope, as you said, that certainly needs to be in the contract. If United Consulting says we can't do what you've set the scope for the \$30,000,000, then it seems like we don't have a contract – I mean, we've got to get a meeting of the minds here so that we make sure we're not into a bait and switch situation. I mean, either they can or they can't do that. And to define that, there were other proposals, I know, from some of the other groups that you looked at for jails that were able to tell you to a penny what you could get for \$35,000,000. So clearly it can be done. Now that's an issue for all of you to decide. It's not a legal issue, it was my intention and I've tried to stay out of all of this, but just to respond to you, the question, I've read the United Consulting response. It was furnished to me by Mr. Hayes and Mr. Mosby. Our conversations have all been cordial, although I'm not sure that we still agree on some of these points.

Commission President Mosby: Well, which point don't we agree on? I mean, I guess that's the question.

Jeff Ahlers: Well, I think the big issue – I can't speak for what we agree on or not. That's the problem. I represent seven people here which makes it a little more difficult than if you represent the governor or the mayor and you've got one client. So it's difficult for me to respond to that question. I can tell you that there are concerns by various members still, on probably more than half of the points that were raised that I don't think an agreement has been reached. But I guess you guys can take a vote and decide if you've reached an agreement. But that's what I hear, but it's difficult for me to speak for seven people, because as you've heard, they all have differing views.

Commission President Mosby: Well, I hear what you're saying and I guess I can try to interpret part of what you're saying, and if we try to address that, and you are right, the scope was in the Commissioner's meeting, the contract says \$30,000,000. We have also asked them to tell us what it will cost if we go 650 expendable, 300, and 20 to 24. In the letter that I sent you after me and you had that discussion, it also tells you in there that what a \$40,000,000 project would cost us and what a \$50,000,000 project would cost us. In their original answer, it also tells you that if the project goes from \$30,000,000 to \$20,000,000 it will be a little bit less. You know, I mean, a lot of it has to do, depends on size. And that's with anything in life. I mean, the more you buy, the more you're going to pay and I don't know how anybody can get around that. For somebody to say that the fees were going to double was totally inaccurate, because if you look at the percentage, if we go with a \$50,000,000 project, the percentage is coming down to around 9.2% as opposed to 10.3. So, I mean, we've tried – and I don't know what other, I guess, questions you're talking about. We've tried to answer, you know, the question on who owns the prints. I mean, he give you three different reasons in there, you know, why they thought they should retain ownership to the prints. They also said, you know, if we have to insert a couple of words to clarify the language, that's fine, too. So, I mean, we've tried to clarify that. I mean, I've tried to clarify every answer that I could

possibly clarify. The day I was sitting at lunch with Councilman Raben he was like, I don't really know, talk to Counselor Ahlers. Well, when I talked to you, Counselor, you was like, I don't have a vote in this. You know, I don't know why I'm trying to negotiate this.

Councilmember Raben: Just to clarify that, you asked me, what would be the legal language, and I said I don't – I'm not an attorney. I'm not qualified to write legal language, that I would prefer that you would have United and your attorney get with our attorney and establish some new language.

Commission President Mosby: Well, the question I was talking about, Councilman, is when I said, what are you really concerned about, what is the main issue. And you said, well, I have two or three, but I don't really know, I need you to talk with the Counselor. That's when I said, tell him to call me. I'll be glad to talk with him. I mean, he went through Counselor Hayes and that's fine, but we did end up hooking up. I tried to answer what I thought you brought up that day and everything I talked to him about, and that's why I faxed him the additional sheet.

Councilmember Raben: A quick important point, you mentioned that in the letter, it states, this pertains to ownership of plans that they state in there that they could change some language. I don't see where that's stated in this letter.

Commission President Mosby: It's not in the one you got. It is in the one I let you read at dinner that day.

Councilmember Raben: Mr. Ahlers' letter?

Commission President Mosby: No. When we went to lunch that day and I tried to address your questions, I let you read that. I'll read it to you again.

Councilmember Raben: You read a paragraph from it but I –

Commission President Mosby: No, I gave you –

Commissioner Fanello: We're wasting time here. We're wasting time. We're going over contractual issues, contract negotiations, where are we headed today? Where are we headed?

Councilmember Hoy: Mr. President, –

Councilmember Tornatta: I got a quick question for Commissioner Mourdock.

Council President Bassemier: Go head.

Councilmember Tornatta: Of the scope, we talked about the scope and at this point the majority voted for the scope, okay, what do you see as the process of attaining that scope for the facility that we want and then how do you propose that we scale that back or what means do you propose of getting to a number if it be \$35,000,000?

Commissioner Mourdock: I'm not sure I understand the question. Are you saying –

Councilmember Tornatta: The question is, there was a scope that was voted on by

the majority, –

Commissioner Mourdock: Right, 650, 300 and 24.

Councilmember Tornatta: Exactly. Now assuming that obviously we're going by that scope which I don't know why we wouldn't, what means do you see for attaining that scope and then what means do you see for bringing that to \$35,000,000 if it doesn't make that, foreseeing the future.

Commissioner Mourdock: First of all, I don't think you can answer that question necessarily as, coming back to Royce's question, you know, what's the first thing you want to do. I see that as being down the road a little bit. If we had these lines of communication open where we were ready and we'd hired the architect, I think what we need to do is the architect, as I said before, is say, okay, now we know our budget is \$35,000,000. We're going to take out the architect's fees and whatever that number is and the construction manager's fees and whatever that is. Now we have, I'm going to make up a number: 30.78 million dollars. What can you build us in jail capacity for 30.78 million? And if the architect at that point comes back and says, well, 30.78 million of hard dollar construction costs will, in fact, build you a 650 bed jail, great. We stop right there. We know we have a 600 bed jail. If he says it's only a 400 bed jail, then I think – I'll follow up with what Catherine said, we have to say, is that what we really want to do or are we going to bite the bullet. Is the Council going to bite the bullet and say, gee, I guess we really do need to raise taxes to do something. But I think you have to keep questioning yourself through this process.

Councilmember Tornatta: I understand.

Commissioner Mourdock: You can't just draw it on the page and say, here it is without any options. I think that's sort of the decision tree you have to build on. But it seems to me we need to see what we can get for that money.

Council President Bassemier: Dave, let me ask you –

Commission President Mosby: And the professionals have that. I mean, they're ready to present exactly what he just said. Here are your fees, here's the CM's fees, here's the amount of money that's left over and here's what you'll get.

Council President Bassemier: Okay, do you need to, let me ask you, I don't think anybody on the Council here, I know several of us, probably the majority is not ready to sign this whole contract, the whole contract, because –

Commission President Mosby: Well, the contract comes as a whole.

Council President Bassemier: Well, can't we piecemeal this thing –

Commission President Mosby: No. I'm not going to piecemeal the jail, and I'm not going to piecemeal the contract.

Council President Bassemier: I tell you what, we probably are wasting our time maybe, because I don't think the Councilmembers will sign such an open ended contract, but we can meet if you want to. There's several things in here that we cannot sign because we do not know what we're getting for our money and so I will say, we can set up a meeting or whatever.

Commission President Mosby: Okay, you don't know what you're getting for your money, and when you bring the professionals on board, that's what you're going to find out. What you're going to get for your money.

Council President Bassemier: Is that before or after we sign the contract?

Councilmember Tornatta: It would have been today.

Commission President Mosby: I was going to say, it would have been today –

Council President Bassemier: We wouldn't have voted on this –

Councilmember Tornatta: It doesn't matter –

Commission President Mosby: I've done signed the contract. I mean, we've done signed the contract.

Council President Bassemier: We're going to meet with the group –

Commission President Mosby: The only thing pending here is are you going to fund it –

Council President Bassemier: – this out first and then we'll have another meeting with –

Commission President Mosby: The contract is not void. I don't guess you understand that.

Council President Bassemier: Oh, I understand it. I've read –

Commission President Mosby: Well, the contract is not void because, I mean, under, I guess I'll have to get my papers out again. Title 36 1.12.5, this contract is not void. The Commissioners have a contract. Now whether you decide you want to fund it or not is another question. If you're going to tell me that your 2.7 million dollar appropriation on February 7th doesn't fund this, and if you're going to tell me that your intent on April 4th to issue a 35 million dollar bond does not give us an intent to go forward with the project, then you back up and you take a vote and you tell me we're not building a jail. And then I'll tell the architects that we just stiffed them and gave them a false impression and that all bets are off.

Council President Bassemier: Counselor, what would you recommend to the rest of the Council? What should we be doing to protect us and the taxpayers on this contract?

Jeff Ahlers: Well, I think the Council already took action within the past month and passed a resolution setting forth that there had been no appropriation and had been no funding of these contracts and so I don't think there should be any mistake and that the record has been clear all along, and that there was no appropriation to fund these contracts. So then, I guess what I am saying to you is that unless you fund those contracts, I mean, I guess it doesn't move forward unless you resolve these differences on the contracts. So I guess it comes down to whether or not, as I hear it here, it's a take it or leave it, or you're able to come together –

Councilmember Tornatta: Right, and we don't want to stall that and may I make a

plan here? May I be a liaison, a one on one liaison with Commissioner Mourdock, and may Mr. Winnecke be a one on one liaison with the two Commissioners, and we try and figure out ways to hash this out? I've had contact with Mr. Winnecke, and maybe that's a possible way to facilitate this before the facilitation.

Council President Bassemier: I would kind of like to recommend Mr. Raben, too, our finance chairman.

Commission President Mosby: There's one way we can decide this. I mean, I talked to Baker & Daniels yesterday. We can take it to the State Board of Tax Commissioners and they'll make a determination. And really, I believe that's the point we're at. Is we just need to let them determine whether I.C. 36-1-12-3.5 is correct.

Council President Bassemier: You want to answer that, Jeff?

Commission President Mosby: So, I mean, that would be the easy way of solving it.

Jeff Ahlers: I think we've already addressed that point. I mean, unless you guys want to rehash that, I think we went through that at the last meeting. We've got our interpretation and you've got yours. I don't think that it makes any difference. You end up in the same place in the end. Regardless of what the State Board of Accounts says, there's been no appropriation, so there's no money there. I mean, you can have a contract and you can sign it and say that we've signed it, but unless it's funded, it's nothing more than that. But that's –

Commission President Mosby: Well, it can be funded out of the proceeds of the bond, so unless –

Jeff Ahlers: Yeah, but there's no bond unless this body approves it. So where's your bond?

Commission President Mosby: That's my question then, did your action on April 4th, was it not good?

Jeff Ahlers: April 4th, what?

Commission President Mosby: When they said we are willing to consider issuing a bond for either rebuilding or construction of one facility or three facilities? The resolution that you passed.

Jeff Ahlers: That resolution said nothing about a bond.

Councilmember Raben: It might have.

Jeff Ahlers: It did not.

Commission President Mosby: Give me a copy of it. I'll get you a copy of it. We've got it over in the office.

Jeff Ahlers: I've got it right here in front of me and there's nothing about a bond. All it was was a resolution to set a cap on the funding. But, I mean, I guess –

Commission President Mosby: To set a cap on a \$35,000,000 bond, okay.

Jeff Ahlers: No. It does not say bond and it's not my intention to get into an argument with you here. But, I mean, it does not say that and I guess the real problem becomes, though, is again, it goes back to consensus. You know, you're saying that we're not going to get what you define the scope as for 35,000,000, so, I guess, if we were wanting to get into questioning each other, does that mean that you intend to disregard the limit? I mean, it becomes really a matter of whether you all want to reach a consensus or whether you don't. But, and I'll be happy to speak with you, Mr. Hayes or whatever you want to do.

Commission President Mosby: I'm more than willing to reach a consensus and a limit. I mean, I would love for somebody to tell me yes, we will appropriate the money. Yes, we'll go forward. And I'd like to get the professionals down here next week and I'd like to see the time lines on issuing bonds, and I'd like to see what we can get for \$35,000,000 and we'll have that information, and what it would cost us to go the other route.

Council President Bassemier: That's a good point. What's your pleasure? You want – I'm sorry, Mr. Winnecke.

Councilmember Winnecke: I'm sorry, I just had to raise my hand high. I was getting a little tired here. I think getting the professionals in...you know, I think that's great and I'm sure they have a lot to offer, but they'll have one piece of the puzzle, and there's a major piece of the puzzle missing and that's our land costs. And that's why I think we've got to look at this thing in phases and I don't think we're looking at the phases. I, too, want to pay the architect for the services rendered to date. And if they can offer an addendum, a one page agreement, whatever it is, with the itemized bill that Mr. Raben referred to, we can see that – we can approve that in our December meeting, we can get that behind us. I think the next phase needs to be somebody determining when – earlier someone said site selection would be done in about three months. Okay, that's February. At that point, you said one to three weeks, I believe, once they look at the sites and say, this site could work or this site cannot work. And then we get the professionals in and say, okay, here are the budgets. I mean, to me, that's where I see this thing going.

Commission President Mosby: And that's where we disagree because I just said a minute ago, I will not have a building driven by site.

Councilmember Winnecke: And I'm not suggesting that, David.

Commission President Mosby: Well, you're saying let's get a site and let's –

Councilmember Winnecke: I'm saying, let's get a site before we know whether we can live within the \$35,000,000. I mean, the issue, if the professionals come in next week and they say you can only get a 450 bed jail for \$30,000,000 and you can't get community corrections and you cannot get a juvenile detention facility, I mean, they're basing that without a land cost, and that's probably the most critical element. I'm just saying, let's figure out where the site is and then tell us what we can do within our means.

Commission President Mosby: They're making an estimation for land cost is what they're doing. And if we put it on the back forty, maybe we save our money. They're making a rough estimation on land cost.

Councilmember Winnecke: So that would be included.

Commission President Mosby: Yeah.

Councilmember Winnecke: Okay.

Council President Bassemier: Yeah, that's the first I'm hearing –

Commission President Mosby: They are going to give you what they consider a total budget. I mean, I've talked with them. They're coming up with all costs that they can think could be included. So, I mean, what you're going to see from the professionals, what you would be seeing right now is exactly what they think you'll get for \$35,000,000 or \$30,000,000 and then they're going to tell you what they think a jail, community corrections and a juvenile detention will cost you. And they're also, I've asked them to break it down just to do two, jail and community corrections and possibly jail and juvenile detention.

Councilmember Winnecke: Okay, that's great. Then can the contract be redone, however you want to phrase it so it breaks down these phases, because the first element of the contract, of the phases that you described earlier, calls for schematic design, 15% of whole, so that's roughly \$462,000. That's why I think it needs to be, the contract itself needs to be redefined and these more clearly defined phases. The first phase being the program scope, they've already provided, and that would include the 600 some odd thousand dollars. The second phase would be however the language would be written to include determining where the land is or where the site is. The third element of that would be whatever needs to happen beyond that.

Commission President Mosby: Well, and as I said a while ago, you keep referring to site, and United and DLZ are not doing the site, Bernardin is. And that site can fall right in before design development. All we got to do is get something from the architects that tells us, you can put this on five acres or you need 20.

Councilmember Winnecke: And that's fine, but –

Commission President Mosby: There's no sense in looking for five and buying five if we need 25.

Councilmember Winnecke: But let's lay that out in the contract. And I do not think that's clearly defined in here.

Commission President Mosby: Well, and I think as the Sheriff stated a while ago, I mean, he has worked with them, they have looked at a couple of sites, and they have told us, I think, bare minimum is nine but there's probably (inaudible) more comfortable there. And that's what we're looking at. But, you know, I mean, –

Council President Bassemier: At what cost?

Commission President Mosby: I'm just saying, you know, they're the professionals, let's get them on board, let's deal with them.

Councilmember Winnecke: And I'm saying I agree with you. But let's do it in clearly defined phases –

Commission President Mosby: And I will disagree with you and President

Bassemier, that this is an open-ended contract because I've addressed everything that you two have said.

Councilmember Winnecke: I'm not saying it's open-ended, I said –

Commission President Mosby: It might not agree to you, but, I mean, we've addressed –

Councilmember Winnecke: I just want to say it's not clearly defined.

Council President Bassemier: I tell you what, I've got Sandie right now, she's looking up a date for next week maybe, if that's okay, and see if we have to advertise that. Jeff, do we have to advertise that? We probably do again.

Commission President Mosby: Next week, we're going to be out of town Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday.

Council President Bassemier: Okay, well you all suggested a meeting, so...you got some dates? We've got to move on here.

Commission President Mosby: I guess – when are you coming back?

Council President Bassemier: We'll change the tape here.

(TAPE CHANGE)

Commission President Mosby: – do something next Thursday at like 2:00 or something. I'll just come on back.

Council President Bassemier: And to address it, the open-ended contract, the reason why I said that was because we do not have a land site, some of this ground in Vanderburgh County is going from \$50,000 to \$100,000 an acre, and we might need 20 acres. So –

Commission President Mosby: Let me ask you a question, President. Are we coming back in here to negotiate contracts or we going to come back in here and move forward?

Council President Bassemier: Well, I think we moved forward today.

Commission President Mosby: I don't. I think we're still at the same point when we walked in this room.

Council President Bassemier: Well, you know the story about opinions. But we're going to set up a meeting and we'll get your experts – I'm sorry, Jeff. We'll get your people in here and we'll go from there, but I think this was a productive meeting. I think there was some very viable points brought out in this meeting. I don't think the other group should have heard just yet, because we haven't ironed all this out yet. So can we set up a meeting to continue this meeting? Mr. Hoy, you got something you want to say?

Commission President Mosby: No, I ain't setting (inaudible) --

Councilmember Hoy: Yeah, I'm not sure we've moved at all, one point on which I

agree with Commissioner Mosby. I'm not sure we've moved that far today at all. It would seem to me that we may need a facilitator a mediator or someone who would get us to the point where the process that is set up and the contract that is signed dovetailed, and work together in an orderly fashion. I do not believe that that is what we have in this contract at all and unless there are substantive changes in this contract, no, I won't vote for it. I will just say that plainly. I think that's why we need to sit down and mediate something that brings together process and contract. I think Mr. Winnecke is on the right track at that point. I think a lot of us are and I think that's what we need to do. I also am not wanting to stiff anybody. I have no desire to stiff United or DLZ, but it's my job as a County Councilman to make sure that the county is not stiffed and I think this contract stiffs the county. It's too open. It needs to be tightened down and I think that we need to do that in a mediated meeting. And that would be my recommendation because I think if we come back without some kind of commitment to that sort of process, we'll be sitting here saying all of the same things, having all of the same arguments. Because the issue here between these two bodies can be summed up in one word and that issue, and this is not going to be popular, nobody is going to like me saying this but it's how I feel, and I always say that and I always say how I feel, we have an issue of trust here. That's the issue, and that is the major issue we're dealing with. And that's why I think we need someone to mediate us and bring us together so that we achieve a level of trust so that we can get this project done, financially take care of the architects who have been selected, that's been done, and move ahead with a contract that we can live with.

Council President Bassemier: You all have a problem with that, getting a facilitator in here and –

Commission President Mosby: I do. I mean, I'll go back to what you said a minute ago. I mean, he's talking about the contract and I think, what'd you tell me, we know what opinions are, something that like. That's what you said. I mean, everybody is going to have an opinion and I guess if he wants to do my job, he doesn't feel like I'm capable of doing my job. He's sitting there telling me I can't do my job and he doesn't feel like this contract is worth the paper it's written on. Well, I have a job to do as a County Commissioner and it's to get a contract and sign it, and he has a job to fund it. So I'm not going to come over and try to tell him how to fund it and I'm not going to tell him what's the best way to do it.

Council President Bassemier: You know, back when Mr. Mourdock had that Blue Ribbon Committee it worked very well. We had a facilitator, we had everybody involved, the Sheriff, the Prosecutors, the Council and the Commissioners, and it worked fine. So, would a facilitator, I think it would work fine –

Commissioner Fanello: I'm going to give you my honest opinion on that. If we're all not mature enough in here as elected officials to work this out and we need a mediator in here, we all better step down.

Council President Bassemier: Well, it's not exactly a mediator, you know, they bounce ideas back –

Commissioner Fanello: No, this is like go to your corner, time out.

Council President Bassemier: No, it's not. If you'd been there, it was very productive.

Commissioner Fanello: No, we were hired – I am not going to spend taxpayer dollars to get a mediator in here. We are all of an age, and adults and elected officials for goodness sakes. If we can't work this out, this is ridiculous.

Council President Bassemier: Phil?

Councilmember Hoy: I think it's ridiculous for you to ask us to sign such an open-ended contract such as this without some substantive changes in it that ensure some sort of financial safety for the Council. Mr. Mosby did –

(Inaudible – Councilmember Tornatta interrupting Councilmember Hoy)

Councilmember Hoy: If you were going to quote me, please quote what I say. Don't say I'm talking about ten story buildings when I'm not –

Commission President Mosby: I didn't say anything about a ten story building.

Councilmember Hoy: And don't say that I am telling you you can't do your job when I'm not saying that. What I am saying is, we have a roomful of major differences, they're not just between you and me, there's quite a number of them here and all I'm saying is, we need someone to bring us together. I don't think that that's an admission that we're not mature individuals. In fact, I think to have someone convene us and work with us as a mediator would demonstrate that we are mature individuals who would be willing to sit down and have genuine, thorough, thoughtful compromise that will get us to the point of building the jail that we need to build.

Councilmember Tornatta: And I agree with that, Councilman Hoy. I think that the facilitators are used in Fortune 500 companies on down. That's a, they're very positive role people. The first thing I asked was would it be possible to have a liaison to the Commissioners to see if something could not be, some of these problems, communication problems, can be brought out. Now that's one thing, Commissioner Mourdock, that you brought out about the communication lines. I'm throwing my hand across the aisle to say I'll be your liaison and go across and if Mr. Winnecke would do that, he would be liaison there, and try and work some of these issues out. Now that's what I have offered across, now what better communication can you have there than to do that even before a facilitator is on board?

Commissioner Mourdock: If that was a question directed to me, I'm certainly open to talking to you any time, any place, Troy. We've met before outside this building and I'll do that again. However, if we're going to do that, I need to be privy to all the communication. I keep hearing about a letter that's gone back and forth between the Commission and Council, I've never seen it. So I don't know what's been addressed in the letter David's talked of, so I agree with Phil. I mean, this issue is bigger than the contract. It isn't about the contract. I think in one sense, Catherine, you're right. We've wasted a lot of time here today because we're talking about the contract and it isn't the issue. It is trust. This group, everybody in this room has got to work together. And until we do that and recognize that all of us have a role, it isn't just the Commission's role to sign a contract, I mean, we have to communicate. It isn't just the Council's role to approve funding, they have to communicate. They have the right to their views just as we have the right to ours. And if we have to have some give and take, that's what it's going to take.

Commission President Mosby: And I totally agree with you. They have a right to their views and we have a right to ours, and if I don't agree with them, but it's their

job to do it, I mean, I can't talk them out of it.

Commissioner Mourdock: That's right, but you can't talk them out of it just by saying here it is, take it or leave it, which is the way it's perceived.

Commission President Mosby: That's not the case, Commissioner. I told you over the last 12 days I've tried to work with them. I've tried to be the facilitator myself.

Commissioner Mourdock: David, you're not hearing what I'm saying. It doesn't matter what you think in the sense of how this is proceeding. What matters is how people are perceiving it. And they're perceiving that the issues aren't being addressed. And somehow we've got to change that perception.

Commission President Mosby: Okay, and that's what I want to ask Councilman Hoy when he says there's no caps on the funds, and I've heard him say this five times today, what is not capped? I mean, that's just my one question. What is not capped? What are you uncomfortable about?

Councilmember Hoy: I'm still uncomfortable with the fact that the scope of the project is not spelled out specifically in the contract, that's one. I'm quite concerned that we haven't, we don't have a plan in place for seeking a site. You have said quite correctly that we don't want the site to dictate, however, whatever site we choose will dictate some things. It always will. The footprint of that site, no matter where it is, will dictate some things. The other thing that will dictate the site and the building are financial considerations. I am not comfortable with the word, assume, in the contract in terms of the 30 million. That's too vague a word and it is a word that attaches to a lot of the contract that I think is too vague. I think probably as we push this down the road, we are going to have to be very intelligently discussing whether or not we do all three facilities and what we choose first. I've already gone on record as saying I do not believe we should have a 300 bed community correction complex. I realize that they're mostly gone, I think there's two judges left, three, and a juvenile judge, who is interested in the juvenile section. But I think, you know, that we may have to trim that expectation because what we're being forced to do legally is to build a jail, period. I'd love to see a juvenile facility. I think I would put that ahead of community corrections on my list but others may not do that. That's why we need to sit down together. And that's not clear. And I am not content with United's answer about who owns the plans at all. And I want it to be clear that United, DLZ and we, all of us, stick together throughout this whole process because you can get out of (inaudible) and that's always had to be in there, but that does give an escape clause. And I don't know that it's possible to change this, but I am not comfortable with the amount of fees that are connected with this contract, even though I am aware that you all have looked at other contracts in other cities. I am just looking at my own feelings about what this costs. And I think those costs are too high and they need to be more carefully delineated should we expand this project and we might. So those are the things you asked me and that's my answer, what I'm uncomfortable with.

Councilmember Raben: Mr. President –

Commission President Mosby: I couldn't remember all of –

Council President Bassemier: Jim, Mr. Winnecke and then I'll go to you.

Councilmember Winnecke: Did you want to respond?

Commission President Mosby: Well, he started at one. I was trying to keep track, but, I mean, I lost count at about six. And, I mean, I don't know which one to even refer to first, but, I mean, I guarantee you, I could sit down and answer 99% of what you just said. Do you have the paper that I sent Counselor Ahlers?

Councilmember Raben: David, let me interrupt just a moment. They answered it in their terms. I mean, the first item addresses ownership of plans and as to why they feel that under no circumstances should we own those plans. Nowhere does it address that they're willing to make any amendments to those articles. Nowhere. And if these plans, you know, if these plans are custom plans, if they're not plans for another jail, you know, I assume that for \$3,000,000, these are going to be custom. I should be able to travel anywhere in the United States and not find another jail like it. For \$3,000,000 I'd better not find it in St. Joe or Porter or somewhere else. So if these are genuine custom drawn plans to our specific needs, then we should have ownership to them. There is one phase in the contract, give me a minute to find it, but it states – what it's pertaining to is at some point should you decide that you want to renovate or extend from the existing facility, that you would have to get written permission from United to do so. That sounds simple, but what if they decide not to allow you to do that? So then you have to –

Commissioner Fanello: What page are you talking about?

Councilmember Raben: I'm finding it. But, David, you're exactly right. They did supply a reply, but it's just because they replied doesn't mean we go along with it. And again, what Councilman Hoy is saying, I don't think we're going anywhere until we work out all these problems within the contract. And I've asked, I've begged and pleaded that one or two of the Commissioners sit down with one or two, maybe Republican and Democrat from both sides, from both bodies, sit down together, work out the problems along with our Council, work out the differences in this contract. And again, I've only addressed my concerns. I don't know about everybody else's. And Catherine, give me just a moment and I'll find that.

Commission President Mosby: Well, Councilman, you say they replied. I mean, you asked me to ask them what would be the total amount of dollars for 30, 40 and 50. I mean, they supplied the information. It's right there in black and white. I mean, now if you're going to tell me you don't agree with it and you want to pay them whatever you think they're worth, I mean, that's a different story. I don't come in and dictate a price on your tires.

Councilmember Raben: They answered part of that, but again, part of my concern was a better definition of scope, change of scope. You know, when they state throughout a contract a change of scope –

Commission President Mosby: Okay the change of scope, and it's like they addressed in one other letter that I had. Change of scope is if we go from \$30,000,000 to \$20,000,000, the fees get smaller. But if we go from 30 to 40, of course, they increase a little bit.

Councilmember Raben: Do they state that in the contract as being the clear definition of scope? Where in the contract do they clearly define scope?

Commissioner Fanello: I don't understand and I wish someone would clarify because I really want to understand. When everybody says the scope is not clarified, what are you looking for in the scope? What do you think the scope should

say?

Councilmember Raben: Our point exactly. What is that? Is that change in light fixtures in the project? If we go from porcelain light fixtures to something else, is that change in the scope?

Commissioner Fanello: No.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, let's define exactly what is scope. I mean, I'm asking you. You define that for me.

Commissioner Fanello: I understand that, but we might have a hundred pages of what a change in scope is. I think –

Councilmember Raben: For \$3,000,000, what could have the potential of being ten million dollars, I'd say it's important enough that they take 500 pages. Let's have it in the contract.

Commissioner Fanello: And I don't know that the answer is not – and I don't know that the answer is not – well, I just don't know that the answer is not in the contract. I'm going to look for it myself.

Jeff Ahlers: So, Mr. Mosby defined the scope and thought it was in the contract but then said that it was not.

Commissioner Fanello: That's not the scope he's talking about.

Councilmember Raben: As to the other comment I made, Catherine, it's at the bottom of page 13. It says the owner shall not use the instruments of service for future additions or alterations to this project or other projects unless the owner obtains prior written agreement with the architects.

Commissioner Fanello: And I imagine –

Councilmember Raben: So ten years from now, if we need to add another pod to that jail, and we want to use those blueprints because we know how those walls are designed, that we need to knock holes into, they're stating no, you can't do that unless we give you written authorization. I mean, it wouldn't behoove them to give us written authorization because they may want to draw –

Commissioner Fanello: And I would like for them to clarify if that's what they mean or not.

Councilmember Raben: And again, there's tons of those. I addressed the insurance issue, I addressed there's one paragraph that states that there is no limitations on cost, let's –

Commissioner Fanello: Jim, we could sit here all day. Each one of us have a different interpretation of this contract. You know, this contract has been negotiated in the best interest of Vanderburgh County and I resent anyone at this table who says it wasn't because I don't think I was elected to take care of myself. I was elected to take care of my constituents. And what I am saying is that we can all have a different interpretation, but I think the attitude that we're taking with this is, well, you didn't negotiate that in the best interests of the county. You know, this

must be wrong. That's not the case. If you have questions, that's fine. But I think we're getting to the point where we're nitpicking here.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, well again, what I think we need to do, I think what Mr. Hoy said and I think I've heard Councilman Winnecke state, this Council is not willing to go any further until first we work out the little problems that we see within this contract.

Commission President Mosby: Okay, Councilman, I just want to address scope for a minute. And in paragraph, it tells you here, in paragraph 1a, scope describes a project to contain a jail component and community corrections component and a juvenile detention component. Paragraph 1.1.1.1 –

Councilmember Raben: Wait a minute. Where are you at?

Commission President Mosby: I'm giving you the paragraph numbers.

Councilmember Raben: Page two?

Commission President Mosby: No, I'm not in the contract. I'm just giving you the paragraph numbers that –

Council President Bassemier: He's on that response back to –

Commission President Mosby: And it's the paragraph 1111 also describes the project of consisting of jail, community corrections, juvenile detention components and further states that all shall be of new construction. 1.1.1.3 establishes the construction budget at \$30,000,000, 1.1.2.1 describes the objective or the use of the facility as consisting of the three aforementioned components. We feel these provisions more than adequately set the size, scope and nature of the project. They are addressed in them four paragraphs and it tells you what you're getting and establishes a budget. And it's as far as they can go with scope until we decide the next step and that's after the architects tell us what we can get.

Council President Bassemier: Mr. Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Two things. One, to Councilman Tornatta's suggestion earlier, I mean, I'd be happy to act as liaison or I'm sure Councilman Wortman is, I think he's officially the Commission liaison, but if it's Curt or myself, I mean, I think either one of us would be glad to do it. You know, gosh I'm whipped. Now I think the horse is about dead today. And if I could offer a suggestion here, maybe the thing to do is have us and Jeff draft or draw up specifically all the fiscally related issues of the contract that we still have issues with, get them to either you or Counselor Hayes in the next week, ten days, whenever the time frame is. While that's going on, you guys continue to bring your professionals down at a mutually agreed upon date to hear what they have to say and we can keep all this dialogue going. But I think if we go much further today, you know, we've all got dinner plans, I suspect. And I've got to be at work at 8:00 in the morning.

Council President Bassemier: Catherine, hold on. Would you all agree to that? If I nominate two people to work with two of you or all three of you, would you all agree to that?

Commission President Mosby: Susan ain't going to agree to that.

Council President Bassemier: Who?

Commission President Mosby: Susan. Not if two of you is going to work with three of us.

Commissioner Mourdock: Wait a minute, who says it can't be a public meeting? I mean, just make it a public meeting.

Commission President Mosby: That's what this is. Where are we getting?

Commissioner Mourdock: Well, hopefully we're making some progress. But yes, it can work, Ed. There can be public meetings. All we have to do is advertise them.

Council President Bassemier: Okay, well, what's you all's pleasure? Do you want to meet again and bring...I guess we just keep it at –

Commissioner Fanello: I just have one question. Councilman Winnecke said that we would address fiscal related issues with the contract and that's within the Council's realm to ask questions about fiscal related matters. But Councilman Raben is bringing up all kinds of questions. So are we going over every page of the contract, which is really not within the scope of the Council's duties, or are we addressing the fiscal matters?

Councilmember Raben: I addressed one that may be borderline, and if you really think about it, it has everything in the world to do with the financial aspect of it. Ownership of plans that you're paying \$3,000,000 for to design, when that project is done, I would assume that I own those plans for any future needs or use I may have for them. That is a financial matter.

Commissioner Fanello: And I understand –

Council President Bassemier: I'm going to take one more question. Evidently, we can't have –

(Inaudible)

Council President Bassemier: We're not agreeing on a facilitator, we're not agreeing on meeting, so I guess we'll have another open meeting. Do you all – Mr. Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: I wanted to make a motion just to the Council, Council motion, I want to ask our legal counsel, Mr. Ahlers, if what I'm about – I'm going to make a motion, an overture motion. May I do that in this meeting of this Council for the Council?

Jeff Ahlers: Sure. This meeting has been advertised. I mean, you just can't make appropriations.

Councilmember Hoy: Okay. I move that the County Council overture the County Commissioners to have a joint meeting with a facilitator present to work with us on establishing a process and on making clarifications and changes in the proposed contract.

Council President Bassemier: Do I have a second on that motion?

Councilmember Raben: Second.

Council President Bassemier: Second by Mr. Raben. Any discussion?

Councilmember Tornatta: I don't know that we can change the contract. What are you talking about changing the contract?

Councilmember Raben: We have to have a contract to sign.

Councilmember Hoy: I'm just talking about discussing those changes, that we have a facilitator, that we overture the three Commissioners to have a facilitator help us get to this point that I spoke of a while ago.

Councilmember Tornatta: Can I say, if you're having a facilitator, could we not make the facilitator address some of the problems as opposed to trying to come up with some different areas in the contract?

Councilmember Hoy: That's what –

Councilmember Tornatta: I think we talked about a process. If we're doing a process, a facilitator might be a good area to do a process, but to go through a contract, I think that's A) it's borderline stepping on the boundaries of this board and B) it is being vague for a facilitator.

Councilmember Hoy: Yeah, all I want – and your point is well taken. I don't want this person to write the contract, I simply want them to try to bring us together on a process and on points where we can have some agreed give and take in this contract. We would not be writing the contract, but I don't think, I'm not sure I can divorce the two in mind. That's why I put the two together and see where that – surely that would move us, you know, a step forward in terms of getting us together and all I'm saying is, let us overture the Commissioners and then the Commissioners, or they're also in session, they can respond. I would just like to see us try this and whatever funding it takes to bring this person in, it wouldn't be a great deal of money to do that.

(Inaudible – several conversations held at once)

Commissioner Mourdock: Turn the mike on.

Phil Hayes: (Inaudible – comments not made from microphone) and I'm just concerned that...

Jeff Ahlers: You don't think this falls in the purpose? I'm just saying, I think Council just votes, you guys, if you want to vote separately, but, I mean, this all falls within the purpose of jail contracts doesn't it? I mean, if you want –

Phil Hayes: I'm concerned about the shape of the Open Door Notice. (Inaudible – comments not made from microphone) I'm concerned that it's too broad for the Open Door Law and just (inaudible) rather than a formal (inaudible) you might still be within the framework of discussion (inaudible). That's the only, just an observation.

Jeff Ahlers: Well, and I appreciate you pointing that out. I guess my thought was is that I thought the purpose of our meeting was –

Teri Lukeman: This is the ad.

Jeff Ahlers: It says for discussion of and action on contracts and services for jail and corrections projects. I guess in my mind, I would think that this motion is part and parcel of saying this is what we propose that we do next in that step on that issue. Isn't that the intent that it is?

Councilmember Hoy: That's the intent.

Council President Bassemier: Okay.

Phil Hayes: (Inaudible – comments not made from the microphone)

Jeff Ahlers: You're suggesting you think everyone has to vote on it?

Phil Hayes: No, (inaudible – comments not made from the microphone)

Commissioner Mourdock: May I ask a –

Jeff Ahlers: That's up to Councilman Hoy. You know, I don't know. No, no, I mean, that's fine. I guess all I – I don't know. I guess I see it as being on the topic and I guess either body can take action. At first I thought you were saying we had to vote together or something.

Council President Bassemier: Let's change the tape.

(TAPE CHANGE)

Council President Bassemier: We have a motion and a second. Discussion?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes, discussion and referenced to a mediator more or less in them terms?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes, a mediator or facilitator.

Council President Bassemier: Facilitator, same thing. Okay, I have a motion and a second. Any more discussion? Roll call vote with County Councilmembers only.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Uh, because I don't understand the total scope of this I have to vote no.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: No.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

Council President Bassemier: Yes. So that is 4-2, it passes. (Councilmember Sutton left meeting before vote was taken). No, where are you, we will turn it over to you now.

Commissioner Fanello: I personally like Councilmember Winnecke and I will still work with you to go over these questions, but I am going to, I am going to make a motion here, I will go ahead and make it but I will also make it again at Monday night's meeting, if I need to. I make a motion that we direct our President to set up a meeting with the State Board of Tax Commissioners, I believe the County Auditor will need to be involved in that. But, I believe that this is something that can be decided by the State Board of Tax Commissioners and we won't need to pay a facilitator and waste taxpayer dollars. So, I am going to make a motion that we get that moving and get that meeting set up with the State Board of Tax Commissioners, because I have been told by our bond counsel that that is where we can get resolution on this issue and I think that is where we need to go.

Commissioner Mourdock: Do you agree Catherine, even if, and I think that is what I heard Councilmember, I am sorry Counselor Ahlers, say before, even if they rule yes to the validity of the contracts, that it is still dependent upon the council to approve the bonds.

Commissioner Fanello: That is, I want their opinion and ruling.

Commissioner Mourdock: But, do you agree with that?

Commissioner Fanello: I don't work for the State Board of Tax Commissioners. I want to get their opinion and ruling. I can't give you an answer because I don't have all of the answers.

Commission President Mosby: What was your question?

Commissioner Mourdock: My question was, and I heard Jeff say, that even if the State Board of Accounts --

Commissioner Fanello: Commissioners.

Commissioner Mourdock: Thank you, Tax Commissioners comes through and says, yes, the Commission has done the proper thing here and that maybe the contract isn't null and void, it still becomes dependent upon the issuing of the bond.

Commission President Mosby: Right.

Commissioner Mourdock: The question is then, do you agree that the Council is ultimately involved with issuing that bond?

Commission President Mosby: Then the council will have to issue a bond, I agree. We just need to clarify who is going to sign this contract and we are not getting it worked out here, so, I mean, she has a motion on the floor.

Unidentified: Is this discussion?

Council President Bassemier: No, that is not us.

Commissioner Mourdock: No, this is ours. I don't have any problem going for that information because it is still going to be the Council's call. So, I will go ahead and second.

Commission President Mosby: Okay, a motion and a second, so ordered.

Commissioner Mourdock: Okay, I have one other motion, if I could then, just to be consistent with what the Council just did, I would move that the County Commission act in a, call it a shadow motion, to the words of Councilman Hoy here a few moments ago regarding a facilitator.

Commissioner Fanello: I am not going to second that because I am not going to waste taxpayer dollars for things that we can work out ourselves. I am willing to sit down with Councilman Winnecke and get some questions answered. I am willing to sit down with Councilman Tornatta and have done so. I called Councilman Raben last week and he wouldn't return my phone call but I will sit down with Councilman Winnecke and get these things worked out but I am not wasting taxpayer dollars on a facilitator.

Council President Bassemier: Jim, you can address that now since you pointed your-

Commission President Mosby: Since, yeah, this is our meeting, I will just be honest, since we are going to do this and go to the State Board of Tax Commissioners just to go ahead and get clarification, I don't see right now where it is going to be beneficial to do that.

Council President Bassemier: Jim, do you want to sum this up? Evidently we didn't go anywhere.

Unidentified: It died for lack of a second.

Councilmember Raben: Now, I guess now I am confused. You have taken the position then that your actions that were taken when you signed this contract, that you stand behind that you still consider that the contract is valid and that no legal, illegal action was taken, with that, understanding your position and the statute that you quoted from earlier that states that any payments made to the contract would be paid out of bond proceeds, I guess I would interpret that that the request for the appropriation December 5th has been cancelled, correct?

Commissioner Fanello: No, I believe we need to pay them for the work to be done.

Councilmember Raben: Now, you can't have it both, the best of both worlds.

Commissioner Fanello: You are still going to get reimbursed from the bond issue, Jim.

Councilmember Raben: Again, your position-

Commissioner Fanello: You are not paying them, you are not paying the-

Councilmember Raben: It states that what you've done is legal so long as it's paid out of the proceeds of the bond.

Commissioner Fanello: And you can be reimbursed and that is-

Councilmember Raben: Well, you can't have the best of both worlds.

Commissioner Fanello: Well, the State Board of Tax Commissioners-

Commission President Mosby: Or other fees, it states, I mean it states that in the contract. You can pay them out of the fees that you set aside, the 2.7 million.

Councilmember Raben: I am going to stick to your statute and I will consider it.

Council President Bassemier: Does anybody want to make a motion for adjournment?

Councilmember Wortman: I make a motion that we adjourn this meeting right now.

Commissioner Fanello: Motion to adjourn.

Councilmember Winnecke: Second.

Council President Bassemier: Meeting adjourned.

(Meeting adjourned at 3:49 p.m.)

VANDEBURGH COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

President David Mosby

Vice-Pres. Catherine Fanello

Member, Richard Mourdock

VANDEBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL

President Ed Bassemier
Winnecke

Vice-Pres. Lloyd

Councilmember James Raben

Councilmember Phil Hoy

Councilmember Curt Wortman

Councilmember Royce Sutton

Councilmember Troy Tornatta

Recorded by Teri Lukeman. Transcribed by B.J. Farrell, G. Tucker, T. Hochstetler & T. Lukeman.

**VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL
MINUTES
DECEMBER 5, 2001**

The Vanderburgh County Council met in session this 5th day of December, 2001 in room 301 of the Civic Center Complex. The meeting was called to order at 3:35 p.m. by County Council President, Ed Bassemier.

President Bassemier: Sheriff, you want to open the meeting, please?

Brad Ellsworth: Oh yes, oh yes, oh yes, the Vanderburgh County Council is now in session pursuant to adjournment.

President Bassemier: Thank you, sir. I'd like to welcome everyone to the December 5th, 2001 County Council meeting. Attendance roll call please.

COUNCILMEMBER	PRESENT	ABSENT
Councilmember Tornatta	X	
Councilmember Sutton	X	
Councilmember Wortman	X	
Councilmember Hoy	X	
Councilmember Raben	X	
Councilmember Winnecke	X	
President Bassemier	X	

President Bassemier: Would everyone please stand for the Pledge of Allegiance?

(Pledge of Allegiance was given.)

APPROVAL OF MINUTES NOVEMBER 7, 2001 REGULAR MEETING NOVEMBER 20, 2001 SPECIAL JOINT MEETING

President Bassemier: Now I'd like to have a motion to approve the minutes for November 7th, 2001 regular meeting and November 20th, 2001 special meeting.

Councilmember Sutton: So moved.

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: That should be 2001.

Sandie Deig: Yeah, 2001.

President Bassemier: Yeah, no problem. I have a motion and a second. Any discussion on those two meetings? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATION REQUESTS
--

CLERK

President Bassemier: Okay, now we'll get into the appropriation ordinance. Would you take it Mr, Raben, Finance Chairman?

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Mr. President. First on the agenda is the Clerk's Office 1010-3530. The Clerk has requested that we defer this matter.

President Bassemier: Okay.

Councilmember Hoy: So moved – or you need a second?

President Bassemier: To defer it? We have a motion to defer it, do I have a second?

Councilmember Winnecke: Second.

President Bassemier: Second by Mr. Winnecke. Everybody in favor, say aye.

CLERK		REQUESTED APPROVED	
1010-3530	Contractual Services	500.00	Deferred
Total		500.00	Deferred

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

SHERIFF (TWO REQUESTS)

Councilmember Raben: Okay, next is the Sheriff's Department, 1050-3370 in the

amount of \$40,050. I'll move approval.

President Bassemier: Do I have a second?

Councilmember Winnecke: Second.

President Bassemier: Second, Mr. Winnecke. Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes. Passes seven/zip.

SHERIFF		REQUESTED APPROVED	
1050-3370	Computer (Data Mgmt)	40,050.00	40,050.00
Total		40,050.00	40,050.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

Councilmember Raben: Okay, next on the agenda is the Sheriff, 1050-1301 for \$3,730; 1050-1531-1050 \$600; 1050-1751 \$840; 1050-1951-1050 for \$260; for a total request of \$5,430. I'll move approval.

President Bassemier: Do I have a second?

Councilmember Winnecke: Second.

President Bassemier: Second, Mr. Winnecke. Any discussion?

Councilmember Wortman: Is this, Mr. President, these are civilians. Are we allowing uniforms to civilians?

Sandie Deig: It's in the union contract.

Councilmember Wortman: Oh, she said it's in the union contract, so...and Shift Differential is, too. It's all in the contract. Okay, thank you.

President Bassemier: Anybody else? Okay, roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

SHERIFF		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1050-1301	Civilian Overtime	3,730.00	3,730.00
1050-1531-1050	Civilian Shift Differential	600.00	600.00
1050-1751	Civilian Uniform Allow.	840.00	840.00
1050-1951-1050	Civilian Teamsters Ed. Fund	260.00	260.00
Total		5,430.00	5,430.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

JAIL

Councilmember Raben: Okay, next is the Jail and a total request of \$410. I'll move approval.

President Bassemier: Do I have a second?

Councilmember Sutton: Second.

President Bassemier: Second by Mr. Sutton. Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

JAIL		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1051-1851	Civilian Overtime	300.00	300.00
1051-1751	Civilian Uniform Allow.	84.00	84.00
1051-1951-1051	Civilian Teamsters Ed. Fund	26.00	26.00
Total		410.00	410.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

CONVENTION & VISITORS BUREAU

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Convention & Visitors Bureau, Mr. President, has been withdrawn, so I will move that that be set in at zero.

Councilmember Hoy: Second.

President Bassemier: Got a second. Okay, any discussion on that? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

CONVENTION & VISITORS BUREAU		REQUESTED	APPROVED
3570-3530	Cont. Services	39,000.00	0.00
Total		39,000.00	0.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

JAIL PROJECT

Councilmember Raben: Okay, next, Jail Project, 3660-4192, I'll move that this be deferred pending our December 19th meeting.

President Bassemier: What was the motion, Mr. Raben?

Councilmember Raben: To defer the request.

President Bassemier: Okay, do I have a second?

Councilmember Winnecke: Second.

President Bassemier: Second by Mr. Winnecke. Any discussion on this?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes. I know we have, at our meeting last week, I don't recall us talking about deferring this. Has something new come up to want to defer it outside of the meeting? I guess I didn't take the impression at that meeting that we're actually going to have action items on that agenda. It was going to be more informational rather than action items.

Councilmember Raben: Well, if we elect not to take action then we can in January.

Councilmember Sutton: Maybe I'm not following.

Councilmember Raben: I think it's my understanding, too, that there was a question as to advertising the meeting jointly or individually and I think as it stands now, we have advertised it individually where we've made our own advertisement on it...have we not? Has that gone through? And along with that, it stated that action may be taken, so...is that not correct? Did we not get it in that way?

Suzanne Crouch: That is correct. The Commissioners chose to do their ad without action being taken. Their attorney was somewhat concerned about taking action, so they did a separate ad that did not have action taken. It's basically to receive information and then the Council did an ad to receive information and possibly take action. If you take action at that meeting, though, because it's an appropriation, we would have to advertise that appropriation again. And we would have to be given direction to do that at this meeting in order to meet the advertising deadlines.

Councilmember Sutton: Well, Councilman Raben, I know you weren't at the meeting last week, and I guess in our discussions that we had and if someone could correct if I was – from speaking out of turn, or if I'm wrong here on this, but in our discussions last week, at no point in time did we talk about taking any type of actions related to this \$610,000. More than anything, the discussion was going to be kind of where we stood, and iron out any unresolved issues that we may have had. This did not come up as a topic of discussion. Like I say, any other Councilman, like I said, unless I heard something different, I believe I was one of the ones that suggested the meeting. And in my suggestion, that surely was not what I suggested.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, well, I mean, again, we can take action on it in January if you'd rather.

Councilmember Sutton: I'd rather actually take action on it today, is what I'd rather do, rather than January.

Councilmember Hoy: I just want to speak to the 19th. My understanding was Councilman Sutton's understanding that that would be informational. I didn't expect to vote on any appropriations in that meeting on the 19th or anything else. We were to gather information from bond counsel, from whoever else–

President Bassemier: Well, I know – I okayed that. The reason why I did, and I kind of thought about you when I made that statement because I know sometimes – I just didn't want to tie our hands on making a motion that might not be for an appropriation – might be for something else. I just didn't want to tie my hands so I okayed that. So, –

Councilmember Hoy: You were expecting a resolution from me.

President Bassemier: No telling what I expected. But I just didn't want to tie the Council's hands.

Councilmember Hoy: No, I'm okay, personally, with just hearing information, but I don't want to vote on any financial appropriations at that meeting, for sure.

Councilmember Raben: And that's fine, so we'll just –

Councilmember Tornatta: Well, I think we're tying hands right now. I mean, we had a time line, December 5th, 6th, 10th, 17th, and 18th, of items that we need to get

handled on this jail project and here again we're going to set this back even farther, and I think we all came to a conclusion off the last meeting that this was going to be a subject that we were going to go ahead and pay that money and it was stated many times during that meeting that that was okay to take care of those architects. We want to take care of the architects. We want to get this ball rolling, and here again we're going to defer this?

Councilmember Winnecke: Mr. President, I guess, I don't have a problem with the deferment. After looking at the information that we received last Wednesday, I'm having trouble making the math work. I don't find \$610,000 worth of invoices here and I guess I don't really understand the December, wait a second, the estimated, paying an estimated invoice for December. I don't know that that's how we normally do business. I mean, I may be wrong and I'd be welcome to hear someone correct me, but I see invoices here for \$533,000 and not \$610,000 first of all.

Councilmember Raben: Actually, the total that I've arrived at is \$434,401.25, that would actually be due to date.

President Bassemier: Mr. Mosby, would you please state your name for the record?

David Mosby: David Mosby, President of the County Commissioners.

President Bassemier: Thank you, sir.

David Mosby: What we had asked, Lloyd, and I think I can answer your question here, to appropriate the \$610,000, not to be all payable at once. But it's an appropriation; payable would be the October and November invoices and what we've done is estimated December's so that we can actually budget that money for the current year that it was to be expended. And December was estimated at \$158,790. Their total is \$533,000 and I think Shireman's is – it would make up the difference of the \$600,000 we're talking about.

Councilmember Winnecke: Still it's less than \$600,000 if you add that 533 and the 59,8.

Councilmember Sutton: When you say estimated December, are you saying estimated expenditures during the month of December or actually an invoice that you would receive in December –

David Mosby: We will probably actually receive an invoice at the end of December for the work that's been done through December. We've got October's and November's and we know what their figures are and then we had them go ahead and estimate out all through December so that we could budget the money for the year that the expense is actually encumbered.

Councilmember Sutton: If we don't pay these – okay, if we just – say we pay what we know we owe rather than what we're anticipating. If we do not pay that, where does that put us in relation to this project?

David Mosby: So what you're saying is if we pay the \$374,400, is that what you're saying?

Councilmember Sutton: Yeah, if we pay that amount, the amount that we've been invoiced that we know we've incurred some cost there, we do not pay that.

David Mosby: Then we just come back in January and ask to appropriate the other \$150,000 or whatever. Yeah, that could be done.

Councilmember Sutton: Yeah, I guess, I mean in terms of in relation to the project, I mean, what – are they gonna –

David Mosby: No, if we pay October and November's, you know, bills then I'm sure there's gonna be a show of willingness to work together here and these guys will no longer feel like they're getting stiffed. I mean, you know, right now, I'm not sure there's that great of a relationship there with, you know, the architects and the engineers because we've not paid them a penny and all we've did is argue about it for four months. If we pay October and November's bills, I'm sure they will see that willingness on our part to work with them and they're going to work with us. And they've not indicated at any point in time they're not going to work with us, it's just the fact that when you talk to them, I guess it's like anybody else, if you were doing business and you weren't getting paid and you were being told you're not going to get paid, you would have to be wondering about your money, where you stand. And it's what these people are going through. I'd go for paying October and November and coming back in January for another appropriation.

Councilmember Sutton: Jim, you said you had a total of 434 that you came up with, now what was yours – was yours the –

Councilmember Raben: I'm coming up with 375,540 and the 59,861, which comes to 334,401.25.

Councilmember Sutton: And you don't want to pay that?

Councilmember Raben: You know, again, I really don't want to pay anything just yet. You know, we've still got the contract issues that have not been addressed and, you know, I thought that's what the meeting that we've rescheduled again was all about. And I hate to (Inaudible – Councilmember Sutton interrupting) a conversation that I wasn't a part of.

Councilmember Tornatta: They're our architect, is that right? I mean, is this outfit our architect?

David Mosby: Yes.

Councilmember Sutton: I guess I'm looking if we, if you, if we're comfortable with this 374, if we just look at that. You get these contract issues resolved, don't you still owe 374? I mean, so why are we waiting till January? We owe the money, let's pay it.

Councilmember Raben: Because I guess technically, again, any payment of any sort could in essence be ratifying the original contract and I, prior to being cut off just a moment ago, I started to make the statement that I don't like to discuss a conversation that I was not a part of, and, Catherine, I hate to put you on the spot here, but from an earlier discussion with our Council attorney, he had stated that you had expressed a willingness to address our concerns and questions and make those adjustments in the contract. And if we do that this month, I'm ready to sign off on everything.

Commissioner Fanello: And that's nothing different than Commissioner Mosby has said, but we're at a point here that they have performed work. I am more than

happy and I said it in the last meeting and in the joint meeting, to sit down with anybody and discuss the contract and try to come to some resolution. And I know that Commissioner Mosby has done the same thing, but that does not preclude us from paying what we owe these people to continue to work on this project. I know that the Sheriff, Chief Deputy Williams have put numerous hours into this thing. We have got to keep moving. So I really can't personally, and I'm not going to speak for David or anybody else, but I personally cannot continue to tell these people to work and to keep this project going if we're not going to make the commitment to even pay them for what we've done so far. So clearing up the contract and clearing up issues is nothing different than what Commissioner Mosby has said. So what does that have to do with paying the invoice?

Councilmember Sutton: Well, and I thought I, you know, some of the contract issues, one was kind of graduating out the payments, spreading those out and I think there's agreement there –

Councilmember Raben: Can I –

Councilmember Sutton: Well, let me – one of the issues was spreading –

President Bassemier: Royce and then Jim.

Councilmember Sutton: One of the issues was spreading out those payments and I think there was some discussion or recommendation of phasing that out rather than paying it all up front. And then there was some issues regarding who would actually be involved with leading the project, whether it's the general or whether you actually have a –

David Mosby: CM.

Councilmember Sutton: Yeah, and so I think – and then there were some other issues that were, that both bodies were willing to look at addressing. But I guess my question earlier was if we know we owe at least the 374, why not go ahead and pay it? Now the amount that's estimated or whatever, you know, we can come back in January and deal with that, but in order for us to stay on track, why not go ahead and pay what we owe and I don't think it will in any way hamper our discussions on how to hammer out some of these issues in the contract, though. But I do think it –

President Bassemier: Wait a minute, Mr. Raben. Jeff, I'm going to let you help me answer this. I know you and Mr. Hayes still have some legal language to clear up in that contract. What's your recommendation on signing –

Councilmember Raben: Mr. President?

President Bassemier: – today, won't that hinder, won't that hurt us in any way, if we accept this contract? What's your legal opinion on this?

Councilmember Raben: If I could –

President Mosby: I'm going to let our attorney respond to it because I don't want to be tied into a contract if we approve the \$610,000, if there's some legal language still need to be cleared up on this contract. That's my question to our attorney.

Councilmember Raben: Ed, can I make a comment before he responds to that?

President Bassemier: Okay.

Councilmember Raben: And this is in the spirit of compromise. I think there's a certain willingness with everybody to bring this entire issue to resolve and yes, we do owe monies, but there are still a lot of concerns within the contract amongst myself and several others here. I would be willing to pay October and November invoices only so long as we, as a body, once again, make the statement that the original contracts have been, in fact, declared null and void, and would get it on the record from both Commissioners present, that the original contracts are –

Councilmember Winnecke: With the idea that the talks would continue.

Councilmember Raben: Right.

President Bassemier: Okay, now hold on, I'm going to let Jeff, what's your answer to that if we approve any – what we need to know, I mean, with nothing in writing right now just with our approval here, what's that going to do to this contract?

Jeff Ahlers: I guess just to summarize, we've been through this numerous times and I've given my opinion and I know they have their opinion, is that, you know, obviously there is, if you make an appropriation under the contract that there is, you know, some risk that they will make an argument that you have ratified it. There are arguments against that. It is obviously a lot clearer to make sure you have a contract you agree upon before you make any appropriations under it. In terms of what you're proposing, Mr. Raben, is a good idea, the only question would be whether or not that would require the consent of United as well. In terms of they're an alleged contracting party here and even if you and Mr. Mosby or this body and the Commissioners would agree, and I don't know that you can have them agree because they don't have a meeting here, so I mean, we get into this – I don't know that you can take the official action that you're requesting. Council can certainly state its intentions, but the Commissioners don't have an advertised meeting here, so I don't know that they're in a position to take action to state what they'll modify in the contract. I mean, I will say this, is that I have spoken in the last 24 hours at length with both Mr. Mosby and Ms. Fanello and there's a willingness to try to work through some of these, it's just that we've got to get together and get at a table with a pen and paper and actually work through it. There's been a lot of talking and it's all been cordial, but we're not getting the pen to the paper and we need to do that and make those changes. But yeah, I mean, you know, without going ad nauseam, I've already gone through all the legal opinions as to the risks of, you know, when you go to make an appropriation, if you're going to challenge the validity of a contract. The only thing I would point out is that there's also been talk about well, when other counties do this or that, you know, in certain points, and I don't know what United, you know, what discussions have gone on off the record, I've never talked to United, so I don't know what they understand the issues to be, but in many instances like this when you're having a bond, you know, even the attorney's, engineers, architects, and everyone sometimes don't even get paid 'til out of the bond proceeds. I don't know that it's that unusual. I understand that we as a county seem to think that there's some merit to paying some of those costs up front is good fiscal management, and that may be what you want to do, and to do that. But in terms of the legal issues, my opinion is still the same.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, let me ask you this, if the motion that I make included subject to their action at their next official meeting, that they would declare the original contracts as signed, null and void. Could we do that?

Jeff Ahlers: Well, you're kind of getting into uncharted territory. I mean, I don't know the answer, whether you can make a conditional appropriation. I mean, that's essentially what you're asking, can you make an appropriation conditionally. I mean, my hunch is you either just need to make the appropriation or not. But I'm not prepared to answer a question that has the potential, you know, six figure magnitude here to say whether or not you can make it conditional. I've never seen that in the five years I've been here I don't think, in terms of making condition.

Councilmember Wortman: Mr. President, call for the question.

President Bassemier: Call for the question.

David Mosby: Can I respond to that?

President Bassemier: I'm sorry, Mr. Wortman, let me let Mr. Hoy say it, and then I'll call the question. Okay, let's give Mr. Hoy –

David Mosby: Can I respond to Councilman Raben's questions after that?

President Bassemier: Go ahead, sir.

David Mosby: No, I'll let Councilman Hoy go first.

Councilmember Hoy: A question I have and I have the same question about implied contract should we grant this. And I would like to see us on the road to resolving these issues. We've all said that. So I'm wondering, you know, if we do grant the appropriation, if we have not said, oh, we agree with this contract. I don't know the answer to that. You're saying it could be construed that way.

Jeff Ahlers: Well, their position is that they've already got a contract, so we're really beyond that argument, but I agree with you, that that's the case.

Councilmember Hoy: Anyway, my understanding, I received two phone calls today that there is a document that has been prepared by United –

David Mosby: There is a draft of a program and the Sheriff and them are going over it right now.

Councilmember Hoy: And I was invited to go – this morning – to go to the Sheriff's Office and read a 247 page document, if possible, before this meeting. Well, I'm kind of like Will Rogers, I don't make my material up, okay. And I did not have the time to do that. So I'm having problems seeing what actually has been accomplished. On the other hand, I would love to pay something because I know they've done some work. But that's – I think if we have a draft available, it would help me. I won't speak for these six other people, just speak for myself. It would help me immensely if there were a copy of that, at least one copy in the Council office here where we could go and check it out and take turns reading it, which is what –

David Mosby: Let me clarify that. It's a draft that United has sent down – okay, I'll let the Sheriff clarify it and then I'll answer Councilman Raben's question.

President Bassemier: Sorry, Mr. Raben, let's get this cleared up and then we'll answer on your question, okay?

Brad Ellsworth: Here's the mysterious document.

President Bassemier: Sheriff, I'm sorry –

Brad Ellsworth: I'm sorry. My name is Brad Ellsworth, Sheriff of Vanderburgh County. This document that was prepared is basically a typed version of several meetings and several visits between United, the architects, DLZ and myself and the Chief Deputy of my staff, based on the five years of meetings, public meetings, that we've had that talked about what we came out of, the five, the 600 bed jail, the 650, 220, the three meetings, the three different kinds of meetings we have. I'm going to pick one of these things out of the middle, well, that's not a very good one: Data Communication Claus. Basically, what they've done is they have prepared one page based on when we got together, we talked about what we need here. You know, do you need a secretarial pool, who needs an office, who needs a cubicle, who needs a chair, who needs just to stand up and do their job, that kind of thing. They then went back and from out notes, and we did bubble charts and what needs to be adjacent to what to make this thing run efficient, effective, you know, does booking need to close to the kitchen? Probably not. Does the kitchen need to be close to medical? No. So we're basically doing a, here's what we need with the three operations and the current employees, looking into the future and let me see if I can – screened searching room. Function, a room for an officer to body search a visitor suspected of carrying contraband. Occupancy, one officer, one visitor. Location, adjacent requirement: primary, close to the lobby; secondary, control room. Floor: tile; wall: CMU painted; doors: commercial pre-finish with hollow metal frame blah, blah, blah, blah, blah, blah, mechanical, HVAC system, plumbing none, fire, smoke, building systems, sprinkle, basically there's a page in here for every area that we base on the information that we had from the five years of meetings, the information we have, what Vanderburgh County needed, a page for every area we did. It's not done. There's areas that we're going back and penciling, saying that's not big enough, that's not even big enough if the guy is standing, and this is based on our experience of running a jail, and running a corrections center, that that's not big enough for, if we've only got 30 feet and I need to search him, I at least need to be able to bend him over. And – I know. So, that's where I can say, that's only 20 feet, I need 40 feet to search him thoroughly. And that's –

Councilmember Sutton: Man!

President Bassemier: I think you better stop while you're ahead, Sheriff.

Councilmember Winnecke: How much did he pay you to say that?

Brad Ellsworth: But that's what this document is. We're penciling, we're going through it line by line, I mean, some of this stuff, we know it's going to have an HVAC system, we know it's going to have a floor, whether it needs to be carpet, or whether it needs to be tile and mopped, that's the kind of thing in this document, that, like I say, is not the end product of a whole lot of hours of meetings between myself and United, and it's not done. If you all came in today and said, we're out of the community correction business, I can take about 50 pages out of here and pull them out of the middle and it'll be done. And it'll save me and Eric a whole lot of work. You know, pull it out, that way I won't have to bubble draw it and say it has to be adjacent to anything. But like I said, those meetings told me we need to at least start planning because we don't want to have 60 employees and have them standing around in a room that's designed like this and saying okay, you're going to going to search him over in that corner, but oh, we should have put it in – we can say that needs a bathroom, it needs a partition, it needs a cubicle, it needs that.

That's what this is, a working document, and you're welcome to come see it. I know what you'll do and I told three Councilmen today, you'll come down, you'll look at it and you'll fan through it, and you'll say go back to drawing and keep up the good work, because it's boring reading unless you're going to live there.

President Bassemier: Thank you, Sheriff. Out of courtesy to Mr. Wortman, he did call for the question, so we've got a motion to defer and a second by Mr. Winnecke –

Councilmember Winnecke: Mr. President, with all due respect –

Councilmember Sutton: What's the motion? Yeah.

Councilmember Winnecke: I mean, I respect the fact that Mr. Wortman has called for the question, but there are a lot of people that want to have something to say here and I think, frankly, we should be all given the chance to –

Councilmember Hoy: It does, point of order, I hope I'm correct on this because I'm not a total expert on parliamentary procedure, but I think to close debate you have to have a two-thirds vote to close anyway, and I think that might be wise today. I don't want to be sitting here at 6:00 because I have some other plans and I think everybody else does, too, but –

President Bassemier: Well, I did let a couple more people speak when he called for the question, so I think we'd better move on with it. Mr. Mosby, can I give Mr. Mosby the courtesy of finishing up, summing this up for us? One minute, sir.

David Mosby: Well, I was trying to remember some of the questions Jim had asked or Councilman Raben had asked a while ago, and I know you weren't here last week, the 374,000, I mean, we pay it, we still have to come back to you in January and ask for the estimated bill for December, so I guess I'm thinking we're still coming back here to negotiate with you. I am more than willing to negotiate in good faith and as I stated last week and I know you were absent, but we will have a better idea once we have the meeting on the 19th of what we are facing, what the 30 million will get us and what we want will cost us. After that, I mean, it's going to be up to the Council and the Commissioners and the Sheriff to sit down and say what can we do. Once we get to that point and we give United a scope of service, which we really do not have now, all we've said is, we want to spend 30 million, but we need this. So we've never defined a scope of service. Once we define a scope of service to United, they will say here is your exact cost. They will also give us a breakdown of what we need to either pay them monthly, quarterly, or however you want to pay it. And we will be able to tell you, and I know that's been a big concern of everybody's, having a conversation with Mr. Ahlers and yourself and a few others, you know, what do we exactly owe and can we cap our fees? We can do that after we give United a scope of service. Right now, we don't know what we're buying and they don't know what we want. They don't even know what they're selling. But once we get to that point, to answer your, I mean, we can sit down and work out a timetable on price and we'll cap that price as everybody has asked. It's not that we don't want to cap it, we just don't know what to cap it at, and that's where we're kind of coming from.

Councilmember Sutton: Mr. President, –

President Bassemier: Thank you, sir. Now, we're going to –

Councilmember Sutton: I was going to ask, what's the motion on the floor.

President Bassemier: To defer it and I had a second by Mr. Winnecke. Roll call vote please, to defer it. Did you set a date on that?

Councilmember Sutton: Well, I thought he made another motion along –

Councilmember Raben: No, I never made a motion. I suggested some other motions.

President Bassemier: Okay, we've got a motion to defer it and a second. Is that your motion, Mr. Raben? You want to make it one more time to clear it.

Jeff Ahlers: I thought it was just deferred. You can state a date or you can do either one. But just clarify.

Councilmember Raben: Let's set a date, I'm still willing to go along with deferring it until the 19th, in which it will be up to the Auditor's Office to make sure that everything is properly advertised to –

President Bassemier: You had the second on that, Mr. Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: My second stands.

Councilmember Raben: – that the advertisement does state action taken, so...

President Bassemier: Okay, roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Let's do the 374. No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: I really, I'm really bothered even with setting the 19th in because I view that as an informational meeting and I think we're not going to have all the information we going to need to vote on the 19th, I don't have the information I want today. But I'll vote yes to try to keep this thing moving along, and I'm not comfortable with the 19th, I'm much more comfortable with January to be honest with you.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: I would like to echo some of Councilman Hoy's comments there, and along with that I'll also make the statement that there is going to have to be some give and it needs to start tomorrow. Any adjustments that anyone would like to see, it's my understanding from the conversation with our attorney that

everybody needs to make their list and get it to the Commissioners and I would suggest that we get on it and get on it quick or it will be January. So yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

JAIL PROJECT		REQUESTED	APPROVED
3660-4192	Architect & Construction Mgmt. Fees	610,000.00	Deferred
Total		610,000.00	Deferred

(Motion carried 5-2/Councilmembers Tornatta and Sutton opposed)

President Bassemier: Then we'll defer that to the 19th.

Suzanne Crouch: Mr. President? We need permission to advertise the appropriation for the 19th of December.

President Bassemier: Okay, so we take a vote on that?

Councilmember Sutton: Mr. President, I mean, before we get – I suggested a meeting, I mean, that really was not what I suggested that, I mean, surely what we were going to talk about, in full discussion we talked about here, we wanted to have some good information presented to us from those who were going to be involved with this. And the issues that delays the decision today on the 610 will not really afford us the opportunity to do that. I mean, the issues that are discussed here, talking about contractual things and that really was not the discussion, the total contractual issues on the 19th, so I don't really see how you'll be able to make a decision on the 19th.

Councilmember Raben: Mr. President, I'll – we'll I can't amend my motion. The motion's already been made, but I'll move that we reopen.

President Bassemier: Reopen, do I have a second to reopen? Is that right, is that what you want? It's already been passed but we can reopen it. You don't want to have it on the 19th, so you want to...

Councilmember Raben: I was going to reopen it, I was going to move to set it in at our January meeting although I don't have the date.

President Bassemier: Jeff, what can we do here?

Jeff Ahlers: You can reopen and revote on it. I mean, you can reopen and make a new motion and vote again if you choose to do so.

Councilmember Hoy: Takes a two-thirds to reopen.

Jeff Ahlers: By parliamentary procedure, but I'd point out that by the rules that Council passed, there's a blanket rule that just says it just takes a simple majority for any motions other than those that are set out specifically such as a new

employee that takes five, etc.

Councilmember Hoy: You're right. One of my goals before I leave this Council is to get us on parliamentary procedure so— but the nether regions may freeze over before that happens.

President Bassemier: Okay, Jim has got a motion to reopen. Mr. Sutton, or do you, I mean, he's ready to reopen it. Do I have a second to reopen it?

Councilmember Sutton: There's six other members here.

President Bassemier: Well, you kind of made a suggestion, I was going to let you see if you still felt that strongly about it. Well, it's going to die here in a minute if nobody wants to reopen it. Let it die?

Jeff Ahlers: What I would suggest that you might want to consider is that since the appropriation is going to have to be advertised and for clarity of purpose since the other meeting was advertised as a joint meeting, I wonder if you want to set in, since you've got a Personnel & Finance Committee meeting later that day, if you want, since we're going to advertise, just advertise a special meeting of Council for 3:15 or 3:00 to vote on this appropriation to make it cleaner so, because the Commissioners are in the joint meeting. Their notice doesn't give them a right to take action and I would suggest to make it clean, you want to adjourn that meeting and then either before or after your Personnel & Finance Committee meeting, I think it's going to be a lot cleaner, but that's up to you. You're going to be here anyway, so...it's just a matter of formality.

Councilmember Hoy: Mr. President? Even though I am doubtful about the 19th, the majority has ruled on this so I will move that we set a special meeting at 3:00 prior to our Personnel & Finance meeting to decide on this appropriation.

President Bassemier: Mr. Tornatta?

Teri Lukeman: I need to change the tape.

President Bassemier: Oh, I'm sorry, let's change the tape.

(Tape changed)

President Bassemier: Well, we've got a motion, let me get a second on it. And then we will discuss it. Do I have a second on it?

Councilmember Tornatta: Do we need a number on the appropriation?

President Bassemier: I've got a second. Okay.

Councilmember Tornatta: Can we make the, if we are not comfortable with the 610 can we do the \$ 434,401.25? Is that a, well we are in the middle of discussion here.

President Bassemier: Yeah, at that meeting, I mean it is up to us, I mean?

Suzanne Crouch: Do we have a second?

President Bassemier: We are just deferring it to that time.

Councilmember Winnecke: I did.

Suzanne Crouch: You did?

President Bassemier: We are just deferring it.

Councilmember Tornatta: Mr. President, we are in discussion now.

Jeff Ahlers: There has already been a deferral. The only thing that we voting on now is setting the special meeting.

Councilmember Tornatta: Yeah, but do we have to, we don't...

Suzanne Crouch: We have to do the amount.

Councilmember Hoy: The amount is already on it as 610.

Jeff Ahlers: It has just been deferred so it's at 610. You guys can obviously do like you always do and set it at a lower amount of the 19th.

Councilmember Tornatta: Yeah, I know.

Jeff Ahlers: You know what I mean?

Councilmember Tornatta: I have seen a lot of things around here, so that's fine.

President Bassemier: Okay, okay. I have a motion and a second and anymore discussion on it? Is everybody clear on what we are getting ready to vote on? Jim, do you want to make your motion again?

Councilmember Raben: Councilmember Hoy has already made the motion.

President Bassemier: I mean, Mr. Hoy.

Councilmember Hoy: The motion is that we have a Special Meeting, what's the date?

Suzanne Crouch: December 19th.

Councilmember Hoy: December 19th, at 3:00 p.m.

Councilmember Tornatta: Uh, 3:15?

Councilmember Hoy: For the purpose of voting on the deferred 3660-4192, appropriate for architect and construction management fees in the amount of \$610,000.00.

President Bassemier: Are you clear, Mr. Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yeah.

President Bassemier: Okay, roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Uh, yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes, it passes 6-1.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Mr. President next we have a whole lot of transfers.

PERMISSION TO ADVERTISE SPECIAL APPROPRIATION MEETING
--

Suzanne Crouch: We need a motion for permission to advertise.

Councilmember Hoy: So moved.

Councilmember Winnecke: Second.

President Bassemier: We've got a motion and a second. Everybody is favor say aye.

Suzanne Crouch: Thank you.

President Bassemier: Okay, next.

TRANSFER REQUESTS

Councilmember Raben: Okay, next we have transfers which there is plenty of. Which is customary this time of year. If anyone has any questions let me know now. If not, I would like to take them all together.

Councilmember Hoy: Almost all of my assignments, except one or two have contacted me and we have discussed them and the transfers that I am assigned to look pretty good.

President Bassemier: Is everybody in agreement with that? Mr. Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: I have a problem with page three, Mr. Raben. The Commissioners Rent to or no wait a minute, I'm sorry, wait a minute, I've got to find it here.

President Bassemier: It's with the Commissioners?

Councilmember Wortman: Yeah.

President Bassemier: Are you talking about the Rent and Legal Services?

Councilmember Raben: Superintendent of County Buildings?

Councilmember Wortman: Yeah, I was thinking about another one, okay. Yeah, okay. Superintendent of County Buildings. Office Supplies to Office Furniture. Uh, what I have a problem there, there is a new desk involved and there are plenty of desks down in the basement and that is what I was wondering about. I've got a problem with that.

President Bassemier: Should we take it separately?

Councilmember Raben: Well, just let Catherine just address it.

Catherine Fanello: Catherine Fanello, County Commissioner. That transfer was actually already approved last month where we transferred money into Office Supply but the Auditor's Office need us to pay out of a furniture account and the \$1,000 is not just for the desk. The desk is just \$300.00.

Councilmember Wortman: But, we still have to vote on it.

Catherine Fanello: I was just letting you know that the desk is not \$1,000.00.

Councilmember Wortman: Let me ask you, why buy a new desk when you've got quite a few down in the basement, a lot of people in this office have older desks.

Catherine Fanello: Well, Councilmember Wortman, with all due respect, some of those in the basement don't even have working drawers in them.

Councilmember Wortman: I tell you, I just don't understand this because to me you are just wasting money.

Catherine Fanello: Well, I haven't seen very many county offices go to the basement and get desks. I mean, these are some of the questions that are probably good questions for people buying lots of computers that are probably not needed. I mean a \$300.00 desk to me is not a waste of money, that desk will probably last quite a long time but the ones down in the basement did not, were not workable, so.

President Bassemier: Thank you, Catherine.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Mr. President. I will take all the transfers as they are listed and I make that in the form of a motion.

Councilmember Winnecke: Second.

President Bassemier: I have a second, any discussion? Mr. Wortman, do you want to say something to that? Is that okay with you or do you want to take it separately?

Councilmember Wortman: I want to take it separately but I will probably be the lone Indian but that's alright I have been there before.

President Bassemier: Can you do that Mr. Raben? Would you do that for Mr. Wortman?

Councilmember Raben: I will amend my motion to include everything as listed with the exception of Item L which is Superintendent of County Buildings.

President Bassemier: Is that okay with you Mr. Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: That's fine.

President Bassemier: Okay, everybody okay with that, except Mr. Wortman? Okay, roll call, oh I am sorry.

Councilmember Winnecke: Second.

President Bassemier: Mr. Winnecke seconded. Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

President Bassemier: Now, that's everything but yours.

Councilmember Wortman: This is to just accept? Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

CLERK		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1010-1190-1010	Subpoena/Summons Clerk	2,200.00	2,200.00
To: 1010-1250-1010	Cashier/Misdemeanor	2,200.00	2,200.00

SHERIFF		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1050-1510-1050	College Reimbursement	7,000.00	7,000.00
To: 1050-2300	Uniforms	7,000.00	7,000.00

SURVEYOR		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1060-2220	Tires & Tubes	23.21	23.21
1060-2320	Instruments	163.35	163.35
1060-2330	Surveyor Stakes	4.09	4.09
1060-3520	Equipment Repair	444.75	444.75
1060-3700	Dues & Subscriptions	5.00	5.00
To: 1060-3371	Computer Hardware	640.40	640.40

CORONER		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1070-2230	Garage & Motor	400.00	400.00
1070-3660	Forensic Dentistry	1,000.00	1,000.00
1070-3130	Travel/Mileage	500.00	500.00
To: 1070-2410	Body Transport	400.00	400.00
1070-3540	Maintenance Contract	1,500.00	1,500.00

PROPERTY TAX BD. OF APPEALS		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1091-1900	FICA	37.00	37.00
To: 1091-1990	Extra Help	37.00	37.00

CENTER TWP. ASSESSOR		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1110-1110-1110	Assessor	150.00	150.00
To: 1110-1972	Level II Certification	150.00	150.00

PERRY TWP. ASSESSOR		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1140-3380	Photography/Blue Prints	521.00	521.00
1140-3410	Printing	504.00	504.00
To: 1140-3520	Equipment Repair	1,025.00	1,025.00

ELECTION OFFICE		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1210-3530	Contractual Services	4,800.00	4,800.00
To: 1210-1110-1210	Board Member	3,600.00	3,600.00
1210-1200-1210	Election Attorney	1,200.00	1,200.00

COMMISSIONERS		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1300-3600	Rent	14,000.00	14,000.00
To: 1300-3610	Legal Services	10,000.00	10,000.00
1300-3420	Legal Advertising	4,000.00	4,000.00

WEIGHTS & MEASURES		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1302-3580	Vehicle Repair	200.00	200.00
To: 1302-3160	Radio/Pagers	200.00	200.00

PUBLIC DEFENDER		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1303-1780	Paralegal	1,800.00	1,800.00
To: 1303-1990	Extra Help	1,800.00	1,800.00

CIRCUIT COURT		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1360-1980	Other Pay	8.00	8.00
1360-3903	Petit Jurors	2,000.00	2,000.00
To: 1360-1990	Extra Help	8.00	8.00
1360-3944	Special Reporter	2,000.00	2,000.00

COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1361-1180-1361	Clerk	5,000.00	5,000.00
1361-1400-1361	Correction Officer	4,000.00	4,000.00
1361-1630-1361	Medical Educator	1,500.00	1,500.00
To: 1361-1850	Union Overtime	10,500.00	10,500.00

LEGAL AID SOCIETY		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1460-3520	Equipment Repair	263.50	263.50
1460-3730	Continuing Education	19.35	19.35
1460-3140	Telephone	217.15	217.15
To: 1460-2600	Office Supply	500.00	500.00

CUM BRIDGE		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 2030-3520	Equipment Repair	15,000.00	15,000.00
To: 2030-4230	Motor Vehicles	15,000.00	15,000.00

CUM BRIDGE		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 2030-4389	Fulton Ave. Bridge	110,000.00	110,000.00
To: 2030-4726	Heather Ct. Culvert #1673	110,000.00	110,000.00

CCD/COMMISSIONERS		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 2031-1300-4386	Fulton Avenue Bridge	250,000.00	250,000.00
To: 2031-1300-4933	Pine Place - Heather Ct.	250,000.00	250,000.00

FAMILY & CHILDREN SERVICES		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 2042-32500	Out of Home Placements- Foster Homes	50,000.00	50,000.00
2042-32550	Misc. Cost of Wards	50,000.00	50,000.00
To: 2042-32540	Preservation Services	100,000.00	100,000.00

HEALTH DEPARTMENT		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 2130-3930	Other Contractual	18,687.00	18,687.00
To: 2130-1380-2130	Spvsr. STD., HIV, AIDS	1.00	1.00
2130-1500-2130	Health Educator/OARR	1.00	1.00
2130-2210	Gas & Oil	350.00	350.00
2130-2241	Institutional & Medical	3,060.00	3,060.00
2130-2721	Laboratory	3,000.00	3,000.00
2130-3140	Telephone	375.00	375.00
2130-3700	Dues & Subscriptions	200.00	200.00
2130-4210	Office Furniture	2,700.00	2,700.00
2130-4250	Misc. Equipment	9,000.00	9,000.00

SURVEYOR MAPS		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 2420-3371	Computer Hardware	1,733.50	1,733.50
2420-2600	Office Supplies	6.50	6.50
To: 2420-3160	Radio/Pagers	1,740.00	1,740.00

SURVEYOR CORNER PERPETUATION		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 2650-3530	Contractual Services	715.00	715.00
To: 2650-2700	Other Supplies	435.00	435.00
2650-2320	Instruments	280.00	280.00

SHERIFF/VCCC MISD. OFFENDER		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 2760-1920	Insurance	63.00	63.00
To: 2760-1910	PERF	63.00	63.00

LATE TRANSFER REQUESTS			
COUNTY HIGHWAY		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 2010-1750	Clothing Allowance	7,231.00	7,231.00
2010-1990	Extra Help	4,000.00	4,000.00
To: 2010-1066	Maint. & Utility	116.00	116.00
2010-1064	Tool Crib Clerk	114.00	114.00
2010-1028	Truck Driver	114.00	114.00
2010-1035	Equip. Operator	116.00	116.00
2010-1060	Mechanic	122.00	122.00
2010-1068	Gasman	114.00	114.00
2010-1041	Laborer	116.00	116.00
2010-1051	Trash Laborer	111.00	111.00
2010-1022	Truck Driver	114.00	114.00
2010-1026	Truck Driver	114.00	114.00
2010-1037	Equip. Operator	116.00	116.00
2010-1021	Truck Driver	114.00	114.00
2010-1050	Trash Cont. Driver	114.00	114.00
2010-1027	Truck Driver	114.00	114.00
2010-1029	Truck Driver	114.00	114.00
2010-1025	Truck Driver	114.00	114.00
2010-1046	Laborer	111.00	111.00
2010-1020	Truck Driver	114.00	114.00
2010-1032	Equip. Operator	116.00	116.00
2010-1063	Grease Man	114.00	114.00
2010-1043	Laborer	111.00	111.00
2010-1067	Tool Crib & Janitor	111.00	111.00
2010-1023	Truck Driver	114.00	114.00
2010-1065	Lead Man	116.00	116.00
2010-1033	Equip. Operator	116.00	116.00
2010-1036	Equip. Operator	116.00	116.00
2010-1038	Equip. Operator	116.00	116.00
2010-1052	Bookkeeper Payroll Clerk	110.00	110.00

(Table continued next page)

2010-1034	Equip. Operator	116.00	116.00
2010-1047	Laborer	111.00	111.00
2010-1045	Laborer	111.00	111.00
2010-1031	Equip. Operator	116.00	116.00
2010-1048	Laborer	111.00	111.00
2010-1061	Asst. Mechanic	116.00	116.00
2010-1062	Asst. Mechanic	116.00	116.00
2010-1044	Laborer	111.00	111.00
2010-1030	Equip. Operator	116.00	116.00
2010-1040	Laborer	111.00	111.00
2010-1850	Union Overtime	6,894.00	6,894.00

CUMULATIVE BRIDGE		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 2030-1150-2030	Laborer	677.00	677.00
To: 2030-1140-2030	Operator	116.00	116.00
2030-1170-2030	Truck Driver	114.00	114.00
2030-1190-2030	Laborer	111.00	111.00
2030-1180-2030	Truck Driver	114.00	114.00
2030-1160-2030	Laborer	111.00	111.00
2030-1200-2030	Laborer	111.00	111.00

CONVENTION & VISITORS BUREAU		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 3570-3440	Advertising	15,000.00	15,000.00
3570-3380	Photography/Blue Prints	3,500.00	3,500.00
3570-3410	Printing	12,000.00	12,000.00
3570-3700	Dues & Subscriptions	1,000.00	1,000.00
3570-3120	Postage/Freight	2,500.00	2,500.00
3570-3794	Convention Services	5,000.00	5,000.00
To: 3570-3530	Contractual Services	39,000.00	39,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

President Bassemier: Okay, back to you.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Mr. President, I will move approval of the transfer for the Superintendent of County Buildings.

Councilmember Winnecke: Second.

President Bassemier: Got a second by Mr. Winnecke.. Do you have any more discussion, Mr. Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: No, I just think it is ridiculous to buy a \$1,000 desk when there is down there more and people getting new desk when we don't need them.

President Bassemier: Okay, I think it wasn't.

Catherine Fanello: It's only \$300.00.

President Bassemier: It's \$300.00 Mr. Wortman. It wasn't as good as you thought.

Councilmember Wortman: Well, then what is that \$1,000.00 for?

President Bassemier: Well, for other things too, right, Catherine?

Catherine Fanello: Right.

President Bassemier: Other things beside a desk. Okay.

Councilmember Wortman: It is still too much money.

President Bassemier: Okay, still too much money, okay. Roll call vote, please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Uh, Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Mr. Wortman you are the taxpayers friend. I vote yes too.

SUPERINTENDENT OF COUNTY BUILDINGS		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1310-2600	Office Supplies	1,000.00	1,000.00
To: 1310-4210	Office Furniture	1,000.00	1,000.00

(Motion carried 6-1/Councilmember Wortman opposed)

Councilmember Sutton: Not this taxpayer.

Councilmember Tornatta: I question that.

Councilmember Winnecke: How big a room would the Sheriff need for him?

Councilmember Hoy: Forty feet.

Councilmember Sutton: We wouldn't even have desks here if he were our, if he were.

Councilmember Wortman: One thing about it, I am not liberal, remember that.

Councilmember Hoy: The Sheriff said he needed forty feet for something.

President Bassemier: Yeah for something. He won't need that big a room.

Councilmember Raben: Curt said that he could raise a family in forty feet, couldn't he?

(Inaudible - too many talking at one time)

Councilmember Raben: Nice thing about it is that we don't charge for the entertainment. Okay, Mr. President, next is amendments to the Salary Ordinance.

AMENDMENTS TO THE SALARY ORDINANCE

Councilmember Raben: First is the Public Defenders office. There is a correction from our November 7 meeting and we need to amend the salary line 1303-1770, Paralegal as the transfer was approved on November 7, 2001. The Sheriff's Department, amend salary line 110050-1301, Civilian Overtime; 1050-1531, Civilian Shift Differential; 1050-1751, Civilian Uniform Allowance; 1050-1951, Teamsters Educational Trust Fund as previously adopted. The Jail salary line 1051-1851, Civilian Overtime; 1051-1751, Civilian Uniform allowance; 1051-1951, Teamsters Educational Trust Fund as previously adopted. The Clerk's office, salary line item 1010-1250, Cashier/Misdemeanor as transfer previously approved. I've already made an error?

Sandie Deig: You didn't.

Councilmember Raben: There is an account that Mr. President, we will back up to the Sheriff, the first line should be 1050-1301 Civilian Overtime. Now, back to the Clerk. Salary line 1010-1250, Cashier/Misdemeanor as transfer was previously adopted. Property Tax Board of Appeals, salary line 1091-1990, Extra Help; as transfer previously approved. Center Township Assessor, salary line 1110-1972, which is a Level II Certification for John Gerard the county assessor, that figure pro-rated is at \$150.00 and that is pro-rated from November 12. The previously paid line was 1130-1972, Election Office salary line 1210-1110, Board Member and 1210-1100, Election Attorney as transfer previously adopted. Public Defender, salary line 1303-1990, Extra Help as previously adopted. Extra Help will be a temporary secretary paid at \$10.00 per hour. Circuit Court, amend salary line 1360-1990, Extra Help as transfer previously approved. Community Corrections salary line 1361-1850, Union Overtime as previously approved. Health Department salary line 2130-1380, Supervisor STD, HIV, AIDS and 2130-1500, Health Educator/OARR as previously adopted. County Highway, amend salary lines as transferred previously

approved. Cum Bridge amend salary ordinance lines as transferred previously approved. That takes care of that and I make that in the form of a motion.

President Bassemier: Do I have a second?

Councilmember Winnecke: Second.

President Bassemier: Second by Mr. Winnecke. Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes. Okay it passes 7-0.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

President Bassemier: Okay, getting to Old Business.

<p>CONFIRMING RESOLUTION OF THE VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL CONFIRMING THE DECLARATION OF AN ECONOMIC REVITALIZATION AREA FOR PROPERTY TAX ABATEMENT FOR REDEVELOPMENT OR REHABILITATION OF PROPERTY LOCATED AT 18200 US HIGHWAY 41 NORTH/AMERIQUAL FOODS, A DIVISION OF AMERIQUAL GROUP, INC.</p>
--

President Bassemier: I need a motion confirming the Resolution of the Vanderburgh County Council confirming the declaration of an economic revitalization area for property tax abatement for redevelopment or rehabilitation of property located at 18200 US Highway 41 North, AmeriQual Foods a division of AmeriQual Group LLC. This is a second reading. Do I have a motion to approve that?

Councilmember Wortman: I make a motion that we approve that confirming

resolution.

Councilmember Raben: Second.

President Bassemier: Second by Mr. Raben. Any discussion on that? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes. That passes 4 -3.

(Motion carried 4-3/Councilmembers Tornatta, Sutton & Hoy opposed)

<p>ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE ISSUANCE NOT TO EXCEED \$3,000,000 AGGREGATE PRINCIPLE AMOUNT OF MULTI-MODE VARIABLE RATE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT REVENUE BONDS, SERIES 2001/PYROTEK INCORPORATED PROJECT</p>
--

President Bassemier: Okay, under New Business, an ordinance authorizing the assurance of not exceeding \$3,000,000.00 aggregate principle amount of multi-mode variable rate economic development revenue bonds, Series 2001/Pyrotek Incorporated project. Do I have a motion to approve?

Councilmember Raben: Mr. President, I will move approval.

Councilmember Sutton: I will-

President Bassemier: Motion to approve by Mr. Raben. Second by Mr. Winnecke I mean Mr. Sutton. Any discussion on that?

Councilmember Hoy: Mr. President, I always vote no on tax abatements but I just

want to explain my yes vote, this is a passed thing. We have to pass this unanimously so I will vote yes on this. I just don't want that to be construed as me having weakened my stand on tax abatement.

President Bassemier: Okay, thank you Mr. Hoy. Mr. Ahlers?

Jeff Ahlers: Yeah. Let me state that, to tell everybody what the law is so that you know where you stand. Under Indiana Code 36-2-4-7, in order to pass on ordinance on the same day, normally you have to have a first reading, one meeting and a second reading the next meeting. In order to pass an ordinance on the same day, what you are going to have to do is waive the final reading and pass this ordinance unanimously. If it does not pass unanimously but by a majority, it would require a second reading on another day. Now, Mr. Compton may want to speak to this. I don't know all of the ins and outs other than the fact the law that they are proceeding under for this ordinance to get this bond requires them to have approval by December 14 or the bond, they can't get the bond as I understand it. So, I just wanted to let you know that if you want them to be able to have this bond that we need to have unanimous approval and a waiver of the final reading by unanimous vote and if you have questions of Mr. Compton about the bond and as I understand it, it has already passed the Economic Development Commission?

Charles Compton: Yes, the two things that we need are actually approval to have final passage on the day of introduction and that requires unanimous approval. The other thing that we need to do is have a call for any remonstrators or petitioners before or against the project to comply with public hearing requirements. But other than that simply to have a motion to have this be approved on the day of introduction that have the vote and hopefully it would come out unanimous and as long as there's been a call for any comments from the public regarding this project, we will be completed in terms of official action for this bond issue.

Councilmember Sutton: When do remonstrators have to come forward? Is that, which we just approved the first reading.

Charles Compton: Actually to publish, they would need to come to this meeting. Part of a publication was when the Economic Development Commission met on the 19th of November, they had the opportunity to come forward. No one came forward. It also published that this meeting would occur on December 5th if anybody wished to speak in opposition of the project. There is a regular meeting of the County Council at 3:30 today, show up and evidence any discontent.

Councilmember Sutton: Mr. President?

President Bassemier: Yes, Mr. Sutton.

Councilmember Sutton: If we are going to have any remonstrators, I would, I would guess that we offer to allow those remonstrators to come forward on this issue.

President Bassemier: Okay, let's make sure I understand this. Mr. Ahlers, we've got a first reading on this. Do we vote on the first reading and then take a vote and it has to be unanimous to get the second reading and then that's when we have it? Help me out here.

Jeff Ahlers: Well, I would suggest that you could do it probably all in one motion if you want. You can move to pass this ordinance on it's first and final reading and to waive a second reading and as long as that motion passes unanimously, since it is

Mr. Compton's bond, I will ask him, since obviously the lid of your bond rises and falls under. If you want to recommend to them a different way, I will let you do that since it works that, but I would suggest that you can do it that way.

Charles Compton: What I think we would have is that the ordinance has been introduced as an ordinance typically would be. We would ask that first there be a motion to consider adoption of this bond ordinance on the date of introduction, actually first what there should be is a call for any remonstrators or petitioners against the project and that should happen first. Perhaps we ought to go ahead with that to see if that happens and if there are not that may shape how we go.

Councilmember Sutton: Mr. President.

President Bassemier: Okay, Mr. Sutton.

Councilmember Sutton: Just as I was asking you, we need to call for any remonstrators?

President Bassemier: Is there anybody that would like to speak to this.

Jeff Ahlers: Do you want to modify, I am not sure that was the motion that was made and that's the reason I pointed that out. Do you want to modify whoever made the motion to take that route. Because I think that motion was to just to-

President Bassemier: To hear it.

Jeff Ahlers: To pass the ordinance. So, if you choose to take that step I would suggest that whoever made the motion and the second rephrase if that is the route that they want to take.

President Bassemier: Is that you, Mr. Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Okay, should the motion state that this is a first and second reading?

Jeff Ahlers: Well, what you can do is move to remove the requirement of a second and final reading at another meeting would be the first motion and second and if that is passed unanimously then make a motion to pass the ordinance on its' first and final reading.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, so we need two motions?

Jeff Ahlers: Correct. The first motion would be to remove the requirement of a second reading at another meeting on this ordinance.

Councilmember Sutton: Actually to suspend the rules.

Jeff Ahlers: Yes, well you can call it that. Motion to suspend the rules that would require a second reading of this ordinance on another day and that would need to pass unanimously.

Councilmember Raben: Mr. President, I will amend my motion to state that we suspend the rules to, that would require this body to have a second reading on another day and move that we take final action today.

President Bassemier: Who was the second on that?

Teri Lukeman: Royce was.

President Bassemier: Royce, will you rescind it? Okay, Mr. Sutton.

Jeff Ahlers: He just needs to accept.

Councilmember Sutton: I accept that amendment to the original motion.

President Bassemier: Okay, thank you sir. Okay, do we need to take?

Jeff Ahlers: You can take a roll call vote on that if you would like on that.

President Bassemier: Okay, let's take a roll call vote.

Charles Compton: Do you want to call for discussion on that from the public?

President Bassemier: Okay. Is there anybody out there that would like to address this issue at there in the public? No, sounds good to me. Okay, anybody on the Council like to discuss it? Okay, roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

Jeff Ahlers: What I would do just because the record can't see when you called for any public comments. Let the record reflect that there was no one who had any comments or remonstrations.

President Bassemier: Let the record show that. Okay, thank you. Now, Mr. Winnecke? Before Mrs. Musgrave comes up, are we done with this?

Councilmember Sutton: No, we still have to have a second.

Councilmember Winnecke: I am sorry, I got lost in the vote taking.

Councilmember Sutton: We've got to have second reading.

Councilmember Raben: This motion will be the first and last final action -

Jeff Ahlers: To approve.

Councilmember Raben: To approve, okay, and I make that in a form of a motion.

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: Have a second by Mr. Wortman. Do we ask the public again?

Jeff Ahlers: You don't have to.

President Bassemier: No. I just want to do everything legal?

Jeff Ahlers: That's fine, if you want to.

President Bassemier: Okay anybody? Any discussion on this? Council or out there we will give everybody a chance again. Let the record show no discussion.

Jeff Ahlers: No one.

President Bassemier: Yeah, no one wanted to come forward and address this. Uh, roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes and that passes.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

President Bassemier: Okay, last of the agenda. Cheryl Musgrave, update on the assessors' computer hardware and software.

Councilmember Winnecke: Mr. President, while Mrs. Musgrave is meandering to the podium, may I make a suggestion?

President Bassemier: Yes.

Councilmember Winnecke: I don't know if this needs to be in the form of a resolution but I think it is important in getting back to the jail issue that you and the Council Attorney, Mr. Ahlers, sit down with Mr. Mosby and the Commission Attorney, Mr. Hayes, as quickly as possible to iron out these contractual issues so that we can act prudently on the 19th on the appropriation ordinance that will be before us.

President Bassemier: I have no problem.

Councilmember Winnecke: I make that in the form of a motion.

Councilmember Hoy: I second.

President Bassemier: Second, Mr. Hoy. Everybody in favor of that, raise your hand. Do you agree with that, Mr. Mosby? To meet with me and our-

Councilmember Sutton: (inaudible)

President Bassemier: I would like to get you involved here. The motion was we get together, our attorney, you and your all attorney, Mr. Hayes.

David Mosby: That's fine, what are we actually discussing?

President Bassemier: I want to make it clear to you.

Councilmember Winnecke: To work out these issues relating to the contract and the specific concerns of the contract so that we can get this appropriation taken care of at the next meeting.

David Mosby: Okay.

President Bassemier: No problem?

David Mosby: I just want to ask for clarification while I was here and standing here and we are talking about jail project. The meeting on the 19th, I mean and we had the advertisement the other night and it said action and discussion on contract and I had the Auditor strike contract from that advertisement.

Suzanne Crouch: Commissioner Mosby, that is the ad that we ran for the Commissioners. Before there was one ad, but because your wording was different

than their wording because I then came back to them and said this was your wording and they wanted different wording. So, then we ran an ad for the Commissioners and then an ad for the Council.

David Mosby: Okay, I guess my question is, is it your intent that we are going to discuss the contract and take action on the contract on the 19th, is that your intent?

Jeff Ahlers: Well, I don't know what, Mr. Winnecke would have to speak to that, I think all Mr. Winnecke is saying is that he would like for-

David Mosby: I understand that.

Jeff Ahlers: For Mr. Bassemier and I get with you and Ms. Fanello or Mr. Hayes and just see if I think in a meeting we can agree on some things and then eventually it would have to be brought back to, quite frankly, mainly your body. I mean your body would have to re-approve any changes to the contract.

David Mosby: Right, but I guess my, the clarification that I am looking for right now is that when we go into this meeting on December 19th at 12:30-

Councilmember Winnecke: That's the information gathering for-

David Mosby: That we are not discussing or taking action on a contract.

Councilmember Winnecke: Right. The appropriation that was deferred today will be taken up at a 3:00-

David Mosby: Right, I just want to make sure that we are still on the same page when we left here last week the only thing that we discussed was that the professionals will give a presentation. We will ask questions of that presentation.

Jeff Ahlers: If you haven't noticed to take action, you wouldn't be able to take action anyway. Although, I would suggest-

David Mosby: It is not our intent to take action.

Jeff Ahlers: The best case scenario would be to get these changes worked out and then quite frankly they would be approved by the Commissioners before that meeting.

David Mosby: I am just asking Mr. Bassemier so that I can go ahead and make an agenda and give to Sandie.

Councilmember Winnecke: I think your assumption is right.

David Mosby: That it will be a presentation by the professionals. Council and Commissioners will ask questions of that presentation and then the Sheriff, I did tell him that he could speak for three or four minutes if he had anything on history or whatever he wanted to give as due to the presentation. We would take public input, if there is somebody here that wants to speak, and we close the meeting.

Councilmember Hoy: That's correct.

David Mosby: Okay, just we don't have no, everybody is on the same page and we don't get into a big-

Councilmember Hoy: That's right.

David Mosby: To do over the contract.

President Bassemier: I guess, let's clear something up. We are going to kind of do it like we did last time? I guess it started out but we are both chairing it, in a round about way?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yeah, you guys can work that out.

David Mosby: We'll co-chair that is not a problem.

President Bassemier: I just, well, yeah.

David Mosby: I mean you will open your meeting and I will open ours and we will just.

President Bassemier: It don't matter to me.

David Mosby: Or some, or we will open the two meetings and suspend all normal business.

President Bassemier: Most of these, you have met with these people, you know who they are, you have met them. I have never met all of them, but yeah that is fine, okay.

David Mosby: Yeah, we will co-chair since we advertised it separately and your advertisement is different than ours.

President Bassemier: Okay.

Jeff Ahlers: Now, is everybody going to give a list then, is that what we are doing then, to me? Or to somebody as to what changes you want? I mean if it is just Ed and I you can either funnel them to Ed so that we know what it is that you want.

President Bassemier: You all understand that? Whatever changes you would like on the contract or if you like the way it is, I mean, okay. Dave, I will get with you later if you want to and set up a time where all of us to set up a time when we can meet.

David Mosby: When we can meet and then I will have Tammy go ahead tomorrow and do an agenda and get it back over to Sandie.

President Bassemier: Because I am open, I am on vacation until almost the first of the year. So, I am pretty well open any day. So, okay. Thank you, sir.

Jeff Ahlers: Did somebody make a motion?

President Bassemier: A motion and a second. Everybody in favor of that say aye.

Jeff Ahlers: I started to say was that just sort of-

President Bassemier: Okay. Cheryl is on her way up, ten minutes ago. State your name and business please.

CHERYL MUSGRAVE - UPDATE ON THE ASSESSORS' COMPUTER HARDWARE AND SOFTWARE
--

Cheryl Musgrave: Cheryl Musgrave, County Assessor. You ask that I come and make a report to you on the Assessor/Auditor computer purchases at the time that you made the appropriation. I have distributed the written report and I would just briefly cover that you did appropriate funds. The bid was advertised twice, the bid was partially awarded. Purchase orders have gone out on the partial award and we are still awaiting some information for the office XP pricing and we hope to award that within, I mean to make that purchase order, it might be the first of year as I understand that we are waiting for something to occur towards the end of this month. I have given you the base price of the units and discussed the ProVal software. I heard from our counsel today that we are getting pretty close to signing the document which will get the ball rolling to get the updated software here. So, are there any questions?

President Bassemier: Any questions for Cheryl?

Councilmember Sutton: A couple of questions.

President Bassemier: Mr. Sutton.

Councilmember Sutton: Yes. This bid, you received bids from two companies?

Cheryl Musgrave: Correct.

Councilmember Sutton: And from what I am reading here the intent is to break apart that? I thought that the bid was the RFP was, everything was all inclusive rather than parceling out pieces of it to any. Can you explain that?

Cheryl Musgrave: The RFP was written so that we could take the low bid that offered on any item by any bidder.

Councilmember Sutton: I am sorry, I didn't hear that last part there.

Cheryl Musgrave: That we could take the low price that was offered by any bidder. As it turned out, I think Matrix's low bid was on items that weren't approved but I would have to go through it. Let me give you a copy of the consultants letter outlining who bid the lowest on what, okay?

Councilmember Sutton: I guess my question is, was the intent that a particular company would bid the whole thing or where they just bidding on parts of the whole piece?

Cheryl Musgrave: The bid was written so that we could award the lowest bid to whoever bid it? Which ever company bid the lowest on it.

Councilmember Sutton: On the entire thing?

Cheryl Musgrave: No, on each individual component.

Councilmember Sutton: Okay, okay, that is where I just needed some clarification there. The other thing, the parts that have not, where you have not reached an agreement or you haven't made a purchase yet, carrying that money over into next

year. Unless you have a contract or a P.O. or something like that, I don't think that you are going to be able to carry that money over.

Cheryl Musgrave: I will have to check. What we are waiting for is the State of Indiana is just about to sign a bulk purchase agreement of some type with Microsoft so that we can get the office XP at a very favorable price. I am not exactly sure when that will conclude but I will take the necessary steps to make sure that we get in on that good deal.

Councilmember Sutton: Well it's just, we may, I mean depending on the timing here you could essentially end up having to come back before us-

Cheryl Musgrave: I hope not.

Councilmember Sutton: For the amount that you are going to need.

Cheryl Musgrave: I will stand on my ear before I do that, okay? Because that takes too long and I don't have that kind of time, as you well know.

Councilmember Sutton: I will take that as a compliment of our efficiency I guess.

Cheryl Musgrave: No, it's the process, itself.

Councilmember Hoy: Or the strength of her ears.

Cheryl Musgrave: Are there any other questions? Then that concludes my report. You can keep that if you would like.

President Bassemier: Thank you, Mrs. Musgrave.

Councilmember Tornatta: Mr. President.

President Bassemier: I'm sorry, was it something for Cheryl?¹

JAIL RESOLUTION

Councilmember Tornatta: No, it's something new. I would like to go over something we had talked about. Catherine, if you would like? I don't know, Commissioner. We had talked about a resolution of the County Council, the County of Vanderburgh and determining after investigation that new jail, work release and juvenile detention facilities are needed. It is the intent that we need to have this resolution in order to proceed.

David Mosby: Exactly. This resolution needs to be passed so that the Board of Tax Commissioners or so that we can show the Board of Tax Commissioners we have everything in line and that is just one step that we have to have in place before we can start or bond proceedings.

Councilmember Tornatta: This was read into the minutes at the last meeting.

David Mosby: I don't know, Jimmy, did you get a copy?

¹Councilmember Winnecke left meeting during this discussion

Councilmember Raben: I do have a copy of it and I am confused, we passed a resolution back in February.

David Mosby: Well, our bond counsel says that we need to pass this resolution for the Board of Tax Commissioners.

Councilmember Tornatta: Has he read that resolution?

David Mosby: Yes, because we referred to that resolution several times. This resolution does not commit you to any amount of money at this point. It is just saying that we understand that there is a need for a project. It is a real simple.

Councilmember Tornatta: I can read it if you-

Councilmember Raben: I have it but I would probably want to address some language in it. I didn't know we were going to go to this today.

David Mosby: I had asked you to do it last week but we ran out of time.

Councilmember Sutton: A resolution?

Councilmember Tornatta: The resolution is as follows:

Whereas the County Council, of the County of Vanderburgh, Indiana the county has determined after investigation that it is necessary and desirable the new jail, work release and juvenile detention facilities, "the project", be constructed for use by the county.

Now therefore, be it resolved by the County Council of County of Vanderburgh, Indiana as follows;

1. The County Council hereby determines that a need exists for a jail project which need can be served by the acquisition, construction, installation and equipping of the jail project. The County Council further determines that the funds needed therefor exceed the funds presently available to the County.
2. This resolution shall be in full force and effect from and upon compliance with the procedures required by law.

Councilmember Raben: Okay.

Councilmember Tornatta: This was passed out last time and I make that in the form of a motion.

Councilmember Sutton: Second.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Mr. President, I guess it is question time but I would request that we delay until our December 19th meeting and again I am not even so sure that the State Board of Accounts would require that this be passed. But-

President Bassemier: Jeff, do you want to comment?

Catherine Fanello: Uh.

President Bassemier: I'm sorry.

Catherine Fanello: Catherine Fanello, County Commissioner. Just to answer your question, yes it is required not by the State Board of Accounts but by the State Board of Tax Commissioners who approves the bond issue and every resolution that we pass is something that is required and will go into the bond transcript.

Councilmember Raben: Mr. President, I will, I mean I won't be voting for it, I would rather wait until December 19th.

President Bassemier: Well, they have a motion and a second.

David Mosby: I don't understand. I mean, what is your question? I mean, it is just saying that we need a project and if we are going to issue a bond, I mean this is just one step the Board of Tax Commissioners want. I mean unless there is not a need for a project.

Councilmember Raben: Well, I have some problems with some language. I mean it states that it is necessary and desirable that new jail, work release and juvenile detention facilities. We may not be able to afford all.

David Mosby: As long as we pass it we can always come back and strike it. But, if we don't pass it then we got to go back and do it over.

Councilmember Raben: I might ask our counsel. If that were changed to just correctional facilities and the other words stricken from this resolution, is that something that we can do today? If I ask that it be done?

Jeff Ahlers: You can make whatever change you want, the only thing, and I don't know why but I don't seem to have a copy of it. But at any rate-

David Mosby: It was in that stuff I gave you last week, Jeff.

Jeff Ahlers: Oh, okay then. I thought that I had seen it but, hold on just a second. It is alright I have it in a separate file for the jail, it's this big.

David Mosby: Oh, I understand, believe me. I keep going and getting and I just want to express to them, this is what bond counsel has said that we need to do.

Jeff Ahlers: The only issue would be and it is for Council to decide whether you are making a determination today that you are building all three of those things. I mean, that's what it says. So, the question is, are you ready to make that commitment to build all three? That's what it says.

President Bassemier: Jeff, does that contradict what we just voted on for the 19th meeting?

Councilmember Tornatta: No.

Jeff Ahlers: I don't know about contradict. I guess the only thing would be rather or not, I guess the question would be, you know, does the cart or the horse come first. I mean, it depends on whether you want to say this is what we are going to build or whether you are going to get the information and find out what you can build and can afford before you pass it.

Councilmember Tornatta: But it says, necessary and desirable. It is a necessity to have this and it is desirable to get all of these taken care of. Whether we can or not is a different issue and this by no means says that anything more than necessary and desirable.

Councilmember Sutton: Well, if we think about the study we paid, actually the grant helped pay for the PMSI deal. Essentially their conclusions were identical but at the same time those were not things that bound us to act in any particular way regarding the facility that we are going to have. However, it did recommend that all three of those areas be in, and I think it is very clear that those are needs but that doesn't mean that we can necessarily can address all of those.

President Bassemier: I do have a motion and a second, in all fairness, uh, we have a motion and second on this. Is there any more discussion on this because we will vote.

Councilmember Wortman: I wanted to ask Mr. Mosby. Did you get a letter from the State Board of Tax Commissioners confirming this? That you have to do it?

David Mosby: Our bond counsel has talked with them, well our bond counsel does this all over the state but this is a step that the State Board of Tax Commissioners spells out that you have to have.

Councilmember Wortman: You didn't receive nothing in writing on it?

David Mosby: No, I haven't talked to them personally. We are working with bond counsel on this, the same as we are with everything else. I mean, he said this, we did it over in the City when we used to bond stuff. I mean, we would have to pass this saying there is a necessary need or a desire to have it. It is just something that they have to have on record that goes in as part of the file before you can issue a bond. I mean you are not going to issue a bond without it. It is just one step that they require. A simply piece of paper saying that you deem it necessary or desirable and that is all that it is.

Teri Lukeman: Excuse me, I need to change the tape.

David Mosby: It is not locking into any money.

Teri Lukeman: Excuse me.

(Tape Change)

President Bassemier: We're kind of in a dilemma here. I'm kind of thinking, with all due respect, maybe we ought to table this until the 19th –

Councilmember Tornatta: There's a motion and a second.

Councilmember Sutton: There's a motion on the floor.

President Bassemier: Well, I was just thinking, it wasn't really fair to Mr. Winnecke. He had a doctor's appointment and then – but it's okay with me. We have a motion and a second.

Councilmember Tornatta: It's a scheduled meeting.

Councilmember Sutton: Now we're not changing our County Council –

President Bassemier: No, I was just – probably we should have brought this up if – I kind of think we should have known about this a bit before here, not wait till the last of the meeting –

Councilmember Tornatta: Mr. President, I mean, –

President Bassemier: I got a motion and a second, and –

Councilmember Tornatta: All I did was go down the agenda and I had to give due respect to the people that were in line –

President Bassemier: I understand. Guy walks out of the room and then we make a motion because he had to go see a doctor. Well, that's okay. Got a motion and a second and we're through discussing it –

Councilmember Tornatta: Is popping up of a resolution anything new to this Council?

President Bassemier: No, but here –

Councilmember Tornatta: I didn't think so.

President Bassemier: Here at the 11th hour here, here a man walks out, he's got a doctor's appoint, let's make a motion.

Councilmember Tornatta: That has nothing to do with it.

President Bassemier: Oh, I know it, I know it.

David Mosby: Mr. President –

President Bassemier: Roll call vote please.

Councilmember Tornatta: What was your agenda, President?

President Bassemier: That wasn't on the agenda.

Councilmember Tornatta: That's right. But we're going to let them go through the agenda and then I'm going to present. Now did I know that –

President Bassemier: Well, it's okay. We'll vote on it. Go ahead.

Councilmember Tornatta: Start casting stones.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: I think somebody needs to spend some time looking over Robert's Rules and revisiting those because there's obviously a clear lack of understanding of what needs to be proceed. Either discussion is cut off when it's

not necessarily in the liking of someone or it's going on in a different direction than what someone had supposed, that is not Robert's Rules of Order. And I think this body –

President Bassemier: Oh, I know we –

Councilmember Sutton: – and I thought this body – there we go again. And I thought that's what this body was trying to conduct a level of decorum here and new business is designed just for that, new business. You can bring up items under new business. We've done that before and so I guess, I think there really needs to be some time spent there. Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: No.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: No.

(Motion fails 3-3/Councilmembers Wortman, Raben and Bassemier opposed)

President Bassemier: No, so it's defeated, three-three tie. So, that's why I said, it'd been best that – but to answer your question, your point's well taken, Mr. Sutton.

Councilmember Sutton: So we're saying here with that vote that we don't want to issue, we don't want to proceed forward with a bond. Is that what we're saying?

Councilmember Tornatta: We're saying we don't want a jail project.

Councilmember Hoy: I want to go on record, Mr. President, if I may, but I want to defer to my colleague, Councilman Sutton, who I don't think was finished and I think in all fairness, if you have more to say I want to hear that first.

Councilmember Sutton: Yeah, I really want to say something here and I am really getting to the point of real frustration and that is, every time it seems to be a discussion before this Council, certain individuals who want to talk, they can talk as long as they want, they can say anything they want to say, they can come back and rebut to anybody they want to rebut to, they can cut off in the middle of discussion, but I'll speak for myself. And I don't know about others, I don't feel like the same courtesy is accorded in this direction as far as what I'm concerned, and I'm elected just like anybody else on this Council. And if you're the President in this chair, as presiding officer of this body, that is not parliamentary procedure.

President Bassemier: Okay, I'm going to address that, sir. Your point is well taken, but probably if you go back and look at all the minutes, I've always given that side I don't know how much time to discuss something over and over. Mr. Wortman

today called for a question and I still let four people speak. And the way we've done it for the last ten years was when somebody calls for a question after we've discussed the issue for about 25 or 30 minutes in this meeting, we've been discussing it for five years, I think everybody had a chance to get their word in edgewise, I don't think I'm cutting anybody off short. God dang, I'm sorry if you feel that way, but I feel like I give everybody the opportunity – Troy, I've even mentioned it to you at times that, do you understand it? Would you like to say more? I don't know how many times, look up the minutes, I have given everybody an opportunity to speak. And that's fine. You've also cut me off, told me I couldn't speak before a vote and that in the rules is not the way it works; however --

President Bassemier: I'm sorry, Mr. Hoy –

Councilmember Hoy: Go ahead and I'll wait my turn.

President Bassemier: But –

Councilmember Tornatta: How would you – when would you have wanted me to present this resolution? Before everybody else stood up? I had my hand raised both times. Now I mean I guess I could have cut off the new business that was before this, but I was going to announce that at the last of the new business. Now I'm sorry I don't have his appointment book, did not know when he was leaving. I consider Mr. Winnecke a comrade of the Council. I have no reason to make it any kind of political maneuvering or strategy to make sure that he gets out of the room before I announce this resolution. But I don't believe that that came about until I made the motion and I almost cut Ms. Musgrave to do that, so –

President Bassemier: Well, I tell you what, something so important, I would think, that it looked kind of like, you know, may be a bit more important to wait, but let me ask, I've got one more thing to say to Mr. Sutton. Mr. Sutton, many a time, many a time, I hold this meeting up at 3:30 because I know you've got a busy agenda. I've held this meeting up many a time to give you a chance to get here on time or to get here so we have all seven because I value your opinion. But many a time, or everybody can say that I hold it up to give you an extra chance to get here even though you're running five or ten minutes late, and I'm sorry if you feel like I've cut you off because I don't mean to. Mr. Hoy, you're next.

Councilmember Hoy: I have two comments. One is, this is why I have argued that we...actually, we have not voted to operate under Robert's Rules of order as a body, if you look in this guidebook. And I agree with you, Councilman Tornatta, I wish we did, because then you have a better procedure and I hate to see us end a session this way because we've done fairly well this year, I think, in our exchanges, not perfectly, but fairly well, but that's why I've advocated adoption of those and we really haven't adopted them and I wish we had. The second thing I want to say is, just looking at the last vote we took which was a tie vote, and since Commissioner Mosby is standing here, just speaking for myself and not for six other people, but I think this Council by this vote is not saying at this point, I certainly hope not, you know, that we don't want a bond issue. We're going to have to have a bond issue and I think all of us know that, so –

David Mosby: My only question is, –

Councilmember Hoy: – I think, you know, my interpretation, even though I voted for us to go ahead and lost that vote, I don't want to misinterpret it, I think that just from what I've heard this Council say, we're going to be open to a bond issue and I think

it's a matter of when the vote took place. The last thing I wish to say, Mr. President, is under new business, Mr. Tornatta is certainly, in my opinion, he has the right to bring up an issue, I've done it, and brought up resolutions. That's in order. So I don't see that as being out of order at all, but some day perhaps we can look at procedure. And you allowed it on the floor and –

President Bassemier: I didn't say it was out of order, I know this was a very important issue and know this issue is dead because we didn't have seven men to vote on it and it's a shame sometimes we – I think Mr. Ahlers is next.

Jeff Ahlers: Yeah, one of the comments I'd make, Mr. Mosby is that if this particular resolution was somehow critical to the bond process, then I would suggest the bond counsel talk to us. I've not hear from Mr. Pittman one time, I've not received a letter, not a phone call.

David Mosby: It's a simple piece of paper I passed out to you last week and, you know, for somebody to say they didn't know this was going to be brought up, that's lack of the president's fault. I mean, I can't help he don't read his information.

President Bassemier: Now wait a minute –

Jeff Ahlers: Wait, wait, wait, wait –

David Mosby: The only thing I want to say, I guess my interpretation right now of what you did, we have no December 19th meeting. I mean, that's going to be my interpretation because this county cannot afford 35 million dollars and you just sat here and voted against a bond issuance, saying you're not going to bond it. You have to have this piece of paper, so I interpret that as, you are not going to build a jail. I mean, there's no sense in dragging the professionals down here. We owe them money already. If you're not going to bond the project, we're not going to build the project, we don't have a project.

Jeff Ahlers: Let me just say, if I could please, let me finish. What I'm saying is, I'm not sure that it's necessarily as critical as you say, that things can't be put back on track. I don't vote on the substance, so what you guys decide to float a bond for, what you decide to build is not my issue. What I'm telling you is, to the extent that Ms. Fanello on her way out of the room or to the extent that you're saying, that somehow this resolution was important to the process, what I'm telling you is, then your –

David Mosby: It's a part of the application.

Jeff Ahlers: Well, then your bond counsel has failed you, okay. Because I've not received one phone call from him, not one letter. As far as I know, neither the President of this Council has, and you know, is he not the bond counsel of the whole county or is he just your attorney.

David Mosby: Why does he have to call you? I'm going to ask you that question. Why does he have to call you?

Jeff Ahlers: Because if you're telling me that's that critical, wouldn't you think it'd be his responsibility to impress upon us that and tell us to where he's going, to give us a road map? I'm just taking a big issue if all of the sudden we're saying that we're going to the point that you're going to say this breaks down the whole process. Then I'm saying, then somebody failed to tell anybody what process we're embarking

upon.

David Mosby: Were you not here at last Wednesday's meeting? I passed that out and I gave an explanation of what it was. You were sitting here. Now if you didn't hear it, I can't help that.

Jeff Ahlers: I'm sorry, Mr. Mosby, that fact that you hand out a resolution has nothing to do with talking about what the bond process is. Who's ever advised this body of what the road map is? What's going to be occurring on one date?

David Mosby: Well, we keep coming in here giving you information –

Jeff Ahlers: I'm talking about an attorney needs to instruct us. If we've got a bond counsel, it needs to be instructing us on what the process is.

David Mosby: The bond counsel is dealing with the Commissioners. He feels like, if he hands us one piece of paper that we can handle bringing that over here and giving it to you and explaining. Now if you had a question on that to be informed, or to inform yourself, you should have took it upon yourself to call Baker & Daniels and talk to Tom Pittman. Now you might sit here and give your opinion, but you're not doing your homework either. You have a phone and you could have called him. Our bond counsel figures that we can bring one piece of paper over here, and as growing men, we will sit here and do what we need to do to move this county forward. We're not moving this county forward, we're sitting here stepping backwards every time. Now we brought one simple piece of paper that binded nobody to nothing. There's no quote or price or anything in that piece of paper, but you've sat here and once again, played games and said nah, we don't do that, we'll hold you up another month.

Jeff Ahlers: I haven't done anything. I'm just telling you that's the poorest communication I've ever heard. If some bond attorney wants to come in here and tell us what process he wants to follow, that's fine. But he ought to be the attorney for the county and not just tell you guys what you want done, but he ought to be instructing us, if that's the case.

(Inaudible – David Mosby and Councilmember both speaking at once)

President Bassemier: One at a time.

David Mosby: We're paying somebody \$175 an hour, why would you want to drag him down here every time to get a question answered? I mean, –

Jeff Ahlers: We have telephones. I don't know that he needs to.

David Mosby: You're right and we're capable. We talk to him on the phone, we cut our time short. You know, he says can you relay this? Sure, I'll carry the message. You know, if you don't believe me, I guess that's fine, then I'm going to have to tell him, you know, Mr. Ahlers doesn't believe you, so we need to spend \$175 for you to call him and tell him we need to do this. And that's exactly what we've gotten in to and now we're sitting here saying we're not going to build a jail. We can't build a jail, the bond says if you cannot afford it, does this county have \$35 million? No. We cannot afford \$35 million. So why would we not have to pass this –

Jeff Ahlers: Don't you have to figure out what you're going to build first?

David Mosby: You all have said 35 million. There's no price in that paper. This just says we need to build a jail. That's what it says.

Councilmember Hoy: Mr. Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Hold it, Mr. Tornatta.

Councilmember Tornatta: I just – we were talking about – and I don't know if this is what you're looking for. It's December 5th, 2001, Wednesday regular meeting of the County Council to A) Adopt appropriation ordinance for architects fees and B) Adopt resolution determining the jail project is needed. I'm just saying that this was given out as well, a time line, and maybe this isn't the time line you're talking about, but this is a time line that was given out in good faith which is kind of what the Council was asking for all the way until December 31, 2004, and one of the items on this was A) to adopt the appropriation ordinance for architect fees and to adopt the resolution determining that the jail process is needed. I don't think that this was A) I don't think that this was brought out of a whim and I think that this was pretty well documented in this draft here.

Jeff Ahlers: What I'm saying is no, what I'm taking issue is people storming out of the room and people threatening to cancel meetings saying that somehow that the process has gone defunct just because one ordinance didn't pass or one resolution didn't pass, and it's a three-three vote, and I'm saying that may be a quantum leap to make that conclusion is all I'm saying.

Councilmember Tornatta: And I ask you the thing. Did you find anything in that resolution that would put us, as the County fiscal body, a –

Jeff Ahlers: I made no recommendation, you voted. I didn't vote. I'm just talking about the process itself, that if there's to be allegations made that somehow this was so critical to the process and that it can't be voted on again, or that somehow meetings are being cancelled because of the vote taken on this, I'm saying that somebody must have failed somewhere along the line to tell how important that is, because I don't think that's the proper conclusion.

Councilmember Tornatta: The question asked was, did you find anything in that resolution that was offensive or was a problem with the County Council? And if it's not, then I agree with Commissioner Mosby that yeah, we are stalling this project, we are putting this behind because we, all of the sudden, find a problem with every document that's brought up and instead of going through with this, it says we do not determine – it says we –

(Inaudible – David Mosby attempting to speak over Councilmember Tornatta)

Jeff Ahlers: I have no idea. It's not my job to make substantive votes, and I'm not taking issue on the substance, okay? I was only addressing when people start threatening to cancel meetings because there's a tie vote on a resolution, I'm sorry, I guess I'm missing where we're going here and –

(Inaudible – David Mosby attempting to speak over Jeff Ahlers)

David Mosby: – if he'll vote yes, I guess, then, this will pass. But if he's going to vote no, then we still don't have a project. I mean, safe to say, four beats three, so whichever way he votes, we either do have a project or we don't have a project.

Jeff Ahlers: I don't have a vote. I think you're directing your anger to the wrong person, okay, all of you.

David Mosby: Your anger is at me because my bond counsel didn't call you. I mean, you didn't tell me last week when I passed all this out, have your bond counsel call me. If you would have, I would have told him to. I just talked to him –

(Inaudible – several speaking at once)

President Bassemier: Mr. Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: I think what we need to do in this moment is look at what reality is. The reality is, we have a tied vote. The reality is we have a meeting on the 19th. The bond counsel will be here, correct, on the 19th?

David Mosby: I can't answer that at this point.

Councilmember Hoy: I thought he was going to be here and I thought –

David Mosby: I'm not sure we have a project. I'm not going to drag him down here if we don't have a project when you just voted to deny the bonds, so –

Councilmember Hoy: No, you're talking – no, this Council –

Councilmember Raben: David, have you read the –

Councilmember Hoy: I'd like to finish my statement. This Council, in all sincerity, in January, I believe it was, this year, set aside 2.7 million dollars for this project. We also said at that time we hoped to set aside another hunk of money in the beginning of 2002. Now I think that is more than a good faith move on the part of this Council and presently we have division, which simply locks us up for a week, that certainly doesn't lock us up for the informational meeting next week. We need to go ahead on the 19th. We need to go ahead with that meeting, have bond counsel here, we need to have the architectural firm here. The other part I'd like in that meeting, the answer to which I still don't have and would like to have is, what are the Indiana standards, you know, for a jail because that's unclear. I thought it was clear, apparently, it's not. That's what this meeting is about, but I don't think there's a person sitting around this table and including the gentleman who's not here, who doesn't believe we should do this project. We have all voted money for it. So I think that's on record and I know you're disappointed. I voted with you today, but we win some, we lose some. And that's where we are. But let's go ahead with the 19th, bring ourselves together, bring the proper players together and that will move us ahead. The other things is, any questions about how Councilman Winnecke would vote are moot because he's not here, and he's not here for the vote, so we could debate – I don't know how he'd vote. You know, I have no notion. But you've got a deadlock here and I think we'll get beyond that. So that's all I'm asking is that we stick together on this and we all show up on the 19th.

David Mosby: And I'll comment quickly to what you said. I mean, you did set 2.7 million aside and we've yet to be able to spend one penny of it, so I'm not sure what 2.7 million is for. And I know you're going to set some more aside next year, but it's not going to be 35 million dollars, so where I'm coming from is, we're trying to get a bond to build a jail and you're going to be far off 35 million, and you voted against, you know, me getting the application in for the bond, so you're not going to bond it and you only got five million dollars, and you won't spend a penny of it, we can't

even pay architects and engineers. What does it look like to me? We're not going to build a jail. It's pretty simple. You've made every vote that has casted that, you've shown it to the public that you're not willing to work and build a jail. I come in here last week and tried to supply you with ten pages of information to give you time lines, to give you resolutions, to try to work out solutions. I told you, we can't cap a fee when we don't have a scope of service. I mean, I've did everything that you've asked me. I talked to Mr. Ahlers for 45 minutes yesterday, and I agreed earlier in the meeting to meet with him, all the find out, you don't even want to fulfil the application to put in for the bond. You just voted against it.

Councilmember Hoy: Half of us do, and we don't know how Mr. Winnecke would have voted and it's unfortunate –

David Mosby: So the fate of this county right now lies with Councilman Winnecke.

Councilmember Hoy: Well, not anymore because he's not here.

David Mosby: He's the only vote left.

David Mosby: These three right here have said no to a jail.

Councilmember Hoy: No, it could be – what I'm saying is, that it could be on the 19th, after hearing bond counsel, having the man here and all of this, we could well end up with four votes, five votes, six votes and probably seven votes. And that's all I'm saying. And I think that – I know this is frustrating to you, certainly it's frustrating to all of us, but this is no time for any of us, including the Council or the Commissioners, or anybody else, to bail out of that 19th meeting. We need to have that meeting badly. We need that informational meeting. And that's –

Councilmember Sutton: Councilman Hoy? In our last special meeting, if you can recall, one of the questions that I asked both bodies, and both bodies didn't have a real definitive answer, and I asked that we come up with, and that was what is the time line? What are we going to be doing? What are the steps? What is the process? And we probably heard four or five different comments or suggestions on what they thought the process was going to be. We got that last week from the Commissioners. I think this body has to put one together or we look at the one the Commissioners have prepared and say, well, maybe not, yes...we need a document that states what we believe the process ought to be, otherwise, each and every issue we're going to find ourselves having road blocks. Whether we like or dislike their agenda, they've put one together, you know, and one of the items on there was that resolution that was today, you know, we've got to come up with something. If we don't like this, then what's our recommendation?

President Bassemier: (Inaudible – microphone not turned on) and back up their words, I'm willing to sign, you know, whatever it takes to get the project on the ground, but as I mentioned at our last special meeting that it's still an open-ended contract until everybody signs it on the dotted line that it will hold up in court, I'd like to see what we're getting for our dollar.

David Mosby: Mr. President, this bond paper has nothing to do with the contract. This goes to the State Board of Tax Commissioners so you can issue a bond. You're wanting to talk about United –

President Bassemier: (Inaudible – microphone not turned on)

David Mosby: Let me ask you this, just a simple question, does the county have 35 million in the bank?

President Bassemier: No.

David Mosby: Okay, are we going to have to have a bond to build the jail?

President Bassemier: (Inaudible – microphone not turned on)

David Mosby: Okay. Are we going to have to have a bond to build a jail? Yes or no?

President Bassemier: I assume we will, but –

David Mosby: Are you going to pay for it?

President Bassemier: The taxpayers are going to –

David Mosby: No, I said are you. But what my question is and you're not answering it, but you know, we either have the money or we don't have the money, the only thing is paper says us we're going to issue a bond. That's all it says. And you have to have that with your application when you go for your final. And this is one part of it and we just backed the whole process up.

Councilmember Raben: Mr. President –

President Bassemier: We're not getting anywhere.

Councilmember Raben: I've sat here very patiently, I want to address a few things. First of all on the comments made when you left the – when I go to your chambers, I sit and listen. I don't act childish like you to do when you come in and leave stomping and screaming. Have a little respect. When you come in our den, act like you respect the actions and the work that this body does just as we do when we come in yours. Second of all, my concern with this resolution I addressed and asked not to vote on it. I stated that I would rather do it December the 19th. I'm not comfortable with the language in it. I do feel like it's somewhat binds us to doing all three and I'm not going to commit us to anything. We can work around that language. This Council hasn't done what we've done in and accomplished in the last ten years making rash, irresponsible decisions. We've questioned people that's come in here for ten dollars and we've questioned them that came in for ten million. We've got that right. So don't try to take that away from us.

David Mosby: I'm not trying to take it away from you, I'm just asking you if you want to build a jail or not, and that was a simple piece of paper with no commitment behind it, to put it in with the application, that's all it is.

Councilmember Sutton: Mr. President, I would ask that this body, and this is a motion, that this body would prepare a list of, I don't want to call it an agenda, but a list of –

President Bassemier: Wish list?

Councilmember Sutton: Not a wish list, let me get the right language here, make sure I'm okay, but basically a time line for the process that we want to follow through this jail process. I would, that's a motion that I ask that we prepare something on

behalf of the Council to that effect.

Councilmember Hoy: I will second that (inaudible – microphone not turned on)

Councilmember Sutton: Time line on the time line? I would say that needs to be prepared before our December 19th meeting.

President Bassemier: Well let me ask you, won't we pick up some points from these experts that we might have an opinion about that we're not thinking of right now, but when they bring it to us, maybe it will help us?

Councilmember Sutton: I would say that that 19th meeting would help us if there are some issues that maybe might be out of line of our side, that would help to sharpen our focus a little bit, but I don't think we should solely depend – I guess maybe it's just the nature, I don't solely depend on the professionals to tell me everything I need to know. But I think there's some things that we already know that are givens for us that we can help, the professionals can help aid us.

President Bassemier: Okay, I have a motion and a second.

Councilmember Hoy: I'll second.

President Bassemier: Second by Mr. Hoy. Now for a little bit more discussion, here we've been asking Jeff to do a lot of extra work, I hope we're prepared here in the near future and when he sends us a bill, it's going to be a little bit extra. Am I hearing this – what do you think?

Jeff Ahlers: Well, I'm saying it depends on what it is. I don't have a problem meeting with people, but if there's going to be a request that this body redraft the contract, I mean, that's something that's fairly significant and I don't think we're doing that now, but if we are, that's a different story. But one of the things I would just say in response to you, is that I guess everybody needs to get to Sandie as soon as possible, what changes you want in the contract, put them in writing, give them to Sandie and she'll compile a list, I guess, for me or if one of you want to take that responsibility for me to have a punch list, so to speak, whenever Ed and I or whoever meets with whatever counterparts are after today, whenever there's been a threat to not have meetings, I'm not sure what's going to occur. I guess we'll find out.

Councilmember Hoy: The other question I have about the motion on the floor is, because I think it's a good motion, how are we going to put this time line together? Who is going to put it together, and you're our president, so I'm passing the ball back to you because I think that's your prerogative to appoint how that's done.

President Bassemier: Well, to start would be the meeting with our attorney, the county, Mr. Mosby and I, and then if we need help or, you know, we'll be calling.

Councilmember Hoy: Okay.

Jeff Ahlers: The time line is different than –

Councilmember Hoy: The time line is different. We have two things here. We have a contract that the four of you are going to meet on and we're to feed in our information, but right now we're discussing Mr. Sutton's motion.

President Bassemier: Well, Mr. Sutton would like to do it before the 19th.

Councilmember Hoy: Yeah, and I know that.

President Bassemier: Can that be done?

Councilmember Hoy: Well, I'm just asking –

Councilmember Sutton: Well, (Inaudible)

President Bassemier: Okay. Mr. Sutton, you want to – I'm going to ask you for your help on this, too. I'll be giving you a lot of calls. Since it's your motion –

Councilmember Sutton: It's my motion, but I'm not saying I know a whole lot about how to do this. I mean –

President Bassemier: Well, you've got your ideas and –

Councilmember Sutton: We've discussed a lot –

Councilmember Hoy: The suggestion has been made by my colleague sitting next to me, I started to say to the right, but that's not fair, I think I'm fiscally more conservative than people around here, and more socially liberal, everybody knows that. But perhaps the four of you, could you incorporate time lines? We've got a time line lying in front of us.

President Bassemier: Yeah, we'll try.

Councilmember Hoy: Alright, I think maybe that would be – is that acceptable to you, Mr. Sutton, that they work on the contract and the time line or not?

Councilmember Sutton: One more time.

President Bassemier: Who's the four we talked about, Mr. Mosby, Mr. Hayes, Mr. Ahlers and myself? Is that the four you had in mind?

President Bassemier: And you're saying that's not a good idea?

Jeff Ahlers: Well, I don't think it is for, well, number one, you've got a short, if somebody wants to make a time line, I mean, I would only suggest that you make your time line. I'm not a jail consultant, you know, you're talking about a short amount of time. I think that's pretty ambitious to come up with something that we're apparently being billed a half a million dollars for them to do it, and somehow we're going to whip it up over night. That's my only thing is to understand what kind of task that you're getting into. There's people that are paid a lot of money and take a lot of time to do this. So do you want something good or not? But, I mean, I don't, you know, I don't know what Royce is wanting, but I'm not sure that that's – I mean, I don't know how we can do it with the Commissioners and we can't even iron out the contracts yet.

Councilmember Tornatta: And no disrespect, but I think that that's part of the whole problem with the whole process we're dealing with now. They get paid all this money to do all these jobs and we're trying to second guess them every time we turn around. I mean, I think that that's part of what the gridlock has been. You know, at some point, they're just doing their job and the Commissioners are trying

to do their due diligence to do their best job, but the Council has jumped into the contract now and we're trying to take on Commissioner's abilities and doing everything that we can to stall a project that today just had a simple form to say, are we going to build a jail. Do we look like our needs to build this jail –

President Bassemier: Troy, I tell you what we'll do –

Councilmember Hoy: The statement today –

Councilmember Tornatta: You want to talk about respect, Mr. Raben? That's it right there. That's the respect. If we're going to talk about one and not the other, that's what we need.

President Bassemier gaveled Councilmember Tornatta.

President Bassemier: Okay, Troy –

Councilmember Tornatta: Now if you want to jump up in the air and do all that stuff, that's fine, but we're talking respect, let's get it from both sides. That's ridiculous.

President Bassemier: I'm going to give you a chance to finish, sir. Are you done?

Councilmember Hoy: I don't – Mr. Tornatta, with all due respect – I'm part of your side. As I recall, I ran on your ticket, ran with you. I am a Democrat and I don't agree with you on what you just said. I think we've gotten too many harsh words going here. We've got a motion on the floor. I think we might have some difficulty, Mr. Sutton, getting this together, but we also have a time line that the Commissioners have laid out. I think some of us could look at that and at least make suggestions on that time line. And I'm not trying to put you, Mr. President, on the spot, but you are our president and, should this motion pass, then I want you to appoint whoever – tries to put together a time line. That time line will be something we can look at in a Council meeting and see. We could get it before the meeting.

President Bassemier: I'll work with Jeff and Mr. Hayes and Mr. Mosby and we'll see what we can come up with and if we need some help, whatever, I'll be giving you a call. I don't know if it could be done, but I'll do my best as your president.

Councilmember Hoy: If we (inaudible) that if we have a time line by the 19th, that's the (inaudible). And I call for the question, sir.

President Bassemier: And you call for the question. Roll call vote.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Yes.

(Motion carried 5-1/Councilmember Wortman opposed)

President Bassemier: I will try to do my best.

Councilmember Sutton: Mr. President, I would just suggest that in getting this time line together, we can use the Commissioners thing as kind of like a guide or a template and we can go back through either Council or whatever and we can scratch through unless you want to name maybe two or three people to take a look at it specifically. You know, we really have not spent the time with the professionals to really get a good sense of what goes where, that type of thing.

President Bassemier: I tell you what, somebody had a good idea about everybody sending it in, Jeff's suggested to send it in to Sandie, so I like your opinions, too, and I don't have – you know you guys are hard at work, and we're all business people, so if you don't mind, give Sandie your suggestions and we'll work on it and I'll work with the Commissioners on it and then I'll be calling you and can go from there. Is that okay with everybody? I mean, do I have a motion to adjourn?

Councilmember Raben: Well, Mr. President, just real quick, on a brighter note. I don't know if anybody looked at their financial statement, but after today, the County will have approximately \$950,000 unexpended in the General Fund, which is considerably better than what I've seen in, you know, a lot of years in the past we've done a good job once again this year, and I think everybody deserves a pat on the back.

President Bassemier: Thank you, Mr. Raben.

Councilmember Sutton: Now we can't carry that all over.

President Bassemier: Can we have a motion to adjourn? We've got an Area Plan meeting. I'm not trying to cut anybody off.

Councilmember Hoy: I make a motion we adjourn, sir.

President Bassemier: Okay.

(Meeting adjourned at 5:32 p.m.)

VANDEBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL

President Ed Bassemier

Vice President Lloyd Winnecke

Councilmember James Raben

Councilmember Phil Hoy

Councilmember Curt Wortman

Councilmember Royce Sutton

Councilmember Troy Tornatta

Recorded by Teri Lukeman. Transcribed by Teri Lukeman and B.J. Farrell.

**JOINT MEETING OF THE
VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL
AND COMMISSIONERS
DECEMBER 19, 2001**

The Vanderburgh County Council and Commissioners held a special joint meeting for discussion of jail and corrections projects on December 19, 2001, in Room 301 of the Civic Center Complex. The meeting was called to order at 12:35 p.m. by County Council President, Ed Bassemier.

Council President Bassemier: Major, Sheriff's Department, do you want to open the meeting, please?

Brad Ellsworth: Oh yes, oh yes, oh yes, the Vanderburgh County Council and Commission is now in session pursuant to adjournment.

Council President Bassemier: Thank you, Sheriff. I want to welcome everybody to the December 19, 2001, special joint meeting. This meeting, the purpose for this meeting is to for information purposes about the jail project. You want to take roll call?

Teri Lukeman: Just start (Inaudible. Mike not on.)

Council President Bassemier: As far as Council members, please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Here.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Here.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Here.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Here.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Here.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Here.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

Council President Bassemier: Here. Mr. Mosby.

Commission President Mosby: Yes, I would like to call to order Board of Commissioners meeting December 19th, regularly scheduled meeting. Present today will be Commissioner Mourdock, Commissioner Fanello, Commissioner Mosby, myself, along with Counselor, Tom Bodkin and Counselor, Phil Hayes. I

guess, if I could at this point, we'll just have a motion to suspend normal business?

Council President Bassemier: Can I have a motion?

Commission President Mosby: To go into the special agenda.

Council President Bassemier: Is that okay? Motion to suspend? Do I have a motion?

Unidentified: Pardon?

Commissioner Mourdock: Just for the record, the County Auditor is here too. I know she stepped out for a moment, but the County Auditor, as she always is—

Commission President Mosby: Oh, I'm sorry. Right.

Commissioner Mourdock: —(Inaudible. Talking over each other.) County Commission meeting.

Commission President Mosby: And in my introductions include the County Auditor, Suzanne Crouch.

Council President Bassemier: Thank you, Commissioner Mourdock. Okay, would everybody please stand for the Pledge of Allegiance?

(The Pledge was given.)

Commission President Mosby: We need a motion to suspend normal business. Yeah, we need a motion.

Commissioner Fanello: I need to make a motion to suspend normal business.

Council President Bassemier: Okay.

Commissioner Mourdock: Second.

Commission President Mosby: So ordered.

Council President Bassemier: Thank you. Information items, Mr. Mosby, do you want to go ahead and start on your presentation by the professionals.

Commission President Mosby: Yes, we'll start today, as you said, this is an informational hearing, so we'll start with a presentation by the professional firms that we have with us, being Crowe Chizek, Shireman and Company, Julie Von Arx, Al Bennett, United Consulting, DLZ, Baker and Daniels, and Mike Claytor from Crowe Chizek. I think they have a designated spokesman, and I will let them go ahead with their presentations and then we will come back with questions by Council members and Commissioners.

Council President Bassemier: Thank you, sir.

Brad Ellsworth: My name is Brad Ellsworth, Sheriff of Vanderburgh County. I've been asked to make the introductions. First I would like to introduce Mike Claytor

with Crowe Chizek, the financial advisor, to make his presentation.

Council President Bassemier: Sir, for the record, please state your name.

Mike Claytor: Yes, sir. My name is Michael Claytor. I'm a partner with the accounting firm, Crowe Chizek and Company.

Council President Bassemier: Okay, sir, thank you.

Mike Claytor: Hopefully, you have before you a couple of packets of information. One is, hopefully, enough detail that if you have any trouble sleeping, you will be able to take care of that. It is in a bound sheet that looks like this that has various detail of financing scenarios. Then the other thing that you have that we provided is a copy of the power point slides that I'm going to go through at this point. I think, probably, you will both squint at the screen and squint at the one's in front of you. So, if I get my bifocals aligned right, and you get your bifocals aligned right, we should be in pretty good shape. What we are going to present today are project sizing scenarios to give information to the Council and Commissioners based on the work of the professional group here as to the type of project that may be pursued by Vanderburgh County. We will have some recommendations in here. We will have various numbers in here. We will be presenting four distinct types of scenarios, and showing what the financing would be for those types of scenarios. The first one is going to be based on bond size. It is based on the direction that we received from you saying that you were wanting to look at a \$35 million bond size. I understand we were talking bond size, not project size, so that's the scale that we've used in that scenario. Then we have used three other scenarios to present you with the information of what the various recommendations would be depending on the type of project. The first would be to build an adult facility of the size recommended in some of the planning procedures that have been gone through. The second would be to build both an adult facility and a juvenile facility. Then the third set of scenarios would be to build all three; a jail, a juvenile facility and a community corrections facility. Now the various scenarios that you have in front of you, and the cost sizes, and the lease payment scenarios that are there are based on assumptions. We've had to make a lot of assumptions here to be able to present this information. We try to make as conservative assumption as we can, so that these numbers should be maximums. These should be the top points. We never want to come back and say, oops, it's going to cost you more. So, in these scenarios we have tried to estimate things high, so that when we do get to a final bid on a project, they come in lower. You definitely don't want to come in higher. We have assumed that we would be doing a lease financing, and that it would be on July 1, 2002. Now, lease financing is what is typically done for governmental projects, building projects. A number of the things that you have done in the past here in the community have been lease financings. Typically, in Indiana these are done as lease financing because of the extremely restrictive nature of the 2% debt limitation in the Indiana Constitution. It is one of the most restrictive limitations in the country, and because of that more Indiana debt is done on a lease basis proportionately than in any other state. It is because of our debt limitation. Now if you look at, we are changing our property tax basis, so our assessed values are all tripling by going to a true tax value system. So, the legislature decided to take away your discretion on that matter, and they have reduced the 2% debt limitation to be based on the old method. So, by tripling assessed values, you are not going to get an increase in your debt limitation. So, that would not free up capacity to do this in a general obligation type of format. We are also looking at using a 25 year amortization to repay the bonds. We are looking at capitalized interest for a 2 ½

year period during part of the planning, and through all of the construction phase. Capitalized interest is a legal requirement for lease financing. We're hoping as we get further along that we could shorten that capitalized interest program, and that would certainly save you money if we're able to do that. We are assuming a 1% underwriters discount, which would be a fee that the underwriter charges for brokering those bonds to people within the community, or to insurance funds. We are assuming an average interest rate of 5.76%. Now that is an extremely high interest rate. We would probably be a full point below that were we to sell the bonds today, but the reason we estimate a high interest rate is because I can't tell you what the rate is going to be in July of 2002. If the project moves at all, we may be issuing the bonds even further down the line, so just to be sure we are within a range where we wouldn't have to go back and start over from a state tax board perspective, we use a high interest rate in our estimate. So, when I give you a payment and say this is what the payment would be, it's assuming a full percent interest higher than I think it really would be if we did this today. Now the county has done a very fiscally responsible thing in setting aside an amount of money and projecting that you will set that aside in each of your budgets until we get to the point where we've done this financing. The county has designated, I understand, \$2.7 million. That is fabulous to do that. What we can do with that, setting that aside this year and next year, we can use part of those funds to help hold down the capitalized interest costs, or to pay some project funds as we go along by doing that as part of the construction costs or part of the soft costs in this deal. That way you will save money on interest and on capitalized interest. So, by setting that aside, you are setting an excellent precedent. That is great, and that is going to be very helpful. There is one small caveat in that, when you set that money aside, and for the last several years the Tax Board has allowed units of government to set that money aside, and they haven't touched it. The Tax Board can consider that money part of your free cash balance in working your budget to reduce your property tax levy. I don't think that is very likely, but it's something that you need to make sure, and I know Suzanne will take that into account when she's working with the Tax Board guys in going through the budget to make sure that is set aside for this project, and not used as part of the budget process. So, that's just a let's make sure we do this. Now not included in the financing numbers that I presented are certain costs, and we're going to cover some of those. Some of them are really unknowns, so I wasn't able to cover them in these numbers. The financing numbers don't include operational costs, because you can't finance those operational costs. Those are budgetary items that you will finance in the normal budget. We have outlined, and in the presentation we will show you the estimates of operating costs for each one of these scenarios, and what the staffing requirements would be, but we have not included that in financing. Obviously, that's a budgetary matter, and that's something then that you would work into your budgets in the future. We have not included a land acquisition cost, because there has not been a site selected. So, that is kind of a number that we need a place holder for that you need to realize either you are going to have to spend maybe part of that money you've set aside for land acquisition, or if it's existing county property that you could currently use that wouldn't have an acquisition cost with it, otherwise, if you don't use one of those two methods, we would have to increase the financing for land acquisition costs. If, in fact, a solution as we finally go through this, includes some modifications to the existing jail, we've not built that into the financing costs. That would be a separate matter to have to be handled later. Then, finally, we haven't included staff training to go into this new methodology, again, because that is an operational cost. That is not something we can finance with a bond issue. So with those assumptions, to tell you what the parameters are of the four scenarios that we are going to be looking at, as I said, the first one is based on a size of bond. We went to the

working group and said, with \$35 million of a bond issue, we will have to set aside a certain amount for capitalized interest, and cost of issuance, and the other things that we have to have in the project, so here's a net amount that you have left for construction costs, which here is shows at about \$26 million, and \$4.8 million as far as actual project costs, what can I buy with that? They came back and said, we're talking about a 448 bed jail for that kind of a price, with 124,475 square feet. Doing that \$35 million bond issue, and using that 5.76% interest rate, a lease payment would be about \$2.85 million. I know we were also talking about a \$35 million deal would come close to that \$2.7 you're setting aside, that's assuming a lot better interest rates, and a shorter capitalized interest period. So, you know, if we were to market today and get good rates and be in good shape, we might be able to do that for the \$2.7 million, but it's, you know, it's in that neighborhood. The second scenario which was the recommended size of the jail facility for an adult jail is 650 beds, which would be a five pod system, the way they build jails now using pod systems to help with operating costs because of the staffing. It's 172,000 square feet, roughly. The bond issue size would be around \$47 million. The annual lease payment would be about \$3.8 million. The actual construction costs, the hard costs, would be \$35.66 million, and the soft costs, and we'll go through those in detail in just a minute, would be \$5.9 million. The next alternative being the combination of the adult facility and the juvenile facility would be 674 beds, which is the 650 adult jail and the 24 juvenile facility. That's roughly 191.6 thousand square feet. A \$52 million bond issue. \$4.25 million lease payment per year. Roughly \$39.6 million in construction costs, hard costs, and \$6.45 in soft costs. Then the final all in facility, 974 beds, which includes 300 beds community corrections, is roughly 231,000 square feet. \$58.8 million bond issue. Almost \$4.8 million annual payment. \$44.8 in construction costs, and \$7 million in soft costs. Now to go into detail and to show those side by side, I'm sorry, this is another squint at the numbers slide. This just presents the same information you just saw, but shows it in a side by side format. I wonder if that...(Inaudible. Stepped away from mike.) make that worse. That is better. That works for my eyes. I don't know if that works for your eyes or not. It shows those same numbers we just went over on a side by side basis as far as project costs, bond issue size, and annual payment. To go into detail for each of those, we talked about the project cost size, those are made up of components, obviously, the first component is the actual construction cost, which in each of those facilities, you can see in the first one, it's roughly \$24 million. For the 650 bed jail it's roughly \$33 million, and it ramps up as you go to higher number of facilities. Furniture fixture and equipment, basically, out quip, excuse me, equipping the building, also ramps up because you'd be doing larger facilities and more facility. Then we have included a contingency. This is a number that we hope we don't have to use, but one of those that you get into a project and you start digging in the ground and you start finding things you have no idea was there, and something comes up just in case. So, a contingency is put into those numbers as a just in case number, and you certainly hope that when you get down to bids, and when you get down to actually doing the surveys on the property that you don't have to use that money and you can do a smaller bond issue. Now this is really a squinter. To get into this one, this is the detail of the soft cost component. We've tried to detail those as much as we could for you to let you know individually what those components are in the project, because, obviously, soft costs are a large component of a project. Of course, there is architectural fees and engineering fees that are the first line item. The second line item, program plan and implementation, is the consulting project to determine the facility size and layout to allow you to have the optimum configuration for what the community needs are. A and E Reimbursables are any costs for reimbursement the architect would have. Base CM Fee is the construction management fee of the firm that would come in and do the day to day beating up

on the contractors, and making sure that the project comes in under budget, makes sure that they can get things done in an appropriate manner. There is CM reimbursables, obviously, other kind of detail of things in there; printing, distribution, surveys, kitchen design, environmental, civil design, you know, review fees, insurance, telecommunications. Issuance cost is in there, the issuance cost pays for things like the financial advisor, the bond counsel, local counsel, the ratings from the rating agency, the printing of the offering document that goes out, those sorts of things. Then there is a total there for the soft costs in the project. Now shift gears a little bit and talk a little bit about the operating costs for the various scenarios that we are looking at. We've seen, you know, part of this is based on number of pods, number of square feet. We do have a detail of the projected operating costs for each of the scenarios. Now one caveat here, and we'll talk a little bit about the current budget, this is the cost to operate the new facility. You are, obviously, already operating a facility. So, when we say you need a jail commander, that is something you already have. So this is not new costs to operate a facility, this is all end costs to operate a facility. Okay? As you can see, depending upon how many pieces to this there are, a four pod facility has a total operating cost projected of about \$4.6 million. The adult only option has a cost of about \$5.9. Adult plus juvenile, a cost of about \$7.1 million, and then the all three component, a cost of about \$9 million. The detail on those, we have looked at, actually the design team has looked at what it would take to operate the facilities, how many people, what the average annual salary would be for that, various types of equipping. This even includes medical and the other types of costs that you would incur at a regular facility as well as whether you build a new facility. So this has the operating costs for the \$35 million scenario. The next page shows the staffing positions, how many positions would be staffed, and then based on the guidance that's put out as to how staffing should be done in a facility, came up with a number of positions. You can see the \$35 million is 86 positions. Then the next slides I will just touch on real briefly. Obviously, the adult facility takes more people with a fifth pod for the 650 beds, because you are going from four pods to five. Again, the staffing detail for that is 96 individuals. Then if you go to adult and juvenile, which is the \$7 million item. That is 132 people. As you can see, those numbers individually and how they are broken down, and see the number of people on the next slide. Then the final slides related to the operating cost show the detail of the \$9 million operating for adult and community corrections, as well as the staffing requirement of about 173 persons. Now to give you a comparison, and we need to validate these numbers, these are at least the numbers that I've been given. Is that, currently, and if we, I'll mess up everybody's eyes and go back to the overall. If you look at the overall different size, you ramp from \$4.6 million up to \$9 million. What I understand the current budget to be of the jail, is roughly \$3.3 million, with 59 staffing. The current community corrections of \$3.26 million with 59 persons. So, your total current costs covered in your budget are \$6.59 million with 118 persons, are the numbers that I've been given that that is your budget today. So, if you look at a comparison, your budget today is about a \$6.6 million, which is sort of in between the adult jail solution and the adult and juvenile. It's a little different if you keep the current community corrections, you are not going to lower costs for that. The way I understand the way these numbers work, the adult is going to increase your costs, the adult and juvenile is, obviously, going to increase your costs, because that is not something you are currently operating. If you throw in community corrections because they are able to do this in one facility, what your current community corrections costs are will come down. Now in total it is going to be higher, because you've got a bigger adult jail, and you've got a juvenile facility, but in total the community corrections will come down. Now total costs, obviously, of \$9 million, that means you are going to have to find \$2.5 million dollars of

additional operating costs if you do all three components. There are some savings if you only do adult and juvenile, and do the \$7 million and don't change community corrections, you're total operating costs are going to be roughly \$10.4, because it would be the current three million, two hundred sixty some thousand that you are spending for community corrections, plus the \$7 million to do adult plus juvenile. So, you know, there are, I can't just say, you know, this is going to cost you \$9 million, because, in fact, if you only do two of the components you may actually have almost \$10.5 million in costs.

Council President Bassemier: Sir, we need to change the tape. Hold that thought.

Mike Claytor: Oh, sure. I'm sorry.

(Tape Change)

Yes, I'm sorry, just throw a rock at me. I respond to rocks really well. The last slide that we have up is a little bit of a (Inaudible) chart to show you a time line, again this is kind of squint at a little bit but it's got a lot of really cool colors on it and it does have the timing of a project to bring out through the schematic design phase and then on through construction phase. As you will see this is the chart that the design team put together awhile ago as we were beginning this project. They expected to already be pretty well along in this phase and ready to go on further into design development and getting the construction documents ready. We are a little bit off of this time line so it will need to be pushed out a little bit as you make your decisions going forward on what Vanderburgh County is going to do. That really concludes the slides that we have. There is a tremendous amount more detail in your book as far as we have included all of the debt service schedules for each of the scenarios and more detail on capitalized interest and how that arrived at and other costs of issuance. But the team would be very happy to answer any questions that you may have.

Council President Bassemier: Could we have the lights please? Thank you. On the Council side, who would like to start please? We will probably want to take a couple of minutes to look at this.

Mike Claytor: That'd be great. I've actually got a deal with an ophthalmologist that if I can get you enough eye strain we might have to get you all new glasses.

Councilmember Winnecke: I'll start.

Council President Bassemier: Okay, Mr. Winnecke.

Councilmember Winnecke: Help us understand how you came up with the scenarios in terms of, how was the price based on? In other words, the \$35,000,000 bond issue, 448 beds, how does that math work?

Mike Claytor: For, in terms of per bed, per square foot?

Councilmember Winnecke: Right, correct.

Mike Claytor: I am going to have to kick that to the design team. They are obviously estimates. All of the estimates are based on square footage estimates of build out with number of pods. Obviously you can't because of the podding system and I know that you are fairly familiar with the concept that jail facilities are now built in

pods so that you centralize your command and you centralize to review and supervise prisoners. So, you can't take a four pod system and make it a four point two pod system. So, you can't take a 448 bed facility and make it a 449 bed facility. You have to go to the next step. So, this was based, all of the other scenarios were based on if we have 650 beds, what, how many pods will that be and what will it take to build it. On the 35,000,000 one we went the other way just because we wanted to stay within the number that you had set. So, we went backwards and went to the design team, here's an amount of money, how many beds can you buy me? But, it is still based on the square footage either way whether it is number of beds times or amount of money divided by. But, I can get you, see if that, we have to get the right. Mark, do you want to address that?

Council President Bassemier: Come on up to the mike, sir, and state your name. We are not going to let you out that easy.

Mark Shireman: I'm Mark Shireman. We worked as a team on this. I worked on the dollars and United DLZ worked on the square footages and the beds. There is a question about that costs per square foot specifically. At this point in time, the cost per square foot is an estimate as Michael said and it is what we call a probable cost. What we have to think about is what's gonna happen a year or so from now when bids are opened? And it is an unknown. So, basically what all of us do it use historical cost data. I have a data base, so does DLZ United and some architect friends of mine and we based this on those estimates and our goal here and my job is to get the fat about of this project during the design phase. So, we set the community corrections up for example at \$118 a square foot and we set the rest of it up at around \$190 a square foot. Now, one of the companies that is well known in the United States is RS Means and Company and I am going to go ahead if I may and pass out a page out of their cost book, if that would be okay? Okay, Michael will pass those out. You will see, if you turn to that second page, you will see that nationwide and regionally they show jail construction at \$132 a square foot to \$217 and I am going off of memory and I hope that I am right about that. So, we are trying to come up with a number that we think is a reasonable number. We don't want to be extremely high and we don't want to be extremely low and again based on our data base and other information that I have gathered we think that the numbers, the estimates, we have are reasonable and not extremely high. I hope that's, does that help?

Councilmember Winnecke: That helps.

Council President Bassemier: Anybody else?

Commissioner Fanello: I have a question. This is more of a question for Mike, it doesn't sound like my microphone was working, when you were going over the, you gave us all of the detail on the bond issue, whenever the Council earlier this year set aside the \$35,000,000, they thought was an amount of a bond issue that they could do without having to raise taxes. Is that true? Will there be a tax rate increase on that size and could you kind of briefly synopsise the --

Mike Claytor: Sure. I think that the original thirty-five was assuming that the lease payment could stay within \$2.7. Which Suzanne has run a number of numbers on that shows the County would be able to set aside \$2.7 and do that. That number is going to depend on both the construction period which impacts the capital interest and the interest rate that we got. So, if we could shorten six months off what we are kind of thinking around right now the period would be, in other words if we go down

to two straight years of capitalized interest instead of two and one half and if we had today's interest rates, then yes we can stay within that \$2.7 million, that shouldn't be a problem. We are working with some unknowns though because we don't know what the interest rate will be necessarily. We are still not sure what the capitalized interest period will be. I kind of mentioned the 2.7 that's already been et aside could be used to help reduce that capitalized interest, so you know I won't say yes, absolutely, you can stay within the 2.7 but you can probably get close to it..

Commissioner Fanello: Could you on the other three bond size scenarios, tell us, kind of explain the tax rate impact just real quickly?

Mike Claytor: Sure, in the booklet you have, behind each tab of a scenario and starting with the \$35,000,000 scenario, if you go to the fourth page behind that tab, that would show you and again as we've said worse case assumptions with the only unknown that might go into the bond issue some kind of land acquisition for the example of the \$35,000,000 scenario, on that fourth page behind the \$35,000,000 tab, the estimated debt service is \$2,854,000 and we have assumed a normal growth in assessed value of roughly, where somewhere near three percent, we have assumed what has been the rate and because we changed assessed value basis we have done this both ways for you, we've done it under the old assessed value method and under the true tax value method. The only thing that I haven't done is gone to the crystal ball and estimated what reassessment is going to do to these numbers. But, as you can see under the old methodology it would be roughly seventeen cents on the rate, that is not assuming using the 2.7, that is assuming that you paid it all out of property taxes. Obviously if you use the 2.7 million that is within your current budget, it's certainly not going to be a seventeen cent impact, it would be a very low impact because the total payment is only estimated to be 2.85. But, under the new true tax value method, it is roughly five and three quarters cents if the payment is 2.8 million. We have included one of those sheets for each one of the tabs but again we have done this in the worse case scenario. We are not assuming for these purposes that you are using any current budget money. This would be the impact if you put it all on property taxes and didn't use any other revenues any savings out of budget. So, for the \$35,000,000 again with those assumptions it starts out at about seventeen cents and ends up a little, well right about nine and a half cents. True tax value method again it starts at five and three quarters cents and ends up about three cents. The true tax value method is the value that we are going to be in for this coming budget year and the only reason that I put both in is that it confuses everybody because last years tax rate might have been three dollars and next years tax rate is going to be a dollar and it's the same amount of money. Just because the true tax value is three times. Just so that you have something to compare to, we put in both methods. Yes, sir?

Council President Bassemier: Mr. Wortman.

Councilmember Wortman: According to that \$35,000,000 right now if we stay with that and we go to the corrections center and juvenile center we are really going to get out of this \$35,000,000 considerable and I don't know if we can afford it. Plus, we know our operating costs are going to go up on top of it so we do have to be careful here and remind everybody that there has been three counties that has had financial problems so we don't want to be the fourth one. Now, I'm very conservative on this and I thought that I would kind of remind everybody we, I think this to me, all we can afford right now. That's the way I look at it, that \$35,000,000 with that 448 beds. Juvenile system, correction center and our judicial system, when that PMSI they lowered the inmates how many was in the jail? I think that

has to be followed up and gone through so that we keep that population down and I think that is one way to do it because it was effective right away and now it has gotten out of hand a little bit. So now was it neglected, just a trend or what, I don't know but I just thought that I would remind everybody, thank you.

Council President Bassemier: Thank you, Mr. Wortman.

Mike Claytor: And you point also, the estimated operating costs for the \$35,000,000 scenario are higher than you current jail operating costs. So, you have to take into account both operations and finance them.

Commissioner Fanello: So, you are saying that we are not going to be saving money if we just build the jail portion and still continue to operate community corrections as a separate entity?

Mike Claytor: Right.

Commissioner Fanello: You do have to add the two together so?

Mike Claytor: Right, if you do adult only, I would have to go back to my slide, I turned off the projector. If you do adult only, you don't have any savings in any community corrections, if you coordinate them then there are some savings in community corrections that offset that.

Commissioner Fanello: So, you actually could be increasing your operating costs? By not building shared services.

Mike Claytor: You, I mean, your operating costs, I want to say it carefully because I don't want to say that are going to save money building a new jail.

Commissioner Fanello: Exactly, but yeah, no.

Mike Claytor: You can't ever tell anybody that they are going to save money by building something new and operating it but in fact there are some economies of scale that you could do with combining community corrections and jail that you will not have if you only do one. But, you know I don't want to come out and say, gee, this is a great way to save money because it is obviously not. If you do a project it is going to cost you capital and operating.

Commissioner Fanello: Well, I was just looking at your spreadsheet and for the 448 beds, the operating costs were approximately 4.6 million and if we were to continue community corrections in it's present state, that operating cost is almost 3.3 million. So adding those two together, we actually increase-

Mike Claytor: That's correct.

Commissioner Fanello: Our operating costs. So, we are not saving any money ourselves.

Mike Claytor: Your operating costs would be about 1.3 million higher.

Commissioner Mourdock: That brings up another very good point. If in fact we, and I am not suggesting this as the goal, but I am trying to understand the methodology, it doesn't make sense to me that if we abandoned this jail that we now have at 268

beds that we all know is antiquated that we all know takes a lot more man power than a modern jail, if we set that aside and simply build what you are calling option one at 400 and whatever it was 448 beds, and in doing that we are adopting a new methodology, a podular jail that is less manpower intensive, how come it takes so many more people to get simply that 200 beds? That doesn't make any sense.

Mike Claytor: And we need to defer some of those questions, because I am not the bond guy, I am the staff guy, but you are going to a larger jail. Even though you are going to the pod system.

Commissioner Mourdock: That's right but the whole theory is that I have understood the pod system is that it is less manpower intensive.

Mike Claytor: Right and if you had a 448 bed jail and you went to a 448 bed pod jail you would reduce your operating cost, but you are not doing that.

Commissioner Mourdock: I understand if it's apples to apples. I understand that we are going from 268 to 400 plus but it still seems to me that we have a huge manpower increase in there to gain those 200 beds in something that is supposed to be more efficient. Again, I understand that you are the bond guy.

Mike Claytor: And I, right, if we go to the \$35,000,000 scenario, if you look at the staffing slide which is on this little jobby here is on page five on the power point slide thing, some of you may actually have the readable power point slide on, but on the barely readable power point slide, you currently have in the existing jail, you have 50 staff for your 260 whatever beds.

Commissioner Mourdock: Two hundred sixty-eight.

Mike Claytor: This has 58 positions for the four pods and then there is a multiplier for some of the positions that get you to the 96 staff. So, it is going from 59 to, I'm sorry I am on the wrong page, it would be going to 86 staff, 59 staff to 86 staff, so you are not, even though you are about doubling the size of your jail you are not doubling the size of your staff. But, I understand.

Commissioner Mourdock: Yeah, you understand my question but it seems like an awful large increase.

Mike Claytor: This is based on the staffing estimates and I understand this is based on the staffing guidelines that the state of Indiana puts out for jail facilities and I don't know if your current staffing meets the Indiana guidelines.

John Staley: The state of Indiana, my name is John Staley, DLZ, I am one of the consultants on the project. The state of Indiana is and has implemented a program of staffing analysis and earlier this year they conducted workshops with various counties concerning the new procedures to be followed. When we developed the plans for the new project, the new facility, we will have to have a staffing plan within this book there is a staffing analysis procedure that we have to calculate. If we were to follow that procedure for the current jail I think you would find that we are far understaffed in accordance with these rules and these rules have been adopted and will be enforced currently in the inspection reports that Paul Downing and his staff conduct twice a year. They have made references to many county facilities having inadequate staff on all shifts. What that means is, in terms of your cell block design today in the linear pod design that you have under these rules you will be required

to have a staff person observing those inmates all of the time for each of those day rooms. If you added up all of those day rooms, in accordance with this criteria, you would see the difference. So, you are correct sir that the pod design does save you money in accordance with the standards that we must follow.

Councilmember Raben: This may not sound right coming from me but one other consideration in terms of operating, operational costs, you have to remember too that just looking at the \$35,000,000 scenario roughly \$850,000 of that is inclusive with what we have now in terms of building maintenance, trash removal, utilities. When you take that out of this facility, I mean that is part of our rent today, so, you know that is going to throw that figure up an additional \$850,000 that's.

Commissioner Fanello: I was going to tell everybody, did they realize that there is a bigger copy with all of the info in there?

Councilmember Winnecke: Just now.

Commissioner Fanello: In case they can't read the slides.

Al Bennett: Thank you, my name is Al Bennet with Bennet Associates. I think you need to consider also that when you build a new jail you are going to building services and operations that are above and beyond what you have now and please excuse me, I have a little cold here. The one operations that you are not paying for not, at least I think that's being paid for by the City, is intake and booking. That will be picked up in this unit and will be virtually a two person post on a twenty-four basis which means that takes ten people to cover that post everyday, 365 days a week or year. I think that there is other services that you do not have that you need to consider as well that will need to consider as well that will require some staffing so this initial intake, initial design for additional facilities will require that much more. As I reviewed, having experience with helping with the design and set up the start up operations and attempting to provide information to Councils and Commissioners all over the state for the last twenty years, I have taken a look at the staffing that has been presented to you today and I think it is amazing how well they have come up with the staffing knowing the State's guidelines and using the American Corrections Association ACA standards without even drawing a line on a piece of paper. But, attempting to do it from past experience and doing it many, many times over a period of a number of years. So, I think even though this is not an exact science, we find that we are giving you, perhaps on the high side, so as to be as correct and not low, we are giving you the opportunity to see operational costs not only for personnel but operational cost of cost of food, cost of clothing, cost of utilities and so on and so forth so that you get an idea of what your budget costs will be the first year that it is in operational and that we know will be down the road away, several years before it will be operating so, it is coming across a little high but I think it is quite accurate and is very close to other jails that are just coming on line in the state of Indiana in the next few months.

Councilmember Hoy: You may want to answer this.

Council President Bassemier: I'm sorry Mr. Hoy but we have to change the tape.

Council President Bassemier: Okay.

(Tape changed)

Councilmember Hoy: Mr. Bennett, you may want to comment on this, I know that when we did the PMSI study you worked primarily on the juvenile section of that.

Al Bennett: The juvenile and the jail.

Councilmember Hoy: And the jail. Under that study, if my memory serves me correctly, you all were recommending a minimum of 400 beds—

Al Bennett: 500.

Councilmember Hoy: —500, and adding some beds if we were a university city, is that correct?

Al Bennett: That is correct.

Councilmember Hoy: Now we're looking at 600, possibly 650 beds. I'm curious as to why, I'm assuming, and I don't assume anything, I'm assuming that came from a recommendation that was made from this county for 650 beds, 350 community correction beds, and 24 juvenile beds.

Commissioner Fanello: 300 community correction.

Councilmember Hoy: I'm sorry.

Commissioner Fanello: 300 community correction beds.

Councilmember Hoy: 300, yeah, that's right.

Al Bennett: Community corrections.

Councilmember Hoy: Your recommendation from PMSI for community corrections was 225. Do we really need to go this large is my question?

Al Bennett: Let me explain that there was a process that took place during the PMSI study in which we received input from the people in the system here in the county, including, Council members, Commissioners, of course, the Sheriff, the Evansville Police Department, the Prosecutor and Judges. There was a fiscal plan committee that came up with a recommendation on the numbers that that study should recommend. So it came from, pretty much, the people from here in the county, and there is nothing wrong with a recommendation for a minimum of 500. In our planning the last few months, we've went back to the same people that we had been talking to a year ago, and the recommendations came in from them to be a little bit higher, both on the jail and on the community corrections center. I might add, that the community corrections center is very unusual. You are a county that is super unusual in this state in that it is accepted, well accepted, the judiciary like to use it, and it seems to be, generally, very successful. So they could see that instead of 225, perhaps 300 might be better. So in the process of a matter of several months, maybe a year or two years, people in their thinking kind of when up, but I can only say that those reflect the input that came to us.

Councilmember Hoy: I just, as you know, because you know me, I have problems with those larger figures. Particularly with community corrections and thinking that we could probably be creative in approaching that situation from another standpoint, and I won't make that speech here because we are here for information. That does

clarify the point for me.

Al Bennett: Well, I hope that I explained the process—

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Al Bennett: —that took place a year ago, and what took place the last few months, and I don't have problem with 650 jail beds in this community knowing other communities of about this size needing about that number of beds for the next, sometime in the next ten or 15 years. We cannot build just for the next year or two, we've got to build, hopefully, for the next 20 years.

Councilmember Hoy: And that's built on the assumption that this industry is just going to get bigger and bigger, which is an assumption, as you know, I resist. I don't, I want to stick with facts here which you've done for me. You've answered my question, but—

Al Bennett: Thank you.

Councilmember Hoy: —we could get into a philosophical discussion, and I'd rather not do that.

Al Bennett: I've enjoyed those discussions in the past.

Mike Claytor: Mr. President, if I may, this is sort of, I don't know if this is a point of information or what to call it. I erred earlier, I need, I know some of you have caught this. I gave you the departmental budget numbers of current operating costs, that doesn't include the Building Authority's maintenance and utility costs. So, in fact, and I don't have those numbers. Unfortunately, the only things I pulled to give you that \$3.3 million number on the jail, and the \$3.26 number on community corrections, that's the departmental budget. I don't know what the utilities are, but the numbers that we put in our presentation include utilities and business maintenance. So, if you add, I don't know what those numbers would be, but there is not as much difference, obviously, between the new costs and what the old costs were when you consider that we've included...and I know you just, you mentioned that, that those items are in there, and that's the sort of catch there that, in fact, we won't have much higher costs when you consider those things that are currently being captured in the Building Authority's budget.

Councilmember Hoy: Mike (Inaudible. Talking over each other.) that would remind, that would remind Council that, that we are still going to be paying rent on all of this space here, no matter what happens, so that empty space over there where the jail is now, we will still be paying the square footage on that. So, we do have to be careful as we estimate these, because I don't, the Civic Center rent is not going to go down.

Mike Claytor: Sure. No, but I wanted to clarify, I was comparing apples and oranges. I apologize for doing that.

Commission President Mosby: Mike?

Council President Bassemier: Commissioner Mosby.

Commission President Mosby: I wanted to ask you one thing I don't you've included

here when you are talking about the departmental costs today. Have you included patient/inmate care? I know you have in your scenario here.

Mike Claytor: Right.

Commission President Mosby: But that doesn't come out of the departments budget, it comes out of our budget, so that's another \$2 million that you can probably take and add to it because they have included it in their scenario.

Mike Claytor: Okay, and I can't tell from the information I have. Eric, is medical in the departmental?

Eric Williams: What I think Commissioner Mosby is referring to is the patient/inmate care account which is (Inaudible. Not at mike.)--

Council President Bassemier: Eric, I'm sorry, Eric. You've got to come, come to the mike, please. Thank you.

Eric Williams: Eric Williams, Chief Deputy Sheriff's Office. I believe you're referring to the money that's used to house juvenile offenders out of this county and other facilities. That money is not factored into our budget, because we have no control over it.

Commission President Mosby: So, I guess--

Eric Williams: Our general annual medical expenses for inmates housed in our facility is included in those numbers.

Commission President Mosby: Okay, but the patient/inmate, the juvenile part of it is it figured in too?

Eric Williams: No.

Commission President Mosby: Okay. I think it's \$1.9 million.

Councilmember Raben: What you do have to remember, though, a lot of that is specialized care that we're not going to do in our 24 bed facility. A big part of that is.

Councilmember Sutton: Could we follow up on something Councilman Hoy was saying?

Council President Bassemier: Okay, Mr. Sutton.

Councilmember Sutton: Just to maybe follow up on your line of questioning, Councilman Hoy. Would like to get an idea, basically, we have two different scenarios in the size of the actual jail facility. Can you, I guess, Mr. Bennett was kind of alluding to it, did make mention of it, based on the assumptions and the data that you gathered, how long do we anticipate this facility lasting us based upon the trends, demographics, what have you? I know that's obviously something that you have to try and factor in when you put together the size. Can you share that? I know you mentioned the 15, 20 year just a few seconds ago. Can you talk about that a little bit more? What went into that?

John Staley: I think Al could answer this as well as myself, but we've both been in this business, I guess, 25 or so years or more, and unfortunately the need continues to grow in spite of projections that crime is down nationally. The U.S. Justice Department said crime is down. In Indiana there is 60 some odd jails that are overcrowded today, and some of them are less than ten years old. A number of them are less than ten years old. So, I think it is prudent to plan ahead, and we try to look to a 15 to 20 year horizon. I think the discussion about alternative has got to be a part of this, because if we just build the jail and we don't look at the entire criminal justice system in any community in terms of alternatives, such as community corrections, home detention programs, they have to go hand in hand. I think that the reports that have been done, and the assessments that have been done that Al participated in have looked at those things, and those continue to be important. The bottom line is you still need adequate space. One of the things that is important to know, if you'd really, if you really conduct a jail in terms of it's operation, with a classification plan, you really can't use 100% of the beds all the time because of the classification of inmates away from each others predators, or certain kind of offenders. So when you look at those beds, there is a constantly changing population there, I'm sure, the Chief Deputy can reiterate this, but, you know, the jail has to be flexible enough to accommodate this sort of detail. We looked at 15 to 20 years, recognizing all these other programs.

Council President Bassemier: Sir, would you give your name again?

John Staley: John Staley, DLZ.

Commissioner Fanello: I have one more question, John. To build on Royce's question. All these scenarios we have here they have expansion capabilities in the scenario?

John Staley: That is correct. When we—

Commissioner Fanello: Well, I know this is 650 bed on up.

John Staley: When we look at the intake booking function, the food services function, inmate property, storage, staffing areas, as we design the facility, we would certainly design it to be capable of expansion, but I think that is essential, because you know you need to plan for this, and whether and how you do it is as important, and sure there are some more costs to accommodate that in the first step, but we believe that is also is important.

Councilmember Sutton: When you say a 15-20 year horizon, what did you factor in to make that projection?

Al Bennett: In the 650 or the 500?

Councilmember Sutton: Either one of, really any of the scenarios that you've presented to us. I guess, just trying to get a real sense of how long the facility, you know, what we are looking at at far as capacity. What we are looking at in terms of the length of, the life of this facility on any of the sizes that are shown here.

Al Bennett: The size of the jail and what bed size you need is basically up to the judiciary. They are the folks that make the decisions that place people in jails. We saw a year ago an operation of the offenders going in and out of court being handled in a very prudent way. Not waiting too long for trial, and we felt under those

circumstances about 500 would be a jail that could be good for at least five years, hopefully, as long as ten years. I would suggest that 450 beds, probably, you'll be back here five years from now asking to make that larger. Now going up to 650, we actually did not make that projection. Again, that figure came from input from people in the community, Council members, Commissioners, Judges, Prosecutors. They are feeling like 500 is not high enough, and that was determined to be 650.

Councilmember Raben: AI?--

Council President Bassemier: I'm sorry, Jim. Let...Mr. Winnecke's been--

Councilmember Winnecke: This gets back to the, Mr. Shireman may actually be better suited for this. Did I understand you to say that when you were computing the cost that the square footage that you used was \$190 a square foot for the jail, and \$118 for community corrections?

Mark Shireman: Yes.

Councilmember Winnecke: Then in these scenarios, like on the \$35 million scenario for instance, shouldn't 125 or 124,475 square feet times \$190 equal the construction cost.

Mark Shireman: What does it equal? Maybe I've--

Mike Claytor: I've got to calculate...this is Mike Claytor again. The construction costs number, and it works out a little odd on the \$35 million, because as I said, we backed into a number, and then, unfortunately, just to make it balance to \$35, instead of being \$34 million 900 when we got done, we rounded the numbers off. So, I've got the \$35 million working out to be \$192 on the actual construction costs, not the project cost. Because project cost includes furniture, fixture and equipments and the contingency. So, I've got construction at \$192 on the 35, \$190 on both the adult scenario and the adult and juvenile. Then because it blends between adult juvenile and community, it comes out to an average of \$178 on that for the scenario.

Councilmember Winnecke: Okay, but wouldn't these, wouldn't those numbers then be reflected in the bullet points tabbed construction costs?

Mike Claytor: In the power point?

Councilmember Winnecke: Right.

Mike Claytor: I hope my two sets of books agree. Actually, if you look at, on the bound book, the, in the very first tab, on the second page you've got the construction costs broken down. I hope that very much agrees with the power point, otherwise my typing skills have left me. Yeah, I've got construction costs on the 35, I've got at --

Councilmember Winnecke: 23,920.

Councilmember Wortman: Where do you see that?

Mike Claytor: I've got that at \$192.17. It would be divided by the 124,475.

Councilmember Winnecke: Do you get \$26,055,000?

Commissioner Fanello: No.

Mike Claytor: No, that's project cost.

Councilmember Winnecke: Well, it says construction cost on this.

Councilmember Sutton: Turn it around. It's called project cost.

Mike Claytor: I'm sorry. I'm sorry, it's headed differently on the power point. If you look at the slide you are on on the power point, where it says project cost. The very next slide below it summarizes the project cost, and it shows construction costs at \$23,920,000.

Councilmember Winnecke: Where would I look at that?

Unidentified: After the tab.

Commission President Mosby: Over here it's got construction cost. That's what Lloyd is doing.

Mike Claytor: Yeah, I apologize. On the earlier slides, it uses the term construction cost, and it really should be project cost. Because the project cost includes; construction, furniture, fixture, equipment and the contingency.

Councilmember Raben: Mr. President?

Council President Bassemier: I'm sorry, Mr. Raben.

Councilmember Raben: I might direct this to either Al or John. Al, you had mentioned that using the figure 450 or 500 beds may be adequate for the next five to ten years. I still have a problem with why that's not adequate. Why...it appears to me as if getting larger than that and getting in the area of 650 is a bigger gamble, because I agree with all of this, nobody knows where the trend is really going, what the future is going to bring. The Feds do state that the crime rate is going down, and I don't know why if the design is not, if the design of the jail is proper why it's absurd to look at the possibility of needing to add another pod ten years from now.

Mike Claytor: Just from the bean counter standpoint. I'm currently working with two counties where this is our second jail bond issue in the last ten years, because they built new jails and now they are building new, new jails. The one in particular is a situation where they designed modular pods that could go up, and, apparently, at the last minute to save money, they ten years ago took out the ability to go higher, and so now they are building a whole new jail when they thought they were going to be able to add to this one. We are seeing that in various places around the state.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, well we're talking about, say for instance, the 650 bed facility expandable to 1,000, where do those, what type of expansion is going to give you that other 350 beds? Are you going to go up? Or just add another pod? Or add another two pods? Again, if we're designing this jail correctly, where it is expandable, I'm not a bean counter, but it seems to me, again, the wiser thing to do is not spend all that money up front in interest for beds that may or may never be used. I still contend that if we get that large and they do get used, shame on us. Because we're not handling society the way we should, but, again, somebody answer that for me.

Commissioner Fanello: Are you saying you don't want to build for expansion? You are saying you don't want to spend dollars, cheap dollars today to build for expansion, but you would rather come back and ask the taxpayers in five years to build an addition?

Councilmember Raben: How is it more expensive? If you are going to pay interest on that today, how is that—

Commissioner Fanello: Well PMSI in their study—

Councilmember Raben: —for the next ten years.

Commissioner Fanello: —said it would 10% to 15% less expensive to build shared services today—

Councilmember Raben: Okay, today, but how much interest are you going to pay on that money over the course of that ten year period?

Commissioner Fanello: Well, I believe interest, if we are talking about 4.76, you estimated 5.76% interest, and it probably will realistically come way in under that, are you saying it's better to wait and borrow money five or ten years from now at a higher interest rate?

Councilmember Raben: I think it's a more secure thing to do for the county.

Commissioner Fanello: I—

Councilmember Raben: Because, again, nobody here in this room, and there is a room full of professionals, and a lot of us that aren't, can answer or tell you where the crime rate is going to be ten years from now.

Commissioner Fanello: And that's exactly the reason. If we are going to spend the money today, we build for the future and we don't come back and ask the taxpayers in five years—

Councilmember Raben: Catherine, that is—

Commissioner Fanello: —to do it again.

Councilmember Raben: —probably in the simplest form, that formulation or that way of thinking is like a young couple today that gets married tomorrow, buys a minivan because they may have a large family ten years from now.

Commissioner Fanello: A minivan doesn't have bars and lots of plumbing in it.

Councilmember Raben: I think, well, it's my opinion, so.

Council President Bassemier: Okay, Mr. Hoy.

Councilmember Hoy: Well, my question about size, I just did some quick math. United just did a jail that was opened in 2001 in St. Joe County, and that jail, if you do the math on that there is one bed per 367 people in that county. What we are proposing here is one bed for every 264 persons. Why?

Commissioner Mourdock: That's the 650 bed number?

Councilmember Sutton: Which one are you looking at, Phil?

Councilmember Hoy: That's the 650 bed number. If you do the math on the population of the county, because St. Joe County is a lot larger, it is, I know you are comparing apples and oranges to an extent. You built that jail in St. Joe County with 600 and how many beds, 72 or 74 beds? For \$35 million dollars, and finished it in 2001. We're looking at a whole lot more money, and United Consulting built that one. Was the architect on that one. So, that's a huge difference in cost, plus they built one bed for every 367 people, persons in that county, and we're looking at building a jail for every 264 persons. Now, I do not believe for one minute that we are any more sinful in this county than they are in St. Joe County, or Allen County, I've lived in Allen County.

Commissioner Mourdock: They do have Notre Dame up there. They may have something.

Councilmember Hoy: They got a coach that can't remember what he did. Had Jesus, you know, signaling a touchdown on the building. Have you not seen Jesus doing this?

Council President Bassemier: Sir, I've got a question. You know, you've got it figured in here on 190 a square foot and, of course, all jails as far as maximum security, you might not need say maybe 150 maybe for felons, and misdemeanors you might need 50. I'm just using a round figure, I know, that's not right here, but you all got it figured in at 190 square foot no matter whether they are misdemeanors or felons. Is that correct on the 190?

Mike Claytor: That's an average square foot number, and as we said earlier, we are estimating high. You really, you don't know what the square footage cost is going to be until you get your bid packets back in and the people actually bid on the construction of the jail, which, I mean, can have all kinds of factors, but this is an estimating number that we are using as an average of 190.

Council President Bassemier: Okay, I was just kind of curious, because I know it costs less to build a minimum security than it does a maximum security. I just didn't know when you get into the numbers again, if we don't need as many maximum security as we do misdemeanors, this cost might go down.

Mike Claytor: Well, and, in fact, if you look at the configuration we've used that same 190 for planning purposes on everything but community corrections. Which is the 118 figure, so you are exactly right, you use a smaller number for the less secure type of facility, but we haven't, just for planning purposes, we haven't differentiated in that number between adult or juvenile. The only differentiation has been in the community corrections side, so. Like I said, these are planning numbers.

Council President Bassemier: One more question. I tell you, I've got a really concern about location. Why, I'm just curious why is this the last thing we are doing? I feel like it should be the first thing we do. Where are we going to build, what back yard are we going to build this in? Why are we, what's the hold up? Maybe this answer is not for you, but I'm curious, I would like to have a location so we can put some more accurate numbers together. So, can somebody answer, Mr. Mosby or? Oh, I'm sorry, before you answer that, we're going to change the tape.

(Tape Changed)

Commission President Mosby: Councilman in an attempt to answer your question, the problem lies within us. I would say that the problem lies within these two bodies.

I mean we are the ones dragging our feet so I would say that it is our problem to find a site and I mean I will take part of that blame. We are sitting here arguing over contracts and numbers and everything else and I don't see a big attempt to go out and iron out a site right now.

Council President Bassemier: I was just kind of curious. This is great and I really do appreciate it what you gave us today. This is the first time that I have seen any numbers to, I didn't see any on the contract as far as how many beds we are going to get for \$35,000,000 so this is great. I want to thank you all for coming here and putting this all together. But, I hope real soon that we can work out differences out so that we can get a location and I know with what you gave us today and your presentation I know that we are going to move forward on this and I appreciate it.

Commission President Mosby: Just to expand for a second because made the comment several times and I still stand by the comment, I didn't want the facility to be driven by the site, I mean I was waiting for some of these numbers, waiting for the size of the project and I still say you know as soon as these people are done today, we have to make a decision on what we are building because we are still not going to know how big of a site we need if we don't make a decision. So, rather than the building by the site, I would rather the site be driven by the building. So, we need to decide that.

Council President Bassemier: Thank you sir. Mr. Tornatta.

Councilmember Tornatta: This might be a better question for Sheriff Ellsworth and of course any professional chime in. Are we considered a regional, a regional site, even though we are Evansville and we can throw numbers per person, per bed, type of situation, are we considered a regional site where we have passers by coming through from Illinois, Kentucky, in the tri-state area where we would be affected?

Brad Ellsworth: Brad Ellsworth, County Sheriff. Probably the most marked example of that is when I think her name was Hesseman was murdered in the Bristol Meyers parking lot by two teens that certainly weren't from here and they were coming to the Vanderburgh County 4-H fair. Absolutely, Evansville, between St. Louis, Louisville, we get a lot of inmates that come from other areas that come here because it is a hub and it is a center and they are running drugs on the interstates, we have I-164, 64 , 41, we are catching people coming down the highways, absolutely it is a center where people come in and commit crimes from the small, the Warrick, the Posey, I don't have the exact numbers but if you look at my numbers historically there is a percentage that are out of Vanderburgh County, absolutely.

Councilmember Tornatta: Is there a way, and Mr. Bennett might be able to answer this, is there a factor for that, considering the counties around? Or is there a way to factor that in?

Brad Ellsworth: I can tell you a couple of things, I know that we have done some research on our bookings and in going back to those number things and you know our bookings have gone up. We did a time line a couple of years ago and I don't

have the chart in front of me but based on history and the time line went straight up the predicted, the highest that we ever had in our jail was 428, to me it doesn't make any sense other to modernize and the really poor design of this jail to go to 44, 448 is ridiculous right now when I had 438 inmates in jail. The true numbers, if this county jail were perfectly designed the real number that ought to be in that jail so that I can do maintenance, so that I can do classifications, so that I can run, would be about 220. Now, you think, well you've got 268 beds, why would you only want 220 people in there? Because my job, running the place, by the Constitution is that I have to classify inmates, I have to keep sometimes sight and sound separate when a judge that inmate A and inmate B can't be in the same cell, I have to separate them. If I get an inmate that has AIDS, hepatitis, tuberculosis, communicable diseases, because of his sexual preference, I have to separate them, then I have to move that to another place. If I have only got, right now I may only have 25 females but I've got 40 female bunks, I may have empty female bunks but I've got 25 men sleeping on the floor, that 268 is a false number because it is not indicative of the population that I have. On top of that we are not, we are living under false numbers right now, this 329 cap and I don't know if there is a judge in the audience but the judges and I won't speak for them, but they are keeping these numbers down based on beds but there is going to come a point where these judges go, I think this person deserves to be in jail and I don't care if they are overcrowded or not and they are going to put them in there and we are going to be in the same boat again. That number went up well above and I think we put a ten year projection and it went well above 400, 450 going into the mid 2000's, 2001, 2005 or whatever, I can't remember the exact numbers, I can pull the chart up. We also have to look at the warrants that are in Vanderburgh County. I've got thousands of warrants. Now if the City police, County police go out and do their, if we go out and arrest them, I have 6,000; 6,000 failure to appear warrants? Six thousand failure to appear warrants in the Vanderburgh County Courts alone where these people have been to court, the judge said come back on April 30th or whatever and they aren't coming back. So, my officers and the city police have to go back out and up on their doors where now when we caught them in the car they didn't have a gun, now I am going up knocking on doors and putting my officers in danger again because we had to let them go and we had to (inaudible) and we did that, we are going to get our guys killed one of these days because we keep letting them out and that also clogs our court system because the judge hits the gavel and he sets another court date and then we arrest them again and he lets them go again because we already have 329 inmates in there and then we have to go out and arrest them again and they give them another court date and they keep continuance after continuance after continuance because these idiots won't come back to court. That's not their nature and they are not coming back. So, it's easier to leave them locked up until you adjudicate their court case and then be done with them and send them off to DOC or the Safe House or whatever you are going to do with them. You also have to look at these numbers. Are we going to be, you know some people don't want to make this a business. But, some people, we could recoup some money in this situation if we build some extra beds, not what we just need in the next five years, but we can stand to gain money in holding DOC inmates and we can also stand to make money in bricks and mortar and we talked about this last week so I won't beat it up. We can get bricks and mortar money from the U.S. Marshall service if we agree to house federal inmates and I think Commissioner Fanello has-

Commissioner Fanello: I think this would be a good time to pull out that chart and it is just for information purposes and I talked with the Sheriff about it a couple of days ago. Just looking at a scenario of housing fifty state inmates and fifty federal inmates, the fifty state inmates at \$35.00 per day and the federal at \$41.00 per day,

I mean if we did that, assuming a 100, those 100 on a 365 basis, our annual total would be one point almost \$1.4 million. Over a 25 year, 25 years that comes out to be \$35 million.

Brad Ellsworth: Say we build it in five years, we say our inmate population does go up, you can then reduce the amount of Feds, reduce the amount of DOC's and you've got the beds for the local bad guys. That's a way that you all could recoup from this money that you are about to spend, or maybe about to spend on this—

Councilmember Raben: Brad, could I, could I stay with that point just a moment that Catherine brought up? Has anybody ran the math on what it costs you to house that inmate?

Commissioner Fanello: Well, I think—

Councilmember Raben: Because I did earlier. I saw this form.

Commissioner Fanello: Uh-huh.

Councilmember Raben: I did earlier, and it's right at \$39 a day.

Commissioner Fanello: It costs us \$39 today to house—

Councilmember Raben: Yeah, if you look at your operational costs and your—

Commissioner Fanello: So, that's why other counties are doing it and recouping money?

Councilmember Raben: Well, I'm just telling you, it costs you \$39 a day—

Commissioner Fanello: I'd have to—

Councilmember Raben: --per inmate to operate that jail.

Commissioner Fanello: --confirm that. Maybe the Sheriff can confirm that, but I don't think that that's—

Brad Ellsworth: We did it one time, and we—

Councilmember Raben: I mean, that's based on the numbers provided today.

Brad Ellsworth: We did it one time, and we thought it came in at about \$26, in that area. The point for me is that it doesn't cost that much more to house 500 or 400. You are basically talking about meals, and it's going to take the same amount of guards if you design it right. Unless you do a whole another pod for Federal and DOC, you are not talking about that much more—

Commissioner Fanello: I mean, are you, I mean, is it okay for other counties to get this money and not Vanderburgh County?

Councilmember Raben: Well, I'm just telling you, don't sell it as a money maker—

Commissioner Fanello: Well, but—

Councilmember Raben: –because that’s–

Commissioner Fanello: –you’re still going to recoup a large portion–

Councilmember Raben: –I mean–

Commissioner Fanello: –even if at \$26, if you’re looking at \$76 a day–

Councilmember Raben: Okay, that’s \$26–

Commissioner Fanello: –combining the per diem.

Councilmember Raben: –on the existing facility. I’m using today’s numbers provided to us by the professionals, and it’s 38., \$38.88 a day.

Commissioner Fanello: I would want Brad and Eric to confirm those numbers–

Councilmember Raben: Well, yeah, that’s fine.

Commissioner Fanello: –because they work in the department.

Councilmember Sutton: On bricks and mortar, if you have Federal or State inmates, what type of numbers would we be talking about in assisting with a project like this.

Brad Ellsworth: They won’t, they won’t enter into an agreement until you a schematic drawing, and agree to it. But I know there is counties that have received over \$1 million. I would venture to guess between \$1 million and \$2 million. Julie Von Arx with Correctional Concepts says that she knows of counties that have received \$2 million per grant. Julie, do you know how many inmates that was housing? Feds?

Julie Von Arx: Between 50 and 100.

Brad Ellsworth: Between 50 and 100 inmates that they would agree to give you \$2 million towards bricks and mortar. I don’t know how many years you have to sign to that agreement, but I–

Councilmember Raben: Brad, can I–

Brad Ellsworth: –that’s Federal, not State.

Councilmember Raben: Can I ask one other question? In terms of housing Federal or State prisoners, is there ever the threat that they, their sentence ends here and they are released in our community? Is that ever a threat?

Brad Ellsworth: Yeah. I think so. There is release dates where we would just release them. Sure.

Councilmember Raben: See that’s, I mean, to me that is something important too. We are talking about crime rate going up and we may or may not release Federal or State prisoners back in our own community.

Brad Ellsworth: Right. It’s, there’s going to be a certain population...when we switched computer systems a couple of years ago, we were putting historical data

in, and we ran, there were 88,000 different people booked into Vanderburgh County Jail in, I think it was, a seven year period. Of that 88,000 booked in, there was only 22,000 different names. There is a very small percentage of the population that is committing a very large percentage of the crimes. So, there is that group that every time you let them out, they are going to go out and commit a crime. That's just the way it is. As much as, as hard...and we don't do a lot of rehabilitation in the jail; AA, NA, some church services, but that's not our job to rehabilitate in the county jail. We do what we can with what we are given, but, you know, that is supposedly what the prisons do. Like I said, it's...the crimes are being committed by a small group. It happens to be more than 268 people in Vanderburgh County.

Council President Bassemier: I've got a question for you, Sheriff.

Brad Ellsworth: Sure.

Council President Bassemier: You know you and I and some others went up to Indianapolis and visited with the DOC, I don't know if I understood this right, but do we have to go ahead and build the facility first and then ask for the funding? Or is it we ask for it now and then build it? What, do you remember?

Brad Ellsworth: My understanding from DOC was that we ask them to put the money for bricks and mortar into the legislature to make it a part of their budget to give us money. We then have to agree to, basically, be a regional facility. For them, for the state DOC to give us bricks and mortar money, we have to agree to be a regional facility. That may, Julie, is that juvenile only? Is that...oh, I'm talking about community corrections too.

Council President Bassemier: Yeah, both.

Brad Ellsworth: I was thinking jail.

Council President Bassemier: Both, community and juvenile.

Brad Ellsworth: Right.

Council President Bassemier: And wasn't that 50% they agreed to give us if we would do this?

Brad Ellsworth: They said they have funded up to 50. The law allows for 50%. I don't know if you would ever really see that number—

Council President Bassemier: Right.

Brad Ellsworth: —but it would allow, the statute allows up to 50% funding on that facility.

Council President Bassemier: I just wonder, if we, you know, if we'd really tried to pursue that just yet? To go after this before we sign any of the contracts or anything?

Commissioner Fanello: Well, but you can't, because he is saying you have to show them plans.

Brad Ellsworth: We don't know the scope of what we are going to build, so it's hard

to say if we're only building a 440 bed jail, and knowing that we can't commit to community corrections, then there's no sense in trying to negotiate—

Council President Bassemier: Right.

Brad Ellsworth: —a jail, or having them put it in their budget. I think we need some, a plan first and then go to them and say—

Council President Bassemier: Okay, I understand it that way, I just wanted to get it on record that way. Okay. Mr. Raben.

Councilmember Raben: I would like to go back to a question that was raised earlier, then other conversations took place, but I had asked that somebody give me their reasoning as to why they think over the next 20 years our jail population would rise to 650? What facts do you have that would substantiate that?

Brad Ellsworth: Basically, what I've said before, we did time lines on bookings. We did time lines on projected, time lines out of the future taking the past, the rate of increase, the amount of warrants that we have outstanding in Vanderburgh County, because those people normally stay here. That is kind of what you have to base it on, in fact, like I said, those statistics and the FBI statistics are felonies only. Regardless of what Mr. Hoy thinks, and I applaud him in his efforts, but, you know, every statutes are changed that increase the things that people (Inaudible). You very rarely see things taken off the books that disallow us from arresting people. Domestic violence, battery, drug cases, you know, the drunk driving increases. You know, that's where we see these increases. Once those laws go in the books, they are hard to get off. I think, historically, we are seeing that go up. Those crime rates and those FBI reports are only as good as what those jurisdictions send in. It doesn't, it only takes care of different kinds of felonies that they are showing. So, certain kinds go down, and they are more interested in violent crimes, the rapes, murders, robberies and that, and they are not talking about the dead beat dad that, you know, the judge might put in for 10 or 15 days, or 20, or whatever, and sentence to a facility. So, you can't be exactly scientific. We are just basically taking historical, what the numbers we've had and going from there.

John Staley: We've got a little caveat to add to that. The state has a guideline, that's not an official guideline, that they recommend. Paul Downing had told us recently, I think in the last few months, the statewide average of inmates is about 2.5 per thousand population. In communities that have a college or university, their recommendation today is four beds per thousand is their rule. That's a recommendation, it's not a requirement, but based on trends that's what they have seen as what we call prudent planning. If you asked Paul Downing to come and speak to you, and you know, it could continue as a part of the design process, obviously, we could design a project as a scope is defined and have this expansion. If Paul were to come and speak as a part of that in the future, I think that he would tell you a little bit more about what the state wide pattern has been, and what their recommendations are for design people or people planning projects.

Councilmember Hoy: The reason that, since I've been mentioned by name, I feel some need to respond, is I, frankly, my cynical side simply says that if you build a 1,500 bed jail, I'm certain we would fill it. This is why I say the whole process is a business. I'm not talking about the business from the standpoint of renting rooms to the state or to the Feds, but I think that's simply a mind set that we deal with. I still stand by my statement that the Safe House and the jail, typically, are places that

we keep low income people, and I'm not convinced that they are any more criminal than middle class and upper class people. In fact, I'm convinced that more crimes are committed in air conditioned offices than are conditioned, than are committed in low income neighborhoods. I think part of this whole growth business reflects our attitude toward the poor, which I think is the last bias in America. I've dealt with that for a long time. Second thing I want to address is what Mr. Tornatta said and the Sheriff said, and that is I would remind you that St. Joe County is located on a number of busy highways. It's right across from the state of Michigan, and is next door to a much, much larger population base than we have in this area. If you take the five counties in the MSA here, which I do and the Feds don't, they don't include Gibson, you've got 340,000 people in five counties, and that's all. I see a major difference between the size of the jail in St. Joe, which you just built. I also see a major difference in the cost. They built a whole lot more beds for \$35 million, and that was in 2001. I can't believe that inflation is going to make us, make it cost that much more for us.

Commissioner Fanello: Is that \$35 million construction cost?

John Staley: The actual—

Councilmember Hoy: This is a sheet of paper provided by United—

Commissioner Mourdock: That is the right question. Was that a hair, guts and feather number? I presume it was.

John Staley: The job was bid though several years ago. It's been open about a year, so when you look at the construction period and the time that the bid was taken, you are talking now about several years that have transpired. So, those numbers have to be looked at in that light. You know, what the bidding climate is in the community also, those things take into account. One of the things about St. Joe County's jail is important to note, is that the city of South Bend has a police department right next door with a lock up, so they are able to house inmates in the lock up for a certain period of time. Our company is currently working on a new plan to expand that jail, the lock up, the police lock up in the police command right adjacent to the jail. So, there is a substantial number of holding cells currently that would be increased in this plan. I think that is the difference here in this community that this jail also serves as a lock up for the city.

Commissioner Mourdock: The latter part of what you just said certainly responds to the potential numbers that could be in the jail over some period of time. But going back, the \$35 million dollars, was that a fully loaded bond number?

John Staley: That's a construction value only.

Commissioner Fanello: Yeah, so—

John Staley: That's a construction cost. There are other costs for design, soft costs, land costs. The city sold the land to the county, and there was an environmental clean up cost. I think the total might have been \$41 million, or something like that total, with the land and the clean up. I don't know that that is a precise number, but the Auditor's office or the Commissioners would have that.

Commissioner Mourdock: Okay, so still then, comparing apples to apples, that soft number, that's not the correct term, that construction cost number compared to the

number you are quoting us is still, would appear to me, that they are getting 50% roughly more beds than we got with 672, than the first scenario you gave us 448. I realize there is certainly some inflation in the time of bidding, but that's seems to be a whole lot.

Mike Claytor: The project cost, Mike Claytor with Crowe Chizek again. The \$35 million bond size, which the \$35 million is the bonds. The project cost is \$26 million. Of that, the hard construction costs without the contingency or the furniture fixtures, is \$23.9. So, you're comparing a \$35 million project cost to a \$35 million dollar bond issue doesn't compare.

Commissioner Mourdock: But theirs does have land and ours doesn't.

Mike Claytor: That's correct. The adult facility, the 650 bed that we've shown you, the project cost, and again that's construction, ff and e and contingency, is \$35.7 million, the 650. So, that's a \$35 million project cost, so that's more similar. Again, without land, but that's a lot more similar number to the South Bend number. You know, \$35.7 compared to \$35 of project costs.

Commissioner Mourdock: Okay.

Mike Claytor: The bond issue is actually \$47 million to get you to a \$35 million project cost, because, you know, you've got your soft costs, which are \$5.9 million, and the capitalized interest is over \$6 million, because of the lease financing. So, and I know those numbers are a little, that's a lot of numbers to absorb all at once, but the 35 is close to what we are showing as project costs for the 650 bed jail.

Councilmember Raben: How difficult would it be to provide us with some other scenarios? I mean, if we went, I'll just give you a scenario, 550 adult, 200 community correction and the 24 juvenile. Then you may figure 600 adult, you know, just if we had two or three scenarios in between these scenarios, because honestly, my personal opinion, I don't know, I mean, looking at what appears to be what a lot of the folks here today want are the bigger scenario, the 974 total. I know that, you know, our budget doesn't allow us to provide that much facilities. So, you know, we need some other scenarios to look at.

Councilmember Tornatta: Mr. Raben, if I could kind of shoot in here. I don't want to overstep the boundaries of the County Council. If we have a number, you know, we set a number, I think it's the Commissioners job to set the amount of beds, and they have set that in their meeting, and the majority voted on that. I guess, if we have an idea of a number, we can set that number in there, but I don't think we can negotiate on the bed size. I think we've got to watch what boundaries we cross. I don't think that's a boundary we can cross today. I think we can cross it on a monetary side, but I don't think we can cross it on the bed number size.

Councilmember Raben: I don't know that there is any problem with probably most everybody on this Council asking for that.

Councilmember Sutton: Well, I think if you look at the, of what the information we have available to us right now, the different scenarios, you know, I think we can, you know, if you played around with the number of beds and either increase or decrease it can give you somewhat of a general range of what you might be looking at. If we are talking about \$35 million, you know, right now that gives us just 448 beds. Now, the question is, this \$35 million figure, how much do you want to dice and slice to

try and get that? Obviously, if you are talking about \$35 million, and you start cutting the number of jail beds so you can accommodate community corrections, obviously, that is not going to work. You know, if you're talking about adding community corrections and the juvenile, you are going to be in excess of the \$35 million. Especially, if you're exceeding 448 beds on the jail. So, that's something that maybe we need to just be aware of that the \$35 million figure is something that doesn't really give us a whole lot of flexibility given what we see here right now.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, well, we might, I mean, then we may want to refer back to the Commissioners. I mean, they are not paying any attention, but I might ask Catherine and David is your recommendation the total package?

Commission President Mosby: I'll refer to Judge Heldt.

Council President Bassemier: I want to change the tape.

Councilmember Raben: No, again this—

(Tape Changed)

Council President Bassemier: — we still have to hear the public input, so and I want to hear from the judge. He's been patiently standing there for about ten minutes now, so we kind of better move on. Not to cut anybody off, but we've got to go with what we advertised. Okay.

Commission President Mosby: To answer Councilman Raben's question, I'm not a professional, so I didn't try to come up with these numbers on my own, but after hearing the judges in our meeting, after sitting through all the juvenile detention meetings that I sat through, and after discussing community corrections and the time, the waiting list and everything that we have over there, that's how these numbers were arrived at. These numbers were more or less recommended to me and I'm taking the recommendation of the professionals.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, but I guess, again, because it's all — I mean, it really does stand between you and us and the 35 million that was established was based on what we were comfortable with, what we could afford without increasing any tax or creating any new taxes. So, you know, again, I'm asking you, do you prefer the 974 bed package, and I mean, help me out here, do you want to increase that tax to do it?

Commission President Mosby: I'm not going to say we're going to increase the tax to do it. What I'd like to do is, we need to look at what the community needs. I don't want to be back here in five years building another jail. I think the Sheriff one day looked at me and said we could cut a ribbon on the front and walk out back and break ground, or I could do it all in one, if we want to build 400-450 beds. We'll just do a ground breaking and ribbon cutting in one day. I don't want to do that. What I want to do is look at what we need, then let's go after the money they're talking about for bricks and mortar through the feds, let's go after the state money, let's look at housing federal prisoners, state prisoners, let's look at the income that we can bring in to offset the cost of this bond. I mean, it doesn't have to come out of tax money. Don't refer to tax money all the time. Look for additional money. Let's go to the state. You can go with me. We'll go up and talk the representatives and the senators. We've got several of them around here. You know, let's talk to Julie. Let's get whatever money we can through bricks and mortar, let's do what we — but

let's don't build something that in five years Mike Claytor is going to be standing back here saying here's the cost of issuing another bond –

Unidentified: No, we won't.

Commission President Mosby: – and Tom is going to be sitting here saying, you know, here's what it's going to take, and we're going to pay all this additional cost over and over. That's what I'm trying to prohibit right here and now. So if it takes building this package, let's see how much money we can get, let's see what we can come up with and then let's look at the bottom line cost of what we might have to do. That's my answer.

Councilmember Raben: I guess my question would be with that is, how long do you think that will take? I mean, if we go to state, try to look for state funds, –

Commission President Mosby: I wish that in your meeting at 3:00, you could walk out and give me an answer and we'd start tomorrow. That would be my hope. You know, that we could move forward tomorrow. Me and you go the Mayor's office, we'll do that meeting with him like we talked about, and then we'll move forward in seeing what kind of other revenues that we could start exploring, what we possibly can get. We have numbers on what we can do with housing prisoners, federal and state, so we can calculate them numbers and we can look at what we can afford. But I'd love to do it 3:30 or 4:00 when you get out.

Councilmember Sutton: Keep in mind, too, though, I mean, the \$35 million dollar figure was not based upon a facility, I mean, there really was nothing that we equated that number to as far as the number of beds, site, that really was not tied to any particular thing related to how this project will be built. So that's something we need to consider here as we're looking at what the numbers are telling us right today. Now that we see what we can possibly get for our dollars, what do we really want? What do we need, based upon what we know now, what we didn't know then.

Councilmember Winnecke: I was just going to say, I believe the initial \$35 million dollar budget was set based on information related to the original PMSI study, so there was a basis for the number beyond just the revenue projections over a decade period of time made by the Auditor's Office. So I do think there was some good basis for the original budget. Can I ask one question?

Council President Bassemier: Yes sir, go ahead.

Councilmember Winnecke: This will be of United and Shireman. How are your fees determined based on each of these scenarios?

Mike Claytor: I'm going to have them answer that, but one thing that I should have pointed out, we are now operating under a state tax board rule that prohibits professionals from charging a percentage fee, so I know that's what we all used to be used to in public contracts, but the tax board will not approve a bond issue until you submit copies of the contracts for all the professionals and you prove that it is not based on a percentage of the deal. So, I don't know if I was assuming your question and assuming wrong, but that is now promulgated into their rules. So that kind of underlies that basis.

Craig Burgess: My name is Craig Burgess. I'm a vice president and the

architectural department manager for United Consulting Engineers and Architects. Given what Mike just said about percentage fees, he's absolutely right. The fees are not in the letter of the contract stated as percentages, but in order to arrive at the hard, fixed fee dollar costs that we proposed, we do go back to construction costs and the overall type and size of the project. It's what we expect the complexity of the job to be in addition to its size, and work from percentages of those figures to arrive at fixed fees. So if we're going to end up talking about some percentages here, and I don't think there's any way around that, but keep in mind that in the contract, they're stated as fixed fees and they are based on percentages of an assumed construction cost that's tied to a specific scope of work. And the distinction that I'm trying to make here is that we designed to this scope of work that we were directed to by the owner, and should those figures, when the project is bid come in higher, if they do come in higher than what we had anticipated, that difference in the original construction cost estimate and the final bid numbers has no effect whatsoever on our fees. We don't get anything extra because of that. Given all of that information, we take a look at, like I said, the size and the complexity of the project. We take a look at the hours that we believe are going to be involved in the various tasks that we have to perform for a given package of service for a given project. We also compare those numbers with national standards that are published by the R S Means Company that Mark referred to earlier. We also used some numbers from another organization out of California called the guidelines group, that looks at architectural and engineering fees for complete professional, high-quality services for different types of projects of different sizes, and based on all of that, we decided that when we first started talking with the Commissioners about this project, that if we were to assume a 30 million dollar construction cost, the appropriate fee for our services would be 8 ½ percent of that, or I should say would be a fixed fee, a fixed sum of money that's based on 8 ½ percent of that 30 million. We believe that that is what's necessary to do a thorough, high-quality professional job. We have in the last week as these four scenarios have been developed, we've had an opportunity to fine tune some of those numbers and the fees have actually come down a bit. And granted, it hasn't been a lot, but I think one of the things that you have to keep in mind is the range of services that are being provided for these particular fee figures. We've assembled a team of very thorough, very professional, very knowledgeable experts in the field that we're bringing into enhance the work that we would do on the project. I honestly believe that in terms of architectural and engineering fees, you do get what you pay for. And I'm not sure what else to add to that besides the fact that we think it's an accurate reflection of the work that's required. Keeping in mind that we are (inaudible) to stay in business and frankly, my own personal opinion is that firms that compete on the basis of fee, don't have any other qualifications on which that they can compete. I honestly don't know how a firm could stay in business doing a project of this size and nature for some of the numbers that I've heard over the last week or so. I firmly believe that what we're proposing is a fair fee, if you take the time to examine what services are provided under our basic package and under our added value package. And I think if you examine the credentials of all the members of the team, I don't think there could be any question on that.

Councilmember Winnecke: How do you compare your fee structure generally to competitors on any given project or in any given – just day to day, I guess.

Craig Burgess: I'm not sure I could give you a completely satisfactory answer to that and the reason for that is, like I said, we use as a guideline for our fee calculations these figures that are published by the R S Means Company that are based on data

that's gathered on recent project history from all over the country. What's happening in a given economic climate in a given geographic location, really sometimes it kind of flies in the face of that information, so it depends on the project, it depends on the location, it depends on the current economic conditions, how those numbers would actually compare to what some of the practitioners in that area are willing to do. All I can do is go back again and say that I firmly believe that what we've proposed is a reasonable fee for the level of services that we'll be providing. We're a very good team, we are very thorough, we're very responsive, I don't think that there would be any question that in the end, everyone involved would be satisfied with our service.

Councilmember Raben: Is it possible, Craig, to at some point, give us your fee for all four scenarios?

Commissioner Fanello: It's in there.

Craig Burgess: Yeah, that's in the information.

Commission President Mosby: Jim, Councilman, look under detail of soft costs on the four scenarios.

Craig Burgess: Let me also add that in going back to Mr. Winnecke's question about how our fees compare to other competitors, –

Council President Bassemier: Sir, could you talk a little louder?

Craig Burgess: Sure. Going back to Mr. Winnecke's question about how our fees compare to competitors, one other aspect that makes it a little bit difficult to answer is the fact that most of our projects, on most of our projects, we're selected on the basis of qualifications. It's typically a situation where since we do mostly public work, a public body will issue a request for qualifications, we'll respond to it, if we're lucky we'll be selected in a short list, they'll interview us, they'll talk to previous clients, then they'll make their selection and at that point we enter into negotiations on the fees. So it's rare that we're actually in a competitive bid environment with a competitor.

Council President Bassemier: Jim, guys, we better hurry. I don't know how many wants to speak out there and we've still got to hear Judge Heldt, so can it be quick?

Councilmember Raben: Okay, can I ask one question of Craig before he gets away? Looking, and I'm sorry, I missed the breakdown on the fees, but looking at this based on \$35 million, am I safe to assume that the fee is down from where it was originally?

Craig Burgess: It is. And I will be the first to admit that the reduction isn't large, but it is less than the 8 ½ percent that we had figured on the \$30 million dollar.

Councilmember Raben: Now the \$500,000, the program plan and implementation, is that the value added services that are addressed in the –

Craig Burgess: The added value services consist of the programming and planning work and also the work that Al and Julie bring to the project actually runs from the beginning of that programming and planning work through the completion of the entire project.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, thank you.

Mark Shireman: I would concur with most of the comments that Craig made and I won't say all those same things. Also when you look in the four scenarios, you'll see our fees are listed there. We have a contract that's about 95% boilerplate, standard in the industry. Based on those services, and based on what it's going to take to do the job, this is what we think the fee should be. And based on what we think our involvement will be in the hours that we'll be here. We're looking at a year of design input and two years in the field. So this is basically the way we calculate it. And I think that if you look at that contract, the services that are in that, and compare that to other situations, I think you'll find it's very fair.

Councilmember Raben: And it appears as if your fee is down, too. Is it?

Mark Shireman: When we first issued a contract, we didn't know what the scenarios might be, we didn't know what the program would be exactly. United and us worked on a program after having read that program which some of you have seen, and after we've seen the scenarios were able to more and better calculate what our costs would be. So that's basically, now that we know what the scope is, this is what we've come up with.

Councilmember Raben: Mark, just one question, and Craig and I discussed this on the phone yesterday, and I'm not at all familiar with working with CM's, but I know on the typical project where you have a general, the general contractor is responsible for acts of nature. For instance, like if a wall blows down or something, and you know, we've had that happen actually twice in the city in big construction projects where there's actually been people killed from a concrete block blowing over or something like that, a wall. Is that your responsibility as a construction manager, or who assumes that liability?

Mark Shireman: Well, basically, when you have a package program, and I'll, if you wouldn't mind, I'll pass out a little cost benefit thing here – every person working on this job will carry a 100% performance and payment bond and full liability insurance. And all the responsibilities will be laid out in those separate contracts. So whatever happens will be covered.

Councilmember Raben: Covered by?

Mark Shireman: The performance and payment bonds and all the insurance.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, and I – just one other question, as CM, will your firm actually take part or bid for any of the services that are being –

Mark Shireman: No, it's against the law for a CM to bid on their own things that they inspect. We'll have full-time people here on the site performing quality control, but we cannot work with our own forces.

Council President Bassemier: Okay, thank you. Thank you very much. Judge? (Inaudible)

Carl Heldt: Carl Heldt, Circuit Court. I just rose to respond to a question Mr. Raben had 20 or 30 minutes ago. If you still want to hear my response, I think I can shed some light on it. I think his question was, what evidence is there that our need for jail beds five years from now would be any greater than it is right now. And my

response is that I think you – at least I look to past experience and the past history as far as needs are concerned. And the jail beds are a function, the number of jail beds needed are a function of the number of felonies filed in a county, in my opinion because the more felonies, the more jail beds you need. And when this jail was built in 1969, we don't have figures from then, but in 1975, and these are round numbers, I think there were 450 felonies filed in Vanderburgh County. Last year there were over 2,400 felonies filed, which is an increase, I think, of around 500% with an increase in the number of jail beds of 0%. And if you look at a graph of those years, I think it pretty much is like this. Now it may very well, I can't guarantee you it's not going to level off and go down, but historically over the last 25 years, it's gone up almost every single year, so if you believe the past experience is a predictor of future occurrences, then that's the evidence that I would present to you that we're going to need more jail beds as the years go by. The other thing I heard while I was standing there was the reference to perhaps a new corrections facility, community corrections facility of 200 beds which is less than what we have now. I think that would be big mistake for several reasons. First of all, community corrections is one of the best thing we do here, and I think that community corrections, I know that community corrections takes pressure off the jail as far as beds and needs are concerned. I think that, quite frankly, I would prefer that you do nothing at all as far as community corrections are concerned if you just want to build 200 beds because it's less than what we have now. You may not know this, that community corrections, it started in the jail, it was work release program run out of the county jail. And it was moved out of the county jail to relief pressure on the beds in the county jail. And I am concerned, I believe that if you lessen the number of community corrections beds or you don't provide what's needed in the future, assuming once again an expanded felony caseload, that a not insubstantial number of those people are going to end up back in the county jail. And so it might be wise to build more jail beds in the case. I firmly believe that.

Councilmember Raben: Judge, on that topic, I guess there's been enough written about our community correction program and the cost or the burden that its put on the county in terms of cost, what are you as a judge doing to...in regards to that with the state in trying to alleviate some of the burden that we've taken with that program?

Carl Heldt: Me, as a judge, what am I doing with the state?

Councilmember Raben: Yeah.

Carl Heldt: I've had no contact with the state with regard to alleviating – you're talking about the funds and such as that?

Councilmember Raben: Sure.

Carl Heldt: The only thing I've done is traveled to Indianapolis to talk to the people at the Department of Corrections with a number of other people in this room. I don't know if any County Councilmen – Mr. Bassemier was there – to try to attempt, I guess, to get some money for bricks and mortar.

Councilmember Raben: Right, and –

Carl Heldt: I think community corrections is a great investment for this community. I think we get our money's worth big-time and always have. I think it's very important to have community corrections so that we can have people that are

convicted of crimes that don't necessarily belong in the Department of Corrections or in the Vanderburgh County Jail be in a place where they can support their families and be rehabilitated. Reverend Hoy talks about, I think, about the need to rehabilitate people, especially people that have drug and alcohol problems. Community Corrections complex is the best place we have here to do that. So I think it's a real community asset. I think instead of it being suppressed, it should be expanded. I think it's money well spent. Even if it's tax money, I think it's money well-spent.

Councilmember Raben: There's probably several in here that would differ on that one with you, Judge.

Carl Heldt: They have a right to do that. It's a free country.

Council President Bassemier: Is that it? Judge, you got anything you want to add?

Carl Heldt: That's all. Thank you.

Council President Bassemier: Commissioners, is it okay to go ahead and open it up to the public? Is that okay? Catherine, you got anything to say?

Commissioner Fanello: I was just going to make –

Council President Bassemier: Mr. Mourdock, you got anything to add here?

(Tape change)

Council President Bassemier: And for the record, sir, please give your name and whatever you want to say. We're here to listen to you and I've seen your face –

Councilmember Tornatta: Mr. President? Mr. President? Did we set a time limit? We talked about that before.

Council President Bassemier: How many out there wants to speak? We've got to have a little break here before 3:00. Is there two of you? Okay, why don't we allow you both five minutes? I mean, is okay?

Unidentified: I don't need that long.

Council President Bassemier: Right, great. Is that okay with everybody? Thank you very much.

Marty Amsler: My name is Marty Amsler and one of the reasons I came down here was some of the articles written from your last meeting. And I lived in Chicago for 30 years and I'm very much ashamed because it sounded like the goings on of Cook County. And we in Evansville in Vanderburgh County, I think, are much bigger people than those up there. As far as, there is an increase in crime and I think there always will be an increase in crime. And according to whatever the comment was made, I think shame on everybody in this chamber and shame on society because, you know, no matter how much we try, there's still those people out there that are always going to commit crimes and each day we find out there are sicker and sicker people out there, as we found out not only within our area but the world. The other thing you talked about was, Mr. Raben, I'm not going to pick on you, but you know, you're asking these people to come back with different figures,

you know, so many beds, so many things, you know, somebody has got to pay for that, sir. I mean, these people, they do so much but you just can't keep going back to the well. So that means that me as a taxpayer within Vanderburgh County is going to have to pay for that, and you can't ask them to do it for free. The other thing is that when they chose a firm, I would imagine that there was a bidding process, and within that bidding process, at least the way it is for all government projects, that there should have been a fee structure and qualifications, which I'm sure that the people within Vanderburgh County and when they selected these people, picked that out. So that should have been public record for everybody. And as a citizen, I'd like to say this, I think this is really important, but I think it's important for you people to do it right the first time. You've got I-69 that's going to be coming into Evansville and we don't know which way it's coming in. But take a look or even remember back when you've taken vacations, look at the different communities that have interstates coming into their towns, and I'm not going to exclude Terre Haute 'cause they didn't do it right, but we've got aggressive people down here that want to see this community grow. And with growth comes additional crime. So as a taxpayer, if I've got to pay a few more dollars as far as my taxes are concerned to get a jail that needs to be properly done the right way, one that can be done that we're not going to be sued later on, that's got the right medical facility within it. I have a friend of mine down in Orange County that's looking into the county jail down there because of a death. They have a citizens committee looking into it. We don't need that. What I'm saying is, please do it right the first time and use common sense on it. You know, black and white doesn't always spell everything out. Use common sense. And every one of you, every one of you have common sense. I thank you very much.

President Bassemier: Before you leave, let's get your name again.

Marty Amsler: Marty Amsler, A-M-S-L-E-R.

Councilmember Raben: Can I answer one thing for Marty? And thank you for your comments, even though some of them were pointed at me, they're good to hear. But you had mentioned that you assumed that there were both RFQ's and RFP's. There were only RFQ's on this project, so...

Marty Amsler: But it probably was a process where you did qualifications and evaluations?

Commission President Mosby: Yes –

Councilmember Wortman: You used to play football.

Marty Amsler: Yes sir.

Councilmember Wortman: That's right, Chicago Bears. I remember you.

Marty Amsler: Well, thank you, sir. That's awful kind of you.

Councilmember Wortman: You used to run over me.

Marty Amsler: Thank you. Thank you. I appreciate that. Anybody else? Thank you very much.

Councilmember Tornatta: I'd just like to say, the sentiments of Mr. Amsler, I think,

travel farther than we think. I think people want to see something be done and be done rather quickly as not to cause any more torment to the county financially. But they want to see it done right and they want to see it done so they don't have to pay twice on a project. And I think that's the one thing I'm looking at. If we do this and do it right, and factor in what the county needs and the projections of what the county is looking toward, then maybe we do need to step out there, but just do it once. And that's what I'm looking at. I want to do it just once. My grandma told me this is the last jail she wants to pay for.

President Bassemier: Thank you sir. Would you state your name please?

Richard Helzerman: My name is Richard Helzerman. I would like to say, before you try to solve a problem you should analyze the problem. And if you don't analyze the problem, you're going to fix something but it's not going to really fix the problem. If you want to talk about how big a jail you need to build, you just heard the Sheriff up here saying he's got 3,000 or 4,000, the number used to be 9,000 or 10,000 outstanding arrest warrants. Unless you build a jail that has 5,000 beds or 4,000 or 3,000 beds, it can be filled in a week or two. And you don't have the money for that. Now if you analyze the problem, each of you should get the jail reports every week. Here's a typical one for December 5th, the problem with the jail is the non, what we call pre-trial felons. Now it isn't the number of felonies that determine how many people are in the jail, it's the number of poor pre-trial felons. If you or I were arrested for something, and you can look at the numbers, a hundred people come into the jail every week and 100 people go out. Just think about it. If you were arrested, you or your wife or your husband or your family would gather together the money, raise the bail and you would be out. And if you look at the numbers, they flow in and out, it's only the poor people that can't afford the bail. Now, the constitution, and all of you took an oath to defend the constitution and to support it. The constitution says that a reasonable bail will be given to every person unless they are a capital offense, which means they would be put to death if they were found guilty. Now, there's 209 in this case, out of the 337 people, 209 of them are pre-trial felons. Of that 209 pre-trial felons, there's only 8 or 10 that are charged with murder and probably only one or two that are going to be put to death if they're found guilty. The rest of them are only there because they're too poor to afford their bail. And it is very upsetting that you all talk about wanting to do something about a problem when there's a constitution. Now, I've talked to Judge Heldt about this. I guess he's not here anymore. And he acknowledged that the constitution says that you're supposed to get a reasonable bail. But he says the law of Indiana says I can charge them a bail based on their failure to appear, based on their previous criminal conduct and all of those things, and I'm gonna do it. Now, when the county was set up by the constitution, the amount of tax base that you had was based on the property tax, and the wealth was in the property tax, and with the constitution you have enough in your property tax to pay for a jail that's big enough if they got the reasonable bail. If the – the state legislature makes the law that the judge can give people unreasonable bails, and the only reason the bail is there is to keep them in jail, then the funding has to come from somewhere else. Now, as our country developed, the schools ran out of money. They had to get state money to run them. The welfare system, as more people got poor, the counties couldn't afford the welfare system, the state and federal government had to help them. Now we're running out of jail space. You do not have the sources of income to pay for the jail that you need. Now the state will tell you, you need four people per thousand for your jail, that's 700 beds. And none of these proposals that these guys have put before you is big enough for the jail that you need. And you don't have the money to do it and I wish that you could put, you need to go to the state legislature, say

look, if you guys are passing all these laws that allow, and aren't willing to abide by the constitution, then you've got to provide the funding for it. And now, the PMS, the last consultants you had in here, they recommended that you have a pre-trial...what is it, a conditional pre-trial release program. Now, if you would put a pre-trial conditional release program, these 209, at least 150 of them could be released under the exact same terms, all you would have to do is hire four probation officers and put them under probation. Say you go out, but you come back and report to me. And they could be having their jobs, they could be supporting their families, they could be preparing their defense. All the judges signed on that they would willing to support whatever the PMS recommended. PMS recommended a pre-trial conditional release program, none of them are doing it. I proposed one, I got one guy out for a week. The judge slammed him back in after a week being out. And so you could save the county all kinds of money. Now you need the new jail, there's no doubt about that, but unless you build one with 700 beds, it's going to be filled within 3 to 6 months and you're going to be back hearing the same thing.

Council President Bassemier: Is there any questions?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yeah, I just want to make a comment. One of the programs Judge Trockman and I sat in yesterday, he's got a program to try and help keep people on the right track and that's the way to do it, I think. We have to use the historical numbers and the professionals, including our Sheriff, to come up with the way the things are moving in the future and the way that things are as in reality. Okay, it's fine to say we need a 5,000 person jail because we have 5,000 warrants, but that's not how the ultimate system works. We need to look at how the system works. That's why we have the professionals here. And I appreciate your point of view, but we do have the Judge Trockmans, we do have the judges that are working to try and make sure that the system flows the best way they can, knowing how the system works. And I think nobody knows better than these professionals that we have, including our Sheriffs and our judges, to know how that does because that's their day in and day out job. And that's where I come from and in asking them questions because they're able to help me to figure out how that system works.

Richard Helzerman: Well, I'm a professional in systems analysis, and I've analyzed the numbers that are given here. And if you take the numbers and you analyze them, you find the problem in the pre-trial felons. If you analyze them a little further, you'll look down at the – have a Superior Court and you have a Circuit Court. More of the cases go to the Circuit Court, four of the seven go to the Circuit Court and three out of seven go to the Superior Court. If you look at the jail, most of the cases are Superior Court cases, now Circuit Court cases, even though they get more of the felonies. And there are significant differences in procedure between the way the Circuit Court operates and the way the Superior Court. And I've calculated that if you could make the Superior Court operate as efficiently as the Circuit Court did, there'd be at least 70 less people in the jail.

Councilmember Tornatta: And are we the only county that works that way?

Richard Helzerman: You are the only county in the world that operates the way the Superior Court does. Yes. You're the only one.

Commissioner Mourdock: I think it is still true, and maybe Julie could reflect on this, cut the rotation system that we have in Vanderburgh County is, I think, the only system in the state that functions that way. It is a unique system, which isn't Superior or Circuit, but we do have some unique nuances.

Richard Helzerman: But there are other significant, there's significant procedural problems with relation to the number and the method of assigning the public defenders. In the Superior Court, every eight weeks, the public defender comes in. So whenever he comes in, if they have to delay for anything, they delay it eight weeks until that guy is back in jail instead of every three weeks like they do in the Circuit Court, because they're back in more regularly.

Council President Bassemier: We've got to wrap this up, thank you, everybody. So anyway, do I have a motion to adjourn?

Councilmember Sutton: Just real quick, Ed, just wanted to say something. I think this was excellent, the information we received here, but we don't want to be remiss in that with all the information that we have gathered here, you know, the question is what do we do with this information? I think we need to at least maybe take a couple minutes here, maybe try to figure out what we do next before we wrap up.

Council President Bassemier: Can I have a motion to adjourn?

Councilmember Sutton: Hold on –

Council President Bassemier: You want to do it now? You want to do it here? I was going to say at 3:00, so –

Councilmember Sutton: I was just talking about in relation to what we've heard.

Commissioner Mourdock: May I ask a question in that regard because I think Royce is again on point, and this has been very helpful for me today as well, seeing all the numbers, but I think the conclusion of today's meeting, if you will, you know, what is that one point that we conclude with? I think it was stated in about the first five minutes by Mr. Claytor when he put up option one, which was to show us at a \$35 million bond project, we could end up 448 beds, and I think that one bit of information puts the question or should put the question in front of the Council, as to what is our fixed, final, absolutely, that's it, top dollar number for the project, because, and that is clearly the Council's call. I think the only variant to that might be is there some way that in addition to the money that the county would do a 35 million, is there some other way that we might try to find bricks and mortar money as the Sheriff suggested or someone else. But it seems to me that with the presentation here, we can all argue exactly as to the square foot price and the per bed price and all of those things and I can certainly get in those arguments, too, but the real bottom line is if we're going to go forward with this project, we need to know exactly what the Council is committed to on dollars because if it's that number, then I would suggest the first thing we need to do to tell United, we meaning the Commission, is to forget about community corrections, forget about the juvenile, and let's see what the real bare bones jail is, because that number, again, doesn't include land. It doesn't include a lot of things, so if we're going to go that direction, the Commission, at this point, needs some guidance from the Council on the dollars.

Commissioner Fanello: I was just going to add one last final sentence. I couldn't have said it better and he's exactly right, we have to have a commitment from the Council before we can continue to move forward. So I would say that would be your next –

Commissioner Mourdock: Let the record show, that may be the first time Catherine

and I –

(Inaudible—laughter from several open mikes obscured last remarks)

Commissioner Mourdock: - in a long time.

Councilmember Tornatta: Commissioner Mourdock, the Commission voted and I just want to ask this while we're all here together, the Commission voted on some language to allocate some funds to, I believe it's United, is that correct? Were your problems satisfied with that? Obviously, –

Commissioner Mourdock: My comments, as you heard them the other night, just for the rest of the Council's benefit here, I think you'll be presented today with a document that Catherine presented on Monday night that was in summary a request for payment for services already provided by United. There was the question that came up during our discussion, did that one request for payment in effect validate or put new life into the original contract as the Commission had acted upon and that this Council had ruled null and void? My comment that I requested of David and Catherine Monday was that we take out language that basically gave new life to that contract and they agreed that we strike that language. That was the motion that was made, that sentence was struck.

Councilmember Tornatta: And so you're...okay. I was just making sure that you voted affirmative and –

Commissioner Mourdock: I did vote affirmative with that language removed. I have not seen the document since. I presume it was struck.

Councilmember Sutton: I don't want to rush us along, but we do need rush along, what are we going to go as a Council?

Councilmember Raben: And to your – Troy, no wait. Royce has still got a concern that he wants to address.

Council President Bassemier: I talked to our counsel, he thinks we can continue this in the next meeting.

Councilmember Sutton: This isn't a contract issue.

Councilmember Winnecke: What we're going to do next.

Councilmember Sutton: Yeah, that's what we're trying to figure out.

Jeff Ahlers: We need to convene the next meeting at three, so you're not going to have a break. That's up to you all, but I mean, I think you have to convene on time or shortly thereafter.

(Inaudible – several speaking at once)

Councilmember Sutton: We could put it up as new business at our next meeting.

Commissioner Mourdock: Well, I will motion for the County Commission to adjourn.

Commissioner Fanello: Second.

Commission President Mosby: So ordered.

Councilmember Sutton: Can we ask that the professionals staff, if they would stay for our Council meeting, could we ask that they do that, because there might be some questions that we may have during that time?

Council President Bassemier: (Inaudible – microphone not turned on)

Councilmember Raben: Well, the special meetings pertains to –

Councilmember Sutton: Right, right.

Council President Bassemier: I think I just advised, we already had the question and answer time, I think we'd better move on. Do I have a motion to adjourn?

Councilmember Winnecke: So moved.

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: Okay, everybody in favor say aye real quick.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

President Bassemier: We'll come back in about ten minutes.

(Meeting adjourned at 3:07 p.m.)

VANDEBURGH COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

President David Mosby

Vice-Pres. Catherine Fanello

Member, Richard Mourdock

VANDEBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL

President Ed Bassemier

Vice-Pres. Lloyd Winnecke

Councilmember James Raben

Councilmember Phil Hoy

Councilmember Curt Wortman

Councilmember Royce Sutton

Councilmember Troy Tornatta

**VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL
MINUTES
SPECIAL MEETING
DECEMBER 19, 2001**

The Vanderburgh County Council met in special session this 19th day of December, 2001 in room 301 of the Civic Center Complex, to discuss and take action on an additional appropriation from the Jail Project Fund. The meeting was called to order at 3:18 p.m. by County Council President, Ed Bassemier.

President Bassemier: Sheriff, you want to open the meeting again? Let’s start out and then do attendance.

Brad Ellsworth: Oh yes, oh yes, oh yes, the Vanderburgh County Council is now in session pursuant to adjournment.

President Bassemier: I’d like to welcome everybody to the special meeting (inaudible – microphone not turned on.) Attendance roll call please.

COUNCILMEMBER	PRESENT	ABSENT
Councilmember Tornatta	X	
Councilmember Sutton	X	
Councilmember Wortman	X	
Councilmember Hoy	X	
Councilmember Raben	X	
Councilmember Winnecke	X	
President Bassemier	X	

President Bassemier: Would everyone please stand for the Pledge of Allegiance?

(Pledge of Allegiance was given)

JAIL PROJECT FUND APPROPRIATION REQUEST
--

JAIL PROJECT

President Bassemier: Okay, first on the agenda, there’s only one today, Appropriation Ordinance. You want to take this one, Mr. Raben?

Councilmember Raben: I certainly can, Mr. President. I don’t really know how to begin this actually. I guess to start off with, I appreciate all the presentations that we had at our earlier meeting. I think I’m probably more comfortable than ever with the people that are going to be involved in this project and I am thankful for them being here today. The request that we have before us today is for the added value services through November. I don’t think anybody in this room, or most everybody in this room is familiar with the dilemma that both bodies, both the Commissioners and the Council have had between each other in regards to the original document, and what’s taken place or the actions that have taken place by this body and the actions that have place by the Commissioners. But, this request, and I think this was probably, the document that is in question today was prompted by myself at some point and Councilman Winnecke to establish a document solely for the purpose of the services that have already been rendered. And Craig Burgess and

I, Councilman Hoy and Councilman Bassemier spent about an hour or an hour and half with a conference call addressing not only this document but the original document. And I had stated to Craig on our conference call that I would be prepared to fund their immediate request if we would receive in writing a document that rescinds the original document. And I guess at that point, David and I addressed it after the meeting. Craig, yesterday, had expressed that he didn't really see a problem with doing that. And again today, he expressed it to myself, our counsel and – who else was in there? Oh, Councilman Winnecke. So that's where we're at. I'm under the opinion that if we do anything today in regards to making this appropriation, that we are in essence doing as our attorney has advised us before; we are somewhat ratifying the original document. So purely from the standpoint of bringing this to the floor, I'm going to move that 3660-4192 be set in at zero and then we'll have further discussion.

President Bassemier: Let's get a second first.

Councilmember Wortman: Second.

President Bassemier: Second by Mr. Wortman. Now do we want to discuss it please?

Councilmember Raben: Okay, now I've hit on most of it, but again, we've delayed this, you know, in my own opinion probably longer than we should already, and that's been purely because our two bodies 30 days ago weren't doing a very good job trying to work out our differences. In the last two weeks that's all changed. I mean, I think there's some healthy communication, everybody on this body is playing a vital role, so I would first like Craig's comments.

Craig Burgess: Craig Burgess, I'm vice-president and architecture department manager with United Consulting Engineers and Architects. As far as the agreement to, I guess, rescind the original document, I guess I would just like to clarify one issue about that. Our contract, the original agreement is with the Board of County Commissioners and the letter of that contract, while it allows the county to terminate it for any reason at all, from our end we're only allowed to terminate it for cause. We are willing to work with the Commission and the Council to come to some kind of understanding about the best way to proceed on this, but we ultimately have to take our direction from the Commissioners. It's not within our power to offer really even an opinion about rescinding the original agreement, but if we're directed to do so by the Commissioners, we're very willing to work those out.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, and you know, in regards to not only this document but the original document, you know, I think it's the appropriate thing to do because there's a list of – I don't have that list in front of me, but probably 15 to 20 concerns that were prepared by our combined list that addresses questions of several Council people. Thank you. And they are working on that. And Craig was quite clear yesterday, that probably not all issues could be addressed, but most of them could be and some language could be adopted that would be suitable for both they and the county. And then there's the other issue that you've already seen in the earlier presentation that the final figures have changed. I mean, they're less than the original document stated, so that document, I guess what I'm trying to get to, is going to be so cut up if you try to make amendments to that document, that the clearest thing to do is tear it up and start over anyway.

Councilmember Tornatta: I don't buy that.

Councilmember Winnecke: Let me say something first.

President Bassemier: Are you done with him?

Councilmember Raben: Yeah, I don't want to take the floor the whole time.

Councilmember Winnecke: I would just say when I came to this building this afternoon I did not know how I was going to vote on this issue. I was torn, I had multiple conversations with several people in this room and I think they all probably felt my pain just based on my line of questioning. I know how I'm going to vote on this now. I know we're not calling for the vote now, but in my opinion, based on what we were presented in the last meeting just moments ago, the contract is going to change. It has to. There are four scenarios here. Whether we end up going with one of these scenarios or a hybrid of these, the contract that this body considers null and void and the contract that the Commission considers intact is going to go away. And I have no problem supporting today the payment of this \$373,000.

President Bassemier: Anybody else? Sir, I just want to thank you for yesterday, your time, it was very interesting and very productive. We covered, I think, about 20 points. We had a list for other Councilmembers or whatever, you addressed every one of them. It seems like you're willing to make changes or language changes in the whole thing. I do appreciate it. We've had numbers today; we never got this in the past. And, I tell you, it's been a pleasure the last two weeks working with the Commissioners and with your group.

Craig Burgess: Well, we're very happy to do whatever is within our power to help.

President Bassemier: Okay. Mr. Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: I have a legal question for Mr. Ahlers. Two questions, really. The first one is, if we vote this amount, okay, presently, and I was in on that conversation with Mr. Burgess yesterday and would echo what's been said and that is, we were able to negotiate some changes that I think are good changes and favorable to moving us ahead. My reluctance, legally, is if I vote today, if I vote a yes today, then am I still getting this Council involved in an implied contract, because we still have the same contract sitting in front of us? Does Mr. Burgess need to take this to the Commissioners first, because –

Councilmember Tornatta: It has been.

Councilmember Hoy: – because that maybe needs to be negotiated first. I've got this document they negotiated Monday night. You've seen it. So, I have to depend on your legal opinion as to where we are and that will help me in my voting.

Jeff Ahlers: In terms of separating the question into two questions. The first question in terms of if you vote any money, do you create an implied contract or ratification? There's been nothing changed that would change the previous legal discussions and opinions that we've had in that regard. It's their contention they have a contract. It's this Council's contention that it was appropriately voided. I am sure that if the matter was ever unfortunately taken to the courts to ultimately sort out who's right there, I am certain that they would probably argue that any appropriation toward that contract would be a ratification. So, that is a risk that you run in terms of that. The agreement that was faxed to me yesterday, I don't believe changes anything in terms of the contract. The only thing that it says as I go through it is that there will be some amendments in the future, but does not say

what that will be. So there is nothing certain in there. All that this, I guess as I read it, whenever you boil it down, is basically a receipt saying that if you appropriate \$373,830, that that will be credited toward the contract amount. I don't think, I don't read this as saying that the contract is going to be – the contract price is going to be reduced. And so the only other thing in here that I see is just saying that, obviously, after today, the presentation or whatever is decided that's going to be built, that there would be an amendment to the final scope of service and fees. But it doesn't state whether the amendment would increase or decrease the fees or any other changes. So I don't know if that answers your question or not, or do you have a follow up?

Craig Burgess: May I offer two points from a lay person's perspective? And I mentioned this in our telephone conversation yesterday, I don't know if it would hold any legal water or not, but we are willing to offer our assurances in a public forum here today and if it's necessary to follow it up in writing, I'm sure that's not a problem either, that payment for the services rendered to date in no way binds the county to the continuation of the work as it's described in the original agreement. The other point that I wanted to mention, and I've mentioned this before, the letter of the contract allows the county to terminate the agreement at any time for any reason. If it should happen that once you pay us for the programming work that's taken place to date, the county decides that at that point they want to terminate the agreement in order to avoid being tied into the rest of work, I mean, that's always their option.

Jeff Ahlers: Just to clarify with Mr. Hoy, so you understand what Mr. Burgess is saying is from their point of view in terms of the county. The Council, if the contract were deemed to be approved or ratified, there's no provision in there for Council to cancel the contract. That would rest with the Commissioners. So once a contract is ratified or appropriated, if that maybe answers your question a little more directly, it's out of your hands at that point.

Councilmember Raben: Craig, I might also add, too, any modifications to the document that was provided to me yesterday and to this Council, between yesterday and today, any modifications to that contract would have to be done in a public meeting anyway by the Commissioners, would it not? So, I mean, you're looking at Monday, the earliest, before – or Wednesday, before they could make that change, you know, which is a possibility.

Craig Burgess: We understand that

Councilmember Hoy: Commissioner Mosby is here. Would you mind – would you comment on, the process as I see it is, I think it would help move this if you all took what Mr. Burgess has and in your meeting rework that for us. I'd be willing to set up another special meeting. I want to see this bill paid, I just don't want to get us in a bind. Would the Commissioners be willing to work that out with –

David Mosby: David Mosby, County Commissioner President. I explained to Mr. Raben yesterday before he left that you can take the word original out of there and put proposed in so that you don't feel like you're signing something that you don't want to sign. I mean, the proposed don't mean – that's fine with me. So that you don't feel like you're signing something that's the original, just insert the word proposed where you got original and go on that assumption. I told Mr. Raben yesterday after our meeting, I'm more than willing to sit down and write addendums to the clarification that we got yesterday on several questions with Mr. Burgess on the phone and I think there was probably clarifications on maybe 15 issues out of

20 that I will agree to. I've had no problem agreeing to it. I know Mr. Winnecke and Mr. Tornatta had conversation with United on Saturday. We sat that meeting up. I have no problem with that and I know there was some clarification there and we're willing to sign that. We have done everything possible. I know that at least five out of the seven of you have been on the phone with Mr. Burgess in the last four or five days. Now back two or three weeks ago, if everything would have went online, and on schedule, we would have had these professionals down here then. And we would have been a lot further along today instead of 30 minutes along from where we just came. We could be a lot further along. We're stalemating here for some reason and that's not my cause. I mean, I have worked with every one of you'se over the last week, took time off work and everything else, come up here, tried to move this project along. I think you heard Mr. Claytor say the quicker this goes, the better off we're going to be. I would have loved to be selling bonds today and got that 4% interest rate or 4.7 that he's talking about. But we cannot keep holding this up. We keep talking about one week, you know, go back in next Wednesday and do this. And go back in next Wednesday and do that. We'll be another month down the road and that is not my objective. That's why we spent the whole last week, four and five hours of Mr. Burgess's time, you know, and everybody else's time and long distance phone calls and meeting and calling here and calling here. You know, Mr. Raben called me on Monday morning; I immediately had something drafted as he asked and had it in Commission Monday night. Mr. Raben wanted to talk to Mr. Burgess; he was in my office yesterday for two hours. I mean, I've tried to work with him every way possible. You know, now we're to a point, he wants to talk about one word. Original or proposed. Put proposed in it. I don't care. It's not a big deal to me. We can get the stuff in writing that Mr. Burgess talked about; we can get an addendum to the contract the same as we did for Mr. Mourdock when he wanted to amend it, and you don't have to rescind a document to amend it. I mean, you can amend an ordinance, you can amend a resolution, you can do whatever you want. You just add an addendum to it. We will get the addendums wrote in; I'll take them to Commission Wednesday night and we'll add the addendums. I just ask that you people get this money appropriated and let's get the process down the road. You heard the public earlier say, if it costs a little bit more, let's build it. We just want something that's efficient. You've got to decide what that scope is.

Councilmember Raben: David, the original document that was signed, I mean, we even have contract amounts that are no longer –

David Mosby: And we will amend that.

Councilmember Raben: – good amounts, but I mean, it seems to me and I might, I'm sure Jeff's not the only attorney in here, but it seems to me that the clearest document is a clean document, not one that refers to different amendments or addendums to this article and that article. I mean, why would – United has agreed to start with a fresh document. Why won't you?

David Mosby: Okay, Councilman, what you just said, you're not going to have me a scope by next Wednesday when I do amend this copy. You've got four scenarios laying in front of you and each one of them have different prices in it. So even if I had a clean copy Wednesday at the Commissioners meeting and I passed it, I'm still going to have to amend it after you decide the scope. So what's the difference? They're called amendments. They're addendums. You add them to documents.

Councilmember Raben: We still have the other articles –

David Mosby: Well, you're not going to give me a scope by Wednesday to have me a clean – you want me to –

Councilmember Raben: I'm not telling you you have to have a new document, a contract in place by next Wednesday. What I would like to do is get these people paid for the services that they've rendered and –

David Mosby: And that's all I'm asking you to do.

Councilmember Raben: But I can't – I mean, –

Councilmember Tornatta: Well, let's vote on –

Councilmember Raben: – I'm comfortable with doing that if we rescind the original document. And again, the company that is responsible for that document has willingly expressed that they will do that, that it rests on your shoulders to rescind it.

David Mosby: What is your deal with rescinding here? I mean –

Councilmember Raben: Because I want a clean document.

David Mosby: You'll get a clean document. We'll give you one with addendums in it, it will be cleaned up.

Councilmember Sutton: What is the motion?

President Bassemier: We've got a motion and a second to set it in at zero. And did somebody call for the question here?

Councilmember Wortman: I call for the question.

President Bassemier: Call for the question.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: Now we're voting on to set it in at zero. Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: I would feel more comfortable if we deferred this until we get a clean contract. I don't feel comfortable voting either way, but I have to. So I'm going to vote yes because I would like to see the contract as it should be. I'd be willing to vote yes on that any day and so I'll vote yes even though I would much prefer to defer this till we get a clean contract. But that's not what's before us.

Councilmember Raben: And I would be happy deferring it. I don't know what we do at this point, but –

Councilmember Sutton: We've got a motion on the floor.

Councilmember Hoy: We've got a motion going. We could reopen.

Councilmember Raben: We can reopen...

Teri Lukeman: Should I continue polling?

Councilmember Raben: If you want to do that, that's what we'll do.

President Bassemier: Mr. Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: I'm convinced that at the end of the day, we'll have a new contract that will encompass the scope and the specific dollar amounts and I think the prudent thing to do with respect to my colleagues is to pay this bill. I will vote no.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: Okay, I'm going to vote yes and the reason for this is, we talked about 20 points yesterday. We talked about making these changes. I'd like to see them in writing, so I'm going to vote yes.

JAIL PROJECT		REQUESTED	APPROVED
3660-4192	Architect & Construction Mgmt. Fees	610,000.00	0.00
Total		610,000.00	0.00

(Motion carried 4-3/Councilmembers Tornatta, Sutton & Winnecke opposed)

Councilmember Hoy: I would like to move, Mr. President, that we reopen.

Councilmember Tornatta: Second.

Councilmember Hoy: I would like to make a motion that we –

President Bassemier: It takes 2/3 –

Jeff Ahlers: It just takes a majority.

(Inaudible)

Jeff Ahlers: That's fine. I mean, we don't have Robert's Rules of Order.

(Inaudible – several speaking at once)

Councilmember Raben: Take the vote. I think (Inaudible – microphone not turned on)

President Bassemier: Okay.

Councilmember Hoy: In the guidebook that we adopted it says 2/3.

President Bassemier: We've got a motion and a second. Why do we want to reopen?

Councilmember Raben: I think Mr. Hoy wants to defer this matter instead of zeroing.

Councilmember Sutton: What's the difference? I mean, if you going –

(Inaudible – several speaking at once)

Councilmember Raben: Well, for one, it doesn't have to be re-advertised, I don't think.

Suzanne Crouch: Yes, it does.

Councilmember Tornatta: Yeah, I rescind my second.

Councilmember Sutton: I mean, you're just going to put it back on another agenda.

Councilmember Tornatta: I got a suggestion. We need –

Councilmember Hoy: My intention in getting it reopened was to keep it alive so that United can meet with the Commissioners with the revisions that we discussed yesterday which I think are good revisions and I think it's good business simply to vote on a contract that you have agreed upon, that's all, and where the language is clear. That's why I wanted to bring it back up for a deferral so then we could set a meeting sooner rather than waiting till January, we can meet for a few minutes and approve the amount of money and move it on; otherwise, we're going to be waiting till –

Councilmember Tornatta: And I just wanted to say that the County Commissioners unanimously voted to accept the document that is before us to pay these people their money due. And yet we are still, you know, we're are still not showing confidence even in a unanimously decision of our County Commissioners in voting this down. If they think it's okay and they set the contracts, what do we have to say about that?

Councilmember Sutton: Well, in the reservations and concerns that people would have would be that the people that we've entered into the contract with would at some point in time want to go back on the old provisions and hold us in some way bound to some of the previous clauses that were agreed to some time ago, and I think they've made it very clear here today that they are willing to revisit areas where there may be some contention where there may be some disagreement and from the Council's perspective, where we maybe have given input. So they've been forthright, they've even said on the record that they were willing to make those adjustments and those amendments, the Commissioners have agreed to it, why don't we just get these people paid for the work that they have performed. It will not change the fact that they've already done the work. This is not work that they are going to do, but this is work that they have done, so the appropriate action that we should have taken is to go ahead and pay the people. The motion was voted down, we have a 3:30 meeting on the docket, a lengthy agenda. Since it was voted down, we need to move on to our next meeting.

President Bassemier: I've got a motion and a second to defer it, Mr. Hoy.

Councilmember Hoy: If I were negotiating this, any contract in business and I have

negotiated contracts, then I would want to see it in writing. I trust that United will make these changes and I think we could move it along quicker if we brought it back to the floor, deferred, got that process through the Commissioners and then have a short meeting and vote this money. We could do that long before the first of the year and get the matter settled. I felt real good about the conversation with Mr. Burgess and I think all of us did. But I have to also go with the man that we have hired as our legal counsel, who is an expert at contracts, and that's why I'm just asking for it to be done in proper order, that's all.

Councilmember Tornatta: But this is a separate contract. I mean, not a contract. This is a separate, just a bill. This is just a bill and the only provision is that if we pay the bill, that this be taken off of the contract price that we come up with. And that was all that we were trying to do as to not complex or muddy up the waters. And I thought that was well understood by several, and you know, put in whatever verbiage you want, and we went over this in the Commissioners meeting on Monday night, but it was made so that people could get their monies before the end of the year for work that they had done up to November and we even cut it back from the 610 to the \$373,830 to try and say look, we want to make a goodwill effort to you people who have done the work for the past few months or throughout the year, and also say that we do have our reservations. So that's why we are making it a separate contract and not entering into your proposed contract that has been null and void by the majority of the County Council. Now I didn't know – I mean, I thought that – I, by no means, thought that was putting our foot in the water, shark infested water, but I thought that was merely making a goodwill gesture to people who have been preparing work.

Jeff Ahlers: Just, while you're debating this, I thought maybe I'd let you know this. As I'm sure that many of you may know, it takes ten days advertisement for an appropriation, so keep that in mind when you're debating this that, I mean, you can't come back next week. That's all I'm telling you is that, just so that nobody, you don't worry about, I mean, it's going to have to be probably, well, whatever ten days is. That's what they were counting over here when I asked them. So just so you know when you're debating this issue, that unlike a special meeting to discuss something that takes 48 hours notice, you've got issues with regard to publishing an appropriation.

Councilmember Hoy: Well, then I'm going to rescind my motion then.

Councilmember Tornatta: I'd like to open it for another motion.

Councilmember Sutton: What's your motion?

Councilmember Tornatta: Motion to reopen.

President Bassemier: Do I have a second then?

Councilmember Winnecke: Second.

President Bassemier: Second, Mr. Winnecke.

Councilmember Tornatta: I would –

President Bassemier: Motion to reopen it first –

Councilmember Tornatta: Okay.

President Bassemier: Okay, let's take a roll call vote to reopen it.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: No. So it passed to reopen 4-3. Okay.

(Motion carried 4-3/Councilmembers Wortman, Raben & Bassemier opposed)

President Bassemier: Hold on a second. I need to clarify something. In the past, when we reopened something, it took 2/3 of the vote. Are we changing that now?

Jeff Ahlers: I'm checking. He said 2/3, she's grabbing her manual to see.

President Bassemier: I just know in the past –

Catherine Fanello: While you're reading your manual –

President Bassemier: Yeah, is this on the record?

Catherine Fanello: I don't know. Is it? You got the tape rolling?

President Bassemier: Just watch what you say!

Catherine Fanello: County Commissioner. You know, I think we have done everything, I know Commissioner Mosby, as he said, has met with everybody possible, taking off his personal time from work. We have made every public display possible to let you know that we're going to make what changes need to be made and that we're willing to compromise. Now that Councilman Raben has done this, I am sensing a spirit on un-compromise on his part and, you know, working in the spirit of bipartisanship is not rolling over and doing what the other party wants all the time and giving them everything they want, but it's coming together and

working to move something forward. You had an opportunity here today to show this community that we were all working together and you failed.

Councilmember Raben: Catherine, I would tend to disagree.

Catherine Fanello: Well, when we're standing here publicly and telling you that we're going to make changes and that you've heard this from all sides involved. You've had your conference calls, everybody's talked with the parties involved, and we're telling you that we're willing to work with you, why is that not good enough? I personally just want to know, why is that not good enough?

Councilmember Raben: Because, again, nothing is in writing yet.

Catherine Fanello: I'm standing here publicly and telling you that things are going to change. Am I going to lie to public? No.

Councilmember Raben: The changes, those new languages have not been written, Catherine, and it's more than a matter of trust –

Catherine Fanello: I think there's another agenda here on your part.

Councilmember Raben: No, and I made the comment in a meeting prior to this meeting, that when you talk about millions of dollars, it's more than just a handshake.

Catherine Fanello: Well, I understand that, Councilman Raben, you do not have to remind me of that. I'm a...

Councilmember Raben: And again, I'll go back to my original question. And I made this clear to Craig yesterday. I said don't be disappointed if this doesn't get approved tomorrow because this body is going to want that original contract rescinded. Did I not say that? I asked you, I said you may be – you probably should bring a document in, a written document with you stating that.

Catherine Fanello: But, let's all remember, statutorily, what our duties are. I believe that everybody has overstepped their boundaries at times throughout this whole negotiations, but we are willing, we have gone far and above what I think any other county commissioner across the state of Indiana would do from the stories I've heard to do and get done what you guys, as a collective body want done. And you're not displaying a spirit of compromise.

Councilmember Raben: Can I take this one step further and tell you how irrational you are being about this? It's our attorney's opinion that any payment at all is a ratification to this contract. He has stated that, okay? You have a contract that you are still in support of that states you owe them \$3,080,000. Those figures have changed, so in light of what he's telling us, it would be extremely irresponsible for this body to take action today because you've not changed those figures. You saw –

Catherine Fanello: But, with all due respect, these conversations have come up in the past couple of days and we are getting toward the end of the year and we're moving into a time where you're delaying this project even more.

Councilmember Raben: I'm not. And actually, I suggested at some 30 days ago that we draft a document only for the services provided. I mentioned that a month ago.

And you decided to do it over the weekend.

Councilmember Raben: Well, Councilman Raben – no, I know, but I think there's another agenda here and I'm going to continue to work in the spirit of compromise, but I think that you did not display that compromise.

Councilmember Hoy: Mr. President?

President Bassemier: (Inaudible – microphone not turned on) – for, so make your motion.

Councilmember Tornatta: Right, and my motion is to accept the article that was passed by the Commissioners with the caveat that it goes –

Councilmember Hoy: We haven't voted to reopen yet.

Suzanne Crouch: Yes, you did.

President Bassemier: Yeah, four to three.

Councilmember Tornatta: – that it is a proposal and not the contract, and that we come up with a total of \$373,830 instead of \$610,000 as originally proposed from 3660-4192. I make that in the form of a motion.

Councilmember Sutton: Second.

President Bassemier: Second by Mr. Sutton. Any discussion? Okay, roll call vote again. Everybody understand this is a motion. Okay.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Tornatta?

Councilmember Tornatta: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Wortman?

Councilmember Wortman: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Hoy?

Councilmember Hoy: I'm going to vote no because I think we have the same motion on the floor that we would have had with an appropriation. And I will say this to the Commissioners, as soon as we see that revised contract, I will be more than happy to vote yes and continue the movement, and we've had good movement today and I think we can continue. But I want to see the (inaudible) in order.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Winnecke?

Councilmember Winnecke: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Bassemier?

President Bassemier: No.

(Motions fails 3-4/Councilmembers Wortman, Hoy, Raben and Bassemier opposed)

President Bassemier: No, so that also fails. Okay, I need a motion to adjourn.

Councilmember Wortman: So moved.

Councilmember Raben: Second.

President Bassemier: Got a second. Everybody in favor say aye.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

President Bassemier: Let's take a five minute break.

(Meeting adjourned at 3:54 p.m.)

VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL

President Ed Bassemier

Vice President Lloyd Winnecke

Councilmember James Raben

Councilmember Phil Hoy

Councilmember Curt Wortman

Councilmember Royce Sutton

Councilmember Troy Tornatta

Recorded and transcribed by Teri Lukeman.