

**VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL  
MINUTES  
JANUARY 2, 2009**

The Vanderburgh County Council met in session this 2nd day of January in room 301 of the Civic Center Complex. The meeting was called to order at 1:06 p.m. by Vanderburgh County Auditor, Bill Fluty.

Bill Fluty: Welcome to the County Council 2009 meeting. Madam Secretary, may I have a roll call please?

COUNCILMEMBER	PRESENT	ABSENT
Councilmember Sutton		X
Councilmember Bassemier	X	
Councilmember Lloyd	X	
Councilmember Goebel	X	
Councilmember Raben		X*
Councilmember Kiefer	X	
Councilmember Shetler	X	

\*Councilmember Raben arrived after roll call taken.

Bill Fluty: Please join me in the Pledge of Allegiance.

(Pledge of Allegiance was given)

<b>ELECTION OF PRESIDENT</b>
------------------------------

Bill Fluty: The first order of business today is to elect a president for 2009. May I have a motion please?

Councilmember Kiefer: I'd like to move that we elect Councilmember Tom Shetler to president.

Councilmember Lloyd: Second.

Bill Fluty: May we have a roll call?

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

President Shetler: Since James isn't here, I think maybe he lost. Maybe we should redo this. Yes.

**(Motion unanimously approved 5-0)**

Bill Fluty: Tom, I'll turn it over to you. Congratulations.

<b>ELECTION OF VICE PRESIDENT</b>
-----------------------------------

President Shetler: Alright, thank you. The next order of business is the election of the Vice President. Do I hear any nominations?

Councilmember Lloyd: I'd like to nominate Joe Kiefer for Vice President.

President Shetler: Do I have a second?

Councilmember Bassemier: Second.

President Shetler: I've got a motion and a second. Roll call vote.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes.

**(Motion unanimously approved 5-0)**

President Shetler: There being five ayes and no nays, congratulations, Joe.

<b>APPOINTMENT OF COUNCIL ATTORNEY</b>
--

President Shetler: Next is the appointment of the County Attorney. Do I have a motion?

Councilmember Lloyd: I make a motion to appoint Jeff Ahlers of Kahn, Dees, Donovan and Kahn as County Council Attorney.

Councilmember Kiefer: I'll second that.

President Shetler: It's been moved and seconded. Any questions? Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes.

**(Motion unanimously approved 5-0)**

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

President Shetler: Next is the appointment of the Committee Chairpersons: Personnel Chairman and Finance Chairman. Do I have a motion for that?

Councilmember Kiefer: Do we do these separately, because I was going to move for Councilman Raben as Finance Chairman.

President Shetler: Yes, that would be – yeah, we could do them both in one motion.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay.

President Shetler: So Mr. Raben for Finance Chairman and Personnel Chairman...?

Councilmember Kiefer: Russ, were you going to...okay, then Russ Lloyd as the Personnel Chairman.

Councilmember Lloyd: Second.

President Shetler: Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes.

**(Motion unanimously approved 5-0)**

President Shetler: There being five ayes and no nays, motion carries. Next is the appropriation ordinance, and basically, we're needing Jim for that. Is there anything that we can skip over to and perhaps he'll be here in a short period of time?

<b>APPROVAL OF DECEMBER 3 AND 17, 2008 MINUTES</b>
--

President Shetler: Approval of minutes. Do I have a motion for approval of minutes?

Councilmember Kiefer: Move that we approve the minutes.

Councilmember Lloyd: Second.

President Shetler: Okay, that was – and that actually should be corrected to state December 3 and 17<sup>th</sup>. So do I have a second to that motion, then?

Councilmember Lloyd: I second it.

President Shetler: Alright, roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes.

**(Motion unanimously approved 5-0)**

President Shetler: There being five ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

<b>APPOINTMENT OF LIAISONS</b>
--------------------------------

President Shetler: Next, we'll go down to new business. Let's see, appointment of the liaisons. Did everybody receive this, Sandie, or did you pass that out?

Sandie Deig: (Microphone not on)

President Shetler: There is one correction to make on that, and that is that Russ Lloyd was on Central Dispatch, and that's to be switched over to Joe Kiefer. So I make that correction.

Councilmember Bassemier: Mr. President?

President Shetler: Yes, Ed?

Councilmember Bassemier: May I please have a change on the airport? It might be kind of a conflict since I work out there. If I could change that assignment?

President Shetler: Ed, could you turn your mic on please?

Councilmember Bassemier: It's on.

President Shetler: So you're requesting a change from the airport?

Councilmember Bassemier: You can put me anywhere, Sir, but I'd rather not be on the airport. It might be a conflict.

President Shetler: Right, that's understandable. Thank you. We can make that switch. Put that underneath my assignments, then.

Councilmember Bassemier: Thank you, Sir.

President Shetler: Any other questions? There was a conflict on the other sheet that we had, so that will be the final – right, so that clears it up then. We don't need a motion, I don't think, for this. Okay, we've already done the Personnel Administration Committee.

<b>APPOINTMENT TO THE ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE COMMISSION</b>
---

President Shetler: Appointment to the ABC Board. We need a motion for appointment to the ABC Board.

Councilmember Lloyd: Make a motion to appoint Bettye Lou Jerrel to the Alcoholic Beverage Commission.

Councilmember Bassemier: Second.

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

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes.

**(Motion unanimously approved 5-0)**

President Shetler: Motion carries five to zero.

<b>APPROVAL OF 2009 MEETING DATES</b>
---------------------------------------

President Shetler: The next item would be any other Council appointments, and at this point, I don't think we have any others to appoint at this particular time. The other is the approval of the 2009 meeting dates. Anyway, on approval of the 2009 meeting dates, which is the first Wednesday of the month at 8:30, and we need a motion for that.

Councilmember Lloyd: So moved.

President Shetler: It's been moved.

Councilmember Kiefer: Second.

President Shetler: It's been moved and seconded. Any questions? It's pretty routine. Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes.

**(Motion unanimously approved 5-0)**

President Shetler: There being five ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

<b>APPOINTMENT TO AREA PLAN COMMISSION</b>
--

President Shetler: We do need to go back to the Council appointments and we need to appoint to the Area Plan Commission, make an appointment to the Area Plan Commission. And I had nominated Joe Kiefer for that position. I think we need a motion and a roll call vote on that as well.

Councilmember Kiefer: On Area Plan Commission?

President Shetler: Oh, is that Russ?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yeah, it was Russ.

President Shetler: Alright, sorry.

Councilmember Kiefer: He's trying to do a fast move on me there.

President Shetler: Okay, so we need a motion and a second then for that, and a roll call vote please.

Councilmember Kiefer: I move that Russ Lloyd be appointed to the Area Plan Commission.

Councilmember Bassemier: Second.

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

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes.

**(Motion unanimously approved 5-0)**

President Shetler: There being five ayes and no nays, the motion carries. Are there any others that needed Council roll call on appointments? Do we need any other roll calls?

<b>BUDGET HEARING DATES</b>
-----------------------------

Councilmember Goebel: Mr. President? Have we discussed the calendar other than the meeting times?

President Shetler: We can go back to that, yes.

Councilmember Goebel: I just wondered if the budget hearing dates are set in stone as of now or is there a possibility of moving that one week earlier?

Sandie Deig: (Microphone not turned on)

Councilmember Goebel: I spoke with James Raben and he said sometimes the other, by the time it comes through Mr. Fluty, it's only a two day turnaround or something like that before we begin hearings, I don't know.

Bill Fluty: Which days are you talking about, Mike? I'm not quite following.

Councilmember Goebel: August the 11, 12, 13, we have the actual budget proposal hearings, and I think last year we had scheduled them a week earlier and I was wondering if that's a possibility again or is that –

Bill Fluty: That's fine with me. Whatever the Council desires.

Councilmember Goebel: Or can we bring this up at a later date?

President Shetler: We'll just – do you want to table that for a few moments until James gets here, if he has no problems with it, then we can move on from there?

**(Discussion continued on page 39)**

<b>PROPOSED LOCAL GOVERNMENT CHANGES</b>
--

Councilmember Goebel: Certainly. If we don't have a lot of business right now until James gets here, I did have a couple other items that I'd like to bring up. First of all, I think it's pretty obvious that there might be some new changes coming our way as far as organization of county government. Last year with the Township Assessors, this year, there's a new broad agenda, I think. I don't know where it will go, but I think we should, perhaps if there are going to be changes in constitutional elected jobs, I think that maybe this body might want to recommend to the state that they allow those elected officials to serve out their entire term before the change takes place or, at the very least, give us guidelines as far as compensation and things like that because there are a number of jobs at the county level that might be changing in the very near future, if you know what I mean.

President Shetler: I think it's an excellent point. I couldn't agree with you more on the whole Assessor debacle that just occurred. You know, we were dealing with, for example, in Marion County, who was exempted from the law in that their township Assessors were paid for the next two years at a different rate going back



to 1980, and for those that were taken out of office based on the election that just happened. In Jefferson County and in Floyd County, those are two examples that I can think of, that actually retained their people as far as being able to pay them, but they are not going to be functioning, and it's all precisely because of the reasons that you're talking about. So I agree, I think they need to lay that out very clearly so that, you know, elected officeholders know what they're doing and it's going to make a much smoother transition in the future for everyone to be involved in working in that. I couldn't agree more. At the same time, we need to make sure that when we have those unifications happening and the consolidations, that we're able to realize some efficiency from it, and that we're able to gain some tax savings for the taxpayers. When you start lumping six and seven and eight offices together, I would think that we should be able to realize a tremendous savings by doing that. So, thank you.

Councilmember Goebel: Well, I think the whole process with the Assessors last year, giving us the June 30<sup>th</sup> deadline, and making that switchover, I think Vanderburgh County did a remarkable job, all things considered, and then having a referendum vote, still having, I think, thirteen Township Assessors remaining in the state, that doesn't make a lot of sense, but we can't debate that here. However, other jobs might be changing and we should have a clearcut mandate or plan if and when those happen. I know it's very early right now and the state government has not yet met, and it might get blocked anyway, but it would be beneficial for us to be thinking at least about how we're going to handle those circumstances. There is the potential for a lot of ill feeling, I think.

President Shetler: Point well taken. Yes?

Councilmember Lloyd: I wanted to second what Councilman Goebel said. And I don't know if any Councilmembers had went to that – there is a website, Commission on Local Government Reform – but, I guess, Governor Daniels has looked at the possibility of pushing through a number of those changes. Like I said, there originally was twenty-seven and they pared that list down, but some of that could affect this body where they're looking at the possibility of expanding the powers of the County Council where we would take on zoning and take that away from the County Commissioner. Then also go from three Commissioners to one, so I made a copy of Governor Daniels' legislative agenda regarding local government reform and I'd be happy to have the Council Secretary make copies of all that and pass it out to the members, but I think the point is, we do need to be aware of that and think about how those changes would affect us and the citizens at large.

President Shetler: Alright, thank you. Yes, Councilman Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: President Shetler, I think we also, now that we have nonbinding review of several other boards' budgets, that we should give them a clearcut date sometime in the near future when those budgets have to be prepared for us so we can review them, because we simply won't have time to deal with those budgets while we're working on our own general budget, and the things we're responsible for. And I think that might give them some direction and help us, too.

President Shetler: Anything else?

Jonathan Weaver: May I approach?

President Shetler: I think you're coming up on the agenda shortly. Anything else?

Jeff Ahlers: (Microphone not turned on)

<b>COUNTY COUNCIL BOARD APPOINTMENTS</b>
--

President Shetler: If we could get a motion on the County Council appointments, that would be the sheet that was passed out to the members, with the exception of the one modification there on, I think, that we made on the Central Dispatch. If we could have a motion on that, please.

Councilmember Lloyd: Are you talking about the County Council liaison appointments?

President Shetler: Yes, correct.

Councilmember Lloyd: Okay.

Jeff Ahlers: The appointments to the various boards, just to get that list approved and on record. I'd just make a motion that it be placed on record with the one correction putting you on the board that was switched on there and that it be as listed, and made of record.

Councilmember Lloyd: Okay, but we're holding off on making the majority of those appointments? Or are we going to make them? I think they need to be read out loud.

President Shetler: There's three or four of those that are left open right now because of some qualification things that we need to get involved in yet, yes. But I think last year what we did, is made those appointments during the calendar year. Yes, Mr. Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: On the appointments, like MPO, is that one that you have to get sworn in for or you just – some of the appointments, I know you get sworn in for, but like Area Plan, I think, that is one –

President Shetler: That is one that they do, yes.

Councilmember Kiefer: – you get sworn in for, so I understand, but a lot of these other ones, you don't. And MPO is not one of those?

Jeff Ahlers: That I don't know, but it would be governed by the statute that governs organizations. Some of these appointments that we have here are to committees and such that are not statutory, but rather, you know, like review board and our personnel committee, and that. So it's governed by us or local entities as opposed to a statute. Now the Alcohol Beverage Commission, for example, you're correct, that's governed by state statute.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay, thanks.

Councilmember Lloyd: I guess just for clarification, I would recommend we read off the ones that we're going to do and then vote on that for the record.

President Shetler: Do you want to read those off, Russ?

Councilmember Lloyd: Sure. Pamela Gallagher, Building Authority Board of Trustees; Gene Koch, Burdette Park Advisory Board; Joe Kiefer, Business Review Committee; Joe Kiefer, Central Dispatch; Royce Sutton, Commission on Homelessness in Vanderburgh County; Tom Shetler, Jr., Economic Development Coalition of Southwest Indiana; Joe Kiefer, Evansville MPO Policy Committee; Lisa Foster, Evansville Museum of Arts and Science, Board of Trustees; Tom Shetler, Jr., Growth Alliance for Greater Evansville; Russ Lloyd, Jr., Human Relations Commission Board; Jim Raben, Jail Overcrowding and Assessment Committee; Royce Sutton, Jail Overcrowding Assessment Committee; Stephanie Roland, M/WBE Utilization Board; Michele Howell, M/WBE Utilization Board; Jayne Manis, Pigeon Creek Greenway Passage Committee; Russ Lloyd, Jr., Solid Waste Board; John Koehler, Southwestern Indiana Mental Health Board; Ryan Beck, West Side Improvement Association.

President Shetler: Okay, any questions? Do we need a –

Councilmember Lloyd: Motion to approve.

Councilmember Kiefer: Second.

President Shetler: It's been moved and seconded. Any questions? Do you have a comment about this, Commissioner?

Troy Tornatta: Yes, Commissioner Troy Tornatta. PTABOA board, I just want to work out between the Commissioners and the Council, we need a Level II on that, and I've talked to Assessor Weaver, so between the two boards, we just need to make sure we do have a Level II on that, so I didn't know if you were approving anything today, but the two that have been on the Commissioner's appointments, I don't believe are Level II, and that's Farmer and Kendall. So, if we need to – if there is a swap or something we need to do, we need to look for a Level II.

President Shetler: We left those intentionally blank for that reason and we are talking with someone right now trying to figure out on that Level II, so –

Troy Tornatta: Okay. Well, if somebody could get with us and let us know so if we need to – if you have a preference off our board and you want to take that person and we'll look for a Level II, it's whatever works, okay?

President Shetler: Alright, thank you, Commissioner. Any other questions? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Kiefer: Do you want to come back to him?

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes.

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

**(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)**

President Shetler: We have six ayes and no nays, motion carries.

<b>APPROPRIATION REQUESTS</b>
-------------------------------

President Shetler: At this time, we'll go back to the Appropriation Ordinance and Mr. Raben, you're up. Thank you.

**SUPERIOR COURT**

Councilmember Raben: Okay, thank you. First on the agenda today is Superior Court 1370-1620-1370 in the amount of \$3,523, I'll move approval.

Councilmember Bassemier: I make a motion to approve.

(Inaudible)

Councilmember Bassemier: Second then.

President Shetler: Okay, it's been moved and seconded. Do we have any questions? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes.

SUPERIOR COURT		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1370-1620-1370	Administrative Asst.	3,523.00	3,523.00
Total		3,523.00	3,523.00

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

President Shetler: There being six ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

COUNTY COUNCIL

Councilmember Raben: County Council, 1480-1910 PERF in the amount of \$7,634, I'll move approval.

Councilmember Lloyd: Second.

President Shetler: It's been seconded. Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes.

COUNTY COUNCIL		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1480-1910	PERF	7,634.00	7,634.00
Total		7,634.00	7,634.00

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

President Shetler: There being six ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

**CIRCUIT COURT SUPPLEMENTAL ADULT PROBATION**

Councilmember Raben: Circuit Court Supplemental in the amount of \$33,910, I'll move approval.

President Shetler: Do I have a second?

Councilmember Bassemier: Second.

President Shetler: It's been seconded. Do we have any questions? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes.

CIRCUIT COURT SUPPLEMENTAL		REQUESTED	APPROVED
2600-1980	Other Pay	31,500.00	31,500.00
2600-1900	FICA	2,410.00	2,410.00
Total		33,910.00	33,910.00

**(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)**

President Shetler: There being six ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

**(Discussion continued on page 25)**

<b>TRANSFER REQUESTS</b>
--------------------------

**COUNTY ASSESSOR (THREE REQUESTS)**

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Mr. President, there are several transfers, we will take these in groups, if that's okay. First group under County Assessor, everyone

is familiar with that. There's actually three different groups including the old Knight Township salaries, as well as the Pigeon, so the three are Center, Knight and Pigeon. I'll move that we approve these transfer requests as listed.

President Shetler: Do we have a second?

Councilmember Goebel: Second.

President Shetler: Okay, any questions?

Councilmember Lloyd: Could I get just a general explanation of what we're doing here?

President Shetler: Alright, now you're up, Mr. Weaver.

Councilmember Raben: I can just briefly cover some of this as well. What happened last year at budgets, not knowing the situation or the outcome of the referendum, half of the budgets were put into the County Assessor's, into a single line, for salaries and then the other half were within the Center, Knight and Pigeon budgets. So we're just basically transferring that other half into his budget.

Jonathan Weaver: Happy New Year, Jonathan Weaver, Vanderburgh County Assessor. Change is always good.

President Shetler: Do we have any other questions? Does anybody --

Councilmember Lloyd: Okay, so these are employees who are already working for the Assessor and they were in the township offices? Is that right?

Jonathan Weaver: Yes.

Councilmember Lloyd: Or they could be new and the --

Jonathan Weaver: I think we have twenty-four positions -- is it twenty-four plus Ms. Stucki?

Councilmember Raben: I don't remember the exact total, but I'm sure that's pretty accurate.

Jonathan Weaver: I just want to -- I also want to say, and I'm probably speaking on behalf of all the officeholders, being a bunch of new guys up here and it's great, and like I said, change is good, come on down. Come on down and see us, spend some time, check us out, see what we're doing, so you can see what our concerns are and so you're well informed on the decisions that you make. And I'd also like to reiterate what Commissioner Tornatta said. The PTABOA is in dire straits, really, and we need a Level II immediately. We have gotten through this past year or the past two years of my term -- you know, I'm a Level II Assessor/Appraiser. We didn't have one this past year and then we had three other members, so we were down a member the entire year, we didn't have a Council -- or the Council may have approved the member last year but they weren't a Level II. And it's hard to get a quorum, and now the law is changing where I can't vote anymore. So the PTABOA is being thrown into disarray. So we really need that Level II as soon as possible because I'll be excusing myself from voting here, and there will only be four people on the board.

Councilmember Lloyd: Question? So is that – there's two positions that the County Council appoints. Are you saying one of them needs to be a Level II?

Jonathan Weaver: Yes, because we have two Commissioner appointees and none of those are Level II's. We have - I think, Mr. Stahl, is he your appointee?

President Shetler: Yes.

Jonathan Weaver: So, these three guys have been wonderful. Just the one vacancy right now. We had Kraig Nance, he was a Level II and I think that's the first person off the top of my head I could think that we could bring back immediately. I haven't talked to him but, you know, it's someone that may or may not be interested, but is qualified.

Councilmember Lloyd: But is that a statutory requirement?

Jonathan Weaver: Yeah, there needs to be –

Councilmember Lloyd: One the whole board, there has to be two Level II's, and you're one of them?

Jonathan Weaver: I'm one of them.

Councilmember Lloyd: Okay.

Councilmember Goebel: I was just wondering if you had someone in mind that you could nominate or get the name to us so we could move on this?

Jonathan Weaver: Kraig Nance is who I – because I believe the Commissioners and this group needs to appoint one Democrat and one Republican and I think we're missing a Democrat. And he is the only one I can think of that's a Level II Democrat.

Councilmember Goebel: And you will contact him?

Jonathan Weaver: I can do that for you.

President Shetler: Well, I think that's our responsibility to take care of that. So we'll deal with that.

Jonathan Weaver: Can you do that soon?

President Shetler: Yes.

Councilmember Lloyd: So between the two bodies of government, the Commissioners and the Council, out of these four individuals, we need one Level II Appraiser?

Jonathan Weaver: Right.

President Shetler: Well, preferably two, I would assume.

Jonathan Weaver: Well, the more, the better, but I think the law says that if the Commissioners don't appoint any Level II's, it's the Council's responsibility, so that



would – assuming that the Commissioners aren't going to make a change, that responsibility lies with you guys.

Councilmember Lloyd: Okay, so we need some government cooperation.

President Shetler: Yes, Mr. Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Mr. Assessor, looking at these requests, are these all of the funds from the salaries that were eliminated, so are there any reductions in – or any savings to local county government in salaries from the change that just occurred with the referendum or is it just pretty much a transfer of all those salaries? Does this represent one hundred percent of the salaries that was being paid out?

Jonathan Weaver: I'm not sure. If I can give you a brief history, I'll tell you what I know and then, Sandie, if you want to correct me, you can step in. There were twenty-four positions in all three townships – we're talking about Knight, Center, and Pigeon Township, plus we had the three Assessor positions. There was one vacancy in Center Township. We hired twenty of the twenty-three employees, we hired three from the outside, that one position in Center Township is still vacant and I'm planning on leaving it vacant, so there's a savings there of twenty-five or thirty thousand, or whatever it is. And then one of the Township Assessors did not apply for a position and the other one demoted herself to part-time, so I thought that was an instant savings there of a hundred thousand. And I'm not sure what's happening with their salaries next year, but I was planning on saving that one position and about a hundred thousand dollars. And I think – we're already consolidating, we're already streamlining.

Councilmember Kiefer: Thank you.

President Shetler: Alright, other questions?

Councilmember Raben: I might have a question. Jonathan, you say there was one position that you are eliminating, and then –

Jonathan Weaver: It's vacant right now, I guess it's up to –

Councilmember Raben: Okay, well, it was, I guess, our understanding was that there was three positions that had not been hired back in early December when we met at our last meeting. You filled those three positions, right?

Jonathan Weaver: Yeah, we met on what, November 17<sup>th</sup>?

Councilmember Raben: Well, we met on – it was December 17<sup>th</sup> was our last meeting.

Jonathan Weaver: No, I'm talking about – oh, you're talking about – I'm talking about the meeting that we sat down –

Councilmember Raben: Oh, no, no, no. I'm talking about our last official meeting.

Jonathan Weaver: Yes, I wasn't here for that.

Councilmember Raben: So in these transfers we're granting the request or the motion was made to grant the request for three spots that were not filled as of

December 17<sup>th</sup>. But did we need to only approve two?

Jonathan Weaver: No, there's three. But then there's that twenty-fourth position that's not filled right now.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, so what will you do, file a repeal for that?

Jonathan Weaver: Uh, we can talk about it, I guess. Right now, it's just a vacancy. I don't know how you want to handle it.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, well I guess what we'd ask then is in February, just file a repeal for that salary line and then we'll make the amendment. Would that, Sandie, would that work? And then we'll do an amendment for that salary line in February.

Sandie Deig: (Microphone not turned on)

Councilmember Raben: So we've already deleted that one? Okay, I've got you. Then we're good, everything's good.

President Shetler: The other three lines are there, but they're not funded.

Jonathan Weaver: Everything should be –

President Shetler: And that's what will be done today by the transferring of the funds. What's the total payroll budget for now, including everything? Do we have an idea?

Bill Fluty: I don't have that at my fingertips, but I can get it for you. It kind of depends on what you do today.

President Shetler: Well, I guess where I'm going to on my question is that, we're looking at perhaps what, two elected officials being eliminated from it and one full-time position, so we're looking at saving \$100,000 over roughly what, a forty-five employee department?

Jonathan Weaver: Yeah, uh-huh, forty-five including myself and my Chief Deputy. So I just wanted to make sure that it was those twenty-four positions, plus the three Assessors, so we have Ms. Stucki still on board, so that's the one, plus the twenty-four, we got the twenty-three. We have the one vacancy, right? So we're all on the same page? Okay.

President Shetler: Okay, so basically, we're looking at something around a seven or eight percent savings at the most or maybe less?

Jonathan Weaver: I think, you know, I don't know what's happened. I just got back from Christmas vacation, so excuse me. You know, I know what happened December 17<sup>th</sup>. I'm not positive what's happened since then. You know, initially, I thought with the two Assessors, one not applying and one going part-time, that was the \$100,000 savings I was talking about. And then the one position available on top of that. So I don't know what you're doing with the two Assessor positions.

Councilmember Raben: I think that's about, in essence, that's where we're at. We're one fewer employee, one and a half fewer Assessors, really, because one

is part-time. So it's probably about a hundred thousand less.

President Shetler: Basically, what I'm looking at is, you have a payroll budget that's about – approximately 1.6 million dollars a year then, is what you're proposing. And I think last year it would have been somewhere in the 1.7 range, so we are basically looking at a cut of approximately \$100,000 percentage wise, that's what – a little less than 6%.

Jonathan Weaver: I didn't calculate the percentage, I'm just looking at the six figure –

President Shetler: Do you have a plan that, on-line that by next year, we'll be able to find some more efficiency here?

Jonathan Weaver: You know, I hate to, everybody, you know, we're – that was very intelligent how that came out. We're going to go in one direction and I think it's going to go smoother. We have a reassessment that's coming up and may or not be changed, that's starting July 1<sup>st</sup> and goes until March 1<sup>st</sup> of 2011. So at this point in time, I'd hate to eliminate more. You know, everybody works hard and this is a work in progress. If you can let me keep as many people as possible, that would be ideal at this point. I feel like –

President Shetler: Unfortunately, that's a lot of times what we think in government, trying to keep as many as possible.

Jonathan Weaver: Well, you know –

President Shetler: I'm looking for ways that, and I think this was the objective here was efficiencies and savings.

Jonathan Weaver: I think I just – I think I just lived up to my end of the bargain where we're saving money. I'm giving you a position back and you're saving \$100,000 between the two Assessors. So I gave you money back. I gave the taxpayers' money back, so now I'm asking you for help.

Councilmember Kiefer: Jonathan, please forgive my lack of knowledge on some of these things since I'm new here on the Council, but are there some other things that you're going to find efficiencies in as far as like utilization of space, what about how you do your filing systems and things like that? Are there other things that maybe aren't visible in this salary? I'd be curious just to know. I mean, I didn't know if there was some elimination of some offices that frees up space or something like that.

Jonathan Weaver: Yeah, July 1<sup>st</sup> when the five townships were eliminated instantaneously by law, you know, we brought everybody in-house, into the Civic Center, and that was saving, I think, \$3,500 a month in rent and utilities and telephone cost. So we've been cutting and we've been streamlining since the beginning. And that's what I'm hoping these three positions, with a hundred thousand plus on that, yeah, I mean, the surplus and the duplication was unreal. I mean, when the five township assessors moved in, in August, yeah, the number of printers, and photocopiers and office supplies, the duplication was just unreal. So we're trying to use all that up. We're going through the files right now. We're scanning to try to get rid of file cabinets and get rid of some paper –

Councilmember Kiefer: Just out of curiosity, the reduction of \$3,500 a month in rent, so there should be a reduction in utilities and things, what happened to that old space? Is that –

Jonathan Weaver: It was, in the rental agreements, Mr. Ziemer was smart enough to put, you know, if these offices were eliminated by law, it terminated the lease immediately, so we took advantage of that and moved them into the Civic Center.

Councilmember Kiefer: Good move on the attorney's part. So, attorneys are handy, Jeff. Thank you.

President Shetler: Did we acquire more space within this building?

Jonathan Weaver: We had – Mr. Fluty was nice enough to give up his conference room and there was a little room there that the State Board of Accounts had between the Auditor and the Treasurer's Office.

President Shetler: So it was basically county offices anyway, so it was a net savings then?

Jonathan Weaver: We moved them in, now we've moved everybody across the hall, they're able to, without moving any walls at this point. Everybody is on the same side of the hallway starting today. I hope to give Mr. Fluty back his conference room by the end of the first quarter. And if you can just bear with me on space, with the file cabinets and give me time to figure out what we have duplication of – you know, we should be able to – that's part of the streamlining process.

President Shetler: Alright, thank you. Any other questions? Yes, Mr. Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Jonathan, I think in fairness to you and the County Assessor's Office, I guess today is the first day that actually it's a united office, so it's pretty hard to determine right now where the savings is going to be and the efficiency until you actually get everyone in place. So would you keep us abreast as far as how things are going and where cost cutting may come? So I think it's a little bit early right now to ask much else from Mr. Weaver.

Jonathan Weaver: Like I said, I think we're at a nice start with the three positions.

President Shetler: Alright, any other questions?

Councilmember Bassemier: What was the motion on that?

Councilmember Raben: The motion was to approve the transfers as listed.

Councilmember Bassemier: I got a question.

President Shetler: I do need a clarification on that, James. Were you including all the transfers or just the ones for the Assessor?

Councilmember Raben: Just the ones for the Assessor, three different groups.

President Shetler: Okay.

Councilmember Bassemier: That makes it clear.

President Shetler: Alright, thank you.

Councilmember Bassemier: Just for the Assessors.

President Shetler: Alright, we have a motion and a second. If no further questions, we'll take a roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes.

COUNTY ASSESSOR		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1090-1470-1090	Center Assessor Salaries	191,976.00	191,976.00
To: 1090-1500-1090	1 <sup>st</sup> Deputy-Real Estate	25,560.00	25,560.00
1090-1510-1090	1 <sup>st</sup> Deputy	21,389.00	21,389.00
1090-1520-1090	Real Estate Deputy	19,615.00	19,615.00
1090-1530-1090	Resident R E Deputy	15,752.00	15,752.00
1090-1540-1090	Dep. Assr. PP/Data	15,752.00	15,752.00
1090-1550-1090	Deputy Assessor	16,504.00	16,504.00
1090-1560-1090	1 <sup>st</sup> Dep/Ofc Coordinator	18,126.00	18,126.00
1090-1570-1090	Pers. Prop. Coordinator	18,126.00	18,126.00
1090-1580-1090	Dep Assr/Deeds/Trans	15,894.00	15,894.00
1090-1900	FICA	12,754.00	12,754.00
1090-1910	PERF	12,504.00	12,504.00

COUNTY ASSESSOR		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1090-1480-1090	Knight Assessor Salaries	187,595.00	187,595.00
To: 1090-1590-1090	1 <sup>st</sup> Deputy-Real Estate	25,560.00	25,560.00
1090-1600-1090	1 <sup>st</sup> Deputy	25,507.00	25,507.00
1090-1610-1090	Real Estate Deputy	19,065.00	19,065.00
1090-1620-1090	1 <sup>st</sup> Dep-Ofc Coordinator	16,504.00	16,504.00
1090-1630-1090	Dep Assr/Mobile Homes	14,480.00	14,480.00
1090-1640-1090	Dep Land Appraiser	19,615.00	19,615.00
1090-1650-1090	Dep Assr Business`	14,480.00	14,480.00
1090-1660-1090	Dep Assr Deeds	14,480.00	14,480.00
1090-1670-1090	2 <sup>nd</sup> Real Estate Dep	13,216.00	13,216.00
1090-1900	FICA	12,462.00	12,462.00
1090-1910	PERF	12,226.00	12,226.00

COUNTY ASSESSOR		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1090-1490-1090	Pigeon Assessor Salaries	184,222.00	184,222.00
To: 1090-1680-1090	1 <sup>st</sup> Dep-Real Estate	25,560.00	25,560.00
1090-1690-1090	1 <sup>st</sup> Deputy	19,115.00	19,115.00
1090-1700-1090	Real Estate Deputy	18,191.00	18,191.00
1090-1710-1090	Dep Assr Bus PP	13,824.00	13,824.00
1090-1720-1090	Real Est Trans Clerk	19,184.00	19,184.00
1090-1730-1090	Dep Assr PP	14,480.00	14,480.00
1090-1740-1090	Ofc Coordinator	15,752.00	15,752.00
1090-1750-1090	1 <sup>st</sup> Dep Bus PP	15,752.00	15,752.00
1090-1760-1090	Real Estate Dep	18,126.00	18,126.00
1090-1900	FICA	12,239.00	12,239.00
1090-1910	PERF	11,999.00	11,999.00

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

Jonathan Weaver: Thank you.

SUPERIOR COURT

Councilmember Raben: Okay, next under Superior Court, we have a transfer in the amount of \$12,788, I'll move approval.

Councilmember Bassemier: Second.

President Shetler: It's been moved and seconded. Any questions? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes.

SUPERIOR COURT		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1370-1620-1370	Admin. Assistant	12,788.00	12,788.00
To: 1370-1971	Accrued Payments	12,788.00	12,788.00

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

President Shetler: The last two motions both carried 6-0, and motion carried then.

CIRCUIT COURT (LATE)  
CIRCUIT COURT SUPPLEMENTAL ADULT PROBATION (LATE)

Councilmember Raben: And last we have a transfer for Circuit Court in the amount of \$6,394 and again for Circuit Court Supplemental Adult Probation in the amount of \$419, I'll move approval.

Councilmember Lloyd: Second.

Councilmember Bassemier: Mr. President, I was going to try to get that in. I want to go back to an appropriation because I think there might be a conflict of interest with me and I'd like to abstain on my motion on one of the appropriations. I'd like to open that back up before I vote on that transfer for Circuit Court. How do we do that or are we going to go back to it afterwards or...?

President Shetler: Well, with us having a motion and a second, we need to probably clear that off the table first and then go back to any other business, I would assume.

Jeff Ahlers: Is he talking about something that's already been voted on?

President Shetler: I think so.

Jeff Ahlers: If it's already been voted on, I mean, I guess it's –

Councilmember Bassemier: Then I'm going to open that back up and I want to know how to open that back up –

President Shetler: You're not talking about the current issue?

Councilmember Bassemier: No, not right now.

President Shetler: Let's dispense with that and then we'll go back.

Jeff Ahlers: I was going to say, you might want to just go ahead and vote on what's pending then, and then decide if you want to open the other back up.

President Shetler: Alright, so we have a motion -

**(Tape changed)**

President Shetler: – any questions? Circuit Court is, I believe, what we're on. Alright, roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: And this is for the Circuit Court transfer?

President Shetler: Correct.

Councilmember Bassemier: I abstain.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?



President Shetler: Yes.

CIRCUIT COURT		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1360-1240-1360	Probation Officer	6,394.00	6,394.00
To: 1360-1971	Accrued Payments	6,394.00	6,394.00

CIRCUIT COURT SUPPLEMENTAL ADULT PROBATION		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 2600-1460-2600	Probation Officer	419.00	419.00
To: 2600-1971	Accrued Payments	419.00	419.00

**(Motion carried 5-0/Councilmember Bassemier abstained)**

President Shetler: We have five ayes, no nays, and one abstention. Motion carries.

**CIRCUIT COURT SUPPLEMENTAL ADULT PROBATION (Discussion continued from page 14)**

Councilmember Raben: Okay, now are you wanting a motion to reopen the Circuit Court Supplemental?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes, Circuit Court Supplemental.

Councilmember Raben: Mr. President, I'll move that we reopen accounts 2600-1980 and 2600-1900 in Circuit Court Supplemental.

President Shetler: You know, we might need to know who made the second on that particular motion the first time around, probably need the same person.

Jeff Ahlers: Well, right now, he's just making the motion to –

Councilmember Raben: I'm making a motion to reopen.

President Shetler: Oh okay, I'm sorry. Go ahead, Joe. Were you – about the second?

Councilmember Kiefer: I can second it and then I just have discussion on it.

President Shetler: Okay.

Councilmember Kiefer: So I'll second it.

President Shetler: It's been moved and seconded. Councilman, I guess I have a question and that is, not to pry personally or anything, but I don't know if you mind stating or what –

Councilmember Bassemier: It might be a conflict of interest. I've got a case pending in Circuit Court and I'd like to abstain from making that vote. I voted yes and I'd just like it put in the record that I abstained on that appropriation.

President Shetler: Okay, thank you. Anybody have any questions with it? Councilman Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Well, the only thing I had a question about is, I didn't know how you normally determined a conflict of interest. I mean, I know when I was on the City Council, I mean, they always wanted you to vote unless you clarified with the attorney, with your Council attorney in advance, that it was a conflict. But, you know, it's not – I'm not making an issue out of it, I am just curious, I mean, you just personally determine it's a conflict or do you have to have legal input on that? Otherwise, you could be voting all the time abstention. But, just a question for Jeff, I guess.

Jeff Ahlers: Well, I mean, I guess there's a question as to whether you truly have a legal conflict of interest. Of course, that would depend upon the facts, the circumstances, and you'd need to do some sort of analysis about it. I suppose that a member of Council can abstain to anything they want regardless of whether it's a conflict or not, and then the record reflects what it is. The only issue here is, is that the vote has already been taken, so I don't know, unless you're going to reopen it, I guess you can do that. But, I mean, it's kind of already been done, you know. The toothpaste is already out of the tube, you know, but at any rate...

Councilmember Lloyd: Mr. President, I think Councilman Bassemier has a matter before the court, so by approving that, he doesn't want to appear that he favors the court or is currying favor with the court, which I can understand.

Councilmember Bassemier: I don't have legal counsel with me today, so I don't know if it's a conflict or not. But I just wanted the record to show that I abstained from that appropriation just in case there might be a conflict. I'm without counsel today on a case pending in Circuit Court.

Councilmember Raben: Okay. Mr. President, the motion was to reopen, so we need to take a vote on that and then we'll make a motion.

President Shetler: Any other questions about the point? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes.

**(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)**

President Shetler: There being six yeses and no nays, the motion carries.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, now I'll make a motion Circuit Court Supplemental accounts 2600-1980 and 2600-1900 in the amount of \$33,910.

Councilmember Kiefer: I move that we approve.

President Shetler: It's a second.

Councilmember Kiefer: Oh, second. Thank you.

President Shetler: Okay, any questions? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Abstain.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes.

**(Motion carried 5-0/Councilmember Bassemier abstained)**

President Shetler: There being five ayes and no nays, one abstention, the motion carries.

<b>AMENDMENTS TO SALARY ORDINANCE</b>
---------------------------------------

Councilmember Raben: That is all for the appropriations and the transfers. Next we'll move into the amendments to the Salary Ordinance. Sandie or Sarah, excuse me, if you wouldn't mind passing those out. There is one thing I want to call your attention to, that might look somewhat out of place. But on page one, we're

approving the salary ordinance for Knight Township Assessor, and that's because the action we took in December puts that line, we actually set that line in place. Now understanding that he's declined to take that payment, but because of the current state statute, we can't change an elected official's salary in the same year. So what we will ask to do, is possibly, if the County Assessor next month would file a repeal, because that money is actually in place for 2009, if you would file a repeal for that amount. But it looks a little funny because you're approving that in this amendment to the Salary Ordinance. But it's just the way we have to do it.

President Shetler: Any questions? Okay, we need a – Did you make a motion?

Councilmember Raben: Okay, well, has everybody been given a copy? There is two pages of amendments to the Salary Ordinance, Mr. President, I'm going to move that we enter these items, these two pages into the record and move for approval.

President Shetler: It's been moved and do we have a second?

Councilmember Bassemier: Second.

President Shetler: We have a second. Any questions? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes.

**(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)**

President Shetler: There being six ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

Councilmember Bassemier: Here we go again, I see a Circuit Court on here again. Can we leave that – can we leave that one out and vote on the rest of them? I don't see any other ones. Let's see...

President Shetler: Do we have a motion to revisit that?

Councilmember Lloyd: I make a motion to repeal the vote and revote.

Councilmember Bassemier: And I apologize.

Councilmember Raben: I'll second.

Councilmember Bassemier: This was just handed to me.

President Shetler: It's been moved and seconded. I guess we need a roll call as opposed to – okay, roll call vote please.

Councilmember Bassemier: Now this is, we're leaving the, just make sure I'm clear, we're leaving –

President Shetler: Right now we're just asking to revisit it.

Councilmember Bassemier: Revisit. Okay. Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes.

**(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)**

President Shetler: Six ayes, no nays, the motion carries.

Councilmember Raben: Alright, I'll move that we enter into the – this is going to be difficult. Just abstain from the whole thing, if you don't mind.

Councilmember Bassemier: Okay.

Councilmember Raben: I'm going to move that we approve the amendments to the Salary Ordinance as listed and ask that they be made a part of the minutes, along with that, we approve the 2009 Salary Ordinance, which everyone has been given a copy of. I neglected to add that to the motion, the original motion.

Councilmember Lloyd: Second.

President Shetler: It's been moved and seconded. Any questions? Okay, roll call

vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Abstain.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes.

**(Motion unanimously approved 5-0/Councilmember Bassemier abstained)**

President Shetler: There being five ayes, no nays, and one abstention, the motion carries.

<b>KNIGHT TOWNSHIP ASSESSOR</b>
---------------------------------

President Shetler: Any old business to come before Council? Yes, Councilman Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: This came to former President Marsha Abell, and I just wanted to read this into the record. It was a letter from Al Folz to Council President Marsha Abell December 22, 2008, regarding Knight Township Assessor's pay:

"Dear Councilman Abell:

The issue has come as a complete surprise to me. I decided in November to quietly retire from public service. I am, and will remain, very grateful to the voters of Knight Township for the honor of serving them for the past 22 years.

I know the Council was simply following the same procedures they allowed for in German and Scott Townships last July. I appreciate your help and cooperation over the years and I appreciate the Council's offer. However, I must refuse. Not submitting a job application was not an oversight on my part.

Sincerely,

Al Folz, Knight Township Assessor"

I'd just like to commend Al Folz. He's been a good public servant for many years and he wanted to retire, decided to, and not take the salary that was his by vote of this Council. And anyway, I want to commend him for that.

<p><b>RESOLUTION FOR THE INDIANA GENERAL ASSEMBLY TO AMEND I.C. 6-9-2.5-7.7 TO EXTEND THE EXPIRATION DATE FOR DEPOSITING FUNDS AT THE RATE OF TWO PERCENT INTO THE CONVENTION CENTRE OPERATING FUND</b></p>
---

President Shetler: We have a couple of other items of business to attend to. One is a resolution to the Indiana General Assembly to amend a particular statute to extend the expiration date for the depositing of funds ready to present for the Convention Center.

Jeff Ahlers: (Microphone not turned on)

President Shetler: Yes please, Jeff.

Jeff Ahlers: I'll briefly explain this and I don't know if Mr. Raben may be more knowledgeable, it's my understanding that the Convention & Visitors Bureau sent over a resolution, I guess, that was received by the Council Office on Monday or Tuesday, I believe. And what they basically did was passed a motion to remove the expiration at the end of 2009 of two percent of the Innkeepers Tax, two percent of the six percent, being deposited in the Centre Operating Fund, because what happens is, is at the end of 2009, that goes to only one percent of the Innkeepers Tax being deposited in the Centre Operating Fund. And so with the legislature, the General Assembly meeting this spring, if we want to have the legislature amend this statute, because this is governed by Indiana Code, then the legislature would need to take this up in this session to modify those expiration dates of the amount of money that's put into the Centre Operating Fund. So we received this on Monday that the Commission had taken this action. I drafted a resolution. It's similar to the one that we passed a couple of years ago and if it meets with your approval or you're free to modify it however you wish. I just assumed that, based upon discussions in the past, that it would be this Council's desire to consider taking action on a resolution to recommend that two percent continue to go into the Centre Operating Fund. So I tried to email that to everybody. I didn't have Mr. Bassemier's email address and I now have that now, so I can email that to you. But because of the holidays coming up, and again, this issue didn't come to us, to our attention, until Monday is when the Convention Bureau came to us. So we wanted to try to respond quickly so that you can get this before the General Assembly. So I think Mr. Raben may have – I guess you're the liaison, right, so you may have more you want to add to this. But –

Councilmember Raben: Well no, you've summed it up pretty well. This is something that I've actually been on them for about the last two years to do because of – I think originally the intent in eliminating the one percent was with hopes of the Centre, you know, revenues increasing and eventually they would, you know, be able to support themselves. But in light of not really having an aggressive, strong anchor hotel, you know, they're really not getting the bookings that they can get and want to get. So, quite honestly, we're going to have to have this extra penny or – to continue to support the Centre. So the Convention Bureau did what they needed to do and it's very important that this Council support this resolution or we're going to be looking for several hundred thousand dollars to make up that deficit out of property taxes and I don't think we want to do that.

Councilmember Goebel: Can we move on that and finish it today?

Jeff Ahlers: Yeah, you can make a motion to pass this resolution or if you have a different one, and then I would suggest that if it passes, that the Council President may want to send that to the attention of our local legislators and we may want to make some phone calls to make sure somebody is going to sponsor legislation on that issue. And Mr. Vezzoso, I don't know, may have already spoken to some of them, so you may want to coordinate with the Convention Bureau on that.

President Shetler: Is that in the form of a motion, I assume?

Councilmember Goebel: I move that we pass the resolution to the Indiana General Assembly to amend the expiration date to 2015 as printed.

President Shetler: Alright, do I have a second?

Councilmember Lloyd: Second.

President Shetler: Any further questions, discussion? Yes.

Councilmember Lloyd: Just clarification. So originally, the state law had this sun setting January 1, 2010 and we're extending it five years, correct?

Jeff Ahlers: Yeah, that's what we're requesting. In fact, this same thing occurred several years ago and we asked that it be extended then, and the legislature did so and now we're on top of the deadline again, and so that's the – I mean, you can ask them to do whatever you want but if you want to be consistent with the Convention Bureau, that's what they asked was to extend it for five years. And your resolution that I've drafted for you is consistent with that position, but I went ahead and made sure to attach as exhibits the Convention Bureau's resolution and then also attach the actual statute with a mark through so you can see how it's currently written and then what we're asking that it be changed to.

Councilmember Lloyd: Since the legislature is organizing now, I would recommend we pass this today.

President Shetler: Any other questions or comments? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.



Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes.

**(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)**

President Shetler: There being six ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

<b>STEVE OWENS PUBLIC DEFENDER</b>
------------------------------------

President Shetler: Mr. Owens, did you...?

Steve Owens: Good afternoon, I'm Steve Owens, I'm the Chief Public Defender. I had written a letter to the Council requesting that the Council vote today on changing one of our part-time line item attorney positions to a classified full-time attorney. The reason for that is we have as we stand here today, I have two openings in part-time positions. I will have a third opening at the end of February due to a retirement. What I'm asking the Council to do is to take one of the line items which is, I believe, 1640, classify that as an executive level step one position for 2009 and beyond. And at the end of February, we will then not fill the 1670 position, which will be used to fund the additional salary. The net effect is around, if my figures are correct, for 2009, will be about a \$20,000 savings in salaries, not including any savings in FICA, PERF or insurance benefits. The second part of my letter also requested that the Council approve a second full-time position at a more experienced level. I understand that that has, I've been informed that that has to go through the Job Study Committee, so what I'm going to ask is that you allow me to withdraw the request for the second full-time position.

President Shetler: Alright, thank you. I think they're checking it out to see what we're able to do today and not able to do. Okay, I think what Mr. Owens is basically asking for here, if I may speak a little bit for you, pardon me for this, but because we basically have placed a moratorium on Job Study for a little bit here because of going through the whole entire county, that this is something that would actually be reducing, that asking that maybe we could waive that or else, maybe Councilman Lloyd could have a hearing on that particular request and go straight to the Council, because that being basically an advisory anyway. So I think that's – am I phrasing this correctly?

Steve Owens: With the number of openings that we have, effective today, we can't handle all the cases that are going to come to us in the near future in the coming months. Not having a Job Study meeting to bring that to puts us in a very big bind. My understanding, at least from Mr. Deisher, and conversations that I've had with him in the past is that basically attorney positions are factored in as an Executive Level Two, as I recall, both in the Prosecutor's Office and for those full-time positions in my office, as well, that are classified. The candidate who would fill this position is leaving the Prosecutor's Office and would be coming to work in my office on January 12<sup>th</sup>, assuming we can get it passed. We're not asking for any additional appropriation. I do believe that probably in March we would be coming to you with a request to transfer some money from the one salaried line item to the other one, as well as a repeal for whatever balance is left.

President Shetler: Mr. Owens, when you and I spoke about this particular issue, that was prior to a tragic incident that happened subsequently. And has that impacted your office, that tragic situation that I'm referring to?

Steve Owens: Yes. When we spoke, we knew we had a retirement, we also knew we had an impending opening at the end of the year, we weren't planning for the third one, obviously, at that time.

President Shetler: Right. So that's the second opening you have currently, is what I'm in reference to?

Steve Owens: Yes. Now it's in a different court and basically what I've tried to do is keep these people, the two that I'm asking you to address today or the one that I'm asking you to address today, and the next one that we will have in March are both in Superior Court. The second request I've made for the full-time position was a Circuit Court, and that's the one I'm withdrawing.

President Shetler: Okay. Yes, Councilman Goebel.

Councilmember Goebel: I think we've already addressed though the salary ordinance the one position where you're combining two part-times, is that...am I correct in understanding that? For the savings of 20,000?

Councilmember Raben: Here, let me – we've already – the first phase of what you want to do was done about five minutes ago.

Councilmember Goebel: The very last item, Steve.

Steve Owens: If you've already approved that, that has been done, and we would ask that we be able to make that effective, I guess, January 12<sup>th</sup>.

President Shetler: It's effective now.

Steve Owens: It's effective now and he's going to start on the 12<sup>th</sup>. And if you've done that, that's all we need.

President Shetler: Alright. Thank you.

Steve Owens: Thank you.

President Shetler: Anybody else have any questions?

<b>BKD CONTRACT</b>
---------------------

President Shetler: Alright, the next item is on the BKD contract. Mr. Deisher?

Tim Deisher: I asked the President to allow me to speak. I apologize for not being here last month for those that were here that discussed it, and I wasn't aware it was going to be on the agenda. Just for the sake of the new folks, if I could give a one minute history that – I went about five years without any increase in my contract and March 1 of 2007, you allowed, I went back and calculated what the percentage increase would have been had I been allowed the increase that the employees received. In March 1 of '07, about half of that was allowed and so a new contract was entered March 1 of '07 through February 28, of '08, with the understanding that

I would get an increase each year along with what the employees received. In the contract it states, "it's anticipated the rates will be adjusted annually by the same percentage or amount of raise given county employees". I prepared a new contract March 1 of 2008 and the Council determined it had a full agenda and wasn't able to hear it. In the December meeting, I had prepared one with the increase and it wasn't allowed, so I just wanted to update everyone and ask that the contract as it was presented in December be allowed.

President Shetler: I think one of the questions that came up from Councilman Sutton at the time, and I don't mean to put words in his mouth, but I'll try to paraphrase the best that I can, and if anybody has a question about that, please bring it up, but I got the feeling from him – because he and I thought along the same line, that perhaps most of the contracts that we see are done with the CPI increase as opposed to floating with the wages of the employees, and just wondered if that may be a better way to handle this contract. But I think that was the question that he was asking or had proposed. And again, if that's incorrect, we might bring that up.

Councilmember Goebel: I don't have my notes, but I know we were talking along those lines. I think another issue was the increase of three percent and maybe the amount of time spent would not correspondingly increase and should we factor that in or not on a, say a given year where there's not as much demand for the position. I don't know, am I mistaken on that?

President Shetler: I think there was more to it, you're correct, yes.

Tim Deisher: If I could speak to that, as far as the demand, I don't get money on the Job Study review of positions if I don't perform that service. As far as the monthly service, that's for the updating the Salary Ordinance, determining the salaries each year, factoring in all the changes of employees throughout the year and that really doesn't change. If I don't do the service for the reviewing positions, then I don't get money for that. It's just a matter of what I get, if I do perform the service.

Councilmember Goebel: That clears it up a bit.

President Shetler: Jeff, do you have a copy of the contract?

Jeff Ahlers: Which copy is it that you would like? I'm sorry.

President Shetler: I just wanted to make sure – you've read it over and looked at it and everything seems to be in order?

Jeff Ahlers: Yes, my understanding is, whenever I looked at it is, except for the dollar amounts, the 2008 document that you provided to us is the same, the one I looked through is the terms in 2007 except for the specific amounts of money, is that correct?

Tim Deisher: Correct.

Jeff Ahlers: Now you're free to do, you know, whatever you want to do, I'm just wanting to make sure to clarify for the record that that's the only difference between what you passed a year or two ago versus today, is just the dollar amounts.

President Shetler: Okay. Yes, Mr. Deisher.

Tim Deisher: If I could speak also, it was prepared with the three percent, which was effective for the January 1, 2008 that the Council never passed. And they've asked me, which is why I put it in here, that I come back each year to ask for an increase versus waiting five years and asking for a larger increase. So I'm really doing what Council had asked March of '07, and, you know, the CPI, I mean the last CPI index I saw was a 5.8% increase versus a three percent increase that I have here.

President Shetler: Okay, basically what we had approved at the last meeting on December 17<sup>th</sup>, based on Councilman Sutton's motion and my second, was that we would continue the contract for '09 at the '08 rate and then appropriate language would be inserted into the contract to adjust that for any future increases or decreases based upon the consumer price index, is what we based it on. So we would need to – so basically, we did approve that at the last meeting, you know, the '09 contract based on '08 rates. And that we would substitute language in there that would increase it at CPI. Now I assume we could go back and revisit that and change that to – if we wanted to change that at this particular time.

Jeff Ahlers: Yeah, the County Council, you can obviously do whatever you want to do. I don't know if everybody has this, but pursuant to directions from President Abell, I sent a letter to Mr. Deisher, we had a telephone conversation after the last meeting when she asked me to relay the action of Council. I did that and then confirmed that in writing that basically says in a paragraph what you just said, that Council took action to approve retaining the services of BKD on a contractual basis in 2009, but it would be at the – the rates that were approved for 2007, and that the Council would entertain adjusting the rates on an annual basis pursuant to the CPI. So if Council wants to change its position on that, it's free to do that. Otherwise, we just need to make sure, if this Council is maintaining the same position as it did at the last meeting, then we will need to just have BKD to change the one sentence and what they've proposed in the written document to coincide with the motion passed by Council at the December meeting.

President Shetler: And what we could do is take that CPI based on the '07 numbers and bringing it up to date then for '09, so that you'd capture both years into that increase.

Councilmember Raben: The rate of the contract in '07 was the same as '08, right?

President Shetler: Correct.

Councilmember Raben: So what they're asking for is a three percent increase over that number –

Jeff Ahlers: Over '07, basically.

Councilmember Raben: So our original motion is based on the CPI, which I understand is at 5.9, so I would like to make the motion that we rescind our – is that not correct, that we rescind our prior action, our December 17<sup>th</sup> action, and then make a new motion that says we will fund the contract at the 2007 - 2008 rates plus three percent.

Tim Deisher: I never received the increase from January 1, 2008, so I'm just asking for a three percent increase and that's the document, the contract that you have before you is with the three percent and I didn't get that March 1 of '08, so I'm just

asking for a three percent increase currently.

Councilmember Kiefer: (Microphone not turned on)

Tim Deisher: Correct.

Councilmember Raben: So the motion on the floor is to rescind our prior action and I guess we can do that, correct?

Jeff Ahlers: Sure.

Councilmember Raben: Okay.

Councilmember Lloyd: Second.

President Shetler: It's been moved and seconded. Any questions? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes.

**(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)**

Councilmember Raben: Now, Mr. President, I would like to move that we approve the BKD contract to reflect the 2007 - 2008 rates plus a three percent.

Jeff Ahlers: Which, to clarify for the record, Mr. Deisher, isn't that what the document dated November 1, 2008 that everyone should have in front of them, isn't that –

Tim Deisher: Correct.

Jeff Ahlers: Those are those numbers, is that correct?

Tim Deisher: Yes. I would ask that you just approve that document.

Councilmember Kiefer: That is dated November 1<sup>st</sup>, 2008?

Jeff Ahlers: Right, if you go to page two of that document at the bottom, there is a heading, engagement fees, and that's what I was just wanting to confirm with him, I assume being an accountant, you've got the figures, right, the math done right that that's the three percent increase?

Tim Deisher: Right, I mean, it's rounded to dollars or ten dollars, maybe five dollars, but it's approximately a three percent increase.

Jeff Ahlers: What I would suggest is that you go one way or the other, either stick with your motion and then, you know, we'll make sure these numbers are correct, or pass it as written, or you can say as written with a three percent adjustment, however you want to do it.

Councilmember Raben: As written or with a three percent –

Jeff Ahlers: Well, if the numbers aren't exactly, I guess what I'm saying is, I want to make sure the record is clear what you're passing, whether we're passing the rates in the November 1, 2008 document as written and we're just going to pass that knowing that that's approximately three percent, but it's these numbers as he says that have been rounded or whether you're saying three percent and then the exact calculation will need to be made.

Councilmember Raben: Well, if these numbers reflect the three percent, Mr. President, I'll amend my motion to state approve the contract at the rates listed on page two.

Councilmember Kiefer: On the November 1, --

Councilmember Raben: Right.

Councilmember Lloyd: Second.

President Shetler: We have a motion. Any questions? Okay, roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes.

**(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)**

President Shetler: There being six ayes and no nays, the motion passes. And if everybody could just hold on for a little bit because we need to get a signature page on that for everybody to sign. Okay. Any other business?

Jeff Ahlers: (Microphone not turned on)

President Shetler: We did. That was included in part of the motion that he made on something else.

<b>BUDGET HEARING DATES (Continued from page 8)</b>
---

Jeff Ahlers: Did you do the meeting dates?

President Shetler: Meeting dates, that's right, we've got to go back to the meeting dates real quickly, and that was, there was a question that Mr. Goebel had raised about if we could do it perhaps a week earlier, James, on the budget in August?

Councilmember Raben: Yeah, I know. He and I have discussed that by phone. The only real concern I had was as to whether or not – it might cut us short that week on our budget books, because usually we get our budget books the first of August, right? So that would be my only concern is that we don't get our budget book two days before we start hearing budgets.

Bill Fluty: I think normally we give the budget book out at the Personnel & Finance, which would be the last week of July.

Councilmember Lloyd: The 29<sup>th</sup>?

Bill Fluty: You'd only have a few days. We would be giving it out the 29<sup>th</sup>.

Councilmember Raben: Let's go ahead and make that change and if we find out that it can't work or doesn't work, we'll have to go back in and reset it in at this original date.

President Shetler: Could you, Mr. Goebel, could you go ahead and spell out that –

Councilmember Goebel: Budget hearing dates, August 4 –

President Shetler: Why don't we do this: why don't we make a motion to amend?

Councilmember Goebel: Okay. I'd like to make a motion to amend the dates for budget hearings in 2009 from August 11, 12, 13 to August 4, 5, and 6.

Councilmember Lloyd: Second that.

President Shetler: Okay, we have a motion and a second and we're going –

Sandie Deig: (Microphone not turned on)

President Shetler: I don't know.

Sandie Deig: Is this date okay, the August 25<sup>th</sup>?

President Shetler: August 25<sup>th</sup>, is that okay? It's the 4, 5, and 6<sup>th</sup> in lieu of the 11, 12, and 13<sup>th</sup>. Everything else stays the same. Do we need to check availability of the room at this time or –

Councilmember Goebel: Mr. President, I think we can maybe make the change now. Last year we changed it later, I know that, because this was the corresponding dates we had originally set and then we went back a week. If we have to do that, we could do it again.

Sandie Deig: We can just send a letter to the Building Authority requesting those dates be set aside.

President Shetler: Alright, so any other questions? Then we'll leave as amended for the 4<sup>th</sup>, the 5<sup>th</sup>, and the 6<sup>th</sup> in lieu of the 11<sup>th</sup>, 12<sup>th</sup>, and 13<sup>th</sup>, so it's an amendment to the meeting dates, and we –

Jeff Ahlers: In all other respects as listed.

President Shetler: And everything else stays the same as listed. Yes. We'll probably have the Council meeting and then do that immediately after or something. We can adjust the times, okay.

Councilmember Goebel: I'm sorry to interrupt again, but I think the August 25<sup>th</sup> budget hearing date, this past year we moved it to the 20<sup>th</sup> to correspond with our Personnel & Finance, as well, which is scheduled for the 26<sup>th</sup>. If we could maybe cover both of those on the same day as we did in the past year?

Sandie Deig: The reason they did that is because on the 26<sup>th</sup>, you were going to do all the other budgets, and that's why.

President Shetler: It was done to accommodate the increase of all the other budgets that we have to do. We were doing those on the 26<sup>th</sup>, and that's why the 25<sup>th</sup> was established, but we could do that all at one time, at the Council's pleasure. And again, it's something we can change later as the time gets nearer.

Councilmember Goebel: I think that's probably better we find out – we set a calendar for the other budgets due to us, as well.

President Shetler: Alright. Okay. Any other questions, points? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?



Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes.

**(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)**

President Shetler: There being six ayes and no nays, the motion carries. Any other business? Okay, motion for adjournment would be in order.

Councilmember Lloyd: Motion to adjourn.

Councilmember Kiefer: Second.

President Shetler: We are adjourned and if everybody could please hold on for a minute, we need to bring up a signature page real quick.

**(There being no further business to come before the Council, the meeting was adjourned at 2:29 p.m.)**

VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL

\_\_\_\_\_  
President Tom Shetler, Jr.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Vice President Joe Kiefer

\_\_\_\_\_  
Councilmember Jim Raben

\_\_\_\_\_  
Councilmember Mike Goebel

\_\_\_\_\_  
Councilmember Russell Lloyd, Jr.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Councilmember Ed Bassemier

\_\_\_\_\_  
Councilmember Royce Sutton

Recorded and transcribed by Teri Lukeman.

**VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL  
MINUTES  
FEBRUARY 4, 2009**

The Vanderburgh County Council met in session this 4th day of February, 2009 in room 301 of the Civic Center Complex. The meeting was called to order at 8:33 a.m. by County Council President Tom Shetler, Jr.

President Shetler: Good morning and welcome to the Vanderburgh County Council meeting. Today is February the 4<sup>th</sup>, it's a little past 8:30 and the first thing I'd like to do is have the attendance roll call please.

COUNCILMEMBER	PRESENT	ABSENT
Councilmember Sutton	X	
Councilmember Bassemier	X	
Councilmember Lloyd	X	
Councilmember Goebel	X	
Councilmember Raben	X	
Councilmember Kiefer	X	
President Shetler	X	

President Shetler: If Councilman Sutton could lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance, please.

(Pledge of Allegiance was given)

<b>APPROVAL OF MINUTES</b>
----------------------------

President Shetler: Next I need a motion for approval of the minutes of January 2<sup>nd</sup>.

Councilmember Lloyd: So moved.

Councilmember Kiefer: Second.

President Shetler: It's been moved and seconded. Do I have any questions? Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being seven ayes and no nays, motion for approval of the minutes passes.

**(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)**

<b>APPROPRIATION ORDINANCE</b>
--------------------------------

President Shetler: Next then is the appropriation ordinance and at this time I'll pass it to Councilman Raben.

**JAIL**

Councilmember Raben: Okay, good morning. Thank you. First on the agenda is 1051-1301 Civilian Overtime for the Jail in the amount of \$10,000, I'll move approval.

Councilman Sutton: Second.

President Shetler: Its been moved and seconded. Do I have any questions with regard to the appropriation? If not, roll call please.

Councilmember Lloyd: I had a question. In this line item, we've used up almost a whole year's worth of overtime in one month. I'd like, I guess, someone to address that. Oh, there he is.

Eric Williams: Good morning, Sheriff Eric Williams. That budget is also accounting for our new additions to the union overtime with the additional medical people, the other thing is the way that budget is set in. We can never predict what they're going to choose at the beginning of the year. The union agreement allows them to choose comp time or overtime, and this year we've had again, a shift of people choosing overtime as opposed to comp time. That budget will replenish multiple times throughout the year. The amount set in at the beginning of the year is not an annual budget for that one, it's just what was set in.

Councilmember Lloyd: Is that something that typically happens every year?

Eric Williams: From my experience it is.

Bill Fluty: I think last year, \$8,000 was spent for the full year. Is that correct?

Eric Williams: I don't have the numbers with me, but probably. But again, with the union agreement, they're allowed to choose between overtime and comp time, and

that line item now has some other people in it because of the change in the union agreement, so there's more people in it now than there used to be.

Councilmember Lloyd: Which group of employees is this?

Eric Williams: It would be my civilian union. It's all the Teamsters that are civilians, which now includes my medical office because they were added to the union.

Bill Fluty: It's nurses, EMT...there's two others, I've forgotten those.

Eric Williams: Clerks, Typists, Receptionists.

Councilmember Kiefer: Mr. President? Sheriff, on the \$10,000, will that then cover you for the rest of 2009 or is that just to get to –

Eric Williams: I doubt that will make it through the year.

Councilmember Kiefer: Have you got any estimates on what it might cost?

Eric Williams: Offhand, no, but I can get those for you.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay, thank you.

Eric Williams: I came without my files this morning.

President Shetler: Other questions? We have a motion on the floor, roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: I'm going to vote yes, but I'm a little concerned that it seems like it's an open-ended commitment here and just be interested to see what figures you can bring to us.

Eric Williams: Absolutely.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: I'll vote yes as well, and I would appreciate seeing an

estimate for the remainder of the year. Thank you.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. I think that’s six and a half ayes and no nays. Seven ayes and no nays, the motion passes.

JAIL		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1051-1301	Civilian Overtime	10,000.00	10,000.00
Total		10,000.00	10,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

PROSECUTOR IV-D

Councilmember Raben: Okay, 1081-1190-1081 Enforcement Agent in the amount of \$4,748, I’ll move approval.

Councilman Sutton: Second.

President Shetler: It’s been seconded. Do I have any questions? Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being seven ayes and no nays, the motion passes.

PROSECUTOR IV-D		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1081-1190-1081	Enforcement Agent	4,748.00	4,748.00
Total		4,748.00	4,748.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

ASSESSOR

Councilmember Raben: Okay, County Assessor, 1090-1971 Accrued Payments in the amount of \$240, I'll move approval.

Councilmember Goebel: Second.

President Shetler: We have a motion and a second. Do I have any questions on the request?

Councilmember Lloyd: It looks like this was an error in last year's salary ordinance. Is that correct?

Councilmember Raben: It's paying an employee for a step increase.

Councilmember Lloyd: Okay, thank you.

President Shetler: Any other questions? Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being seven ayes and no nays, the motion passes.

ASSESSOR		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1090-1971	Accrued Payments	240.00	240.00
Total		240.00	240.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

## COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE

President Shetler: Next is Cooperative Extension.

Councilmember Raben: Okay first, Mr. President, is FICA in the amount of \$462, then we have Extra Help in the amount of \$6,038, and Contractual Services in the amount of \$361. I'll move that we approve the \$462 and the \$6,038, zero out of the \$361. I make that in the form of a motion.

President Shetler: It's been moved. Do I have a second?

Councilmember Lloyd: Second.

President Shetler: Okay, we have a motion and a second. Probably ought to give an explanation on that.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, on the reason to zero out the Contractual Services, back, in fact, there was some discussion on this at budgets back in August and this basically would reinstate an extra half of a percent. Purdue, which funds a large portion of these salaries, Purdue granted a three percent increase; the county, we approved and budgeted a two and a half percent. So this is just keeping this line consistent with the rest of the county employees at a two and a half percent.

President Shetler: Yes, Councilman Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: So, I guess, Cooperative Extension, they wanted to give a raise of three percent, when all other county employees had two and a half percent? Okay, and that was because Purdue gave three percent?

Councilmember Raben: Correct.

Councilmember Lloyd: Okay, I agree with what you're doing.

Susan Plassmeier: Susan Plassmeier from the Cooperative Extension Service. That three percent was what Purdue did statewide, and they pay 70% of our salaries. The county picks up about 30%. It's 69/31%. So it doesn't necessarily just, it's not just salary increases, but benefits is kind of also bundled into that. There's some other things: our computer line, so it's not just all 100% toward salary. And I have to find that money somewhere. If I have to pay it out of my pocket, Purdue is not just going to say you can't pay \$361, and it's okay. So that's just the way they operate.

Councilmember Raben: Well, you could file an appropriation for an upcoming meeting for whatever that difference is for the computer and the FICA. You said, you're talking about this \$361.

Susan Plassmeier: I'm saying it's just bundled all together. It's not just our salary. It takes into, Purdue pays all the Extension Educator benefits and in that figure that they give us, it also encompasses our computer system, our T-1 line. We are not through the county computer system, Purdue maintains that, so that it's statewide, so every county is operating the same. So it's not, I guess what I'm saying, it's not just toward our salaries, that three percent that was charged. It was for the total package.



Councilmember Raben: Okay, so they increased your total package by three percent?

Susan Plassmeier: Yes.

Councilmember Raben: And your data lines increased by three percent?

Susan Plassmeier: No, not the computers. We have a separate computer line item that pays for our lease for our computers. But what I'm saying is, that that encompasses not necessarily that computer line item, but like the T-1 service that they provide for us. They provide our technical assistance when we have problems. You know, the county doesn't come out, it's Purdue that could come down or they get in our computer system and you see the little arrows moving around where they're up on campus fixing something within our system. And also it goes toward some training money also. Have I totally confused you?

Councilmember Raben: Somewhat, but is there a figure that gets us closer? I mean, I don't think we want to approve the \$361 because part of that \$361 in some form or fashion will be that –

Susan Plassmeier: Purdue University pays the balance of the educator's salaries, benefits, staff development training expenses. Their contribution is approximately 69% of the salary and benefit package and the county contributes 31%. In addition, Purdue is paying approximately \$1,000 this year per educator for staff development. We also have two part-time staff that are totally funded by Purdue for the family nutrition program. They pay their staff and pick up their benefits, training and teaching materials, and then this value of the high speed internet connection, they value at \$8,000 per year on the T-1 line. So it's all that lumped together.

Councilmember Raben: But you can't tell me how much of this 361, how much of that represents the half of a percent increase?

Susan Plassmeier: No.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, there's funds in place to fund you for the next month or two, correct? I mean, this \$361 does not have to be approved today.

Susan Plassmeier: Well, I've got to let them know. So, yeah, we send up like half a year at a time or so, of the money up to Purdue.

Councilmember Raben: Why don't we do this: let's leave the motion as is. You come back to us next month with a request for an appropriation for the items you've stated less the half of a percent increase on salary.

Susan Plassmeier: Okay.

Councilmember Raben: Is that fair?

Councilman Sutton: I guess I did have a question not on the Contractual side, but on that Extra Help side. The length of time for this grant that you've received, is it just the current academic year?

Susan Plassmeier: It goes through summer also.

Councilman Sutton: Goes through summer. And is the program already in place or is this something that's going to pick up in the summer?

Susan Plassmeier: No, it's already in place. This is the second year for that grant, so it's a continuation of the program. And it's an in and out thing. I mean, the county gets reimbursed by the school corporation for that money, for the salaries.

Councilman Sutton: The cycle for this grant, are you intending to reapply for the next academic year, I guess, that will start in September?

Susan Plassmeier: In the fall, yes, we would like to. I mean, yes.

Councilman Sutton: So the monies that you are requesting here won't carry over into the next grant cycle? It's just this one only.

Susan Plassmeier: Correct.

Councilman Sutton: I guess what do you do in the interim? I guess our calendar year is different from the academic year, how do you make up for that period where the funds are exhausted?

Susan Plassmeier: This is my office manager.

Susan English: Susan English, office manager. Its not really happened because, yeah, it's just that our cycles are off. So we'll be back in the fall if, for sure, the grant happens again for the 2009 - 2010 year, and then we'll have to come back again. We do have some money in our part-time help line item anyway, so that's what gets us through, I guess, is what you're asking.

Councilman Sutton: Yeah, just wondering if you guys are going to come back in the fall asking for –

Susan English: Yeah. We've done this. This is the second year for the grants that we've done. Yeah, because they won't get us the money up front, we have to – after they've worked, then we have to request that from the school corp.

Councilman Sutton: So the total cost actually is just a shade over 12,000, I guess?

Susan English: \$1,300 is what they've set aside for salaries – \$13,000.

President Shetler: Okay, any further questions?

Bill Fluty: I just have a clarification. You signed a contract with the Commissioners for \$72,934 for Contractual Services. Would this 361, is it an increase to this amount?

Susan Plassmeier: Yes.

Bill Fluty: Okay, so the contract would –

Susan Plassmeier: The one that was signed is correct.

Bill Fluty: This is correct, the 361 is within that?

Susan Plassmeier: That would be on top of that. It would be an additional one, so if they–

Bill Fluty: You’d have to come back and correct it? That’s what I wanted to ask.

Susan Plassmeier: Yes.

Bill Fluty: But we do have this signed, this is the correct amount right now?

Susan Plassmeier: Yes. The amount that I was asking was \$73,295. And that was what, 72-something, you said?

Bill Fluty: 72,934.

Susan Plassmeier: 361 short.

President Shetler: Okay, any other questions? Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: We are deleting the 361 today? Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being seven ayes and no nays, the motion passes.

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1230-1900	FICA	462.00	462.00
1230-1990	Extra Help	6,038.00	6,038.00
1230-3530	Contractual Services	361.00	0.00
Total		6,861.00	6,500.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

**LEGAL AID**

Councilmember Raben: Okay, next Legal Aid, 1460-3600 Rent in the amount of \$1,362, I'll move approval.

Councilmember Lloyd: Second.

President Shetler: It's been moved and seconded? Questions? No questions, call for the roll.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being seven ayes and no nays, the motion passes.

<b>LEGAL AID</b>		<b>REQUESTED</b>	<b>APPROVED</b>
1460-3600	Rent	1,362.00	1,362.00
Total		1,362.00	1,362.00

**(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)**

**HIGHWAY**

Councilmember Raben: Okay, next under County Highway, 2010-1530 Shift Differential in the amount of \$335, I'll move approval.

Councilmember Bassemier: Second.

President Shetler: Motion and a second. Any questions? Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. Again, there being seven ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

HIGHWAY		REQUESTED	APPROVED
2010-1530	Shift Differential	335.00	335.00
Total		335.00	335.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

**SUPERIOR COURT SUPPLEMENTAL ADULT PROBATION**

President Shetler: Next is Superior Court.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, next under Superior Court. We have several items for a total of \$9,249, I'll move approval.

Councilmember Bassemier: Second.

President Shetler: We've got a motion and a second. Any questions?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yeah, Mr. President, the Probation Officers, what is this money for on the Probation Officers?

Councilmember Raben: I can answer that. Or, that's fine, go ahead.

President Shetler: Judge?

Terry Dietsch: Terry Dietsch, Senior Judge Superior Court. Mr. Kiefer, the state has a minimum salary schedule for Probation Officers. We use our probation user fees to supplement those salaries to bring them up to the state level. We do this and

we've done this for years so that we don't ask you to appropriate money from the county general fund and use the probation user fees to augment those salaries. This changes very little year to year. The only reason we're here today is because some clerical error was made by someone between the time we submitted this supplemental budget and it was actually approved.

Councilmember Kiefer: Thank you, Judge.

President Shetler: Any other questions? We have a motion on the floor then. Roll call please. Thank you, Judge.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being seven ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

SUPERIOR COURT SUPPLEMENTAL		REQUESTED	APPROVED
2620-1100-2620	Chief Probation Ofcr.	152.00	152.00
2620-1110-2620	Probation Officer	5,477.00	5,477.00
2620-1220-2620	Probation Officer	374.00	374.00
2620-1230-2620	Probation Officer	374.00	374.00
2620-1240-2620	Probation Officer	576.00	576.00
2620-1270-2620	Probation Officer	576.00	576.00
2620-1900	FICA	576.00	576.00
2620-1910	PERF	1,144.00	1,144.00
Total		9,249.00	9,249.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

<b>GENERAL FUND REPEAL REQUESTS</b>
-------------------------------------

President Shetler: Next the Transfers?

**PROSECUTOR  
ASSESSOR**

Councilmember Raben: Mr. President? Well, we have repeals. I move that we accept the repeals as listed.

Councilman Sutton: Second.

Councilmember Lloyd: Do we want to accept the repeal for Knight Township? Is that correct?

Councilmember Kiefer: I have a question about that.

President Shetler: Yes, Mr. Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Jeff Ahlers? Are we legally allowed to repeal something that's been – elected official's salary?

Jeff Ahlers: Well, this presents an interesting, I suppose, scenario. I mean, clearly, the law says you can't change the salary of an elected official for the year in which it's fixed. The Knight Township official has sent correspondence stating that he does not want to accept those funds. So that creates a little different scenario than normal, so, you know, I mean, I guess, technically, he's still an officeholder and didn't resign the office. So –

Councilmember Kiefer: – so if we change the salary, we're taking the money back.

Jeff Ahlers: Yeah. I mean, that's essentially what's occurring, so, I mean, I guess it can be put back on a line item if something would change there. But it's a little different scenario there.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay.

Jeff Ahlers: But, I mean, technically, the salary can't be changed, so it's a matter of whether you're moving the money out, but you're keeping that salary line item the same. I suppose what occurs is, is whether or not he needs to – well, I guess he's just not going to accept the money. And the question becomes whether or not it's better at the end of the year that it just becomes leftover money in the line item that gets put into the general fund versus changing it now. So I guess if there's not necessarily a need to do it now, you can leave it in that line item and then bring it back into the general fund at the end of the year. I mean, it's –

Councilmember Raben: Is that how you would be more comfortable?

Jeff Ahlers: I would say for now, that's probably what we ought to do. I mean, this is an unusual scenario that we're faced with.

Councilmember Raben: Mr. President, I will amend my motion for County

Prosecutor, 1080-1450-1080 to accept the repeal in the amount of \$4,547 and under 1090-1590-1090 set that repeal in at zero.

President Shetler: Okay, Royce, I think you seconded the motion originally?

Councilman Sutton: Right, right, and I'll accept the amendment to the motion.

President Shetler: Okay, discussion? Councilman Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: I would think with the quagmire that we were placed into, that we should just accept as is and be done with it.

President Shetler: Any other questions or comments? Yes, Councilman Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Jeff, did we get a letter stating that he would not accept this salary? Do we have that in writing?

Jeff Ahlers: That is my understanding that we do have that. Now, the only reason that causes me pause is that I suppose, technically, what you're really talking about here is an office, not a person. The person in that office has sent a letter saying that he does not want to accept that salary. But I suppose if that office became vacant, and that it were refilled with someone else, I suppose they could feel differently. So understand that it is that office that you're talking about the salary and not really the person, potentially. I mean, again, this is a case of first impressions, so in terms of how you deal with it, I'm just saying the safest way would just be to leave it. Now if the county is \$25,000 short of making ends meet, maybe we look at this a little differently or whatever. But I'm just saying at this point, I, you know, that might be the safest way.

Councilmember Goebel: Mr. Ahlers, does that office still exist?

Jeff Ahlers: Yes. It exists until the term expires, by law. I mean, what essentially happened, and we discussed this, I think, in the November and December meetings is, what that legislation did was it left those offices in place – it just left to the discretion of the County Council as to what they get paid when, even though many of their duties have been transferred to the County Assessor. But, I mean, the office still exists.

Councilmember Goebel: I understand that, but I would think this would be a good time just to be done with it, not to revisit it. If it's a technicality, who is going to check that?

Jeff Ahlers: Well, that would be for the state budgeting department of finance and board of accounts would be the ones that would check that.

Councilmember Goebel: There might be some technicalities they passed our way that they probably should check first with the changes that they put upon us and left it up to our discretion and every other county's discretion. So I think we should accept the repeal.

Councilman Sutton: Is he still considered the officeholder?

Jeff Ahlers: Yes, he is. I mean, as far as I know, I've not seen any correspondence



where he has resigned the office. He has just, as I understand it, stated that he will not accept the salary. The office itself, the legislature did not abolish. So, technically, I suppose if there were a different officeholder this year, I suppose they could view it differently than he does. He personally has said that he will not accept it, but that office still exists for what, two more years. Now, next year, obviously, you know, you can zero that out. The problem is, as we talked about in November and December, is that the law puts you in this conundrum of saying you can't change the salary of an elected officeholder in that year, and that's why all that had to be done by December 31. But because of the transition going on, the legislation, I mean, all this stuff obviously created a perfect storm in terms of, unfortunately, how Council had to deal with this.

Councilmember Kiefer: Jeff, but the money, at the end of the year, if it's left here and at the end of the year it's not used, then it goes back to the general fund, correct?

Jeff Ahlers: Yes, you can sweep that back into the general fund. Is that correct, Mr. Fluty?

Bill Fluty: Correct.

Councilmember Kiefer: So I think we should be okay just to leave that where it is unless the general fund, you know, like you said earlier, you know, unless we're in a tight spot and you actually have to – you know, that's a situation to deal with at that time, but I think the correct way to do it would be to leave it in place until – that way, you're not violating any kind of situation, law or anything else.

President Shetler: I might add that all of those positions, I believe, by law all of the township assessors are also, if they're Level II, still are going to be paid \$1,000 per year and that was by statute across the state of Indiana. So it is a bonafide office that is being paid at least a minimal amount of money. The rest of it was up to the discretion of County Council to go beyond that \$1,000. I see no reason why we would rush into, nobody is going to spend that money no matter where it's placed and I see no reason to rush into transferring it immediately out of that and put into the general fund or to repeal at this moment. I don't know what advantage we're gaining from it.

Councilman Sutton: I guess I asked my question earlier as I did because for some unforeseen circumstance, and say he was no longer in that office, does that office have to be filled by someone? I would assume that it would be, yes, and that person may have a different change of thought than Mr. Folz has about the compensation on that and may decide that they feel like they ought to be entitled to whatever has been appropriated here. That's why I seem to believe that by repealing the money, I think we were probably on the right course there because one person has decided that they won't take it doesn't necessarily mean that someone else may not see it another way.

President Shetler: I think the way that I read the Attorney General's opinion of it was, that whatever was appropriated January 1 was what was going to be set for the entire year. So I don't think any action we take now will actually take that money away. It just means that we wouldn't have that money sitting there in reserve if, in fact, we would need it for some reason. Then we would have to come back and reappropriate the money back into that line if the scenario that you're outlining would come to fruition. So we could be backdooring this thing going

around in circles here. I'm not so sure that there is any reason to rush into something and have to redo it and come back to it at a different point in time. I think that we can let it sit and let the taxpayers enjoy a benefit of \$25,000 thanks to Mr. Folz's generosity of handing it back. So I don't see any reason why we should put that into any other fund right now to take a chance on spending it. Yes?

Councilmember Bassemier: Mr. President? Jeff, what was your recommendation again?

Jeff Ahlers: Well, like I said, unless you have a great need for it right now, obviously, the safest thing to do would be to leave the money in place. If, in the meantime, if you think you want this dealt with rather than waiting until the end of the year, I can certainly consult with the State Board of Accounts or the Department of Local Government Finance and see what their opinion is on this, whether we can remove the funding from that line item even though, I guess in the salary ordinance, we would leave that salary in place. I mean, that becomes the real question is whether you can remove the funding from a salary line item while that's still there because – so that would be the safest way to handle this.

Councilmember Lloyd: I agree with Councilman Goebel, but it seems like we probably need to spend a little bit of time researching this. I mean, we could bring this back up next month.

Councilmember Goebel: Mr. President, I still feel strongly, Mr. Folz has done the right thing, put the money back in. I think we ought to put closure to it today. Accept the money back and be done with it.

Councilmember Kiefer: I call for the vote for the motion that was made.

President Shetler: Any other questions, anything else?

Councilmember Raben: Just a brief comment. Either way, I think we probably need to get a new clarification from the DLGF because we're talking about two other officeholders, too. There is a risk that one can resign and somebody would be entitled to a salary, and you've got two others. And I'm fine repealing the amount today. If we've got to come back in at another date and appropriate the fund back in. I mean, it would be nice to bring closure to it today if we can. But by the same token, we might need further clarification as to if it's even possible for somebody else. Because again, we're talking about three offices, not one.

Councilmember Goebel: This is uncharted territory. I mean, it was placed upon us. I think we take our chances, which would be about 100% that nothing else is going to develop after today if we accept the repeal.

President Shetler: Okay, any other questions? Points?

Councilman Sutton: Restate that motion.

President Shetler: Where we are today, the motion on the table is to repeal only the Prosecutor's office at this point in time.

Councilmember Raben: Again, I would like to –

President Shetler: And then we could revisit the Knight Township after we get some

more information from the State and get clarification on that, we can revisit that next  
—

Councilmember Raben: I'm fine with that.

Councilmember Bassemier: Can we take it separately?

Councilmember Raben: Okay.

Jeff Ahlers: What you might want to do is just, given all the discussion, I don't know if you just want to pull the existing motion and amendments off and then remake the motion for the Prosecutor, and then it's just so that we have a clear record, perhaps.

Councilmember Raben: Alright, Mr. President, I'm going to pull my original motion. My new motion is 1080-1450-1080 under Prosecutor in the amount of \$4,547. I'll move approval.

Councilmember Kiefer: Second.

Councilman Sutton: And I'll pull my second.

President Shetler: You're going to pull your second. Okay, then we have a new second. Okay, any questions about that motion? Okay, roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being seven ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

PROSECUTOR		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1080-1450-1080	Investigator	4,547.00	4,547.00
Total		4,547.00	4,547.00

**(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)**

President Shetler: And then Assessor, do we have a motion on anything on that?

Councilmember Raben: Okay, 1090-1590-1090 in the amount of zero. That's what you're asking for, correct?

Councilmember Kiefer: Do we even do a motion or –

President Shetler: I mean, I wouldn't think we'd need a motion.

Councilmember Kiefer: Then we wouldn't do anything.

President Shetler: Right.

Councilmember Raben: Well, for the record we have to vote on it.

President Shetler: Okay, we can put that in there at zero then. I assume that will work?

Jeff Ahlers: Yes, you can do it either way. Yeah, that's fine.

Councilmember Bassemier: Jim, can you do it the other way? Put it in and – I got a reason for that.

Councilmember Raben: Here's my motion, 1090-1590-1090 Knight Assessor in the amount of \$25,560.

Jeff Ahlers: To repeal.

Councilmember Raben: To repeal.

President Shetler: We have a motion, and need a second.

Councilmember Goebel: Second.

President Shetler: If you want to repeal, you vote in the affirmative, yes. If you don't want to repeal it, then you'll be voting no. Questions? Questions about the motion or how it's stated? Alright, roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: I'd like to research it more, so I'm going to vote no.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: I'm going to vote no today but I would like to bring this to closure immediately, as soon as possible.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: No, because I'd like to get a little bit more research on this. Thank you.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: No. There being three ayes and four nays, the motion fails.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, now Mr. President, will you get some clarification from the DLGF on this?

President Shetler: Yes, we will.

Councilmember Raben: And not just as to this office, but the other two?

President Shetler: Yes.

Councilmember Raben: Okay.

ASSESSOR		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1090-1590-1090	Knight Assessor	25,560.00	0.00
Total		25,560.00	0.00

(Motion fails 3-4/Councilmembers Lloyd, Raben, Kiefer and Shetler opposed)

<b>TRANSFER REQUESTS</b>
--------------------------

President Shetler: Next, the transfer requests.

**CLERK**

Councilmember Raben: Okay, we have County Clerk in the amount of \$2,476, I'll move approval.

Councilmember Lloyd: Second.

President Shetler: We've got a motion and a second. Any questions? Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being seven ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

CLERK		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1010-1470-1010	Assistant Supervisor/ Bookkeeper	2,476.00	2,476.00
To: 1010-1330-1010	Bookkeeping Clerk	2,476.00	2,476.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

CUMULATIVE BRIDGE

Councilmember Raben: Cum Bridge in the amount of \$17,881, I'll move approval.

Councilmember Lloyd: Second.

President Shetler: It's been moved and seconded. Any questions? Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: We're in the middle of a vote. I was wondering for how long

is the replacement? Is this a set time or...this is probably the wrong time to ask since we've started the roll call.

Councilmember Raben: This person is on a leave of absence, but I don't –

President Shetler: Mr. Duckworth is here.

Councilmember Raben: Oh, I'm sorry.

Mike Duckworth: Mike Duckworth, Superintendent of County Highway. This is a situation where we have a union member that is on an extended leave of absence. According to the contractual agreements, they're allowed up to a year for extended leave. This transfer would take the temporary person through July 31<sup>st</sup> of '09, which is at the end of the leave time period and so they would either come back to work at that time or we would proceed with hiring a different person.

Councilmember Goebel: Mike, is this paid leave?

Mike Duckworth: The only pay involved according to the contract is for health insurance benefits so there is no actual pay, so it's just moving money from a salary account to a temporary account because the employee that is replacing her is a temporary employee.

Councilmember Goebel: Thank you.

President Shetler: Okay, any other questions?

Teri Lukeman: We were in the middle of the vote.

President Shetler: Yeah, we were in the middle of the vote. Okay, Mike, I don't think you –

Councilmember Goebel: I'm sorry, yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being seven ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

CUMULATIVE BRIDGE		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 2030-1150-2030	Laborer	17,881.00	17,881.00
To: 2030-1970	Temporary Replacement	17,881.00	17,881.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

## REASSESSMENT/PTABOA

Councilmember Raben: Okay, next under Reassessment/PTABOA in the amount of \$10,000. I'll move approval.

President Shetler: We have a motion, do we have a second?

Councilmember Bassemier: Second.

President Shetler: Moved and seconded. Any questions?

Councilmember Lloyd: So are you requesting approval for \$10,000?

Councilmember Raben: Yes, with questions. I think the President had a question.

President Shetler: Yeah, several times the County Assessor has been here and maybe, Jonathan, you can come up front and explain a few things to us, but I have yet to see a written plan and, personally, before I could vote in favor of bringing any more people on board, I'd really like to have a written plan of exactly how we're going to consolidate this office. So, if I recall back in December of last year, you had indicated that if these were all consolidated into one office, that there would be a great savings due to the county and every month, I keep seeing your face back here requesting more and more. I hear rumors in the halls about software packages being needed to increase the load and stuff. I hear things about maybe a quarter million dollars or so to revamp the offices and I'm starting to wonder where the savings is going to be had. So I'd really like to see a written plan.

Jonathan Weaver: So where do you want to start? Jonathan Weaver, Vanderburgh County Assessor. What's your first question?

President Shetler: My first question is, are you able to get a written plan to us so that we can look at the office, see how you're laying out full-time employees, where you need the part-time employees, and what kind of work load you're expecting during the coming year?

Jonathan Weaver: You've all been invited down to check things out. You know, we segmented it into departments: we have a real estate department, we have a personal property department, we have an appeals department, inheritance, deeds, transfers, sales disclosures. And everything is running smoothly. You know, we want to open up the office so we can be like the Auditor's office, the Treasurer's office, the Recorder's office. You know, we feel claustrophobic, we need the space. We crammed 45 people down there.

President Shetler: Okay, is it possible to put together a written plan so we know really what your total expenditures are going to be during this next calendar year?

Jonathan Weaver: Well, you know, I had all intentions of going back to your other comment about saving money. The opportunity was there to save over \$100,000 in salaries. I gave you back a position from Center Township that paid anywhere from 25 - \$30,000, so I'm doing my part in saving the county money. We moved everybody in-house from the out township offices, where we're saving \$3,500 a month in rent, utilities and phone bills. So my part, I feel like, we've been doing that. You know, the law says I inherit the budget of the township assessors. As far as I know, I've been cut \$75,000 in part-time money. So that's one law that's broken. You know, we need Level II pay. And as far as I know, we're not getting the Level



Il pay. You know, we're the most specialized office on the second floor of the Civic Center. You know, my staff deserves the pay. We deserve to be paid higher than everybody else and, you know, we have 27 Level II's in the office and they're entitled to their bonus.

President Shetler: Okay, so back to the question, is it possible for you to present to the Council a written plan of what your expenditures will be during the next eight to twelve months and that way we could start planning and what we know are the cost requirements of this office of consolidating the township offices and –

Jonathan Weaver: The plan is there. That's what the budget is that we formulate every August. I mean, there's my budgetary plan on what I need. And yes, we need to –

President Shetler: So you're not intending to come back to this Council to ask for any additional software, you're not planning on coming back to this Council to ask for any additional capital expenditures for remodeling the offices and revamping?

Jonathan Weaver: Well, I mean, the remodeling needs to be done. I don't know where that –

President Shetler: Okay, well, that's not in the budget and those are the kind of things I'm asking for as well as employees both part-time and full-time.

Jonathan Weaver: The money should be there for the remodel project from my understanding from Mr. Rector and the Commissioners.

President Shetler: What we need is a plan so that we understand exactly what you're going to need for the next several months, and are you going to be able to comply with that?

Jonathan Weaver: I could write a written plan, but you're adding more work for me to do. You know, we have enough things to do. The budget is there, you know what I need the money for, the salaries and other line items that are in the budget.

President Shetler: Questions? Yes, Mr. Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: John, we're here to try to help you, so we're trying to get a handle on all this, so we're not trying to put you on the spot or anything, we're just trying to help you because there's – not saying your people don't deserve extra pay or deserve more pay, but so does everybody else.

Jonathan Weaver: And, you know, prior to the first transition, this was very smooth and I don't know what happened in the month of December that's caused an uproar with what's going on. I wasn't here for the December meeting, but three of my full-time people were cut. Where in a public forum was that mentioned? I stood before you on January 2<sup>nd</sup> for 20 minutes or so getting grilled with questions and not one time did it come up that you were cutting my entire part-time staff or reducing the pay of four people in my office.

President Shetler: I think you had 20 full-time employees prior to what, in July, and you have 42 now? I don't see where you –

Councilmember Lloyd: He had 18 in July and now he has 42.

President Shetler: I'm not sure where the cut comes in to play.

Jonathan Weaver: Three full-time people were cut in December's meeting.

President Shetler: When you go from 18 to 42?

Jonathan Weaver: The law says I inherit the line item budgets, so we had 18 originally. With the referendum, I inherited 23 more plus Ms. Stucki and, you know, it was a misunderstanding. I forgave you for that misunderstanding, but then when I came back in January and you cut my seven part-time people and reduced the salary without Job Study for my four other people in my office, I mean, there's a problem there. I mean, I need to know what's going on.

President Shetler: I think I was going at your word that you were able to make some efficiencies out of the consolidation of the townships and that you weren't expecting 100% of everything that was in the line items of all the townships before to be, automatically assume that you'd be having some kind of kingdom there of 48 - 49 people, that you would be able to realize some efficiency. That's why we need a written plan from you so that we understand exactly what the workload is, what the responsibilities are of the various different people in those line items, so that we'll be able to determine what you, in fact, need, 42 - 46 full-time employees, and whether or not you need any, and if so, how many part-time employees.

Jonathan Weaver: Well, right now, you know, I have a reassessment coming up starting July 1 and, you know, my part-time budget of \$75,000 was cut. You cut \$70,000 out of my reassessment budget before this year even began. And then you're cutting \$57,700 for line items that the law says I need to have and, you know, especially need that Level II pay. So I have been open, I've been honest on what's going on since all of this started last year. And, like I said, the last two months, something, you know, it's not being mentioned in the public forum, especially last month when I was standing up here before you.

Councilmember Raben: Jonathan, you brought up the Level II a few times. I mean, I think everyone here's intent, certainly mine, that everybody that obtained their Level II will be compensated for their Level II, but I don't know where that's been cut.

Jonathan Weaver: I have notes here saying that it's part of \$57,000 that you're not allowing me to keep.

President Shetler: I think that's by statute that we have to pay an extra thousand dollars for Level II.

Jonathan Weaver: I want to make sure you guys realize that.

Councilman Sutton: There wasn't any action taken by this Council to change that compensation for someone who has their certification. We've always compensated for that and, you know, we had discussions over the last couple of months where we talked about the number of people in your office, you shared how many you were bringing on, how many you weren't going to retain, and we worked from those numbers. This is the first year that we've had all the assessing duties housed within one office. Here we are the first week in February, I would assume that we would have had some things that maybe were unanticipated, but as far as intentional actions on this Council to take away from or hurt the Assessor's office, I'm unaware of any actions that's been taken by this Council unless there is something that I'm missing or someone else is missing. Now if we are asking for some clarification on

some things, if we're asking for a plan on how to move forward, I think it's in the mutual benefit of both of us, the Council and the Assessor, for us to see what the picture will look like, will only help to improve where we're going forward. If those things can't be put together, whether it's mutually put together or whether you're putting it together and presenting it to us for us to review, I can't see where there's any harm in doing that.

President Shetler: Well said. Yes, Mr. Lloyd.

Councilmember Lloyd: This request, we're looking at the Property Tax Board of Appeals, 10,000 to go to Extra Help, I guess one of the things that the Council had questioned, you know, when your office goes from 18 full-time to 42 employees and I know the salary was roughly 670,000 for that office last year, to this year, 1.7 million approximately, we were just wondering why at the very beginning of the year, that you would need extra help, part-time people doing this type of work when the reassessment won't start until July. I mean, will you need Extra Help money in July, as well?

Jonathan Weaver: Well, you know, we have to start putting a plan together. I need to know what's available and those part-time people were paired up with a full-time person to go out in the field, measure, check on properties and do that sort of thing. And now it's taking away from the data inputters, now they have to go out in the field, I have to go out in the field, so it creates a little headache there.

Councilmember Raben: Do we actually have people out in the field measuring right now as part of the reassessment?

Jonathan Weaver: Yes. Not at this second, but not last week, but we were doing it the first couple weeks of this year, yeah. I was out there with one of them.

Councilmember Raben: So how many of the 42 were out measuring two weeks ago?

Jonathan Weaver: Uh, probably at least five or six of us.

Councilmember Lloyd: So the Property Tax Board of Appeal, you were requesting this transfer to take that budget from \$15,000 to \$5,000, you won't have that many meetings where you'll only need \$5,000 in that line?

Jonathan Weaver: At this point, I don't believe so. We didn't have one in January, we have one next week coming up, so – I feel like I've done my part in trying to cut and now I just feel I'm not being informed. You know, like I said, I don't understand what happened last month. You didn't say a word to me about cutting my seven part-time people until I got a memo four days later. And then three days later when they get their paychecks, four of my staff come to me and they have a pay cut, you know. This is not good for morale in any direction. First I had to ask seven people to go home and then four people I have to explain that I didn't know why they got a pay cut, you know.

Councilmember Raben: I would hope we don't have seven part-time people starting January 1 to prepare for reassessment that starts in July. But there's nothing you do that can't be fixed, there's nothing we do that can't be fixed. I like Tom's idea, come to us with a plan on what we're going to do moving forward. I've heard the same rumors, too, that there's some big numbers floating out there with software packages and stuff like that, and the renovation has gotten to be, or the word that's floating out there, the number that's floating out there is a lot higher than I would

have ever thought it would be. So come back to us in thirty days, if it takes you forty-five days, I don't care. But come back to us as soon as you can with a report on what you think your real needs are going to be for the balance of '09, how many part-time people you're going to need, you know, in preparation for July 1, and we'll work with you.

Jonathan Weaver: I'm not asking for a super remodel, I just want the walls taken down. You know, I'm not asking for new carpet and, obviously, we're going to have color differences because Center got new carpet and all four offices had a different color carpet. You know, I don't know what's going to happen with that, but at this point, I just want some walls knocked down, so we can open it up and breathe.

Councilmember Raben: Bring all that to us and we'll work with you.

Jonathan Weaver: Alright, great.

President Shetler: I do want to clarify something is that on the Level II, that's by statute and we have no course in that action, whatsoever, and those folks are paid twice a year. They're paid in June and paid in December. So that's why they haven't received their pay yet. It's not due until June, and that's a thousand dollars on an annual basis for all those with Level II's.

Jonathan Weaver: I mean, we just want to make sure the money is there in the future so when they're paid twice a year, they're available.

President Shetler: Okay, any other questions regarding the motion?

**(TAPE CHANGE)**

Councilmember Goebel: – I'll repeat what I've said all along, that you've been put in a trying situation, I'm sure, with the mergers of township assessors to your office and from my understanding, things are going pretty smoothly, all things considered. It's nothing, I think, that this body wanted or maybe the Township Assessors in your office thrown right into your lap to work with. But I think this Council also is trying to work with you and to follow up on what Mr. Sutton said, we have not consciously done anything that I know of to damage. I think what we need to know exactly is if you're getting extra help, where that help maybe is going or what the need is right now and I think down the road, perhaps, a schematic or a plan for your office might be very beneficial for us to understand a little bit more of your problems. Thank you.

Jonathan Weaver: So what are we going to do about the four pay cuts? I mean did you guys not know you voted for that? I mean, --

Sandie Deig: You said there was one Chief Deputy and one Assessor in your office. We also treated your other people coming in the same as Glen Koob and her staff was. Glen Koob went to a PAT IV, her Chief Deputy went to PAT III. That's what the Council did for the other three offices.

Jonathan Weaver: Now those people, in their defense, were expecting, you know, a Job Study was done in August, I believe, so they were expecting a Job Study –

Sandie Deig: (Inaudible)

Jonathan Weaver: Well, one of them wasn't a former Chief Deputy that got a pay cut.

Sandie Deig: She got – a former Chief Deputy went to a PAT III – are you talking about Mauer?

Jonathan Weaver: No. So we had three Chief Deputies and they were reduced. And they knew that was going to happen at some point, but they didn't expect it so soon. But there was another woman in the office who wasn't expecting a pay cut, a staffer.

Sandie Deig: Chief Deputies were made PAT III's and the Assessors were PAT IV's, and the one person I think you're talking about, maybe I could be mistaken, she could have been a PAT III, but her salary was more as a COMOT VI.

Councilman Sutton: Councilman Kiefer, I think you're the liaison for the Assessor's office? Is it possible, maybe, for the two of you guys to get together, kind of formulate this plan that we've been discussing?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yeah, I'll be glad to do that.

Councilman Sutton: He is supposed to bring something back to us, maybe address some of these issues that maybe are just now coming to light today.

Councilmember Kiefer: I'll get some clarification.

Councilmember Raben: These issues are Job Study related issues really. And I think that is – who is our Job Study Chairman?

Councilmember Lloyd: Okay, congratulations.

Councilmember Raben: But these are, I mean, how jobs are factored, that's all Job Study.

Councilman Sutton: Well, but the question was about these additional expenses that may be coming down the pike at some point in time.

Jonathan Weaver: We could talk about the software, I don't know where you're getting \$250,000, but, you know, we're talking about a new GIS aerial photograph being taken.

President Shetler: I think back to those four employees we were talking about, is that they fell into certain groupings. It had nothing to – it was just by ordinance where we have the Job Study ordinance that's there and it happens to fall into certain categories and they were declared a PAT III or COMOT VI or whatever the heck they were, I have no idea. I don't know who they are, or what positions they are, or what we're even dealing with on a specific basis, but in general, what was done is that given their job description and their title, their responsibilities, their tenure with the county, etcetera, were placed into certain categories and that's really pretty well a generalized thing that we have no control over. The only time that they can be changed is when we have actual Job Study meetings which we suspended those because of the review that BKD is currently going through right now with various different departments within the county. So there was nothing done by any purpose by this Council body at all. I mean, it simply wasn't a factor.

Jonathan Weaver: I'd still like to –

Councilmember Lloyd: Real briefly, so the three elected officials, their jobs were

eliminated by the voters, so we had to figure out a way to put them into the current county classifications, same with their chief deputies, you don't want three other assessors running around with you in that office as well as their Chief Deputies. I mean, they had to be put into certain classifications and that's what was done as far as I know. And unfortunately, the pay of an elected official and the pay of the Chief Deputy, you can't have four or five Chief Deputies in your office.

Jonathan Weaver: Right, and I agree with that. But they weren't expecting it so soon, so that was my question, why it happened so soon. And they were expecting a Job Study. So I was just seeking clarification. But thanks.

President Shetler: Any other questions?

Jonathan Weaver: – the fourth position that wasn't a Chief Deputy, why she received a pay cut.

President Shetler: Alright, any other questions? We have a motion on the floor to approve. Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: I want to make sure I get clarification before I take this vote. This is – the Extra Help is strictly for the July reassessment?

President Shetler: That's probably a question for Mr. Weaver.

Jonathan Weaver: I don't know how any office can operate without part-time people. You know, you have things that happen, deaths, people going on vacation, sickness, you know, I think I need part-time people year round.

Councilman Sutton: Okay. No.

President Shetler: Did that answer your question?

Councilman Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: No, if he doesn't need it until July, I vote no.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: No.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: No. There being no ayes and seven nays, the motion does not pass.

REASSESSMENT/PTABOA		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 2490-1091-1180	PTABOA Member	10,000.00	0.00
To: 2490-1091-1990	Extra Help	10,000.00	0.00

(Motion unanimously fails 0-7)

LOCAL ROADS & STREETS (LATE)

Councilmember Raben: Next under Local Roads & Streets we have a late transfer in the amount of \$100,000 and that is from Bituminous Materials into Calcium & Chloride.

Councilmember Bassemier: Second.

President Shetler: We have a motion and a second. Does anyone have a question of why –

Councilmember Lloyd: I'd like to hear from the Highway/Garage on this.

Councilmember Raben: I can cover this if you'd like. Everybody knows that our last event used a fair amount of salt and I think the intent is, is to have some funds in place if the superintendent and the Commissioners can locate some salt, the funds would be available to purchase more salt in the event that, you know, we should run out before the end of the winter. That's pretty much it in a nutshell, isn't it?

Mike Duckworth: That's exactly it. I will tell you that we started the season with 3700 ton, we had a few minor events early where we used some and this last event, because of the reoccurring snow storms and especially the ice, we're at the end of this event probably going to be down to about 12 - 1300 ton tops. I, personally, don't feel that that may not be enough to get us through February. I can't predict, like any of the television stations, I can't predict the weather very well, and we've had some systems come through that we weren't expecting, but I would much rather have the money in place. I will tell you that I have located some, but it's not any better news than it was when I was back here in, I guess, August or September. I think the lowest amount I've received an estimate on is \$132.50 a ton at this point.

President Shetler: What did we pay in August?

Mike Duckworth: 125.

President Shetler: 125? We were getting a bargain –

Mike Duckworth: No, we were getting it, was the bargain. You couldn't find it. But yeah, it went from like the previous year, somewhere in the 40's, 45, \$47 a ton and I tried to go through INDOT, they supposedly had some surplus. But because of this event, they've diminished their surplus and so none was available. And I would be, I think remiss in my duties if I said to you that I would feel comfortable about us trying to take the rest of the season with what we have.

President Shetler: Are we mixing it with sand and thinning it out as much as we can?

Mike Duckworth: Well, sand is, of course, not a deicer and it doesn't help in our hilly areas in the county. And when we can do that, we do, for traction. But to be very honest with you, this last event has, as they say, has been the worst since 2004 and it has not only been the fact that we've been out salting and deicing and pretreating and those kind of things, but about the time we get done we get hit with another system, and so we have to go and completely go over our roadways again. And our crews have just been excellent and putting the time in, I mean, it's – you know the situation. It's been very tough. But I have to say to you that this is a need that I think substantiates what we do and I wouldn't be here unless I thought it was important.

President Shetler: Alright, thank you. Questions?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yeah, I just want to tell you, tell your guys out there that they've done a fantastic job. They worked very hard and we're getting some real good reports about how good the roads have been taken care of. And I think you're on the right track by getting this money in place just when a deal comes around the corner, you can jump on it.

Mike Duckworth: Right, I appreciate that. I would just tell you, I would rather have the material here and not worrying about having to get it when I run out.

Councilmember Bassemier: And pay more for it.

Mike Duckworth: And Commissioner Tornatta and I have spoke and I would recommend to this Council and the Commissioners that we start a search for salt this spring to get the very best price that we can get and get it here and get it secured for the next season. I think you're going to have to work ahead of time to do that.

Councilman Sutton: Mike, I'm going to ask you a question I asked you back in September when you made the request, where are you going to put all this material? We're not going to leave it outside now are we?

Mike Duckworth: No Sir. We have an agreement with the Evansville-Vanderburgh School Corporation. We have a building that in late March they're going to demolish as a part of their strategic plan and renovations to Cedar Hall school, and it's kept inside there.

Councilmember Lloyd: What did you say the price per ton was now or did you tell us?

Mike Duckworth: The best price I've been able to get in the last few days is \$132.50 a ton. Now we, just to be very clear about this, we have 60,000 in our existing Calcium & Chloride account. But if we get 1000 ton, which is a conservative amount that I think we need to add to what we have, it's going to be \$132,500, and that's going to be my recommendation to the Commissioners to go ahead and do that if we can't find it in the next few days any cheaper. Because when you find it in this market, you better get it and secure it. And that's having it trucked in from, I believe, Peoria, Illinois.

President Shetler: Mike, roughly, how much did you use during this past deal?

Mike Duckworth: I'm going to estimate – I have it here. We started with 3700 and



we have 1200, I'm going to say we used somewhere around 1700 tons in this last event.

President Shetler: Alright, thank you. Yes, Councilman Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: I was going to ask the same thing, you used about 60% of your entire supply?

Mike Duckworth: Yes. It's hard to figure this and Troy and I talked about this, is the fact that, you know, we don't have a scale to weigh it, that's an added expense, and we do it by buckets and we have different sized trucks that we use and, you know, we're in about the ninth day of a seven day event. And I really haven't had the time to, with handling everything else, sit down and really put a microscope on this because we've had everything from truck breakdowns to county residents with concerns and dealing with Vectren because they have lines in trees and we can't remove the trees until they prepare the lines, and so we've had a number of different issues. And, once again, I will tell you that not only have we depleted a lot of our salt or calcium chloride budget, we've depleted a lot of our overtime budget as well. And I don't know that in April or May that we're not going to have other kinds of storms and events come through that we'll need to pay overtime. So I can tell you that there should be some expectations that we'll be coming back to you for those kinds of appropriations as well.

President Shetler: Alright, thank you. Councilman Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Two quick questions. Mike, you made mention that we were housing it in an EVSC building that's going to be demolished, so are we looking at, if we don't use this salt, we're going to have to find a home for it?

Mike Duckworth: No, we've almost depleted, we've not had the time to – we have probably 5 or 600 ton left in that facility that we can move over to our facility that we've depleted out of. What I'm saying is, at the end of the day, we're going to have 1200 ton, which our existing facility, our existing salt barn on our property can hold. So if we buy another 1000, I'll probably have about 700 over there that I'm sure – I'd be willing to bet that we would use. So the thought is, by the end of March, we would need all existing salt back over to our facility and our agreement is to vacate that at that time.

Councilmember Raben: Okay. The next question, if you were to locate salt tomorrow, how long would it take to get it?

Mike Duckworth: They're saying three to four days.

Councilmember Raben: Three to four days to your –

Mike Duckworth: In this particular company that has given me the low bid at this point. It can't come by barge at this time because we've got waterways that are frozen and all that.

Councilmember Raben: And then the other thing, when you are talking and the tonnage that's coming in and going out, I mean, are you, I mean, I guess when you're loading it out, you're using however many yard bucket, what does salt weight a yard, does anybody know?

Mike Duckworth: I don't know offhand. We basically, we measure it by the size of

trucks that we have and how many truckloads that are being used. I just haven't put that together.

Councilmember Raben: Because it just seems like 500 ton, if we're, like you and I talked about, if we're putting 5 to 6 tons on a truck at a time, that's –

Mike Duckworth: And I misspoke, it's an average of about ten ton per truck. And we have a couple trucks that are a little bigger and we have a few trucks that are a little bit smaller.

Councilmember Raben: If you have 500 tons, is 50 truckloads.

Mike Duckworth: And you separate that by 12 trucks, you know, it's three or four trucks a night, normally, three to four hoppers full per –

Councilmember Raben: Thank you.

President Shetler: Councilman Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: December and January have passed, now we have February and March, so maybe if we get through this month. I just hope we don't get too much and have an oversupply at a higher cost. And I think your idea of trying to find it when the price maybe will come back down is the best avenue to take. But I just hope we don't buy too much right now. We've got to have enough to protect us the rest of this winter, but if we had about 40% of it left, maybe we're close already.

President Shetler: Do you have a rail spur there?

Mike Duckworth: I'm sorry?

President Shetler: Do you have a rail spur, rail service there at your –

Mike Duckworth: No, we do not.

President Shetler: What about next door? They have –

Mike Duckworth: We asked that option with the providers, the vendors that we're buying it from and we're really at their mercy as to how they ship it. I mean, when you put in on rail, you have to offload it and I think there's some cost with that because they had one of the vendors we had talked to had offloaded it at Jeffersonville or they had it on a barge, well, it would cost us \$15 a ton to have it reloaded. I mean, that's just the cost that I'm trying to stay away from and they're telling me the cheapest way to do it at this point is to have it trucked. So we're kind of at their mercy there.

President Shetler: Alright, thanks.

Mike Duckworth: If I may make one comment, because I don't know how much longer I'm going to be doing this, but I would just recommend to this body to work with the city, and we have been, and also the school corporation to find a piece of property somewhere where we could have a reserve supply of 5000 ton. Now the reason I say that is, right now in the middle of a snow season is not the time to look for salt. And if you had a barn with that kind of a reserve in it, then as you use it, you could replace it and so you would always have the knowledge that the community

is protected by having that kind of reserve there. And I know that's an up-front cost and I know the economic times we're in, but this is really about public safety and I don't, in the position I'm in and I know the Commissioners and you all don't want to have to risk not being able to get an emergency vehicle or someone back to a subdivision or back to a residence where someone is having a medical problem. So that's just my recommendation that we look out from where we are now and try to do something in that regard to make it a safer situation for our community.

President Shetler: Well, it's a good one and I think maybe we should either look at third party storage, for example – someone that's got water, rail and all the transportation modes available, so that –

Mike Duckworth: I have checked with Mulzer, they are not in a position to do that right now, but that doesn't mean that –

President Shetler: That's what I had in mind.

Mike Duckworth: – that doesn't mean that in the future that they wouldn't be. But I think all those things, the other thing is, I would love for local communities to get in on the Indiana Department of Transportation's purchase power. I mean, these big companies that deal with this salt only deal with the DOT because they buy such massive amounts. DOT, as I understand it, got theirs for 60 something dollars a ton. Now maybe that's going to take us working with the state and trying to get on that, I don't know if that's even possible, but that's another avenue that I think we can look at.

Councilmember Goebel: I think we have to explore that because if you spent \$100,000 now to get it, maybe get twice as much in the spring for that same \$100,000, we've got to look for the bargains.

Mike Duckworth: I agree, but –

Councilmember Goebel: I hope we don't spend all this money now, is my statement.

President Shetler: Yes, Commissioner?

Troy Tornatta: Commissioner Troy Tornatta. How about we put something in motion where the County Council President and the County Commissioner President would have to sign off on any expenditure on these monies for salt? So it would have to run through both boards? Is there anything that would be illegal about going through that process with the monies that have been appropriated?

Councilman Sutton: Well, right now, what's being requested, I mean, is an appropriation that would be controlled by the County Commissioners. I guess it's totally up to you guys –

Troy Tornatta: I guess my point is, there is going to be a lot of questions of this Council and I know that there's some uneasiness about giving that money over and, you know, in times like these, I mean, I think it's good to have dialogue back and forth and, you know, maybe it would make this Council feel a little bit more at ease.

Councilman Sutton: I don't think we have any issues with the expenditure, it's just the amounts that the expenditures will go out and the most efficient way, I guess it's more so –

Councilmember Raben: I don't think anybody is questioning that you're going to do the right thing. I mean, that's why –

Troy Tornatta: But it would allow you guys to know what you're spending that money on, at what cost, and have a little bit more stake and knowing what money is going out because, obviously, what I'd like to do is repeal as much of that money back into the general fund as possible. And I think we do need dialogue to decide, you know, because it's your constituents as well as mine that you have to serve in those areas, and it's your monies that you have to put out there to know that we are making the right decision as a whole.

President Shetler: I guess I'd rather see us spend our energy perhaps getting together with Mike or whoever his successor might be, school corporation, same thing we're doing on the other purchasing powers there on consolidating and look for some facilities and try to consolidate this so our purchasing power one, is greater, two, that we're able to get it where all transportation modes are accessible so that we can drive that price down as well. That's the kind of thing I'd like to see us do, plan for the future.

Troy Tornatta: We'll bring that up with the new purchasing director and get that going right away. I think there's something, one of the house bills is talking about just this type of scenario, so you know, if it passes through the state, we might have that problem alleviated.

President Shetler: Alright, yes, Councilman Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Troy, we've got that dialogue right now, don't we? I mean, you're welcome to come here any time and talk to us and give us the information. We've all got email and –

Troy Tornatta: Right, what we'll have, we could have a position where Mike would be able to find something at a lower price and at that point would let this body know. Obviously, yeah, we have the right to be able to do that. My position is to make sure that the Council is as comfortable as possible.

President Shetler: Thank you. Alright.

Councilmember Goebel: I'm sorry, I think we've belabored it enough, but I know Mike is going to look and Troy will look for the best possible purchase, but if we can hang on to our money, this weekend, the weather is going to be in the 50's, maybe we'll get rid of some of this stuff naturally and maybe we can get through it without – if you said that INDOT got it for \$60 and we paid \$142, and now it's \$132 –

Mike Duckworth: INDOT got it because of the volume that they buy. When you're going to buy 1000 or 2000 ton, and we are, the city is in the same shape that we're in right now. They're going to buy another thousand ton or whatever because they're low. I guess my point I'm trying to make to all of you is this, it is so rare because of the availability, that I would hate passing up, when it's available, and someone else purchases it, because we're looking for a lower price, and I sure understand that, but in a week, there may not be any available. And I think we're unfortunately in a position to where, if you can get it, you better get it while you can. Because a week from now, these other communities in this area, Madison, you know, all through the region here, have had this same kind of events that we've had, some worse, some okay. But they're going to be looking for some, too, and whatever the availability is going to diminish. So that's just my caution to everyone. I think when you can get

it to finish out this year, you get it, you have it in storage ready to go. If you don't have to use it, you can sure use it next year.

President Shetler: Alright, thank you. Alright, any other questions? I think we have a motion on the floor here. So roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being seven ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

LOCAL ROADS & STREETS		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 2160-2530	Bituminous Materials	100,000.00	100,000.00
To: 2160-2580	Calcium & Chloride	100,000.00	100,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

AMENDMENTS TO SALARY ORDINANCE

Councilmember Raben: I think that concludes all the transfers, we'll move to the amendments to the salary ordinance. We have several today: we have the Jail, Prosecutor IV-D, County Assessor, Co-op Extension, County Highway, Superior Court Supplemental Adult Probation, County Clerk and the Health Department, Mr. President, I'd like to move that these amendments be entered in and made part of the minutes.

President Shetler: Motion, do I have a second?

Councilman Sutton: Second.

President Shetler: It's been seconded. Any questions? Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being seven ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

**(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)**

<b>APPOINTMENT TO PROPERTY TAX ASSESSMENT BOARD OF APPEALS</b>
--

President Shetler: We have no old business. Under new business, we have appointments to the PTABOA board. The two that I recommend for the Council to appoint will be the republican nominee Carrie Hatt-Figueroa, who is a Level II, and Kraig Nance, who is also a Level II, would be the democratic appointee. Do I have any questions?

Councilmember Raben: Do we need a motion on that?

President Shetler: Yeah.

Councilmember Raben: I make a motion to approve.

President Shetler: It's been moved. Do I have a second? I need a second.

Councilmember Bassemier: Second.

President Shetler: It's been seconded by Councilman Bassemier. Any questions? Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being seven ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

**(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)**

<p><b>PRELIMINARY RESOLUTION EQUAL DEVELOPMENT, LLC</b></p>
---

President Shetler: Next is a – I'm going to skip over that one. The preliminary resolution of the Vanderburgh County Council declaring an economic revitalization area for tax phase-in for real property located at 2700 South Green River Road.

Libbie Au: Good morning. For the record, Libbie Au with GAGE. This is the preliminary resolution for Equal Development Group for the construction of a 48 unit affordable rental housing apartment complex. This project will contain two and three bedroom units for families and seniors whose income is less than 60% of the area median income for Vanderburgh County and the project will also utilize section 42 housing tax credits. The total project invested is 1.7 million and there will be two jobs created. The project did score a total of 70 points, for a phase-in of seven years. With me today is Mr. Bill Hollingsworth, he is the president of Equal Development Group to answer any questions or concerns from Councilmembers.

Councilmember Kiefer: I have a question. Did you say the total project cost was 1.7 million?

Libbie Au: I'm sorry, 7.1 million.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay, that's what I thought. Thank you.

Councilmember Raben: Libbie, I had a question. I don't recall, and maybe some of those records are still available, but unless, I'm trying to think if there's any other

members, Councilman Sutton, possibly. We've only, that I can recall since I've been on Council, had two similar situations where we had housing developments. One is on North Green River Road and the Burkhardt area, before that was the Burkhardt area, the Spurling development. And the other one was at St. Joe by the Rural King, McCullough Development. Do you recall or do you know how many years they were granted?

Libbie Au: Yes. Those two projects were actually granted under the old ordinance, so under the old ordinance you had the discretion to award three, six or ten years and it was solely based on the amount of investment as well as job creation. I believe what happened was initially, three years were awarded and then I think, looking back at the records, based on the amount of investment, it was bumped up to six years.

Councilmember Raben: Both projects?

Libbie Au: I believe so, yes. Oh, I'm sorry, on Lakeside, it was initially three and bumped to six and then on Leisure Living it was three years based on the investment amount.

Councilmember Raben: So three for Leisure and six for Lakeside.

Libbie Au: And again, this is the first housing project that has come before this Council under the new scoring system.

Councilmember Raben: You know, I don't know that the scoring system makes a huge difference for this type of project because, you know, so much focus is put on employment levels and stuff like that. We were kind of shooting from the hip before, but the recommendation is seven. Mr. President, I think we ought to, I mean, it would be my wish not to exceed either of the two projects prior, in fairness to both those individuals. I mean, we probably need to not exceed six years.

President Shetler: My only concern, I guess, at this point is that I don't want to call that a depressed area, but it is an area that we badly need investment in to keep it stable and –

Councilmember Raben: The Leisure Living project was in a depressed area behind a Kmart that had sat empty for 20-something years and in almost a flood plain area. I mean, that, as well, was depressed and that one we granted three.

Councilman Sutton: I would say, too, probably the difference between this project and some of the others that we dealt with is this project here is a section 42 housing or taxpayer project is exclusively for – your income cannot exceed a certain level. Whereas the other projects, the seniors, for the most part, we were anticipating that the income levels wouldn't be off the charts, but there were no income restrictions on those units necessarily. This one, you can't – you have to meet certain income eligibility standards to actually – to live in this project here. So if we remove the site off the equation, and just look at the residents who actually will occupy it, it will be some of the most – probably the neediest, and I know there is a need for this type of housing. We've had probably four other projects here locally that I'm aware of that are designed to meet this particular need. Most of your multi-family housing projects here are really open market type of projects and very few are geared toward the low to moderate income market.

Bill Hollingsworth: Mr. Sutton, my name is Bill Hollingsworth, I'm actually the owner



of Equal Development. Actually, precisely right, one of the issues, I think, there are three stages for this particular project. One is the tax abatement for the seven years, the second is to get approval from the state, which is the Indiana Housing Community Development Authority, and then the third is actually to go out and get all the stuff that I have these letters of intent from financiers and banks and stuff like that. But the biggest part of this is that, I guess, it's affordable so my rents are substantially lower than most of the markets, which is great, because it provides for housing for first time firemen, fire persons, police persons, school teachers, all that stuff that. Boy, that's worth to me -- a lot of the job opportunities coming to town and say, do you have affordable housing? And I know as a region, Indianapolis, Evansville, and the area has a pretty good, I guess, equation for that and that's why a lot of folks choose to be in this area when they plan new plants. But I think from the economic part of it that also with the economic times, I've got to tell you, it's tough to get this stuff through and I don't know when the other opportunities were for the other apartment complexes, but I'd tell you that from a -- yeah, it's tough to get anything built now. From a person that's been doing it for more than ten years, it's about -- it is by far the toughest I've ever had. And I guess this is one of the three lynchpins, if we get it or we don't, that the project goes forward or it doesn't.

Councilmember Raben: Are these single level dwellings?

Bill Hollingsworth: No Sir, it's three stories. Each individual unit is single level.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, but they're three story and that was the other thing that we needed to consider ten years ago was, you know, particularly for handicapped and elderly, everything was single level, you know, they weren't climbing stairs or, for that matter, using elevators, and the cost of those projects really got up there because, you know, it's much cheaper to go up than to spread out.

Bill Hollingsworth: Excuse me, I'm sorry to interrupt, I guess just one thing as far, I guess, an aside or a dovetail for that, we actually are setting aside five units at no cost to the resident, for handicapped residents. We've had some support of services scheduled with Aurora and a few other, the Housing Authority, to provide for some handicapped accessible (inaudible) and all the first floor units will be adaptable.

Councilmember Bassemier: Mr. President?

President Shetler: Yes, Councilman Bassemier.

Councilmember Bassemier: Hi, Mr. Hollingsworth. Nice talking to you yesterday.

Bill Hollingsworth: Thank you, I appreciate it.

Councilmember Bassemier: I've got some concerns. Right now there is three large complexes out there right now and, of course, their price range is about the same as yours. We've got Hornbrook Estates out there, has got 240 units, we've got the Village Green Apartments out there, just the same neighborhood, we've got 384 units. I talked to the managers out there and they've got some concerns, they've got a vacancy rate of about eight percent and they're running about 92% full vacancies and they're kind of concerned with a new complex going out there, that might hurt them and you got something to say to that?

Bill Hollingsworth: Yeah, actually, and I appreciate you asking that. One of the things that we have to do as part of even getting to this point is to have a ridiculously

expensive third party market study. And, I tell you, 92% is actually probably one of the tightest markets in the state. Our (inaudible) are averaging about 95% of folks that would be in the same economic stratification as we would provide for. So, as far as opportunity for new apartment complexes, I'd tell you that I understand someone sitting behind the desk saying, well, I don't want you to make my job any harder and what I'm going to tell you is going to be, don't make my job any harder by putting a new apartment complex in. At least that would be my vote if I was sitting at that desk. But from an overall view, those things happen and there is a very much needed, particularly for this income, in the market. And the market study bears that out, it's a third party market study that does this nationally, Vogt, Williams & Bowen out of Columbus, Ohio, and they probably do, you know, five hundred of these studies a year and that's all they do is feasibility studies for apartment complexes and it was a very favorable recommendation, particularly, I mean, they went to every single apartment complex in Evansville.

Councilmember Bassemier: Okay, I got a question. Are you going to pay for the utilities or are they going to pay for their own?

Bill Hollingsworth: The residents are going to pay for their own, but one of the, I guess, the unique things about this property is it's probably one of the most green residential properties that I've ever heard of or I've ever done, for sure. We're going to have tankless water heaters, which saves somewhere around 40% in water heating costs, geothermal heat pumps in the ground, below three feet it gets to be 54 degrees year round, so in the wintertime it's a huge savings, we're actually going to have some bamboo flooring which will be just in small areas, but it's a very sustainable green, renewable flooring instead of using petroleum based carpet or a vinyl. We actually have extremely efficient LED exterior lighting. Each unit will be, and this is as far as I know, the only one in the state will have each unit be Energy Star Rated, meaning that the EPA is going to have some third party company verify its EPA rated by the number of appliances that are energy star, dishwasher, refrigerator, HVAC system, which is the geothermal (inaudible) for and several other items. And then the other, I guess part of this is the low impact procurement procedures which is, you know, an industry term that means that, as much as I can, I suspect you folks have concern for this, too, as much as I can, I'm going to not waste and use as much local stuff as I can. It provides for me generally, so I'm not traveling in from out of state, out of city, lower costs and also a better warranty service when things are done.

Councilmember Bassemier: Okay, I know in the past on tax abatements we usually vote in favor of them because they hire a lot of employees. Is two, is that all you're going to plan on hiring in the future?

Bill Hollingsworth: Yes Sir. That's as much as I can commit to. I'd tell you that during lease up, I'm sure we'd have another part-time person down here and I guess for an apartment complex, it's not necessarily the folks that we hire although I'm happy to employ the folks and they will be very professional and they'll be on site every day, there will be a clubhouse, which also has a green roof. But that's, I don't know if that answered your question, it's the folks that are afforded the opportunity to live in an apartment complex that has an A- bill level, utilities are substantially lower, so they can go out and eventually go on to buy homes, and it provides for a much better community in that process. I mean, I'm probably the least likely person you'd imagine, but genuinely the most likely person to tell you that I want my residents to buy homes in four or five years because they're not being charged more than a third of their income in rent. It just provides for a better story. My residents refer and I stay full.

Councilmember Bassemier: Have you already purchased the property or is it an option to purchase?

Bill Hollingsworth: It's under contracts and it's conditioned on this, the approval of the Indiana Housing Community Development Authority, the application we submitted, and then also just getting all the loans closed. And time wise, the Indiana Housing Community Development Authority award comes out in April, the third Thursday, I believe, and then it would probably take two or three months to get the rest of this done.

Councilmember Bassemier: Thank you, Sir.

Bill Hollingsworth: I appreciate it.

President Shetler: I do appreciate you going green, but I tell you what, that tank water heater came in handy when my electricity was out for 84 hours, taking a warm shower, at least some semblance of it anyway. So, yes, Joe?

Councilmember Kiefer: A couple of question, comments. First, I guess, being in the real estate development business, I'm absolutely amazed that you're able to get this project done under these financial climates, but, you know, I just want to make sure I understand this clearly and maybe Ms. Au can answer this, but under the data that you provided to us, it looks like you did some kind of estimated tax revenue without project, this property pays approximately \$84,106 over the course of ten years or roughly somewhere between 7 and \$9,000 a year in property taxes.

Libbie Au: That's correct.

Councilmember Kiefer: And under the proposed plan, over the ten years it will pay \$893,000? You know, where the first year is zero but then it ramps up years five, its' paying \$84,000 and then over \$100,000 after that?

Libbie Au: That's correct.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay, and that's after all the deductions where finally, year eight, it's paying the full amount of \$143,000?

Libbie Au: That's correct.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay.

Libbie Au: And that estimate is based on the amount invested. So we're only looking at the additional increase, so the phase-in is not on the current taxes and the assessed value, but the –

Councilmember Kiefer: But even at that, year three, you're still paying 32,000, where under the current system, the way the land is today, it would only be paying \$7,900?

Libbie Au: That's correct.

Councilmember Kiefer: So there is an increase in tax revenue to the community even with the phase-in? I just wanted to make sure I understood that correctly.

Libbie Au: That's correct.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay, a question for Mr. Hollingsworth. Are you going to build this, the complete project is not done in phases? It's going to be all done at one time?

Bill Hollingsworth: Yes Sir. It should be three, maybe four buildings, but more than likely three buildings and a clubhouse. And I just completed 128 units in South Bend in one phase, and we started September of '07, and finished in August of '08. So eleven months for 128 units. I suspect this will probably be about seven or eight months of construction.

Councilmember Kiefer: And how, your pro forma, how quickly does it show you being leased up and what vacancy factor are you using?

Bill Hollingsworth: The state requires for the applications to use a 7% vacancy, that's when Mr. Bassemier had said 8% vacant is actually pretty normal, good. So I'm underwriting at 7%, which is right in that same range of normal. And then lease up wise, the market study always proclaims somewhere around 6 and 8 units per month. And this particular market study, I believe, said nine or ten units per month because of the demand in the market, which is good. I tell you that in South Bend, we moved in the first residents just last September and we're at 95%, which is about 26 people per month, which is probably, arguably, one of the fastest in the state, which is a testament to the developer being (inaudible) about it.

Councilmember Kiefer: Just out of curiosity, what kind of cap rate are you using on this project?

Bill Hollingsworth: Because it's affordable, cap rates kind of don't apply because as you think about our income, it's genuinely half of what you'd expect this cost of product to be, so cap rates aren't applicable, I guess, if that makes sense. Because if you value it out, it doesn't make sense because the equity investment from the tax (Inaudible) you sell off. I don't know if that helps you or not.

Councilmember Kiefer: Well, the reason I'm asking is because I want to know if your intent is to turn around and sell this project after you're completed or if you're going to retain ownership.

Bill Hollingsworth: Actually, it's part of this section 42 process. I actually have to retain ownership and I'm the sole owner for the next 15 years, which is, you know, in my opinion, a very good thing. At least you have consistency and someone you can trust and, you don't know me from Adam, but I tell you, I can.

Councilmember Kiefer: One last question, Councilman Raben had mentioned that some of the other projects were done in six years, does this kill your IRR if you did six years instead of seven?

Bill Hollingsworth: I tell you that I'd prefer ten because you can underwrite it with the loan. Seven years is going to be hard to get banks to underwrite. If you can understand like a seven year mortgage on there, if you will –

Councilmember Kiefer: Sure, I understand.

Bill Hollingsworth: To get seven years, I've got my bank to write off on it, and that was pretty tough. I tell you, six years is going to be harder, particularly in this market. Like you said, it is, it's tough to get anything built.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay. Thanks.

Bill Hollingsworth: Thank you.

President Shetler: Other questions? Councilman Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: I had one question. I wondered about the vacancy rate in the general market for apartments.

Bill Hollingsworth: Yeah, in general with market and affordable (inaudible) being the tax credits, I think it's around the 91 - 92%, which is genuinely, of all the markets I've seen in the last ten years doing this, it's probably the tightest. South Bend was about 90 ½, which was, at the time, the tightest I'd seen. But I've been doing this for ten years, and you know, Indianapolis is happy at 85% full, which is scary.

Councilmember Lloyd: Indianapolis is quite a bit tougher than this market here, this market is pretty good for apartments, especially affordable.

Councilmember Raben: One last question, what percentage of the overall project, the construction, is going to be hired by local contractors?

Bill Hollingsworth: We haven't set a particular amount, but I'd tell you that because of this process, and it's a new green standard process and something I had done previously because it makes sense, which is kind of what half the green stuff is, is that as much as I can, South Bend, I think we did somewhere around 20% locally which (inaudible), Elkhart, I guess it was also Elkhart County, St. Joseph County, Elkhart, and part of this stuff you just can't get locally. Truss buildings and that stuff, you can, or bricks, whatever, but some of those appliances, obviously, you can. If you can buy them, you know, everything I can, locally, labor wise, electricians, plumbing, all that stuff, I know in South Bend, they're required that everyone have a local subcontractor that's licensed in the city, itself, so they practice in the city prior, which provided, I don't know if you folks have that or not, but that's something that actually helped out quite a bit from my perspective to get things going. So, no percentage, but as much as I can, honestly.

Councilmember Raben: (Inaudible, microphone not turned on)

Bill Hollingsworth: About 20%, yeah.

Councilmember Raben: (Inaudible, microphone not turned on)

Councilmember Goebel: Twenty percent construction or 20 percent purchasing?

Bill Hollingsworth: Construction. Purchasing, we do as much as possible locally. And part of it is, you know, you don't make whatever it is that you don't make here, you can't do. And then labor wise, every time that someone comes in and stays in a hotel, it helps your economy short term, I'd much rather have somebody that costs cheaper to do the same thing, and stay at home, from a labor perspective. So, as much as I can. It's just the nature of some of these businesses. New construction apartment business are somewhat more specialized and have a little bit more traveling than local homes. You know, you have the finish carpenter, but the finish carpenter to go in and do 48 units over the next three weeks, it's a different type of pitch and I'm sure there's someone here, but –

Councilmember Raben: We, locally, we do other apartment and office buildings and

all sorts of complexes, so I'm sure we've got the skilled labor, the contractors that will meet every need. When it gets into geothermic stuff, you know, that might be, you might have to look a little harder, but, I mean, it's important to us that anybody that can screw a wire on a nut or put a hammer in a board or put mortar on a brick, do it here locally.

Bill Hollingsworth: Absolutely, I agree.

Councilmember Raben: I don't know that this project requires a different brick than any other facility here.

Bill Hollingsworth: Yeah, and I tell you my commitment is to always be a good neighbor and be as wanted in the neighborhood as possible, which means if, you know, the plumber down the street does my plumbing, I'm a happier guy because I can call him because he's local and he's usually cheaper because he's not staying in a hotel. So I appreciate your questions for sure.

President Shetler: Councilman Goebel may have been next.

Councilmember Goebel: I was just going to mention, I think we have some pretty innovative workers in this community already that are working green, so I would hope you would exhaust our resources here first. Thank you.

Bill Hollingsworth: And I tell you that Ms. Au had talked about some kind of list of local subcontractors or even the building department having those if you, in fact, have to have them. My expectation is I have 72 people bid on an individual sub and then five that, you know, my, people I have used before. I have no problem using as many local as possible, and encourage it.

President Shetler: Councilman Kiefer and then Councilman Sutton.

Councilmember Kiefer: Since you use, there's some federal tax credits on this, are you going to be using minority contractors?

Bill Hollingsworth: I've actually committed to use two minority contracts. It was not something we had to do, it was something I offered to the state, so two of subs will be minority, state certified.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay, thank you.

Councilman Sutton: How much of a tax rate allocation are you using on this project?

Bill Hollingsworth: I'm requesting \$800,000 for ten years.

Councilman Sutton: And just one point that was mentioned a little earlier about just the credit markets being as they are, granted, you don't have your allocation as of yet, but do you have any type of commitment on the credit side for this project?

Bill Hollingsworth: Yeah, and actually, that's a great question given the market, to sell tax credit now is actually very, very, very tough. And what it is, is folks that have that opportunity, I guess, the old number one buyer of tax credits used to be Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, which used to be quasi government needed them and now the government don't need them. So the market has gone from 90 cents to a dollar, to 65 - 70 cents. And the people that are still out there are very much picking the absolute best plum deals, which is why the tax abatement for me makes it so -- I'm

in the running for it, where there's no financial issues, it's good, it's a solid deal, it covers (inaudible) ratio, so tax abatement is imperative, but I have two: National Equity Fund and City Real Estate Securities, which is part of City Security –

**(TAPE CHANGED)**

Bill Hollingsworth: – had letter of interest, which –

Councilman Sutton: Is City, I thought they had pulled out of Indiana? Are they still –

Bill Hollingsworth: Part of City Securities, which is actually their real estate division. That's who did my South Bend deal as well, and they syndicated it to Fifth Third Bank and National City Bank, so I have two, which is very rare, and they're letters of interest, so I tell you that I'll be spending a lot of money before I get to the point where I'm at the closing table, and I hope so.

President Shetler: Any other questions, points? Yes, Councilman Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Just real quick, and I was actually on the Council when we did the Leisure Living, so I can appreciate what Councilman Raben said about the five years, but, I mean, looking at the project and what Mr. Hollingsworth has presented to us, based on the scoring, I would like to see us go with the seven years. I mean, do we need a motion for that?

President Shetler: Well, I think what we're going to do is this, first of all maybe I'll get a sense here, if we need it, but first if everybody is in agreement that we go with the seven, then we'll just make one motion. If we're not, then we'll go with the motion to give preliminary approval of the resolution and then we'll vote separately with a different motion on establishing the year of it.

Councilmember Raben: Having one reading today, though, right?

President Shetler: That is correct, so I guess we'll –

Councilmember Raben: So we'll have to circle the wagons again.

Jeff Ahlers: It's not really necessarily a first or second reading. What it is, you've got the preliminary resolution and then the confirming resolution, so it's just a little different than an ordinance, so there will be a confirming resolution that Ms. Au will bring back to us next month, so what Mr. Shetler is stating is correct. You can either do it in one motion or two. The advantage to doing it in two is if there is a disagreement on the number of years then you don't run the risk of defeating if it would have been your intent to create it as an economic revitalization area and that your only disagreement is over the number of years, that it is not defeated because then it can't come back to the confirming. So, as Mr. Shetler stated, if there seems to be a consensus on the number of years, I guess you could do it in one motion on the preliminary or you might want to divide that up if there is a disagreement on the number of years. But in either event, it has to come back for a confirming and at that confirming resolution, you could amend the number of years at that time as well, it doesn't –

Libbie Au: That's correct.

President Shetler: Okay, so we'll try to clean this up today if we can. We had two

different opinions of a six –

Councilmember Kiefer: I'm with Councilman Lloyd, I think we need to go to seven because I know from my own experience how difficult and challenging it is to get the financing, and I would like to get a verbal commitment that you can do better than 20% on local contractors. I think that's the more disturbing thing to me, just saying hey, 20% versus the seven years because I think the numbers prove out that there's going to be some good tax income, so I don't want to see us shoot ourselves in the foot and lose out on that.

Councilmember Bassemier: Mr. President, I'd like to see us vote on the resolution first and then vote on the number of years afterwards. Could we do that?

President Shetler: Alright, yes we can do that.

Councilmember Bassemier: I mean, it's got to pass first. No use getting the number of years –

President Shetler: Well, if you would like to make a motion in that regard, that would be fine.

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

President Shetler: So we have a motion on the floor to approve the preliminary resolution without a stipulation of the term. Do I have a second?

Councilmember Bassemier: Is that alright with you, Mr. Raben? You're the –

Councilmember Raben: Fine with me.

Councilmember Lloyd: Second.

President Shetler: We have a motion and second. Does everybody understand the motion? Is there any questions about the motion itself? Alright, roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: First of all, I'd like to, I wish you were hiring more than two employees, and I'm afraid it's going to hurt those other complexes out there. I've talked to the managers out there and they're very concerned. And I wish you was using more than 20% of local contractors, and I'm going to vote no.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?



Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: I'd like to say that, you know, if at all possible, you can use more local contractors, I would appreciate it, but I will vote yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being six ayes and one nay, the motion carries.

**(Motion carried 6-1/Councilman Bassemier opposed)**

President Shetler: Now we need a motion to establish the term. Do I have a motion?

Councilmember Raben: Could I offer a suggestion before we make a motion?

President Shetler: You may.

Councilmember Raben: It's quite possible a motion could be made here since that is a concern shared by a lot of us, that for the first reading, the motion be made for six years and if, you know, hopefully within 30 days he'll have a closer look at who the contractor is going to be and if we can get that up to 50% local contractors, we'll go to seven years. Some might call it blackmail, some –

Councilman Sutton: You're loading up on the man here.

Bill Hollingsworth: May I speak? Actually, I appreciate that. In the next month, to get to the point where I even have construction drawings, it's not going to be until April, which is after I get the award, the construction drawings are several hundred thousand dollars, so I don't even know –

Councilmember Raben: I do want you to know that we'll have to –

Bill Hollingsworth: And I understand.

Councilmember Raben: We'll have to have a confirming resolution again what, in twelve months? Or, not the confirming, but the –

Councilman Sutton: Just the annual re-certification or hearing.

Councilmember Raben: Compliance review in a year, and at that point, it's going to be important that that number be greater than 20 percent, so I make a motion that we approve for a period of seven years.

Councilman Sutton: Second.

President Shetler: We have a motion and a second for a term of seven years. Are there any questions about the motion?

Jeff Ahlers: I would clarify, Mr. Shetler, that what the motion is, is to fill in the blank on section five of the preliminary resolution, that the length of deduction to be allowed for the project for real property shall be for seven years, correct?

Councilmember Raben: Correct.

President Shetler: Okay, any questions? Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Since I voted no on the resolution, I vote no on the years.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: I wanted to point out, I guess, when we did this in the 90's with Leisure Living, we were flying blind, we didn't have any guidelines, so how we ended up with five or six, I mean, I think we did a good job on that. But since we have these guidelines, I think it looks, I think it will be a good project for the community, and I vote yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Since we'll revisit the years, I'm more inclined to think six, but to get through today, I'll vote yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being six ayes and one nay and no abstentions, the motion carries.

**(Motion carried 6-1/Councilmember Bassemier opposed)**

<b>APPOINTMENT TO ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION</b>
---

President Shetler: Next is appointment to the Economic Development Commission and I'd like to nominate Michelle Peterlin. I think she's held that post in the past and so this is basically reappointing her to the Economic Development –

Councilmember Lloyd: (Inaudible)

President Shetler: Michelle.

Councilmember Lloyd: I thought you said Cheryl.

President Shetler: Michelle Peterlin. So do I need a motion on that one?

Jeff Ahlers: Go ahead.

President Shetler: Do I have a motion for approval on that?

Councilmember Lloyd: So moved.

President Shetler: It's been moved. Second?

Councilmember Bassemier: Second.

President Shetler: Moved and seconded. Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being seven ayes, no nays, the motion carries.

**(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)**

<b>HOUSE BILL 1588</b>
------------------------

President Shetler: Alright now, there are a couple of other things real quickly and I know it's getting late, we're combining two meetings into one and that's probably one of the reasons why it's taking so long, so I apologize, but the snow was in the way. So the next is on a resolution that has been requested of us from the Mayor's office concerning the stadium and I think we might have a proposal to put that off to another time. Councilman Raben, you've been working closely with that, if you –

Councilmember Raben: That is correct. In fact, Sandie, did we check availability on this room for Friday of this week and –

Sandie Deig: (Inaudible – microphone not turned on)

President Shetler: Now we'll have to do that after 10:30 because we have to give 48

hours notice.

Jeff Ahlers: Well, I would suggest probably after noon because by the time Sandie sends out the notice, that, I mean, I can draft that up real quick or –

Councilmember Raben: Let's set it for 2:00 or 3:30 –

Sandie Deig: (Inaudible – microphone not turned on)

President Shetler: For three?

Councilmember Raben: I'd had, in fact, I guess until the 11<sup>th</sup> hour, thought we had a resolution that we would be ready to prepare today but it – the President and I have had a lot of dialogue back and forth with the mayor on a resolution that he would like to see this body pass and the City Council would need to pass it, hopefully, Monday, but with it, it's an extension of our Innkeeper's Tax, the one percent that we lose in 2009 and that, granted we've already passed that, but the House Bill that the resolution relates to still in its current form, only has it in there, the extension for two years and then along with that is an extension or some changes in the Food & Beverage. But again, our legal counsel will complete the resolution and hopefully tomorrow afternoon have something for everybody to look at.

Jeff Ahlers: Yeah, that should be fine. In fact, I'll get with whoever wants to speak with me later today. My goal would be, while it's fresh in my mind, and I've read through the ten page bill, that I'd like to go ahead and get that done today. So anybody who has comments or what have you, please call me today and if there is differences of opinion between the seven of you as to what it says, then perhaps I'll have different versions and you can sort that out on Friday. If I can, do you have something, Mr. Raben, or do you want me to go ahead with a few comments that I have on this to –

President Shetler: Councilman Goebel might have a comment or question.

Councilmember Goebel: Actually, it's not about the bill. I think it's very important that there's a real strong chance that I won't be in town on Friday afternoon if that will make a difference on the vote. I just want to make you aware of that now.

Councilmember Lloyd: I think we would need a quorum. I would hate to have Councilman Goebel not there.

Councilmember Raben: Yes, it's important that we try to get you back.

Councilmember Goebel: I can let you know by tomorrow.

Councilmember Lloyd: Real quick, we also have in front of us a resolution that passed the County Commission last night and it refers to House Bill 1588, which you have in front of you, and as Councilman Raben stated, there's a provision in here that I would deem unacceptable to the County Council regarding the way the funding is distributed. So I would say that we do not want to pass what the Commissioners did and we need to just draft our own. And the bill refers to the Vanderburgh County Council so, other than for county unity, what the Commissioners passed, to my mind, is irrelevant.

Councilmember Raben: Well, that was no fault of theirs. I mean, it was brought to them late yesterday. All this kind of was given to us late last week and the

Commissioners legal counsel only had a short window to work on that, and I'm sure they'll be glad to pass a new one that mirrors ours with hopes that the city will pass one that mirrors ours as well.

Councilmember Lloyd: I know talking to the state representatives, we need to have exactly what we want in that resolution because that's what the state assembly, they'll use what's on paper when they do their crafting of the bills and horse trading at the end of the session, so I mean, we need to determine exactly what we want and not just assume that they're going to get it right or that they're going to even read the minutes of our meetings. That's why we need to really be careful with what we're asking for in the resolution.

Councilman Sutton: What are you, Councilman, what are you proposing? I mean, you say there's some areas where you feel like there's numbers you have issues with, what, I mean, are there some specifics so that, I mean, as we begin to try to address this we'll see where the differences might be?

Councilmember Lloyd: Well like, just one thing, the Convention Centre operating expenses reduces from two percent to one percent after December 31<sup>st</sup>, 2011. I believe we had requested five years, as one small example.

Councilmember Raben: That's what's in the House Bill as written.

Councilmember Lloyd: Right.

Councilmember Raben: We need to, and it's –yeah, we want it back for five, which would be the –

Councilmember Lloyd: 2015.

President Shetler: Okay. Alright, yes.

Jeff Ahlers: To follow up on what Mr. Lloyd stated and I would direct your attention because most of you probably still have fresh in your mind, if you recall at our last meeting, we passed a resolution for the Indiana General Assembly to amend IC 6-9-2.5-7.7 to extend the expiration date for depositing funds at the rate of two percent into the Convention Centre Operating Fund and that was resolution number 2009-CO.R-01-09-001. And to follow up on the comments made, in that, what you passed was to request that the General Assembly modify that statute so that through January 1, 2015, that those funds would remain at that rate to go into the Convention Centre Operating fund. House Bill 1588, and I made sure to put a copy of that on everybody's desk because I think it's important for you to take a look at it, has in there that it only goes through 2011. So unless any of you have changed your opinion since we passed that resolution last month, we are in the resolution, you're going to want to request that that be consistent with our last resolution. One of the other things, in a quick read and I'm going to go through it again, in the bill is that what essentially it does, is that – and keep in mind that the first resolution that we dealt with last month had to do with the Innkeepers Tax, so that portion would need to be changed. The other provisions of House Bill 1588 concern the Food & Beverage Tax and what is sought in this bill, generally, is that the Food & Beverage Tax would continue, that a portion of it would continue to be used to pay for the bonds on the Vanderburgh Convention Centre. When that expires, then that money would then shift to, if County Council enacts an ordinance, would shift then to pay for a municipal arena or event center to contribute toward the payment of bonds or leases or the financing for that project. Now one thing I would direct your attention

to is if you look on page 4 of that, it talks about that the County Treasurer is the one that would make the determination as to whether or not there's excess funds. So you may want to give some consideration whether County Council would want to make that determination or whether we want to spell out more specifically what determines excess funds because currently, right now, you know, there's, you know, some excess money in that fund. And from time to time, I know that the county, that you use that money to, whether it's to put on a new roof or to make, you know, some capital improvements, and so we need to make sure that we clarify the language so that we don't have a statute that's vague, that we have fighting over in the future, is that it is your desire to make sure that you keep that balance that's in there now and that that would continue through the date of the payment of the bonds. When that is done, then that money would then shift to the municipal arena. So you might be thinking about, in terms of if that's consistent with what you want to do. And again, if different of you have a difference of opinion as to what it should say, I'll draft more than one resolution. You know, I'll be happy to try to draft however many we need to suit everyone and you're obviously the Councilmen who need to vote on it and sort it out. But those are the things that I would point to as to what probably needs to be clarified. The other thing is, is in terms of your resolution whether we want to focus more on the House Bill or whether you also want to, as part of your resolution, make an endorsement of the arena. I see in the County Commissioner's resolution that it essentially endorses that project, and so, again, that would be up to you whether to include that in here or just address the provisions with regard to the funding of the Convention Centre bonds and operating funds. So you need to give me some direction as to how you want to do that. And then, if you have any other questions, let me know.

President Shetler: Okay, the room is secured for 3:30 Friday afternoon. So we will set that up for 3:30 Friday in this room. Any –

Councilmember Raben: It works better for Mike if –

Councilmember Goebel: 3:30 is fine.

Councilmember Raben: Did she already reserve?

President Shetler: Yes, it is a done deal on that.

Councilmember Raben: Oh okay.

President Shetler: I have one other business to bring up and that is with regards to the Chamber of Commerce has asked us if we would at least compose a letter that would basically be in support of the one single county exec, that is being proposed by the State Legislature. I believe there is a hearing this afternoon on that. Councilman Kiefer has been pretty directly involved in that. Do you want to elaborate, Joe?

Councilmember Kiefer: Sure. After talking with Steve Schaefer from the Chamber yesterday afternoon, he thought maybe the best approach would be hold off on the letter, wait to see what they come up with and then we can kind of write our letter in response to what they created.

President Shetler: I think that's probably a good suggestion. Mr. Goebel and I have spoken a little bit about it. We have reservations of getting into the same fiasco that was created last year by the township assessor ordeal.

Councilmember Kiefer: So at this time –

President Shetler: See what they've got in front of us before we say yes or no.

Councilmember Kiefer: Yeah, so at this time, there's no letter or ask for anything.

President Shetler: Alright, thank you.

Councilman Sutton: Well, in light of what we learned from the township assessor situation, I think we just need to stay as plugged in and as close to that situation and how it progresses, and then what ultimately is passed by the State Legislature, making sure that there are enough, if it goes in that direction, make sure that the provisions are put into place to implement that so it doesn't have a negative impact like we may have seen on the assessors side or questions that aren't being answered that should be included in. I think that's about all we can really do at this point.

President Shetler: Right. Thank you. Anything else? Any other comments? Yes?

Jeff Ahlers: What we're going to do is okay, the meeting is going to be noticed for Friday at 3:30, is that correct?

President Shetler: I'm sorry, I do have a correction on that. We'll make that at 3:00 on Friday.

Jeff Ahlers: And what I will do is I will work with Sandie after the meeting, because what we're going to do is to comply with the notice requirements, we just need to send a notice to all the media outlets and such that are requested to be notified. Now, you know, we'll state that the purpose is to consider, you know, the House Bill and any other business. However, we're not going to be advertising appropriations and that, just so that you know that we can't take up some types of business that would require other types of notice. The other thing I have is that I placed on your desk a letter with a lot of attachments concerning budget and assessment deadlines so that everybody knows, given that the new duties that the County Council now has with regard to reviewing other taxing unit budgets and such and other things going on, I think this is fairly comprehensive in terms of giving you an overview of all those dates and what you need to be looking forward to as your responsibility and responsibilities of some of the other officeholders. If you have any questions or need any other information, let me know. But, and some of you may get that. I wasn't clear in talking from some folks, some of these memos say they go to County Council, some of you say you don't get them, so I just wanted to make sure you had these because I thought these were informative.

Councilman Sutton: Was there a problem with that 3:30? With the room?

Sandie Deig: (Microphone not turned on)

President Shetler: I think what we were trying to do is accommodate everyone the best we can. But is that creating a problem for you, then?

Councilman Sutton: 3:30 is fine, 3:00 is a problem. Yeah.

President Shetler: 3:30 works?

Councilman Sutton: Uh-huh.

President Shetler: Okay, go back to 3:30?

Councilman Sutton: Yeah.

President Shetler: Councilman Sutton has a problem earlier.

Councilman Sutton: Right. Right.

President Shetler: So he would rather go 3:30 if that's okay with Councilman Goebel, then...

Councilman Sutton: Well, hopefully, everyone has not got that all penned in there. But yeah, 3:30 will work a lot better.

President Shetler: Alright, no further business? The motion for adjournment?

Councilmember Lloyd: Motion to adjourn.

President Shetler: Thank you.

**(There being no further business to come before the Council, the meeting was adjourned at 10:44 a.m.)**



VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL

\_\_\_\_\_  
President Tom Shetler, Jr.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Vice President Joe Kiefer

\_\_\_\_\_  
Councilmember Jim Raben

\_\_\_\_\_  
Councilmember Mike Goebel

\_\_\_\_\_  
Councilmember Russell Lloyd, Jr.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Councilmember Ed Bassemier

\_\_\_\_\_  
Councilmember Royce Sutton

Recorded and transcribed by Teri Lukeman.

**VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL  
SPECIAL MEETING  
MINUTES  
FEBRUARY 6, 2009**

The Vanderburgh County Council held a special meeting on the 6th day of February, 2009 in room 301 of the Civic Center Complex to consider and take action upon a resolution concerning House Bill 1588. The meeting was called to order at 3:35 p.m. by County Council President Tom Shetler, Jr.

President Shetler: Good afternoon, and welcome to the Vanderburgh County Council special meeting. If we could call the roll please.

COUNCILMEMBER	PRESENT	ABSENT
Councilmember Sutton	X	
Councilmember Bassemier	X	
Councilmember Lloyd		X*
Councilmember Goebel		X
Councilmember Raben	X	
Councilmember Kiefer	X	
President Shetler	X	

\*Councilmember Lloyd arrived shortly after attendance roll call.

President Shetler: There being five members present we have a quorum and we'll begin the meeting. At this time I'd like to ask Councilman Bassemier if you would lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance, please.

(Pledge of Allegiance was given)

President Shetler: Okay, thank you. First of all let me just lay out just a little bit of ground rules here because it is a special meeting that is dedicated only to the resolution for the County Council concerning the Indiana General Assembly House Bill 1588 and the Vanderburgh County Innkeepers Tax and Vanderburgh County Food & Beverage Tax. In other words, basically, what I'm saying is, this body does not make the decision on the merits of the stadium one way or the other. That is not the job of the County Council in any way, shape or form. That is up to the mayor and the City Council. So I do want to make that clear and so any kind of, I guess, debate or points that you would like to make, we'd like to keep them strictly to what we are discussing today, which is this resolution endorsing the Innkeepers Tax and the Food & Beverage Tax, as it currently is. I do want to also try to restrict if we can, everybody's comments to just two minutes so that we don't get into a lengthy debate on that. And please, not to be repetitive, if someone has already made the comments, ditto is fine. That will work sufficiently for us, I think, today. Again, I want to stress that our job is to protect the treasury of Vanderburgh County. I think we had a couple of Councilmen that have worked overtime on this. In fact, most of this whole body has, but I know particularly finance chairman, Jim Raben and Russ Lloyd have put a lot of time in doing their due diligence and to make sure that the county's treasury is protected and I would also like to give a big pat on the back to our counselor, Jeff Ahlers, for all the work he's put into it. So at this time, it's usually customary to get things rolling, if somebody has a motion for approval, the chair would accept that.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Mr. President, I'll move approval for the resolution of the Vanderburgh County Council concerning the Indiana General Assembly House Bill 1588 and the Vanderburgh County Innkeepers Tax and the Vanderburgh County Food & Beverage Tax resolution.

President Shetler: Okay, I have a motion, do I have a second?

Councilmember Bassemier: Second.

President Shetler: I have a motion and a second. Do we have any questions about the resolution among ourselves first? We've had different copies and different variations that we've look at over the last couple of days, I know, and you've just gotten the latest version very recently. Mine was hot. So if anybody has any questions about it. If not, --

Councilmember Kiefer: Maybe we can note that Councilman Russ Lloyd, Jr. just entered the chambers.

President Shetler: Does anybody have any comments? I guess first, anybody that is here to speak in favor of the resolution? Yes, Mayor?

Jonathan Weinzapfel: Mr. Chairman, members of the County Council, I don't make it a habit of coming to County Council meetings. Frankly, this is the first time I've been invited, so I appreciate the opportunity to speak in favor of this resolution. I want to applaud the work of Councilman Raben. We have had numerous conversations over the last two weeks about this issue. Both of us are interested in making sure that the city was protected and that the county was protected, and that we approve and support a bill that's in the best interests of our community. And through his hard work and a lot of elbow grease, maybe, I think we've got an agreement that makes sense for everybody. So I just wanted to thank Councilman Raben for all of his work and urge your adoption of the resolution. And I'd be happy to answer any questions about this.

President Shetler: Thank you, Mayor. Does anyone have any questions?

Councilmember Raben: You're too kind. Thank you.

President Shetler: Okay, does anybody else have any comments for the resolution? Yes.

Bruce Griffin: Just fifty words but it's almost in response to the media reports I've been seeing the last couple of days. I felt like I had to and it's going to sound kind of negative.

President Shetler: Excuse me, Mr. Griffin, I need you, for the record, to put your name and address into the --

Bruce Griffin: Bruce Griffin at 4100 Court Street here in the city. It's going to start out negative, but it's pretty positive overall. I'm in support of this resolution. In response to those media reports I'm just going to ask that you please disregard the senseless ramblings of the chronic malcontents whose brains and mouths are hopelessly stuck on autopilot in the No position. Those people that say no to everything and anything that comes along. That's what I'm responding to there.

Secondly, adopt this resolution in support of the Food & Beverage Tax amendment and let's move forward, move the process forward toward the groundbreaking of our new downtown Evansville arena. Thank you.

President Shetler: Thank you, Mr. Griffin. Alright, anybody else in support of that who wishes to speak? If not, we'll take remonstrators. Remonstrators? Again, if we could keep it to two minutes or less, we would greatly appreciate it. And also, keeping your remarks basically strictly to the resolution as it is stated.

Rodney Witherspoon: I'm Rodney Witherspoon. I live in the county at 8990 Will Place. First of all I'd like to say that I will not disparage the people who are in favor of this amendment as the one gentleman has seen favor to disparage the people who may not be in favor of it, but I think it is absolutely a travesty the way this is being handled as far as the lack of public input. I believe your attorney just handed out the resolution, the final copy of the resolution. The public has not had a chance to see this or discuss it. I don't believe that the figures that the Mayor was given as far as the amount of revenue that will be available through the Food & Beverage Tax is going to be there. I think you all know it's not going to be there. Jim, you have a business, you know what's happened to your business. Everyone of you who has opened up your statements of your financial investments, you know what those look like. And yet, you're all willing to put your brain on hold and just – I don't know what you're doing, hoping against hope that this money will be there in the future. That is not the way to run government. So we're not getting any (inaudible) had to sit back and watch as the County Commissioners basically approved a resolution where the public had no input there. Now we're in Council and you people are doing the same thing. You're poised to approve this resolution with no public input here. I don't know if you people really believe in representative government in this county, and I'm ashamed of all of you.

President Shetler: I do want to point out that one of the things that we looked at very closely is how much money that we have retained in the Food & Beverage, our balance in that account today is approximately three million dollars. We also have a depreciation allowance that is approximately around three million dollars. We've asked Mr. Rector if he would please put together for us the cost that we might look at over the next 11 to 12 years. He's actually run that all the way up to the year 2020 with a professional firm that came in and did this. I think it was within the last six months, and the figure for that is around four million dollars. So when you are looking at expenses that may amount to four million dollars with a balance of about six million dollars to work with on that, I think the Council, that's what I was saying early on, that we've been very prudent on making sure that the County treasury has been protected here and that we have not – we're not dipping in and getting into our resources in any way. So I do want to point that out. Other remonstrators? Yes, Ma'am?

Councilmember Lloyd: While we're waiting, I don't know if anybody had mentioned Councilmember Goebel, he did return my call and left me a message. He's in Indianapolis and he couldn't make it back but the resolution copy that he was able to see, he said he was in support of. But anyway, he won't be here today.

President Shetler: Alright, thank you. Yes, Councilman Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Just so the public understands, a resolution is not a binding document that the County Council – you know, it's a recommendation to the state

legislature. The state legislature are the ones that have the authority to pass this House Bill 1588 and so, you know, we could recommend all sorts of things and they could still do what they want to do. So don't feel like that you're unrepresented because there's multiple layers of people that are involved in this project and this proposal here.

President Shetler: Alright, thank you. I do want to point out that we're trying to keep our points to two minutes. This body does not decide the merits of the stadium. We only decide on this resolution which is geared towards the Innkeepers Tax and the Food & Beverage Tax.

Frankie Niedhammer: Okay, I understand.

President Shetler: And we need your name and address, then.

Frankie Niedhammer: I'm Frankie Niedhammer and I live on Route 17, Evansville, Indiana. I'm president of the Vanderburgh County Taxpayers Association. I do appreciate that you are having this hearing and that you, in my organization's consideration, feel that this is the way it should be done where you hear people and explain things to them. My concern is that this gives the impression that we're willing to turn over to the city, county monies. And in a way, it sort of leads to consolidation of government. And the county, which is another question, giving the inference that that is agreeable to the county, concerns me. I don't think we should be giving money to the city for a project that is solely the dream of the Mayor. This is the County Council and represents the county, the same way the County Commissioners should represent the county, and at least give the people in the county an opportunity to make their thoughts on the subject heard. Whether we have a stadium or not is another issue. The county, with the problems we are going to be having and are beginning to see because of the economic situation, will probably need every penny they can get. And if there should by accident be something left over from the Centre out of the Food & Beverage Tax, it would be nice if it came back to the county so we would have some kind of additional funding to support the changes that are going on, like our roads because of the increased population in the county, they're beating up the roads around my place. The increases in welfare costs, there are a lot of things that have changed out in the county because of the housing that has popped up. And that money would help if there were any left over. But my main concern is the inference that the county would say, oh, whatever the city wants is fine. And if you want to consolidate us and reduce, streamline all of the offices, great, we'll just all be a city and that's not the way it should be. And I would just as soon this wasn't approved so that image wasn't given. If there are that many layers, then they'll manage to do it without this support for the Mayor. Thank you.

President Shetler: Your points are well taken and I do want to point out, though, to you that the statute that's already in place, there's nothing that's going to be added to it, there's no new taxes being added to it. It's the difference between what is paid out and the money can only be used for the Centre at the present time. It can't be used for roads and streets, for example.

Frankie Niedhammer: The way I understood, it could be used for the Centre, and if there were monies in addition to what the Centre needed, it reverted to the county. That's my understanding.

President Shetler: No, I think that goes into basically either, like a repair fund if you will, but it stays within that fund. And I pointed out, I think, right before you had walked in, that fund currently has between, well, there is a depreciation allowance right now that has about three million dollars in it and there is a Food & Beverage balance that has about three million surplus in it, I'm rounding numbers off here, and we've projected the cost out for the next eleven – twelve years of repairs and maintenance that would be necessary on the building to be about four million dollars.

Frankie Niedhammer: I can believe that.

President Shetler: So that leaves us a balance of about two million dollars, and that's the point that I was making, that I think we are being good stewards of the county's treasury in that we are ensuring that there's going to be surplus and not a deficit even after twelve years. The other point is that there will be no new taxes, that the city will basically be gaining off of it the amount of money right now, I think we have a debt service of about two and a half million dollars, 2.6 and this is bringing in about three and a half a year?

Bill Fluty: Three six.

President Shetler: So it's about a million dollars the first year or two that the city would get the difference of. After that, it's going to keep going downward. The next year about eight because our debt service increases up until the year 2016?

Bill Fluty: Eighteen.

President Shetler: So anyway, and by that time, that three point six debt service will be about equal to the amount of money that we're receiving in. So there aren't any new taxes and we're well aware exactly what you're saying, trying to make sure that we don't use up the county's treasury.

Frankie Niedhammer: Well, the other thing is, the idea of money going to the arena because the arena is a city project and – if it happens. And I'm not real in favor of it myself, part of it is the location, but we won't get into that because that's not today.

President Shetler: It's not our decision on that. But okay, thank you.

Frankie Niedhammer: Thank you.

President Shetler: Any other remonstrators, any other – seeing none, any other comments from Council? Questions?

Councilman Sutton: I was just going to note that even depending on what our action is today, the House Bill that's introduced by Representative Dennis Avery will be heard next Tuesday for those who want to continue to follow the progression of this particular measure.

President Shetler: Thank you, Councilman. Okay, call for the roll then.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: I'd just like to briefly point out that we were also – I mean, I think as County Councilmembers, we were – it's our charge to look out for the best interests of the county and I feel that in these negotiations with the city, that we tried to do that and I feel that we came out with an excellent compromise. And what the Commissioners passed, this is radically different if anybody looked at the Commissioners' resolution. And then, I guess, President Shetler, you had discussed the mechanics of this, if it passes or fails going forward, but I vote yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: I'd like to echo Councilman Lloyd's comments because I think this really protects us on the debt service plus on the capital reserve in case there's problems that we'd need to have money set aside, and I think it does a good job at protecting us in that area, so I vote yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: I vote yes. There being six ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

**(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)**

President Shetler: I would like to express my gratitude for everybody showing up today and expressing your opinions. And again, as Councilman Sutton pointed out, the hearing at the State Legislature will be next Tuesday. Is that in the morning or afternoon? Royce, do you know?

Councilman Sutton: I don't have a time, but I know it's in room 156B, it's the meeting of local government –

President Shetler: 9:30 in the morning, and that will be Indianapolis time. They're one hour ahead of us, so keep that in mind. Alright, there being no other business, a motion for adjournment would be in order.

Councilmember Lloyd: Real quick, then we would give, pass this along to the Commissioners and the City Council whether they would be willing to adopt in the same form or their prescribed form, maybe Mr. Ahlers can alert us on that.

Jeff Ahlers: What were you requesting, Mr. Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: The mechanics of this since it just passed.

Jeff Ahlers: I assume what we'll do, I don't know whether Council President wants to coordinate with the presidents of the other bodies whether all the resolutions will be sent up together or whether each body will send them and I'd suggest, I think Ms. Deig may have a list. I don't know if we want to send it to multiple – I'd say to all of the State Representatives from our area, but whether or not we send it to the Speaker of the House, and the Senate President and such, I –

Marilee Fowler: I was in contact with Representative Avery and he wanted – I'm Marilee Fowler with the Evansville Convention & Visitors Bureau, and our board, too, has a resolution. It's just primarily for the Innkeepers Tax for the Centre continuation, so I have that resolution. I do have a copy of the County Commissioner's. Either the Mayor or I can take yours as well, and we needed twelve copies to pass out to everybody on the committee on Tuesday morning.

Jeff Ahlers: I will tell you that I think you might look, but if it's the resolution that you passed, I think I've got as an exhibit to this, but you may want to have yours separate as well so that it stands out.

Marilee Fowler: Well, that way we'll have something else to show full support, but that's fine, however you'd like to do it.

President Shetler: Motion would be in order then for –

Councilman Sutton: Just do want to – since the resolutions that the respective bodies have passed are somewhat different but they all speak to the same spirit of what they're willing to do, I think ours is probably a little bit more detailed, a little bit more thorough, just trying to make sure that as that information is presented before that House committee, how they can consider that. Is there going to be someone here locally that's going to speak to maybe the differences between the three but recognizing that the three are in support of the recommendation?

President Shetler: I think that we have spoken to Ms. Suzanne Crouch and also to Venetta Becker on that issue and I think they recognize the fact that we have our own parochial interest involved here and that our responsibility and duty is merely fiscal and watching over the treasury. And they understand that, and that's why ours is really, I think, geared towards that as opposed to the others who are looking after other interests that they had in mind. So I think that's clear in the work that Councilman Lloyd and Councilman Raben put into this, that we were looking after the interests of the county. And I think they'll take that into perspective as it is.

Councilman Sutton: I mean, that's exactly what I want to make sure that it's very clear, we don't want to send a mixed signal or message up there because obviously they can't clearly understand what we're trying to communicate and our interests are different but I think ultimately what we're trying to do, we're trying to accomplish the same thing. So in terms of speaking on this, I'm supposing that Representative Avery will present which version or all three? Marilee, are you –

President Shetler: Mayor?

Jonathan Weinzapfel: Thank you. If I could, real quick, I will ask the City Council to consider and hopefully approve an identical resolution as this. I think what's important to present to the General Assembly at the committee hearing on Tuesday morning is that there is consensus, bipartisan consensus within local government about how we would like to see these funds used and primarily, that's what our local



legislative delegation is interested in seeing. And I think they will fully endorse and support what we have outlined here. And I think they wanted the detail because I think they probably wanted to prepare an amendment to effectuate these changes to House Bill 1588. But I will be up there and will share with them, obviously, this resolution and hopefully, if I have a copy of the city's by then, they will consider it Monday night, I will also present that.

Councilman Sutton: That's what I was looking for because I know we can't have all three or four different versions, so that would be good.

President Shetler: Thank you. Yes, Councilman Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Spoken by a former legislator, that's good. The legislation of 1588 did refer to the Vanderburgh County Council, so I'm pleased that we were able to pass this and I think that certainly holds weight there with Representative Avery.

President Shetler: Alright. Thank you. Anything else? A motion would be in order for –

Councilmember Kiefer: Move to adjourn.

President Shetler: Try this again. Third time is a charm. I have a motion for adjournment. Thank you all very much. I appreciate it.

**(There being no further business to come before the Council, the meeting was adjourned at 3:58 p.m.)**

VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL

\_\_\_\_\_  
President Tom Shetler, Jr.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Vice President Joe Kiefer

\_\_\_\_\_  
Councilmember Jim Raben

\_\_\_\_\_  
Councilmember Mike Goebel

\_\_\_\_\_  
Councilmember Russell Lloyd, Jr.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Councilmember Ed Bassemier

\_\_\_\_\_  
Councilmember Royce Sutton

Recorded and transcribed by Teri Lukeman.

**VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL  
MINUTES  
MARCH 4, 2009**

The Vanderburgh County Council met in session this 4th day of March, 2009 in room 301 of the Civic Center Complex. The meeting was called to order at 8:31 a.m. by County Council President Tom Shetler, Jr.

President Shetler: Okay, good morning. Today is March the 4<sup>th</sup>, it's a hair past 8:30 and I'd like to welcome everybody to the Vanderburgh County Council meeting. First we'll have the attendance and then we'll have the Pledge of Allegiance led by Councilman Joe Kiefer.

COUNCILMEMBER	PRESENT	ABSENT
Councilmember Sutton	X	
Councilmember Bassemier	X	
Councilmember Lloyd	X	
Councilmember Goebel	X	
Councilmember Raben		X
Councilmember Kiefer	X	
President Shetler	X	

President Shetler: There being a quorum, six present and one absent, Councilman Kiefer, if you could lead us in Pledge of Allegiance please.

(Pledge of Allegiance was given)

<b>APPROVAL OF MINUTES</b>
----------------------------

President Shetler: Alright, we need a motion for approval of the minutes of February the 4<sup>th</sup> and February the 6<sup>th</sup> meetings. February 6<sup>th</sup> was a special meeting that we had.

Councilman Sutton: So moved.

Councilmember Lloyd: Second.

President Shetler: Do we have any questions, any comments? If not, roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being six ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

**(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)**

<b>APPROPRIATION ORDINANCE</b>
--------------------------------

**RECORDER**

President Shetler: We have the appropriation ordinance. With Councilman Raben's absence, I'll handle those. First we have the Recorder's office and I would entertain a motion for approval on that. Do I have a motion?

Councilman Sutton: So moved.

Councilmember Goebel: Second.

Councilmember Bassemier: Tom, who was that on now?

President Shetler: That's on the Recorder's office.

Councilmember Bassemier: Okay.

President Shetler: We have a motion and a second. Do we have any questions?

Councilmember Lloyd: Just total dollars, \$10,765.

President Shetler: Yes, that's correct. That's what I have. Okay, any other questions? Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being six ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

RECORDER		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1040-1900	FICA	765.00	765.00
1040-1990	Extra Help	10,000.00	10,000.00
Total		10,765.00	10,765.00

**(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)**

## **JAIL**

President Shetler: Next is the Jail and that's for the Civilian Shift Differential, \$5,800. Do I have a motion on that?

Councilmember Lloyd: Motion to approve.

President Shetler: Its been moved. And a second?

Councilmember Goebel: Second.

President Shetler: Its been moved and seconded. Any questions, comments? Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being six ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

JAIL		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1051-1531	Civilian Shift Diff.	5,800.00	5,800.00
Total		5,800.00	5,800.00

**(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)**

## **ELECTION OFFICE**

President Shetler: Next is the Election Office and that's the PERF for \$102. Do I have a motion for approval please?

Councilmember Lloyd: So moved.

President Shetler: Its been moved. Second?

Councilman Sutton: Second.

President Shetler: Its been moved and seconded. Any questions? Any comments? Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being six ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

ELECTION OFFICE		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1210-1910	PERF	102.00	102.00
Total		102.00	102.00

**(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)**

## **COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE**

President Shetler: The next is on the Cooperative Extension, Contractual Services. I think we had some questions about this the last time and I'm not sure – I think

Councilman Raben had indicated that he hadn't gotten all the information that he had asked for, but do I have a motion for approval on this?

Councilman Sutton: For \$361, I move approval.

President Shetler: Its been moved.

Councilmember Bassemier: Second.

President Shetler: We have a second. Do we have any questions about – yes, Councilman Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: This Co-op Extension, this was – I guess to recap, this differential would be between what wage increase that Purdue University would grant their employees versus what Vanderburgh County had set, which the Council had set the two and a half percent. So based on the information that we received on it, I would urge the Councilmembers to vote no on this.

President Shetler: Alright, thank you. I think last week underneath the discovery portion of it, basically, that's what we had found or indicated, is that Purdue gave a three percent increase, we had a two and a half percent, and basically, we have been fairly consistent in that on joint departments with the city and the county, whatever agency had the control over the governing body, like city, if they were, for example, on Purchasing, that rate increase went into effect for them. So Purchasing people got a five hundred dollar across the board increase because that's what the city did across their board. Even though they were joint, and they may have benefitted from a two and a half, they got the five hundred dollars. So we've been consistent in holding the line on that. So do I have other questions? Yes, Councilman Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Just one thought on this, too, if the Cooperative Extension employees, if they would be able to work out something with Purdue University where they could become full-time employees of Purdue, I think the Council would certainly commend that and then they would be maybe covered by the benefits of Purdue or the wage increase of Purdue. But currently, they're still classified as Vanderburgh County employees. So I think that's why we need to consider the salary ordinance that Vanderburgh County uses.

President Shetler: Alright, thank you. Anything else? Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: No.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: No. There being no ayes and six nays, the motion fails.

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1230-3530	Contractual Services	361.00	0.00
Total		361.00	0.00

**(Motion fails 0-6/All Councilmembers opposed)**

### COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS

President Shetler: The next is the Community Corrections in the amount of \$4,921. Do I have a motion for approval?

Councilman Sutton: So moved.

President Shetler: Its been moved and do I have a second?

Councilmember Goebel: Second.

President Shetler: Moved and seconded. Any questions, comments? Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being six ayes and no nays, the motion carries.



COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1361-1560-1361	Case Manager	3,631.00	3,631.00
1361-1630-1361	Medical Educator	1,290.00	1,290.00
Total		4,921.00	4,921.00

**(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)**

## **DRUG & ALCOHOL DEFERRAL SERVICE**

President Shetler: Next is Drug & Alcohol Deferral Service for \$4,100 for rent. I think we had some questions on that the last time. Motion for approval?

Councilmember Bassemier: Make a motion to approve.

President Shetler: Its been moved. Do I have a second?

Councilmember Lloyd: I'll second.

President Shetler: Its been seconded. I think there's some questions concerning that rent, exact location and if there was other opportunities, does anybody have the same questions this time or – yes, Councilman Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: I was just going to say Mrs. Koch is from the DADS program, so –

Deloris Koch: If I could answer any questions, I'd be glad to.

President Shetler: If you would just give us your name and –

Deloris Koch: Deloris Koch, Program Director of the DADS program.

President Shetler: Alright, thank you. Whereabouts are you located now?

Deloris Koch: 111 Northwest Fourth Street, it's called the Landmark Building. It's on Fourth Street between Sycamore and Vine.

Councilmember Sutton: Right over by the court building.

Deloris Koch: Yes, it's right next door to the court building.

President Shetler: Councilman Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Just out of curiosity, I think one of the questions that was asked last week was about the size of the facility, what type of rent you have, is this a gross rent, is it a net rent, triple net rent, is it a space that possibly could have been, you know, since we have so much vacancy at the Old Courthouse, is it a space that could be at some of our other locations, where we actually own --

Deloris Koch: It's possible that it could be at another location. I would have some concerns about who would pay for the renovation to remodel a space for our purposes. We have need for individual offices for our staff because of the privacy concerns for our clients. They would have to – you know, it wouldn't be enough just to do partitions. In a large space, we would actually need separate offices, I

believe, to keep the sound controlled. And also, as far as clients that are entering and leaving the building, we need to keep that relatively discreet. So it has served our purposes quite well for this long. I wouldn't object to a move if a space could be designed for our needs without a great deal of expense.

Councilmember Kiefer: How big of a facility is that right now that you've rented?

Deloris Koch: The space we have – the lease agreement says approximately 1,800 square feet.

Councilmember Kiefer: Is that a gross rent? Does that include utilities?

Deloris Koch: Yes, it does. It includes utilities.

Councilmember Kiefer: Thank you.

President Shetler: How long of a contract do you have on that space?

Deloris Koch: Pardon me?

President Shetler: Is that a year to year?

Deloris Koch: Year, yes, sir.

President Shetler: Joe, could I recommend that perhaps you might get with Ms. Koch later on and be able to sit down with her since that's your field of expertise, and look at it and just analyze that between the Old Courthouse and see what kind of needs and see if it's even possible to accommodate them at one of our other buildings that we're paying rent on?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yeah, I'd be glad to do that.

Councilmember Bassemier: Mr. President?

President Shetler: I think Councilman Goebel and then Councilman Bassemier. Thank you.

Councilmember Goebel: Deloris, as far as your clientele, is there a screening process when they enter your facility?

Deloris Koch: A screening process?

Councilmember Goebel: As far as – for weapons, safety?

Deloris Koch: No, there is none.

Councilmember Goebel: Okay, thank you.

Deloris Koch: That is a concern.

President Shetler: Yes, Councilman Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Mr. President, I'm the liaison officer for that department and I've talked with Mrs. Koch and I'd like to sit in, if I could, with Mr. Kiefer. And

also, we talked about maybe using the old jail. And, of course, I've got a meeting in a couple of days with Dave Rector. And she said she would not be against that if there is privacy and the partitions are right or the walls. And we also talked about the courthouse and a few other locations, so if it's okay, I'd like to sit in on that meeting. I'll get with Joe when he's going to meet with Mrs. Koch, if that's okay with you.

President Shetler: Sure. I guess the other thing might be some kind of profile of your clientele as far as geographic profile is what I'm thinking, I guess, more or less. And that might be helpful to them to try to determine what properties we have available that might work best for them for your, typically, your people that are using the service.

Deloris Koch: We definitely prefer a downtown location close to the courthouse because I have to be in the court every morning. And I currently walk, I can do the few blocks, that's not a problem, but definitely, we want to keep it close to the court building.

President Shetler: Alright, thank you.

Councilman Sutton: I don't know if you, depending on what the structure and the topic is on the meeting and how far you might want to – but you might want to have one of the Commissioners involved with this as well, since we are talking about building space and contracts and so forth.

President Shetler: We might get a hold of Commissioner Tornatta on that to see if one of them could join you in the meeting to try to figure out –

Councilmember Kiefer: Yeah, I'll do that because I think its important to try to utilize current space that we have, but I will also add that, at that rent rate, if it's a gross rent, includes utilities, that is very, very cheap rent, so it's not like it's a bad rent rate or anything like that. But utilization of other county owned space would be best or ideal if it made sense. Thank you.

President Shetler: Thank you. Yes, Councilman Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: This summary, you know, Commissioner Tornatta was here last week and he had talked about, I think the Council indicated to him we'd like to see an analysis of all the county rent, especially outside this building, the different outside facilities, what the county is paying in rent. Obviously, that's the Commissioner's call, but there may be ways where we can have efficiencies especially when you look at the Old Courthouse, you know, the possibility of renovating the old jail space, these are areas that have quite a bit of square foot available. You know, in this case, this looks like the county is getting a pretty good deal on the building and it serves their needs well, but if there are other locations where we may be paying outside rent that we don't need to be.

President Shetler: Right, thank you. Okay, Councilman Sutton, did you have a further comment or was that –

Councilman Sutton: I was just going to go down the same path.

President Shetler: Alright, anything else? Alright, roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being six ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

DRUG & ALCOHOL DEFERRAL SERVICE		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1371-3600	Rent	4,100.00	4,100.00
Total		4,100.00	4,100.00

**(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)**

### **CUMULATIVE BRIDGE**

President Shetler: The next is Cumulative Bridge fund, \$5,908. Do I have a motion for approval?

Councilmember Lloyd: So moved.

President Shetler: And a second?

Councilmember Bassemier: Second.

President Shetler: And seconded. Are there any questions? Mr. Duckworth is here. Yes, Councilman Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: I was going to ask our attorney if he had looked at the ordinance. Wasn't this the state of emergency in the county?

Jeff Ahlers: Yeah, I mean, I think, well, based on looking at the ordinance, the money is due to be paid. So I think the issue we discussed the other day was whether or not going forward, did the Commissioners want to relook at it. But their ordinance as they've currently got it written says that the money, you know, that that's the amount of money that should be paid.

Councilman Sutton: I think our question was when, the timeliness, I guess, and how

that may coincide. Maybe it's more appropriate, maybe germane to the next item as opposed to this one. But with the – I think there's probably two different issues maybe with the two requests we've got there.

President Shetler: Okay, any other comments or questions? Let's stay with the Bridge then for the moment here. There being no other questions or comments, roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being six ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

CUMULATIVE BRIDGE		REQUESTED	APPROVED
2030-1850	Union Overtime	5,000.00	5,000.00
2030-1900	FICA	383.00	383.00
2030-1910	PERF	525.00	525.00
Total		5,908.00	5,908.00

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

LOCAL ROADS & STREETS

President Shetler: Next is the Local Roads & Streets fund appropriation. Do I have a motion for approval?

Councilmember Lloyd: So moved.

President Shetler: Its been moved and a second?

Councilmember Bassemier: Second.

President Shetler: And seconded. Any questions, comments?

Councilman Sutton: I'm okay with the Bituminous, that's a heck of a word, materials part of this request, but I think I've already spoken enough on the other. But the request for the Supervisor overtime, I still think that the ordinance, it does not speak clearly, and the timeliness in regards to receiving the FEMA funds first, as opposed to paying this out. I think there's a real issue. I'm going to vote against it, but I don't have a problem with the material.

Councilmember Bassemier: Does the handbook cover that? That in a state of emergency, that we do pay overtime to the supervisors? Is that in our handbook?

Sandie Deig: (Microphone not turned on)

Councilmember Bassemier: I didn't know if there was a change. Okay, thank you.

President Shetler: I know that when we had this circumstance come up before, we did place on there and if timeliness sounds to me to be the question, Councilman Sutton, and perhaps I'm incorrect there, but, and what we did is actually stipulated that that wasn't paid out until we received the federal funding, which came about two or three months later for it. So I don't know if anyone would want to entertain that as an amendment to your motion, I mean, to the motion that was made here to delay it until such time that we actually received the money then.

Jeff Ahlers: One of the things I would add there is that, I mean, I think that determination needs to be made by the County Commissioners and their attorney when it's paid because now you're getting into potentially labor and employment laws. I mean, I'm just telling you that it's clear from the handbook and ordinance, you know, it's saying, doesn't condition it upon anything. If they want to do that or you want to overture them to look at that and do that, you may do that, but I don't – I would encourage you not to put that stipulation on that money from here because I think that's a decision that the Commissioners and their attorney need to make because you get into, you know, wage payment statutes and such as to when things may be due and owing, and I think they need to make that call because it's their department and the executive branch.

Councilman Sutton: Well, but here's your issue, in that ordinance it specifically indicates that it's related to a state of emergency. When I asked Commissioner Tornatta when he was here last week, how many days were we under the state of emergency, he indicated that there was one. The pay that we're talking about here is for more than one day. And who declares that state of emergency? Is it a local state of emergency? State? So just, there's some issues there that really aren't clear and so the amount that we're paying out, even if you look beyond the supervisor and who was actually getting the pay, you still aren't really, have a clear path of how this should be paid out and why.

Jeff Ahlers: And I think it's appropriate, if you want, there isn't a timeliness problem with them getting their money, I mean, I think it's clearly appropriate, if you guys want to call a representative from the County Commissioners and the County Attorney in here to ask them that question. I'm just saying that that is, you know, their department and that's a call that they ultimately have to make as to how they comply with their salary ordinances and labor and employment laws. So, I mean, if you have factual questions, I think that that's certainly something that this Council has the ability to look into, but I think you need to get those folks before you then and ask the questions. Do you know what I'm saying?

President Shetler: Yes, Councilman Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: We talked about this a little bit last week, the state of emergency, that is a legal situation that's declared by either the mayor or the County Commissioners or both. I thought it was more than one day, though, he said one day? Is that right? Commissioner Tornatta? Seemed like the public was asked to be off the streets more than one day.

Councilman Sutton: Well, it was recommended that people not, but we weren't under a state of emergency on some of those other days, just that one day.

President Shetler: Well, and I was confused myself because I know that there are different levels of a state of emergency and I think that there was one day that it was at the high peak, and then there was another couple of days where it was at a different level, and what constituted a state of emergency by law, according to what we were looking at, so the point is well taken.

Councilmember Kiefer: I have a question. If the state of emergency was only one day, but yet, there is enough monies here in place for three days, can we amend – can we vote to amend this to say, overtime pay not to exceed the amount of the state of emergency even though we're voting for more money than may actually be there? Because now I'm confused. Was the state of emergency one day or three days? And so, I believe this money is for three days.

Councilman Sutton: Well, not to refute my own argument, but what they're saying is that the conditions that were created during that period of time took more than one day – took an extended period of time beyond the one day. That's really what's being said here, if I'm correct.

Councilmember Kiefer: Yeah, but I thought the law said that we only had to pay during the state of emergency time. Overtime during that state of emergency. So I guess I'm looking back at you, Jeff, to say okay, if that's the case, then can we pass this with this amount, but just request that they only spend whatever amounts of money was available for that one day instead of three days?

Jeff Ahlers: One of the things I would say you can look at here is keeping in mind that, you know, we appropriate money, they make some of these decisions as to actually, you know, I guess authorizing the overtime for their employees. I guess one of the questions would be, is if there is sufficient funds in those accounts, I don't know that you have to do anything today. Now if those accounts, you know, don't have enough funds to pay what they're asking, you know, then perhaps you need to make an appropriation today. But otherwise, you know, I suppose that you could put this off to do your factual investigation.

Bill Fluty: This is a special account, this 2160-1300 and there is no money in that. So if you don't act today, it is zero and we could not pay from that account.

President Shetler: Mr. Duckworth, could you shed any light as far as the actual time of the state of emergency and if it's less than, justify the rest?

Mike Duckworth: I'll try to clarify this as best I can. I will tell you that, first of all, Mike Duckworth, Superintendent of County Highway department. I will tell you that I received my information from Sherman Greer as to the length of the state of emergency. It commenced – let me get my notes here – it commenced on the 26<sup>th</sup>, which was a Monday and it actually was not lifted until the following Monday, on the second of February. And Mr. Sutton is right, although the announcement to the public was that they were not remanded to stay at home and stay off the roads, there

is a gray area there about the type of state of emergency there was, but the declaration was signed and it was not lifted until the 2<sup>nd</sup>. During that time period, the hours that I provided to you is what the supervisors worked. And that's what we feel should be paid under the ordinance. I will say this, there are three different areas here. First of all, the Cum Bridge, we have Cum Bridge employees that are called in after the Highway employees are called in, that had to be called in. They're only allocated about \$5,000 a year in their overtime account. And this appropriation is to replenish that because we don't know what's going to be coming up later on in the year and we want to have necessary funds in that account. The highway account money has almost been depleted because of the number of call-outs, not only during this state of emergency, but other call-outs that we've had for wind storms and snow storms and different things. And that's been depleted. So the union employees have been paid. This is to replenish those accounts for future needs in the area of overtime in the bridge and the highway. And Mr. Fluty indicated the highway supervisor account carries a zero amount until this comes into effect, and then we ask for an appropriation to cover the time period that was worked during these hours. And that's what we've done. I believe that's \$8,428, something to that effect.

President Shetler: Let me ask you this: do you do the hiring out there when there is a vacancy for –

Mike Duckworth: The Commissioners.

President Shetler: I'm talking about a union job, or the Commissioners do the hiring and do you interview them at all? Do you, when they start their job, do you talk to them?

Mike Duckworth: Are you talking about the union employees or are you talking about the supervisors?

President Shetler: Any employee that goes to the county garage. Union or non-union.

Mike Duckworth: The Superintendent does interview them and makes a recommendation to the Commissioners. The Commissioners, many times will tell us who to interview or how many to interview and those kinds of things.

President Shetler: When you're in that discussion with them, when you're interviewing, do you point out that it's a 40 hour job or do you indicate the fact that there could be situations that arise that they may be called upon, particularly during snow seasons, where they may have to go out and clear the streets at 2:00 in the morning and –

Mike Duckworth: Are you talking to the union employees?

President Shetler: Any of them.

Mike Duckworth: Well, it's completely different because the union employees, by contract, if they're called out over 40 hours, the county is required to pay them for that time, time and a half, and they have a specific –

President Shetler: I understand that. But my question more specifically is, do you, when you're interviewing and you're talking to them or describing to them their job responsibilities, do you indicate to them that they basically have a 40 hour job and that's it, period, or do you indicate that there might be a possibility, given weather



conditions that are inclement, that they may have to come in early to help get things going as far as salt trucks and get graders out on the roads and this and that? And there will be times that they'll be putting in more than a 40 hour week?

Mike Duckworth: Yes, I think that's understood.

President Shetler: Alright, thank you. I don't have any other questions, unless somebody else does.

Councilmember Lloyd: For clarification, the state of emergency, that's just a legal situation. I don't think there's degrees of it, so it's like taking a shower. I mean, you just take a shower, a whole shower, you don't take half a shower.

Mike Duckworth: Well, I agree with that, and so it extends for seven days unless it's lifted by the Commissioners and this was not lifted, it just expired, I believe. If it goes over seven days, there has to be a new state of emergency drawn up.

President Shetler: Councilman Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Mike, to reiterate what we said last time, we think you and your supervisors and the people under your supervision did an outstanding job through the recent crisis, but have you applied for FEMA monies?

Mike Duckworth: Oh yes. In fact, I met with FEMA, we had a general meeting of all departments involved, and actually when I got there, our part of that equation was that about 200 and some odd thousand, when I left it was 480,000, due to the fact that they did agree to pay for the salt use in clearing the roads, which was about \$225,000. So our portion of that is \$483,000, I think.

Councilmember Goebel: Okay, and that will be coming at a later date, is that correct?

Mike Duckworth: If the President signs a declaration, then that will be coming and I think it's at a rate of 75%, but as I said at the last meeting, Sherman has indicated to me that there are in-kind services and other kinds of things that he thinks will fill in that 25% gap, so we should get most of that money.

President Shetler: Okay, any other questions?

Councilmember Goebel: So the Union Overtime is to replenish the account?

Mike Duckworth: Yes, because we've already paid their overtime and –

Councilmember Goebel: I was going to ask the Auditor, do we need to put in then, the FICA and PERF at this point, along with that?

Bill Fluty: (Microphone not turned on)

Councilmember Goebel: And can we vote on these separately, is my question.

President Shetler: Can you vote on each line separately?

Councilmember Goebel: Well, I'm under the same sense that Councilmember Sutton has. When FEMA comes forward, then I think 2160-1300 should be appropriated at that time.

President Shetler: We can. We would have to amend the motion because as it is right now, I think we're doing it in one lump sum of \$139,000, so it could be amended to break it down.

Councilmember Kiefer: How do we do that because Councilman Sutton already voted?

Councilman Sutton: No, we haven't taken a vote yet.

Councilmember Bassemier: We've got a motion.

Councilman Sutton: I mean, we could conceivably just take everything but the personnel part out of the motion and vote on that, then come back separately, and vote on that.

Councilmember Bassemier: It would need a motion to do that, wouldn't it, Mr. President?

President Shetler: Well, I think it would probably be more appropriate to amend the motion that's on the table to include that. That would be up to you two guys since you moved and you seconded.

Councilman Sutton: So essentially take that Bituminous Materials separately.

President Shetler: Well, or you could – yeah, there's a variety of different ways to dissect this, yes.

Councilmember Lloyd: I made the motion so I'm willing to rescind the motion, and first, I'll remake a motion for just approval of 2160-2530 Bituminous Materials for \$100,000.

Councilmember Bassemier: I will rescind my motion, too, and second that.

President Shetler: And then second that. Okay, we have a motion and a second and does everybody understand what's going on? Alright, do we have any questions about the materials? Roll call vote.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being six ayes and no nays, the motion for Materials passes.

LOCAL ROADS & STREETS		REQUESTED	APPROVED
2160-2530	Bituminous Materials	100,000.00	100,000.00
Total		100,000.00	100,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

President Shetler: Now, we have a few other line items here, how do you wish to break that down?

Councilmember Lloyd: Mr. President, I'd to move approval for 2160-1300, 2160-1850, 2160-1900, 8,428, 25,000, 2,558, and then 2160-1910 3,258.

Councilmember Bassemier: I'll second that.

President Shetler: So basically, all the items except for the Materials, then, is that correct?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

President Shetler: Okay, we have a motion and a second. Do we have any further questions?

Councilmember Kiefer: I do. I guess I'm confused because the Union Overtime, we're lumping this in with the Supervisor Overtime?

President Shetler: In that motion, that's correct.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay, I just want to understand that. Thank you.

President Shetler: Yes, Councilman Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: I mean, we have to replenish that union amount, don't we?

Bill Fluty: I would hate to say you have to do anything, but it's in the contract and as I understand right now, they do not have very much money left in that account and there's quite a few months left in the year.

President Shetler: But thus far, they've been paid up to date, –

Bill Fluty: That is correct.

President Shetler: – so as far as have to, they're paid. If something comes up, it could be a problem.

Councilmember Goebel: I was hoping we could fulfill all of it except for the first line item. But that's not what's on the floor right now.

Bill Fluty: If he'd amend his motion just for the 25,000, the FICA 2,558 and the PERF

3,258, and then vote on the top one separately, then I think you can do what you want to do or vote that however you want to vote.

Councilmember Lloyd: Okay, I just want to vote on the motion as stated.

President Shetler: Okay, so we have a motion on the floor. Do I have any questions about this specific motion? Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: I'm going to vote yes because this is all lumped together and I want to make sure this Union Overtime is made, so I'm going to vote yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being four ayes and two nays, the motion carries.

LOCAL ROADS & STREETS		REQUESTED	APPROVED
2160-1300	Supervisor Overtime	8,428.00	8,428.00
2160-1850	Union Overtime	25,000.00	25,000.00
2160-1900	FICA	2,558.00	2,558.00
2160-1910	PERF	3,258.00	3,258.00
Total		39,244.00	39,244.00

(Motion carried 4-2/Councilmembers Sutton and Goebel opposed)

REASSESSMENT/COUNTY ASSESSOR

President Shetler: The next item is on Reassessment, Maintenance Contract for \$85,893. Let me quickly just set the ground rules here. I know that there's a vendor here present to answer questions and I appreciate that, but I don't think the Council wants to get involved in trying to allow different sales people to come forward and present programs. I think that could set a dangerous precedent for us, whether it be in this area or different materials, or we've had, you know, Mr. Duckworth has come forward and presented different kinds of large pieces of equipment. And I think if we allowed sales folks to come forward and present that, we could get ourselves in a real mess here. And it's really not our job to pick the vendor, and I know there are

other vendors out there that do have the same product or at least similar products. So I know that there's a presentation and I'm grateful for that, and I'd like to see that, I think that this is a good software package that could help our county out in a lot of respects. I have reservations and questions about a few areas, but I do think that we need to set some ground rules here so that we don't open ourselves up in the future for having different sales presentations before this body when we don't want to get involved in that. That's not our job and our responsibility. So, alright, first I guess I need a motion for approval of the Maintenance Contract that the Assessor is requesting.

Councilmember Bassemier: Make a motion to approve.

President Shetler: We've got a motion.

Councilmember Lloyd: Second.

President Shetler: And a second. Alright, do I have any questions, comments?

Councilman Sutton: (Inaudible) discuss anything further, I didn't know if we had any additional questions. I know some of the questions that we –

President Shetler: Mr. Weaver, do you want to give a general presentation or is there somebody that, you know, Matt Arvay or someone that you want...

Councilman Sutton: I mean, there are several questions that we did pose last –

Jonathan Weaver: Jonathan Weaver, Vanderburgh County Assessor. We just want to clarify that we had the vendor come in to show you what the product can do, it wasn't a sales pitch. From our understanding, it was a sole source provider and the only product out there. I don't know if Mr. Arvay has anything to say. That's all I have to say unless you have any questions.

Matt Arvay: Matt Arvay, CIO computer services. You know, I could answer some of the questions that I heard from the last meeting as far as, like the difference of Google Earth versus this new flight. Basically, Google Earth is ortho photography, top down view, that's kind of tilted. Okay, and I do have an example of that if I could pass it around, versus the Pictometry that we would be receiving, which you could see a lot more detail about the structures (Inaudible – comments made away from the microphone). Hopefully, that helps clear up a little bit of that question. I think there may have been some confusion on the deliverables we would get. You, of course, get the oblique imagery, which is the angled imagery that you'll see in the picture here. As a byproduct of the process, you do get additional ortho photography. It's not as accurate as the ortho photography of years gone by, but it is the top down view and it's a byproduct for free from their process in creating these oblique images. You also look at building outlines. Outlines of buildings that are the line work that you'd see, are the outlines of the parcel property boundaries, you would get outlines of buildings with an attribute with the change classification, where they have an automated process, and this is one of their selling points of what they say is a sole source. The tag and outline of a line, it was the difference between 2004 and 2009, that helps the Assessor's office automatically detect changes in buildings, additions, swimming pools, things of that nature. You get unlimited software, this EFS software which is their viewer to view the software. You get unlimited ArcGIS plug-ins. The ArcGIS is the standardized GIS software package that we use within the city-county today. So those software packages have a plug-in to see this oblique imagery. You also, departmental wide, in the Assessor's office

themselves, they get this product with this ChangeFindr, again, helps them detect changes digitally of what's going on so they can kind of focus on those areas a little bit faster. And then there is a plug-in for our 911 OSSI software system. They do not charge for that plug-in, so out at Central Dispatch they will be able to see this oblique imagery and make decisions and provide information to our first responders, provide them information they've never been able to provide before: exits in the back of the building, windows, doors, whatever the situation is. I think that's really powerful as a byproduct of what the Assessor wants to do. Some of the other information just to provide you, sixteen other counties in Indiana are using this product. All of them went with sole source, no counties went out to bid. Marion County, Hendricks, Johnson and Wayne are some of the counties that do use this. Seventy-five to eighty percent of them specifically use it for reassessment, that's how it started. A lot of these groups are into their second flights and getting updated flights and other departments have come forward, and I do have a study here from Marion County where they basically surveyed the departments and you can look at the utilization. Its just grown tremendously with the product. The first year cost basically covers, you've get one flight, that is spread out as a payment over two years. In addition to the first year cost you have the ChangeFindr fee. That's, again, that change detection process that allows the Assessors to focus on areas of change quickly, not just with the visual aspects of it, but the digital automated process of (inaudible), and I think that's important. And that's pretty much what I have to provide you, more information, and if you have any additional questions?

President Shetler: Matt, these pictures that we're passing around? Is this something you took off the Internet or –

Matt Arvay: You could get the Google Earth, what the imagery of 2004, Pictometry flew Vanderburgh County in 2004 in hopes that we would get our –

President Shetler: But, I mean, are these things you had provided or were they provided –

Matt Arvay: They were provided to me.

President Shetler: From?

Matt Arvay: From Pictometry.

President Shetler: Oh, from the vendor themselves.

Matt Arvay: Uh-huh.

President Shetler: Okay.

Councilmember Kiefer: Mr. President?

Councilmember Lloyd: It looks like they shook the camera on one of these pictures.

President Shetler: Yes, Councilman Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Matt, just a couple of things have come up in my mind as you were talking. One, you said these pictures, the latest pictures were taken in 2004?

Matt Arvay: Yes, they flew on their own accord in 2004.

Councilmember Kiefer: So would they be taking a new set of pictures for 2009?

Matt Arvay: Yes.

Councilmember Kiefer: So it's not satellite imagery or anything like that?

Matt Arvay: They actually would fly in April of this year if this was approved and we would have a delivery of oblique imagery and ortho and all the deliverables I mentioned by the end of July. We would also, they're giving us the 2004 flight that they already did free of charge, and that proposal back in 2004 was \$112,000. They are giving that to us free (inaudible) 2004. In addition to that, in this contract, and we just talked about disaster, crisis, this ice storm, they will fly a disaster over Vanderburgh County at no charge on our request. The only thing they wouldn't do would be flooding. They would do it at 50% off. But if we have this ice and we wanted them to fly, we had a tornado of F4 or above, they would come and fly and provide us that imagery free of charge. That is in the contract.

President Shetler: Do we have to declare an emergency to get that service?

Matt Arvay: Uh yeah, it's a declared –

Councilmember Kiefer: Matt, another question. You mentioned some other departments being able to use this, and I think the Sheriff last week spoke to the benefits, what other departments, I mean, who all would you envision, because you interface with both city and county, I mean, who all –

Matt Arvay: Central Dispatch, Sheriff, I talked to Brad Mills, Area Planning Commission, and in their meetings, they would use this to kind of look at structures. It wouldn't totally eliminate their field work –

Councilmember Kiefer: What about the fire department?

Matt Arvay: I can see the fire department using that in planning, absolutely, Building Commission, Drainage Board, Zoning Board meetings, absolutely, utility...

President Shetler: Councilman Goebel, did you have your hand up?

Councilmember Bassemier: Mr. President, I'd like to echo what Mr. Kiefer said. He pretty well covered what I was going to say, but I do like the fact that other departments can benefit from this software and especially the Sheriff's department for their mens' personal safety and I think this is a good thing. Thank you.

Councilmember Lloyd: Mr. President, is there any issue with capacity as far as like Central Dispatch, their computers, to be able to pull up the images?

Matt Arvay: Not that I'm aware of.

Councilmember Lloyd: Okay, so they have the memory that they could do it like immediately or is that an issue with some of these other departments?

Matt Arvay: No, because it would be loaded on our servers down in the computer services area, on our servers and then the clients would just be viewing it, if you will. So no, you would have no problems with that.

Councilmember Lloyd: If the Council looks at – we would like to get more information

on this and it's not approved today, what's the cost there? Is there a setback as far as aerial photography or anything like that?

Matt Arvay: I think it's time sensitive, is what we really have here. In order for Jonathan to do his reassessment, we have to get on the flight schedule for early spring. And that's really the main factor here is time sensitivity. You know, they would fly in April. If we take another month, you know, we may not be able to fit in on their time schedule to fly in April to get the imagery by July, so he can do his reassessment. I think that's really the critical decision point here is the time sensitivity getting on the flight schedule for an early spring flight.

President Shetler: Is it, they're scheduling the flight times or do you have to do it when the leaves are basically down?

Matt Arvay: Yeah, that and then you have a fall flight, too, but they do have other clients that they're flying, so slots fill up.

President Shetler: Okay.

Councilmember Lloyd: What is the cost of just the aerial photos?

Matt Arvay: The aerial photo itself is, I guess, \$80,020 plus the \$360 one time delivery charge for the media, so I guess that would be \$80,380. The ChangeFindr detection software and processing is \$44,927.85, so you have two aspects to this proposed project: the flight and then this change detection software. Year one would be half the flight cost of \$40,100, \$360 for the media deliverable, and the total cost of the ChangeFindr of \$44,927.85. So your first year total cost would be \$85,297.85. Year two would be \$40,010.

President Shetler: And as I understand what really is unique, I think last week we had indicated that this was a sole vendor, but that's not correct. I mean, there are other vendors who do pictorial type or whatever this is called, 3-D, I'm going to call it. Keep it easy in my mind here. But there are other vendors who actually do a 3-D type of photograph, but what's unique is the fact that they're going to be able to take a time line that they've done since four years ago and be able to distinguish the differences in those photos, so that the most minute changes in a person's property could be detected.

Matt Arvay: Exactly, that's one of the aspects as well as just providing us the old imagery that nobody else can provide us from 2004.

President Shetler: And that is included in part of this deal. I guess a question that I have maybe for Mr. Weaver is that, you know, with trending that we have today, the whole methodology of assessing property isn't quite like it used to be when the guy had to go in the backyard and check every little detail out and every minute measurement had to be done there. Today they kind of what, I guess go through a neighborhood and if a certain number of houses have been sold, they kind of trend that into the whole neighborhood goes up 20% or whatever. And I'm not familiar with the exact details, but it's not quite like it used to be, is it?

Jonathan Weaver: No, we're basing it more on sales, but it's also important that we can back up by the cost approach, by showing that, you know, we have all the property record cards accurate and that we have the correct square footage, and if they have a yard barn, and how many plumbing fixtures do they have, whether or not they have a basement, it's important to have –



President Shetler: Now the plumbing fixtures probably won't be detected by this, I wouldn't think.

Jonathan Weaver: No, but I'm just saying...

President Shetler: So, but the minute details, the smaller details really don't matter quite as much as the big picture. And the big picture, we get off of building permits, like swimming pools and additions to homes and those kind of things that might make a difference between this specific piece of property and a neighbor who just sold their house, which tends to change the property values in the neighborhood.

Jonathan Weaver: Oh, that's very important, but it's very important to have our information up to date and make sure that we're accurate on all those things.

President Shetler: Alright. My biggest concern right now, and I do see the benefit for the Sheriff, the city police, the fire department, for the Building Commissioner's office, for a variety of different things, is that I'd like to see more investors into this program. And I'd like to see us reach out to the city and to a few of the other folks and see if they couldn't, I guess, put some skin into the game here and invest a little bit along with us instead of the county shouldering the entire expense.

Matt Arvay: Tom, just to help a little bit with that question and going off permits, in Marion County, with the use of this product, they found an additional \$888,000 in assessed value because of things not reported through permitting of pools and those things. They also found cell towers in Philadelphia that were thrown up that were not under permit and those type of things. So it's a good checks and balance in that respect, too.

President Shetler: Alright, thank you.

Councilmember Kiefer: Matt, I think the Council President made a good point with the other people investing in it. If I recall correctly, the Building Commissioner, didn't he implement a new software package a few years ago for – and what I recall is that there were some home builders and real estate people and private sector people put some money up toward the cost of that.

Matt Arvay: No, that was a city funded software product. Back in 2000, the year prior to me arriving in Vanderburgh County –

**(Tape change)**

– Builders Association did contribute to get this base mapping and this GIS –

Councilmember Kiefer: Then maybe that's what I'm thinking of.

Matt Arvay: Yeah, the Realtor's Association did contribute some money back then. I don't recall –

Councilmember Kiefer: Is there a way to have a user fee on this or I think there's a good idea there that other departments and private sector could use this to a big advantage. Is there a way to have a user fee attached to it or – I'm just throwing out –

Matt Arvay: You could do that if the appropriate body, I guess, would want to establish that. I know in past years its been debated and open government, public

records and being open about that is really kind of outside my –

Councilmember Kiefer: So is that –

Matt Arvay: It could be done, though, I'm sure.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay.

President Shetler: Councilman Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: I was just looking through Marion County's pamphlet here. DMD, in this particular month, used it more than did the assessors, public safety, DPW and prosecutor. Obviously, it has merit for multi-purpose use for different departments, was this funded entirely by the Marion County Assessor's office?

Matt Arvay: What my understanding is, is what you're seeing is a document that they were proving the usability of it, getting ready for the second go around.

Councilmember Goebel: I think that's a great selling point for it.

Matt Arvay: The assessors got it started, they used it for their reassessment and then they wanted to fly again and the Council says, you know, is it being used? Well, they went out and they surveyed all the different departments and they put together this study to basically get approval for a second flight. So they proved that – you know, the Assessors purchased it, all these other departments, over time, started really heavily relying on it, and that's what they proved in the study to fly it again.

Councilmember Goebel: I think that's the general point of this group, that if different departments will be using, maybe different departments can ante up, also. Because there's no doubt that the pictures are great. You can see good things. I'm not so sure the Google picture is of Vanderburgh County, it's a little bit smeared. But the Picto – you know what I mean – the 3-D picture is very, very clear. I was wondering if also, is this a possibility for stimulus funding because public safety is involved.

Matt Arvay: I don't know.

President Shetler: I might want to point out one thing and then I'd get back to Councilman Sutton here, real quickly, is that we did discuss the possibility of going through the Purchasing department on this and the problem may be developing the specs, and you felt that it may be outside of your typical boundaries of what you're capable of doing so that we have to go outside, and hiring someone to actually do that kind of technical write-up for bidding could cost us much more than what we would possibly save. So we, I guess, underneath the laws, we are allowed to go with a professional firm and contract directly with them because of their expertise and that's not a problem anyway. So we could go outside of that. So if that's a question on anybody's mind, we have explored that possibility. Councilman Sutton?

Councilman Sutton: Well, I commend Jonathan Weaver, the Assessor, for bringing this forward to us. I mean, any time that there is opportunities for the county to look forward and envision things that are going to really help the county in what we do and that's always a good thing. And I guess the key thing we definitely want to remember is the importance of gathering this data for the Reassessment. And that cannot be delayed or pushed aside. So just kind of maybe just as an aside, within the last month or so you came with the part-time help request and you mentioned

it at the meeting last week, I think you maybe ought to give some consideration to bringing that forward since this here, on this project, this is a larger project and this is to help you with the assessment and I don't think you can have all the parts and pieces in place, and the timeliness that you need to help with the reassessment. Now back to this particular software here, I think it would be very valuable for us to – just like we did when we were looking at the GIS package, get all of the stakeholders together to see how they could benefit from this, how it could be fully utilized, because it's very clear this is not just an assessor's piece of software here. So really gathering the strength of this and the discussions about others to buy in and not just buy in with their voices, but buy in with their wallets as well, who may benefit from this, could really help us in gathering together the total picture of what this software can and will do for Vanderburgh County. And the discussions that we've had about additional costs that may come along with this, whether there's some other hardware that might need to be purchased as a result of these other departments utilizing this. We need to maybe get a better picture of who those people are and what that cost will actually be.

Matt Arvay: The only cost, in my budget, you know, we maintain the (inaudible) where this information will be housed, so we're always upgrading our servers, our storage space, so that's really not going to be an issue. And then again, this free viewer is – it's a lightweight viewer that we'll be able to view it even on older machines. Sure, it will be slower, but it will be viewed – I don't see it being a resource problem.

Councilman Sutton: Well, I know, Jonathan, you've had some discussions with some of the other departments, Matt, maybe you have as well, but in terms of leading, putting together this proposal with all of the stakeholders involved, are either or one of you guys going to kind of take hold of, that's kind of what I see as the natural next step of trying to build this proposal before us so that we can see what we have here and we see what the potential is. But I think there's probably even a greater potential. And we talk about economic development and how it can be used here in a great way.

Matt Arvay: The other groups that could use this product, the school corp if they wanted to use it for teaching, it's unlimited licensing, it would be available to them, any not-for-profit quasi government entity if they would have it, so there are a lot of folks that could use it. Again, I go back to the time sensitivity of getting this flight in the spring in order to do the reassessment is really the problem right now.

Councilman Sutton: Who is going to – Jonathan, are you going to lead this? Matt, who is going to lead this process?

Jonathan Weaver: I guess from a technical end, you guys, computer services. From an administrative end, well, we have Greg Grabner, who is the GIS guy.

Matt Arvay: Right. I mean, I could set up a meeting, a big meeting of stakeholders and show them the software, show them what it can and can't do and let them give us feedback. I mean, it's probably the easiest way versus me hitting all these potential stakeholders. Set up a meeting and see if we can coordinate two to three meetings or something and go from there.

Councilman Sutton: That would be, if someone can take the reins of this and move it forward. Jonathan has his specific need and he knows what he wants. But do the others really know and understand the potential of this?

Matt Arvay: Well, I could do that.

President Shetler: Yeah, and Matt, I guess from what I understand from speaking with some people, there are some other vendors out there. I would like to have a little bit of discussion with them and we're talking about a fairly decent sized ticket item here. You know, \$20,000 might be saved, I don't know. But I would like to have a little bit of evidence that we've discussed it and talked with people and to know the advantages and disadvantages between the different vendors.

Matt Arvay: Again, I'm not a photogrammetrist, that's what these folks are that create these images and they have a special skill set. But what I can do is provide the differences maybe that I can find out between potential vendors and what makes them unique. Again, I've got to take the vendor's word that they are unique, they have a unique process.

President Shetler: Okay, yes, Councilman Lloyd.

Councilmember Lloyd: I'll try to finish this up here. So I understand that the last aerial photos were done in 2004, is that right?

Matt Arvay: 2005. The state of Indiana flew the whole state through Homeland Security grant monies and we, as a city-county, did what they call a buy-up, we did a buy-up contract for \$49,121, and that was divided 50/50 between city and county. And that allowed us to buy up the accuracy level of what the state was doing. And we hope, you know, in future years the state will do it again.

Councilmember Lloyd: Okay, and then just to try to summarize some of this, it looks like areas that would use it are city-county departments, you've got Central Dispatch, Evansville Police Department, the Sheriff, Building Commissioner, Area Plan, Metropolitan Development – DMD, the Evansville Fire Department, and then GAGE I would think would use it as well. And then I hadn't really thought about it, you tossed out EVSC as a possible user. I think if the county, if we approve this today, Mr. President, I don't think there would be any incentive at all for the city to come in here and assist the county in this purchase. So I think to get that meeting together and look at the funding, I think the Council seems to be pretty supportive of this, especially, I mean, I'm very supportive of the need to do the aerial photos, but I think to get the other players and look at city funding for this, that I don't think that we need to approve this today. That's just my opinion.

President Shetler: Okay, other comments or questions? Yes?

Councilmember Kiefer: So, Matt, does the ITAC group, then get involved in this?

Matt Arvay: We could present it to them and then maybe they could see uses within their departments there. Absolutely. Again, the only thing I'll say is that there is a possibility that we do not get a spring flight. I want to make that very clear.

Councilmember Kiefer: I understand that. I think this is a great program, I really think I see the benefits of this, but I also see long term, next year and the year after and year after, if we can get these other groups like the school corp, the city, and others to buy in on this, this could – because I've never seen these computer programs where the next year it's zero. You know, it's always some cost attached to it. So if we can get them to buy in, this would be a great program.

President Shetler: Okay, let's see, we have a motion on the floor here, we can vote

on that or we can I guess pull it –

Councilman Sutton: Is there a motion on the floor already? I believe so.

President Shetler: Yes, there is. And we can, I guess, vote on that, we can pull it and vote it on at a later time if that seems to be –

Councilmember Kiefer: I'd like to pull it and vote on it at a later time because I don't want to vote no necessarily because I think it's a good program, but I'd like to pull it so we can vote on it after we've gotten this additional feedback that hey, the city is going to participate and others might participate, if that's okay.

President Shetler: Alright.

Councilmember Bassemier: I'd like to withdraw. Yeah, I'll make a motion. I think I made the motion.

President Shetler: Okay, you want to withdraw and then you second –

Jonathan Weaver: Can I say something?

President Shetler: Oh, you want to vote on it? Okay.

Jonathan Weaver: Can we – you know, this is very time sensitive and if we're not going get these flights in April, we're not going to get it until July, you know, where we have to wait four months. Can we front the first payment out of Reassessment and then talk about the \$40,000 next year to be shared with other entities within the jurisdiction?

President Shetler: Well, I guess we'd have to change, amend the amounts of money here we're talking about.

Jonathan Weaver: I'm just addressing your concerns about this coming from one funding source. But if we can get this –

President Shetler: That's one question, but I have a couple other questions. I know you passed out one other piece of information here, one other vendor. But last week, you told me there weren't any other vendors.

Jonathan Weaver: This is the same vendor, this is Pictometry, what I handed out. But what I want to say about this, if you have any questions, is that we've been talking about this, I think since the fall of 2007. And what I presented before is, last year at this time the quote was 136,000. As far as I understand, these are the same specs and I feel like we've done our due diligence to try to get that cost down. Now it's 125,000 and change.

Councilmember Goebel: Jonathan, if this were approved, how long would it take for the Pictometry group to actually get up and take the pictures that would guarantee you –

Matt Arvay: They would fly in April, deliver by July 31<sup>st</sup> of this year – next month.

Councilmember Goebel: So this is more of an issue, leaves on trees than it is as far as being able to use it this spring.

Jonathan Weaver: Yeah, we're not going to be able to use it this spring, I just found out it's going to be delivered in July. But then if we wait until October and November to take the pictures, then that puts me back another three to four months and then we're talking about the beginning of next year before we can start using it, it sounds like.

Councilmember Goebel: I understand what you're saying, but you have to understand that maybe if other groups are going to use this, maybe we could work out a joint agreement. Everyone, I think, here is in support of the project.

Jonathan Weaver: You know, and I think that's something behind the scenes we've been talking about since late '07, how to pay for this and I did put this in my budget in August out of Reassessment, so we've talked to other departments about splitting the cost and then, you know, at this point in time, you know, you talk about being a leader, taking charge on this, you know, I feel like we're stepping forward to pay for this for the other departments, and I think that's a good thing and I think the other departments will appreciate that. You know, and if that's a big issue to you guys, you know, I'm asking, okay please, this year, and we can talk about next year's installment of 40,000, maybe we can split that between everybody.

President Shetler: Yes, Councilman?

Councilmember Bassemier: I will rescind my motion till next month, maybe we can get some more players in this.

President Shetler: Okay, we have a motion and –

Councilmember Lloyd: I'll withdraw my second.

President Shetler: Alright, so we don't have a motion any longer for the approval of that. Let me ask you this, I don't know if it's you, Jonathan, I need to ask or Matt, but what kind of lead time do they need to get that plane up in the air? I mean, our next scheduled meeting is like April 1<sup>st</sup>, to appropriate.

Matt Arvay: I don't know what's the possibility, but is there any way we can give them some sort of comfort level that, you know, yeah, we want to go out and do some more research, try to get some more players, but if we don't get other players to contribute, that give them some comfort level, keep us on the schedule, I guess, in some way? The 44,927.85 is definitely totally unique to the assessors, that's the ChangeFindr software. No other departments would really use that software, it's specifically assessor software. The \$80,020 for the flight that's spread out over two years is what I think we're really talking about trying to get some contributing groups to contribute with that cost, not the assessors' ChangeFindr cost, right?

President Shetler: Let me ask you a question about that ChangeFindr software, is that related to the 2004 picture?

Matt Arvay: 2004, and then the new 2009, it will detect changes automatically over time between those two –

President Shetler: So it's not detecting what was taking place in '04 in those pictures?

Matt Arvay: Its got '04 data, '09 data.

President Shetler: But not the 2000?

Matt Arvay: What the 2000 – that's ortho photography, that's totally a different, that was for base mapping. That was to develop –

President Shetler: And it's only because this particular vendor went out and had taken, they had been proactive and had taken some aerial photos in '04 in hopes to sell those, but that project fell through, I think because they didn't get the FEMA funding or whatever the case might have been.

Matt Arvay: Yeah, the Homeland Security grant money was just spent elsewhere.

President Shetler: And that's the reason why they have the advantage of being able to go backwards and stuff.

Matt Arvay: And what they say is their technology they use for this change detection process is what they say makes them unique.

President Shetler: I think we've got a couple of choices here. And what I'm hearing, and I might be incorrect and correct me if I'm wrong, but I'm hearing that everybody is pretty well in favor of this program. We see a lot of benefits for not only the assessors, but everyone, including all the groups you've just outlined numerous times here. So I think we all agree with that. The second thing, though, I'm hearing is that we would like to have some other buy-ins to it, but I think all of us in our minds have a few questions, too. I mean, I, other than the buy-in by others, I would like to see, I'd like to feel more comfortable knowing that we are getting the best deal. I don't have a problem with us going to one vendor, and not utilizing the process of the purchasing department and bidding format in this particular manner because I know it could end up costing us as much or more. I would like to have some assurance, though, that we really have done our due diligence and that we have checked with other vendors. I mean, that's my own personal – and I think there are others that have various different questions. Now, the alternatives that we have are this: we have a scheduled meeting for March the 18<sup>th</sup>, which is a Personnel & Finance Committee, we could add to that, though, a special meeting where we could actually discuss that. That gives you a couple of week's time to get this group together to get some of those questions answered and to come in with that kind of a program. That other alternative is to come back April 1<sup>st</sup> when we have the next scheduled meeting and present this again and answering those questions. I don't know how much time you're going to need: two weeks or four weeks.

Matt Arvay: I will try to be aggressive on the March 18<sup>th</sup>, I'd try to get it together by then.

President Shetler: And then the next question is, will that leave ample time for you to get the scheduled flight?

Matt Arvay: I think if we could maybe do something on the 18<sup>th</sup>. I mean, I'll talk to the group after the meeting to see what our time constraints really are. But for some reason, if we cannot gather the information or don't have all the answers for you on the 18<sup>th</sup>, we could always go to the second, but I could email you that answer, that would a decision on the 18<sup>th</sup> or the 2<sup>nd</sup> be ample enough time for them to keep us on the flight schedule.

President Shetler: Alright.

Councilmember Lloyd: Mr. President, I don't know if it would be appropriate for you, but someone needs to send a request either to the City Council or the Mayor's office that this is what we're looking at doing, and we'd like the city to financially participate.

President Shetler: Yes, I will do that. Good idea. Thank you. Alright, anybody else? I think what we might need is a motion to defer is what I'm thinking.

Councilmember Kiefer: Matt, I just want to make sure I understand. If we voted on this today and put all the money in place today, they still would not have it ready until July, which is, in essence, too late –

Matt Arvay: At the latest, they said the end of July.

Councilmember Kiefer: Yeah, which would be too late for the spring assessment.

Jonathan Weaver: Yeah, but that timing is perfect to have it in place to begin the reassessment July 1<sup>st</sup>, so we can start. So, I mean, the timing is now, in my opinion. It's just, it's there. I'm afraid, April, with the leaves on the trees, I mean, I don't know how many – it's getting – we're cutting it close. I was afraid taking the pictures in March was cutting it close.

Matt Arvay: I can ask the company in trying to get, you know, see exactly what we could fit in the schedule, that's what I was told this morning. I don't even know if they were aware that it needed to be a little faster. So maybe they can accommodate, I'm not sure.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay, thank you.

Councilmember Bassemier: Mr. President, since I made the motion, I rescinded it, I'd like to make a motion that we defer it until March the 18<sup>th</sup>.

Councilmember Kiefer: Second.

President Shetler: Okay, we have a motion to defer and a second. Now, and we would do that in the same amount, the \$85,893, and that's real critical because we have to advertise that for – Teri would need to make sure that she's advertised that for the amount. We could go less but not any more than that and that has to be done this Sunday.

Matt Arvay: Who should I work with on Council? Russ, you're my liaison, do I work with you on this?

Councilmember Lloyd: I'm going to be pretty busy until April 15<sup>th</sup>.

President Shetler: How about Councilman Kiefer since this originated out of the Assessor's office, I think we can keep it there for –

Councilmember Kiefer: Thank you.

President Shetler: I've been reading all this stuff on real estate, you've got time, Joe. Unfortunately, I have time, too. Let's see, we have a motion. Any questions about the motion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?



Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being six ayes and no nays, the motion carries to defer until March the 18<sup>th</sup>.

REASSESSMENT/COUNTY ASSESSOR		REQUESTED	APPROVED
2490-1090-3540	Maintenance Contract	85,893.00	Deferred
Total		85,893.00	Deferred

**(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)**

Matt Arvay: See you then.

President Shetler: Alright, thank you. And that will be a regular, I guess – a special meeting to discuss this specific thing after the Personnel & Finance. Okay? Yeah, we may do that first because we'll have to publish the time on that. So we may do that first, Jonathan and Matt. Does any of the Councilmen have any questions about anything that's coming up on the agenda that might require legal counsel?

Councilman Sutton: Probably the last thing on the agenda.

President Shetler: Yeah, Mr. Ahlers needs to –

Jeff Ahlers: And you can call me. Amy Steinhart from my office will be taking my place, but I just didn't know if all those documents you've been furnished in advance, if there was anything on the cooperative purchasing department that you had questions on or Community Corrections or the Equal Development confirming resolution. Those are the only items I see that are coming up. If you had anything specifically for me that you had questions, I'd be happy to answer those before I leave or Amy can call me if something comes up.

Councilmember Lloyd: Can we just take all those now? If we move on the agenda?

President Shetler: Do you still have time yet or –

Jeff Ahlers: That's fine.

**LEGAL AID UNITED WAY**

President Shetler: Okay. Well, we have Legal Aid United Way. Let's get that – any questions about – I need a motion on the next item which is United –

Councilmember Lloyd: Motion to approve the Legal Aid United Way.

Councilmember Goebel: Second.

President Shetler: Okay, Its been moved and seconded. Do I have any questions? Any comments? Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being six ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

<b>LEGAL AID UNITED WAY</b>		<b>REQUESTED</b>	<b>APPROVED</b>
4290-2600	Office Supplies	1,500.00	1,500.00
4290-3730	Continuing Education	2,000.00	2,000.00
4290-3990	Miscellaneous	4,220.00	4,220.00
4290-3450	Yellow Pages	175.00	175.00
Total		7,895.00	7,895.00

**(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)**

<b>TRANSFER REQUEST</b>
-------------------------

**HIGHWAY (LATE)**

President Shetler: Next is a late transfer. Do I have a motion for approval?

Councilmember Lloyd: So moved.

President Shetler: Its been moved and seconded by...

Councilmember Kiefer: Second.

President Shetler: Councilman Kiefer. All in favor signify by saying aye. Oh no, I'm sorry, we've got to take a roll call vote.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. Okay, there being six ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

HIGHWAY		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 2010-1002	Network Specialist	10,940.00	10,940.00
To: 2010-1971	Accrued Payments	10,940.00	10,940.00

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

<div>CONFIRMING RESOLUTION EQUAL DEVELOPMENT, LLC</div>
---

President Shetler: Let's see, we need a motion on the resolution on the economic revitalization area.

Councilmember Lloyd: I'll make a motion to approve. I believe the stated tax abatement was seven years. I make a motion to approve.

Councilmember Kiefer: Second.

Jeff Ahlers: Do you guys, also, as part of your motion, there was a letter from Mr. Hollingsworth with some conditions. Do you want to go ahead for the record and make that letter a part of the record and those as conditions of your passing the confirming resolution? It's a February 27, 2009 letter that I forwarded to all of you

and it's also on your desks as well.

Councilmember Lloyd: I'd like to add to that motion, the February 27<sup>th</sup>, 2009 letter from Mr. Hollingsworth, Equal Development.

Councilmember Kiefer: And I'll second that motion.

President Shetler: Okay, any questions?

Councilman Sutton: Just to make that clear for those who don't know what we're talking about, that letter indicates, there was a question about whether on this project, if local subcontractors would be utilized and this letter indicates that they are making a commitment to do such with all effort on this project.

Councilmember Bassemier: Mr. President, last month I voted on the first reading, I didn't know if there was anybody here from that company, I was going to – the reason why I voted no last time was because there was over a thousand units out there already and I've talked to several managers out there and they're kind of concerned that it might hurt their businesses. And also I understand it's still going to stay only hiring two employees and I know in the past when I was on the Council, we supported this because they would hire a lot of employees like Azteca Milling Company hiring 160 people. Also, I have no commitment that they're going to – before I understood that they was only going to use 20 percent of local contractors and I read in this letter that they said they will invite them, but they have not committed, so I'm just giving you my reason, I'm going to still continue to vote no on this project.

Councilmember Goebel: When we review this in a year if it does pass, that could be conditions for withdrawal, correct?

Jeff Ahlers: If they don't comply, if there's not substantial compliance with their statement of benefits, then you have the right to move to revoke the tax phase-in.

Councilmember Bassemier: I'd also like to add, there's several complexes in that neighborhood that's got an eight percent vacancy rate and they feel like this could only hurt them by adding this new complex. And I kind of feel like, myself, I personally like to help the existing businesses and complexes out there instead of some new one that might come in and hurt the other complexes. Thank you.

President Shetler: Alright, thank you. I guess in some small way, I look at this as our little small stimulus package that we're getting actually from the private sector into our community and so it is a substantial investment that I have to see as a good thing for our community. Any other questions? There is a motion on the floor, so roll call in just a minute.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being five ayes and one nay, the motion carries.

**(Motion carried 5-1/Councilmember Bassemier opposed)**

<b>2009 AGREEMENT TO OPERATE COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS</b>
--

President Shetler: Next is the 2009 agreement to operate Community Corrections. Do I have a motion?

Councilman Sutton: So moved.

President Shetler: Its been moved.

Councilmember Lloyd: Second.

President Shetler: And seconded. Do I have any questions or comments? Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: It's substantially the same as last year, yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being six ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

<p><b>2009 COMPENSATION AGREEMENT IN LIEU OF STATUTORY FEES BETWEEN SHERIFF ERIC WILLIAMS AND VANDERBURGH COUNTY</b></p>
--

President Shetler: Next is the compensation agreement in lieu of statutory fees between Eric Williams, Sheriff of Vanderburgh County and the county of Vanderburgh. Motion for approval?

Councilman Sutton: So moved.

President Shetler: Its been moved and seconded by...

Councilmember Lloyd: Second.

President Shetler: Councilman Lloyd. Do you have any questions, comments?

Councilmember Lloyd: I don't know if, Mr. Ahlers, if there is any highlights you could offer on the contract?

Jeff Ahlers: The contract is in substantially the same form that it has been in the past. It just merely, what they're doing is, is it's just the way that over probably the past decade that the Sheriff has been compensated that, rather than him taking fees for meals and items such as that, that there is a little higher salary in there and then there is also, combined with the other agreement, provides duties and responsibilities with regard to Community Corrections. In reviewing it, it appears to be substantially the same as it has been in the past.

President Shetler: Alright, other questions, comments? Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being six ayes and no nays, the motion carries. We may have pulled the trigger a little too quickly.

Eric Williams: It passed so there's probably no point in commenting other than the fact that it's identical to the last year's contract, salary included, other than the date.

President Shetler: Alright, thank you, Sheriff.

**(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)**

President Shetler: We'll go back to – there's nothing else that we saw...

Jeff Ahlers: There's F, the Co-op.

President Shetler: Okay, Inter-Local Agreement for Cooperative Purchasing Organization, does anybody have a question that might pertain to Mr. Ahlers? If not, then I'm going to excuse him so he can get on with – he needs to leave and then – what I think we'll do then, if there aren't any questions about that per se, we'll go back to – did we do that Highway transfer? We did, didn't we?

<b>AMENDMENTS TO SALARY ORDINANCE</b>
---------------------------------------

President Shetler: We'll go back to the Amendments to the Salary Ordinance and I would ask for a motion for approval.

Councilmember Lloyd: If those need to be read into the record, I'd be happy to do that.

President Shetler: Yes, please. Thank you.

Councilmember Lloyd: The amendments to the salary ordinance, Recorder, amend salary ordinance line 1040-1990 Extra Help as appropriation approved. Jail, amend salary ordinance line 1081-1531 Civilian Shift Differential as approved. Community Corrections, amend salary ordinance line 1361-1560 Case Manager as appropriation approved. Set the salary line in as a PAT IV, Step 6 with a salary of \$45,337, hire date May 15, 1988. Amend salary ordinance 1361-1630 Medical Educator as appropriation was approved. The 2009 salary \$44,544. And that's a 2.5% increase for 2009. Cumulative Bridge department, amend salary ordinance line 2030-1850 Union Overtime as appropriation approved. Local Roads & Streets, salary ordinance line 2160-1300 Supervisors Overtime as appropriation approved. Amend salary ordinance line 2160-1850 Union Overtime as appropriation approved. County Highway, amend salary ordinance line 2010-1971 Accrued Payments as the transfer approved. Day Reporting Court, amend salary ordinance to include a new salary line for the Day Reporting Drug Court Aide in account 136D. This is a COMOT V position with an initiation salary of \$28,704 (\$13.74 per hour). These funds are from a grant from the Department of Corrections, and I'd like to make that in the form of a motion.

President Shetler: Its been moved. Do I have a second?

Councilmember Bassemier: Second.

President Shetler: Do I have any questions? Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being six ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

**(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)**

<b>PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE POLE APPOINTMENT</b>
--

President Shetler: The next then, we'll go to the new business, Vanderburgh County Redevelopment Commission appointments, we made that at the last meeting. So that's already been done. And Personnel Administration Committee, I don't think we officially made that, but that is Robert Goedde to be appointed to that. Do I have a motion for approval?

Councilmember Lloyd: Motion to approve.

President Shetler: Its been moved. Do I have a second?

Councilmember Bassemier: Second.

President Shetler: Its been seconded. Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.



Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being six ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

**(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)**

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>INTER-LOCAL GOVERNMENT AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATIVE PURCHASING ORGANIZATION AMONG CITY OF EVANSVILLE, VANDERBURGH COUNTY AND EVANSVILLE-VANDERBURGH SCHOOL CORPORATION</b></p>
---

President Shetler: Next is the Inter-Local Government Agreement for Cooperative Purchasing Organization between the city, the county and the school corporation. Do I have any questions? I need a motion, I guess, motion and second.

Councilmember Lloyd: Motion to approve.

President Shetler: Its been moved.

Councilmember Goebel: Second.

President Shetler: And seconded by Councilman Goebel. Do I have any questions or comments?

Councilman Sutton: Just to maybe get a little bit of background on this, this initiative was announced oh, about a month, month and a half ago and there was a meeting that was gathered, several of us to discuss this. The school corporation has really kind of taken the lead on this in regards to how we can become more efficient in our purchases by buying in bulk or as a group. So they have taken the initiative of pulling all of these organizations, these entities together. There's still a little bit of work to be done on the county side because we operate a little bit different than the city in terms of getting everyone on board. But clearly, the efficiencies can be seen and costs that we're expending now for paper, supplies, equipment, can go down drastically as a result of buying in bulk. So I think that's what we have before us is an opportunity for us to see some of our resources which, in these times, we really need to look at every opportunity possible to see how we can better utilize our resources.

President Shetler: In addition to that, that department was able to be reduced by what, two employees?

Councilman Sutton: There's two employees that were reassigned to other offices but, yeah, reduced the staffing there as well.

President Shetler: So we had an immediate effect, really, of saving some monies off of personnel as well as the benefits that Councilman Sutton outlined. So it's a, I think, a program that's going to be in the making here, a little bit, but is definitely going to be saving us some bucks over the years. Any other questions or comments? We have a motion and we'll take a roll call vote on that please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: I echo the sentiments of Councilman Sutton and Councilman Shetler, so with that, I vote yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Aye. There being six ayes, no nays, the motion carries.

**(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)**

<b>COUNTY TREASURER RICK DAVIS</b>
------------------------------------

President Shetler: The next item is County Treasurer Rick Davis has a proposal on a property tax billing system conversion.

Rick Davis: Thank you. Rick Davis, Vanderburgh County Treasurer. I'm here today with Mr. Scott Davis from computer services, and at some point, Mr. Bill Fluty has been a project leader on the conversion I'm about to discuss, so if you have any questions, don't be surprised if he may jump in. I'm here today to tell you that the Treasurer's office is in the midst of a major property tax billing system conversion. Its been a project that has been in the works for more than a year with technical data being converted in earnest in December 2008. Vanderburgh County has replaced a 1980 COBOL system with a Windows based system, Manatron, that has been certified by the Department of Local Government Finance. The county Treasurer's office and the Auditor's office simultaneously went live with the new system on February 6, 2009. As a result, we expect to have greater customer service in addition to speed and accuracy when it comes to our tax time collections. We still have some wrinkles to iron out and our staffs will have continuous training throughout the year due to the fact that we have various annual duties that need to be performed throughout the year. But we are excited about where we are in this process and as I stated, Mr. Bill Fluty, Auditor, has been the project leader. One item that we have not addressed during this project until now was the Treasurer's office tax billing database website. The vendor who originally designed the tax billing database, web pages for the Vanderburgh County Treasurer's office is Vision Internet, and they will charge Vanderburgh County approximately \$25,000 to modify the webpages to display the data from MVP tax. That is a one-time expense fix, used only to maintain current displayed information. According to conservative

estimates provided by computer services from Vision Internet, any time a change needs to be made in our website due to changes in MVP tax data structure, the county would be looking at an additional and considerable expense estimated at 10,000 to \$25,000 per project. Luckily, Manatron, the company that landed the contract for Vanderburgh County's tax billing system, also has a website product. Manatron has submitted a proposal to provide this service for an additional cost of \$24,000 to replace our current web pages with their PropertyMax web system. The best aspect about PropertyMax is their ability to better serve our public. We can configure information that is available to the public via the Internet to match what is currently available in our office. So someone interfacing with our website can view what would be available to them if they came to a public terminal in our office. Information should also be updated much more frequently than has been possible before, a situation that would not only help our office, but would help the Auditor's office as well. Currently if someone were to buy or sell a home in May or June of last year, currently, that information is still showing the previous owner. If Mr. Shetler sold a home to Mr. Fluty, right now, this time of year, Mr. Shetler would be calling our office or the Auditor or the Assessor, asking why am I still listed as the owner of this piece of property. I sold it back in June. That information would now be updated within a 24 hour period. And previously, that information was only rolled over one time per year, so this is something that could be done every day and 24 hours after the fix. Should Vanderburgh County choose to sign on with PropertyMax, the up-front \$24,000 cost would cover an entire year from sustainability, support, service and the data would be integrated with our current tax billing system. The initial cost includes the cost of the first year's maintenance and support as well as implementation costs. The recurring annual cost to maintain the site would be \$12,000 per year beginning one year from now. It would take, I've been told, no more than 90 days for full conversion to take place on the county's internet site once the project is scheduled to begin. And if it does pass today, I would be on the phone with Manatron immediately and try to get that done as soon as possible. I would like to get it done about the time where tax bills go out, so people can be (inaudible) for information, especially after hours when we're not available. The CIO, Matt Arvay, and computer services staff strongly recommend Vanderburgh County migrating to the Manatron PropertyMax system. Also, the Information Technology Advisory Council, also known as ITAC, an advisory panel of elected county officeholders and appointed city of Evansville department heads, unanimously approved the recommendation for Manatron's PropertyMax due to the product's best and most effective long-term solution to provide the best value for Vanderburgh County residents. I have provided you an executive level summary of the two products for you to view and in addition, I've also included some statistics from the tax billing database website so you can get a look at how many people visit that site. It was around 132,000 people and you'll notice that April and May are the two months when we get the most hits. So that's, especially while I'm going to be on the phone with Manatron if this passes today and try to get that done to better serve our customers. I'll be happy to answer any questions you have, as well, as I stated earlier, Scott Davis from computer services.

Councilmember Goebel: Good morning, Rick. Will this contract begin then after the three month, when the implementation is concluded or does it start, if it passes today, right now? The contract itself, because it won't be fully operational for us.

Rick Davis: If I may, I do believe, since they're going to be doing the work that it will start immediately because they'll be getting paid to do the conversion and get the website set up. If I'm incorrect, Scott, you might want to...

Scott Davis: I wouldn't want to speak outside my purview. When the project was

originally put in place, the language for the payment terms and the parameters of this addition were reviewed as part of the master contract. And I believe that the payment terms in there, the timing as to when it paid for which portions, the annual maintenance and all that were reviewed and approved by county legal at the time. I believe that they have reviewed the contract, the supplemental agreement language for this again recently. Does that...?

Councilmember Goebel: So it starts today if it is passed? Or is this part of the contract we have right now with Manatron?

Bill Fluty: Let me just – can I back up just a little bit? Last summer I was in here and I asked for, and I've forgotten the amount, but it is, I think, close to \$480,000 to implement the tax billing system for the Auditor and the Treasurer. At that time, also, we knew that we'd have to update their database, but we didn't make that part of the original contract at that time. We set that aside. One of two things were going to happen: we weren't going to do it, which probably wasn't an option, but as we got these other things done, we were going to address it. That's what we're here for now. We do have funds from money that we asked for last year, and the project has gone well. We asked for a little bit of cushion in there and we have that money which could be available to do this. But we want to come forward and say that you didn't direct us to do this, so we want you to know that if you want to let us use that money that we asked for back in July, I think it was, to go forward for this part of this project. So we do have the money in place for this. It's not a new appropriation. It's money from the original conversion. Now we have X amount of dollars set aside for the contract for Manatron. We had X dollars set aside for hardware, software, contractual services. So that's just an update of where we are now and we have the ability to do this with some of that same money that we asked for in July.

Councilmember Lloyd: So this is money in the Auditor's budget that was dedicated to this?

Bill Fluty: This was actually put in the Council's budget.

Councilmember Lloyd: Mr. President, I'd like to make a motion to approve.

President Shetler: I have a motion.

Councilmember Bassemier: Second.

President Shetler: And a second. Okay, any other questions, then? Councilman Goebel, is that...? Alright, thank you. No other questions? Roll call vote.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being six ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

**(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)**

Rick Davis: One other thing if I might add. Regarding the Assessor's issue earlier, I went to ITAC to present this hoping that, in the past, the Sheriff or the Fire Chief were the ITAC president. I was hoping to bring them with me to present this with you. And I, unfortunately, became the president of ITAC. I want you to know that I'm going to be talking to Matt Arvay –

Councilmember Lloyd: Congratulations.

Rick Davis: Yeah, thank you very much. I'm going to talk to Matt Arvay and Mr. Weaver after this meeting and tell them that this is something that I think ITAC definitely should be a part of because it includes city of Evansville department heads and elected officeholders from the county, and I think it would have a little more teeth and strength with it if ITAC came before you as well and the city would see some merit from that as well. So I'm going to go down and talk to Mr. Arvay and Mr. Weaver and tell them we're more than happy to join in their efforts.

Councilmember Kiefer: Rick, I appreciate that. Thank you very much.

Rick Davis: No problem, thank you.

<p><b>CHANGE OF PERSONNEL &amp; FINANCE MARCH MEETING DATE AND FILING DEADLINE FOR APRIL MEETING</b></p>
--

President Shetler: I don't think we need a vote on this, it's just the information to let you know that the meeting has been changed from March the 25<sup>th</sup> to March the 18<sup>th</sup>, and the April meeting deadline is March the 6<sup>th</sup>.

<p><b>MAY COUNTY COUNCIL MEETING</b></p>
--

President Shetler: I personally may have a conflict on May the 6<sup>th</sup>, but we've got some time on, I guess, if that would work for everybody to reschedule on that, but I have a conflict myself on that schedule, so I'll be looking at some other alternatives. If not, then I'll be absent.

<p><b>WALKING TO FREEDOM</b></p>
----------------------------------

President Shetler: We did get something in late here from the Commissioners, Walking to Freedom. I think that was – is that just for our information or is that something we need to –

Councilmember Goebel: I'm not real familiar with it. I didn't get a chance to review

the Commissioner's meeting yesterday, but I think this is a project that will involve us, promote fitness and conclude at the Freedom Festival, but maybe someone else can address it a little better than I. They're trying to get teams to go walking and provide pedometers and – I'm not sure...

President Shetler: I'm not sure either, it was just put here and I'm not really...

Sandie Deig: They brought it in this morning.

President Shetler: Yeah. We had just received it this morning in our office so I'm, again, not familiar with it and I apologize, but it was kind of a late notice. And it appears that they are wanting teams to sign up by March 9<sup>th</sup>, which is coming up Monday, for your teams and stuff. And the contest is actually starting the 16<sup>th</sup> through June 19<sup>th</sup>. I suppose, since it's not really any kind of official thing, we could probably communicate this by email, perhaps? And try to decide if we want to do something with this. Would that be an appropriate...

Councilmember Goebel: It looks like a good project.

President Shetler: Alright. Okay.

Councilmember Lloyd: Mr. President, I have a Personnel Administration Committee meeting, so I'm headed out. Thank you.

President Shetler: Alright, I need a motion for adjournment.

<b>HOMELESS CONNECT PROGRAM</b>
---------------------------------

Councilman Sutton: There was one other item, Mr. President. At our last meeting, Commissioner Tornatta had mentioned about the local homeless initiative, the Homeless Connect program, that's going to be the 12<sup>th</sup> of this month. He requested or made mention about a contribution to the organization in the amount of \$2,500–

**(Tape Change)**

– really sure how that works or how that will be handled, so I don't know if it will come out of the Commissioner's budget or how...not really sure there. But I just wanted to make sure that –

President Shetler: I think they need to make a request for an appropriation from one of their line items. I think that would be the mechanics. But you're right, he did, but I think they need to initiate it somehow. Councilman Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: I don't have anything to add. I think maybe just bring it up today that we're considering and will follow the lead of the Commissioners.

President Shetler: Thank you. Any other business?

<b>COUNTY COUNCIL ITAC APPOINTMENT</b>
--

President Shetler: On the ITAC appointment for the Council, Russ Lloyd has indicated interest in that and unless I have any objections? Councilman Lloyd will be the appointment then we'll make to the ITAC board.

Councilman Sutton: Were we going to have some further discussion, too? We mentioned it last week, the question surrounding the Job Study Committee, and what the status of that is regarding all of the reassessing, that whole program. I saw Deisher out here earlier, too bad he got away. I would like to have heard what his progress has been on that because this whole discussion about having a Job Study meeting and we don't have that review done. It just seems like we've got some things a little bit ahead of themselves on how to do that. I just don't see how we can have a Job Study meeting without the review being completed.

President Shetler: I will be meeting with him shortly and I'll ask him to report back to Council then on the March 18<sup>th</sup> meeting. If that will work?

Councilman Sutton: Well, I mean, I'd like to hear more, but just, I just don't know how we can take any requests at this time. I know we –

President Shetler: Those requests were actually taken, they had come in a few days prior to that cutoff, and that's the only reason that we thought we might be able to get those in play before now. And it had gotten to the point that they really needed to move forward and that's the only reason why those things are being considered at this point in time.

Councilmember Goebel: There have been other requests, though.

President Shetler: After that point, in fact, that's correct. Yes, there have. And that's the reason why those are still being held until that Job Study is finished. I think he first reported that was going to take, what, 18 months or so? The best of my recollection, it was going to take about 18 months to get that total report done. And I guess the hope was, that at least we would have certain offices and maybe he has that finished, where certain offices are completed and maybe we could get some of those put online or enacted –

Sandie Deig: (Inaudible – microphone not turned on)

President Shetler: Okay, and that will be the biggest. So, but we could perhaps implement those other offices that he has completed and get those discussed, and that would help get the flow of activity back at least with everyone but the Sheriff's department. Alright, any other comments? Any other business? Motion would be in order for adjournment.

Councilman Sutton: So moved.

President Shetler: Alright, thank you, guys.

**(There being no further business to come before the Council, the meeting was adjourned at 10:20 a.m.)**

VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL

\_\_\_\_\_  
President Tom Shetler, Jr.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Vice President Joe Kiefer

\_\_\_\_\_  
Councilmember Jim Raben

\_\_\_\_\_  
Councilmember Mike Goebel

\_\_\_\_\_  
Councilmember Russell Lloyd, Jr.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Councilmember Ed Bassemier

\_\_\_\_\_  
Councilmember Royce Sutton

Recorded and transcribed by Teri Lukeman.



**VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL  
SPECIAL MEETING  
MINUTES  
MARCH 18, 2009**

The Vanderburgh County Council held a special meeting on the 18th day of March, 2009 in room 301 of the Civic Center Complex to consider and take action upon a request for additional appropriation from the Reassessment Fund.

President Shetler: If we could, if everyone could take their seats real quick, we'll open the meeting. Thank you. We actually have two meetings going on today. The first will be the special meeting which has the one agenda item and that is the item on the – I'm going to call it 3-D imaging rather than using the proper name of the company here. So it was opaque imaging or something, I think that's what technically it is. We will deal with that in just a second. At this time I'd like to call for a roll call please.

COUNCILMEMBER	PRESENT	ABSENT
Councilmember Sutton	X	
Councilmember Bassemier	X	
Councilmember Lloyd	X	
Councilmember Goebel	X	
Councilmember Raben	X	
Councilmember Kiefer		X
President Shetler	X	

President Shetler: There being six members present and one absent, we have a quorum. I'd like to ask Councilman Raben to lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance, please.

(Pledge of Allegiance was given)

Councilmember Lloyd: Mr. President, I just wanted to mention, Councilman Kiefer was called away on business to Indianapolis, so kind of a sudden thing. He regrets not being able to attend.

President Shetler: Okay, thank you.

<b>ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATION REQUEST</b>
---

**REASSESSMENT/COUNTY ASSESSOR**

President Shetler: The first item on the agenda, and the only item on the agenda, is the appropriation for the County Assessor underneath the Reassessment budget line item. Do I have any questions or comments?

Councilmember Goebel: I think there probably are some questions.

President Shetler: Yes, I think so. We have a few.

Councilmember Bassemier: Mr. President, I'll make a motion to approve.

President Shetler: We have a motion on the floor to approve as written.

Councilmember Raben: I'll second the motion.

President Shetler: Alright, we have a motion and a second. Discussion? Yes, Councilman Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: I know last night at the Commissioner's meeting, there was a lot of discussion about this and at the ITAC board meeting, the city of Evansville had made a pledge to provide \$20,000 over two years towards this Pictometry agreement. But I guess yesterday the city corporate counsel, Mr. Jones, indicated that he was not comfortable with that agreement due to the fact that I guess there was a lawsuit involved with the company, Pictometry, so he was going to withdraw his support. Now I know that generated a lot of questions at the Commissioner's meeting and I guess they were still working on that last night. Maybe Mr. Ahlers would have something to add on that. But anyway, it sounded like the city was withdrawing their support and I think that was a concern to this Council because we had indicated that we wanted to see if other departments that would benefit from this expenditure, if they would make a contribution towards it. So, I mean, I'm concerned that there may be some problems here with the city side of it and there's some legal issues here.

President Shetler: Thank you. I know that Ms. Schymik is here representing the county as well as our counsel, Mr. Ahlers. Do you have anything to add to that?

Jeff Ahlers: Yeah, if you'd like, I can just tell you, I've had some conversations with Kathryn Schymik, who is representing the Commissioners and David Jones, the city legal counsel. There are some legal concerns with regard to the contract in terms of trying to have an indemnity provision put in there by where this company would, Pictometry would indemnify the county if there's ever any litigation or liabilities that could arise, there's also some issues with regard to the license agreements and such. And there has been some discussions concerning making changes to the contract. And I think Pictometry is in agreement with some of those changes. I'm not sure where that process is in terms of whether all of the concerns have been addressed. And I think that is continuing to be ongoing as the executive branch, you know, the city legal counsel and then the County Commissioners as the executive branch, their legal counsel, have been continuing to speak with, and maybe Mr. Arvay or Mr. Weaver have as well, with Pictometry to work out these concerns. And Ms. Schymik is here and she may be able to give you an overview of the concerns that the Commissioners may have had and the actions that they've taken. So the long and the short of it is, there are still legal issues to be worked out. I think some of it is being worked out, but we are not done with that. So at this moment, I guess you would have to say that there isn't a contract that everybody is in agreement with. In terms of the city itself, I did not get a clear indication yesterday as to what the city's position is as to whether they are in or out. I mean, I know if concerns were addressed, my understanding was, I think the city was willing to go forward. But I guess we're at the stage where I'm not sure everybody's concerns have been addressed. So I don't know that the city is in or out, and if someone knows that, I guess they can tell us what the city's position is.

Matt Arvay: Matt Arvay, CIO. The city's position is the same as the county's. They want to work through the legal issues and get a contract that everybody is happy with, but the money has been identified and it will go towards this project as long as the legal issues are worked out and everybody is happy with the contract. So they're

not pulling out, but, you know, the financial aspects, it's just, they want to work with the county and the Commissioner's legal counsel to get a contract that everybody agrees on.

Jeff Ahlers: One of the concerns is that I am not sure that some of the issues can be addressed. It's just going to be – I mean, they can be addressed as much as they can be. Some of it is ultimately just going to be for the parties, they're going to have to decide what they're comfortable with. Either they can live with it or they can't. And that is, that, for example, Pictometry, it's my understanding, is willing to insert an indemnity provision in the contract that they will indemnify us for any losses. However, as you may well know, an indemnity is only as good as the company that stands behind it. So if Pictometry would have some adverse financial situation or lose the patent lawsuit that's pending over this product, and if that would, for example, put them out of business or make them insolvent, then your indemnity may not be any good. They're also willing, I understand, to put in a performance bond which would, then you would have an insurance company standing behind putting in, installing the product. But not having seen what the performance bond says, and knowing what performance bonds normally say, likely, that insurance company's obligation may end at the time that it's installed. So if you had problems six months or a year from now, or you wanted to update the system and the company wasn't in business, I don't know that that would help you. Now, the long and the short of it is, I don't know that anybody knows whether there's problems or not with Pictometry. It's just, there are these issues and there are these concerns. And so the question becomes, how certain or how guaranteed do you want to be that everything is going to come out the way that you want it to and that everything is going to be indemnified and guaranteed. And like a lot of things in life, I don't know that there is ever going to be a one hundred percent. I think that there's been movement made to get you a lot more provisions than that company normally gives or that anyone else gets. And I think that everybody from the city and the county has done an excellent job of ferreting those things out. But, ultimately, you're going to have to decide whether there's the urgency for this project to proceed now versus waiting to get these issues worked out. Or whether balancing, you know, the benefit to the county and the city, whether the money that's going to be saved by getting this product now rather than waiting is going to offset and it's something you want to move forward with. And Ms. Schymik can add in, I guess, what the Commissioner's position is, I guess, and voice whatever concerns they have or Mr. Tornatta.

Councilmember Lloyd: Maybe she could explain what they passed last night.

Kathryn Schymik: Well, I can defer to our president since he is here, and let him explain the action the Commissioners took and I can supplement if I need to.

Troy Tornatta: Okay, Troy Tornatta, Commissioner President. What we wanted to do last night is to expedite the process. If we thought there was going to be a flyover and that was going to happen between meetings, we wanted to make sure that we were in place. We normally do not like to do that, but we have a comfort level with the County Council and with the city, that we think that there is a possibility, if something could happen, it could happen a little bit quicker if we put some caveats out on the table. We wanted to make sure that, obviously, the legal is handled and we're comfortable with the legal measures. We wanted to make sure that the – help me out here – there were four.

Kathryn Schymik: I think Jeff adequately summarized what the legal concerns are, and the conditions that were built into the motion that was passed last night was that

number one, that the indemnification language be inserted into the contract. That's pretty well been agreed upon with Pictometry. I think that issue was resolved. But, as Jeff was explaining, we also wanted to attach some sort of collateral to that indemnification whether it be a performance bond or something else that the company would offer to back that up. That's the issue that we're still left to kind of figure out and be a little bit creative on and try to decide how we can back that indemnification up. Obviously, Council's approval of appropriating the funds and then also the city's approval of the terms of the contract, since they are going to be financially obligated for a portion of it. So those are the four components that have to fall into place before this contract will be signed. If all four of those come together, then the Commissioners did authorize President Tornatta to sign the agreement whenever it is ready so that it can proceed. If all four of those components do not come into place, we'll kind of be back to square one. We'll either have to come back in front of the Commissioners with some different terms and they'll have to decide if they're comfortable with those or just postpone this until a later date.

Councilmember Bassemier: Mr. Ahlers, your recommendations? Do you think we ought to defer this or what is your recommendation until all the legal issues are cleared up or once we appropriate this?

Jeff Ahlers: Well, I guess there's a couple ways to look at it. I mean, obviously, if you tell me to look at it from a purely legal standpoint, you prefer to have all these things worked out before you move forward. But in the real world, sometimes there's, you know, business concerns or whether there's deadlines with assessments and such that, if you think that there's money to be saved by moving forward with it and understanding that the risks have been minimized as much as they can be, but that there may still be some, you have to balance that. So I don't know if there's a black and white answer for me to give you, Mr. Bassemier, other than one of the things that occur is, I guess, keeping in mind, in terms of the separation of powers is that, you know, one thing that occurs is, that, of course, if you appropriate the money today, then basically you leave into the hands of the County Commissioners, I suppose, as being the safety valve as to whether the matter goes forward. Because, ultimately, they're the ones that have to negotiate the terms of the contract and approve the contract, so just because money is appropriated today does not necessarily mean that it occurs. If the County Commissioners would determine that they do not want to sign the contract or if it does not meet their approval, then the project could stop at that point. But you would be putting that in their hands. Once you appropriate the money, essentially, unless you have conditions upon that appropriation, at that point, it's out of your hands and it would be in the Commissioner's hands. So does that help you or...?

Councilmember Bassemier: A little bit.

Councilman Sutton: There's really no way that we can get a true sense of how long this legal process may go on, when it may be resolved, but I guess maybe the area that I am probably most interested maybe here initially, the discussions that were shared with us in our last meeting was the need to get these aeriels completed before too much foliage begins to develop on the trees and all, so that you can get good shots of all the buildings throughout. So moving this forward was of urgent need to proceed forward. I guess my question is, the aerial photos that will be taken, does Pictometry have the exclusive rights on the use of those photos and their software or is the county the owner of those images that are going to be taken? Because if that is the case, if the county is the owner of those images, exclusively, I mean, if something did happen with Pictometry, they went down the tubes,

conceivably those aerals could be used with any other company that might be out there, another vendor, that can provide the same or similar services that Pictometry is going to handle. So if somebody could answer that question for me.

Troy Tornatta: Well, not to speak out of turn, but, I mean, we're going to own the photos, but we won't necessarily have the equipment –

Kathryn Schymik: What it is, per the terms of the agreement, Pictometry retains ownership of all the images and the information that they gather and obtain. We have a license to use that information. And it's a two year license that we are paying an annual fee for. After that two years, then we have a perpetual license at which point, we only pay, I believe it's a five percent, it's a \$2,600 annual fee to have the software and those upgrades and support provided for the – and this is kind of out of my world – Matt Arvay can speak more to the technical side of that – but basically to have the support and any upgrades that would be required. That's where the concern comes in from our standpoint is, obviously, the patent infringement lawsuit speaks to the way these images are captured and the database that they are then put into. And if there would be an adverse judgement entered against Pictometry, you know, it's hard for us to say and we really don't know what adverse – what effect that might have on our contractual relationship with Pictometry and our, I guess, ongoing ability to continue to use that program or those images. That's, you know, something that we can only, I guess, anticipate or try to prepare for the worst case scenario.

Councilman Sutton: And that's, I appreciate that answer because that's where my concern is, and I guess the other consideration that I'd like for us to maybe give some thought to, is this company the only one that can fly the aerals for the services that we need, either for Pictometry or whomever we may use as a vendor out there, so if we find that there are other options for us that then Vanderburgh County, I guess, then is involved with it, the city of Evansville, are the owners of the images that are taken. Has there been any thought on that?

Matt Arvay: Yeah, on the software question, they have this free viewer that they provide and that's the unlimited licensing. But the key is that it also plugs into some legacy applications, like the OSSI for the public safety group, the Manatron product for the CAMA, assessment, and the billing system, and our GIS software called ESRI, you know, ArcView, (inaudible) type software, we standardized for the past seven, eight years. So if their EFS software went away and then I think that legal is trying to put some safeguards for that in the contract, then maybe we get a copy of that and maybe they put something, I don't know, in an escrow account or something. But we could still use the imagery, hopefully, whatever legal counsel is going to come up with, performance bond or some other creative way of protecting that imagery. But the software, we have other software packages that are critical throughout the enterprise that we use that would still be able to use the imagery today. As far as the various companies, Council asked me last week to do some research and I spent a lot of time trying to find who else does this type of work. And at one time there were four companies: Pictometry, GEOSPAN, Woolpert and a group called MultiVision USA. MultiVision USA is no longer around, they don't exist anymore. Woolpert has a different type of process to create the oblique imagery. It's not exactly as similar as Pictometry and GEOSPAN, but even with that said, they were filled up for the spring and they declined to participate in the process. So it came down for me to Pictometry and GEOSPAN. And some of the differences are, and I went through this, market share: Pictometry has approximately 600 clients, 16 in the state of Indiana. GEOSPAN has 14 aerial clients and some folks will see that

they've done some street level flying and that's different than the flying from the airplanes. Some of the – and some of the big ones in Indiana were Marion County, of course, and Elkhart, some of those groups. The other big thing, again, was the viewing software or the software that they allow. They've already worked with OSSl, they've already worked with Manatron, so they've worked with those groups for the application programming interface that plugs in but allows those software products to show the images. They also have, again, the ArcGIS suite integration, which is our GIS software. GEOSPAN, on the other hand, has an API, and they've included a hundred hours of programming time that they would work with us to interact with those products. So we don't know the unknown cost of what OSSl would cost on their end to help integrate the GEOSPAN product and what Manatron may or may not charge to integrate. The other key differences I found were in the deliverables. Of course, Pictometry has offered the 2004 flight for free, which at that time, and I mentioned this last week, was worth \$112,000. They do the 2009 flight, they also provide building outlines, the vector line work around the buildings. GEOSPAN, they do not have access to the 2004 flight, they would give 2009 and they would provide an additional cost for the building outlines. So there is an additional cost. The cost of the imagery itself: Pictometry was \$80,020, GEOSPAN was \$75,000. But again, no building outlines, and their annual software fee after year one was \$3,600 a year versus \$2,600 a year after year two. So there are some fundamental differences there. Both of them do disaster flyovers, if we have a disaster, federally declared emergency, they will come fly free of charge. And those were the basic differences between the two groups.

Councilman Sutton: Well, just to make sure I'm clear on that, so regarding my question on the technology, the software that's used by the various companies, the aeriels that would potentially be flown could not be – you couldn't transfer them between one company to the other?

Matt Arvay: Pictometry says that the way they process their imagery, that their software only works with their imagery.

Councilman Sutton: These are tech guys, don't they know how to do everything? Make it work.

Councilmember Raben: Well, you're probably getting into copyright infringements there. I mean, if it's in the contract that you don't own them, can't use them beyond their services, I mean, we don't want to get into that either.

President Shetler: Councilman Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: My major question is, if funds are delivered today and the Commissioners do ratify a contract, will this flyover be in time to help with reassessment this particular year? Do we have a flight schedule?

Matt Arvay: They both have given a verbal that if we get this contract signed, you know, this week we work through the issues, that they will both be able to make our deadlines. They have, Pictometry has planes, 16 planes in the area, they're in Louisville and they're working their way north. GEOSPAN has verbally said that if we get everything worked out, they will be able to do it also. They understand that with the foliage that's starting to come out, that they have planes in the area and they know they can get up here and get it done.

Councilmember Goebel: So we would be able to utilize this information this particular

spring, is that correct?

Matt Arvay: They would fly this spring.

Councilmember Goebel: Jonathan?

Jonathan Weaver: Good morning. Jonathan Weaver, Vanderburgh County Assessor. First of all, thank you so much for making a special meeting for this. I don't know, I can't guarantee that that flight is going to happen. I'm just going off everybody else's word, so...

Councilmember Goebel: Well, while you're here, the other question I have, if we do approve and the aerial photos are taken, will that then allow you not to contract out for commercial reassessment and thus save, this would be a giant savings, I think, to the county if we go this route.

Jonathan Weaver: At this point in time, I think this is the best plan for the reassessment and this is all, at this point in time, I plan on spending. And we have statutory deadlines that we need to meet to get into a contract with for a vendor, and we're going to miss those.

Councilmember Raben: Just a few general comments. As far as this whole project, I think it's probably a magnificent project. I mean, I think from the standpoint of public safety it's, you know, there's a lot to this. The problem I see right now as it is today, you know, I don't think we need to be taxiing out the runway because I think the, right now, the fog needs to lift. You know, it's so foggy, there isn't enough information as to whether or not this company is going to be here and I don't want to be faced six months from now hiring a crop duster to finish this. So, Mr. President, I would like to see us wait. If we can get the principals from Pictometry in here next month maybe that would be helpful to get them to answer some of these questions we have, get the county more comfortable, would give the city an opportunity to get a little more comfortable with this. We know we've got their commitment, and what's thirty more days if it means doing the project right and having the right vendor?

Troy Tornatta: Well, thirty more days would mean that we wouldn't get the pictures that we need. I mean, that's the difficulty with the process. Now I did ask because I heard that at some point we might have reassessment delayed one year because of the problems that other people are having throughout the state. But they haven't committed to that yet. And without that commitment, because I am with you, I would rather see this process moved from the 11<sup>th</sup> hour to another calendar. However, at this time, we have no commitment the reassessment is going to be moved. If reassessment is not moved, then we have to do it this year, we're taking a big tool out of our arsenal and the only thing I'll say is, you know, we know it's timing, we think it's poor timing on the Commissioners' side. I know it's bad timing on the Council's side, no time is a good time. But we did do a process like this with the road salt. There was a \$100,000 expenditure on road salt, the Commissioners did not take advantage of that money and it's still sitting in that area because at the time it was \$145 a ton, and we thought that that was not in the best interest, we went back and saw that we were going to have an adequate amount of salt if there was an event to come out and we held back from buying. Now there's a contract out that we can get that salt at a lesser rate. So there is \$100,000 identified in just that one line item that we've done this process already. We feel that we've got provisions and we would encourage this body to put provisions into any type of motion that was

made to approve money for this project. If we have all our ducks in a row except your provisions, except the Commissioner's provisions, the city would have to be onboard to do this because that's a Commissioner's provision, then we could, at a moment's notice, be able to cut this deal and get a plane up in the air before the foliage gets on the trees.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, can I make one recommendation, Mr. President?

President Shetler: Yes.

Councilmember Raben: You know, in this account today is \$110,000 that was budgeted last year. I mean, if the Commissioners want to move forward with this and take the onus for whether things go right or not, we don't have to do anything today. We can zero the request and they can spend it from the existing funds within the line item.

Jonathan Weaver: Can I interject and say we have a contract with a commercial/industrial tender, if you want to so speak, that we're paying periodic payments, that's what that \$110,000 is for, to disburse throughout the year.

President Shetler: Did I misunderstand the Commissioner's meeting last night or the newspaper yesterday?

Jonathan Weaver: We hire out annual trending for commercial and industrial properties and that's what the current contract did. That's what that line item is for this year.

Councilmember Raben: What's the amount of that contract?

Jonathan Weaver: 98 or 96,000.

President Shetler: So the idea was that you would spend another \$250,000 on top of that \$100,000 if you don't get this?

Jonathan Weaver: In our research that we've done throughout the state, looking back at the 2002 reassessment, we have seen counties spend anywhere from 450,000 to \$10,000,000 on reassessment. There's an article in the Tippecanoe County paper –

President Shetler: I'm really kind of concerned about Vanderburgh County and what your intent of the \$250,000 was.

Jonathan Weaver: I'm telling you what other counties are spending. They're spending a lot of money. I'm trying to get 1/8 of what's in that reassessment fund right now to get this aerial photography, and I feel that's sufficient enough to complete this reassessment successfully and accurately. That comment that if I can't get this photography, yeah, I may need additional service and contracting out the commercial/industrial end of the reassessment. But we have a statutory deadline, again, in the contract there of April 15<sup>th</sup> and we haven't bid it out and we haven't gone through those channels, so the possibility of getting into a contract for the reassessment for commercial/industrial purposes is pretty slim. So this is why I'm pushing for this photography.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, I thought you had, okay two different contracts.



Jonathan Weaver: Trending and the reassessment, so we're in the contract for the annual trending, the reassessment is a different thing.

President Shetler: I would like to have a real clear picture that if we're going to enter into this \$85,000, that we are not going to be seeing a request coming forward to this Council for another \$250,000 for commercial and industrial reassessment being done by a third party out there.

Jonathan Weaver: Well, if you can guarantee me that this is approved today, I can make that happen.

President Shetler: So, you're saying that if this money is approved, and this program is online, we will not need to go with any outside contractors for the commercial and industrial reassessment?

Jonathan Weaver: And that was the original goal. I'm just laying –

President Shetler: I mean, that's what you're saying. I just want to make that clear.

Jonathan Weaver: I'm laying out all the options for you that are – it was the picture or, you know, it was residential in-house, and then possibly contracting out the commercial and industrial reassessment part. So I don't want to give you any surprises later.

President Shetler: That's what I'm trying to avoid. So you are saying you will not be back asking or requesting an additional...

Jonathan Weaver: We have a deadline of April 15<sup>th</sup> again to contract with a vendor and that's not going to happen by April 15<sup>th</sup>.

President Shetler: I feel like I'm getting an opaque answer and I'm looking for something that's oblique, that's crystal clear here.

Kathryn Schymik: We need to kind of qualify all this by the fact that this is only one of the components that needs to come into place with this contract because, obviously, all the terms and provisions have not been worked out yet, as we discussed earlier. We've got some of these legal issues that we're still trying to work through. It's hopeful that we'll be able to resolve those, I think we've resolved one but there's the one outstanding being how we're going to back up that indemnification. You know, are they going to be able to get bonded if that's the route we go? Is there some other collateral they're going to be able to offer? So I think that if all the ducks fall in a row, maybe Mr. Weaver feels confident that this will provide him with what he needs for reassessment, but, you know, the appropriation is only one of those components and I just want to kind of qualify that for the Commissioners to protect them by saying that if we can't work out the terms of the contract, then in that event Mr. Weaver may be back in front of you because we weren't able to enter the contract, they weren't able to take the aerial photos, and he's got to go a different route with the reassessment.

President Shetler: Okay, I'll rephrase my question. If we approve this today, and if all the conditions are met, and we're able to get the flyover accomplished this spring before there's any obstructions of foliage, then can we expect that you will not come back before this Council to request \$250,000 or any amount of money for commercial/industrial reassessment?

Jonathan Weaver: I can make that happen.

President Shetler: So that is a yes?

Jonathan Weaver: Yes.

President Shetler: Okay, thank you. Yes, Councilman Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: I think Mrs. Schymik had indicated that the lawsuit, GEOSPAN was suing Pictometry and that was, didn't you say that trial was coming up in 2010?

Kathryn Schymik: That trial is tentatively set. It's pending in the district court of Minnesota with a tentative trial date of May 2010. So, obviously, a settlement could occur in the interim but it's still a ways out and, again, it's not going to affect immediate delivery of the, under the contract, the flyover will take place, the pictures will be delivered. I think the concerns from a legal standpoint is just the ongoing ability to use what we've been provided and receive the support that we need to – you know, after we've made that investment.

Councilmember Lloyd: So really, if we would approve that, this thing would be pretty far down the road before anything would ever happen legally in that regard?

Kathryn Schymik: Right. And again, you know, as we tend to do as lawyers, we look at worst case scenarios and try to, you know, plan for that. It could be that we are never impacted by the outcome of that lawsuit or it could be a favorable ruling for Pictometry. But the fact that that is looming out there, it does kind of speak to the basis of what the contract is that we're considering. We want to just make sure that we build in some protection so that even if the worst case scenario does happen, the county is not impacted.

Councilmember Lloyd: Okay, one other question. I know Commissioner Tornatta had indicated about the possibility of the delay in reassessment, Senate Bill 561 passed the Senate 48-0, there would be a one year delay on the reassessment state-wide. I was wondering if either one of you, how would that impact what we're doing here? I mean, would it be a mistake to go into this if the reassessment was delayed for a year?

Jonathan Weaver: This is the first I'm hearing about that vote, so thanks for the update. You know, that's good news for all of us, I guess. That does create less stress and less urgency, so thanks for the –

Councilmember Lloyd: It has to pass the House. We don't know that it will do that, but one side passed it overwhelmingly. But, I mean, we don't know and won't know until the end of April what the result is.

Troy Tornatta: The question is probably better, and I'll ask you the question, do you think that if we were to do this today knowing that our reassessment is back a year, is that going to, I mean, is this still going to be a positive tool to use for the future or do you feel like if it's pushed back a year, there are better negotiation terms and we could see what's going on. I mean, what do you see for doing your job? And keep in mind, the one thing I want to keep clear is, the Commissioners feel like, as an officeholder, Mr. Weaver should bring these things to us – we're not fighting for Mr. Weaver, we're fighting to make sure that the contract is right. So that's our place

here at this table. And just as a clarification, Mr. Raben, we feel like we want to make the whole contract appropriation. In talking to Mr. Fluty, and I don't know if he talked to you, but we feel that we need to make that entire appropriation and then any monies that we receive back, just goes back into the fund. But we feel we need to, because of the contract, we need to have all those dollars in place.

President Shetler: I actually have one more question.

Councilmember Raben: Well, I don't know that you got your answer yet.

Jonathan Weaver: In terms of, yeah, there's so many other departments that we talked about that this is going to help out, and you have the support of many professional organizations in the community, the realtors, the Southwestern Indiana Builders Association –

President Shetler: Excuse me, Mr. Weaver –

Jonathan Weaver: So I don't know if I'm answering your questions correctly –

President Shetler: Speak into your microphone.

Jonathan Weaver: Public safety, so, I mean, there's a lot of people.

Troy Tornatta: Will it help you do your job?

Jonathan Weaver: It's going to be great in the future, yes.

President Shetler: Yes, Councilman Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Just a comment based on the last few minutes here. Jonathan, as far as Commissioner Tornatta's question that he asked a few minutes ago, if the reassessment is delayed another year, I mean, you don't want to say it would be totally obsolete, but you are going to have photos out there that aren't correct when you do your next reassessment because, you know, properties come and go. Industrial/commercial properties are torn down, new ones are developed that aren't going to be part of what you're looking at if it is delayed a year from now.

Jonathan Weaver: I don't know if I get what you're saying.

President Shetler: He's saying that, basically, that we're dealing with a certain amount of aged data and it's going to be sitting there on the shelf for nine to twelve months and you're going to be working off of some changes within our community. And to have an accurate assessment, shouldn't we have the most up to date data that's available to us, rather than using stale, outdated stuff?

Councilmember Raben: If reassessment is delayed for a year, you're not going to have the photos of anything built between now and then. I mean, commercial properties, much less, anything that's demo'ed.

Jonathan Weaver: At the same time, we want to get a head start on the reassessment, too. We don't want to be starting July 1<sup>st</sup>. You know, we want to get – we want to hit the ground running. We want to –

Councilmember Raben: But if it's delayed a year are you going to start immediately,

even though it's delayed?

Jonathan Weaver: With 80,000 parcels, if we were to physically visit every single one of those parcels, with the current staff I have, it would take five years. So and what we're trying to incorporate along with some other counties across the state is called a rolling reassessment. Pick 20,000 parcels a year and do those and so we're up to date on all of them, so we don't have to do them all at once. So there's benefits to starting early. That's what we've been doing with the 12,000 appeals that we received the last two years.

Councilmember Goebel: It's very likely this is going to be delayed for a year by the action of the Senate because that would be a bi-partisan vote, I would think, if it's unanimous. So the House will probably follow suit. However, are there more flyovers according to the contract, one in the fall and one next spring as well? Or is it just a one-shot deal right away?

Jonathan Weaver: They dictate their flight plan based on the foliage. So if we miss it because of the foliage on the leaves, their next flight schedule, I assume, is November, December, January, in that time frame, so the essence of this was, you know, if we did the flight today, we get the data the end of July, which gets it to us relatively on time or reasonably, and taking the flight in December, a year from now, we'd probably get it back in March of next year is when we would get that data. Which, if the dates for the reassessment stick, you know, it's a little later than I had hoped. If it's changed, like it may be, you know, we'll be right on schedule.

Councilmember Goebel: We will know for sure by April 29 if reassessment is delayed a year. Will that be too late?

Troy Tornatta: Yeah. Well, the leaves are going to be on the trees.

Councilmember Goebel: But, I mean, if you had the money in place to begin the Pictometry by April 29, I guess the foliage –

Troy Tornatta: Probably still be too late. And the only thing, and I don't know this necessarily, what's done in the House, but if the House did not see that legislation, then they have to go in conference committee and kind of hash that out, and just because the Senate does something, doesn't mean the House is going to do it. And may be contrary to what they're doing. So I'm just saying, those are a lot of, to me, bigger what if's than maybe finding out if we can work out some of these other issues and just put it out on the table. And obviously, as I've tried to do at all times, call all the interested parties to tell them of a decision that's going to be made, so as to not leave anybody out, if that would be the measure.

Councilmember Goebel: The example you gave on the salt and holding up on purchasing at a higher price, I think, I commend you for that and you operated in the best interests of the county. And I think if that money is in place, your promise is, right now, you're not going to use that money unless all of these provisions are satisfiable to you and to the city as well.

Troy Tornatta: Right, and my promise is only to do what is right contractually for the county, to hire these individual, Pictometry, GEOSPAN, is of no meaning to me. As long as he feels that it's the right company, I just need to protect the contract through our legal counsel, and both legal counsels have been doing an outstanding job to come down to terms.

President Shetler: Alright, thank you. I have one question yet for Matt that I'd like to – it's a lingering question that just keeps coming back in my mind, back and forth here. And that is this whole idea on Google and I've had a couple of realtors that discussed this with me recently and they use it a lot and I guess it's part of their MLS contract or something that they're able to use and stuff. Can you tell me what the difference, because other than \$85,000, tell me what the difference between Google and what this Pictometry or the, I guess, what is it, the oblique imagery will give us?

Matt Arvay: My understanding is, that you have a top-down ortho photography picture. That's the top-down view. On Google Earth, they use that top-down view and then you, when you zoom in, you kind of tilt that. And depending on the angle you're zooming in, you get a better quality versus maybe the angle, that one that you saw was a pretty poor --

**(Tape changed)**

– it's a consistent angle throughout the county and then you see the results and the differences. That's basically what you've got. You've got a modern picture and a clear picture from an angle that you can then rotate around a property 360 degrees. That's in essence, in a nutshell, what's the difference.

President Shetler: Alright. I have a little bit of a problem with these pictures because this is what was shown last time, number one, it's commercial from Pictometry, the company who took pictures and took something off of Google that was four years old, and took something of theirs that was somewhat new. So I have a problem using this as any kind of –

Matt Arvay: I brought them because I presented them last time and –

President Shetler: – evidence. That's why I really need to know, like the technical difference of it, and what they used here was like four years old technology. As you know better than I, technology improves daily –

Matt Arvay: That's what you see. What I'm saying is –

President Shetler: – that hasn't improved any, and Google has not improved it though?

Matt Arvay: What's on Google is a 2004 flight. They didn't go to Google and pick a 2004 out there. And I went back and I had staff zoom in. And again, its about how the angle that you go in at Google Earth and how far you tilt that image as far as quality. I don't, in my honest opinion, I don't think there was any ill intent there, it just, you zoom in, you do a screen capture, you print the thing out. I did put some sticky notes on there to kind of help because there was some question on was it really Evansville and, you know, to try to help identify a few buildings.

President Shetler: Alright, thank you.

Councilmember Raben: We probably need to move on with this but I had one last question. If we appropriate these funds today, you said the contract that you actually are paying out of that line today is like 96 or 98,000? Is that right, Jonathan? So there is probably 10 or \$12,000 in there that, I mean, we can probably reduce this amount by that and use what surplus is going to be in that line if we'd like.

Jonathan Weaver: I hate to come before you though in a month or two and say, you know, we need \$20,000 for the installment payment to the contractor if we're using that money in the current line item for this, if I understand you correctly. Is that what you're saying?

Councilmember Raben: No, your trending contract you said was 96 or 98,000. There is 110 in that account, I mean, that's what you're going to need for trending, right, what the contract is for?

Jonathan Weaver: Yes.

Councilmember Raben: So the remark I made was, we could reduce this amount, this 85 by probably \$10,000 and you'd still have ample monies in the fund to cover both contracts.

Matt Arvay: Jim, the contract is actually \$125,307.85. It's split up over two years. The first year's costs are \$85,297.85, but the total contractual cost is the \$125,307.85, so I think in order to, I guess, move forward with one of the four requirements, you'd really need the \$125,307.85 appropriated, even though it would be paid over two years because that's what the contract states.

Councilmember Raben: The request is for \$85,893. We can't go beyond that today.

President Shetler: Right, because the request is for 86, which is for this year. I think the point that they're trying to make is that there is a balance projected of \$12,000 approximately in that account for the end of the year and we could take that 12,000, subtract it off the 86 and change or 85 and change, and come up about a 74 or 75,000 new money appropriation as opposed to the 86.

Jonathan Weaver: Sounds like a plan.

President Shetler: Councilman Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Okay, you know, none of us know what the legislature is going to do. I know, and Mr. Weaver may know more than me, a lot of the counties are behind on their assessments, and that's why the legislature is looking at that one year delay. The flyover would be done before April 30<sup>th</sup>, is that correct?

Jonathan Weaver: I don't have a – I've never heard of a full commitment date, that's what I'm hearing from just the conversations that we're having, so you know, the question is, is that too late? If you look at the trees right now, they're already starting to bud.

Councilmember Lloyd: I think Councilman Goebel was maybe on this track, if we knew by April 30<sup>th</sup> that they were going to have a one year delay, could some of the flyovers be done later? That's my question?

Matt Arvay: My understanding is that the foliage would be out, it may even be out, you know, the next few weeks. You're already starting to see it, you know, it all depends on the weather, the sunlight, all those types of factors in there, so I believe April 29<sup>th</sup> would probably be too late for a quality picture.

President Shetler: Okay, one other request that I'd like to make and that is, is it possible that we could write in the contract here that we actually own those images

or do you feel like that might be out of the question? And again, I don't know if that's going to help us if they would lose the lawsuit anyway.

Kathryn Schymik: Mr. Arvay and I were actually just talking about that, some other possibilities for kind of backing up what this indemnification provision is going to be. And obviously what we want to do is protect the investment that the county and city have made into this program. So those are some things that we will definitely look into. I mean, per the terms of contract right now, they do own the images, we just have a license for them. It is a perpetual license, once the initial two year period ends, that's the way the contract they presented to us was set up. But we can go back and readdress that and make sure that we are not going to have any ownership issues with the images going forward. But the contract that the county has been asked to sign is for the full amount of \$120,000. It's my understanding – or whatever the full amount – \$125,000. It was my understanding from discussing it with Bill Fluty yesterday that we really needed to appropriate that entire amount because that was the amount that the county is going to contract for and be obligated to immediately upon signing. And if only half of the funds are appropriated, you know, we're obligated to the full amount. So –

Councilmember Raben: We can't go beyond what's advertised.

President Shetler: Yeah, that's –

Kathryn Schymik: Okay.

Councilmember Raben: – by statute.

Kathryn Schymik: Right, I wasn't aware of what the request made was, I just knew what the contract amount was.

Councilmember Goebel: If the city kicks in \$40,000, that would make it 125, is that not correct?

Matt Arvay: If they were going to pay their whole share in one year, but that was an anticipated thing, the 20 and 20 because it's really a two year contract.

Councilmember Goebel: I understand, but I think Mr. Tornatta alluded that unless the city kicks in, then we're not going to go with it anyway.

Matt Arvay: Well, they're going to kick in, so yes, I guess they would appropriate 40,000 to be spent over two years.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, do you understand?

Kathryn Schymik: I do understand that legal issue.

Councilmember Raben: We can't exceed what's advertised. But I guess the question is on the trending side, have we signed the new contract on that because we may be okay anyway. We can come back in at a later date and make an additional appropriation to cover that side of it?

Jonathan Weaver: As far as I know, we asked for that money in August, so –

President Shetler: But have you obligated that money because – I mean, --

Jonathan Weaver: As far as I know, yeah, I –

Councilmember Raben: There is a contract signed on that? Do you know?

Jonathan Weaver: Yeah, yes.

President Shetler: Okay, because we made this pretty clear last time that whatever amount of money you needed for the contract, if we advertised that, that's all we could do and you came back and made this request for this specific amount.

Jonathan Weaver: Well, it was the first year amount. So I was unaware that the 125 was due immediately, so...

Councilmember Raben: You see where we're going with this, you would be okay for right now, if you don't have another contract signed obligating that 98. If you haven't actually, officially signed that contract yet, we can make this all work out.

Kathryn Schymik: And the 125 is not due immediately, it's due over a two year period, but when we sign the contract, we're obligating the county to, you know, to make those payments over that two year period. And I think that's maybe where the confusion came in. Yes, you're only going to pay half of it in year one, but you have already signed and obligated the county to pay year two, once the contract is executed.

President Shetler: And for the city to kind of bail us out of that predicament that we found ourselves in at the moment, they would have to appropriate and go through the City Council and advertise, which would be two or three weeks down the road as well. So that isn't a bailout, either.

Councilmember Raben: That still doesn't fix it because the money then has to be reappropriated. I mean, it can be transferred into this fund, but we still have to make an additional appropriation.

Councilman Sutton: Well, you could just put it on the April 1<sup>st</sup> agenda at the full amount that you need.

Troy Tornatta: Or the additional amount.

Councilman Sutton: Yeah, the additional amount.

Troy Tornatta: There's probably –

Councilmember Raben: You can probably work that out in the contract. It's year one, year two.

Troy Tornatta: Yeah. And I know we've done that in the past where we've had yearly contracts where we have not had the full amount.

Councilmember Raben: We do it with leases.

Troy Tornatta: That's exactly right. So, I think that that can all be worked out in the contract and make it work if we can come to terms on just getting dollars in the pot.

President Shetler: Okay, I'm going to go back real quickly to us owning the images.



If, in fact, they lose the lawsuit, though, and it's based upon infringing on their patent rights of how they captured those pictures, then that property would no longer have been the right for them to have sold it to us to begin with, so would we then lose it?

Kathryn Schymik: Well, I mean, I guess there's always that possibility. The complaint that they filed, they asked for monetary damages and they asked for injunctive relief that would prevent Pictometry from continuing to sell the images that they capture pursuant to the method that's under the patent. We're not under jurisdiction of the court where that suit is pending. It's the district court of Minnesota and I would be surprised if a court would step in and interfere with a contract that we, as a third party, in good faith entered into with Pictometry. That being said, we do have knowledge of this pending lawsuit and, you know, I guess if they wanted to file a claim against the county for continuing infringing activity because we obtained and used images that weren't lawful because they violated the patent. I mean, you know, they could always go that route. Again, this is all very speculative and to predict what any outcome might be, you know, we really can't do that. But is that a possibility that GEOSPAN might come back and tell the county that we can no longer use those images and seek an injunction against us for the use? Absolutely, that's a possibility.

President Shetler: We have a question on the floor, motion and do we want to summarize this? Does anybody have any questions about what we're –

Councilmember Bassemier: One last thing and then let's call for a vote, if I could. Of course, I'm in favor of it, but I'm hearing a lot of ifs. I'm hearing promises and these documents are going to be signed, there's legal issues and I don't know if we ought to defer this until April 1<sup>st</sup> until we see more things in writing. Like I said, I'm hearing a lot of ifs, a lot of promises. Are we going to have a reassessment coming up? So maybe we ought to defer this until the 1<sup>st</sup>. If not, I'm ready for a vote.

Jeff Ahlers: If I could, perhaps, Mr. Shetler, so that maybe to recap, come back to the beginning, where we are. Currently pending is a motion that was made and seconded to approve those funds. Currently there is no conditions on that motion. If I could summarize maybe a lot of the things that I've heard here, some of the conditions that I've heard some of you talk about and I think that you would need to amend your motions if you're going to make these conditions, but I do think that any contract, as usual, if it's, you know, more than a year, needs to specifically state in there that it is subject to annual appropriation by Council and the vendor will just have to accept that because we do that in all leases or contracts where there's an ongoing obligation, that it's subject to annual appropriation so that we're not on the hook beyond this year and that's just a fact they'll have to, you know, I think they should have to live with that because that's the way we do things and it's the law. I think that the other condition that's been talked about is that there be a full and complete indemnity for any and all claims and liabilities that would arise from us contracting with them or accepting their services and goods, and that that indemnity and the performance needs to be backed up by some sort of collateral, whether it's a performance bond from an insurance company that will continue for as long as we're using this product in the foreseeable future or whether it's by escrowed funds or however the Commissioner's legal counsel sees appropriate to secure that. But, as we know, if a company goes out of business or is insolvent, the indemnity wouldn't be worth anything unless it's secured by some sort of collateral or insurance bond, and that I hear everybody saying they want that. There's some further contracting and licensing issues that need to be resolved to the satisfaction of the Commissioner's legal counsel and to the Commissioners including some of these

issues concerning licensing. I hear some of the Councilmembers, perhaps maybe all of you, on this issue that we should own the images, which I think is, from a legal standpoint, I think is a good thing. You're paying for them, why shouldn't you own them? And the same thing comes up a lot of times in negotiations with architects, you know, who owns the plans. And I guess my position always is, if you paid for them, you know, you should own them and that that would give you some rights if at some point you'd need to use them for other, you know, that you'd always have to get permission from them. And so, I would suggest that that be included as a condition as well. I guess one of the things I'm a little unclear about, is the city going to approve the contract and sign it as well? I mean, I guess it occurs to me, if there is any ongoing obligation, it seems to me that the city ought to be a signatory so that they're also comfortable with the contract and in agreement, so that there isn't a situation where we've got this joint venture, so to speak, and that at some point the city decides we don't want to be a part of it anymore, where does that leave us. So that, perhaps there ought to be some obligation there as well as the city ought to be comfortable with the terms as well, since their legal counsel has gone over that. And, I don't know if that left anything out or not, but I guess that would be my summary of what I heard collectively from the Council, and I guess the question becomes whether you want to make those as conditions to your appropriation. If you do, you'll need to amend it, otherwise, as it's stated, there's just an appropriation of money and then you would be leaving it up to the County Commissioners to resolve any terms or conditions, or make the decision as to whether to go ahead and sign the contract.

President Shetler: Alright, do I have any questions?

Councilman Sutton: There was a motion on the floor, I don't know if anyone wanted to amend their motion to include some of those caveats to ensure that some of these questions are addressed before proceeding forward with what we've got, is really what the question is.

Councilmember Raben: And what we can do there is, memo or – I mean, there is a lot there, but I don't know if that can be as an addendum to the vote that we'll insert a list of concerns that would be forwarded to the Commissioners as well as the city. We also need to amend the motion if we're going to use some of the existing funds within that line, and I would recommend that we set it in at 74,000. But, Jeff, how do we do that? I mean, if we wanted to make sure the language is all intact?

Jeff Ahlers: Well, I guess there's several ways to do it, one of which, obviously, if you agree to withdraw the motion to set in the new amount, when you do that, I guess the question becomes whether or not the appropriation – I mean, I guess in some respects you either have to make an appropriation or you don't. I guess the question becomes whether you attach conditions that you're telling the County Commissioners that you're not to spend this money unless these are satisfied. Ultimately, that money needs to be appropriated if that's what you're going to do and it's in the account. I suppose your – I mean, I guess what you would have to resort to is that if the Commissioners did not comply with the conditions that you're putting on, I guess you can take the money from them elsewhere or I guess that would be – but, I mean, once the money is appropriated, technically, then it goes to the executive body to negotiate those terms.

Councilmember Raben: Let me do this, I'm going to amend the motion, well, you –

Councilmember Bassemier: I'll rescind my motion.

Councilmember Raben: I only seconded, I didn't make the motion. So the motion needs to be for \$74,000. And it ought –

President Shetler: Okay, let's do this, why don't we withdraw or I would ask, okay, we've got Councilman Bassemier asked to withdraw –

Councilmember Raben: And I withdraw my second.

President Shetler: Okay, so we have no motion on the floor. So now we are clear.

Councilmember Raben: I would like to make a motion that we approve account 2490-1090-3540 in the amount of \$74,000. And with that motion, I would like, and we can simply, we'll have this on record, that since we can't really do what you're stating, you can't attach a bunch of conditions with every appropriation, that the County Commissioners hear and address our concerns before signing the contract with Pictometry. And you might say that on the record, and then that takes care of, I think, what everybody – that might satisfy everybody. Is that correct?

President Shetler: Yes, because the point is that, once we appropriate the money, we cannot put conditions on that appropriation as such. The only thing – it's appropriated, \$74,000. The only thing we can do is advise the Commissioners to look for these certain points that we are concerned about.

Troy Tornatta: I am the one that would sign that document as voted last night, so I will address any concerns that you have with our counsel and have those concerns stated in the contract, and that contract will then be in front of Counselor Ahlers and then we'll pass, either get in contact with you or we'll pass it on to all the members to let them know that it's at a place and that we're ready to sign.

Councilman Sutton: Just so that we're really clear. I mean, there was about four different conditions that Mr. Ahlers shared with us. If you could prepare those in some kind of written form without too much jargon or legalese with it so that we can all understand what it's saying, but if you could prepare those for all of us and then if you could get those to the Commissioners' counsel and then to the Commissioners as well, that would be extremely helpful for us. Can you do that for us?

Jeff Ahlers: I can do that or what I was going to suggest is, I don't know what time or when the minutes can be done and they'll be in writing or if you want it done separately.

Councilmember Sutton: Well, I'd like it separate, yeah.

Councilmember Raben: Yeah, just as a recap, basically.

Troy Tornatta: Yeah, and we'll take that checklist and use it with our checklist.

Matt Arvay: Council President, I just want to make mention, Mr. Ahlers said about the city/county signing the contract. And again, city legal is working with county legal and if they get a mutual contract that everyone is happy with, the city would sign the contract. It would be a joint contract and we've had many joint contracts over the years where both parties were required to sign for it to be a valid contract.

President Shetler: Right. Thank you. Any other questions? Anything that needs to be cleared up on the motion? You moved, I think, didn't you?

Councilmember Raben: I made the motion.

Councilmember Lloyd: Second.

President Shetler: Okay, any other questions? Roll call please. And the motion is for \$74,000 even. Alright, roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being six ayes and no nays, the motion carries for \$74,000.

COUNTY ASSESSOR		REQUESTED	APPROVED
2490-1090-3540	Maintenance Contract	85,893.00	74,000.00
Total		85,893.00	74,000.00

**(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)**

President Shetler: Thank you. Next, we'll move into our next regularly scheduled meeting of the Personnel & Finance.

Councilmember Lloyd: Do we need to adjourn this?

President Shetler: I'm sorry, yes.

Councilmember Lloyd: Motion to adjourn.

President Shetler: Thank you. Meeting adjourned. And then we'll move on to the Personnel & Finance committee meeting.

**(There being no further business to come before the Council, the meeting was adjourned at 9:37 a.m.)**

VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL

\_\_\_\_\_  
President Tom Shetler, Jr.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Vice President Joe Kiefer

\_\_\_\_\_  
Councilmember Jim Raben

\_\_\_\_\_  
Councilmember Mike Goebel

\_\_\_\_\_  
Councilmember Russell Lloyd, Jr.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Councilmember Ed Bassemier

\_\_\_\_\_  
Councilmember Royce Sutton

Recorded and transcribed by Teri Lukeman.

**VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL  
MINUTES  
APRIL 1, 2009**

The Vanderburgh County Council met in session this 1<sup>st</sup> day of April, 2009 in room 301 of the Civic Center Complex. The meeting was called to order at 8:30 a.m. by County Council President Tom Shetler, Jr.

President Shetler: Good morning. It's April the 1<sup>st</sup>. I don't know if that's appropriate or not, but it is April the 1<sup>st</sup> and we welcome everybody to the County Council meeting this morning. If we could have the attendance roll call first, please.

COUNCILMEMBER	PRESENT	ABSENT
Councilmember Sutton	X*	
Councilmember Bassemier	X	
Councilmember Lloyd	X	
Councilmember Goebel	X	
Councilmember Raben	X	
Councilmember Kiefer	X	
President Shetler	X	

\*Arrived just after roll called.

President Shetler: There being six present and one absent, we have a quorum. Next, I'd like to ask Councilman Lloyd to please lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance, please. I would like to make note that Councilman Sutton has entered the room and so we have all seven present.

(Pledge of Allegiance was given)

<div>APPROVAL OF MINUTES MARCH 4, 2009 REGULAR MEETING MARCH 18, 2009 SPECIAL MEETING</div>
---

President Shetler: Next is a motion for approval of the minutes of the regular meeting of March the 4<sup>th</sup> and the special meeting that was done on March the 18<sup>th</sup>.

Councilmember Lloyd: Motion to approve.

President Shetler: We have a motion. And a second?

Councilmember Raben: Second.

President Shetler: Any questions? Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being seven ayes and no nays, the motion carries for approval of the minutes for both meetings.

**(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)**

<b>APPROPRIATION ORDINANCE</b>
--------------------------------

**AUDITOR**

President Shetler: Appropriation Ordinance, Councilman Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Okay, thank you, Mr. President. First on the agenda today under County Auditor, 1020-3530 Contractual Services, I move that that be set in at zero and we'll pick that item up later in the agenda.

Councilman Sutton: Second.

President Shetler: Its been moved and seconded. Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Aye. Seven ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

AUDITOR		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1020-3530	Contractual Services	15,000.00	0.00
Total		15,000.00	0.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

**PROSECUTOR**  
**PROSECUTOR IV-D**

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Mr. President, next I'm going to – we'll take Prosecutor and Prosecutor IV-D together. We have under Prosecutor 1080-1030-1080, 1080-1190-1080, 1080-1900, and 1080-1910; under IV-D, 1081-1160-1081, 1081-1900 and 1081-1910. I would like some discussion on this. I'm going to move to approve to get it on the floor.

Councilmember Lloyd: Second.

President Shetler: Its been moved and seconded. Questions?

Councilmember Raben: Just a brief comment. During challenging times like this, my gut says delay these until budgets which is, for sure, the more appropriate time to look at increasing individuals pay and it was even suggested by Councilman Goebel yesterday that we do so. I tend to agree with that, but I guess its been brought to my attention a few of these were requested several months ago: one going back as far as June or July, so I stick with my motion to approve this because of that condition. But I do think that from this date forward, we need to screw any requests down and postpone everything until August.

Councilmember Bassemier: Mr. President?

President Shetler: Yes, Councilman Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: This was approved by the twelve member Job Study Committee? Okay, thanks.

President Shetler: Alright, other comments, questions? Yes, Councilman Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: I know we had had some emailed discussions on this and as president of the Personnel Administration, I mean, I would agree that some of these were held over and I think these need to be approved, but I would agree that we should hold off on any further personnel committee meetings until after budget hearings. And that's probably a better time to look at some of these.

President Shetler: Alright, thank you. Councilman Goebel?



Councilmember Goebel: So the Job Study probably won't consider any other cases until after budget, is that –

Councilmember Lloyd: That would be my intent.

Councilmember Goebel: I do think that we should be across the board on it. There is no doubt there is merit and these are probably well deserved. But there may be others that come forward with requests, and I think we should probably treat them all the same.

President Shetler: Councilman Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: I'm glad that, Councilman Goebel, you brought this up about maybe holding off on this, because I know a lot of private sector companies are giving wage freezes or some companies are even taking pay cuts. I'm, personally, uncomfortable giving out pay increases when we're in this type of economy and would favor holding off until the budget time.

President Shetler: I think, and I guess, yes, it is a pay increase, but in the Prosecutor's office, for example, in those situations, I believe what we were talking about are people who were just coming underneath the gun of actually changing positions within the department, and so it wasn't – they're actually being compensated for work, an increased workload or responsibilities within that department that they had actually started as much as nine months ago, I think, in one case. So, yes, it's a pay increase, but it's also a different job than what they had done before. So that's why I think the Job Study decided that it deserved to be looked at and also, too, basically, reviewed it and said it was okay. Now I can't speak specifically, but the Judge is here and perhaps he can speak to the other later, on that position there. But I know in those positions there, we were dealing with people who were actually working with additional responsibilities and workload, and that's why the increase. So it wasn't like they simply got a five percent or ten percent wage increase because they continued to do the same thing they had always done. Councilman Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: I'd like to reiterate, I think there is definite merit, I'm just worried about the times right now and also other cases where we may be burdened with trying to handle, so I think it would be a fair approach to not consider until budget time, across the board.

Councilman Sutton: There was a question that arose last month kind of concerning these Job Study issues around the period when it was decided when no additional Job Study requests were going to be considered, and so the Job Study didn't meet for a while as the whole process is being reworked. One, do we know when that is going to be completed?

President Shetler: Mr. Deisher could not be here today. He is planning to come at the end of April to give us an update on where he is on that. The last conversation that I had with him was that things were on schedule, in fact, I think, a bit ahead of schedule, and that he fully expected I think to start on the Sheriff's department. Has he begun that?

Eric Williams: We're exchanging information.

President Shetler: Right. Okay, so I knew he was in the process of beginning that. And I think the Sheriff may have been about the last of the groupings that he had to

get involved in. So I think it's about ready to wrap up and the impression that I – I think that we had been told that the deadline on it would be somewhere in the neighborhood of September around budget time, and I think he feels as if he's going to easily meet that deadline, if not sooner.

Councilman Sutton: And I guess my second question is, do we know for sure if these were the only requests received before this moratorium on Job Study requests? Are these the only ones? I mean, I know the Clerk, at one point in time had some requests and I think there were some discussions about some requests in the Treasurer's office. Do we know if these are the only ones that were received prior to that time when no other requests were going to be –

President Shetler: Yes, Mrs. Deig?

Sandie Deig: The Treasurer's office was completed over a year ago. Its been completed. Maybe she didn't agree with everything, but it was completed. Then the other one –

Councilmember Lloyd: Turn your microphone on.

Sandie Deig: But the rest of them had all been processed before the deadline. They have been received.

Councilman Sutton: And all these that were being considered here were received before that deadline?

Sandie Deig: As far as I know.

Councilmember Raben: Everything that had been requested up until the last Job Study meeting has been heard, right?

Councilmember Lloyd: The Job Study heard four and approved three, I mean, as of January 1, that was the only ones that I saw. So there's none in the tank right now.

President Shetler: Alright, any other questions? Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: I concur with Councilman Goebel on some of his concerns and thoughts and I'm going to vote no on this.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: While I think these people are all deserved of a raise, I think with this economic climate, we should wait until the budget, so I vote no.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being four ayes and three nays, the motion carries.

Councilmember Raben: Actually, I don't think it does.

Jeff Ahlers: Yeah, they changed it, you're probably thinking of the law that was in effect until a couple of years ago that said it took two-thirds to increase a salary. They've changed that now where it's just a majority except with the exception of the officeholder.

President Shetler: Thank you.

PROSECUTOR		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1080-1030-1080	Deputy	4,740.00	4,740.00
1080-1190-1080	Deputy	4,739.00	4,739.00
1080-1900	FICA	726.00	726.00
1080-1910	PERF	711.00	711.00
Total		10,916.00	10,916.00

PROSECUTOR IV-D		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1081-1160-1081	Deputy Prosecutor	4,739.00	4,739.00
1081-1900	FICA	363.00	363.00
1081-1910	PERF	356.00	356.00
Total		5,458.00	5,458.00

(Motion carried 4-3/Councilmembers Sutton, Goebel & Kiefer opposed)

SUPERINTENDENT OF COUNTY BUILDINGS

Councilmember Raben: Okay next, Superintendent of County Buildings, 1310-1120-1310, 1310-1140-1310, 1310-1900 and 1310-1910 PERF for a total of \$2,074. These are not like the previous requests, these are just adjustments that were missed at budgets. These are part of the union contract, so I move approval.

Councilman Sutton: Second.

President Shetler: Do we have any questions? Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being seven ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

SUPERINTENDENT OF COUNTY BUILDINGS		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1310-1120-1310	Carpenter	1,504.00	1,504.00
1310-1140-1310	Maintenance	250.00	250.00
1310-1900	FICA	135.00	135.00
1310-1910	PERF	185.00	185.00
Total		2,074.00	2,074.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

RIVERBOAT

Councilmember Raben: Next, under Riverboat, 1490-3116 Homeless Connect in the amount of \$2,500, I'll move approval.

Councilmember Bassemier: Second.

President Shetler: Any questions, comments? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being seven ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

RIVERBOAT		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1490-3116	Homeless Connect	2,500.00	2,500.00
Total		2,500.00	2,500.00

**(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)**

#### **REASSESSMENT/AUDITOR**

Councilmember Raben: Auditor/Reassessment, Contractual Services in the amount of \$7,250, I'll move approval.

Councilmember Lloyd: Second.

President Shetler: We have a motion and a second. Any questions? Auditor Fluty, do you have any comments or questions?

Bill Fluty: No. I think I presented all the information and Joe spoke to that last week. We reduced it from 15,000 to 7,250. We do have a contract from Crowe Horwath and we'll be moving that on to the County Attorney and signing that at a later date. And then tentatively we have this scheduled for July.

President Shetler: Alright, thank you.

Councilmember Goebel: And you did work with the County Assessor as far as funds are okay with?

Bill Fluty: I sent all that information to the County Assessor, the same information that you received.

Councilmember Goebel: And I think he's in agreement with that, as well. Thank you.

President Shetler: Any other questions?

Councilmember Lloyd: I have a question. Do we want to change this to \$7,250?

President Shetler: Yes.

Councilmember Lloyd: Instead of 15?

Councilmember Raben: Yes, that's the motion.

Councilmember Lloyd: Oh, I'm sorry. I guess I wasn't listening.

Councilmember Bassemier: Is that 215 or 250?

Bill Fluty: 250.

President Shetler: Okay, any other questions? \$7,250 is the motion. Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Bill, I just want to thank you for getting this done at a lesser cost than what you estimated earlier. Thank you and I vote yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being seven ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

Bill Fluty: Thank you.

REASSESSMENT/AUDITOR		REQUESTED	APPROVED
2490-1020-3530	Contractual Services	15,000.00	7,250.00
Total		15,000.00	7,250.00

**(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)**

## **JAIL PROJECT**

Councilmember Raben: Okay next, 3660-4196 Facility Improvement in the amount of \$130,000. I'll moved approval.

Councilmember Bassemier: Second.

President Shetler: Questions, comments?

Councilmember Goebel: When will this project begin again, immediately?

Dave Rector: Good morning, Dave Rector, Building Authority. It's part of the ongoing project in the old jail. We hope to wrap up the demolition part within the next two to three weeks. We're trying. But the window portion of it now, with your approval, we'll go ahead and go out for bid for that and get it going concurrently with the rest of it.

Councilmember Goebel: Thank you.

President Shetler: Alright, thanks, Mr. Rector. Any other questions, comments? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being seven ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

JAIL PROJECT		REQUESTED	APPROVED
3660-4196	Facility Improvement	130,000.00	130,000.00
Total		130,000.00	130,000.00

**(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)**

<b>TRANSFER REQUESTS</b>
--------------------------

**CLERK**

Councilmember Raben: Okay next, the Clerk has a transfer from 1010-1160-1010 into 1010-1320-1010 in the amount of \$1,131. I'll move approval.

Councilmember Bassemier: Second.

President Shetler: Questions, comments? Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being seven ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

CLERK		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1010-1160-1010	Sr. Clerk- Circuit/Superior	1,131.00	1,131.00
To: 1010-1320-1010	Sm. Claims Counter Clerk	1,131.00	1,131.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

**CORONER**

Councilmember Raben: Okay next, under Coroner, and I will mention that, while she may have forgotten to put the rationale in with the appropriation request, we did get a quite detailed rationale sent to all of us a few days ago. Mr. President, I'm going to move that, there's several of them under Coroner, that those transfers be approved as listed.

Councilmember Bassemier: Second.

President Shetler: Its been moved and seconded. Do we have any questions or comments?

Councilman Sutton: Just one question.

President Shetler: Yes, Councilman Sutton?



Councilman Sutton: Ms. Groves, I think it was back in January you provided a list to us that reflected some of the larger ticket items that need to be addressed in your office and they aren't necessarily all covered under this request here, but we had discussed at the end of last year that there were some ongoing issues with the facility there that we needed to really make ourselves aware of and including possibly the Building Authority in with that. Just wanted to make sure we stay on track with keeping those on the front burner with your office in terms of what you're looking at from a time horizon standpoint, and addressing some of those issues, or are you intending to come back at some point in time with a request to –

Annie Groves: I've been working right now with the Commissioners to see if they can get some funding for me. However, I'm not making any progress, I'll be real honest with you. We started out that, you know, I thought the roof was a priority. Somehow, then it became my vehicles for a priority. They had granted me one vehicle. I do feel I need two. Then we went to the alarm system because we had an incident where we needed to update our security. I still am looking at the roof. They're talking about building on to the facility and in order to do that, they asked for sketches. I have no money in an architectural budget to do that, so I'm kind of back at square one needing your help on where I move from here.

Councilman Sutton: You know, that building is, what, --

Annie Groves: Nineteen years old.

Councilman Sutton: Nineteen years old, and it is at the point where a lot of the – just the overall wear and tear is beginning to show on the building.

Annie Groves: Correct.

Councilman Sutton: And we don't want to get ourselves in a position where the expenses end up being much greater than they are already. So if we can find a way to stay on top of this, keeping us abreast of where things are going on this because, at least from the Council's standpoint, we'd much rather do maintenance than overhauls of large areas of the building. I know you'd mentioned about the refrigeration system and the issues that are going on with that, so –

Annie Groves: I have given all those priorities to the Commissioners. They've only acted on two of them so far.

Councilman Sutton: Okay, and you've got those listed out. We've got to find a way to make sure those things happen.

Annie Groves: You know, I agree with you. And I would like to also mention that since 1991, we have generated over \$400,000 worth of revenue. I don't know, I'm going to have to turn to Councilman Raben, if there is any way that we could earmark, I know we can't have a non-reverting fund. But I don't know if we could put that into a special account to where that money is always used to update that building.

Councilmember Raben: Well, that's something we'd have to address. I can't give you an answer on that today, but by the time that fund would build the monies that it would need to address these needs, you know, particularly a roof that sounds like it's somewhat immediate, I think we need to do just like Councilman Sutton has suggested, keep the list working. As soon as you get estimates on the actual roof repairs, I'm not –

Annie Groves: Who do I need to go to, do I come to the Commissioners, I'm, you know –

Councilman Sutton: Most of your requests are CCD type of items, which that's the Commissioners, under that. And I don't know what the balance is – what's the balance looking like in that, Bill, in that CCD fund?

Councilmember Raben: There would be funding available for roof repairs, but to spend from that account, it does require their approval. So –

Annie Groves: Well, I'm back at square one is where I'm back at because they've now asked for me to go ahead and do this with, you know, added on space. I don't have any money in my budget to get an architect to do that.

Councilmember Raben: I'm, until this morning, I've not heard about any additions to that facility.

Annie Groves: That was at the last meeting because we're running out of storage, you know, we're running out of storage. They said go ahead and get prices. You know, when you do the roof, make for sure the roof line would match the new if we add on.

Councilmember Raben: Annie, what type of storage are you referring to? Without getting too –

Annie Groves: I need some for files, etcetera. I do need them for, we have to keep paraffin blocks and slides, is what we have to keep. They have to be temperature controlled because the paraffin would melt. So that kind of stuff.

Councilmember Raben: The actual files, you know, it's quite possible, I mean, if that's the lion share of the space, which it probably is, with –

Annie Groves: Well, we have those right now all up in our attic and we've been told we can't put any more weight upstairs.

Councilmember Raben: But we have a contract with an outside firm for file storage. We've got this space that we've just appropriated another \$130,000 for today that, at some point, could serve as, I'm sure there's an area that could be set for file storage. I don't think we really need to be looking at an addition to that building so much as, you know, maybe we need to help you with your storage issues in other facilities within the county.

Annie Groves: Well see, I'm kind of in an odd situation here. I've been asked by the Commissioners to do this by adding on to the building and now it's kind of like, I don't think we need it. I'm just asking – I want a roof, is what I want.

Councilmember Raben: I'll be happy to contact the Commissioners and, I mean, with everybody's blessing here, but I'm of the opinion that I don't think we really need to be looking at any additions to that facility when we've got the third floor here, about 30,000 feet that – yeah, between the two floors, that we're really not sure what we're going to do with. So I think we need to stay on tap with the roof repairs and put off any additions. And I'll contact them if everybody is okay with that.

Councilman Sutton: Yeah, and I'd be more than happy to be involved with that as well, especially, you had mentioned, that's a great idea on the storage issue. I

mean, we've got a fantastic storage system that we utilize through the Clerk that, you guys have some of the same type of needs in terms of securing your records that they have –

Annie Groves: Yes, we do.

Councilman Sutton: – that we could utilize that space. We're already paying for it anyway. So maybe, Jim, if we could get with –

Councilmember Raben: We might have to get up there ourselves –

Annie Groves: I've already patched it once by myself, so – and there's a lot of other things that we need and I would like to get back on to that task. I would like to. And I would also like to say, though, I'm more than willing to find new ways to get more revenue if that money can be somehow put back into the building. I know that you said we can't, but if I come and keep begging, is what I'm trying to say, could you realize that we are generating revenue? I am looking at new ways to try to generate some more revenue, so it isn't always such a burden, you know. Last year we turned in 35,000. That's probably what I'm going to need for a roof. It would take care of that, you know. I just want to let you know, I'm trying to balance out here, and look for ways.

Bill Fluty: Many offices generate revenue, it goes into the General fund, and it does support your budget kind of on the back side, but it's a slippery slope to generate revenue and put it into a fund to be used totally for that department, so it's not –

Annie Groves: Then I have another question. If I want to increase some fees, which board do I go to?

Councilman Sutton: That's the Commissioners.

Annie Groves: Commissioners? Okay, thank you.

Councilmember Raben: I don't know that she even has to do that. I mean, --

Councilman Sutton: Well, don't they have to annually submit in the listing of fees for the county? I know they do it for all the Health department fees and a couple of other departments, I wouldn't see why she wouldn't have to do the same.

Councilmember Raben: Okay. The fees that you're collecting are from other counties. You're really not collecting any fees within the county, are you?

Annie Groves: No.

Jeff Ahlers: It really depends on which fees. If they're statutory fees, some of those require approval of either the Commissioners or the Council. Now if these are fees that are not statutory fees, like Councilman Raben said, that perhaps what you're charging other counties for services, that probably doesn't need to be approved. So, I would suggest that you get with the County Attorney or me if you have specific fees. In other words, if the fees you're talking about are already in an ordinance, then those will need to be passed by the body who is responsible for that ordinance to increase it. If they're fees that are not statutory fees or part of a current county ordinance, which those are published, you know, then you're –

Annie Groves: Those are not part of the ordinance. They're not part of that at all.

President Shetler: Yes, Councilman?

Councilmember Raben: I mean, if everybody is okay, we might, because its probably been a long time since we've really circled what and how your fees are generated, but it's my understanding, and correct me if I'm wrong, but, you know, part of being the tri-state regional medical hub, if someone passes in Deaconess Hospital, as an example, here in Vanderburgh County and they're from Posey County, and it should result in the need for an autopsy, we are the responsible party for performing that autopsy, right?

Annie Groves: Well, if the accident occurred in Posey County and they were transported up here, we can bill Posey County back for the entire investigation. However, if it happens in Kentucky or Illinois, we cannot, we have to absorb it all. And the fees I'm talking about generating are morgue fees. Anyone that uses our facility, 35 other counties in Indiana and Illinois use our facility and we charge them a \$100 morgue fee, is the type of fees I'm talking about.

Councilmember Raben: You're going to work with her on that?

Jeff Ahlers: Yeah, I mean, what you need to do is, there should be an – there is an ordinance that sets forth, you know, like copy costs from the Clerk's office and certain items like that, that statutorily have to be passed in an ordinance, so what you need to do is determine whether the fees that you're talking about are currently subject to statute or ordinance. And if they are, we will need to amend them here.

Annie Groves: Neither one of them are.

Jeff Ahlers: Okay, and feel free to call –

Annie Groves: They were read into –

Jeff Ahlers: – me or Ted Ziemer if you have questions on that.

Annie Groves: In 1991 when they built the facility, they just read the fees into the Commissioners' minutes and that's how it stayed.

President Shetler: I guess, first of all, I just want to get it kind of clear here, so what you're saying is, you really don't feel, yourself, that you need additional room if we can resolve the storage file –

Annie Groves: I would like storage room. It doesn't matter to me where it's at.

President Shetler: Okay, so as long as that's resolved, there isn't any need for additional – okay, I just want to clarify. I'm concerned a little bit on that autopsy, because it seemed to me that was put at bare bones last year at budgets, that we figured up about how many autopsies we were doing. To the best of my recollection, it was 150 –

Annie Groves: It was 180,000.

President Shetler: Well, 150 autopsies a year, roughly, or 200. And we were paying out roughly 1,000 - 1,200?

Annie Groves: Last year, we did 160.

President Shetler: Okay.

Annie Groves: And then I was able to encumber \$54,000 to go into the budget for this year.

President Shetler: Okay, so you have about 230 in that account.

Annie Groves: 234,000.

President Shetler: Okay, and you're expecting that there will be roughly 160, keeping on par from last year and the years past.

Annie Groves: Well, we're already up 25 cases from last year, so I don't have any – but I feel very comfortable with the numbers that I have due to all the past years. Somehow, we end up evened out.

President Shetler: How much does it cost for an autopsy?

Annie Groves: Well, right now, it costs 1,200. However, we're getting ready to go into a contract, the Commissioners are in the process of doing a contract and it's probably going to go up 1,300 with that then including their own supplies. We won't be furnishing their scalpel blades, etcetera anymore. They will furnish that. So we will save in one area, but it's going to cost in the other.

President Shetler: The 25 that you say you're up, is that by the quarter or is that projected out through the year?

Annie Groves: That's as I stand here right now. We had 25 more people die in 2009 at this time than what we did in 2008.

President Shetler: That required autopsies?

Annie Groves: Not all of them did, no.

President Shetler: Okay. So you're looking at something around \$178,000 or something like that, if it goes to 1,300 and you do 160 autopsies?

Annie Groves: Uh-huh.

President Shetler: So then you should have adequate money in that line item. Okay. That's what my concern was.

Annie Groves: Yeah, right now –

President Shetler: Transferring money out and then coming back later on.

Annie Groves: This is, usually I would never think of transferring out of that account.

Councilmember Raben: I might interrupt, too. She had called me several weeks back on this and I had suggested she do a transfer. And we'll, if we need to replace these funds later in the year, we will, but chances are, we won't, so this was saving the possibility of an additional appropriation.

President Shetler: Yeah, and it sounds like, based on that transfer of money, that \$54,000 that you should have adequate supplies there. The contract, is that with an

out of town firm or a local firm or –

Annie Groves: It's going to be with a local, it's going to be with an individual doctor for the autopsies. It will be an individual person.

President Shetler: Right, okay.

Annie Groves: Well, he has a corporation, but he's an individual.

President Shetler: Right, because before, we were using an out of town firm and sometimes they would – I don't know how regularly they came in town, but –

Annie Groves: Well, we weren't actually using an out of town firm.

President Shetler: I thought that guy was from Bloomington, Illinois or Bloomington, Indiana, or something.

Annie Groves: He has a home here and he has a home in Bloomington.

President Shetler: I see.

Annie Groves: Yes.

President Shetler: Alright, thank you. I have no other questions. Anybody else have any questions or comments? Alright, roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being seven ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

<b>CORONER</b>		<b>REQUESTED</b>	<b>APPROVED</b>
From: 1070-3650	Autopsies	13,700.00	13,700.00
1070-3160	Radio/Pagers	1,500.00	1,500.00
To: 1070-3310	Training	1,900.00	1,900.00
1070-3530	Contractual Services	1,500.00	1,500.00
1070-4122	Buildings & Equipment	3,800.00	3,800.00
1070-2600	Office Supplies	1,500.00	1,500.00
1070-2720	Lab Supplies	2,500.00	2,500.00
1070-3190	Solid Waste Disposal	4,000.00	4,000.00

**(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)**

### **COMMISSIONERS**

Councilmember Raben: Okay next under County Commissioners, transfer from 1300-3533 to 1300-3700 Dues & Subscriptions in the amount of 300. I'll move approval.

Councilmember Lloyd: Second.

President Shetler: Questions, comments? Roll call, please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being seven ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

COMMISSIONERS		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1300-3533	EAP	300.00	300.00
To: 1300-3700	Dues & Subscriptions	300.00	300.00

**(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)**

## CIRCUIT COURT

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Circuit Court, another transfer from account 1360-1240-1360 to account 1360-1390-1360 in the amount of \$1,150. I'll move approval.

Councilmember Bassemier: Second.

President Shetler: Its been moved and seconded. Do I have any questions? Judge Heldt is here if anybody does or if you have a comment, Judge.

Carl Heldt: Good morning, Carl Heldt, Circuit Court. This is for a head Bailiff position that was applied for last year and was approved by the Job Study committee, because of the increase in her duties. And I appreciate the concerns that you've all expressed on the prior vote. I can only say in this case, that this transfer is the result of a long-time probation officer who has retired, so we're saving a lot on his salary and transferring some to this, so it's not – it's a net gain, really, at this point, for what that's worth. But other than that I'll be happy to answer any questions.

President Shetler: Do you have any questions? Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: And I think, again, it's probably a very worthy request, but just to be consistent with what I voted earlier, I'm going to vote no on this.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: I'll follow suit. No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: No.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?



President Shetler: Yes. There being four ayes and three nays, the motion carries.

CIRCUIT COURT		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1360-1240-1360	Probation Officer	1,150.00	1,150.00
To: 1360-1390-1360	Bailiff	1,150.00	1,150.00

**(Motion carried 4-3/Councilmembers Sutton, Goebel & Kiefer opposed)**

<b>AMENDMENTS TO SALARY ORDINANCE</b>
---------------------------------------

Councilmember Raben: Okay, and last are the amendments to the Salary Ordinance. First, under Prosecutor, I move we amend salary line 1080-1030 Deputy Prosecutor as an Executive II, Step 3, with an annual salary of 62,373; line 1080-1190 Deputy Prosecutor at the rate of \$57,633; under Prosecutor IV-D salary line 1081-1160 Deputy Prosecutor as an Executive II, Step 3, at the rate of \$62,373. Superintendent of County Buildings, I move that we amend salary line 1310-1120 at \$39,391; line 1310-1140 Maintenance at \$36,624, this is according to the union contract. Under County Clerk, move we amend salary line 1010-1320 Small Claims Clerk as previously approved, the current employee is a COMOT IV, Step 3 with an annual salary of \$30,338. The hire date was March 19<sup>th</sup> of '03. Under Circuit Court, move that we amend salary line 1360-1390 Head Bailiff as previously adopted. The current employee is a COMOT VI, Step 1 with an annual salary of \$31,618. And under County Clerk, line 1010-1330 Bookkeeping Clerk, setting the 2009 salary in at \$33,306. The current employee was previously a joint city/county employee with a hire date of October 12<sup>th</sup>, 1993. I'd like to make that in the form of a motion.

Councilmember Lloyd: Second.

President Shetler: It's been moved and seconded. Do I have any questions or comments? Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being seven ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

**(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)**

<b>CHANGE OF MAY MEETING DATE</b>
-----------------------------------

President Shetler: I don't have any old business. The only new business I might bring up is that the May 6<sup>th</sup> meeting has been changed to May 5<sup>th</sup>, which is a Tuesday and that will be at the same time, at 8:30 in the morning in the same chambers here. So that will be a Tuesday morning at 8:30 rather than the Wednesday, May 6<sup>th</sup> meeting. So if you can make changes on your calendars for that, please.

Councilman Sutton: And the reason for that change?

President Shetler: I actually have a personal conflict. I asked to check around to see if that was a problem, and if you (inaudible) I apologize if that's going to create a problem.

Councilman Sutton: Well, just, not necessarily a problem, but just, you know, we kind of consistently have the meetings at a certain time, and we advertise and people who want to see or hear, when we kind of change them, it does kind of affect others, other than just ourselves. So, just, if we can at any way possible, stick to our regular meeting schedule. I know that from time to time we all have personal or business items that maybe we have to attend to that may prevent us from participating, but that's why there are seven of us. You know, and hopefully we don't have things when the majority of us are going to be out. But if we could do that.

President Shetler: Alright, any other questions, comments?

Councilman Sutton: One other thing. This is for the Auditor. Do we have a – you prepare a monthly, a layout of our different budgets and the appropriations, and the balances on those. Is that ready for us yet?

Bill Fluty: I do that as soon as I have a certified budget, and I don't have that back from the DLGF yet. But it should be within the next month. So, hopefully, you'll have it by the May meeting.

Councilman Sutton: Okay. Alright.

President Shetler: Okay, motion for adjournment?

Councilmember Lloyd: So moved.

President Shetler: It's been moved. Thank you all very much and the next meeting is at the end of April. Thank you.

**(There being no further business to come before the Council, the meeting was adjourned at 9:14 a.m.)**

**VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL**

---

President Tom Shetler, Jr.

---

Vice President Joe Kiefer

---

Councilmember Jim Raben

---

Councilmember Mike Goebel

---

Councilmember Russell Lloyd, Jr.

---

Councilmember Ed Bassemier

---

Councilmember Royce Sutton

Recorded and transcribed by Teri Lukeman.

**VANDEBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL  
MINUTES  
MAY 5, 2009**

The Vanderburgh County Council met in session this 5<sup>th</sup> day of May 2009 in room 301 of the Civic Center Complex. The meeting was called to order at 8:35 a.m. by County Council President Tom Shetler, Jr.

President Shetler: It's May the 5<sup>th</sup>, Tuesday morning. I'd like to welcome you all to the County Council meeting this morning. First, I'd like to call for the roll call, please.

COUNCILMEMBER	PRESENT	ABSENT
Councilmember Sutton	X	
Councilmember Bassemier	X	
Councilmember Lloyd	X	
Councilmember Goebel	X	
Councilmember Raben	X	
Councilmember Kiefer	X	
President Shetler	X	

President Shetler: We have five here and two present, that's makes seven accountable. So we'll go on from there. I'd like to ask Councilman Sutton if he would please lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance.

(Pledge of Allegiance was given)

<b>APPROVAL OF MINUTES</b>
----------------------------

President Shetler: Next is the minutes from the April 1<sup>st</sup> regular meeting. Do I have a motion for approval or any questions?

Councilmember Lloyd: Motion to approve.

President Shetler: It's been moved for approval. Do I have a second?

Councilmember Bassemier: Second.

President Shetler: Second by Councilman Bassemier. Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being seven ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

**(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)**

<b>APPROPRIATION ORDINANCE</b>
--------------------------------

President Shetler: Next is the appropriation ordinance, Councilman Raben.

**SHERIFF**

Councilmember Raben: Okay, thank you, Mr. President. First on the agenda today under Sheriff, we have six items listed for a total of \$62,183. This is for the – you know, I do have one question, Sheriff. The three Court Screeners, the FTO Incentive and FICA and PERF, for a total of \$62,183. I should have asked you this a few moments ago. The FTO Incentive, is there, that \$1,200, if we're doing four people at \$100 a month, this will only pay three months. Is that all you need?

Eric Williams: Yeah, I'm set with the appropriation to get me through the rest of the year because of how we've done it the first part of the year. And then, obviously, in the detail I sent you for the follow-up would give the number what the appropriation request will be in our budget for 2010. But yeah, my request will take care of the rest of the year...at 125 is what I'd asked for.

Councilmember Raben: Okay. Do we want to discuss that also, because I know that was a concern?

President Shetler: Yeah, I think we had two separate questions and I guess since we started talking about the number of people, let's deal with that issue and then we'll go on to the amount. So do we have any questions further about going from four to eight? Yes, Councilman Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: I mean, I think four to eight, the way the Sheriff is going to use it, and I guess you had indicated that it would cut back on some of your overtime?

Eric Williams: Yes, I sent a follow-up with the minimum amount that I think we'll save on our comp. time/overtime budget next year. It would more than pay for itself that way.

Councilmember Lloyd: Okay and this applies to what, 113 deputies? Or that's how it's mainly going to be used, the four versus the eight?

Eric Williams: Yeah, the full training dollars go to a selected four currently, eight hopefully, deputies. Eight specific deputies, it's not spread out across the entire group.

Councilmember Lloyd: Right. That's all I have on that. I guess the second question would be, 100 versus 125, is a 25% increase. That's something that I think might be better handled in the budget and, you know, the city does a thousand a year, the Sheriff is doing \$1,200, I think we might be better off leaving it at a hundred a month. That's my opinion.

Councilmember Kiefer: Mr. President?

President Shetler: Yes, Councilman Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Sheriff, I think the police department offers some other incentives other than money, and I don't know if it's something that would translate well into the Sheriff's department or not, but like, they give their field training officers maybe like the better equipment that's available, like maybe the better laptops or maybe, you know, a little bit better vehicles or something like that. I mean, is there some other incentive other than financial you might be able to utilize?

Eric Williams: We already try to do some of that within reason. My fleet is not near as deep as the Evansville Police Department's, so we try to make sure that all of our fleet is in decent condition and everybody gets a decent piece of equipment regardless of their assignment. Now when we do add new vehicles to the fleet, we try to cycle those through the field training deputies first when it's appropriate. But to say that one car is better than the other is probably a stretch of the imagination more often than not.

Councilmember Kiefer: I understand, thank you.

President Shetler: Alright, other questions? Okay, do we have a motion then or do we have a –

Councilmember Kiefer: Is there a motion to change –

Councilmember Lloyd: I mean, I would recommend changing line one to a thousand dollars.

Councilman Sutton: Was there a motion already on the floor on this?

Councilmember Raben: There is actually is a motion to approve, but we can break this up or –

President Shetler: Why don't we break it up into two different parts there? Let's go first with the first question on increasing the number of field deputies or officers from four to eight, if you would, and then we'll do a second question on the amount.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, well, I'll rescind my original motion and I'll make a motion first to increase the number of field deputies to eight. I'll make that in the form of a motion.

Councilmember Kiefer: Second.

President Shetler: Alright, we've got a motion and a second. Roll call please – or questions about it? Roll call.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being seven ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

**(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)**

President Shetler: Now we need a motion on the amount to pay then.

Councilmember Raben: Can we ask one more question? Just shooting from the hip here, how many hours a month or a year do you think in addition to their normal responsibilities do they spend training?

Eric Williams: Above and beyond their normal eighty hours? They spend a few hours after every shift doing reports or before shift getting ready, preparing lesson plans and doing those kinds of things. But the real incentive comes from the increased responsibility that goes with being a field training deputy. They're responsible for new people that get hired on for the first year of their employment. They're assigned to somebody for a month at a time and rotated through the shifts. The responsibility comes from supervising another person as a non-supervisor, from critiquing them, seeing to it that their weaknesses are remediated, their strengths are recognized and a lot of other things short of just additional hours. I mean, I would say that the additional hours are minor compared to just the increased responsibility of documenting, I mean, they write very rigorous reports on a daily basis about the progress of these individuals so that we can make good decisions prior to the probationary year being up, whether or not we want to retain them as deputies before their first year is up. So I don't know if that answers your question, but there's not a real tremendous increase in hours. While there is some,

some use it more than others, but the real responsibility comes from their day to day activities.

Councilman Sutton: Now you had indicated – I'm sorry, were you going to say something?

Councilmember Raben: The rest of the question was, do you feel like, number one, that usually, it's the best of the best claiming that role –

Eric Williams: I think last week I made mention that we're very selective in who we pick because those are the people that need to set the image for who we want our new people to become, how we want them to police, how we want them to treat the community, so we do try to pick the best of the best when we're looking at our field training deputies. Not to say that everybody that works in the Sheriff's office isn't a high quality, professional individual, but there are some people that have a greater aptitude for training, and a greater aptitude for being able to critique and write reports and those kinds of things. And we've seen, historically, that the field training deputies are oftentimes the ones that do well at the promotional process. So I think that's a pretty clear indicator that they do excel at what they do.

Councilman Sutton: I was just going to ask, you had mentioned regarding this, when was the last time that this has been adjusted? I mean, it's a hundred dollars now, how long has it been at a hundred dollars?

Eric Williams: Before my time. I would guess that was probably established in Sheriff Hamner's administration.

Councilman Sutton: So we're talking about what, three hundred dollars, I guess, per man here and...what's that? Additional \$25.

Eric Williams: It would be 250 actually, I think.

Councilman Sutton: Twenty-five dollars a month.

Eric Williams: Three hundred, yeah. I need to do my Chisanbop.

Councilman Sutton: You had mentioned something about just the equipment or supplies that you guys put into this additional training and the cost that's incurred with that. Can you talk about that a little bit?

Eric Williams: Explain your question again.

Councilman Sutton: The deputies that are selected for this particular program, what you guys, the Sheriff's department, what you put into getting those people prepared to provide this training.

Eric Williams: There is a certification process they go through that they would go to a school where they become certified field training deputies just in that area of training: training new people, training them on how to become good law enforcement professionals. In addition, we would send them to the Indiana Law Enforcement Academy or some other place in the state which would certify them to be an instructor for the state. That instructor status by the state would allow that anytime they teach, either individually or as a group, that those hours can be applied toward the continuing education credits required by all law enforcement in



the state of Indiana. They're usually the first ones to go to specialized training so that they can come back. We try to use the 'train the trainer' approach within the Sheriff's office. It becomes very costly to train everybody at the expensive school, but if I can train four or five individuals that are very good at instructing, it's much easier then to distribute that new information across the board to the rest of the Sheriff's office. So we do make a fairly sizable investment in those people through time as far as training dollars go.

Councilman Sutton: I guess I have no problem with the 125. I guess it seems –

Eric Williams: I know oftentimes we get compared to the Evansville Police Department, you know, we're sister agencies in the same community, but there are a lot of differences in different areas. They have a much deeper pool of people to choose from. They have more field training – for them its field training officers, to distribute the workload amongst. My eight compared to their number is probably pretty small, so I think in this case, I mean, I would really ask that the Council – I would encourage the Council to go on and award the \$125 and let the Sheriff's office be ahead of them on one thing.

Councilman Sutton: Well, and I think it is difficult to make the comparison between what the city police does and –

Eric Williams: While our goals are relatively the same, our environments and the way we do business are substantially different.

Councilman Sutton: Well, and if you look man per man, or I guess woman per woman as well, on the respective departments, those who are out there in the field, I think we would find on the whole, our Sheriff's deputies have a higher level degree of training and education level than those on the city. Not disparaging the police department in any way at all, but just looking strictly man per man, you guys have a higher level per person than they do on the city side.

Eric Williams: I'm a little biased and I'd like to think that. But both agencies are great agencies. One of the primary differences that I see between the two agencies is our missions and the things that we do day to day. The Evansville Police Department has a substantial number of officers that are deployed in a fairly concentrated population. One of the advantages that they oftentimes have is the ability to deploy multiple people to a scene very quickly because they've got more people working at any given time. The thing that the deputies find themselves doing is having to deal with situations by themselves. You know, we get a run at Baseline and I-65 at the Armstrong Recreation Center, you may be dealing with a fight by yourself for several minutes before you get a backup there. And so it requires a different way of thinking about things. Not that one is better or different, it's just the nature of the areas we police. You know, I don't know that my guys would do overly well in the center city or in the concentrated areas where they've got the run volume that goes on and on and on and on. It's just different styles.

President Shetler: I might point out that underneath the present, that at \$1,000 or, I'm sorry, \$1,200 a year per four that we presently have, we're spending \$4,800. At \$125 times eight, that will be in the neighborhood of what, \$12,000? So that would be a 150% increase in that particular line item and I think that's where my concern would be. Later on in the meeting we're going to be talking a little bit about how we're going to need to hold the line pretty tight on next year's increases and stuff, so kind of setting the tone for that –

Eric Williams: I completely understand –

President Shetler: – might be from my perspective there.

Eric Williams: I completely understand, however, this line item has been neglected for 16 plus years now and, you know, part of being a professional agency and recruiting the best to do this, there has to be some incentive. I would tell you that probably the workload is far greater than the \$125 I'm asking for, but these people also love what they do and they want to do it. So I'm not kidding anybody, these guys want to do this job because they enjoy it, they feel like it's a very good benefit. They feel like they're really making a difference in the office but I have to reward them to some degree commensurate with the workload I'm asking them to do. Otherwise, I'm not going to get the qualified people to do the job.

President Shetler: Alright, thank you, Sheriff. Yes, Councilman Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: I was going to echo what you said. I mean, I think what we're looking at with the county employees is the possibility of a zero percent increase, so I don't think this sets a very good example if we're going to give that kind of increase and I would like to see it pursued at budget time. But, I mean, it's not a large amount of money, but I think it sets a bad example.

President Shetler: Okay, any further discussion? Do we have a...we need a motion for the hundred to –

Councilman Sutton: I'd like to make a motion in relation to what we have presented before us at the \$1,200 level.

Councilmember Bassemier: I'll second.

President Shetler: Well, 125 is...

Councilman Sutton: At 125.

President Shetler: Right, so it will be \$1,500 a year annually. Okay, we have a motion and a second. Any further discussion? Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: I'm going to make a brief statement before I make this vote. But I think it's important because we're talking about training our officers that, if it's a matter of \$300 a year, in the overall scheme of things, if we have the best people on the street, I don't think it's really damaging our big picture that much, so I'm going to vote yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: I'm in favor of doing something for the officers because I think they need it, but I think as Councilman Lloyd said, I really prefer to do this at budget time and do this for 2010. So I'd be in favor of doing it at that time instead of now. So with that, I'll vote nay.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: I feel likewise, that it is a \$300 per man increase, but we've doubled the man force, so we're dealing with a 150% increase overall, so I'm going to have to vote no. So we have four ayes and three nays, motion carries.

SHERIFF		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1050-1520	FTO Incentive	1,200.00	1,200.00

**(Motion carried 4-3/Councilmembers Lloyd, Kiefer and Shetler opposed)**

Eric Williams: I don't know if it's appropriate to comment, just so you know, though, the year increase will actually reduce some of the pay, because they're going to lose the overtime, so they're actually going to get a reduction, they're just going to get a consistent \$125. So you really are going to save money and they're actually, four of them are going to get a reduction for anyone that actually looks at real dollars they're seeing. But this makes it consistent across the board for everybody who is doing a like job.

President Shetler: Yes?

Councilmember Raben: I was going to move on. Are we –

President Shetler: Yes.

Councilmember Raben: Next, under 1050-1130-0236 down through 1050-1910 PERF, for a total, let's see, we have to back that out.

Councilmember Lloyd: Aren't we doing the grant for the Sheriff?

Councilmember Raben: No, we've not voted on the other. We voted on the \$1,200.

Councilmember Lloyd: Oh, I'm sorry.

President Shetler: We need to do the Court Screeners.

Councilmember Raben: Right?

President Shetler: Correct, yeah, we're on the...

Councilmember Raben: Okay, 60,983, does that look right?

Jeff Ahlers: We've got our accountant here.

Eric Williams: You're getting ready to get recruited.

Councilmember Raben: \$60,983, I make that in the form of a motion.

President Shetler: Any questions? Second to the motion?

Councilmember Lloyd: Second.

President Shetler: It's been moved and seconded. Okay, any other questions?  
Roll call please.

(Inaudible)

Councilmember Raben: I can, do you want me to read them in completely? Okay, 1050-1130-0236 in the amount of \$17,653, 1050-1130-0237 and 1050-1130-0238 both in the amount of \$17,653, FICA \$4,052, PERF 3,972, for a total of \$60,983.

Councilmember Kiefer: Second.

President Shetler: Okay, we have a motion and a second. Any other questions?  
Roll call.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being seven ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

SHERIFF		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1050-1130-0236	Court Screener	17,653.00	17,653.00
1050-1130-0237	Court Screener	17,653.00	17,653.00
1050-1130-0238	Court Screener	17,653.00	17,653.00
1050-1900	FICA	4,052.00	4,052.00
1050-1910	PERF	3,972.00	3,972.00
Total		60,983.00	60,983.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

SHERIFF/DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

Councilmember Raben: Next under Sheriff/Domestic Violence grant account in the amount of \$18,000, I'll move approval.

Councilmember Goebel: Second.

President Shetler: It's been moved and seconded. Any questions? Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being seven ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

SHERIFF/DOMESTIC VIOLENCE		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1052-3994	Matching Grant	18,000.00	18,000.00
Total		18,000.00	18,000.00

**(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)**

## **JAIL PROJECT**

President Shetler: Do you want to skip to the Jail?

Councilmember Raben: Please. If you turn to page three on your agenda, under Jail Project, 3660-4197, this is listed under the Jail Set Aside account, the request is \$340,750. The Sheriff has prioritized his list of what he deems is the most important, the things that need the most immediate attention out there, which if you add it up, it's roughly \$145,000.

Eric Williams: If I could interject real quick, that was myself and Mr. Rector did that together, so his input was taken into account on this list.

Councilmember Raben: One thing to consider, I would like to delay this request until next month. I did place a call to Mr. Rector and I think he's on vacation until the 11<sup>th</sup>. So, obviously, he could not be here for good reasons, but there is an unappropriated balance within the original bond issue for the new facility out there that has several hundred thousand dollars that is laying there, that we're paying interest on today, that is within the Building Authority's control. And I would like to spend from that first before we tap into General fund monies. So I would like, if the other six members are willing, to delay this until June.

Councilmember Lloyd: The county would be, I mean, I guess the Building Authority would be earning interest on it. We wouldn't have to pay them anything for that, though.

Councilmember Raben: Well, but it's part of the original bond issue. So yeah, I guess, if they've got reinvested, they're paying interest and they may be gaining interest. But, you know, regardless, they're still paying interest on the money. Whether they're coming out ahead, I don't know.

Councilmember Lloyd: What was that money for?

Councilmember Raben: That was the original bond issue of \$35,000,000 or whatever the figure was back several years ago.

President Shetler: Sheriff, is there anything in here that would create a problem for you if waited a month?

Eric Williams: No. I spoke to Councilman Raben earlier and said I have no issue with waiting if it means getting the numbers where everybody is comfortable. There's a few that I don't think we can prolong indefinitely, obviously, but if it's next month I might suggest, because I know the confusion that I had trying to figure out where this would come from and then maybe between now and then that myself and Dave Rector and maybe somebody from the Auditor's Office go through and look at all of the Jail related accounts and come up with a balance of what's where and who's got what, so that we can make some informed decisions because I'm still a little unclear on who has which pockets of dollars and who controls them.

President Shetler: Yes, Councilman Goebel.

Councilmember Goebel: Sheriff, if we are going to wait, thank you for allowing that

or going along with that. But on the ladders to the second level, chase platforms, I think there are 16 there, do we actually need all of those or have we gotten by, maybe you can ask Dave before our next meeting.

Eric Williams: I know that issue well enough because it came up during the final stages of design. And the way those chases are designed, they're independent chases on the sides of each of the housing units. They don't connect with one another. They're just a tower that goes up the side of the housing unit. And there are 16 separate towers like that throughout the facility, so you couldn't use one to get to the other to – you know, the thought would be that they're all in a row or you can work your way down, and you can't. They're separate, independent little towers that you'd have to get inside of each one of them.

Councilmember Goebel: How do they get to that point now? Do they carry ladders?

Eric Williams: I probably can't say on tape exactly what I suggest to them, but they have to carry ladders around and it's a difficult entrance to get in there and to get them turned up inside there and they spend just as much time getting in and out of them as they do working on the problem that they're trying to fix. And I think they can construct a ladder that's affixed to the wall of the chase that takes up a lot less room, freeing up space to work. It's pretty tight quarters inside those chases.

Councilmember Goebel: Thank you.

President Shetler: Okay. Any other questions? Does somebody have an objection? I think the way we might handle this is to actually zero that from that particular fund because your request is actually to look at taking it through a different fund anyway, so zero this and get a motion and vote on it, and then we can resubmit underneath the –

Councilmember Raben: And that is my motion, to set this in at zero.

Councilmember Lloyd: Second.

President Shetler: Okay. It's been moved and seconded. Any questions about the motion? Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being seven ayes and no nays, the motion carries.  
Thank you, Sheriff.

JAIL PROJECT		REQUESTED	APPROVED
3660-4197	New Facility Set Aside	340,750.00	0.00
Total		340,750.00	0.00

**(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)**

<b>REQUEST FOR USE OF 911 CAPITAL FUNDS</b>
---

Eric Williams: While I'm here, will you give an affirming vote on the E911 request?  
I'm hesitant to go to City Council until I have the approval of my own Council.

Councilmember Bassemier: Make a motion to approve.

Councilmember Goebel: Second.

Councilmember Lloyd: It's in the Sheriff's letter, page –

Eric Williams: \$40,350.

Councilmember Goebel: And that funding will come from Central Dispatch, correct?

Eric Williams: From the capital account for the E911. Did I get that right?

Councilmember Raben: Yeah.

President Shetler: Yeah, it's not actually appropriating anything right now, just kind of giving his approval on it, so since we have a motion and a second, what we'll do is just do a voice vote on it, unless it's real close or real objectionable rather than doing a roll call on it. Do I have any questions with the Sheriff about...

Eric Williams: I will go to the City Council once you affirm it because it's my understanding that both bodies have to give affirming votes on that request.

President Shetler: All in favor, signify by saying aye.

**(All Councilmembers responded in the affirmative)**

President Shetler: Those opposed? Hearing none, the motion carries.

**(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)**

Eric Williams: Thank you very much.



## COUNTY ASSESSOR

President Shetler: The next then, County Assessor, and that is, yes, Councilman Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Mr. President, under County Assessor, everybody has a clear understanding as to why we're doing these appropriations and then later in the agenda, repealing funds. So I am going to move, under County Assessor, account 1090-1500-1090 down through 1090-1910, for a total of \$457,000. I'm going to move approval.

Councilmember Bassemier: Second.

President Shetler: Motion and a second. Questions?

Councilmember Lloyd: To clarify, this is mainly a bookkeeping change to move, to put this into the County Assessor and take it out of all the townships, right?

Councilmember Raben: Yeah, it's a wash.

Councilmember Lloyd: So there's really no dollar effect?

President Shetler: Correct. Okay, any other questions? Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being seven ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

COUNTY ASSESSOR		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1090-1500-1090	1 <sup>st</sup> Dep. (Dep. Assr)	20,943.00	20,943.00
1090-1510-1090	Real Estate Deputy	16,813.00	16,813.00
1090-1520-1090	Real Estate Deputy	19,615.00	19,615.00
1090-1530-1090	Res. Real Estate Dep.	15,751.00	15,751.00
1090-1540-1090	Dep. Assr. PP/Data	14,319.00	14,319.00
1090-1550-1090	Deputy Assessor	16,504.00	16,504.00
1090-1560-1090	Real Est. Deputy	16,464.00	16,464.00
1090-1570-1090	Prs. Prop. Coordinator	18,125.00	18,125.00
1090-1600-1090	1 <sup>st</sup> Dep. (Dep. Assr)	20,020.00	20,020.00
1090-1610-1090	Real Estate Deputy	19,065.00	19,065.00
1090-1620-1090	Real Est. Deputy	16,504.00	16,504.00
1090-1630-1090	Dep Assr Mobile Home	14,479.00	14,479.00
1090-1640-1090	Dep. Land Appraiser	19,615.00	19,615.00
1090-1650-1090	Dep. Assr. Business	14,479.00	14,479.00
1090-1660-1090	Dep. Assr. Deeds	13,168.00	13,168.00
1090-1670-1090	2 <sup>nd</sup> Real Est. Deputy	13,215.00	13,215.00
1090-1690-1090	1 <sup>st</sup> Deputy (Dep. Assr)	15,044.00	15,044.00
1090-1700-1090	Real Estate Deputy	18,191.00	18,191.00
1090-1710-1090	Dep. Assr. Bus. PP	13,824.00	13,824.00
1090-1720-1090	Real Est. Trans. Clerk	19,184.00	19,184.00
1090-1730-1090	Dep. Assr. PP	13,168.00	13,168.00
1090-1740-1090	Real Est. Deputy	14,319.00	14,319.00
1090-1750-1090	Dep. Assr./Bus. PP	15,751.00	15,751.00
1090-1760-1090	Real Estate Dep.	18,125.00	18,125.00
1090-1900	FICA	30,456.00	30,456.00
1090-1910	PERF	29,859.00	29,859.00
Total		457,000.00	457,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

Councilmember Raben: Okay, next under County Assessor, 1090-4114 Office Renovations in the amount of \$70,000. Mr. President, I’m going to move that these be set in at zero and move to discussion.

Councilmember Lloyd: Second.

President Shetler: We have a motion and a second. Do I have any questions about the motion? Yes, Councilman Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: One thing about this, looking at the grand scheme of things, you know, we received the Assessor's plan that kind of laid out how the office operates. But when you've combined what, four townships into one office, if the County Assessor would come here and say, you know, we're reorganizing duties and we can eliminate four positions, would you be willing to pay \$70,000 for renovations, I think the Council would be more favorable toward that. If, you know, we would see some movement on the County Assessor's side from reorganizing the duties and better taking care of what's going on in that office. It's just, when you look in the business world, many times when you have combinations you eliminate duplicate positions, and we haven't seen any of that out of the County Assessor. So, you know, if he would move to generate some efficiencies in that office -- and there is one of his deputies.

Glen Koob: Yes.

Councilmember Lloyd: I just wanted to make that point that if he came in and said, we're going to reorganize, there's a possibility we can eliminate some positions, would the Council be interested in assisting with \$70,000 for office renovations? I think he would get a more favorable look than what is occurring now.

President Shetler: Alright. Yes, Councilman Raben?

Councilmember Raben: And with or without that, I mean, my main reason or concern with the appropriation in the amount of \$70,000 is, you know, we still don't have an affirmative plan on what we're doing next door with the 30,000 feet on the other side of that wall. So until we get that far along in the process with that space, I hate to spend \$70,000 here when it's quite possible somebody down the hall in and around this office could possibly move into that newer space and allow him more opportunities there. So I understand the situation down there is crowded and no doubt, I mean, some expansions or renovations need to happen, but until we know exactly what we're going to do next door I think we're foolish to spend \$70,000 for what might be just a band-aid effect.

President Shetler: Councilman Bassemier was actually next and then Councilman Kiefer.

Councilmember Bassemier: I was just going to ask...Ms. Koob?

Glen Koob: Oh, I'm sorry, Glen Koob, Vanderburgh County Assessor's Office. Before you ask me, let me just say, I think last week Assessor Weaver said that he was going to be gone this week to an advanced Assessor class or school.

Councilmember Bassemier: Since we've consolidated the township assessors, in your honest opinion, have we saved any money since this has all been changed?

Glen Koob: Yes, we lost three full-time people and then, as Jim will know, this sticks in my craw, we lost all of our part-time people. And you saved probably \$25,000 a person by hiring the part-time people to go out in the field and let our full-time people in there. I would like to visit the part about what exactly people we could get rid of. And there's not people doing duplicate jobs. I don't understand that. But we have a real estate department, the people that were chief deputies are now bringing their knowledge, honestly, to the real estate department. And I can speak on the real estate department because that's what I deal with, okay. And I know the rest of the jobs because I was an Assessor at Perry Township. So I don't see where there's duplication of jobs, honestly.

Councilmember Bassemier: The other question I have, I know a couple of years ago, I think the Commissioners and all of you got together and said it would be best to stay in that location, but that was before they consolidated the Assessor's office. Is there a possibility now that your office, instead of spending the \$70,000, move to the old jail and let them renovate the old jail for your offices? Would that be feasible at the present time?

Glen Koob: You know, I really can't speak on it. I thought it was going to be more expensive to move us to the old jail and I thought we were in the thought that since we were there with the Auditor, the Recorder and the Treasurer, who we deal with every day, I thought we were going to stay where we were, just remove the walls. I don't know. I'm really, I guess, not in on the beginning, the basic, you know, discussions with it, but I thought that's where we were. And the reason why we need to move, Center Township is larger – I have 16 people in my office in the real estate division and we're all in Knight Township's old office. Well, as Councilman Kiefer and Councilman Goebel, they've been down there and they saw, when you walk in the door, we have one lady up under the counter with her desk, it's not even a desk, it's a table. Then we have three other people to her left that their desks are back to back and then there's another one on the side of her. And so as you, you have to kind of wind your way to get into the one door. You know, and then in the very back office it's like a quarter of what an officeholder would sit in. A quarter of an office. And you have two people in there. Thank goodness they're both small ladies. But we have two desks in there where there's two people sitting in there. So it is cramped in my office. And we just need to move them down, you know, to shift the – and it would be nice if it was wide open like the Auditor's Office and the Treasurer's Office because, and the Records's Office because we do intermingle a lot. Like now, I have to walk next door to get to my two real estate people that are in another office because they don't fit in mine, and I have to go over there and tell them their duties and, you know, explain to them, again, what I just told the people in my office. I guess they could have come over, but you know, I had enough...then the next department is the transfer department, we deal with them a lot because they do the deeds. Then the other one is the sales disclosure, you know, it would be nice if we were in there because when there is a sale, we have to know what that sale is about. Is it an arm's length sale, or whatever? So yes, it would be great if we were all in there, that we could all intermingle and do our duties. And I don't know, I really don't know, honestly, who you could get rid of because they all have a duty. And we do help. If the personal property department, if they're busy, like they're really going to be busy May 15<sup>th</sup>, they'll get buckets, and buckets, and buckets, postal boxes of mail because of the personal property forms. Then, right now, we're helping the transfer department do addressing, and we've got 24,000 addresses to work on and correct and look at to make sure they're correct for the dispatch center out there. So, you know, we intermingle with a lot of offices. It's not like we, as Councilman Kiefer will tell you, you know, we're pretty busy. I think he was pretty overwhelmed when he came down there that day. We do a lot down there. We still have to look at houses, we don't just go out and say, oh, that house sold for \$100,000, so that's what the assessment is. You don't do it that way. You have sales, comps, you have costs that you have to go by according to the state, and income, which you don't use on houses, but you do use on commercial. So that's what we do. Come on down and see us.

President Shetler: Alright, thank you. Councilman Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Thank you. Glen, I totally appreciate what you guys are going through and I would not say that your people aren't working. A couple of things as far as from my perspective is, last week, I think Mr. Rector said there may

be some ways to do it less expensively. You know, one idea was maybe, and I think Councilman Sutton suggested this, maybe relocate on a temporary basis while they come in there and get the construction done and knock it out, so that could save some money. And then I agree with Councilman Raben, you know, we still have a master plan that I think we're waiting on as far as this vacant space, so for some of those reasons, you know, I'd kind of like to wait to see because I don't want to rush off to spend the 70 and then later it comes out in the master plan that, boy, this is a more ideal way of doing it. Or, David Rector comes up with some better, more efficient way to do the work so it's a little bit less expensive. So for those reasons is why I'd like to wait to see how we might be able to do this less expensively. And additionally, and I do appreciate the fact that you guys did have GAGE in there. I'd really like to see what their report is when that final product comes out as well. But thank you for what you're doing. Appreciate it.

President Shetler: Councilman Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Good morning, Glen.

Glen Koob: Good morning, Mike.

Councilmember Goebel: I don't think we need to go over, I think this group is going to vote to hold for now. I think right now the Assessor's Office is in a temporary stage regardless, so we do need to make sure this is exactly what we want. I do wholeheartedly agree that we should keep the Assessor's Office where it is located and I don't know what offices might be able to be moved to the other area, but I think that plan has to be developed before we vote funding for this. On a different topic, do you know if the state legislature granted a delay in the Reassessment since their session dealing with that is over? I know they've got to come back for the final –

Glen Koob: You know, we had a telephone conference with the DLGF a couple of weeks ago and, Barry Wood, he's like the Assistant DLGF Director, he told me he would call me and he gave me the bill number. It was House Bill something where they were, you know how they get together. I'm not real sure. Do you know? I don't know.

Councilmember Goebel: Well, their session –

Glen Koob: Bill, do you know?

Bill Fluty: I can tell you what's proposed. There is a plan now, and where they're headed, there is a lot going on right now and I can't say that it has or hasn't been passed, but the proposal is to delay the reassessment completely or actually do away with it. But then actually offer up a rolling reassessment, which actually allows doing 20,000 parcels in each county, with actually a percentage of either farm, ag, industrial, or residential. So they're lessening what they have to accomplish every year and do it on a 20,000 parcel basis or some percentage that fits that county. So reassessment, if it goes forward, it's going to change dynamically. It's going to be less of a burden because it's very difficult for them to get all 96,000 parcels done in a year's time. So they're looking for a rolling reassessment.

Councilmember Goebel: So reassessment would be every five years then?

Glen Koob: It would be five years in a row instead of –

Bill Fluty: Every year. It will just be continuous.

Glen Koob: Instead of being 18 months, it's going to be every year. We're going to do 20,000 parcels. And that would be like the size, say, of Armstrong, German, Perry, Union and part of Scott. But that's just residential.

Councilmember Goebel: And an individual's property would be reassessed every five years if you do 20% each year, correct?

Glen Koob: Yeah, I don't really like that plan, but –

Councilmember Goebel: So the reassessment workload is going to be per year, knocked down 80%?

Glen Koob: Well, I know, but that's the reassessment workload, but we still have, say, for instance, you build a house after March 1, 2009, we still have to pick you up for 2010 and put you on the rolls because we may not hit your house for four years down the road, so we can't let your house sit there not paying taxes on it for four years. So we have to do our ongoing duties. You know what I'm saying?

Councilmember Goebel: You might become quite popular if you could work that out.

Glen Koob: I bet I will.

Councilmember Goebel: The other question I had was concerning Pictometry. Have we had those photos taken or is that going to be delayed until fall?

Glen Koob: No, I believe they've taken the photos and I believe we're supposed to get them in June, that's what – rumor has it. I really am probably not a good person to ask that one because I haven't seen the photos or I haven't talked to the people. That's not in my bailiwick. I don't know.

Councilmember Goebel: We haven't gotten official word here after it was approved.

Glen Koob: Okay, well, maybe they have, but I don't really know that.

Councilmember Goebel: Does anyone know?

Glen Koob: I've been doing trending since February and I'm finished actually for next year.

President Shetler: Mike, I haven't heard. I've not gotten anything.

Councilmember Goebel: I assume then that it has not been done. Is that a good bet?

President Shetler: I don't know.

Councilmember Goebel: We'll drop that. Thank you.

Glen Koob: The guy that's gone today or the guy that would know is off today.

President Shetler: Okay.

Councilmember Lloyd: To your point, Pictometry was going to allow the office to operate more efficiently as well.

Glen Koob: Yes, it will. What Pictometry will do, is if you go – well, let's don't use you. If a taxpayer would go out and they would put an addition on their house and not get a building permit, it will come, a show of, like, say for instance, we're taking these pictures, I'm using this as an example, okay? Say we would take these pictures this year in 2009 and next year, while we're doing the reassessment, it's still doing our pickups. Someone would go out and put a room addition on or build a new garage, which happens a lot farther out in the county. And we would know then if we had other pictures taken, that they had put an addition on their house or put a new garage in because we wouldn't have it. It would – what it does is, it shows your original house and then it, the way I understand it is, it outlines it in red, the new part that you put on. If you put a two-story house, an addition up, and a lot of people are remodeling now because it's so expensive to build and with the economy. You know, so they are remodeling. And believe it or not, sorry taxpayers of Vanderburgh County, they don't always get a permit. So that's what Pictometry is going to help with a lot.

President Shetler: Alright, thank you. Okay, we have a motion –

Bill Fluty: Let me, I think I said 20,000 parcels. I meant to say 20% of the parcels, if anybody caught that. So, did I say 20%?

Glen Koob: Yeah.

Bill Fluty: If I said 20,000, I meant 20% of the parcels.

Glen Koob: And we have 82,000 parcels in residential, commercial, tax exempt, that's not counting the personal property we do now or the deed changes or the transfers, well, that's transfers of real estate or any of that. That just is in the real estate department.

President Shetler: Councilman Sutton?

Councilman Sutton: Now, I know a lot of what you guys are dealing with wasn't of your making, it was things related to the referendum and to the state changes and all regarding how your office operates and all the offices coming together, but I was going to ask and I don't know if you would be able, I don't know if you've got the response since Assessor Weaver isn't here and Mr. Rector isn't in town as well, but regarding the discussion we had last week, and Councilman Kiefer mentioned it regarding the suggestions on how we might be able to look at this project, perhaps a more efficient or maybe a less costly way, has there been any progress made on that suggestion?

Glen Koob: I can't answer that, I'm sorry. I'm sure I could – I'll make a note and tell Jonathan when he gets back maybe to contact you and let you know that answer.

Councilman Sutton: Well, I think we all would like to know the answer.

Glen Koob: Sure, I meant, then you could spread the word.

Councilman Sutton: I think that what we're – I think you guys have explained, and rationally so, how it's important that you're in the location that you're in regarding the other offices that you deal with. But I think one of the questions that we are still really plodding over is how this project can be done, recognizing that you guys are all divided off and would like to have it, the efficiency of being able to walk across the room and hand a piece of paper rather than going in and out of the office, that type

of thing. So if we can get some indication on when that progress is going to begin on looking at some other alternatives rather than this second or third shift proposal, that does drive up the cost considerably and if there are some other options or Mr. Rector was a little – he wasn't quite sure if relocating the office on a temporary basis was something that was doable, but –

Glen Koob: I don't know how that's going to work. That's like – I'm not being flippant or anything, but that's like moving all you guys and your computers and stuff into the restroom. You know, moving all of us back across the hall. I mean, can you imagine?

Councilman Sutton: But at the same time, too, the amount of work that a contractor can do in say, an eight hour shift, and then get you back in line to be ready to perform your duties at 8 a.m. the next morning, that's going to significantly cut down on the amount of work. You figure moving the items out to start the project and then moving them back at the end of the project, you're cutting out a considerable amount of time from that contractor and it is stretching out this project.

Glen Koob: Isn't there only three walls?

Councilman Sutton: According to what you guys – three walls.

Glen Koob: I thought they were movable walls from day one, but I don't know.

Councilmember Lloyd: There is electrical run through those walls, though.

Glen Koob: How does – Bill, how did you do your office over there at the Auditor's office?

Councilman Sutton: So perhaps, maybe that's something that he can, as they begin to explore this a little further, like I said, I know you aren't prepared necessarily to discuss that and cover that today, but as soon as we could hear something, I think will give us at least more to work with considering this request we've got here today.

Glen Koob: Okay, to whoever asked me about the Pictometry? I forgot. Councilman Goebel, Eric just got an email and said that the photos have been taken for Pictometry, okay?

President Shetler: Thank you. Okay, I think it boils down to, there's a couple of different reasons here, one, we'd like to see some greater efficiency gained in the office to help facilitate a movement, and then second is, that we would like to see a master plan of the building so we don't spend those monies again down the road here, and I think those are two good, valid reasons why we might want to consider not spending \$70,000 today, but putting that off. The next time Mr. Rector is here, I would like to point out, he's done an excellent job in taking care of this building and putting it together and I understand that his dilemma is that there is a change of administration constantly within: between Commissioners, Councils, City Council, County Council, Mayor or whatever, and as soon as he gets a direction, somebody else is out and a new person is in, and there is a new direction. Basically, that the board that's set up there is a bipartisan apolitical board and I guess, basically, he needs to just probably just take it like he's done everything else and just make a decision, show it to us all, some of us are going to not like every part of it, but we're going to like a lot of it. And just, that becomes our master plan and go with it so that we all feel rooted in what the plan is going to be for the future for this building.



Glen Koob: And just one real quick comment on that, this is a little bit different circumstance, as Councilman Sutton said, is that we've taken eight offices and put them into one office or to four offices, I guess. We've taken eight offices and that's a little bit different because I don't think it was designed for eight. So that's where the difference is. I don't think any, like say, for instance, Bill, if he changes in the Auditor's office, you know, I know what you're saying, nobody, or they'd be silly to go in there and redo that Auditor's office or the Treasurer's office or whatever, but now, all their walls are down. Ours aren't, and I understand what you're saying.

President Shetler: There's no doubt that it would help facilitate smoother working environment for you all, but I think, you know, the risk of duplicating those dollars down the road, to me, is too great to vote in the affirmative on it today. And I would hate to see us do that. We don't have money to do that with today. I would like –

Glen Koob: I tell you what, you go ahead and give us ours and then down the road, you tell them no, okay. Thank you.

President Shetler: The other thing that, you know, and this has nothing to do, it does somewhat in the Assessor's office, just trying to think out if the box here a little bit, I think we may need to look at Auditor, Treasurer, Assessor, and other offices, looking at maybe everybody has their seasons with their workload. And maybe what we need to do is look at who can be cross trained and that for a couple of months they work in the Treasurer's office while they're real busy in May and in November, and a couple of other months they're working at a busier time when you guys are doing reassessment, and maybe they're working at the end of the year, beginning of the year in the Auditor's office, but some people who are cross trained, and perhaps we don't need 30 employees divvied out between the different departments. Maybe we could get by with just ten. So it might be a way of reducing staff by cross training some folks within the offices. And again, it's a way that, I think we've got to break down those parochial barriers within our offices, think outside the box, and think taxpayers, number one, on how to save. So that would be the direction I'd like to give your office and the Auditor's office, and the Treasurer's office, in the future here, so that this coming year it's going to be – it could be very, very tight. We're looking at the state, a billion dollar shortfall, that's going to come down to us and you know that. Because the super council up at Indianapolis has a tendency to sit down on us and cut our monies out. So anyway, we have a motion on the floor –

Councilmember Lloyd: Call for the question.

Councilmember Bassemier: Can you restate the motion?

Councilmember Raben: Motion is to set the request in at zero.

President Shetler: So roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being seven ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

COUNTY ASSESSOR		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1090-4114	Office Renovations	70,000.00	0.00
Total		70,000.00	0.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

REASSESSMENT/COUNTY ASSESSOR

Councilmember Raben: Okay, next under Reassessment, under County Assessor, we have account 2490-1090-1972 down through 2490-1090-3540 for a total of \$21,637. I'll move for approval with a question.

Councilman Sutton: Second.

President Shetler: It's been moved and seconded. Do we have questions? Roll call please.

(Inaudible)

Councilmember Goebel: I know we're limited on time, but again, we have a request for Office Supplies for \$5,000, and I think later in PTABOA, another \$3,500?

Glen Koob: I think that stems from the Council not – I'm not sure about this, but you can tell me. I thought that you would repeal all of the other three townships? I'm not really sure about this, you can tell me, somebody surely can. But then now they're asking for money back in that line item. I think you repealed it, and they never – the money from Knight, Center and Pigeon never rolled over to the County's budget. Is that right? Sandie might know.

Councilmember Lloyd: This is the Reassessment budget.

Glen Koob: Oh, this is Reassessment? Well, isn't that where all of our office supplies and stuff has always come out of? It's the Reassessment budget. Just our salaries always came out of the regular budget.

Councilmember Lloyd: Since it's a reassessment year, I think we're looking at spending that money out of the Reassessment budget. I mean, you could argue it

is used for reassessment.

Glen Koob: Well, that's where they always take our office supplies and things, Councilman Lloyd, they just take our salaries out of the General fund. They always have for 15 years or ten years, haven't they, Sandie?

Councilmember Goebel: Glen, I'm not going in that direction, I'm just kind of curious, the need right now for \$5,000 for Office Supplies without any real explanation except office supplies, it's kind of vague to us.

Glen Koob: Let me say this, we've been given a new rule not to use so much paper because we're running out of money in our Office Supply budget. So, you know, maybe that's a Jonathan question. I don't think that was addressed last week, was it? No. But that's what it is. I think we're running out of money in those line items and that's – since all of us moved over, he inherited everyone and he didn't get any money for it, I believe that's where it's coming from, Mike.

Councilmember Goebel: Yes, I understand. And you're right, this should have been asked last week, however, it would be nice to know what some of these expenses are from this end.

Glen Koob: Okay, alright. Well, you know, I can ask and let you know. I mean, I'll run downstairs when I'm finished and ask and come back and let you know. Alright?

President Shetler: Would you want to take this off and have them come back?

Councilmember Goebel: Not necessarily, I just wanted clarification. If the need is there, if it's not used, I guess it reverts back.

Councilmember Raben: The question is, and I may ask this of the Auditor, the other townships, outlying townships had Office Supply monies in their budgets that was approved, so have those funds been repealed or transferred back within the Assessor's office?

Bill Fluty: My understanding is, he started out this year only with his County Assessor's office supplies, and these are just to pick up, at that point in time, I think you wanted to look at what you needed and I think at that time you talked about, you thought you would be back to ask for appropriations.

Glen Koob: You know, down at the bottom of this form, it shows disbursements and the balance in all those accounts, so that last account has to do with the Pictometry, isn't it? Councilman Shetler, remember the \$110,000 a couple of weeks ago? Remember? That has to do with the Pictometry, I believe, I'm pretty sure. But you can see the disbursements at the bottom of that sheet.

Councilmember Lloyd: The Office Supplies is 2490-1090-2600, and the budget was \$4,000 in that. And then, according to this budget book, last year, they spent \$7,529 for Office Supplies out of the Reassessment. Of course, last year, you didn't have all those township people in there.

Councilmember Raben: I think, I mean, Mr. President, I think that looks appropriate.

Councilmember Goebel: Thank you.

President Shetler: Okay, any more questions? Roll call on the motion, please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being seven ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

COUNTY ASSESSOR		REQUESTED	APPROVED
2490-1090-1972	Level II Certification	7,500.00	7,500.00
2490-1090-1900	FICA	574.00	574.00
2490-1090-1910	PERF	563.00	563.00
2490-1090-2600	Office Supplies	5,000.00	5,000.00
2490-1090-3130	Travel/Mileage	2,000.00	2,000.00
2490-1090-4220	Office Machines	3,000.00	3,000.00
2490-1090-3700	Dues & Subscriptions	1,000.00	1,000.00
2490-1090-3540	Maintenance Contract	2,000.00	2,000.00
Total		21,637.00	21,637.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

President Shetler: I think that does the appropriations.

Glen Koob: What? Is that it? I’ve got two more things. I’ve got two more papers, you guys. I have one – oh, maybe this is for later on down the agenda. It’s for the PTABOA.

Councilmember Raben: We’re going there right now.

Glen Koob: Alright, thank you very much.

<b>GENERAL FUND REPEALS</b>
-----------------------------

**CENTER ASSESSOR  
KNIGHT ASSESSOR  
PIGEON ASSESSOR  
PUBLIC DEFENDER**

Councilmember Raben: Next under General Fund Repeals, we have the Center Assessor, Knight Assessor, and Pigeon assessor, along with Public Defender, I'll move approval on all as listed.

Councilman Sutton: Second.

President Shetler: Any questions? Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being seven ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

CENTER ASSESSOR		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1110-1110-1110	Center Assessor	25,560.00	25,560.00
1110-1120-1110	Chief Deputy	21,389.00	21,389.00
1110-1130-1110	Real Estate Deputy	19,615.00	19,615.00
1110-1140-1110	Residential RE Dep.	15,752.00	15,752.00
1110-1150-1110	Dep. Assr. PP/Data	15,752.00	15,752.00

(Table continued next page)

1110-1160-1110	Deputy Assessor	16,504.00	16,504.00
1110-1170-1110	1 <sup>st</sup> Dep/Ofc Coord.	18,126.00	18,126.00
1110-1180-1110	Pers. Prop. Coord.	18,126.00	18,126.00
1110-1190-1110	Dep. Assr./Deeds	15,894.00	15,894.00
1110-1900	FICA	12,754.00	12,754.00
1110-1910	PERF	6,146.00	6,146.00
Total		185,618.00	185,618.00

KNIGHT ASSESSOR		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1130-1110-1130	Knight Assessor	25,560.00	25,560.00
1130-1120-1130	Chief Deputy	25,507.00	25,507.00
1130-1130-1130	Real Estate Deputy	19,065.00	19,065.00
1130-1140-1130	1 <sup>st</sup> Dep/Ofc. Coord.	16,504.00	16,504.00
1130-1150-1130	Dep. Assr. Mobile Home	14,480.00	14,480.00
1130-1160-1130	Dep. Land Appraiser	19,615.00	19,615.00
1130-1170-1130	Dep. Assr/Business	14,480.00	14,480.00
1130-1180-1130	Dep. Assessor Deeds	14,480.00	14,480.00
1130-1190-1130	2 <sup>nd</sup> Real Est. Deputy	13,216.00	13,216.00
1130-1900	FICA	12,463.00	12,463.00
1130-1910	PERF	6,830.00	6,830.00
Total		182,200.00	182,200.00

PIGEON ASSESSOR		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1150-1110-1150	Pigeon Assessor	25,560.00	25,560.00
1150-1120-1150	Chief Deputy	19,115.00	19,115.00
1150-1130-1150	Real Estate Deputy	18,191.00	18,191.00
1150-1140-1150	Dep. Assr. Bus/PP	13,824.00	13,824.00
1150-1150-1150	Real Est. Trans. Clerk	19,184.00	19,184.00
1150-1160-1150	Dep. Assr. Pers. Prop.	14,480.00	14,480.00
1150-1170-1150	Office Coordinator	15,752.00	15,752.00
1150-1180-1150	Bus. PP 1 <sup>st</sup> Deputy	15,752.00	15,752.00
1150-1190-1150	Real Estate Deputy	18,126.00	18,126.00
1150-1900	FICA	12,239.00	12,239.00
1150-1910	PERF	5,663.00	5,663.00
Total		177,886.00	177,886.00

PUBLIC DEFENDER		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1303-1670-1303	Public Defender	18,786.00	18,786.00
Total		18,786.00	18,786.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

<b>TRANSFER REQUESTS</b>
--------------------------

**CLERK  
PUBLIC DEFENDER  
COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS  
SUPERIOR COURT  
COUNTY COUNCIL  
REASSESSMENT/PTABOA  
DRUG & ALCOHOL DEFERRAL SERVICE (LATE)**

Councilmember Raben: Okay, next under Transfers, we have the Clerk, Public Defender, Community Corrections, Superior Court, County Council, Reassessment/PTABOA, and Drug & Alcohol Deferral Services. Mr. President, I'll move that we approve all transfers as listed.

President Shetler: It's been moved, do I have a second?

Councilman Sutton: Second.

President Shetler: It's been seconded. Any questions? Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being seven ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

**CLERK** **REQUESTED** **APPROVED**

From: 1010-1330-1010	Bookkeeping Clerk	3,065.00	3,065.00
To: 1010-1140-1010	Cashier/Child Support	3,065.00	3,065.00

**PUBLIC DEFENDER** **REQUESTED** **APPROVED**

From: 1303-1670-1303	Public Defender	13,918.00	13,918.00
To: 1303-1640-1303	Public Defender	13,918.00	13,918.00

**COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS** **REQUESTED** **APPROVED**

From: 1361-1210-1361	Confinement Officer	4,870.00	4,870.00
1361-1440-1361	Confinement Officer	10,450.00	10,450.00
To: 1361-1850	Union Overtime	15,320.00	15,320.00

**SUPERIOR COURT** **REQUESTED** **APPROVED**

From: 1370-1410-1370	Probation Officer	6,265.00	6,265.00
To: 1370-1970	Temp. Replacement	6,265.00	6,265.00

**COUNTY COUNCIL** **REQUESTED** **APPROVED**

From: 1480-3520	Equipment Repair	146.00	146.00
To: 1480-4220	Office Machines	146.00	146.00

**REASSESSMENT/PTABOA** **REQUESTED** **APPROVED**

From: 2490-1091-1180	PTABOA Member	4,000.00	4,000.00
To: 2490-1091-2600	Office Supplies	3,500.00	3,500.00
2490-1091-3130	Travel/Mileage	500.00	500.00

**DRUG & ALCOHOL DEFERRAL SERVICE** **REQUESTED** **APPROVED**

From: 1371-3770	Treatment Cost	65.00	65.00
To: 1371-4220	Office Equipment	65.00	65.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)



<b>AMENDMENTS TO SALARY ORDINANCE</b>
---------------------------------------

President Shetler: Next, amendments to the salary ordinance.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, under amendments to the salary ordinance, there is quite a few today, Mr. President, I'm going to move that we approve the amendments as noted and ask that they be entered into the minutes.

President Shetler: Everybody has received a copy of that? Anybody have any questions? I need a second.

Councilmember Goebel: Second.

President Shetler: It's been seconded. Are there any questions? Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being seven ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

**(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)**

<b>CHIEF DEPUTY ASSESSOR JOB DESCRIPTION</b>
--

President Shetler: Is there any old business?

Councilmember Lloyd: Mr. President? Last week we had a situation with the Chief Deputy of the Vanderburgh County Assessor. Since we've just left the amendments to the salary ordinance, is that, can we take that up at this time?

President Shetler: Yes.

Councilmember Lloyd: Councilman Raben wasn't here last week. I believe all of the Councilmembers should have a copy of the job description for the Chief Deputy to the County Assessor and we talked to Mr. Weaver last week about this and apparently, I think President Shetler was the one that noted the Chief Deputy was, I guess, paid at 80 hours of regular salaried time. This person is an exempt employee, approximate salary, like 46,920 a year. And this employee has been off, rightly so, on maternity leave and taking Family Medical Leave. However, when we asked the Assessor, Mr. Weaver, it's been known that this employee was not in the building, but he was signing off the time records that she had been here 40 hours for two weeks. She was not in the building other than coming in maybe one day on Friday or part of a day. And Mr. Weaver indicated that this employee was working from home and fulfilling her eight hours of county straight time working from home, sending him emails, I guess making phone calls to the various people in the office. If the Chief Deputy would serve as the supervisor of the Assessor's Office when the Assessor is out, or in other duties and I think questions were raised, how could the Chief Deputy be supervising 40 paid people in the office when they are not present? And if you look at this job description, which is very extensive, it's four pages, a number of what the duties are, like on the first page you've got:

"Directly supervises and makes task assignments to Real Estate Deputy and Real Estate Clerk.

Answers telephone, greets visitors."

These type of duties, at least in my mind would not be, you would not be able to do them from home. So, I guess, the question was, there were several questions, but county policy regarding exempt employees taking work home, you know, is this employee, she's certainly entitled to her leave based on maternity, but is she entitled to eight hours straight time a day when she is at home working? I mean, you can look at the other duties in the job description. I guess one question was to Mr. Ahlers, and this was brought up to Mr. Weaver, is this some kind of candidate for ghost employment? And I didn't know if you'd had a chance to look at that.

Jeff Ahlers: Well, one of the issues with regard to ghost employment I guess would be whether or not the job duties were being performed. I suppose if someone is not working the amount of time that they're billing to the county, that that may well be suspect under various laws. So that would be a question that would have to be looked into as to whether or not work is actually being performed or duties are being performed or not. When someone is accepting pay or whether someone is authorizing pay, the law also provides, also applies to the person authorizing the pay if duties weren't being performed. So, I mean, those are issues that would have to be looked into. I did speak with one of the county attorneys who works with County Attorney David Miller, Ted Ziemer, and he is going to bring this up with the Commissioners as to whether or not to more specifically address this in the county personnel policy as to whether or not employees will be allowed to get paid to not be in the office or in the building. So I don't think the Commissions have met yet or as of the last time I communicated with Mr. Ziemer, he has not had a chance to bring that to the Commission's attention or had not received a response. So we'll see where that goes in that regard. Obviously, one other thing from a legal standpoint, and a couple of you had asked me, was that if you look at Indiana statute 36-2-5-3, it's very clear in that statute that the County Council controls the compensation and number of officers, deputies, and employees. And the statute

specifically states that this includes the power to describe and classify positions and services. So certainly it's within the ambit of County Council to determine what are the duties and the description and classification of employees, which would include the Chief Deputy. So certainly if you want to modify the classification you can, or if you feel it appropriate to notify the officeholders that you believe that the job classification or description is not being met, certainly you could do that as well, and would be free to adjust compensation or duties accordingly.

President Shetler: Let me kind of rephrase the question a little bit then. What you're saying is, that an officeholder or an elected official may not arbitrarily change the job description of any employee without coming to the Council first?

Jeff Ahlers: That's correct. I mean, County Council controls the classification description and compensation levels of all employees being paid by the General Fund.

President Shetler: Alright. Based on some of Mr. Weaver's comments last week, he readily, I felt, admitted that the job description had been changed to accommodate work at home for this particular employee. That being the case, what would your advice be for us: to send a letter to him asking him to cease that kind of activity? Or for us to change the handbook and go from here? I'm concerned about the precedent that we may be setting allowing work at home.

Jeff Ahlers: Well, I would say, I guess you could address it on a number of different levels. You know, one level, of course, we asked the County Attorney's office to approach the Commissioners which, typically, are the ones that promulgate the personnel manual to perhaps address it there. Certainly it's within your authority to send a letter to the officeholder if you believe that there is an employee that's not performing their duties according to their description and classification as promulgated by County Council, that would certainly be within your authority to do so. In terms of anything beyond that, I guess you would have to do some factual investigation as to whether or not there's any other legal issues, would tend to be a little more factually sensitive and would probably need further inquiry beyond that.

Councilmember Kiefer: Mr. President? Does anybody – is she still working from home or is she back in? I didn't know if she – Glen, is she back at the office now?

(Inaudible – comments not made from the microphone)

President Shetler: Full time?

Glen Koob: I really don't know, I'm at the other end of the hall and I've been doing trending, and I have no idea.

President Shetler: This sounds like another argument for the \$70,000 remodel.

Glen Koob: That's right. Okay, let's go back to that. I can answer questions on that better. But I really don't know. I know that she is here because she came in the office yesterday afternoon, so I don't – I know she's here.

President Shetler: I guess the question that might be on my mind then, since she's the Chief Deputy, why wouldn't she have been here today representing?

Glen Koob: She's been off for three months or however long since she – I shouldn't

say three months, I don't know how long she's been off. You do, I'm sure, but she's not up to date on some of this stuff. You know. We've been going over this, so, I mean, these are our issues. She's not been in the loop, I should say.

President Shetler: Okay, --

Glen Koob: I mean, she makes up the things but he just had me come up today. She's down there, call her.

President Shetler: Okay, I think part of what the whole argument was, is that I think she was paid the last eighty hours because she was supposed to be in the loop, but you're telling me she was not in the loop.

Glen Koob: No, I did not tell you that. I did not say that. Let me make that perfectly clear. No, it's not my issue and I really don't have any -- I can't speak to that.

President Shetler: I think I heard Councilman Kiefer next and then Councilman Lloyd. Thank you.

Councilmember Kiefer: Well, I was just trying to discern whether or not, you know, she was still out and this was still an issue that was pressing us or if it was a one time thing and now it was something we just need to address with the Commissioners to tighten up the personnel policies on whether or not this is something...but it sounds like, if she's still not there, then it might be an ongoing issue.

Glen Koob: She's there.

Councilmember Kiefer: Oh, okay. I'm just asking, you know, I thought you said you didn't know if she was working back at the office.

Glen Koob: Yeah, she is working, he asked, I think Councilman Shetler asked me how long or somebody did and I said, I don't know. I really don't know. She's here.

Councilmember Kiefer: Oh okay, so she is back at the office on a full-time basis.

Glen Koob: She was here yesterday, she was in my office yesterday afternoon seeing Shirley, I think.

Councilmember Kiefer: So it may be that we just need to get this, tighten up the policies with the Commissioners if she's back -- it sounds like she is.

Councilmember Lloyd: I was just going to further inform Councilman Raben since he wasn't here, it was our understanding she had exhausted all her personal and vacation time. I had written down February 17, I don't know if that was the date when she left or that was the date the baby was born. That's the date she left? Okay, and she's been employed approximately three years, I believe, she came in with Assessor Weaver, so I mean, the question is, is the county getting eighty hours of work or forty hours of work a week out of her at home? And my contention would be, I don't see how we could. I don't believe she would have access to the computer system as far as to make changes from home or do you know that?

Glen Koob: That's between the tech department and her. I really don't know.

Councilmember Raben: You know, just one brief comment, whether in this isolated case the person is or isn't, or does have access, doesn't have, it still takes us down a dangerous path because it's not just with pregnancies, it's surgeries, you know, elective, non-elective, you know, regardless. We've got 650 employees that all would like to, when they're off for medical reasons or you know, whatever reason, to be paid. You know, and you just, once you get started, you know, it never ends. And, you know, if the person, once they use their time, as the policy states, once you use your sick days, your personal days, your vacation days, you don't get paid. You know, that's your incentive to get back to work. I mean, that's the other problem. We'd have a lot of people that, you know, spend an additional month off that, you know, if they were still able to get paid for not being here. So, and then the other things are, too, there are some other reasons such as comp. issues. You know, if I'm working from my house and I trip and fall down my steps, you were paying me, I was at work. You know, we've got workman comp. issues. When they're driving their automobile, you're getting paid eight hours and you have an accident in your car because you ran down to the grocery while you're on duty, I'm on duty. You know, in the business world, that's certainly a lot of concern and, you know, that's why a lot of businesses prohibit people to work outside of the office, so, or outside of the factory, or what have you. But we just don't want to go here. I mean, hopefully, this is an isolated case and it's not going on within any of our county offices, hopefully it hasn't and hopefully it won't ever happen again. So I don't think we change a thing, I think we follow the policy to the T and, you know, the time off is, what you have coming to you is what you got, and other than that, get back to work.

Councilman Sutton: Last week I asked the question at the end of the discussion on this topic, okay, what's the next step, where do we go from here, what's going to be the issues that are going to be addressed and who is going to be involved with that? Government is a different animal and I think sometimes government, in terms of what it does, it operates very well, but there are other times when, you know, we have these issues that arise that we scratch our heads and wonder why we're doing it a certain way or how come it can't be viewed from a different perspective. In this case here, you know, as we know, each of our county offices, they can operate as their own, not only are they running the operations of their office, but they're their own HR area, as well. They've got other functions. We don't have a centralized human resources function for county government. When you look at it from a traditional standpoint of how things operate today. The Commissioners have a little bit of that HR function, we have a little bit from the standpoint, from a compensation standpoint, but really it comes down to each individual officeholder making decisions on their own about their interpretation of policy and their direction on how they're going to follow certain things. And I'm not sure that that's always necessarily in line with probably what the overriding, over arching policy may be for the county and perhaps maybe as we look at issues like this, I'm sure that there are other offices that probably have some, what we would deem as violations or infractions of our policy as a whole, but how do you monitor that? I'm not really sure what the next step is, whether it's here before this body or the Commissioners in regards to that. One of the first steps I think would be very helpful is that each officeholder, if there was someone or something that could take leadership on this, and explain step by step what this personnel policy actually means and what they're supposed to do, because there may be some violations of the policy just based upon just lack of knowledge and we would hate to see that. Whether that's the issue here, I'm not really sure.

President Shetler: Well said, Councilman Sutton. I guess where I'm coming from,

I think the next step would be to pass this along to the Commissioners, which is in the process of being done, for them to present this in the handbook so that the employee handbook reflects it. I think state law is also another integral part of this whole HR issue here, that this year some – and I think they do give us fairly clear channels here in that a department head or an elected officeholder may not arbitrarily change the job description on their own. They must come back to this body and request such a change. And that's what keeps it so that the public understands what's going on because this is the public place to do those kinds of things. And then it's a different matter. I think Councilman Raben's points about workman's compensation and those kind of issues and questions are legitimate questions and I'm also thinking in terms of someone hearing about someone getting paid a forty hour work week and they say, well, I just saw them going out and picking up the mail at 2:00 this afternoon, and I saw them walking down the street doing this and doing that and stuff. It gets to be, you know, people complain about county and city workers anyway sometimes, you know, not maybe working as hard as they thought they ought to be working and stuff, not realizing that they're waiting on concrete to be delivered or a chainsaw that broke or whatever may have happened, they see them standing there and they jump to conclusions right away that they're standing around. But we just need to patch those holes up. I think it would be a good idea to perhaps send a letter to the officeholders explaining that this is – that the proper steps that one needs to take in the future and hopefully the Commissioners will tighten it up with the handbook. So I think there are some remedies to the situation that we have and that we can move forward from this point on.

Councilman Sutton: I would suggest you send that letter to all the officeholders.

President Shetler: Good suggestion. Very good suggestion.

Councilman Sutton: Just based on what I said earlier.

President Shetler: That's excellent. I agree. Alright, anything else? Yes, Councilman Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yeah, well said, Mr. President. I do think that, you know, there's two issues here. One is, the Council discouraging the use of working from the home, which I think from my understanding, there's nothing illegal about this. I think Ted Ziemer had said that, you know, there was no clear definition of that in the policy, so that's one issue. But the other issue is, like you said, changing what they do and changing that description, that job description. So there's really two separate issues and I don't see anything wrong with the Council broaching this conversation and discouraging the use of working from home as Mr. Shetler said. That's a dangerous precedent that affects tax dollars.

President Shetler: Alright. Yes, Councilman Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: The other thing that was questioned last week, the Assessor, Mr. Weaver, he indicated that the Chief Deputy signed all the time tickets for Kronos or at least they verified all the employees in the office worked forty hours that week while she was not there. So, I mean, I think that's a problem, but as we indicated, I guess, legally, if an officeholder says yes, this employee worked forty hours and signs off on it, then that's the legal issue. She may be on the phone with the Assessor two hours a day or three hours a day.

Glen Koob: I have some input on that. As a department head, we have a calendar that we keep track of our own employees and match it with her, so that's really not an issue. Each department head does that.

Councilmember Lloyd: Okay, but then they're saying whatever you turn in is correct.

Glen Koob: Well, they swipe a time card, we just keep the sick and the vacation and the – something else – oh, the personal time. We do that. But they do swipe in a card and Bill gets it in his office. So that's how, you know, they keep track of it like that. Everybody has a time card. And we keep track of the personal time, the vacation, and the –

President Shetler: Of course there are issues that deal with when someone leaves for lunch and swipes the card and then maybe someone else swipes it for them or –

Glen Koob: No. No.

President Shetler: – come back in and you have some verifiable stuff that she's supposed to be directly involved in.

Glen Koob: They rat on each other. Just kidding. I know they're watching. Just kidding.

President Shetler: Yeah, her job is to – okay. Thank you.

Councilmember Kiefer: But then she, I don't know that – again, this is good reason why the Commissioners need to tighten this policy up a little bit. But, you know, I don't know that she has necessarily done anything wrong, because she's been given permission by her person she reports to. She's been given the okay to work from home. So, I mean, I don't want to sit here and make all accusations about a certain employee when she's been given permission from her direct person she reports to, to do these things.

President Shetler: No, I would agree. I think that the officeholder has probably overstepped his boundaries and what he is actually authorized to be able to do in this particular case of re-describing an employee's job description. Alright, any other questions or comments about that?

<b>PROPOSED 2010 COUNTY EMPLOYEE COMPENSATION</b>
---

President Shetler: One thing I want to bring up real quickly, since a couple of department heads are still here before we get into Mr. Deisher's comments, is that for the 2010 wages, I'd like for all the department heads to set in a rate of zero for an increase in pay. I'm alarmed that, I think I heard on the news this morning or last night that the state budget looks like, just in the last month, maybe a 250 million dollar deficit. A billion dollars for the year that they may be looking or facing towards, their usual way of reconciling that and making things on an even playing field is to come back to the local level and put more burden on us. And I'm concerned about that. Now, by saying that, that's not to say that we aren't going to try everything we possibly can to try to come up with some kind of pay increase for every employee. As long as I can recall, we've done that at some level or another. But this year, for budget purposes because many are starting to inquire about it, I would entertain that we would ask them to submit a zero percent wage increase

and that we could go from there at budget sessions. By then everything should be ironed out at the state level and we should know a little bit better where we stand and be able to see what money is left in the treasury after it's all said and done and decide at that point what we're going to be able to afford.

Councilman Sutton: Mr. President, I recognize this is your first year in the chair there, but we always vote on that.

President Shetler: I said I'd entertain, I didn't –

Councilman Sutton: Okay, we take recommendations from the floor before we make a pronouncement or announcement about what direction we're going to do, so I didn't know what your –

President Shetler: I said I entertained, Councilman Sutton. I thought I made that clear. I didn't suggest that –

Councilman Sutton: Well I guess hearing what you were saying is, you were saying to get the word out to the other officeholders, that this is what we were going to do. And I was just – it didn't sound like a "we", it sounded like a "me" as the way you were suggesting that.

President Shetler: Yes, Councilman Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: (Inaudible – microphone not turned on) that we will keep an open mind that way, if there's no monies there and we set in an amount, that it won't hurt their feelings if we have to drop it. I like the part you said, we will keep an open mind if there's extra monies. I know the twelve years I sat on the Council, we always found monies in insurance or whatever. Just so we keep an open mind, if there is monies there, I'd like to see our hard-working employees get some kind of raise.

President Shetler: Alright, thank you. Councilman Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Will this directive also be issued to the organizations we have oversight for?

President Shetler: That's a – given the last meeting, that's a good point to bring up. I would think so, yes. If this would pass by the body that this recommendation that I'm making would go through, then yes, I would suggest that we do this to all supporting agencies.

Councilmember Goebel: Like Councilmember Bassemier said, I think we all would like to see pay raises for the employees. I don't know if we're really informed at this point enough, with what's happening at state, I think it's pretty obvious all revenues are down as far as operating government: income tax, property tax, even river boat gambling monies and things like that are down, so we've got to be realistic, but do we know yet, Mr. Fluty?

Bill Fluty: I don't think we're quite there yet and I think some of that is going to evolve here shortly. As you all know, we have caps that are coming up where we will not be able to collect beyond a certain point of one and a half, two and a half percent or three and a half percent, depending on the categories. After those, and this will be the first year for those caps. Once you see those caps this year, you



can make a prediction of how they will affect you the following years and that will tell you kind of where you're headed. And I think as soon as those tax bills are out, we actually will see what caps, what monies aren't available to you this year. There will be a prediction to make for the following years, then I think you can make an informed decision on how you want to go forward. And then rate caps, they're telling you to do two things, cut services, cut expenses or maybe look for another tax, because you're not going to get it from property tax.

Councilman Sutton: Are you getting a general sense of when you think that information might be available to you?

Bill Fluty: That's going to be in the next month, month and a half.

Councilman Sutton: I mean, I'd think Councilman Goebel's suggestion is a really good one. I think it would benefit us all if when you got that information, if you could give us, and normally it's before we start our budget time that you will give some projections and some information about where we stand financially. I think, given the environment that we're in right now, as soon as you know something, if we could have in maybe our regular meeting, a presentation from your office about the financial status, the standing of the county based upon the state information and the projections that you have. I mean, we got our first financial statement this month. That would not only help us from a budget standpoint, but help us really going forward for the rest of this year and then inform the public as well about the financial situation that we all are trying to operate under.

Bill Fluty: I think the July meeting I would have all that answered and we'd have the first six months of the year. I would actually know how those caps impacted us. We'd see our miscellaneous revenues for the first six months of the year. I think we run similar to other businesses, when the economy is like this, our miscellaneous falls, too. But I'd be happy to do that and I think that will give you a clear picture about this year's budgets and budgets following.

President Shetler: Yes, Councilman Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: President Shetler, you're suggesting that departments begin now, though, figuring at a zero and they can just add to it without taking a vote here or – because I don't know if we have enough information with that, but if they begin the process now, they've got somewhere to go. I don't think anyone thinks we're going to be able to grant what we have in the past, at this point.

President Shetler: That's correct. Usually in May, the department heads start picking up the forms to start filling out and they usually want some guidance by this body to how much they should plug in for salary increases and my suggestion is, is that we look at establishing an '09 figure to slot in for the time being. By the time the budget hearings come around in August, we will have the information from the County Auditor, we will have known what the state is doing at the legislature level and hopefully have some kind of better feel on where the economy is at that time. And then I think as we get down and we start squeezing things together, we might be able to come up with an – as Councilman Bassemier pointed out, I would rather add something to it. I think we'll have a whole lot more grateful people than we will if we have to end up taking away from. So that's merely my suggestion and it's up to this body to decide on that. Councilman Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: And I did – I can't speak for him, but I did talk to Councilman

Raben about this and he was okay with it at this point. What we're trying to do is give the department heads and the officeholders guidance so what the president is recommending is zero percent with the hope that the Council can find monies to grant some kind of general salary increase. But historically we've given them this, the first of May we've given them some kind of number to shoot for.

Councilmember Bassemier: Mr. President, I'd just like to add to what I suggested a while ago, there's no way, if the employees do get a raise, it's going to benefit me, because I'm not going to take a pay raise for my next three years or health insurance, so I'm all for the employees. But I'd just, for the money, if it's there, that they would get some of it for a decent pay raise.

President Shetler: Alright, agreed. Okay, did – we've got a couple department heads here, do you guys want to make any comment or...

Rick Davis: If I may?

President Shetler: Yes, Rick?

Rick Davis: Glen has a request, she wanted to know if –

Glen Koob: I just wanted to know, I thought in the past, Sandie, that we had to turn in a small amount whether they allowed us to or not because if we didn't turn it in, we weren't allowed to raise it. Is that not true?

Sandie Deig: (Inaudible – microphone not turned on)

Glen Koob: Okay, but if we don't turn it in, we don't get it, right? If they would happen to change their minds?

Sandie Deig: (Inaudible – microphone not turned on)

Glen Koob: They can?

Sandie Deig: Council can raise it; they can take something out of another line.

Glen Koob: Okay, okay. Thanks.

Rick Davis: For those of you who don't know, Rick Davis, County Treasurer. As an officeholder, officeholders did not take a pay raise last year and county employees did get a slight raise. Zero percent is easy to figure out. I can do that in my head. I can just give you what we had last year. I, personally, would like at least anywhere from one to 3 percent to turn in. You can always turn it down, but at least we've got a number out there, even if it's just one or one and a half, or even 3 percent. Yes, the economy is really lousy right now and there's still a lot of uncertainty, especially with the state of Indiana, they're going into a special session, but at least give us the opportunity to put the numbers out there for you so that you can turn them down. A zero percent, that's real easy, that's a no-brainer. So at least let us give you a one, two, three percent and then chop them down once you get the request.

President Shetler: Of course there are several businesses out there and non-profits that have actually taken a cut, reduction, to save employees.

Rick Davis: And as with last year, as an officeholder, I'd be glad not to take a raise

if my employees could get one. I think one of the officeholders last year said they make us look good and I wholeheartedly agree with that comment. If you want the officeholders and therefore the Chief Deputies, because they're set in at 75 percent of our salary, if you want us to put a zero percent raise in for those two items, I'm all for that. But at least let me let the employees have a chance to increase their wages next year.

President Shetler: Alright, thanks, Rick. Yes, Councilman Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: I don't know what the numbers, how they'll balance, I agree and appreciate Mr. Davis' comment, but I think if we go to simply a 1 percent, it's going to be much more beneficial for the people in the top than it will be for the lower levels as far as pay goes and so maybe just a number figure if we're going down that low instead of a percentage. I don't know –

President Shetler: And I think that's all worthy of debate of how to maybe orchestrate that this coming year, which is, I guess, why I'm, I don't want to say deferring it because the two and a half that we gave last year was not in concrete until we passed it anyway, so at this moment, I guess I'm suggesting that we kind of defer that on down until we have a lot more information and don't get people's hopes up too high here, I guess, is where I'm coming from.

Councilmember Goebel: I don't think that hopes are going to be too high. I do think we have to do everything we can to retain workers. That's all I have to say. Thank you.

President Shetler: Alright, do I have a motion?

Councilmember Lloyd: Motion to set in the increase at zero.

President Shetler: At the '09 levels? Do I have a second?

Councilmember Kiefer: Second.

President Shetler: Motion and it's been seconded. Any further questions about the motion? Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: I'm just going to be real brief, I mean, we operate a year behind in county government, and we all know what's been going on just within the economy and even at the budget period last year, I think we were very clear in making it known that 2010 would be a very tough year for Vanderburgh County. I don't think we, in any way, well, we didn't put it any other way, that 2009, if we were able to give a raise at that time, it would be a stretch for us for this year in 2010, it was looking highly improbable, so I'm going to go ahead and vote yes for this.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: I'm going to vote yes, also, you know my feelings. If there's monies there, I know we'll all work together and give our county employees a raise if we can. So until we find out the exact figure, I'm going to vote yes, also.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

**(Councilmember Raben left prior to vote)**

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being six ayes and no nays, the motion carries to plug in zero, and I'd give direction to Sandie to send out a memo to all the officeholders and department heads setting the salary at the 2009 level. And again, I do want to add some optimism behind that all and to say that we will make every effort to try to pass on an increase. Not promising any kind of big lofty increase, but you know, it may be modest, but that we will try to pass on something to each and every employee.

<b>TIM DEISHER BKD/UPDATE ON JOB STUDY</b>
--

Tim Deisher: As the president said, Tim Deisher with BKD. I just wanted to report in on where we're at with the process of updating the job descriptions. We have updated and finished the job descriptions for the Auditor's office, Recorder and Treasurer's offices. The Council had asked us not to piecemeal it, the job descriptions when bringing before this body, but do so whenever the job is complete. The next plan is for job descriptions in the Sheriff's department and the Clerk's office be updated. And we're currently in the plan of gathering the organizational data to present to you an engagement letter to do so. We hope to have that by your mid-May meeting and be able to finalize that and get started on those offices by June. Other offices is the Assessor, looking, figuring out the courts and continue the process throughout 2009.

President Shetler: Alright, questions? Yes, Councilman Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Tim, when you guys write these job descriptions, and you may have described this before maybe last year before I was on Council or maybe even earlier and I just didn't understand the process, but do you physically go out and visit each of these departments, meet with these employees, meet with the department heads? Can you tell me a little bit about your process for writing a job description?

Tim Deisher: Sure, it's a good question. We first meet with the officeholder and whoever they designate that we work with just to set up the parameters, set out the expectations and set up the process. We then hold employee meetings so we meet with each of the employees of the various offices to convey the process. We have a form, different forms for COMOT employees, PAT employees and so forth, for them to then fill out to give us feedback and input as to what their duties are and things that have changed over the 20 or 30 years since they were last done. And the officeholder, department head, reviews their forms prior to us getting the forms and then we have a process of rewriting and we submit them to the officeholder or

department head, the rewritten job description. They give us feedback as far as tweaking it and then they finally sign off on the job description that comes before Personnel and to Council.

Councilmember Kiefer: So all you are doing is looking at what is actually, what each employee actually does in order to write their description? There's no part of this process that you discover, hey, if you did something a little bit differently, it might make it better for that position? You don't make recommendations on job descriptions, you're just merely recording what is actually happening?

Tim Deisher: Yeah. For the Auditor, I mean, he's running the office and we don't try to step in and make, recommend changes. We take what they're currently doing and documenting that in their job description at the officeholder or department head's approval.

Councilmember Kiefer: Yeah, and I understand that and appreciate that, I just am curious if there are things that in this lengthy and somewhat probably costly process of writing all these descriptions, if you can't help but notice something that says, you know, if you would do this and that, boy, that would probably save a lot of money. But that's obviously not your directive or your job, but I was just curious how that worked.

President Shetler: Other questions? Councilman Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: The number of positions in the two offices that you're getting ready to tackle, I guess the Sheriff, you're already in the middle of and the Clerk is the next one?

Tim Deisher: The Sheriff's we're working on, we think we've got a pretty good number but having interaction back and forth. There's 52 positions in the Clerk's office for job descriptions.

President Shetler: Other questions, comments? Thank you, Tim. Appreciate the update.

<p><b>RICK DAVIS, TREASURER</b> <b>2009 PROPERTY TAX BILLS</b></p>
--

Rick Davis: Thank you for having me this morning on short notice. I came here, I'm not asking for money, I'm here for a public service announcement.

President Shetler: Thank you, then.

Rick Davis: Yes. As you know, tax bills have not arrived in the mail yet and the phones the last month or two in our office and I'm sure in the Auditor's office, as well, I talked to the ladies down at the switchboard, they've all been getting questions, people are asking when are my taxes going to be due? As you know, we went to a new property tax billing system this year. Due to that, we had some conversion issues that had to be taken care of in addition to changes in the state legislature. Its been very complex. We have the new software system, we are nearly complete. At this time, we are hoping to bill in late May with a mid-June deadline. And that's if everything between now and that day goes well. There is still a few more complicated steps to go. But I did want to tell everyone watching on television today to be expecting a mid-June deadline. We have done the best

that we can in our office to publicize that, especially for folks who are on a fixed income or social security, they only get one check per month. The last thing I wanted to do is give people the bare minimum, 15 day notice required by law to pay a 600 or \$1,200 installment where they would only have 15 days to come up with that amount of money. So the newspaper the last three weeks has run two articles stating what I just said. The first one telling them to expect a mid-June payment deadline. And the second one, I asked people to budget, save a little bit out of that May check that they get, so when they get their June check and their bill for June that they don't have to decide whether to pay their tax bill or medicine or food or clothing. So, the newspaper did a great job as well as some of the T.V. stations getting that word out. And we've also put that information on our Internet website. We've had a lot of traffic driven to the website and I also want to tell people that, even though they may only get the 15 day notice when they get the bill in the mail, we are doing our best to give them an additional two week notice to go to our website. We have the website, it's basically ready to go. Unfortunately, it just has zeros valued in right now. We don't want to unveil it and just have zeroes on the website. We want people to go to the website we have now which has the old information, so they could at least see what they paid last year and budget, even though they don't have a bill now, they can kind of get a good gauge, at least in the ballpark, of what they spent last year. So we've left the old website up so people can look at their information from last year for budgeting purposes. Once we have the new bills, it generally takes two weeks for the printer to print the bills. During that two week period we will have a press conference, I hope that Auditor Fluty will join me and Assessor Weaver, because the three of us are a three-man team with property tax billing. We want to drive people to our new website so that they can see how much their bill is. Instead of 15 days, that's a 29 day window, which is closer to a month. So I'm happy with that and they can pay their bill in advance using that information and they can pay that bill online. So public relations are very critical right now to give people as much notice as they can so they aren't surprised or shocked whenever they get their bill at the end of May. And I appreciate you allowing me to come up and inform you of that. I also dropped off, each of you has a list here, it's from the Department of Local Government Finance. It shows where all of the counties in the state of Indiana are. And for those of you at home, if you want this chart, you can go to [www.in.gov/dlgf](http://www.in.gov/dlgf). On the side there will be a column that says Rates and other information. Click on Rates and at the bottom there will be a pdf chart of the entire map that shows where everyone is. If you'll notice, Marion and Brown county are still white, they haven't even started. They are way behind the curve and up in the northern section, Porter, LaPorte and St. Joe are in the very beginning sections. Posey County billed for last year about a month ago, so despite the changes with HB 1001 and despite the fact that we've had to convert to a new software system, I think we are in great shape when you look at the colors below where we are in purple. And I'd like to commend Auditor Fluty. Every Thursday at 1:00 we had what we call a Manatron meeting, property tax billing system meeting, and we've kept up on a schedule throughout this process with our printer, with the software vendor, with the Auditor's office and the Treasurer's office and also for Assessor Weaver. He started the race off and handed the baton off to Bill and the Auditor's office, and the Treasurer's office is waiting for the baton and we've almost gotten it. And it's been a three-man team to get where we are. And I can answer any questions if you might have any. The main thing, I just wanted to be here today and anybody watching on television, let them know, expect a bill in late May with a mid-June deadline.

President Shetler: I'm not sure you were a bearer of good news or bad news, but anyway, we do appreciate it. I do have one point to bring up and Councilman

Sutton last year worked pretty hard on trying to streamline and make the whole transition of receiving the tax money much smoother and faster and easier. And I know that we came to some conclusions with that and I am hoping, since there has been a change of guard there a little bit, that's all still in play and –

Rick Davis: Well what – we have a new system and everybody, basically, at the counter has the ability, with a hand scanner, every bill will have a bar code on it just like when you go to the store and you swipe the item and it shows how much it is. We have a scanner at each of the desks and people who are paying by check, we're going to let them sit down just like when you go do your taxes at H & R Block, and if you're paying by check, people at the desk can scan your bill and you can write them a check and pay. If you're paying with a money order or cash, you'll go to the window. We're keeping the staff all together in one location because of that. We have some technological advances this year that weren't available last year, A. B, there was some cost with splitting the staff up. I'm sure you're talking about Easy Pay where people were able to pay on the third floor. We're keeping everybody on the second floor in the Treasurer's office and, again, that's because people in the office who did not have the ability to cashier last year, now have that ability due to the hand scanners, A. And B, I wanted to hesitate until I had more answers, but one of the local unions, the sheet metal workers, I've talked with them about donating a drop box for the front of the building. And I've talked to Dave Rector about this as well. And they're in the process of getting some materials donated to them. It's still very early in the process, but I did want to share this information with you because when people come in the last two weeks, they have to stand in a very long line at the Civic Center if they don't want to drop it off at the post office. We are trying to get the ability to have a drop box in the front of the building where people can drive, drop their property tax bill in the box and continue on their merry way without having to find parking, walk five minutes, and have several blocks to come into the building or face getting a parking ticket. So I think that's going to be a huge difference maker there as well in cutting down the number of people in our lines.

President Shetler: The next question that I had, how reliable is using last year's tax information for this year? I mean, do you have any kind of predictability of that at all? Would that be a ten percent variance or five percent, or twenty or twenty-five percent?

Rick Davis: I think Auditor Fluty has a better handle on that than I would. For instance, property tax replacement credit, that was there last year, that's not here this year. And there are probably some other funding mechanisms that may – well, it's not apples to apples when you compare last year to this year. It would be very dangerous to do that, I think, at this point.

President Shetler: I mean, since we're putting the word out to the public that, look at last year's, I'm just saying, should they, is there a number that we might look at and say take that number times twenty percent and would be safe or...

Bill Fluty: Just looking at last year's, if you remember last year, your homeowners with a homestead on file, their bill was cut in half. You can't look to have that happen this year. There was \$600,000,000 that the state actually applied across the state, all 92 counties for homeowners, that has been cut to \$140,000,000 this year. So that alone will make a difference. There will be an increase is my guess just due to that alone, but every tax bill is figured on its own merit. You may have increases in assessed valuation, you have exemption changes, and you may have

a decrease in your assessed valuation. But last year was quite a different year than any other year to look back on and say, because it was cut in half on most home owners. So just prepare. I think you've got some time, and those tax bills and that information is going to be coming out shortly

President Shetler: And then I guess the third question, since we're a month behind in getting it out, is that going to affect cash flow or affect county government operations in any way, shape, or form?

Rick Davis: Well, actually, we're right on schedule, almost within a week of what happened last year. A lot of people forget, last year taxes were due June 6, I believe, and mid-June is within a nine day period. So the staff, the Treasurer's office and almost everybody from there last year is there again this year. They proved to everyone that they could have a June billing and collect the money and disburse it to the entities that live off of the property tax money and they did it last year. We have a new system, now there is some training that still needs to be done. Their confidence level as far as knowing the new system isn't as strong as it was last year with the old system, but I'm hoping that, you know, going from a 1980's software to a 2009 Windows based software should, I'm hoping, make it much easier. It's – I might want to note for the folks at home that can't read this chart that you guys have, out of the 92 counties, only nine of them have a deadline right now. Only two of them have a May 11<sup>th</sup> deadline. One has a May 29<sup>th</sup>, two have June 10<sup>th</sup>, two have June 12<sup>th</sup>, one June 26<sup>th</sup> and one June 30<sup>th</sup>, so again, we're still way ahead of where a lot of the counties are. You asked also about should people, do they think their bills are going up or down? You know, we don't know that answer. But one indication I got in the middle of January when we were converting our data, in the past, people got their bill and it showed what they're paying this year and it showed what they paid last year. Just two years of data. We were converting and we were in the middle of this conversion process when the Department of Local Government Finance said, this year we want you to add that third year. Now, that kind of tells me that they want when people get their bills and they see what it is this year and they see what it was last year when Bill was talking that, you know, it was really low last year. I think they want that third additional year in there so that people can see, this is what you paid two years ago, and it was really high. This is what you paid last year, it was really low. And I'm having a feeling it's going to be somewhere in there. That's just a hypothesis, it's an educated guess, we don't have any data to back that up. But when the DLGF gives you an edict that you need to add an additional third year in there, I think it's to show a very high figure that was paid a couple of years ago when there were basically T.E.A. parties in Indianapolis two years ago and the mayor was thrown out of office because of high property tax bills. So I think that third year gives us a good indication that taxes might go up a little bit compared to last year, but again, it's just a hypothesis.

President Shetler: Councilman Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: This may be for Auditor Fluty. It's my understanding for city taxpayers, the city homestead where they had paid a homestead exemption, that's either been reduced or eliminated. Is that right or not?

Bill Fluty: The local?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yeah, the local.



Bill Fluty: Yes, that's correct.

Councilmember Lloyd: It's eliminated?

Bill Fluty: Yes.

Councilmember Lloyd: Okay, because I know back in the old days, we always tried to fund that but that's been – yeah, there's no local so that's another thing thrown into the mix that's going to be a higher bill.

Councilmember Kiefer: Councilman Lloyd, do you recall, like, on a \$100,000 home, for example, what did that homestead tax credit amount to in dollars?

Councilmember Lloyd: I don't know in dollars. I think it was eight percent or something like that.

Bill Fluty: You have to remember this year, also, I think he said apples to apples. This is so much different with House Bill 1001. You also have a new supplemental homestead that a homeowner receives which is, you normally got 45,000 and now you're getting another 35%. So these things, the prediction on this is – you're adding some things, you're subtracting some things and until all of the rates come in and we're still waiting for one piece from the DLGF on the homestead that they are applying this year, I can't answer those questions.

President Shetler: Councilman Sutton?

Councilman Sutton: Rick, under a normal circumstance from the time that the bills go out to the actual due date, isn't it normally like thirty to forty-five days that we provide?

Rick Davis: Somewhere in there, yeah. If I may, I think I know where you are going.

Councilman Sutton: Well, I don't know if you know where I'm going. Let me say it, then you can respond. I recognize that you guys want to try to move this forward efficiently and try to get this done and obviously the county depends upon the revenue, but I don't know if there's really much of a difference between getting, setting that due date in mid-June or late June, early July. I just think along this line: we've got a number of people in this community, you give them a two week window to get something paid, that's very tight. And I know you recognize, you mentioned that they could go on the website, we've got a ton of people in this community, they're not going to go on any website, they're not going to get on and pay property taxes electronically as much as we may push it. There's just a certain number of people – I mean, I carry a cell phone, Blackberry and everything else and I'm technologically savvy, but I don't assume that everyone else operates in that same fashion. And I just think the two week window is much too short for this community and unless we're talking about tremendous adverse affects of us not having that revenue coming in, whether it's mid-June, late June, early July, I can't see any reason why we can't give our taxpayers here, especially since it was – we were the ones who made the technological changes on our software, why can't we give them a thirty to forty-five day window to make that payment on the property taxes? I just think it's the right thing to do. Two weeks is just too short.

Rick Davis: I do agree with that thought, wholeheartedly. And the reason why we have to do that is we don't want the school corporation, the city of Evansville,

Vanderburgh County, the Levee Authority, the libraries to have to borrow money in order to pay their bills and pay their employees and pay their light bills and pay their water bills. They need this money to operate on and we need to disburse what's called settlement. We need to disburse that and generally that's the end of June, July 1. And we have to have a period of time to let the checks that come in, clear. We don't want to collect checks on one day, have the majority of them bounce and disburse money to these government entities and then not have any money to operate on. Too, I agree with the 15 day notice. I talked with Representative Gail Riecken and I told her, generally, if you're one day late to 30 days late, you have to pay a 5 percent penalty. And I told her that because of the mandates that the state had made, that it's not fair to the taxpayers to only have 15 days to make such a major payment. And she got a bill passed in the House, it passed 61 to 38, waiving the five percent penalty during the 30 day period. It was my idea, I thank Gail for bringing it forward, and it passed. However, it stalled in the Senate. It didn't even get out of hearing because some of the Treasurers in other counties felt like it might be more work on their end in order to get it done. And also they were afraid it would delay billing further, due to software changes. I didn't feel a software change was needed. I thought the five percent, thirty day penalty waiver could be handled manually. And it would only affect people with homesteads, it wouldn't affect businesses and it wouldn't affect escrow payments. It would only affect people who had a homestead exemption. So basically it was narrowed down to residences. Also they were worried that people would take advantage of that thirty day window and not pay, and then we wouldn't have any money to disburse as well.

Councilman Sutton: But giving them a two week window, you're going to increase the percentage of individuals who are likely going to pay late anyway and you're going to increase the percentage of people who won't make the payment at all until they've got the resources. And the majority of people who work on – well, we're all on a fixed income to a certain degree except maybe for Tom, but for most people to say, okay, I want you to prepare this month for something that's going to happen next month that's going to be a large expense, that's pressing them pretty tight. So I know you're agreeing with me, but are we looking at ways that we can get that moved to the end of June?

President Shetler: Well, to follow up on Royce's comment here and I don't mean to tell you, maybe I don't know if I'm asking or telling or suggesting a way, but couldn't you take approximately 75 or 80% of those proceeds and advance, I mean, at a certain point in time, advance that because you've already collected, if June 10<sup>th</sup>, for example, is your deadline that you get your money in, and allow that thirty days as he is suggesting, then you take 75% of that by the 21<sup>st</sup> or 22<sup>nd</sup> and pay that out, that's holding back 20 - 25% of bad checks that could come along or for whatever reasons that you may have a problem and yet we're accomplishing what Councilman Sutton is suggesting and we're being, I think, pretty prudent on making sure that the money is in hand, the city, county and the rest of the government entities are taken care of because they've got their cash flow and don't need to go right away to the bank, and then you can reconcile that come July 15<sup>th</sup> or July 30<sup>th</sup> or whatever.

Rick Davis: I've already had that discussion with the school corporation because they've already called me a couple of times wanting to know, when, when, when. And I told them that once we begin the billing process, we could start advancing them in increments. Right now, we've only collected about 400,000, \$450,000 in advance payments for the year. And if they only get a nickle of that, that's not very much money. It's not enough, either. I also want to remind you, a lot of folks are

on escrow and the banks already have that money in hand and actually they're investing that money, and whatever the deadline is, when they get that property tax bill, they wait until that very last day to make that payment. And that's, from the last count, around 26,000 of the tax bills are in escrow. So we will get that money on the deadline day regardless, but we can't advance that money because it's not in and the escrow, the banks will wait until the very last day to make that payment, because they invest that money and make money off of those investments.

President Shetler: I understand and I think the point is, though, that while that's state law, the 14 - 15 day minimum that you've suggested, you have the option of extending that out a little further if you desire. So, and without, I'm saying that there may be what you've described on the calendar maybe 21 days at least, which gives a little bit of time here for folks, because and I agree, I think Councilman Sutton is suggesting that what could happen here is you're going to end up with more bad checks and more of a situation, more of a problem that you're creating as opposed to if you extend that out a little bit further, will cut down on that risk.

Rick Davis: Again, I have to be prudent financially for the county. I need to invest that money and if we delay it and money is not coming in, A, the newspaper even asked me, aren't you not being prudent, you're not investing the money, you're not having it come in? I do feel I need to invest that money when it comes in, A. B, it's very important for the school corporation, the levee, the libraries, the city, the county, to get that money to live on. I have to balance what's best for the taxpayer and what's best for the entities. And actually, if the government entities have to borrow, that's not good for the taxpayer either because they have to pay that percentage rate that is -- **(Tape changed)** -- that's why I'm here today. That's why we've had two or three newspaper articles, one on the front page. That's why it's been on the T.V. That's why we've got this Internet site. We are going to do a massive public relations campaign to give people as much time as possible to budget for this expense. And I don't think that 15 days is enough, I really don't. But it was done last year and the county proved with a 15 day window, that they could collect that money and settle. And I agree with you, I tried to do it the right way by going to our state representative and getting the law changed in order to waive that five percent penalty, and it was done in the House, but it didn't pass in the Senate. And we have to move forward. Mr. Shetler was asking questions earlier, you know, talking about the economic outlook, we need answers and we need them soon in order for you guys to make decisions and in order for the school corporation to make decisions. You have to remember, the school corporation has many, many buildings and a massive capital project coming down the pike. The city may have an arena they want to build. We have to collect this money for the school corporation to do what they need to do. With the referendum that was passed overwhelmingly, I think it was over 70% of the people voted in favor of it. We can't hold back any longer. We've got to collect.

Councilman Sutton: I'm not saying not collect it, I'm just saying you have to consider the source from which you're collecting.

Rick Davis: Absolutely.

Councilman Sutton: And if the source is unable to adequately...and if you've got the discretion to move that date, I mean, why not move it? The school corporation and the other government entities who depend upon property tax revenue, it is not uncommon for school corporations and what have you all across the state, they take anticipation notes that they will actually, certain revenue will be generated and

it does not slow down their operations, their projects. They move forward and if you're talking about two weeks, three weeks, I can't see how their projects will be delayed or – am I the only one? Is it just me maybe? Just...?

President Shetler: No, I hear what you're saying and I don't disagree that you – there's some flexibility here.

Councilman Sutton: Right, I mean, it's your – I mean, we don't make the – we don't set those dates. I mean, that's your call on that. I'm just saying, just recognize the point that we're trying to make here and I just don't think, just looking at the community given a two week window, even with as much information as we get out there, that's really – if Vectren dropped off a bill at my door saying it was due in two weeks, I'd think there's a problem with Vectren that they need to address that. I just think most bills that we get, we get at least 30 days.

Rick Davis: And I also wanted to mention that we, every call that we receive from folks wanting to know their bill, we've written their email address down and as soon as we have that information, we are sending them an email, go to our website, and in some instances, we're writing phone numbers down and calling people and telling them how much is owed whenever we have that information. It's a list over a hundred people long right now.

President Shetler: County Auditor Bill Fluty.

Bill Fluty: Councilman Sutton, I can contact all the taxing units and see what financial, how this could impact them if we didn't have a June 30<sup>th</sup> distribution and that could play into Treasurer Davis' decision on the length of time. Some of them are strapped. I know some of their debt services, they have to make some bond payments and they're expecting to do it with this money. They may or may not have adequate reserves to do that. They may not. I don't know that. I think the county is in good position and I think we could be fine and then we talked about advancing some money, if they could advance some money if we do have a debt – and I can get that information back to you to see if they are strapped or not.

President Shetler: Alright, thank you. Any other questions or comments? Rick, thank you for bringing that to the public's attention and to our attention. It's certainly an important thing to make sure the cash flow stays for all units of government.

Rick Davis: I plan to do the same at the Commissioner meeting tonight and the school corporation has already called three times wanting to know. They're itching to –

President Shetler: Check's in the mail.

Rick Davis: – get that information. Absolutely. Thank you for your time.

President Shetler: Alright. Yes, Councilman Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Motion to adjourn.

President Shetler: Motion and second. Thank you all.

**(There being no further business to come before the Council, the meeting was adjourned at 10:45 a.m.)**

**VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL**

---

President Tom Shetler, Jr.

---

Vice President Joe Kiefer

---

Councilmember Jim Raben

---

Councilmember Mike Goebel

---

Councilmember Russell Lloyd, Jr.

---

Councilmember Ed Bassemier

---

Councilmember Royce Sutton

Recorded and transcribed by Teri Lukeman.

**VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL  
MINUTES  
JUNE 3, 2009**

The Vanderburgh County Council met in session this 3<sup>rd</sup> day of June 2009 in room 301 of the Civic Center Complex. The meeting was called to order at 8:34 a.m. by County Council President Tom Shetler, Jr.

President Shetler: Okay, good morning. Today is June the 3<sup>rd</sup>. I'd like to welcome you to the Vanderburgh County Council meeting this morning. I'd like at this time to call for the roll call please.

COUNCILMEMBER	PRESENT	ABSENT
Councilmember Sutton	X	
Councilmember Bassemier	X	
Councilmember Lloyd	X	
Councilmember Goebel	X	
Councilmember Raben	X	
Councilmember Kiefer		X*
President Shetler	X	

\*Arrived during discussion of appropriations

President Shetler: There being six present and one absent, we have a quorum. I'd like to ask Councilman Sutton to please lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance.

(Pledge of Allegiance was given)

President Shetler: Thank you, Councilmen.

<b>APPROVAL OF MINUTES</b>
----------------------------

President Shetler: Next is the approval of the minutes of the May 5<sup>th</sup> meeting. Everybody should have received a copy. Anybody have any questions? Motion will be in order for approval.

Councilman Sutton: So moved.

President Shetler: It's been moved.

Councilmember Lloyd: Second.

President Shetler: Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Abstain.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being five ayes and one abstention, the motion carries.

**(Motion unanimously approved 5-0)**

<b>APPROPRIATION ORDINANCE</b>
--------------------------------

President Shetler: Next is the appropriation ordinance, Councilman Raben.

**SHERIFF  
COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS**

Councilmember Raben: Okay, good morning. Thank you, Mr. President. First on the agenda under the Sheriff is Shift Differential in the amount of \$1,500. With that is also a request under Community Corrections, Extra Help and FICA for \$10,610. I'll move approval for both items.

Councilmember Lloyd: Second.

President Shetler: We have a motion and a second. Any questions? Discussion? Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being six ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

<b>SHERIFF</b>		<b>REQUESTED</b>	<b>APPROVED</b>
1050-1531	Civ. Shift Differential	1,500.00	1,500.00
Total		1,500.00	1,500.00

<b>COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS</b>		<b>REQUESTED</b>	<b>APPROVED</b>
1361-1990	Extra Help	9,856.00	9,856.00
1361-1900	FICA	754.00	754.00
Total		10,610.00	10,610.00

**(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)**

## **COUNTY COUNCIL**

Councilmember Raben: Next, under County Council, Consultant in the amount of \$25,000, I'll move approval – \$25,500, excuse me.

Councilmember Lloyd: Second.

President Shetler: There are some changes that have been made by our attorney on that contract so maybe Mr. Ahlers needs to --

Jeff Ahlers: Yeah, I just needed a clarification. I assume that your motion is just an appropriation and then I guess later under new business we'll address the contract, is that what we're going to do?

Councilmember Raben: That's fine.

Jeff Ahlers: I mean, in other words, this motion is not approving the contract. You're just appropriating the money, right?

Councilmember Raben: Right.

Jeff Ahlers: Okay, if you want to do that, we can address the contract later.

President Shetler: That's fine. That makes sense. Okay, so we have a motion and a second on the floor on the appropriation. Any questions, discussion? Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?



Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being six ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

COUNTY COUNCIL		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1480-3460	Consultant	25,500.00	25,500.00
Total		25,500.00	25,500.00

**(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)**

## **CCD/CORONER**

Councilmember Raben: Next, under Coroner for a new minivan for transporting persons in the amount of \$24,000. I'll move approval.

Councilmember Bassemier: Second.

President Shetler: I guess in discussion, I'd bring it up and I brought it up the last time, and Ms. Groves was not here, but I, again, have a little bit of an issue myself because of maybe not going through the purchasing department. I don't know if there's other opportunities out there for us to piggyback on the state. I know that we've spoken to two different vendors and I got the rationale on just those exclusive vendors, but I would rather see us go through the purchasing department, use our standard process that we have so that we don't begin a new process here where department heads and officeholders are just randomly going out and contacting whomever. So that's my only –

Annie Groves: There was no bids on a state list for minivans, so that's why...I looked into it, but there was no –

President Shetler: Yeah, I received your letter and I didn't fully understand that, but are you saying there were no recent bids or were you saying that when they –

Annie Groves: In 2009 when I tried to look at the state bid list, they didn't have any minivans bid.

President Shetler: I don't know -- because a couple things I've been involved in, in the past, I know they have piggybacked on that. Is there a contact person with the state or that can tell us exactly what's available to us and not available to us on that?

Annie Groves: To be real honest, I always go through Sheriff Williams. He's the one that gets me all the lists and stuff. He stays up on all that. But he was the one, you know, I worked with him and we called the Sheriff's department and there was

no bids. And I don't know who the contact person is. I know that our purchasing department also said that we didn't have, you know, they looked it up for me, too, and we didn't have any minivans there.

President Shetler: I guess I'm not opposed to the amount of money, I'm not opposed to the fact that you need a van. Making sure that we do the process correctly so that we don't set, you know, a new precedent, that's where I'm coming from.

Annie Groves: Oh, I understand that.

President Shetler: But anyway, that's my point. Anybody else have a question?

Councilmember Bassemier: Mr. President, just for the record, I did check with Annie to prepare for this information she's given you. Royce, you asked me also if she checked into a pool and I think she's checked into that, too. And I just wanted to let you know, I did my job. That's all I have.

President Shetler: Thank you. Councilman Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: I was just wondering, did you talk to purchasing about it?

Annie Groves: I called them and asked them if there was anything on the state list. And I'm willing to take your guidance, but when I was told, I was just told to go get price checks on all this stuff. You know, no one told me that I needed to go through anything else. The Commissioners said, you know, you need to price check this and that's what I did.

Councilmember Lloyd: What did purchasing tell you to do on that?

Annie Groves: I am just now working with purchasing on other areas of the building, you know, because that came up last night by the county attorney.

President Shetler: Alright, Councilman Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: We can put the money in place, regardless, is that correct?

President Shetler: We can certainly do that. I don't know if that would prevent someone to go out and purchase it, you know, without abiding by our guidance unless we kind of make sure those things are in line first, and I guess that's where my reluctance would be a little bit now.

Councilmember Raben: I mean, we can get Annie on the record this morning stating that she'll take it through purchasing.

President Shetler: Right, and then they'll develop bid specifications and that way we have -- all dealers have an opportunity to place a bid on this.

Annie Groves: Okay.

President Shetler: They're all hungry, I think, right now. And I think they all would like to have an opportunity on that.

Annie Groves: There is only two dealers in Vanderburgh County that have USA products, so no one else carries a minivan.

President Shetler: What –

Annie Groves: There's only two dealerships.

President Shetler: Your letter indicated that, but I was a little bit, I guess, skeptical of that from the standpoint that, I mean, Princeton is making a minivan, which is a Toyota product, which is owned by a foreign country, but by the same token it's produced right here. So I didn't know what –

Annie Groves: Well, according to Deb Spalding when I spoke to her, she said Indiana state law says you have to buy US unless you can justify otherwise. And I don't really think I can justify that because, you know, in my opinion, the minivan is just the minivan. So, you know, I'm willing to work with her, but this is what she did tell me, that you have to buy, per state law, in the US first, US products first.

President Shetler: Councilman Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Annie, hi, good morning.

Annie Groves: Good morning.

Councilmember Kiefer: Just a couple questions and thoughts. This wasn't originally what I was going to ask but since Tom brought it up, there are a lot of people that are employed at Toyota and I do know that we do like to keep our local people working, so that would be maybe an extraordinary consideration for Toyota just because we have people here in Evansville that work there. And they pay taxes here in Evansville. But anyway, I know you'll look into that and do what's right on that. Just out of curiosity, has there ever been any consideration for a previously owned vehicle? I mean, sometimes you can get huge discounts with a vehicle that might only have 10,000 miles on it or 6,000 miles. It's been a dealer car or vehicle or something. I would think that we might be able to get some kind of discount for something like that. But I didn't know because you might have special needs where it has to be equipped a certain way as well.

Annie Groves: I'm to the point now, I would like to have something that we don't have to have towed from the scene like we had to a few weeks ago. So that's where I'm at.

President Shetler: Alright, thank you. I guess what I would be looking for is some kind of commitment that we at least go through the purchasing, that they develop bids and specifications and that it goes through a bidding process like we do on most other capital projects. That way, if they need to specify in there that it has to be American made, I'm not qualified to determine what is American made because I know sometimes there is 80% of the parts are made in America, it's assembled in Canada, it's not American made. But other times, 80% of the parts are made in Mexico or Canada, and it's assembled here in the United States and it's now one of ours. I don't know what qualifies what. But they'll know that and they can put the bid specs together so that everyone does have a fair chance to bid on an American product that meets specifications then.

Annie Groves: Can I ask a question then on another matter? Because I went out

and got price checks also for the building on roofs and stuff because I had been led to believe the only thing I needed to do is go get three price checks. So do you also want me to give you all that information and you put all that out for bid, too, for the building, for the roof and the gutters and everything?

President Shetler: I personally think it's always a prudent thing to do to make sure that the taxpayers are guarded by that so that it's not just hand selected to a particular vendor. But, I mean, that's my own personal opinion.

Annie Groves: I just want to do what's right and I really –

President Shetler: I don't know what the law calls for –

Annie Groves: I really haven't gotten a lot of guidance in this area, so I would appreciate it if I could get some kind of –

President Shetler: Yeah, the Commissioners will deal with that. That's really more –

Annie Groves: – if I can get some help. Okay.

President Shetler: Yes. Any other questions? Okay, we have a motion on the floor and a –

Councilmember Bassemier: And a second.

President Shetler: And a second. I'm making the one stipulation on that, but I mean, that's my own personal feeling. I don't know if we would need to make an amendment to that if anybody is interested in amending that to include that that goes through purchasing, or if you're agreeing to do that?

Annie Groves: Sure.

President Shetler: Okay, alright, that's all we probably need then.

Councilmember Raben: Okay.

President Shetler: Alright, any other questions or comments?

Councilmember Lloyd: I mean, that just means there's a possibility that we would spend less than \$24,000. I mean, it just depends on how the bids come in or –

President Shetler: Right.

Councilmember Bassemier: Excuse me, Annie, would you explain that you put in a little bit extra for the –

Annie Groves: Yeah, we do need a little bit extra, you know, because we have to equip the back of it, so if we have any spills, you know, that we can easily clean it up. The Commissioners have also said that we need to have our logo on it, so that's an extra expense. So there is going to be a few extra expenses.

Councilmember Bassemier: And a gurney, you said you need a new gurney.

Annie Groves: A new gurney would be really nice, you know, so.

Councilmember Bassemier: I looked at her vehicle that they're driving now and it's in pretty bad shape. It's rusted on the top and it is kind of embarrassing, especially when it won't start when you're getting ready to drive away with a person.

President Shetler: Yes, Councilman Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Annie, would you mind reporting back to us what you end up with just out of curiosity since we talked about all this? You know, I'd be curious to know what vehicle ultimately you end up with and how much you spend on it.

Annie Groves: Sure.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay, thank you.

Annie Groves: You're welcome.

President Shetler: Okay, any other questions? Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being seven ayes and no nays, the motion carries. Thank you.

CORONER		REQUESTED	APPROVED
2031-1070-4230	Coroner's Vehicles	24,000.00	24,000.00
Total		24,000.00	24,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

REASSESSMENT/COUNTY ASSESSOR

Councilmember Raben: Okay, next under County Assessor, Contractual Services in the amount of \$8,822, and Maintenance Contract in the amount of \$700, for a total of \$9,522, I'll move approval.

Councilmember Lloyd: Second.

President Shetler: It's been moved and seconded. Any questions? Comments?

Councilmember Lloyd: I might point out, this is out of the Reassessment fund.

President Shetler: Yes, correct. Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being seven ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

COUNTY ASSESSOR		REQUESTED	APPROVED
2490-1090-3530	Contractual Services	8,822.00	8,822.00
2490-1090-3540	Maintenance Contract	700.00	700.00
Total		9,522.00	9,522.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

JAIL PROJECT

Councilmember Raben: Okay, next under Jail Project. We have a request in the amount of, it's for Facility Improvements, the request was for \$340,750. I'm going

to make a motion to begin discussion in the amount of \$152,000.

Councilmember Goebel: Second.

President Shetler: It's been moved and seconded. Questions? Comments? Yes, Councilman Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Well, this is the high priority items that the Sheriff and Mr. Rector had brought before us, so that total was approximately \$151,050, and so Councilman Raben rounded it up to \$152,000. I would like to commend Mr. Rector for giving us the information, where the – what funds the Building Authority has related to the jail project. In fact, he gave us the history all the way back to when the bonds were issued, which was nice, he had a lot of detail there. But the total out of the \$340,000, maybe there's other items that either the Building Authority would look at purchasing out of those funds or make do without them. But anyway, I think we had a pretty detailed discussion with the Sheriff on the items that would really be high priority and also would assist them in saving time on some of these things. So we all received that detailed letter from the Sheriff if there's any questions on that. But I think this would turn out to be a good compromise.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, I'd like to address one of my new concerns as of just this morning. I got my hands on the actual agreement with the Building Authority and the county that was established back in May of '04. And in this agreement it specifically refers to a lot of these items. You know, just to give a little more detail, the county, every year, puts \$100,000 in addition to your rent that is to establish a reserve for making repairs to the facility. In fact, we're, by contract, we have to do that through year 2015 unless the fund develops a million dollars. Currently, there is \$727,500 in that depreciation reserve. So I guess I'm bringing this to everyone's attention because a lot of these items, I think, after reviewing this contract, should have come out of those reserves. And secondly, we do, at some point in time, we want to be cautious moving forward because we don't want to extend beyond the million dollars that we're responsible for. I mean, you know, if you talk 2015, that's six more – well, five more budget years. So, we can get beyond our cap that we're responsible for but, again, I guess, Dave, and I apologize just getting this, this morning, I haven't had an opportunity to talk to you specifically on the contractual side of it, but one of the big ones on here is the chillers in the amount of, I think those are \$30,000. Item A addresses just that as being responsible – it would be on page 5, that the depreciation reserves should be picking up that portion. So I didn't know if you could address some of this or not. As I look through this list, Dave, I see many of these items that we're coming to for General fund money, that fall in all these categories. So, I apologize for kind of putting you on the spot here --

Dave Rector: It's not a problem. Good morning, Dave Rector, Building Authority. The maintenance agreement you refer to actually is set up for the jail and corrections. The \$750,000, there's about a half million in the jail, that would grow to a million. In Corrections, there's about \$250,000, that grows to half a million. And it's very similar to the memorandum of understanding that we have with the Centre for the depreciation reserves that are used for major capital items: roof replacement, chiller repair, that kind of thing. My own philosophy is, I try not to touch that depreciation reserve unless we have to just – it's there for emergencies and we're looking, 2015 down the road, and if something happens, we've got to have some money to do it or else you guys are going to have to find the money to do it. So I try to be real conservative with that. The chiller repair, what happened this year is we needed to, I didn't plan \$30,000 for a three year old chiller in my

operational budget. Unfortunately, it hit and we have to do it. That is an item we could go back and take out of the depreciation reserves if you all so would like to. I'm just trying to not go after that, keeping it for emergency purposes. That's just a personal philosophy with the way that we treat depreciation reserves. And, with any of these items that you may not fund, if towards the end of the year budgetarily we're doing okay, I'll try to do them out of operational expenses. But I try to be as true as I can to the operation expenses because that's what reflects back to you within our budget.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, I guess, you know, the fund is in place is how I look at it and then, you know, another item, the bench installation and painting of cells 21, 22, and 23 for \$20,000, it addresses just after lawn care services, painting and replacement of fixed equipment and fixtures. So, you know, I guess I'm kind of looking at it as we've already spent our \$100,000 annually and we're developing this fund to pick up most of these items. I don't know why we would further fund and continue to grow that other one when in fact we're obligated through 2015 to put \$100,000 annually in there. So I would, and I understand, you know, a lot of this there is a great need for, but if we want to take time this morning, I would recommend that we pick and choose what may or may not fall in these categories and appropriate General fund monies for those and lean on the Building Authority to pick up the balance under the reserves.

Dave Rector: And I'd appreciate some feedback from all of you, do you agree or disagree with the way we try to treat depreciation reserves. As I said, I try to hold that pretty close for a major expenditure that may hit to replace instead of just doing these 30, \$20,000 kind of things.

President Shetler: Yes, Councilman Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Well, I don't know about the regular maintenance, the painting and things like that, but, to me, the chillers, that's something of an emergency and maybe that's what this fund is for, but I understand your point, too, you're trying to protect for a severe or high end emergency. These funds are coming from, if we appropriate today, what source?

Councilmember Raben: It's basically a General fund account. It's our Jail set aside, which is kind of tagged with that name, but for all practical purposes, it's purely General fund monies. So it's – and that's the other thing, too, you know, we've got a little over 2.5 million dollars in that account today. But we also need our own reserves for the other 60 budgets that we're responsible for should we have any travesties within any other workings of government. So we need to be careful and treat it as what it is, it is a reserve account. Maybe we need to fix a new name on it at budget time. Maybe, you know, I don't like that title today, Jail set aside. I think it ought to be, I think we need to put another name on it in September, but I'd like to safeguard that for what other emergencies we have in the future.

President Shetler: Yes, Councilman Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Councilman Raben, in regard to what the responsibilities are, I think this maintenance agreement spells it out pretty clearly, it says, "The Building Authority agrees to maintain the new county jail (except maintenance of security electronics system and related equipment, telecommunication systems, data network, parking lot snow removal, cleaning of inmate and kitchen areas and those items specifically excluded by the county)." So I think it pretty much says



that, you know, they do everything except those things. But, Dave, to your concern, I think you're also protected as well because this agreement goes on to say, "The county shall provide the Building Authority with a reasonable working balance to fund the Building Authority's responsibilities hereunder." So the way I'm viewing it is, even if you utilize your monies that you have available, you're still protected because, by this contract, we're not going to let you just go without monies to take care of it. And I guess another way to do this, this is all taxpayer dollars no matter how you shake it out, whether it comes from this fund or that fund, it's all taxpayer dollars. So I'm glad that we've gone through the exercise to determine which items are the most urgent ones and most prudent ones to take care of first. But I'd feel comfortable allowing Dave to pay for this stuff out of the Building Authority because it says that in the agreement, and then if there is a situation where he needs more money, well then, we'll have to address that because that's also our responsibility to make sure he's got enough reserve or enough funds to operate.

Dave Rector: Again, it's a personal thing, but when I give you my budget each year, I intend to live by that and I don't think that I'm one that I can come back and ask for an additional appropriation. I've told you what I think we can operate under and that's what I try to do. This year we're going to reduce it again. This will be the fourth year out of six years we've reduced the budget to the city and county. I'm cognizant of doing that. When I tell you that, though, I intend to live by that budget and I would be embarrassed to come back and say, oh, I've blown it, I need another \$50,000. Not to say that won't ever happen, but I really try not –

Councilmember Kiefer: Dave, you do a great job and really, honestly, these things, like Councilman Goebel said, they seem to be somewhat of an emergency, unexpected. I mean, I don't think you would have dreamt it or we would have dreamt that boiler system would have had a problem. You know, so I would not be one here at all that would say, you know, there was some error on your part because there wasn't. I mean, this is just probably more of an error on the architect or engineer's part by not specifying better equipment and getting us a warranty that was a little bit better.

President Shetler: When you're putting together the budget and assessing the rent, according to the expenses that, I guess, you're figuring in there, when you go back against – if something happens like with on a clearly county piece of property that you're responsible for, does that go into the whole pool where it's divided among all of the tenants or does it go into like the county specifically?

Dave Rector: If it's for the Civic Center, it's spread across city and county. If it's for the Jail only, that obviously is just a county funded facility, so it would just be county. But if it happens here, it's spread across everything.

President Shetler: So the county, in your accounting method that you're using, the Jail is a separate item totally and doesn't go into –

Dave Rector: Yes, you see a whole separate line item for the Jail and each of those budgetary items, by line item on what we expect our expenses to be for the next year.

President Shetler: When you are developing that budget, do you try to maintain a certain amount of reserves for the maintenance then, over and above the \$100,000 that we're actually putting back in depreciation?

Dave Rector: We have a line item for maintenance repairs, that kind of thing, that we expect to incur on a routine basis throughout the year, preventive maintenance on just the air handling units, changing filters, belts, that kind of thing, constantly repairing toilets. Inmates are notoriously hard on the toilets out there and repairing those. So just daily kind of maintenance kind of things, that's what our line item is for, is just repairs and maintenance. There's grounds expense, there's –

President Shetler: How much is in that account, is budgeted annually?

Dave Rector: Total for the Jail?

President Shetler: Yeah.

Dave Rector: A little over a million.

President Shetler: For maintenance?

Dave Rector: No. No, no. That's total –

President Shetler: No, just for the maintenance.

Dave Rector: I think I put about 80,000 in there.

President Shetler: Okay, and then you've got the \$100,000 that we're setting aside, so basically, you could say \$180,000 of a total budget.

Dave Rector: But as discussed, I've not touched the depreciation reserves for the jail since we started it.

President Shetler: Right. And the – if that hundred were somehow incorporated along with the 80, that would just mean that the rent itself would go up?

Dave Rector: True.

President Shetler: In essence. Okay, alright. Thank you.

Councilmember Raben: One last comment, Dave. And I want to echo a lot of what Joe said, thanks for what you do, and you are doing a great job, and certainly I apologize for putting you in the hot seat today.

Dave Rector: Thank you.

Councilmember Raben: But looking at this, if we pull the items that appear to be part of our contractual agreement within the facility and the Building Authority, David, I'm kind of going through this. Initially, what the thought was, with \$152,000, for now was, taking all of what Sheriff Williams had considered as high priority and then some other items that weren't as high but were essentials that he really needed. And I'm looking at, on the first page of what he provided to us, and I don't think you have this and maybe you do.

Councilmember Lloyd: That's the letter from Sheriff Williams dated April 27<sup>th</sup>?

Councilmember Raben: Here's a copy, Dave. Yeah, take that with you and I'll – the fifth from the bottom item is install water supply for garden hose in booking

plumbing chases. You know, I would think that that would fall under plumbing.

Dave Rector: What that is, that's an additional installation, it was not designed into the Jail. Let me see how we can say this on T.V...well, when inebriated inmates come in, they don't always contain themselves, and it's to hose the area down. And right now, they're carrying buckets back there to try to mop it up.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, and I would think that that could fall under the plumbing side of it. Of course, the repair chiller, we've already addressed that. The roof access ladders, that's to get up and actually do maintenance and what have you, right?

Dave Rector: We have a roof access ladder now that is in the design of the original building that, to access the roof, you go up to the second floor mezzanine, down a hallway, into a mechanical room, climb up on to the roof, the roof hatch is actually installed backwards and it's really very difficult access to a roof for maintenance purposes. What this would do is, we're going to go over to the Corrections, put a roof access ladder up on the single story unit that will get us up on to the roofs and we can get around from there.

Councilmember Raben: And I did skip over one: the very bottom item on the first page, ladders for second level chase platforms.

Dave Rector: What that is, we added, the Jail has evolved as we've been there, with concerns we had going into there. You have two-story chases that are about ten foot wide, four foot deep that all the plumbing is in these chases and on the second levels of the mezzanines where inmates are held, where all the plumbing for the toilets are that get stopped up, we had no way of getting into those. So at first we started and we cut access ports into those. To get into those, then, we had to set extension ladders up to try to crawl over into that, which was not safe so we put platforms that side of it. Now to get to those platforms, we have to use extension ladders. But if it's muddy, if it's icy, if it's snowy and you're carrying equipment up in a tool belt, so this would have some permanent ladders to get up to those platforms.

Councilmember Raben: Okay. What those items that I just cited that we've just discussed, amount to \$80,000 on the button and what I would recommend is that \$80,000 for those specific items come out of the depreciation reserve fund. And then what my recommendation is going to be is to set in about \$50,000 for the Sheriff to – or no, set in \$72,000 for the Sheriff to then go in and the other items that really aren't part of the physical structure or – and this is precursive because, you know, kind of adjusting this on the fly, but that would allow him to make the other high priority and some of the lower priority items that he really feels like he needs. So what I would like to do, Mr. President, if I can, is amend my motion to set that Facility Improvements in at \$72,000.

President Shetler: You may if the seconder agrees.

Councilmember Lloyd: Who was the seconder?

President Shetler: I think Mike was, weren't you, Mr. Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: I'll amend my second.

Councilmember Lloyd: Question –

Dave Rector: Not to speak for the Sheriff, but I do know there are some things on here, security-wise that he really would like to do.

Councilmember Raben: And if you don't mind, I'll run through that so you'd know, if you like if you want to check those off. In fact, Dave, the copy that I gave you, they're already highlighted. So you'll just need to, the items –

Dave Rector: That you've highlighted?

Councilmember Raben: That was part of the original \$150,000 motion before the adjusted figure. So just to give you an idea so you understand what part that we're saying that you need to spend of the reserves, install water supply for \$2,500, the last item, the ladders for the second level, on the next page, repair chiller and then the roof access ladders. We're approving everything else that's highlighted outside of those four items, okay?

President Shetler: Okay, so the motion is to basically appropriate \$72,000 as opposed to the 340,750, and then directing to take \$80,000 out of the depreciation for the other items that are highlighted, and then the other items, no recommendation.

Councilmember Raben: No recommendation. We can circle the wagons and look at those at budget time or whatever. But these items I think carried the highest priority with the Sheriff. In fact, I mean, he made this list, so –

President Shetler: Okay. Councilman Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Dave, what's your sense on this motion today?

Dave Rector: It's doable. As I said to start out with, I'll have to go back to the depreciation reserves and I'm okay with that, it's just, I try to build that up if we have a major catastrophe that's going to cost us hundreds of thousands of dollars that we have that. Knowing that if that happens, I can come back to you and ask for it, I just don't like to have to do that. I like to be able to take care of what you've given me with what we have. So yes, we can do it.

Councilmember Goebel: Thank you.

Councilmember Raben: You know, again, I'm treating the two, because it is one in the same, the Corrections and the Jail, taking 80 out of that is still going to allow you, you'll still have like, 640 something thousand dollars within that fund. And we're going to put another \$100,000 in it again in September.

Dave Rector: And I think your idea to change how this –

Councilmember Raben: Okay, I'll amend my motion to include the document provided by Sheriff Williams to be entered into the minutes. The date on this document is April 30<sup>th</sup>, 2009.

Councilman Sutton: Can you specify which document it is because we also receive that?

Councilmember Raben: Everyone was given a copy of this but it's from the Sheriff of Vanderburgh County, it addresses the County Councilmembers and it references Sheriff's Council request for May 2009 follow up information. It goes on to say, "During your meeting last week," referring to our April meeting, "members of the Council asked a few questions about my request that I was unable to completely answer at the time. Please find the responses to those questions below." And it goes on to say that, "You requested that I prioritize projects that were submitted for the jail. Building Authority Superintendent Dave Rector and I met and assigned the listed priorities for these projects." So it's again, it was the total \$340,000 kind of, the list of those items, prioritized and that's it in a nutshell.

President Shetler: Councilman Sutton, did you have a further point?

Councilman Sutton: He was making it as an amendment to his motion, I don't know if the seconder also agreed to the amendment.

Councilmember Goebel: I will amend my second.

President Shetler: We have an amended, amended.

Councilman Sutton: The process that you follow to draw down on the depreciation reserve, how does that work?

Dave Rector: Right now those funds may not be readily available because it is so much money. We try to invest those in CD's that might get a good interest. Not anymore. But they're invested in CD's to try to get the best interest rate as we can and then when it becomes available, I'll have to take it out of there and put it into our operational budget.

Councilman Sutton: So that process for you, you don't have to go through your board to get an additional approval, and so the process, timewise, takes approximately how long?

Dave Rector: According to when those CD's are due. I'm not sure. We have them invested, we have the Civic Center depreciation reserves, the Centre, the Jail's so we bid that out to all the banks and whichever one gives us the best rate.

Councilman Sutton: So we may potentially get a penalty?

Dave Rector: No, I won't draw it out and do that. We'll handle it within the budget until I can get it out of there.

President Shetler: Okay, any other questions?

Dave Rector: I think James' suggestion maybe to change the title of this line item probably is a good one and I think that's what started some of this was just the misnomer of jail set aside. We thought that's what it was for, jail expenses, until Mr. Fluty said no, it's really General fund. And I think that's what got some of this going is we thought we had some money here to make these improvements.

Councilmember Raben: Dave, thank you.

President Shetler: Alright, thank you. So boiling it down again, we're basically talking about a \$72,000 appropriation as far as this ordinance is concerned. Any

questions? Roll – Councilman Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: I just wanted to make sure I understand this. This \$72,000 is not for what would be considered maintenance or reserve items?

Councilmember Raben: Again, a lot of this was said on the fly this morning. Some of those technically could or couldn't be part of maintenance but I think Dave picking up the bigger items that are more relative to the structure, you know, it's what I could pick out fairly quick here. There might be a \$500 item that could or couldn't have fallen into the other.

Councilmember Kiefer: But basically, the essence is, he's picking up the maintenance or reserve items and we're picking up the other stuff on the critical list from Sheriff Ellsworth – I mean, Sheriff Williams, I apologize.

Dave Rector: I have a pretty good idea of what he wants to get done with that. There's some important security items.

President Shetler: Alright, any other questions? Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being seven ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

JAIL PROJECT		REQUESTED	APPROVED
3660-4197	2009 Facility Improvements	340,750.00	72,000.00
Total		340,750.00	72,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

Councilman Sutton: Before we move on, the other items, are you going to get with the Sheriff and kind of rework the list, come back to us at some point in time here in the next couple of months? What are you looking at on that?

Dave Rector: We can. Let us get these items completed as we've discussed. And then as we go into the year, as I said, I don't object at all to try and get this done if we're doing well within our operational budget. If not, then we're going to have to come back and talk about it.

Councilman Sutton: Okay.

President Shetler: Alright, thank you.

Dave Rector: Thank you.

<b>REPEAL REQUEST</b>
-----------------------

**LEGAL AID/UNITED WAY**

Councilmember Raben: Next under Legal Aid/United Way, this is a repeal from Miscellaneous in the amount of \$1,028, I move approval.

Councilmember Lloyd: Second.

President Shetler: It's been moved and seconded. Any questions? Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being seven ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

LEGAL AID/UNITED WAY		REQUESTED	APPROVED
4290-3990	Miscellaneous	1,028.00	1,028.00
Total		1,028.00	1,028.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

<b>TRANSFER REQUESTS</b>
--------------------------

**CLERK**  
**CUMULATIVE BRIDGE**  
**HEALTH DEPARTMENT**  
**LEGAL AID (LATE)**  
**LEGAL AID/UNITED WAY (LATE)**

Councilmember Raben: Okay, last Mr. President, it looks like we have five transfers, I'm going to move that we accept all transfers as listed.

Councilmember Goebel: Second.

President Shetler: It's been moved and seconded. Do I have any questions or comments?

Councilmember Lloyd: I talked to the County Clerk and that was a necessary transfer for the County Clerk.

President Shetler: Thank you. Any other questions? Comments? Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?



President Shetler: Yes. There being seven ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

**CLERK REQUESTED APPROVED**

From: 1010-1630-1010	First Deputy/Elections	875.00	875.00
To: 1010-1260-1010	Appeals & Venue Clerk	875.00	875.00

**CUMULATIVE BRIDGE REQUESTED APPROVED**

From: 2030-1970	Temp. Replacement	6,500.00	6,500.00
To: 2030-1150-2030	Laborer	6,500.00	6,500.00

**HEALTH DEPARTMENT REQUESTED APPROVED**

From: 2130-1240-2130	Public Health Nurse	25,000.00	25,000.00
2130-1430-2130	Deputy Registrar	7,000.00	7,000.00
To: 2130-1971	Accrued Payments	32,000.00	32,000.00

**LEGAL AID REQUESTED APPROVED**

From: 1460-1190-1460	Jr. Legal Secretary #2	1,911.00	1,911.00
To: 1460-1970	Temp. Replacement	1,911.00	1,911.00

**LEGAL AID/UNITED WAY REQUESTED APPROVED**

From: 4290-1190-4290	Jr. Legal Secretary #2	1,123.00	1,123.00
To: 4290-1970	Temp. Replacement	1,123.00	1,123.00

**(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)**

**AMENDMENTS TO SALARY ORDINANCE**

Councilmember Raben: Okay, and my last business is the Amendments to the Salary Ordinance. First under Sheriff, salary line 1050-1531 Shift Differential as previously adopted. Community Corrections, 1361-1990 Extra Help as previously adopted for two part-time employees for the Drug Court program. They are to be paid at the rate of \$8.00 per hour for a maximum of 20 hours a week for 52 weeks a year. County Clerk, amend salary line 1010-1260 Circuit/Superior Appeals Venue Clerk as previously approved and transferred. The position is a COMOT IV, Step 2 with an annual salary of \$28,959. Cum Bridge, amend salary line 2030-1150 Laborer as previously adopted. Laborer returned to work releasing Temporary Replacement. Health Department, salary line 2130-1971 as previously adopted. This transfer is to provide funding for the Executive Director's buyout, salary lines

2130-1240 and 2130-1430 will remain vacant. There is a balance of \$1,695.24 in line 2130-1240 and \$9,669.00 in line 2130-1430 after this transfer. And last, Legal Aid, amend salary line 1460-1970 and 4290-1970 Temporary Replacement as previously approved and transferred. The Temporary Replacement is to work as a COMOT IV at the initiation step, and this position is a split salary. Part of the salary is paid by Legal Aid General fund and the balance paid by United Way/Legal Aid. That's it, Mr. President, and I'll make that in the form of a motion.

President Shetler: Its been moved...

Councilmember Bassemier: Second.

President Shetler: And seconded by Councilman Bassemier. Questions? Comments? Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being seven ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

**(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)**

<p><b>LIBBIE AU/GROWTH ALLIANCE FOR GREATER EVANSVILLE COMPLIANCE REVIEWS</b></p>
---

President Shetler: Next is under new business, tax phase-in. Libbie?

Libbie Au: Good morning, Libbie Au with GAGE. I'm attending the Council meeting this morning to begin to present the compliance information for the tax phase-in program. The first spreadsheet contains the compliance information for the two companies that I've received information for. Both companies have reported over

100 percent compliance in real estate investment. In regards to job creation, we were almost at 100 percent for both companies. One company did fall below their estimate by one employee. However, there is a letter attached to the information to address that. The second spreadsheet contains the tax estimates for both of those projects. The estimate resulted in tax revenue of approximately 85,000. I can now answer any questions from Councilmembers.

President Shetler: Yes, Councilman Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Nice report and good information.

Libbie Au: Thank you.

President Shetler: Councilman Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: I might make a point, too, it's good to see these kind of numbers in this really tough economic climate, and I empathize with Mr. Schroeder from Crescent Plastics. They had projected 40, they achieved 39 employees, but they do many good things for this community and they're really a model corporate citizen, so I would urge the Council to approve these.

President Shetler: Yes, any other questions? Comments? We need a motion then for approval.

Councilmember Lloyd: Motion to approve.

Councilmember Goebel: Second.

President Shetler: It's been moved and seconded. Any other questions? Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being seven ayes and no nays, the motion carries. Thank you.

**(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)**

<b>BKD LETTER OF ENGAGEMENT</b>
---------------------------------

President Shetler: Next is the BKD letter of engagement.

Jeff Ahlers: I spoke with Tim Deisher, and some changes were made to the letter from last time. On the top of page three, there were a couple of provisions asking the County to indemnify them for, I guess, their acts and, you know, I asked that that be deleted. Some other items, and I'm going to point them out to you because you'll just have to make a determination as to what you want to do about it. In place of that, what they did insert up there was a sentence at the top of page three that says, "Any liability of BKD and its personnel to you is limited to three times the amount of the fee you paid for this engagement as liquidated damages." So you can either agree not to accept that or to accept that. But what they're doing is limiting their liability. I guess your contract with them is in the approximate amount of \$25,000, so they're wanting to limit their liability, I'm not sure why a professional organization does that. I've not quite seen engagement letters like this from professional organizations, but nonetheless, that's there, I'd point that out so you can either choose to approve it, or not approve it, or approve it with it X'd out, however you want to do that. The only other thing is at the bottom, the bottom of page two there's a sentence down there talking about liability of an LLP. Some of that's just standard language, but the main change was, is I had them take out the indemnification provisions and I didn't see any reason for the county to ever be indemnifying a supplier or vendor. Usually you would want that to run the other way. Anyway, I'd point out that one item at the top of page three and you guys can decide whether you want to allow them to limit their liability. I'm not sure what liability arises out of job descriptions, but nonetheless, that sentence is there and you can either accept it or not.

President Shetler: That's really kind of where my question was going. What kind of exposure you thought we might have and kind of indicating it may be nothing at all.

Jeff Ahlers: I can't imagine that in terms of, that alone, I can't imagine that a lot comes out of it, but who knows now days what could come up. You know, I guess if a job description was, you know, so I don't see it as being overly critical, nonetheless, it's there. It's up to you whether you want to allow that limitation of liability.

President Shetler: Other questions or comments?

Councilmember Raben: What's your thoughts on it?

President Shetler: I personally don't have a problem with the way it's been revised. I think it's acceptable and I think with the \$75,000 cap of the three times the legal fee, I mean, the county fee that we're paying, that, I don't think, myself, there is any real exposure, but...I mean, I would urge approval, but...

Troy Tornatta: Troy Tornatta, County Commissioner. I wouldn't approve that in a million years, I mean, on the Commissioner's side. I wouldn't do the provision for the indemnification, I wouldn't do a provision for a cap on their responsibilities. If they did something screwing up that bad, they need to pay for it.

President Shetler: Well, the indemnification has been taken out and we're – that's a done deal.

Troy Tornatta: Is that – okay. I mean, it's in there. He said you'd have to strike it.

Jeff Ahlers: No, we took out the indemnification, but what they put in, in place of it, was wanting to cap liquidated damages at three times the value of the fees that they get. And so I had suggested that they not, but that's what he wanted so, you know, and Mr. Deisher is not here to speak to it. So, I mean, it's up to you to do what you want to do. If you want to strike it out and say we'll approve it with it stricken out, then I guess they decide what they want to do with it, you know.

Councilmember Bassemier: Mr. President, I'd rather strike it out. There's got to be a reason here. I'm a little afraid, I think we ought to – I don't think we ought to agree to that.

Councilmember Raben: Do you want to make that in the form of a motion then?

Councilmember Kiefer: Can I ask a question? Councilman Lloyd, you're an accountant. I've got a question. I mean, don't most accounting firms have insurance, like liability insurance for themselves or their firm to cover errors and omissions, and things like that? I mean, I don't understand what the big deal is on this.

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes, they do have insurance and in our engagement letters at Kruse Dicus, we don't have a clause like that. So limiting liability, I mean, --

Councilmember Kiefer: Maybe that would be a solution is for them to have insurance to cover.

Councilmember Lloyd: They have, I'm sure they have professional liability insurance to cover malpractice.

Councilmember Kiefer: Yeah, so I don't understand why they need any cap or anything like that. I mean, especially if they, any prudent business is going to have insurance.

Councilmember Bassemier: Then why don't they just leave it in there if they're already covered? I mean, you know.

Councilmember Raben: Mr. President, I'm going to make a motion to approve the agreement as written with the exception of at the top of page three, strike the sentence, "Any liability of BKD and its personnel to you is limited to three times the amount of the fee you paid for this engagement as liquidated damages."

Councilmember Goebel: Second.

President Shetler: Okay, we have a motion and a second. Any other questions or comments?

Councilman Sutton: I didn't realize there was so much concern or potential risk in liability on writing a job description. Seems pretty innocuous to me.

President Shetler: If it wasn't, everybody would be doing it, right? Alright, any other questions? Comments? Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being seven ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

**(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)**

<b>2009 PROPERTY TAX BILLS</b>
--------------------------------

President Shetler: I don't have anything else on the agenda. Does anybody else have anything else to bring up? Yes, Councilman Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: I know people have seen these tax bills, they went out, and I know a lot of the taxpayers received those Monday. We've heard from a number of clients on the commercial side that 40%, 50%, 60% increases like on small business owners, hotels, small retailers. So, although when you look at the bill, if you look at '07, that's really the one you should compare to, but I have sympathy for those taxpayers. It's very difficult to budget a 40 or 50% increase in your property taxes. And I've had conversations with our county Auditor about it. The state, in 2008, put in – was it 640 million towards property tax relief? This year, more like 140 million, so there's a huge difference there. But coming around to the County Council, we've got a large responsibility of holding the line on our budget this year, and I would hope that we could hold the line to the extent of trying to operate on a flat budget or something along those lines. And I just wanted to express sympathy for the average taxpayer that's getting hit with quite a large

increase. But if you look at it over multiple years, it's not quite so bad. Thank you.

Councilmember Kiefer: I'd like to echo your comments, Councilman Lloyd, because I got a couple of phone calls from neighbors last night asking me how much mine went up compared to how much theirs went up, so I do know that people are looking at these and realizing they're getting a big hit.

Councilmember Goebel: I have a question for the Auditor, if I could. Could John Taxpayer, looking at the tax bill, this year or what we're paying this year is a 1.5 cap, is that correct, on the assessed value? Does that 1.5 come after deductions or is that just the assessed value and then you make the deductions after that?

Bill Fluty: If he looks at his comparison statement and all the information that's been provided to the taxpayer by the DLGF on their comparison statement, they can actually get to if they would qualify for their tax cap. There are a few homes, because if you take off their exemptions, that actually did qualify for a tax cap. But there are some, on certain aspects of what they have on their property, whether it be a shed or some of those things, but it's minimal on their tax cap on some of those. But they'll be able to get to that with that information.

Councilmember Goebel: Thank you.

President Shetler: Yes, Councilman Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: One other point, I don't know if anybody saw the Evansville Courier & Press today, but we've got issues with the Assessor where he made, he coded properties wrong. Apartments were coded not residential, they were coded commercial, so there might be some errors there that will have to be addressed. I'd just like to express my disappointment there and ask the Auditor if he knows what effect this will be on the county to have these errors by the County Assessor.

Bill Fluty: Really, it's a classification in code. Those corrections are being processed by his office and will move to our office. Then again, there's going to be some ins and outs, mostly. But we will process those as they come in. The effect, I can't predict that right now. I haven't received those corrections. But they did not receive the tax cap that they deserve, so it will be a reduction of their bill if they hit that threshold, which, in turn, would be a reduction to the taxing unit. But that's actually what it should have been, so that's just getting them where they're supposed to be.

Councilmember Lloyd: We've just had to deal with a lot of issues and problems from the Assessor's office and I'm disappointed in that and I hope they can get their act together down there. Thank you.

President Shetler: Any other questions? Comments?

Councilman Sutton: Now, Auditor Fluty, now we saw the article, I guess, in the paper this morning. Now, I know that the process that the state puts into place where you guys are submitting in different forms, different tables, who all is involved with that here? When we talk about the Treasurer, I mean, are there more than just the Treasurer's office that's involved with coming up with that final determination of what that will be? I was always under the impression that the Auditor, the Treasurer, the Assessor are all working together to compile all that information to ultimately, when we see that tax bill in the mail, so that what may be a surprise to

us, when we receive the ultimate figures, that you guys already have those tables and so can you – who all is involved with that process?

Bill Fluty: All of us have different pieces and parts of it, defined duties of what we do through the process. Classification codes are the responsibility of the County Assessor, and because of this being a different year, if they're not in the right classifications as they dumped into our system through an allocation file in March, they don't receive the right property tax cap. These particular properties were in commercial, when they should have been in residential and they were dumped through a file, allocation file, I think, in mid-March. With that said, there's 500 of those and we're correcting those as they come. But we're all involved in this process.

Councilman Sutton: Did you meet with the – did your office meet with the Assessor or the Treasurer's office and have a discussion about this when you guys discovered maybe this classification issue?

Bill Fluty: It came to light last week in their office through calls from apartment owners that they believed their classification was incorrect. They called the Assessor's office and I think they started the process. I've been working with their staff on just what we needed to correct these, just the correct paperwork on these things, so we've been in contact with them. We've managed to make a form with these nine classifications that we'll need for all property tax corrections. They'll fill that form out, attach it to a 133, we'll get those and process them as soon as they come over. I'm not sure how quickly they will come over but as they come over, we'll process them. One of two things: it will be a correction to the spring bill, which is doubtful it will get corrected for the spring bill, but then it will be a correction to their fall bill.

Councilman Sutton: And how many are we talking about? How many bills do we estimate have incorrect information on them –

Bill Fluty: Appeals, I don't know. What we're talking about here, I understood there was 500. As those come across, I'll have a direct count of how many there are. That was just an estimate provided by their office to our office just to inform us of the workload that is coming to our office, and to be able to answer questions on apartment buildings, you know, how does this process work on the caps. Then again, we'll just work through those corrections.

Councilman Sutton: So you guys are all working together, it sounds like, on this and discussing and getting it –

Bill Fluty: Yes, that's correct.

Councilman Sutton: – and that's a good thing.

President Shetler: Yes, Councilman Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: I'm not sure that we should even be discussing this because we don't have the information in hand. If they're all working together hand in hand, as the departments should, I think these things will all be remedied under the code or the law of the state. I do think, most importantly, people, in general, were expecting a continuation of the major property tax downward cycle that we received last year. I think a lot of people now are faced with sticker shock again



and didn't fully understand how much of a break the state granted to property tax owners, and now we're facing, some people are going back almost to the level we had a couple of years ago. And that's, I think Councilmember Lloyd said we have to maintain our budget here because we've got to try to protect as best we can as a group, the property taxpayers in Vanderburgh County.

Councilmember Bassemier: Mr. President?

President Shetler: I'm going to piggyback just real quickly on what Councilman Goebel mentioned. And the state put in, what, 625 or 650 million dollars last year to help ease the burden on taxpayers, which is about 100 and something million dollars this year –

Councilmember Goebel: When I received my tax bill last year, I hid it because I thought it was a mistake, and I didn't want anyone -- I was going to pay it and shut the door. But this year, I find that it, like everyone else, --

President Shetler: In addition to that, those folks who are city residents also received an 8% homestead credit that they no longer receive from the city part of it. So there is a couple of significant factors that have increased the taxes which are out of our control. Now what is in our control is the budgets coming up and the fact that we've got to be very diligent in making sure that that line is held so that there are no new tax increases, that we do our part. So I'm piggybacking a bit on what you said and we're going to have to be good stewards of that this year.

**(Tape changed)**

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes, Councilman Lloyd said he was disappointed in the Assessor's office and, Jonathan, I think you need to explain yourself, your point, what happened, whatever.

Jonathan Weaver: Well, thank you. I'm Jonathan Weaver, Vanderburgh County Assessor. Thank you for bringing up those points. If you look at, really, number 4a on your bill, you can see the comparison that the state supplemented over the last couple of years. Councilman Lloyd, I'd like to answer your allegations or whatever problems you may have with my office. You mentioned that article, that's a .6% error that we inadvertently made. What do you mean by not getting my act together? We submitted our trending for '09 pay '10 May 15<sup>th</sup>. We're about to get approved for next year's tax bill already, our assessment data, almost before this year's bill was calculated. I mean, we stepped up this process so the taxpayers can get their bill months before it's due. And that's what needs to happen, not weeks, so they can save up for this major expense. So we stepped that up, we processed over 12,000 appeals in the last two years. Nobody in the state has done that many, that fast, in that amount of time. I mean, we work hard so what else do you perceive as a problem in my office?

Councilmember Lloyd: Just a question I have, and I have a call in to an associate of mine that has apartments in the county. What's going to be the cost to the county to redo the statements? Will that be minimal, or if we're going to redo their fall bill?

Jonathan Weaver: That's a question for whoever sends out the bill, the rebill.

Bill Fluty: As he's mentioned, we've done, I think, did you say 12,000?

Jonathan Weaver: Appeals, the last two years.

Bill Fluty: There's 500 more, but it's just a process of reprinting that bill, calculating. I have a corrections clerk who is very busy. She'll just calculate those corrections, put it in the mail, send it to that taxpayer. They'll have to know what their corrected bill is because it will be a reduction in November, is what I'm assuming it will be.

Jonathan Weaver: And what we've recommended to those apartment complexes through their representatives was that, you know, we're going to fix the problem. We recommend that they pay this installment, and it appears that November's installment will be cheaper and they'll have more money for the holidays, and they seem to maybe appreciate that.

President Shetler: How many multiple family units are we talking about, parcels of property?

Jonathan Weaver: We're talking 500 parcels, and there's 81,000 in the county, so this is .6%. Point six of a percent.

President Shetler: But out of multiple family units, there's 500, so all of those were incorrect is what you're saying.

Jonathan Weaver: We got a memo on October 30<sup>th</sup> from the DLGF and we were approved, our trending, last year. We submitted it in July. We were approved October 7<sup>th</sup>, we submitted it to the Auditor October 31<sup>st</sup>. In that couple of week's time period there, we were – we had a – we were in contact with Manatron, who does our assessment software and also does the tax billing system. They wrote scripts for the program for the allocations, and those were what we went with, it was verified by the DLGF memo of October 30<sup>th</sup> and we went with it. And we, at that point in time, the bulk of our work was done and if there was a problem, I feel it should have been brought to my attention.

Bill Fluty: I have just a comment on that. It's two parts. He gave us the gross assessed valuations in October. The allocation file actually came in March, which actually breaks down the scripts run that puts these into these buckets. So there's two pieces to this equation. Then also with that file sitting there in October, we were implementing a new system at that time, it got up and running somewhere in February. About the time the allocations, – the allocation file, which we needed, we couldn't bill without it because it actually puts everything into the right buckets to apply the right cap, came in March. I think it's mid-March, but I have the date for that if you'd like to see that. But that's actually when that came that actually breaks those down and puts them in those correct buckets. So it's two processes here.

President Shetler: So actually, the error rate on multiple family was 100%? I mean, you're saying that all of the multiple families were misclassified?

Jonathan Weaver: I didn't say all the multiple families, this is what I was told.

President Shetler: All the multiple families were misclassified?

Jonathan Weaver: That's what you're saying.

President Shetler: Well, that's the question I'm asking you.

Jonathan Weaver: And at this point in time, I couldn't answer that.

President Shetler: Okay, alright. Any other comments? Yes, Councilman Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Public service announcement. Human Relations Commission banquet is Thursday, June 18<sup>th</sup> at 7 p.m. The guest speaker, Dr. Mary Frances Berry, former director of the US Civil Rights Commission. Tickets are \$30 and I hope everybody can attend. It's at the Centre. Thank you. June 18<sup>th</sup>, Thursday evening at 7:00.

President Shetler: Any other announcements, comments? Motion for adjournment would be in order.

Councilmember Kiefer: So moved.

President Shetler: It's been moved for adjournment. Thank you very much.

**(There being no further business to come before the Council, the meeting was adjourned at 9:44 a.m.)**

VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL

\_\_\_\_\_  
President Tom Shetler, Jr.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Vice President Joe Kiefer

\_\_\_\_\_  
Councilmember Jim Raben

\_\_\_\_\_  
Councilmember Mike Goebel

\_\_\_\_\_  
Councilmember Russell Lloyd, Jr.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Councilmember Ed Bassemier

\_\_\_\_\_  
Councilmember Royce Sutton

Recorded and transcribed by Teri Lukeman.

**VANDEBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL  
MINUTES  
JULY 1, 2009**

The Vanderburgh County Council met in session this 1st day of July 2009 in room 301 of the Civic Center Complex. The meeting was called to order at 8:30 a.m. by County Council President Tom Shetler, Jr.

President Shetler: Good morning, it's July the 1<sup>st</sup> – June went awful quick and I hope July doesn't go near as fast, but it's nice weather outside. I'd like to ask – first of all I guess we want the roll call and then the Pledge of Allegiance, and ask Councilman Lloyd, since he's dressed patriotically today, to lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance.

COUNCILMEMBER	PRESENT	ABSENT
Councilmember Sutton		X
Councilmember Bassemier	X	
Councilmember Lloyd	X	
Councilmember Goebel	X	
Councilmember Raben	X	
Councilmember Kiefer	X	
President Shetler	X	

President Shetler: There being six present and one absent, we have a quorum. And again, I'll ask Councilman Lloyd to lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance.

(Pledge of Allegiance was given)

<b>APPROVAL OF MINUTES</b>
----------------------------

President Shetler: Next I need a motion for approval of the minutes.

Councilmember Lloyd: So moved.

President Shetler: It's been moved, do I have a second for the June 3<sup>rd</sup> –

Councilmember Raben: Second.

President Shetler: Roll call please.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being six ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

**(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)**

<b>APPROPRIATION ORDINANCE</b>
--------------------------------

President Shetler: Next is the appropriation ordinance. Councilman Raben?

**JAIL  
COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS**

Councilmember Raben: Okay, thank you, Mr. President. Good morning. First on the agenda today under the Jail, we have three Confinement Officers, positions, for a total request of \$9,580, and then under Community Corrections, same request, three Confinement Officers in the amount of \$7,185. I'll move approval.

Councilmember Bassemier: Second.

President Shetler: Do we have any questions? Roll call please.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being six ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

JAIL		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1051-1130-0363	Conf. Officer Super.	2,395.00	2,395.00
1051-1130-0364	Conf. Officer Super.	2,395.00	2,395.00
1051-1130-0365	Conf. Officer Super.	2,395.00	2,395.00
1051-1130-0366	Conf. Officer Super.	2,395.00	2,395.00
Total		9,580.00	9,580.00

COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1361-1240-1361	Conf. Officer Super.	2,395.00	2,395.00
1361-1270-1361	Conf. Officer Super.	2,395.00	2,395.00
1361-1350-1361	Conf. Officer Super.	2,395.00	2,395.00
Total		7,185.00	7,185.00

**(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)**

## HEALTH DEPARTMENT

Councilmember Raben: Okay, next under Health Department, 2130-1160-2130 and 2130-1170-2130 in the amount of \$600. I'll move approval.

Councilmember Kiefer: Second.

President Shetler: It's been moved and seconded. Any questions? Comments? Roll call please.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being six ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

HEALTH DEPARTMENT		REQUESTED	APPROVED
2130-1160-2130	Director/Nursing Div.	480.00	480.00
2130-1170-2130	Med. Lab Tech. Super.	120.00	120.00
Total		600.00	600.00

**(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)**

#### REASSESSMENT/COUNTY ASSESSOR

Councilmember Raben: Okay, next under Reassessment funds, under County Assessor, we have requests for a Level II Certification with FICA and PERF for the amount of \$576, I'll move approval.

Councilmember Kiefer: Second.

President Shetler: Motion has been moved and seconded. Any questions? Comments? Roll call please.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being six ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

REASSESSMENT/ COUNTY ASSESSOR		REQUESTED	APPROVED
2490-1090-1972	Level II Certification	500.00	500.00
2490-1090-1900	FICA	39.00	39.00
2490-1090-1910	PERF	37.00	37.00
Total		576.00	576.00

**(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)**



## TOURISM CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Tourism Capital Improvement Fund 3600-4111 under Improvements in the amount of \$232,000, I'll move approval.

Councilmember Bassemier: Second.

President Shetler: It's been moved and seconded. Questions? Councilman Goebel?

Councilmember Bassemier: Tom, I'm sorry, sir. I think Marilee would like to say something if that's okay.

Marilee Fowler: Marilee Fowler with the Evansville Convention & Visitor's Bureau. Our commission met yesterday and they've asked me to put the maintenance repairs on hold until we can get the actual bids. What we came to you with were what we estimated those to be and so that part of this, the \$130,900, we'd like to put that, as I said, on hold and have you just approve the renovation work, which is \$101,100.

Councilmember Goebel: Marilee, the \$101,100, now you'll put that out for bid?

Marilee Fowler: The 101,100 has already been bid. Those are the actual costs to do that work. So if you approve that part of this request today, we will probably be letting those bids this afternoon. Now for the second portion of that, the maintenance work we need to do on that building, \$130,900, what we had presented to you was what PCI had presented us with estimates. The board wants us to actually get those bids and come back to you with what those will be – what the actual bids will be and have you approve it at that point.

Councilmember Bassemier: So you want \$101,100 and put the \$130,900 on hold?

Marilee Fowler: Correct.

Councilmember Bassemier: I'll rescind my motion.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Mr. President, I'll amend my motion under Tourism Capital Improvements in the amount of \$101,100.

President Shetler: Okay, we have an amendment and then the second has agreed as well, so we have a change to \$101,100. Alright, Councilman Goebel, did you have any further questions?

Councilmember Goebel: No.

President Shetler: Councilman Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Well, this is money that's in the Tourism Capital fund, so it's not General fund money for additional appropriation.

Marilee Fowler: That's correct.

President Shetler: How did you go about getting bids? Did you advertise for bids?

Marilee Fowler: The renovation work that we're doing, the \$101,100 was, we publicized those in the newspaper and those bids have come forth. We had Bill Gaisser, our architect that has worked on this building over all these years reviewed

them and made the recommendations based on this figure and those were all the lowest bids.

President Shetler: So we went by normal procedures, and there wasn't anything outside of the ordinary?

Marilee Fowler: Correct.

President Shetler: Any other questions, comments? We have a motion, roll call please.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being six ayes and no nays, the motion carries. Thank you.

TOURISM CAP. IMPROVEMENT		REQUESTED	APPROVED
3600-4111	Improvements	232,000.00	101,100.00
Total		232,000.00	101,100.00

**(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)**

<b>TRANSFER REQUESTS</b>
--------------------------

**CUMULATIVE BRIDGE  
LOCAL ROADS & STREETS  
HEALTH DEPARTMENT**

Councilmember Raben: Next under Cum Bridge and Local Roads & Streets, we have two transfers, one under Cum Bridge in the amount of \$20,000 and Local Roads & Streets in the amount of \$25,000. And along with this, in the audience today we also have our new superintendent, Chris Walsh, who might want to step up and introduce himself to everybody, but I'll move approval.

Chris Walsh: Good morning. My name is Chris Walsh, Vanderburgh County Highway Department. I apologize it's taken me this long to get here, to introduce myself to you. I wanted to get the paving off to a good start. I left each one of you one of my cards. If there's any concerns or if there's anything I can help you with, feel free to call on me. I'll be more than happy to help any one of you. And if you had any questions on the transfer, I'm available for that. We've had some problems this year with – actually, the one gradall that gave us problems has never given us a problem. It's about fifteen years old. So that's the one I've gotten taken care of. The one that I think Mr. Duckworth had come before on is still having problems, but we're dealing with them on an ongoing basis.

President Shetler: Don't apologize for not coming forward before now. That means that you haven't asked us for any new money. And not that we don't want to see you, it's just that we appreciate that fact. So, it's good to have you on board. Mike?

Councilmember Goebel: Chris, this is the equipment or the repair of the gradall is going to be done in-house, is that correct?

Chris Walsh: On the second gradall, it is. The other gradall we have, it was the main pin, and a gradall has a telescoping arm and the main pin; it could only be done at Southeastern, we had to send that one out.

Councilmember Goebel: Okay.

Chris Walsh: We do as much in-house as we can possibly do and we have a really good mechanic staff there.

Councilmember Goebel: I hate to bring something else up right now but I'm going to. We've had numerous discussions here in the past over salt, and do we have ample supply now? And have we been able to buy that and –

Chris Walsh: Yes, we just got notified that the state bid has been awarded. Our region was awarded to American Salt and the price is \$60 a ton which is dramatically lower than what it was last year, so we're kind of excited about that and we shouldn't have any problems with salt. We can go, I think Rockport is the closest destination. If, worst case scenario, they can't get it to me, I can get my trucks to Rockport and get it back here.

Councilmember Goebel: So we're set.

Chris Walsh: We are set.

Councilmember Goebel: And I think last year the price was about what, \$120 –

Chris Walsh: One twenty. I was with the city last year and I want to say 120 - 125.

Councilmember Goebel: One forty-two to us, I believe.

Chris Walsh: Was it?

Councilmember Goebel: Yeah, so you've cut it well over fifty percent.

Chris Walsh: Yeah, it looks like it's going to be an excellent deal for everyone.

Councilmember Kiefer: Chris, I was just going to comment that it might be worth checking into and it's just a thought that crossed my mind, but there might be a future market on salt. You might be able to buy contracts for -- paper contracts to hedge a position against fluctuating prices. It would be something worth checking into. Because it's not something you have to take delivery on, just, you hedge a position and then when you need it, you're protected.

Chris Walsh: Okay, I'll check into it.

Councilmember Goebel: I think the state does that, but I believe this is in line with what we paid in the past, prior to the last two years.

Chris Walsh: Yeah, it's a little bit higher, but probably about where it would have been irregardless of last year. If it had gone up a little bit at a time, we'd probably be in the \$55 to \$60 range anyway, would be my guess.

Councilmember Bassemier: Chris, I know you're new on board but have you had a chance to check out you all's work week? I know you're working ten hour shifts, four days a week.

Chris Walsh: Yes, I'm doing some preliminary study right now. We're going to go back to the five-day work week, I believe the first of November. And we're looking over, I'm trying to quantify what kind of savings we really did get out of that and I'd be happy to report back to you to see. You know, there's some advantages and then again, there are some disadvantages.

Councilmember Bassemier: And that's the reason why I asked --

Chris Walsh: Weather related. On a four day week, if it rains a couple of days, that's only two days I'm paving instead of three. So we're going to look at all of that.

Councilmember Bassemier: I was thinking about your snow days and overtime?

Chris Walsh: That won't be affected if we go back to a five day week in November.

Councilmember Bassemier: Okay, and you are going back?

Chris Walsh: Yeah.

President Shetler: Yes, Councilman Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Chris, do you still live on Wilson Square?

Chris Walsh: Yes, sir.

Councilmember Lloyd: That's my former neighbor. I moved out of the neighborhood, I don't know why.

Chris Walsh: We'd like to have you back.

Councilmember Lloyd: You could always tell Chris' house, he's got all these political signs in his yard. A couple of questions on the gradalls. What is the approximate age of those?

Chris Walsh: The oldest one which has had the most problems, it's two-fold, it's not just the age because with proper maintenance, we can really get a long life. That one was purchased and it was only one of about two made. It was like a prototype. And those two had all the bugs and we got one of them, and we've been dealing with it over the years. And I want to say it's about 15 to 18 years old. And then the one that we've got this appropriation for is about 14 years old and it's been a great piece of equipment. It was just a piece in it that takes a lot of wear that's quite expensive to fix, just happened to give out on us.

Councilmember Lloyd: And you guys use them pretty heavily?

Chris Walsh: We have three of them, and yeah, we do. We're probably one of the only counties in the state to have three of those. So we're pretty gifted and I go back to the tornado. We could bring to bear three gradalls on scene and it had a big impact.

Councilmember Lloyd: And then what is the cost of a new one?

Chris Walsh: \$300,000 range, just off the top of my head.

Councilmember Lloyd: I think Mr. Duckworth was before this body before looking for new ones and we just never could justify that.

Chris Walsh: Yeah, I was hoping there would be a new one there when I got there.

Councilmember Lloyd: Well, there's dreams – well, thank you.

President Shetler: Councilman Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Are you running on schedule on your paving in the county?

Chris Walsh: Yeah, we're about 28 to 30% right now. I wanted to push and get as much done this month as I could because, you know, unlike in the past, now we only get a 30 day guarantee on the price, and I just had the feeling it was really going to jump up on us and I was trying to get as much ahead of the game as I could. So I feel confident we're in a pretty good position.

Councilmember Bassemier: Thank you.

President Shetler: The gradalls, is it possible to rent those anywhere?

Chris Walsh: Yeah, they're quite expensive and I haven't recently checked into it. I did when I was at the city. The city didn't have a gradall at the time when I was there and it's quite expensive.

President Shetler: I guess what I'm thinking of, since we have one and a half or two that are functioning most all the time, and we have them in our possession and keep crews going on that, when we need the third one, would we – would it be more prudent just to rent those for the couple of months we actually need it?

Chris Walsh: It's a definite possibility, and if you'd like, I'd get some figures for you and get you a better idea exactly where – we have an equipment rental account so it's just a matter of me getting some pricing on it for you.

President Shetler: Thank you. I would appreciate that because it doesn't make sense to me to put that much capital into something and particularly if you're only using it for a couple three months and –

Chris Walsh: The one in question that's down right now, and I'm talking off the top of my head, a couple thousand dollars, so it's hard to not justify putting – but it is a band-aid on a problem, so –

President Shetler: Alright, thank you. Any other questions, comments? Alright, thank you, Chris, nice review.

Chris Walsh: Thank you.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, under Health Department, we have a late transfer for \$500, I'll move approval. Did we vote on that last –

President Shetler: No, we need a motion. Could we just do transfers all at once?

Councilmember Raben: I'd like to amend my motion to include the Health Department in the amount of \$500.

President Shetler: Just get it all at one time.

Councilmember Raben: Who seconded?

Councilmember Kiefer: Second. I don't know if there was a second.

President Shetler: And that's for all the transfers?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

President Shetler: Okay, we have a motion and a second. Any other further questions, comments? Roll call please.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being six ayes, no nays, the motion carries.

CUMULATIVE BRIDGE		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 2030-4250	Misc. Equipment	20,000.00	20,000.00
To: 2030-3520	Equipment Repair	20,000.00	20,000.00

LOCAL ROADS & STREETS		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 2160-4310	Road Equipment	25,000.00	25,000.00
To: 2160-3820	Tractor & Truck Repair	12,500.00	12,500.00
2160-3830	Road Equip. Repair	12,500.00	12,500.00

HEALTH DEPARTMENT		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 2130-1430-2130	Deputy Registrar	500.00	500.00
To: 2130-1971	Accrued Payments	500.00	500.00

**(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)**

<b>AMENDMENTS TO SALARY ORDINANCE</b>
---------------------------------------

Councilmember Raben: Okay, and the last order of business is the amendments to the salary ordinance. First, salary line 1051-363 Confinement Officer Supervisor as previously adopted setting the 2009 salary in at \$42,540, the hire date for this individual is 8/28/95. Line 1051-364 Confinement Officer Supervisor as previously adopted at a 2009 rate of \$42,163. The effective hire date on this one is 9/29/97. 1051-365 as previously adopted at an annual rate of – 2009 rate of \$42,040, hire date on this employee is 10/4/99. 1051-366 setting the 2009 salary in at \$43,540, the hire date is 12/24/88. Under Community Corrections, 1361-1240 Confinement Officer Supervisor as previously adopted setting the 2009 salary at \$44,493, the effective hire date is 4/6/85. 1361-1270 setting the 2009 salary in at \$42,040, the effective hire date is 8/9/99. 1361-1350 setting the 2009 salary in at \$43,540, the effective hire date is 9/18/89. Under Health Department, 2130-1160 Director/Nursing Division as previously adopted, setting the 2009 salary in at \$61,018, the effective hire date is 1/23/93. 2130-1170 Medical Lab Tech Supervisor in as previously adopted, setting the 2009 rate in at \$41,641, the effective date is 8/18/93. 2130-1971 setting in the Accrued Payments as previously adopted. And under County Assessor, amend salary line 1090-1972 Level II Certification as previously adopted. The pro-rated Level II for Ken McWilliams and Cassie Ainsworth is \$250 each for 2009. This will set the salary line 1090-1972 in at \$19,000 for 2009. I make that in the form of a motion.

Councilmember Lloyd: Second.

President Shetler: We have a motion and a second. Questions? Roll call please.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Madelyn Grayson: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being six ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

**(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)**

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>GROWTH ALLIANCE FOR GREATER EVANSVILLE COMPLIANCE REVIEWS</b></p>
---

President Shetler: The next item is, underneath new business, Libbie Au with GAGE. Good morning, Libbie.

Libbie Au: Good morning. For the record, Libbie Au with GAGE. I'm here this morning to formally present the compliance information I have received thus far for 2009. The first spreadsheet contains the compliance information that compares the projected investment and employment with the actual investment and employment. And the second spreadsheet contains the estimated tax revenue as a result of these projects. Also attached are the letters of explanations from the companies that did fall below their investment and employment figures. I can now answer any questions or concerns from Councilmembers.

President Shetler: Councilman Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Libbie, do you have anything to add to this from the last meeting on any of these companies?

Libbie Au: I did contact the company that we were speaking about at the last meeting and they indicated that the project that was approved in 2008 is still in the process of being completed. Because of the economy, it was slowed down a little bit but they do still have every intention of completing the project and raising that investment figure.

Councilmember Goebel: Did they give you a time frame?



Libbie Au: I asked for that, and they have not, but I can continue to do so.

Councilmember Goebel: We're granting the tax phase-in based on, I guess, good faith at this point. At what point would we review this and maybe think otherwise? I know the economy is sour right now. It's pretty obvious and I think they have good intentions, just at some point, if we're granting a phase-in for investment that's not occurring, at what point will we ask for maybe a re-evaluation of the phase-in itself?

Councilmember Lloyd: Which company is this?

Libbie Au: I believe it's Graham Packaging.

President Shetler: I guess it would probably be up to an individual Councilmember, if they want to bring forward some kind of motion to make a change in it. I currently, given the economic climate as you alluded to, I'd be a little reluctant now and try to, I guess, give them as much leeway as we possibly can. I know that the pharmaceutical market is fairly solid right now but there's a lot of volatility as well, with their suppliers. And Graham could very well be caught up into some of that. I know that some local suppliers have been kind of shifting around because of bids and stuff, so there could have been some things that they had hoped to get business-wise that perhaps they weren't successful in doing. I'm not certain of the specifics on this particular situation here but I know that they're heavily involved in some of that packaging deal and it's a matter of some of that, on food products and other, so I'm not sure exactly what the nature of it is, but I would suspect that that's something that each one of us could bring up at any time and then try to, you know, if we're concerned and would want to reverse that action we've taken before.

Councilmember Lloyd: When you think about it, we're giving the – we're allowing the tax phase-in on the projected amount, but they don't realize any actual savings unless they spend the money, is that correct?

Libbie Au: That's correct. It would be based on the acquisition or purchase acquisition of personal property.

Councilmember Lloyd: So, I mean, we're hopeful that they will make the full investment, but as of right now, they haven't, but I don't think the county is not necessarily out anything. And actually, if they don't make the investment in the next couple of years, they're going to be the ones that are losing out because of the time frame of the credit, isn't that correct?

Councilmember Raben: Their credit would expire.

Councilmember Lloyd: Right, their credit is going to expire if they don't make the investment within a period of time, but the economic situation kind of dictates what they're going to do. But I can agree with Councilman Goebel on this, and hopefully we've seen the bottom, things seem to be picking up in some areas, so I'm hopeful that they can spend and make the additional investment at some point in the near future.

Councilmember Goebel: I think it's obvious that their intentions are good and they came forward in good faith. And, Libbie, I want to thank you again for keeping us posted and any information that you get from them, pass it on, that would be great.

Libbie Au: I will.

President Shetler: Alright, any other comments or questions? Thank you.

<b>BOARD APPOINTMENTS</b>
---------------------------

President Shetler: Next is, I did make an appointment, re-appointment actually, Bob Davies, who was on the Willard Library Board currently. They asked me if he could be retained, and I've known Bob for some time and a good community person and he's been re-appointed to the Willard Library Board. Also, recommending to appoint as a liaison to the Evansville-Vanderburgh Public Library is Russ Lloyd, Jr. Again, that was a request made by the library to make sure that they have Russ Lloyd, as their – because there was some long-time close ties there, so –

Councilmember Lloyd: Well, I'm a reader, so, and I think they do a good job at the library. I've known Marcia Au for a long time and they have a top-notch facility. I think they're an asset for our community and I look forward to working with them when they bring their budget before the Council.

<b>JOINT CITY/COUNTY BUDGET HEARING</b>
---

President Shetler: Thanks, Russ. I do want to point out that there is a joint budget hearing scheduled for the City and County Councils, that will be on July 31<sup>st</sup> at –

Councilmember Kiefer: That's actually the 29<sup>th</sup>. Yeah, that date is – well, it said July 31<sup>st</sup>, Wednesday, when July 31<sup>st</sup> falls on Friday.

President Shetler: That is the Wednesday, you're correct.

Councilmember Kiefer: Right.

President Shetler: And that's at 3:30 in the afternoon, the 29<sup>th</sup>. When Sandie gets back in here we'll just double-check and make sure it's not Friday, the 31<sup>st</sup> and that it is Wednesday. And earlier I was told it was going to be on that Wednesday. So I'm going to assume that's correct. Any other business? Yes, Councilman Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: I think in light of the state further cutting back on the property tax replacement for next year and we've already asked, this body has already asked the various departments to set in zero salaries, I think it might be prudent at this time to ask each of those department heads to look further for cuts that they can make in each of the departments so we don't necessarily have to go in not knowing nearly as well, having the expertise as they do running their own departments, maybe they can find further savings for the county for our upcoming budget hearings. Instead of asking for more money, maybe looking themselves, looking at their various departments, and trying to help us out to help them, because we have to work together. Next year is going to be, I think, a brutal year for the county and all local governments.

President Shetler: Yeah, good point and I concur. Any other comments or questions? Yes, Councilman Lloyd?

<b>HOMESTEAD TAX CREDIT</b>
-----------------------------

Councilmember Lloyd: I'd like to, first of all, commend President Shetler on the

letter regarding the local homestead tax percentage to City Council, and wanted to know, have you heard anything from the City Council?

President Shetler: I have not heard anything from them. Of course, the Mayor reacted pretty swiftly on that, I think, 15 minutes after we came up with the resolution or the letter to ask them to do it. And so, I think that everything is pretty much in sync and the city is recognizing that the taxpayers are demanding it as well as we are. So I don't, I think it's something that will get through; whether it's going to be a full 8% or not, I'm not sure. But, and that's another thing I did want to remind everybody – and that date, by the way, let's go back on. It is the 29<sup>th</sup> on that Wednesday at 3:30 for the joint City/County. But you're going to have to kind of be on guard here a little bit, all of us, I'm not sure when the city will act on that homestead credit, but as soon as they do, we're going to have to be calling a special meeting to act on it as well. We discussed the idea, Mr. Ahlers and I, about the possibility of going ahead and doing an ordinance. The problem is, it really must mirror the city's ordinance. So if we pass something and an i isn't dotted or a t isn't crossed the same way that the city did it, we could end up having to redo it anyway. So it's important for those to mirror. So it's best, since they have 70% of the vote, for us to wait until theirs is done and then we'll come into the chambers and vote on it.

Councilmember Goebel: I think the city acted very quickly because of the outcry and the way it was handled. I don't think anyone, as I mentioned last time, feels good about the way the homestead credit was handled. And it, once again, it was a meeting evidently between members from different departments, and I think the Mayor has obviously made the comment that they're going to reinstate, so we don't need to take any action today.

President Shetler: Right.

Councilmember Raben: I would like to mention, though, that if possible, you might circle the wagons with them because while it seems like we've got a lot of time, we really don't. You know, the deadline is August 1<sup>st</sup> and once they take their action, you know, we're going to need some time to prepare our resolution and advertise it, you know, we're bound by law to advertise it for 14 days, so we're going to be crowding the deadline. So you might encourage them to act as – or at least let them know we have to – we probably have to have 16 or 17 days to do what we need to formally do.

President Shetler: I think Councilman Lloyd and then Councilman Goebel.

Councilmember Lloyd: Well, I'm available any time in July, so maybe you can call Councilman Watts, the President of the City Council, and just find out what kind of date they're looking at. You know, even if it's one of their Monday evenings, we can come to that if we have to, to have a joint meeting. I don't remember if I sent this to everybody. I talked to the Department of Local Government Finance and they sent a spreadsheet that shows all the local option income taxes. And out of the 92 counties, now you've got CAGIT, COIT, CEDIT, so you've got different types of taxes. Not everybody has COIT, but there was 59 counties that gave a local homestead credit and that includes a COIT credit, a CEDIT credit, and a Local Option Income Tax Credit. So out of the 59, it's kind of funny, the state's spreadsheet, they just drew lines through Vanderburgh, so we were the only one that repealed it for '09. But anyway, out of the 92, 59 gave some kind of credit on the local income tax. And I'll make that available to the other Councilmembers.

President Shetler: Okay, thank you. Yes, Councilman Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Back to the other business as far as the special meeting. We can't act until the city acts. Can we call a special meeting at our, is July 31<sup>st</sup> our next –

President Shetler: Well, the Town of Darmstadt will need to act on this, too. Now they could – they could act as soon as the city has finished as well. Presumably they'll do the same thing we would do.

Councilmember Goebel: August 1<sup>st</sup> is the deadline, though.

President Shetler: Yes. Let me check and make sure that's going to meet all the legal qualifications and as far as I'm concerned, that would be, you know, what we'd need to do, I would think that would be fine.

Councilmember Goebel: I think it's pretty obvious we're going to do what the city does.

President Shetler: Right.

Councilmember Goebel: So if they have their work taken care of, I think it's a good idea that they have to give us time to make notification.

President Shetler: Right. Councilman Kiefer.

<b>POSTPONEMENT OF REASSESSMENT</b>
-------------------------------------

Councilmember Kiefer: I understand the General Assembly postponed the reassessment for a year. I don't know if, Mr. Weaver, you want to speak to that? I mean, are you familiar with that, that the reassessment has been delayed?

Jonathan Weaver: Good morning, Jonathan Weaver, Vanderburgh County Assessor. Yeah, I found out last night that they are putting it off a year, which gives us more time to do a better job and, you know, we'll work with it.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay, I think that kind of helps us on the Pictometry thing, you know, takes some of the pressure off on that, but they can come back when the leaves are off the trees and take pictures.

Jonathan Weaver: Well, the images have been delivered.

Councilmember Kiefer: Oh, they've already been done and delivered?

Jonathan Weaver: The flight was taken pretty much immediately after that meeting we had. The notes I have and the last email I received was the oblique imagery and the standard orthos is delivered. They're waiting on some information from computer services, which I believe they delivered to them yesterday in electronic format and then the ChangeFindr results will be delivered in September.

Councilmember Kiefer: So when will that be available on the Internet, that people can view those?

Jonathan Weaver: We're going to have a training session in-house for my staff, I'm

going to say at this point in time by the end of the year. I can't give you a specific date at this point in time.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay, thank you.

Jonathan Weaver: Anything else?

President Shetler: Were those pictures, they'll be what, about 18 months old then by the time you really utilize them?

Jonathan Weaver: No, we'll be able to utilize them immediately, so –

President Shetler: For the reassessment?

Jonathan Weaver: What we're doing is a rolling reassessment. We're doing a portion of the county. Instead of doing all 80,000 plus parcels at one time, we're going to be doing a portion of it every year. So this is going to be quite the benefit to us.

President Shetler: Right. Okay. Any other questions? Yes, Councilman Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Is that because I guess a lot of counties are not on time with their reassessments? Is that why the state would do that?

Jonathan Weaver: You know, I don't know the particular reason. I didn't campaign to push it back so, you know, we were ready to go.

Councilmember Lloyd: Okay. On just another note, I'm glad the General Assembly did pass a budget. I know I talked to Auditor Fluty about what would happen to the local government if they didn't pass a budget. And it would have caused some hardship, obviously license branches closing, state parks closing, so I commend our General Assembly for doing that and the Governor on pushing a budget that did not raise taxes and held the line on spending when their revenues were down ten to fifteen percent.

President Shetler: Okay, any other comments? Any other business? Motion for adjournment would be in order.

Councilmember Lloyd: So moved.

President Shetler: Thank you. Appreciate it.

**(There being no further business to come before the Council, the meeting was adjourned at 9:10 a.m.)**

**VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL**

---

President Tom Shetler, Jr.

---

Vice President Joe Kiefer

---

Councilmember Jim Raben

---

Councilmember Mike Goebel

---

Councilmember Russell Lloyd, Jr.

---

Councilmember Ed Bassemier

---

Councilmember Royce Sutton

Recorded by Madelyn Grayson. Transcribed by Teri Lukeman.

**VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL  
SPECIAL MEETING  
JULY 21, 2009**

The Vanderburgh County Council met in special session this 21st day of July 2009 in room 301 of the Civic Center Complex. The meeting was called to order at 8:35 a.m. by County Council President Tom Shetler, Jr.

President Shetler: Good morning. It's a little bit past 8:30 and we have a special meeting today to consider the Homestead Credit for the year 2010. And I'd like at this time to call the roll and then we'll have the Pledge of Allegiance.

COUNCILMEMBER	PRESENT	ABSENT
Councilmember Sutton	X	
Councilmember Bassemier	X	
Councilmember Lloyd	X	
Councilmember Goebel	X	
Councilmember Raben	X	
Councilmember Kiefer	X	
President Shetler	X	

President Shetler: There being seven people present, we have a quorum, and so I'd like to ask Councilman Raben if he would lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance, please.

(Pledge of Allegiance was given)

**APPROVAL OF 2010 HOMESTEAD TAX CREDIT  
ON FIRST AND FINAL READING**

President Shetler: Okay, we are here for the sole purpose of discussing and putting before the public the Homestead Credit for the year 2010. I don't know that we can really take up any other official business, although there may be a few other things that we may want to bring up, some reminders at least that I have to give to you anyway. This needs to be kind of done in a specific way and I might let Mr. Ahlers kind of outline that so that we do this correctly.

Jeff Ahlers: What you have before you are two documents that have been noticed and advertised for public hearing today and for you to discuss and take action upon, the first of which is a Resolution of the Vanderburgh County Council Proposing An Ordinance of the Vanderburgh County Income Tax Council Establishing the Percentage Credit Allowed for Homesteads for 2010 and Casting the Votes of the County Council on Said Ordinance, which is resolution number CO.R-07-09-006. Attached to that resolution, of course, and the way this works, because the Income Tax Council doesn't all meet at once because it's comprised of the three different bodies all of which aren't even in the same city. So we vote by the resolution to cast our votes, and then there is also An Ordinance of the Vanderburgh County Income Tax Council Amending the Percentage Credit Allowed for Homesteads for 2010. So what I would suggest we do is have, after a public hearing, that there be three motions. The first motion of which would be for this Council to move for this to be the first and final reading so that there would not be the necessity of another

reading at some other time. And if that passes unanimously, then this can be the final hearing. And so, then the second motion would be to pass the resolution casting our 28.517 votes in favor of the ordinance and then thirdly, to keep the record clear, I would suggest that we go ahead and vote on and pass the ordinance so that there is nothing left in the record for anybody to doubt whether or not that we've taken action on pretty much every motion, resolution and ordinance and properly cast our votes. Any questions?

President Shetler: Do I have any questions about procedure first? Okay, being a public hearing, I'll ask for any public comments regarding the Homestead Credit. Seeing that we're not being rushed by comments from the audience, does anybody on Council have comments? Questions? Yes, Councilman Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Just specify, we need a unanimous vote so that we are basically doing like two readings in one meeting, is that correct?

Jeff Ahlers: That's correct, Councilman Lloyd. Essentially, and I guess, because this is a much different process than any other resolution or ordinance that we pass, normally a resolution only takes one reading and if you assume that's all we're doing, that's probably all it would take. But given the fact that there is an ordinance, just out of an abundance of caution, I'd just suggest that we go ahead and the motion, the initial motion just needs to pass unanimously, saying that this will be the first and final reading. The subsequent resolution and ordinance votes, you would not necessarily have to be unanimous.

Councilmember Lloyd: We're acting as our end of the local Income Tax Council?

Jeff Ahlers: That's correct. The City Council has acted a few days ago to cast their 70.719 votes, the Town of Darmstadt has .764 votes, I'm not sure when or if they've already acted. So we're acting as three separate members of the Income Tax Council, and casting our ballot on the ordinance.

Councilmember Lloyd: And then this is for 2010.

Jeff Ahlers: That's correct. This would be for the Homestead Tax Credit that would be for 2010.

Councilmember Lloyd: Thank you.

President Shetler: Okay. Yes, Councilman Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Mr. President, I'm going to move that today's action count as our first and final vote to approve this resolution. I'd like to make that in the form of a motion.

Councilmember Goebel: Second.

President Shetler: Moved and seconded. Question? Comments? Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.



Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being seven ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

**(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)**

<p><b>APPROVAL OF A RESOLUTION OF THE VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL PROPOSING AN ORDINANCE OF THE VANDERBURGH COUNTY INCOME TAX COUNCIL ESTABLISHING THE PERCENTAGE CREDIT ALLOWED FOR HOMESTEADS FOR 2010 AND CASTING THE VOTES OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL ON SAID ORDINANCE RESOLUTION NO. CO.R-07-09-006</b></p>
---

President Shetler: We need another motion then on the –

Councilmember Raben: I'll make a motion to cast our 28.517 votes approving this resolution R-07-09-006.

President Shetler: We have a motion.

Councilmember Bassemier: Second.

President Shetler: A couple seconds. Any questions? Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being seven ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

**(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)**

<p><b>APPROVAL OF AN ORDINANCE OF THE VANDERBURGH COUNTY INCOME TAX COUNCIL AMENDING THE PERCENTAGE CREDIT ALLOWED FOR HOMESTEADS FOR 2010</b></p>
--

Councilmember Raben: Okay, now I'd like to make a motion to approve, again, the ordinance R-07-09-006 as our second and final vote.

Councilmember Bassemier: Second.

Jeff Ahlers: Actually, the ordinance isn't numbered. It would just be An Ordinance of the Vanderburgh County Income Tax Council Amending the Percentage Credit Allowed for Homesteads for 2010.

Councilmember Raben: I apologize, let the record state the correction in the motion.

President Shetler: We have a motion and a second. Any questions? Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being seven ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

**(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)**

President Shetler: That basically concludes the - yes, Councilman Sutton?

Councilman Sutton: There is something I did want to at least have some discussion on. I know that – because we look at the 2009 Homestead Tax Credit at least on the county side, the potential fiscal impact is somewhere in the neighborhood of about 1.2 million, something like that.

Councilmember Kiefer: Two and a half million.

Councilman Sutton: Yeah, two and a half million, okay. For 2010, granted, I know we're looking at projected numbers, what is the impact that we're talking about as a result of the action that we've taken today, because as we get ready to go – we're about to enter into budget hearings, obviously, this would be something very important for us to be very aware of regarding some very key decisions on a number of different things.

Bill Fluty: I would expect it would be close to the same amount. Then again, it's based on homesteads filed, that number doesn't increase or decrease dramatically. But I would guess still in that same range, 2.5.

Councilman Sutton: So a total of a five million dollar impact with, granted we haven't – there hasn't been any action taken on the 2009, based upon what we've been hearing over the last few days, but, so, in total, over the next month or so, we're going to need to make some adjustments to the county budget amounting to five million dollars downward?

Bill Fluty: There are a lot of variables to that, but that is probably a true statement. Revenues, tax collections, how other revenues come in, actually what the budget is for 2010, how it will pan out, and we're looking out over the next eighteen months. But yes, we're looking at five million dollars.

Councilman Sutton: I don't know if there's been any additional thought or some plans maybe laid out regarding how we handle this, how we make the appropriate adjustments going through our normal budget process, probably will not be fully sufficient because that's focused upon 2010. I think probably if we're looking at appropriately adjusting this, I would recommend that at least a committee of this body would be formed that would look at several different options and in dealing with at least the 2009 impact if we do, again, make the adjustments there. And then, of course, the budget process will take care of the 2010 adjustments. But that

is a pretty significant impact upon the county of which, I don't think any of us have made any particular plans. There are some areas where we probably can make some cuts, but the type of cuts we've been making won't come close to at least the 2009 adjustments.

President Shetler: It's a good point. I have actually been thinking along those same lines in that perhaps looking at maybe doing it for a committee of the whole, and having more of training session perhaps in the beginning where we would sit down and be able to have our County Auditor explain to us exactly where the revenue streams come from and what those monies could be used for and cannot be used for, so that we have a full understanding of how the income comes into the county government and then go from there to start thinking in terms of ways that we can wrap our arms around the expenses, the cost of county government, much like you do at the bank and that we do at our place. It's difficult in county government in that there is, and I'm not advocating any other form of government, but it is difficult in county government to wrap your arms around managing the costs when there is, not like in the city of Evansville where you have a single mayor or a single executive who is responsible for doing that. And when you have a variety of different elected officeholders and department heads who are autonomous, and have their own authority, it does make things a little bit more difficult. But we need to do that. We need to find ways that we can wrap our arms around the expenses and manage the cost of county government the best we can. Yes, Councilman Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: I think a seminar of that nature definitely has merit so we have a better, clearer understanding. To the County Auditor I have a question, as far as, I don't think deal with this year right now, but for next year, what percentage would you estimate we'd have to cut as far as expenses go to match the projected loss in income or revenue? Three percent, five percent? Do you have any idea?

Bill Fluty: A lot of things are going to play out between now and next year. Number one is what budget you're going to approve for 2010. I think that's first on the list of what's presented and what those needs are. You have been conservative in past years, you do have different pots of money that you've held on to over the years. You know what those are. You may have to look at those to make ends meet, I guess, in a sense, the end of this year and next year. You also know that the caps do increase next year as they drop from 1 ½, 2 ½, 3 ½ to 1, 2, and 3, which actually I think will mean 1,400,000 less in property taxes that you can collect. That will be a factor. You have information that there are declining revenues right now. One of our key factors that we have wait on is our County Option Income Tax numbers that should be out in August. They should give you a better handle of how we can budget for next year and where we'll have to look to make cuts.

Councilmember Goebel: The state is also reducing its property tax replacement from 140,000,000 down to 80,000,000 for next year, as far as the credits go?

Bill Fluty: Property tax replacement credit is completely gone this year, the Homestead Credit goes from 140,000,000 this year down to 80,000,000 next year, and down to zero the following year.

Councilmember Goebel: That's the –

Bill Fluty: And you have no control over that and that's –

Councilmember Goebel: And that's by state mandate.

Bill Fluty: That's correct, the General Assembly.

Councilmember Goebel: The reason I'm asking the question is, if we have a feel for how much less revenue we have coming in, and maybe it's three percent, we could ask now all departments to factor that in and maybe propose cuts from within their own departments so it can be maybe, I don't think it's going to be pain free, but at least more palatable because they can have a say in where we're going to cut across the board. That's, I think we've already agreed we're going to freeze all salaries, but maybe we're going to have to go a little deeper.

Bill Fluty: Yes, I understood that all departments are trying to put in a zero line budget, I think is what you called it, James, the same as last year. And that's a starting point. If you have to go deeper than that, it might be a little early to tell right now, but we're close. To get to an exact percentage, I can work on that, but it's difficult to say that. When those budgets come out, then that information will follow.

Councilmember Goebel: I just think that, you know, we're less than a month away, so we've got to start doing something in that regard and I think we need to ask all entities to look inside and maybe make cuts.

Bill Fluty: You have to remember most offices are salaries and benefits and office supplies. Surely you're not going to be able to get enough in office supplies to make these kind of cuts that you may have to make, so you're going to have to look at a hiring freeze, that may be a possibility, you might look at just the people that retire, job changes that maybe you're not going to fill those positions as quickly as you have in the past, look at them individually, that may be a start. You might be cutting services of some type, might be doing something we're doing now that we may not be able to do in the future. So, obviously, things could be cut back that way.

President Shetler: Councilman Goebel, last year's budget was \$52,000,000, roughly, I'm thinking, for the county, wasn't it?

Bill Fluty: It was higher than that.

Councilmember Kiefer: So a little over four percent.

Bill Fluty: About 62, I think.

President Shetler: Alright, so basically, you're talking in the neighborhood of about, roughly eight percent cut that may have to happen across the board, compared to what, if we're going to try to make up that five million dollars. A couple of thoughts that have gone through my mind is making a set up, basically a two-tier employee structure. It's something we haven't gotten into yet. I've just kind of weighed it out through my mind and been checking through different sources on how that might work. Something that companies have engaged in over the last several years. It's a way that, after you do a hiring freeze, it's a way that you can at least lower your cost of new employees coming in to the workforce, leaving all the present people alone at their present scales and what they were brought in as, but for the new people coming in, in the future, we've gotten to the point where some of the new positions coming in, they're now starting off at a much higher level than you might

find in private industry because we have given that annual three percent across the board, even on new people starting off. So I think there's a way there to set up a two-tier structure on our employment that could save us several hundred thousands of dollars a year and I think there's some ways that we may have to look at, as the Auditor mentioned, of hiring freezes, as well as we've already talked about the salary freeze.

Councilmember Goebel: We're not talking about making up the difference from this year? Next year. That will be a double whammy, I think. I'm talking about Y2010.

President Shetler: I think, personally, that if we're talking about a hiring freeze, and doing that through, you know, maybe even eliminating, do that through attrition, that that's something that we could, in fact, implement sooner rather than later. I mean, the next four or five months could be fairly critical on doing that because I would, I'm guessing, this is an assumption, which is poor to do, but I'm assuming that a lot of people retire toward the end of the year.

Councilman Sutton: Councilman Shetler, that might be one of the ideas that we would pursue, but we are talking about millions of dollars here.

President Shetler: Absolutely, I understand.

Councilman Sutton: We're not talking thousands or hundreds here, so there's going to have to be some – I don't know what they all are, but that's why I proposed a committee, something, there's going to have to be some rather aggressive measures taken.

Councilmember Kiefer: What about capital, what about using the money as a one-time hit for 2009, two and a half million, what about capital reserves or capital monies, you know, or eliminating some capital type projects that could be used to fund 2009? I mean, instead of taking it all from operating?

Councilmember Raben: You're referring to if we have to write checks back?

Councilmember Kiefer: Right.

Councilmember Raben: Yeah, that's probably what we'll have to do.

Bill Fluty: You're asking me that? To answer that right now would be a little premature. We're still looking at the end of the year revenues, and taxes seem to be in shape and make this or get close to making this budget, but we still have that money that we're going to have to redirect back to the Homestead Credit for the fall bill, is what I'm anticipating is going to happen. So we'll have to redirect that money. You do have different reserves, your Rainy Day Fund, you have your Jail Set Aside Fund, so you do have some ways where you could kind of move this money around to get through 2009.

Councilmember Raben: As far as 2010, I mean, I appreciate and I – everybody's comments are fantastic. I mean, Royce, I agree 100%. I think we need to get a committee established of three of us, because that's all by law we're allowed to have and start crafting our way into 2010. But looking at some of the funds that Bill discussed, I mean, we might have to redirect what we do in the future with our Riverboat. You know, we've got three different accounts that we set aside a million

and a half dollars in every year that, you know, we may have to look at eliminating those three structures that those funds go into or a couple of them anyway. So there is no doubt we can get through it. It's going to be leaner times than we've seen in the past and, in fact, I can recall back in '99, you know, we put on a hiring freeze, so it's not unprecedented by this body and we can enact a lot of things and make up a lot of ground really quick. Just shooting from the hip, I think salaries probably are responsible for in excess of 50% of our budget, I would bet, or close to it. So hiring freezes, I mean, you can make up a lot of ground pretty quick. The two-tier structure, there is a lot of merit to that. But I like everything I'm hearing here today and it's all doable. I'm confident it's all doable.

President Shetler: Okay, I wanted to, before – also to remind everybody that we have a joint, speaking of the budget and monies, a joint meeting with the City and County Council in these chambers on July 29<sup>th</sup>, and that is at 3:30. I tried to get it done earlier in the day so that we could save a little bit on the environment and not have to drive our gasoline cars back and forth, but anyway, that didn't work out. So we will meet here at 8:30 and then come back at 3:30 with the city and county. I also wanted you to keep on your minds, and I think we're going to try to work this out for August the 3<sup>rd</sup>, but the '09 Homestead Credit, you've probably read a bit in the newspapers and stuff and through the news media, we'll hopefully be able to tackle that on August the 3<sup>rd</sup> at our regularly scheduled meeting. Then there is also the issue that was brought to light yesterday with the State Legislature passing the statute that allows for taxpayers to actually pay their taxes over a twelve month period of time rather than just on a semi-annual basis as it's been customary in the past, and I think that's an action that needs to take place by the county in order to afford that opportunity to our residents. So that, hopefully, we could get in line to do something on the 3<sup>rd</sup> as well.

Councilmember Kiefer: Question? Do you know if that legislation allows us to charge some type of interest or is that interest free, that they are allowed to spread their payments out?

President Shetler: Rick, do you know anything further?

Councilmember Raben: If you're paying in advance, if you're spreading it out, I mean, I don't see how we can charge interest when we're being –

Rick Davis: That would be interest free as far as I know. I have several questions.

President Shetler: Is it pre or is it post? In other words, are they paying ahead on that or are they paying behind on it?

Rick Davis: They would be paying ahead and behind. They would be paying monthly. I have several questions. I called the Indiana Treasurer's Association president yesterday and he wasn't very clear on some of this as well. So Mr. Ahlers, I will try to do my best to answer some questions because I have several. For instance, if people are paying on a monthly basis, this year, for instance, our bills were not ready to be delivered. We had no idea how much your bill was going to be at home until mid-May. Now people, I sat there and thought to myself, if someone had a \$600 payment last year, and they were paying \$100 a month January, February, March, April, May, they were going to be around \$130 off. If they had budgeted this into their monthly budget and they're just getting by. Maybe their wife lost her job or they lost hours at the factory, which has happened, people

in our community have had to take a pay cut this year, what happens when we give them their bill June 1 and they've got 15 days to come up with an extra \$130? That will have to weigh into your decision whether or not to do this. And what happens if they pay the bulk of that and then miss a payment? And my worst fear is if they are living month to month and they've got this in their monthly bill, what happens if they don't have the money and we take an ACH withdrawal, they're going to get fee'd at the bank. They're going to get fee'd by us, most likely. How long will this continue? Also, our fall payment is due November 10<sup>th</sup>. They'll be paying in December. There are lots of questions that need to be answered. I'll probably talk to the State Board of Accounts or Department of Local Government Finance. I wanted to remind everyone watching at home, we have a similar program already in place in our office. If you want to pay on a monthly basis on your bill, even pre-payments, we'll accept them. The only difference between what was pitched yesterday and what our office currently does, is we don't take ACH payments per month. And I think in a tough economy right now, accepting a check when the taxpayer knows they have the money in the account is a greater service to the public than to have them sign up for a monthly plan and then, you know, January everything is fine, April, one of our factories shuts down, then what happens? That's what I'm worried about, because it's tough out there right now, especially for people who want to take advantage of something like this. The newspaper printed that probably around 30% of our parcels are already on escrow where they do pay the bank on a monthly basis and the interest question was a very good question, too. Do we earn interest on that? Yes, in a sense we would because if they pay in January, February and March, we take that money and we invest it. So we would be earning interest there. I doubt that the taxpayer would get that interest back, but again, those are questions we'll have to ask. I've got a lot of questions that I would want to have answered and I can bring to you at the August 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting, and I'll probably talk to the State Board of Accounts or DLGF.

President Shetler: I apologize. I was giving the wrong date out, it's August the 5<sup>th</sup> instead of the 3<sup>rd</sup>.

Rick Davis: Okay, August the 5<sup>th</sup>.

President Shetler: Yes, my apologies.

Rick Davis: But just to reiterate, we do have a similar plan in place. And out of 100,000 parcels, only a dozen or two dozen people are on it. And it's mostly for people – the people who are taking advantage of it are people who are worried because they've had their hours cut, they were worried that when the bill was going to come in May or June, they didn't know at the time, they were worried that they were going to have a difficult time coming up with \$600 out of the blue and our office has bent over backward to help folks like that. We put them on a payment plan to get them to pay on the expected due date where they don't have to pay any penalties. If the amount of money they'd have to pay per month is past that, we try to get them within that five percent penalty period the first 30 days. If they can't do that, we try to get them caught up as soon as possible in that ten percent period and try to convince them to start making pre-payments for the fall payment. And it's been very successful. The folks who have agreed to do this, for the most part, have lived up to their word. And it's a non-binding contract where what was proposed yesterday or by law, would also, you know, they'd have to sign their name on the dotted line and live up to that promise. So what we're offering is free of charge to them and is not a contract where, if they miss a payment because



somebody had an illness and missed two weeks of work or whatever the case may be, if they miss that payment, they don't get an extra hit or an extra penalty, we just hope somewhere down the line they make up that difference with an extra payment.

President Shetler: Councilman Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Rick, even though it's free of charge from your office, they still, if they don't meet the deadline, they still have that penalty, correct?

Rick Davis: Yes. We –

Councilmember Goebel: So it's not really free of charge.

Rick Davis: It is free of charge if they make what would be due June 16<sup>th</sup>, by that June 16<sup>th</sup> deadline.

Councilmember Goebel: I understand.

Rick Davis: And that's our goal. When they call in January or February, at the time, we were hoping for May 11<sup>th</sup>. We tried to get them on a plan by May 11<sup>th</sup>, you know, divide their amount of what they paid last year, because we were guesstimating, and tried to get them to pay a monthly amount, where when they got their bill, it wasn't such a big hit. But if they can't do it, then we try for the five percent period, within that 30 day window, and then after that, it's a ten percent penalty, but at least it keeps them off tax sale, it's a smaller bill when they get it in the mail, and we've bent over backwards to help folks like that.

Councilmember Goebel: I think when you do your research, you can maybe report back and then we could – it's premature right now. Some of the counties are on this plan, and what the benefits and costs will be. Thank you.

Rick Davis: No problem, I'm glad to be here.

President Shetler: Okay, any other comments? Yes, Councilman Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: So if someone goes on ACH, I mean, if they end up not having the money and that payment doesn't clear, that's not any different than writing a bad check, right, for your office?

Rick Davis: Basically, yes.

Councilmember Lloyd: So, I mean, part of it is communication. We need the taxpayers to communicate with you. And from the way it sounds, the ones on the plan are doing that.

Rick Davis: Yes, absolutely.

Councilmember Lloyd: So it's something to think about. The only other thing I'd like to point out, it's going to make our job a lot harder on the 2009 Homestead and obviously, we all thought those deadlines had all passed long ago, that there was no effect, so, you know, I'd like to commend Governor Mitch Daniels for getting involved and having the state agencies go in and waive those rules so that the county can do that. And, obviously, in this bad economy, I mean, it's going to be

good for taxpayers to get that rebate and it's just going to make our job harder, but that's what we were elected to do.

Rick Davis: Bear in mind one more thing, Vanderburgh County, two years ago in 2007, when the taxes were really, really high, to the best of my knowledge, Vanderburgh County was the first county to bill that year, or one of the first. And everybody down here in Vanderburgh County was really upset because we had these high bills. Nobody in Indianapolis heard. It wasn't an issue. And then, guess what happened? Marion County folks got their bills and the little donut hole around Marion County, they all got their bills and they were really mad. And then, all of the sudden, we had a tax problem in the state of Indiana. And Marion County has not billed for 2009 yet. It may be the end of this year or the beginning of next year before Marion County folks see their 2009 bills. They recently got their 2008 bills within the last month or two, so they're really happy in Marion County right now, because that's part of the 620,000,000 that Mr. Goebel was talking about a few minutes ago. Once Marion County bills for 2009, I have a feeling it's going to be a state-wide problem again with the General Assembly, and we just heard they got a 1.3 billion dollar surplus with the state. That sounds like a whole lot of money to folks at home but for people who deal with millions of dollars like you, it's not that big of an amount. However, I have a sneaking suspicion that once Marion County bills go out and it becomes a state-wide issue again, that the state is going to increase that \$80,000,000 for next year, it's just a sneaking suspicion, because it will, once Marion County gets their bills out, people will be picketing on the courthouse steps again at the General Assembly in the next twelve months.

President Shetler: Councilman Kiefer, did you have a point?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yeah, I was just going to point out, you know, this whole brouhaha over the tax exemption and everything that occurred, would it be prudent for the Council to send the legislature a letter saying, requesting them to pass a law that says the exemption is in place unless we take an action to remove the exemption as opposed to, it's not in place unless we take an action to approve it?

Councilmember Goebel: Do you think that's going to be an issue in the future?

Councilmember Kiefer: You never know. Another mayor, another Council, it could come up. But it was just a thought to make it much simpler, because I think some of this slipped by people because it's just too easy in the vastness of government to miss something like this and for some people, it was a rather innocent mistake, and they just missed it. And this way, if the legislature passes it to where it's automatic unless we take action to reverse it, I think would be a good thing.

President Shetler: Well, I think the other thing we discussed a meeting or two ago was trying to set the date at least for that so that we have until like October the 1<sup>st</sup> so that it kind of falls with everything else and the budget process makes a lot more sense as well. So that might be the avenue that we'll take with the legislature as far as trying to get them to pass that deadline on from August the 1<sup>st</sup> to at least October 1<sup>st</sup>, that way, it will be on the top of our minds throughout the process, anyway. So, okay.

Councilman Sutton: I had proposed earlier about the committee and dealing with some of these issues, Councilman Raben seemed to be agreeable, I'm, I guess volunteering myself to serve on it if we decide to put together a committee of that

nature. But obviously, we need more than two but I just want to hear – and obviously, we do need to hear from the Auditor in terms of giving us a general overview, but –

President Shetler: I have checked into the possibility of us doing this as an informational session and whether or not we could do it. There would be, I guess, no decisions made, just information only, more of a learning session, that if we could do that and it be essentially a closed-door meeting so that we would have that kind of freedom to throw out ideas and discuss possibilities there, that could be looked at. And then, and there are some possibilities, that's why I'm thinking in terms of the committee as a whole. So I'm thinking the same way you are, but I'm thinking that it may be advantageous, rather than restricting it to three or four people, to looking at it, that all of us would participate in that particular committee meeting. So I don't know, Counselor Ahlers, if you have any point on that?

Jeff Ahlers: You know, one of the things you could do as well, I suppose, is there is nothing that says the meetings have to be televised if you think it would be easier to work. But one of things you could do is, I guess, what I hear you saying is something similar to maybe how we do Personnel & Finance Committee, I guess you could go ahead and notice, it but it wouldn't necessarily have to be televised. But otherwise, you know, I guess to be on the safe side, I would suggest that you probably always notice up a meeting if you're going to meet as a whole. If you're going to have a quorum, it's always – I would suggest that you advertise it.

President Shetler: Are there any times in July because we're going to be getting into this thing running pretty strong come August. We have about two weeks left in July.

Councilman Sutton: Well, I guess my suggestion is, maybe for expediting the process, now obviously, the committee, we would open that up, I guess, if we needed to, but in the month of August, we've got a number of meetings to deal with just the 2010 budget and then, of course, we've got our regular Personnel & Finance and our regular meeting in August. Now if we're talking about layering another series of meetings, trying to get everyone here might be somewhat of a challenge, but if that's what you're intending to move forward with, and really, if we're talking about the end of July trying to get something in still, you know, we've got, what, ten days left in July, we've already got a meeting scheduled for the end of – two meetings, already, scheduled for the end of July, so we are kind of pressing ourselves a little bit. But, I'm open.

President Shetler: Councilman Raben, your schedule the next couple of weeks?

Councilmember Raben: We'll make it work. The other idea I had is, depending on the structure, you know, if it's more of an informational type meeting with information provided to us by the Auditor, you know, it's possible to have two or three different meetings where everybody kind of gets to share in on the same information, you know, just so long as there's no more than three of us at a time. So however you want to handle it, I, you know, you don't have to make the decision today, but maybe, you know, contact us in the next day or two, but we can do it as a single committee or try to circulate everybody through the same process.

President Shetler: Why don't we set up the committee of three just as Councilman Sutton has suggested, and Councilman Raben and Councilman Sutton and myself could serve on that and then we could work out at least that part, the first detail of

if we want to have a committee of the whole or how we want to go from there. And at least get something started from there. That would at least get the ball rolling.

Jeff Ahlers: If, as Mr. Raben said, if it's purely information, you know, we had that happen whenever we had the House Enrolled Act, you know, 1001, when it came down and people from the state came down and spoke to us, I mean, it's one thing if you're being spoken to, the problem you run into is if you meet as a whole and you've not advertised, that while it may be intended that no decisions, you know, are taken and it's merely, you know, you're discussing, the problem becomes, you know, whether someone else perceives it differently and just to, an abundance of caution, if you're going to be discussing among yourselves and you're going to have a quorum present, I would recommend that, you know, you advertise accordingly so that there is no mistake that, you know, you're in compliance.

Councilmember Kiefer: I prefer just to make them public meetings. This all affects the public, just open it up and we don't have to worry about it.

Councilman Sutton: Well, you could take our Personnel & Finance meeting that we've got next Wednesday, and I don't know how long it will take for Auditor Fluty to put together a presentation of the information that we are needing to pore over and attach that on to our meeting for next week.

President Shetler: Is that doable?

Bill Fluty: Yes, I think some of it will be, I did send out last week an email, you all received that. Of course, that is actually the bulk of the information, but I think our budget books will be done next week. That's a good time to start, but yes, I'll have something for you by next Wednesday.

Councilmember Goebel: I think if we have graphs and things, it could be even posted so viewers at home could watch, I think that would be really beneficial, too. Most of us are visual, at least I am.

Councilmember Lloyd: It's my understanding if we met as a group, budgetary issues is not an exception for Open Door Law. You know, you have personnel issues, industrial development, real estate purchase, labor contracts, and I don't think budgetary information would fall under that. So if we wanted the whole Council to meet, I would think it would have to be a public meeting.

Councilmember Raben: And again, to Councilman Kiefer's point, I think it would be good for the general public that has an interest in seeing how all this is bundled up into one basket. You know, it really doesn't hurt, I mean, I think a lot of people are interested in hearing just that. So I like this idea the best.

President Shetler: Any other questions? Comments? Motion for adjournment?

Councilmember Lloyd: Motion to adjourn.

President Shetler: Thank you.

**(There being no further business to come before the Council, the meeting was adjourned at 9:18 a.m.)**

VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL

\_\_\_\_\_  
President Tom Shetler, Jr.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Vice President Joe Kiefer

\_\_\_\_\_  
Councilmember Jim Raben

\_\_\_\_\_  
Councilmember Mike Goebel

\_\_\_\_\_  
Councilmember Russell Lloyd, Jr.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Councilmember Ed Bassemier

\_\_\_\_\_  
Councilmember Royce Sutton

Recorded and transcribed by Teri Lukeman.

**VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL  
MINUTES  
AUGUST 5, 2009**

The Vanderburgh County Council met in session this 5th day of August 2009 in room 301 of the Civic Center Complex. The meeting was called to order at 8:34 a.m. by County Council President Tom Shetler, Jr.

President Shetler: Good morning, all. It's August the 5th and time for the County Council meeting. We'll have the roll call, please.

COUNCILMEMBER	PRESENT	ABSENT
Councilmember Sutton	X	
Councilmember Bassemier	X	
Councilmember Lloyd	X	
Councilmember Goebel	X	
Councilmember Raben	X	
Councilmember Kiefer	X	
President Shetler	X	

President Shetler: We have all seven members in attendance. I'd like to ask Councilman Kiefer to please lead the Pledge of Allegiance.

(Pledge of Allegiance was given)

<b>APPROVAL OF MINUTES</b>
----------------------------

President Shetler: Okay, everybody was mailed the minutes. Do I have any questions? We need a motion for approval.

Councilmember Lloyd: Motion to approve.

President Shetler: It's been moved and...seconded by...

Councilmember Bassemier: Second.

President Shetler: Councilman Bassemier. Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being seven ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

**(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)**

<b>FOOD &amp; BEVERAGE ORDINANCE</b>
--------------------------------------

President Shetler: Next on the agenda I'm going to change this just a little bit out of synch here. I'd like to deal next with the resolution concerning the Food & Beverage Tax. Ordinance, I'm sorry. The ordinance on Food & Beverage. Do I have any questions? Does everybody have that ordinance with them? There's been a slight change in it. I'll let our attorney, Mr. Ahlers, explain that slight change that was made.

Jeff Ahlers: I'd furnished you, I guess about a week or so ago, the ordinance pertaining to the Food & Beverage Tax. Yesterday there was a minor revision, it would be on page four, section three, F, and F was added, and it was just one sentence. And the only thing that we were doing there is to clarify, because over time, sometimes that tax changes. I don't know, this bond may go longer than some of us are here, and was to make sure to clarify that in the ordinance, that the way that the ordinance appropriates the funds is based upon how the tax rate is in effect as of July 1, 2009. So, in other words, if that were different in the future, it would have to be revisited. So if you want to include that, you can. If you don't want to, I mean, you can go with the old version. But that was the intent of adding that, was to make sure that when you're making a decision, you're making it upon the known facts that you have now, versus, you know, what would happen in the future, if that tax rate changed, would it need to be re-allocated in the future with an amendment to the ordinance or something. Any questions on that?

Councilmember Lloyd: So that provision would be so the tax rate – I mean, some future Council may raise that tax rate, but this pertains only to the current tax rate on Food & Beverage.

Jeff Ahlers: Yeah, it's basically saying that, as it allocates within the ordinance, you know, how much comes to the County for the payment on the bond to the Centre, and how much of the excess goes to the city, that that's based upon the statute that was in effect July 1, 2009. Now, one could argue that, you know, because all this is subject to a statute, that all is subject to change by the General Assembly, but it was just a point of clarification in that regard.

President Shetler: Any other questions? Comments? And this will satisfy our indebtedness that we have on the Centre and get that completed by the year, what, 2016, I think is, we're obligated to that point or something. And the county's monies

are secured and that's first on this ordinance as we understand it?

Jeff Ahlers: Correct. What happens is that, from the first day of the month following passage, which you'll have to determine whether you're going to do this in two readings like a normal ordinance, you know, vote this month and then next month, or whether you're going to do it all in one reading. At any rate, it takes effect the first day of the month following passage. And what occurs at that point is, the county keeps in its Centre operating fund, the current balance that has accumulated and can use that for operation, repairs and remodeling of the Centre. But from the point forward of its effective date, the amount that comes in off the taxes first is used to pay the on-going bond payment obligations upon the Centre, and then anything over that amount every month would go toward the city on the arena project, toward their bond.

President Shetler: Alright, thank you.

Councilmember Kiefer: I'll make a motion that we approve Ordinance No. CO. 08-09-014.

President Shetler: Do we need a special motion to do this today if it's by unanimous or – yeah?

Jeff Ahlers: If you want to pass it in one reading, you need to have a motion saying that, and all of the members would have to vote unanimously to consent to consider this ordinance at the same meeting in which it is introduced, which is today. And if that passes unanimously, then you may vote on the ordinance and pass it.

Councilmember Kiefer: I'll amend my motion to, as you had stated –

Jeff Ahlers: Well, what you could do is just, I guess, withdraw your motion, make a motion if you want to do this first, --

Councilmember Kiefer: Yeah, I'll withdraw my motion and then I'll make a motion to, as you had stated, make this one vote if it passes unanimously, and to bypass the other reading.

President Shetler: Alright, we have a motion on the floor, do we have a second?

Councilman Sutton: Second.

President Shetler: Second by Councilman Sutton. Any questions? Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.



Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being seven ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

**(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)**

President Shetler: Now we need a motion to adopt the ordinance itself, then.

Jeff Ahlers: Correct.

Councilmember Kiefer: I'll make a motion to adopt the ordinance CO. 08-09-014.

Councilman Sutton: I'll second that motion.

President Shetler: It's been moved and seconded, then, and that's for all readings.

Councilmember Kiefer: That's correct.

Jeff Ahlers: You can go ahead and vote now or have discussion.

President Shetler: Roll call, please. Or, I'm sorry, questions.

Councilmember Lloyd: A couple of comments. All we're voting on here is the Food & Beverage Tax redirection. Part of the reasoning for this, this tax is authorized by the Indiana Legislature and this tax was scheduled to run out in 2010, I believe. We were able to work with the legislature and the mayor to extend it, and part of the reasoning on the extension was the county has no capital projects scheduled beyond paying off the bonds for the Centre, which is 2015 or 2016. Then the revenue stream, the Food & Beverage Tax, which, by law, has to go to capital projects would be redirected towards the new arena that the city wants to finance. I can attest, when I was mayor, that Roberts Stadium is at the end of its useful life and something does need to be done, so this is the decision that was made by the citizens committee and the mayor to locate the new arena downtown. I've done an analysis on the city arena financing and I think it is tight. So for such a large project, I think it's important. You're going to float 124 million in bonds that I think the project managers really need to watch the project to try to avoid cost overruns. So, I mean, I'd like to make those points before we vote.

President Shetler: Yes, Councilman Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: I just want to clarify that the motion was for the amended ordinance that – or the latest version that Mr. Ahlers presented. I just wanted to

make sure there was clarification that I included that amended change.

President Shetler: Okay, any other questions or comments? Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes.

**(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)**

President Shetler: I need to read into the minutes that at this meeting, it was introduced and all members present at the meeting on this date voted and gave their unanimous consent to consider Ordinance No. CO. 08-09-014, An Ordinance of the Vanderburgh County Council Amending the Code of Ordinance of Vanderburgh County Pertaining to the Food and Beverage Tax at the same meeting at which it was introduced, and thereupon voted seven in favor and zero against Ordinance No. CO. 08-09-014 as presented. In other words, it passed unanimously.

<b>APPROPRIATION ORDINANCE</b>
--------------------------------

President Shetler: The next item on the agenda is the appropriation ordinance.

**AUDITOR**

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Mr. President, under County Auditor, 1020-2700 Office Supplies in the amount of \$5,000, I'll move approval.

Councilmember Bassemier: Second.

President Shetler: Questions? Comments? Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being seven ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

AUDITOR		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1020-2700	Other Supplies	5,000.00	5,000.00
Total		5,000.00	5,000.00

**(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)**

## **JAIL**

Councilmember Raben: Under Jail, 1051-2260 Food in the amount of \$260,000, I'll move approval.

Councilmember Lloyd: Second.

President Shetler: It's been moved and seconded. Any questions? Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being seven ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

JAIL		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1051-2260	Food	260,000.00	260,000.00
Total		260,000.00	260,000.00

**(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)**

## **BURDETTE PARK**

Councilmember Raben: Burdette Park, 1450-1180-1450 and 1450-1900, Other Employees and FICA for a total of \$86,120, I'll move approval.

Councilman Sutton: Second.

President Shetler: Its been moved and seconded. Questions? Roll call, please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being seven ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

<b>BURDETTE PARK</b>		<b>REQUESTED</b>	<b>APPROVED</b>
1450-1180-1450	Other Employees	80,000.00	80,000.00
1450-1900	FICA	6,120.00	6,120.00
Total		86,120.00	86,120.00

**(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)**

### **TOURISM CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT**

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Tourism Capital Improvement, 3600-4111 in the amount of \$148,900, I'll move approval.

Councilmember Bassemier: Second.

President Shetler: It's been moved and seconded. Do we have any questions? Ms. Fowler is here to answer any questions if anybody has any.

Councilmember Lloyd: Just, do we have any other updates to give on the project?

Marilee Fowler: I'm Marilee Fowler with the Evansville Convention & Visitors Bureau. Actually, we have good news. From the time that we submitted this to get on your agenda, we actually opened the bids and they're \$9,000 less, so the actual figure is \$139,058.50, so we think that's very good news.

Councilmember Bassemier: Marilee, what was that figure again?

Marilee Fowler: \$139,058.50.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, I can amend my motion to approve \$139,059.

Councilmember Bassemier: I'll amend my motion and second \$139,058?

Marilee Fowler: 059. You're giving me an extra fifty cents. I'll spend it wisely.

Councilmember Bassemier: I'll second.

President Shetler: Okay, we have a motion and a second. Any further questions or comments? Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being seven ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

TOURISM CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT		REQUESTED	APPROVED
3600-4111	Improvements	148,900.00	139,059.00
Total		148,900.00	139,059.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

TRANSFER REQUESTS
-------------------

AREA PLAN LOCAL ROADS & STREETS LEGAL AID/UNITED WAY	LEGAL AID LOCAL EMERGENCY PLAN COMM.
--	---

Councilmember Raben: Under Transfers, Mr. President, I'm going to move that we approve all transfers as listed.

President Shetler: Do I have a second?

Councilmember Lloyd: Second.

President Shetler: We have a second. Questions or comments? Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being seven ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

AREA PLAN		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1240-2700	Other Supplies	375.00	375.00
To: 1240-4210	Office Furniture	375.00	375.00

LEGAL AID		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1460-1190-1460	Jr. Legal Secretary #2	3,824.00	3,824.00
To: 1460-1970	Temp. Replacement	3,824.00	3,824.00

LOCAL ROADS & STREETS		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 2160-4329	County Line Road	2,000.00	2,000.00
To: 2160-3610	Legal Services	2,000.00	2,000.00

LOCAL EMERGENCY PLAN COMMISSION		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 2861-3130	Travel/Mileage	500.00	500.00
2861-3310	Training	1,500.00	1,500.00
2861-4431	Hazmat Response	100.00	100.00
2861-3313	Educ/Public Outreach	350.00	350.00
To: 2861-3210	Emergency Mgmt.	2,450.00	2,450.00

LEGAL AID/UNITED WAY		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 4290-1190-4290	Jr. Legal Secretary #2	2,246.00	2,246.00
To: 4290-1970	Temp. Replacement	2,246.00	2,246.00

**(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)**

<b>AMENDMENTS TO SALARY ORDINANCE</b>
---------------------------------------

Councilmember Raben: Okay, and last under Amendments to the Salary Ordinance, I'll move that we amend salary line 1450-1180 Other Employees as previously approved. Under Legal Aid/United Way, that we amend salary line 1460-1970 and line 4290-1970 Temporary Replacement as previously adopted. I'd like to make that in the form of a motion.

Councilman Sutton: Second.

President Shetler: We have a motion and a second. Questions? Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being seven ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

**(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)**

<b>OLD BUSINESS</b>
---------------------

President Shetler: Underneath, kind of old business here, I do want to remind everybody that budget sessions are beginning August the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup>, and they will start at 9:00 in the morning. We do have a special meeting with regards to the Homestead Credit of '09 and that was set up for the 18<sup>th</sup> at 8:45 in the same room, so that we can do that prior to. Yes, Mike?

Councilmember Goebel: I don't know if it's a good time to discuss it, but, Mr. Fluty, the latest news from the state, you sent a memo out, how will that impact us?



Bill Fluty: The email I sent out the other day?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Bill Fluty: That's a calculation of the Homestead Credit. It's been previously reported in the media, it is 5.1, but because of the supplemental homestead and how it interacts with the calculation of tax bills, it actually comes to 3.3.

Councilmember Goebel: So that's good news to us sitting here.

Bill Fluty: Yes, but it's less credit to the taxpayer.

Councilmember Goebel: Thank you.

President Shetler: Does it mean that the taxpayers actually received part of that credit from that 35% supplemental, did they already receive a part of that credit earlier or –

Bill Fluty: No.

President Shetler: Where did that supplemental come in to it?

Bill Fluty: The supplemental was enacted by the General Assembly. That is a deduction, not a credit, similar to your homestead deduction.

President Shetler: Without it, the taxes would have been higher?

Bill Fluty: That's correct.

President Shetler: Right, so if they have –

Bill Fluty: Two different things, though.

President Shetler: Yeah, so in effect, they did kind of receive that.

Bill Fluty: The supplemental is independent from the local homestead credit. Two different things.

President Shetler: Right. Okay.

Councilmember Lloyd: On the homestead, so the tax base was slightly lower, is why that figure came out lower, the 3.3 million versus the 5.1?

Bill Fluty: Of course, figuring the tax bills is just a little bit complicated to get to that number, but there is a lot of things that go into that factor. But number one would be that the supplemental wasn't in effect for 2008, but is in effect for 2009.

Councilmember Lloyd: Okay. And as the county part of the local Income Tax Council, we have 29% of the say, but the taxpayer is still getting the full eight percent, which is the good news, and technically, it's a wash for them. They're getting maybe more state credit than they thought, maybe less local credit, but they're still getting the full eight percent that's been enacted in the city and county since 1992, I believe. So, I mean, I think that's good news. The figure is just slightly lower.

Bill Fluty: I wouldn't say it's a wash because it's actually, the credit amount is lower this year than it was last year.

Councilmember Lloyd: Okay, but I mean it was – we calculated for the eight percent, but it came in lower, is what you're saying?

Bill Fluty: Repeat that.

Councilmember Lloyd: Well, the motion that was passed was for the eight percent local homestead credit. The motion that was passed by both the Councils.

Bill Fluty: Eight percent doesn't calculate to the same amount of money that it did the previous year.

Councilmember Lloyd: Right, but that was the intent of the local Councils, it just happens that because of that supplemental, that the dollar amount is lower.

Bill Fluty: That's correct, but two different things here. But just be clear that your eight percent doesn't amount to the same credit that they received from one year to the next. It's less for this year because of the supplemental.

Councilmember Lloyd: Based on many factors, that number is always going to be different.

Bill Fluty: It changes yearly.

President Shetler: Okay, any other questions or comments? Motion for adjournment would be in order.

Councilmember Lloyd: One item of new business. I couldn't get a full answer out of Councilman Raben, tentatively, we are going to have a Personnel Committee Job Study meeting August 20<sup>th</sup>, at 9:00 a.m., so that would be Thursday, August 20<sup>th</sup> at 9:00 a.m., unless something changes. So we'll let everybody know that's on the Job Study committee.

President Shetler: Okay, anything else? Motion would be in order for adjournment.

Councilman Sutton: So moved.

Councilmember Lloyd: Second.

President Shetler: And seconded. Thank you very much.

**(There being no further business to come before the Council, the meeting was adjourned at 8:54 a.m.)**

**VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL**

---

President Tom Shetler, Jr.

---

Vice President Joe Kiefer

---

Councilmember Jim Raben

---

Councilmember Mike Goebel

---

Councilmember Russell Lloyd, Jr.

---

Councilmember Ed Bassemier

---

Councilmember Royce Sutton

Recorded and transcribed by Teri Lukeman.

**VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL  
BUDGET HEARINGS  
AUGUST 18, 2009**

The Vanderburgh County Council met in session this 18<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2009 in room 301 of the Civic Center Complex. The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m. by County Council President Tom Shetler, Jr.

President Shetler: Before we begin, I do want to just kind of set maybe the tempo a little bit. I have something to pass out to the County Councilmen. I have a sharpened pencil and sharpener for each one of you. What I’m hoping is that we all, and I apologize, one of them was a little bit less expensive than the others. I want you to leave that there on your desk these next two days, and anytime you get tempted to give in to some of these officeholders who want a few extra bucks put in their budgets, I want you to get out that pencil sharpener and just start sharpening that pencil down and realize that, guys, we’ve got a tough budget ahead of us and we’ve got a lot of work ahead of us. We just need to be reminded that we’re working for the taxpayers and to make sure that we keep the rolls down as low as we possibly can. So, that’s the way I kind of wanted to start this meeting off today is to let everybody know that we’re serious about it. We, our goal is to make sure that our total amount of budget is exactly what it was last year, or less, if it’s at all possible. So, given the fact that–

Rick Davis: I brought a fountain pen if you guys–

President Shetler: Well, we’ve been using a fountain pen for too long. So, thank you. Alright, without any further delay, Rick, you’re the fortunate guy to get to go first here. Okay, excuse me. We’ll take roll call real quick and attendance.

COUNCILMEMBER	PRESENT	ABSENT
Councilmember Sutton	X	
Councilmember Bassemier	X	
Councilmember Lloyd	X	
Councilmember Goebel	X	
Councilmember Raben	X	
Councilmember Kiefer	X	
President Shetler	X	

President Shetler: It was my effort to try and speed things along a little bit here, because I know we’ve got a long day ahead of us. We have seven members present, none absent, so we have a quorum.

**TREASURER**

President Shetler: Yes, Councilman Raben.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, can we, are we ready to begin questions?

President Shetler: I think we are.

Councilmember Raben: Good morning, Rick.

Rick Davis: Good morning. For those of you keeping score at home, my name is Rick Davis and I'm the Vanderburgh County Treasurer.

Councilmember Raben: Rick, your budget is pretty much the same as last year?

Rick Davis: Yes.

Councilmember Raben: I do have one question.

Rick Davis: Yes?

Councilmember Raben: There is one item that looks like there may be some room for a slight reduction and that's 3410, Printing.

Rick Davis: Oh, the \$65,000 figure?

Councilmember Raben: Yeah.

Rick Davis: Well, I'm glad you brought that up, because that's exactly what I wanted to tackle with you guys today. We spent \$46,300 to print our tax bills this year. The printing of the tax bills was done in South Carolina. It was not done here in Evansville. It has been 18 years since the Vanderburgh County Treasurer's office has printed the bills in-house. The county invested roughly half a million in a new property tax billing system, which went into effect this year, February 6<sup>th</sup>. With that new software we have the ability to print the tax bills in-house. That is a major task. It took a professional printer in South Carolina two weeks to print the bills, stuff them and put them on a loading dock to be mailed. I feel like we could do that in-house now. That's why I left this at \$65,000, because if we do this in-house, and I came here to get your blessing to do this as well, we will need to buy a high speed printer, and we will most likely need to buy an inserter, and we're even possibly considering the postage metering machine itself. But, I would like to put this out for a bid, or a request for proposal actually, and see if we can capture this cost. We only had one bid last year on this contract. One bid. That is not healthy. One. And, two, after the contract was signed, the day that the bills were to be delivered, we received an e-mail that we had excessive programming fees. They didn't go into great detail, and we didn't respond to that e-mail, but after the bills were printed and delivered I received an invoice for \$7,850. I informed our County Attorney, Mr. Ziemer, he instructed me that it was not in the contract and we do not pay it. We have not paid that bill. But, I definitely, with the investment we put in with the property tax billing software, I would like to see us print these bills in-house. I've talked to other counties in the State who are on Manatron, the software that we are on, several of them are printing the bills in-house. The last time it was done in our office it was done on typewriter. We've gone way past that in technology. I've got the room to do it. I've got the budget to purchase the equipment, and I think that we can re-capture these costs. We may not capture it next year, but the year after and the year after, once the capital costs are gone, I think we should be able to re-capture some of these costs and that budget should be able to be trimmed from the next year on.

Councilmember Goebel: Does this request, is it reflected anywhere else in the budget?

Rick Davis: No, I left it in the printing costs, because if it doesn't come in as low as I think, we still need to hire a vendor. Again, we only had one last year and it was \$46,300, and then they charged, tried to put almost \$8,000 on top of that. So, we need a little cushion there, and the DLGF has added one more sheet of paper for next year. We just got that memo sometime this month. So, I don't know what else they're going to throw on us. They've been known to mandate things in February when we should be printing and delivering in March and April. So, I left it in there as a cushion.

Councilmember Goebel: That seems like a reasonable approach. What do you estimate that it's going to, it would cost your office to do it compared to the \$46,000 contract?

Rick Davis: Well, we would have to buy equipment.

Councilmember Goebel: After the—

Rick Davis: Oh, after that?

Councilmember Goebel: Just the actual cost?

Rick Davis: Toner and paper. Once we get the equipment, toner and paper, and then postage. But, you know, we have postage regardless of whether it's done, outsourced or not. As an example, the 48,000 adjusted bills we're going to send out, we're going to use recycled envelopes that have 2008-2009 dates on them. We're going to put a label over them and say adjusted 2009. For that, for those 48,000 bills, I've got the, we've only spent, here it is, \$2,800 in toner and the labels. Now, we didn't have to buy envelopes because we have some, we're going to recycle. But, that's not counting postage either. Postage is going to be around \$19,000 to \$20,000. We've gotten a few phone calls this morning due to the article in the newspaper. For those who have paid for the full year this year, you will most likely get a refund check. We've had several phone calls today.

Councilmember Sutton: Say, Rick, I know often times you do have to make an investment up front to ultimately see a savings. I appreciate you taking a look at this from a broader perspective and trying to find ways that ultimately will save the county dollars. But, as well as you've shared with us what your, some of your hardware and equipment costs are going to be, what about the manpower that's going to be involved in this? Have you factored that in? I mean, is this something where you're talking about potential overtime? Or part-time help that's going to be required during the cycle when you're preparing the mailing and all the other processes that go on with getting the bills out the door?

Rick Davis: We'll get the job done with the manpower we've got now. I don't foresee us having to hire part-time help. We're all just gonna, we're a team, we're going to have to help each other out. I've even contemplated having someone come in as a second shift to get the job done in a timely manner. Somebody who would normally come in between 7:30 and 4:30, two or three of those people they come in in the evening and they work from 3:30 in the afternoon until 11:30 at night. It's a very important job. We have a State law that says we have to give 15 days from the postmark to the due date. So, we will not be able to dicker around. Once we get the bills from the Auditor, we need to get them printed, we need to get them stuffed, we need to get them delivered. I like the fact that we can do it in-house. I can see

what's going on. There are a lot of decisions that factor in on what somebody pays for their property tax bill, but there's only one name on that bill whenever people get it, and it's mine. I like having the control in my office as well. But, we can get the job done with the manpower that we've got.

Councilmember Sutton: We've got 92 counties, you know, we send this out and we only get one bid back on—

Rick Davis: That's exactly correct.

Councilmember Sutton: What are the other counties doing? I mean, is this—

Rick Davis: They, I don't know. Maybe they're smaller. We're one of the, we're a larger county. We're not the largest, but some of the counties may go....like Manatron can print the bill themselves. Perhaps they go with Manatron. Or, perhaps they have a vendor, a local vendor, that can do it. We have a lot of variable data on these bills. They're nothing like they were 18 years ago. I think back then you got a bill, here's how much is owed. Now you have to have a comparison statement showing what you paid in the past, what percentage goes to the Levee Authority, the city, the county, etcetera. But, that's all built into the software that we've already paid for with a half a million dollar investment that we made.

Councilmember Sutton: I would say, on the whole, I mean, this is, your budget is a good start for us, because it does present, for the most part, a straight line budget up and down. So, I want to commend you for that.

Rick Davis: Thank you.

Councilmember Sutton: Maybe that sends a message to the other budgets that we're also going to be reviewing over the next couple of days here.

Rick Davis: Okay, and one more offer, too. Mr. Shetler's talked about, you know, having some floaters from office to office. If we buy this equipment, yes, it will be in the Treasurer's office, but there are times when the County Auditor sends out many letters, you know, hundreds of letters at a time. There are times when the County Assessor will send appeals letters out that are, you know, over 1,000. We will more than, we are more than welcome to let the other two offices come over and use that equipment. The county taxpayers paid for it, it benefits the county offices. I have no problem at all letting the County Auditor and Assessor come over and use that equipment.

President Shetler: Well, Rick, you're kind of going where I was kind of thinking here. I appreciate your initiative. I think it's a great idea, and you've opened the door here for us, I think, to maybe think a little broader on it. That might be to look at putting this in a centralized printing operation so that it could be utilized by the various different departments within this building and keep the costs down, and yet, at the same time, be able to....maybe Purchasing might be the area to put it in. I'm not sure. I think that's something we can start talking about the next couple of days and weeks to decide exactly if we want to go this avenue, where we might do something like that.

Rick Davis: Purchasing just got out of that business though. They had their own metering equipment for postage, and, you know, they're over at the School Corporation building now.

President Shetler: Right.

Rick Davis: They're not even here.

President Shetler: Right.

Rick Davis: I've got a side room that the State Board of Accounts used to have, and then last year when the township assessors were consolidated on July 1, the Assessor moved those township assessors over into that office. It's just sitting there with excess furniture and some storage for the Assessor's office right now. I've talked to the Assessor, he's going to remove them as soon as possible if we get this project going. We do have the room, and it's in a centralized location for both the Treasurer, the Auditor, and also the Assessor. So, we've got the room and it's in a nice, convenient location for all three of those offices.

President Shetler: Alright. Thank you, Rick.

Councilmember Sutton: Councilman Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes?

Councilmember Sutton: I mean, taking on your idea, I mean, we might even want to think a little broader than just county.

President Shetler: Right.

Councilmember Sutton: I mean, the city, the School Corporation—

President Shetler: And School Corp.

Councilmember Sutton: Surely, they're doing—

President Shetler: Get involved in that whole collaboration.

Councilmember Sutton: Yeah.

Rick Davis: Actually, I, the first place I called whenever we had our joint city-county Purchasing, the first place I called was the Evansville-Vanderburgh School Corporation. I asked them, could you print the bills? That would be, basically, at cost. They've got the vocational center. My first thought was have the high school kids do it. Have it done at the technical center. They've got high speed equipment out there. For several months they said it could be done. Then, a couple of months ago they said it can't. So actually, that was my first call was with the School Corporation to see if they could do it.

President Shetler: Alright, thank you. Councilman Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: I think the questions that I had were answered. Thanks.



President Shetler: Alright. Anybody else. Councilman Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: I mean, I would agree, it's an excellent idea. So, what you're looking at is just to see what the cost of the equipment would be, and then the pay back on that, which I think is created by doing it.

Rick Davis: Yeah, for instance, we've got \$65,000 in the budget for printing. If the capital costs are \$50,000 or \$55,000, then, you know, you've got \$10,000 or \$15,000 extra. It doesn't get spent. Or, we use that to maybe purchase paper for the first year. But, that second year you're not going to have that \$50,000 or \$55,000 cost. We're back to toner and paper, perhaps some maintenance, you know, we may have a maintenance agreement in case the equipment breaks down. On the last day they come out and fix it. Those types of things. But, I see this budget being dramatically decreased when I'm standing in front of you guys next year.

Councilmember Lloyd: Well, and I think with the county, with the county ITAC Board doing other equipment purchases, you may be able to get a good printer, high speed printer for a lot less.

Rick Davis: Yes. This was brought before the Information Technology Advisory Council, and they're on board with that.

Councilmember Lloyd: Okay. Great. Thank you.

President Shetler: Alright. Jim?

Councilmember Raben: Just a brief comment. I'm not looking for an answer here on the floor on this, but you might consider looking at possibly putting this in the Recorder's office.

Rick Davis: In the Recorder's?

Councilmember Raben: The equipment and the paper, supplies, things like that.

Rick Davis: I came from there. I don't know if they've got the room.

Councilmember Raben: They have the funding, that's what I'm looking at.

Rick Davis: Oh, okay. Gotcha. The, oh, that thing called the Perpetuation Account, I think is what it's called. Yes. Does anybody else have any other questions? Obviously, our investments this year, with, you know, we're talking expenditures now, but revenues from our office are a big factor, too. Our revenues from interest off of our investments are down, but we're making money, and it's better than what my PERF is doing when I open it up every quarter. We should be right around the \$900,000 mark by the end of the year on interest earned for the county. That's not what you're accustomed to, but with the economic climate we've got right now, I think that's fairly good.

President Shetler: Okay, other questions?

Rick Davis: So, do I need a vote, or do I just have your blessing to go ahead to the Commissioners and ask for a request for proposal for the equipment to start printing our bills in-house.

Councilmember Sutton: I think you have our contemplation.

President Shetler: Yeah.

Councilmember Sutton: We don't vote here today.

Rick Davis: Okay.

Councilmember Sutton: We just take—

Rick Davis: Should I come back at a Council meeting?

President Shetler: This is just a review session. Actually, this won't be finalized until the latter part of September? Something like that.

Councilmember Raben: I think the decision is his ultimately anyway. I mean, you, your office has made a decision on where they've been printed in the past. If you've got a better mousetrap, I think you need to make that decision.

Rick Davis: Okay, well then, I will go to the Commissioners and see if we can get a request for proposal. I'll come back as soon as possible and give you a report on where we stand. Because I think it's very important we do this in-house. Thank you for your time.

President Shetler: Thank you.

## ***WEIGHTS & MEASURES***

President Shetler: Okay, Weights and Measures. Page 77 in the budget book.

Loretta Townsend: Loretta Townsend, Weights and Measures Department.

President Shetler: Has anything been decided yet on the location that you guys are looking at?

Loretta Townsend: Yes. I don't know that there's a contract, or if there's going to be a contract signed, but it's located at 2901 East Morgan, which is just west of McDonald Golf Course. We've been out there a number of times, and once it's cleaned out, it will work.

President Shetler: Are there any, that's a city property?

Loretta Townsend: It is city property. I understand that it was given, not given to, but they allowed Wessleman's to use it for storage and this type of thing, providing, or as long as another department did not need it. Of course, we need it, and so they're out and we're in.

President Shetler: What kind of rent are we going to have to pay on that building?

Loretta Townsend: I'm looking for Troy, because I do not know. I don't know. I don't know if there will be rent. It belongs to the city and we're part city, so it's not like paying it to a private place. There may not be any rent. I just don't know. Whenever we had to make this out, the budget, I didn't know where we was going. The sidewalk, I guess. I mean, we had no idea where we were going to go or what was going to happen. We just knew that we had to go. If we go out there, there's going to be monthly expenses that, of course, included in that \$5,900 a year rent. There's going to be electric, now that's going to come about. There's going to be water, that type of thing. Then, all of our cleaning supplies, we've done our own cleaning for a good while. I mean, we're not above doing our own cleaning, but you're going to have to have, we could go over to the hotel and get supplies from them to do it with. Out there, we're going to have to go to the dollar store or somewhere else to get them, you know. So, we just, it will be cheaper, it is a place to go. Hopefully, they're not going to tear that down to build something. I don't know what to tell you to leave in there for it. We're going to rely on Other Supplies a lot for the things that we've been getting from the hotel for the last 20 years.

President Shetler: Have we exhausted all alternatives with county properties that we have out there that might be more centrally located?

Loretta Townsend: Nothing's going to be more centrally located. I mean, we are centrally located now, per se, but we take the whole county in, the north side, the east side, the west side. So, we've got the whole county, so being in town, per se, it's easy accessible, and what I'm looking at is the big fence around it, because you don't want me to have to come in here and ask to replace that hundred gallon prover at the cost of \$30,000, you know. Then, even our test measures run about a thousand dollars a piece.

President Shetler: And there are bathroom facilities in there?

Loretta Townsend: There is a bathroom facility in there, and they're going to make it larger, because we're going to have to share it with the guys.

President Shetler: Alright.

Loretta Townsend: We've already got some rules for that with them.

President Shetler: This really has nothing to do with, you know, the budget, per se—

Loretta Townsend: Yeah.

President Shetler: —but, since you're here I do have a question on it. The monthly reports that we get from your office that tells us about how many inspections, is it possible to, I guess, two things that I'm thinking about, one, is it possible to let us know what places that you have visited—

Loretta Townsend: Yeah, that's possible.

President Shetler: —as opposed to just—

Loretta Townsend: Yeah.

President Shetler: —you know, raw numbers.

Loretta Townsend: Yeah.

President Shetler: And, the second part of that question, is it possible that on, I don't know if you have a standard form that the state requires you to use—

Loretta Townsend: Yes, yes.

President Shetler: —or if you could do something in addition to that? Thinking in terms of the Health Department and the inspections that they do on food service, and you all, I think, offer a very similar type of service to the consumer, and to assure us that, you know, that the weights that we're getting and the gallons that we're putting in the tanks and stuff is all accurate. I'm afraid that sometimes that your office is out of sight and out of mind. I'm trying to make it in a way that it may be a little bit more pressing on people's minds that they understand what those tax dollars are going for. What I'm thinking in terms of, that like you see every so often in the newspaper—

Loretta Townsend: Uh-huh.

President Shetler: —where a critical violation has been committed by XYZ restaurant. They had, you know, found this, this and this on down the line, and that, you know, perhaps the violators of those that that could be reported to the news media so that they would be able to give a listing of those people, and we could, you know, as a consumer could look at it and avoid those who might be habitual criminals, or, I mean, habitual violators of those weights and measures and stuff.

Loretta Townsend: There's only one problem I've had with that, and it's my idea, I don't know. In the Health Department these things can be avoided by the people who are doing them. You know, like not wearing gloves, not using the sanitizer, you know, dirty things being put back on the wall, that all could be avoided. In ours, most of the time, it's actually not the gas stations are at fault, or the scale. They might, they don't deliberately take them off, you know. They've got to get in there, they've got to cut the seal, they've got to (Inaudible) calibration. If they know to cut the seal, they're going to belong to us. We don't welch on going after them then, but I hate to do that to a number of places and they're not even aware that their equipment is off until we go there. They've got no means of checking to see if it's giving away too much, or if it's giving away less than it should be. A lot of times on the scales it's the same thing, you know. They're taking our inspections that tell them they need to get it fixed. So, that's the only thing that I sort of back off from, Tom. You're sort of putting it to people that really, actually it's not their fault, but in there, the Health Department, yeah, I mean, if they don't wash their hands, or if they're drinking and stuff around cooking food, or whatever....they know they're doing that. It is their fault.

President Shetler: Alright. Thank you. Yes, Councilman Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Just a general comment. One of the bigger differences, too, when you read an inspection report about a restaurant that says they found two violations, the restaurant continues to be open.

Loretta Townsend: Yeah.

Councilmember Raben: When she inspects a gas pump and it's not operating correctly, it's locked down.

Loretta Townsend: It's padlocked.

Councilmember Raben: So—

Loretta Townsend: With big red tags hanging on them so nobody, you know, they know it. Even our yellow tags that we put on them, because maybe a glass might be broken and it's got nothing to do with the calibration of what you're going to get or something, we'll hang a yellow tag on them. That's one way of them getting fixed. People will shy away from that. If they see any kind of tag at all, they're gone, they're out of there, you know. There's one on every corner in town, that's where they go.

President Shetler: Yes?

Councilmember Kiefer: Loretta?

Loretta Townsend: Uh-huh.

Councilmember Kiefer: In this conversation, are the equipment that you find broken down, mostly is it usually age related? Or sometimes is it brand new equipment?

Loretta Townsend: Yeah.

Councilmember Kiefer: I'm just curious if it's age related, older equipment?

Loretta Townsend: Mostly it's age related, a lot of times, because they've had some gas pumps out there, that honest to God, I mean, they're ancient. Eventually, I mean, it's going to want to quit on you. You know, things are going to wear out inside of them, the meters are going to go bad, this type of thing.

Councilmember Kiefer: Well, the reason that I wondered, because I notice throughout the community you have fewer and fewer franchise type gasoline stations. You have more mom and pop, local ownership, I guess, and it seems like that's where, at least where I notice a lot of the gas stations are getting run down and they don't have the money to keep them up. Their signage looks bad, other things as well.

Loretta Townsend: In some cases, now how can I say this, in some cases they do still belong to a large conglomerate. They have leased it out to some people who are not really aware of how to operate businesses. There's where your problem goes, Joe. I'm trying to put it lightly. We also have trouble with those people, too, trying to make them understand what they have to do.

Councilmember Bassemier: Loretta, it looks like your whole budget is the same as it was last year?

Loretta Townsend: It is the same.

Councilmember Bassemier: Except maybe FICA, but—

Loretta Townsend: Well, Ed, we don't have any control over that top part of it.

Councilmember Bassemier: I know you don't, but my question is, do you think you can hold this the same? I mean, you've got Gas and Oil, you've got Vehicle Repairs, and how is your vehicles right now? Are they holding up?

Loretta Townsend: Right now they're holding up. I mean, it's a day-to-day deal in that Ford. But, I think we can. We usually do it every year. Our whole budget, well, the county, especially with the portion that the county has to pay is a lot less, I've been watching and listening to this, and some of these departments line items. I mean, we're able to live within it, unless something happens that was unforeseen. You know, how often do I come in here and ask for an additional appropriation? I don't.

Councilmember Bassemier: No, you don't.

Loretta Townsend: Because we'll start transferring. We'll just start digging in another line item and transfer it out, you know, into something to where we have to have it. So, it can be done.

Councilmember Bassemier: I know that you are very conservative.

Loretta Townsend: Well, we don't need good stuff, fancy stuff. We're not too fancy. I mean, you know.

Councilmember Bassemier: Well, thank you.

Loretta Townsend: I've often said before, that if I had anything to say about it, I would have a restraining order within 1,000 feet of the building of all the furniture stores in town. I mean, we don't need new furniture.

Councilmember Lloyd: Loretta, question, you indicated that Commissioner Tornatta was talking to the city about—

Loretta Townsend: Uh-huh.

Councilmember Lloyd: —the move to Morgan Avenue?

Loretta Townsend: That's why I was looking for him, but I didn't see him. Because he can maybe answer some of this.

Councilmember Lloyd: So, he may know if, what the possibility may be for the rent?

Loretta Townsend: Yeah. Yeah.

Councilmember Lloyd: Okay, has the Executive then given you any other information about moving? When you need to move?

Loretta Townsend: No, but I do know, I believe, that our contract is up at the end of this year.

Councilmember Lloyd: Okay.

Loretta Townsend: I can't see the Commissioners signing another contract with anybody, you know, so.

Councilmember Lloyd: No. Okay, so—

Loretta Townsend: I believe we'll have to be out by then.

Councilmember Lloyd: And, I guess, if, you know, there's a possibility if they want you out sooner, they may have to compensate the county for that.

Loretta Townsend: Uh-huh.

Councilmember Lloyd: Okay, great. Thank you.

Councilmember Sutton: You know, I guess, with this whole discussion around the new location, without having the, being able to see the rental agreement, I mean, I don't know if we've got, if we're going to end up with a similar type of arrangement. So, it would be nice if, I guess, maybe if you could get back with us—

Loretta Townsend: It's handed over free, huh?

Councilmember Sutton: —on what that's, what's going to be involved with that, because there's so many different types of lease agreements that can be put together.

Loretta Townsend: Uh-huh.

Councilmember Sutton: So, I don't know if we're going to end up with some maintenance costs, or some other things related to that facility. Or other issues that might be needed to get the building up to par so that you can move in that they're looking for the county to take responsibility for. So, maybe if you can get some of that information to us, because I've just got a feeling that the line that we see here right now today at \$5,900 for rent, I just kind of get a feeling that that's not going to be exactly the same that we've seen before. So, you can kind of help us with that by getting some details on what the county is expected, what's expected of the county in this arrangement with the city.

Loretta Townsend: You want to know? You think that we don't want to know? We don't even know, you know. We don't know how we're going to get moved. I mean, things like that. What if something happens once we're in there, where we could call the Executive Inn, they would come over and they would have it fixed. My guys are good, but they're not that good. I mean, there's certain things, you know, they can't do. They're not plumbers, they're not—

Councilmember Sutton: That's the kind of thing that I would like to know more about. It's just a little bit, I guess, concerned, and not wanting us to end up in a situation where you're coming back to us with a bunch of costs later on that you're uncomfortable coming up here with because, you know, the contract calls for us to do certain things that maybe under ordinary circumstances we wouldn't have had to do that.

Loretta Townsend: After, before you'll find me coming up here and asking for additional money, we're going to go through every line item, no matter what it's

called in there, and we're going to come up with as much money out of the other line items that we can before I'll come up here and ask. You know, I'm a good, if I have to, I'll transfer. Sandie knows, we are a transfer, I don't when we asked for the last appropriation. You've got some of them up here almost every week, you know, but we try to live with what we get, one way or the other, you know. I hope I don't have to come back for all that, because that's also a pain to us that something's gone wrong, too.

Councilmember Goebel: I just want to say thanks, Loretta. I believe you've come with a very good budget to us, it's the same, and if you have any needs you'll probably come back to us if you have to.

Loretta Townsend: If we can't find them somewhere else.

Councilmember Goebel: Okay, thanks.

President Shetler: Alright, thank you.

Loretta Townsend: Uh-huh.

President Shetler: Appreciate it.

### ***SUPERIOR COURT***

President Shetler: Superior Court. Judge Dietsch?

Terry Dietsch: Good morning.

President Shetler: Is that from tennis?

Terry Dietsch: Terry Dietsch, senior judge Vanderburgh Superior Court. First, let me take the opportunity to introduce Ms. Kelly Ward, who is our Court Administrator. She will be not only assisting me, but she may have occasion to appear before you from time to time.

President Shetler: Alright. Thank you.

Terry Dietsch: Our budget is substantially the same with the following exceptions. We have increased in two line items, a rationale was sent to the Council. One is the YCC contract, which automatically goes up, as you well know. The other is the Law Book account, and we entered into a contract, and for 2010 it calls for a five percent increase. But, over the term of the contract it's going to save us money. We have decreased our requests from the 2009 figures in one, two, three, four accounts, and we have held the line in all the remaining line items.

President Shetler: Judge, the printing costs that you have in here, is that for like Xeroxing? Or is that for doing some heavier printing from time to time?

Terry Dietsch: No, that's for envelopes and what else?

Kelly Ward: (Inaudible. Not at mic.)

President Shetler: Supply type?



Terry Dietsch: Yes, that type thing.

President Shetler: Stationary and stuff.

Terry Dietsch: Yes, yes.

President Shetler: Again, piggybacking on the Treasurer earlier, I didn't know if that was something that could help reduce your costs if there was a centralized printing system around here.

Terry Dietsch: Of course, we would be open to that, you know.

President Shetler: Alright, thank you. Questions? Okay.

Terry Dietsch: On our—

President Shetler: Yes?

Councilmember Sutton: One quick question. Judge, I don't know if you've got a book up there like we've got, the Admin Assistant position....I'm on page 94.

Terry Dietsch: What line item? What's the number?

Councilmember Sutton: 1620-1370. 1620-1370. Is that position supporting, are you with me? I'll wait until you get there.

Terry Dietsch: 16, what did you say?

Councilmember Sutton: 1620-1370.

Terry Dietsch: I don't have it. What's the name of the line item?

President Shetler: Administrative Assistant.

Councilmember Sutton: Administrative Assistant.

Terry Dietsch: Okay.

Councilmember Sutton: In that position—

Terry Dietsch: Oh, I'm sorry. You're in the personnel.

President Shetler: About the fourth page of your--

Terry Dietsch: Yeah, I've got it.

Councilmember Sutton: See it, it's just a little bit past the midway point.

Terry Dietsch: Okay.

Councilmember Sutton: Now, does that position, who does that position support?

Councilmember Lloyd: That was Rosemary Norbury.

Terry Dietsch: Yes.

Councilmember Sutton: Right, I was trying to find out who that position supports?

Terry Dietsch: What we've done is, we have rearranged the workload in the Court Administrator's office. In addition to the Court Administrator, we had that position and we called that internally the Budget Clerk. We have rearranged some of that work. That position has taken on some additional duties, but some of the duties from that position have now been transferred to the Court Administrator, because we think it's more efficient that way.

Councilmember Sutton: So, again, this person supports who? Does it support you? Or does it support four other people?

Terry Dietsch: The court.

Councilmember Sutton: I mean, how many people does this person support?

Terry Dietsch: In addition, handles all of the questions that come in by phone or in person. Just does practically everything in the office. The Court Administrator now has become more of an administrator rather than a judicial person.

Councilmember Sutton: Court Administrator?

Terry Dietsch: Ms. Ward is, in addition, an attorney.

Councilmember Sutton: The Court Administrator, I'm trying to find that position.

President Shetler: It's two down below that, isn't it? 169, 1690-1370?

Councilmember Sutton: And the, perhaps I'll talk with, on the personnel side, just kind of figure out what the, I guess, the qualifications are for those two positions. That just kind of interests me on those two here, just regarding where those are. Both require a college degree on those positions?

Terry Dietsch: No, but Ms. Ward is a licensed attorney. The Administrative Assistant, that position is governed by the Job Study.

Councilmember Sutton: So, the Court Administrator you have to be an attorney?

Terry Dietsch: No, it doesn't have to be.

Councilmember Sutton: Is that a minimum requirement?

Terry Dietsch: It certainly helps, and we're thankful that Ms. Ward is willing to do that.

Councilmember Sutton: That's all I have.

President Shetler: Okay, thank you. Yes, Councilman Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: All the way to the back under, you have CASA, and then you have GAL-CASA? Line number, or account number 3933, we had nothing in the

budget in '09, and, I guess, we're going to continue '10. Was that just some kind of restructuring with CASA?

Terry Dietsch: Well, that originally was a grant.

Councilmember Lloyd: Okay.

Terry Dietsch: Okay?

Councilmember Lloyd: Okay. Thank you.

President Shetler: Other questions? Alright.

### ***SUPERIOR COURT SUPPLEMENTAL ADULT PROBATION***

Terry Dietsch: On the adult supplemental probation—

President Shetler: Yes.

Terry Dietsch: —budget, all of the proper adjustments have been made for that for 2010. Those figures are accurate.

### ***SUPERIOR DRUG COURT***

Terry Dietsch: Then, on the Drug Court budget, Judge Trockman could not be here this morning. He's out of town. I am informed that the line items in that budget have remained the same, with the exception of one item, and that's insurance. That has gone up, and, unfortunately, I cannot tell you why that is. But, I'm sure Judge Trockman would be able to explain that.

Councilmember Lloyd: You mean, other than that it's a flat line budget. It looks pretty good.

President Shetler: Alright. Any other questions? Alright. Thank you. Was that a tennis accident, Judge?

Terry Dietsch: Pardon?

President Shetler: Tennis accident on your foot there?

Terry Dietsch: No, it was simply an act of stupidity that resulted in a fractured ankle, Mr. Shetler.

President Shetler: Okay. Didn't mean to get any personal details here, Terry. Thank you.

### ***CIRCUIT COURT***

President Shetler: Circuit Court? Page 85.

Carl Heldt: Good morning. Carl Heldt, Circuit Court Judge. Mr. Chairman, members of the Council, starting with our general budget, it's flat with the exceptions of a two year step increase for a Bailiff at 1350-1360, and 3723, Psychological Evaluations,

we're asking for an additional \$1,000. These are evaluations of criminal defendants when there's been a suggestion that they're incompetent to stand trial and assist in their defense, or were insane at the time of the commission of the crime. We, when they're required, they're required, and we have to hire psychologists or psychiatrists to do that. It's been lower in past years possibly because Southwestern Indiana Mental Health Center does those for nothing for us, but of late there's been, from time to time, a shortage of personnel over there to do that work. So, when that happens we have to go outside their system to get that done. So, that's the additional \$1,000. On the Probation User Fees, there's a couple of step increases, and then for Other Pay, 1980, that is for a Probation Officer and an Intern to cover court, to free up the Probation Officers to do their work. That was approved back in February of this year. So, it's a change from last year, but it's not a change in effect. It's the same as it was when you approved it back in February. The Rent, 3600, that's rent over at 501 John Street, and that's a \$611 increase, and that's the first rent increase over there in nine years, going on ten years. So, I think those are all the changes, and I would be happy to answer any questions. Or, Karen Angermeier is here as well, our Administrative Assistant.

President Shetler: Questions? Yes, Councilman Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: I mean, I just noticed one of their Probation Officers had a pretty big decrease. I assume that person left or retired. It's number—

Carl Heldt: Yes.

Councilmember Lloyd: 1240-1360.

Carl Heldt: Was that Larry?

Karen Angermeier: Yes.

Carl Heldt: Yeah, Larry McDowell had substantial time in and retired and was replaced.

Councilmember Lloyd: Well, and that really helped the overall budget decrease—

Carl Heldt: Yes.

Councilmember Lloyd: —in personnel costs. So, appreciate that. That's good. Looks good.

Councilmember Sutton: Judge, what did you say 3530 includes, the Contractual Services? The \$58,000?

Carl Heldt: That is, as a matter of fact, it's Mr. McDowell, who retired as Probation Officer and it's an intern?

Karen Angermeier: It's 3530.

Councilmember Sutton: 3530, Contractual Services.

Carl Heldt: Oh, I don't know.

Karen Angermeier: That is the maintenance agreement on our FTR Gold, our transcription equipment.

Councilmember Sutton: How much more time do you have on that agreement, do you know?

Karen Angermeier: It is a year-to-year agreement.

Councilmember Sutton: Okay. Thank you.

President Shetler: Judge, I didn't notice in Superior Court, but Law Librarian, do you guys share that between Superior and Circuit?

Carl Heldt: No, that's in the Circuit Court budget. I may say this is maybe one of the few years that I haven't asked for an increase on that. For obvious reasons I knew you all wanted to flat line everything. It's really, and this is also the law library that's supported substantially by attorneys who contribute money to a law library foundation. We have, what we've had to do because of the drastic increase in subscription costs, is that we've really cut back big time in the law library as far as hard copies of books are concerned. We really didn't want to do that, but the numbers are just, there's not enough competition in the law book business. There's no way I could come and ask you for more money under those circumstances, I didn't think. So, we're actually cutting back on what we've got.

President Shetler: Okay, thank you. Yes, Councilman Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Judge Heldt, this is just a general question concerning the copy machine lease, a few meetings ago—

Carl Heldt: She's going to have to answer, but go ahead.

Councilmember Goebel: Okay. We, I guess, were advised that there might be a comprehensive plan for copy machine lease. Would this be eliminated if that plan goes forward? Do you know anything about it?

Karen Angermeier: I don't know anything about that. These are state bid plans on our copy machines through Xerox.

Councilmember Goebel: Okay.

Karen Angermeier: We've run numerous calendars, court calendars every day and that sort of thing.

Councilmember Goebel: If we come forward with a county-wide proposal, which I thought we were working on, would the courts be involved in that, with other offices here?

Karen Angermeier: Sure. I don't see any reason why we couldn't be.

Councilmember Goebel: Thank you.

President Shetler: Yes, Councilman Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Good morning, Judge. One small account that I'm kind of zeroed in on, 3730, Continuing Ed. The request is \$2,000. Is that one that we could look at trimming back a little bit?

Carl Heldt: Well, I mean, it's, I'm sure is that just for the judges, or is that for the Probation as well? Just judges? We're required, we've got three lawyers in our office, and we're required, to keep our license, to have continuing legal education. I don't think we've abused that. The policy has been that the office pays for that. So, what have we spent? I don't know what we've spent this year.

Councilmember Raben: It shows you've spent \$180 this year.

Karen Angermeier: This year we've been able to handle a lot of these locally. Our staff attorney has been able to earn her hours locally. So, that's why it has been lower this year.

Councilmember Raben: Okay. It looks like, and this kind of goes back to the no good deed goes unpunished thing, you know, you're not spending it and now it's, you know, I'm not trying to penalize you for not spending it, but you spent \$690 last year, roughly \$800 the year before, and while we're looking for every penny, that was just a line that looked like we could take back to \$1,000 or \$1,500 and probably still cover it.

Carl Heldt: If you wish. Whatever historically we've been doing, I'm sure—

Councilmember Raben: We're looking for every penny.

Carl Heldt: I would ask that what we've done historically, and not reduce us below that, because I don't see it going down from what we've spent anyway.

Councilmember Raben: Yeah. This would cover what, \$1,000 or \$1,500 looks like it would be more than adequate.

Carl Heldt: \$1,500 would be nice, I guess.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, \$1,500.

Carl Heldt: Okay.

President Shetler: Do we mix Travel and that account a little bit together then?

Carl Heldt: I don't think so.

President Shetler: What she just commented about the out of town.

Carl Heldt: We don't, or do we? Do we put the travel—

Karen Angermeier: Travel is separate.

Carl Heldt: Travel is separate.

President Shetler: I understand that it's separate in the budget, but, well, I guess, you brought up the point about they've been local. So, that kind of raised the

question to me that, within that line item, do you, if it is out of town, are you saying that the tuition is higher? The fee for being involved in it is higher if it's out of town versus local?

Carl Heldt: You know, I don't know, I can't think of any out of town. Out of town CLE for sure is when there's a judicial conference and the judges go to a judicial conference and we get a lot of CLE there. We will have some travel expenses for that, although a lot of it is picked up by the State. I don't know, I can't think of any CLE, other than that, that any of us have gone out of town for.

President Shetler: Okay.

Carl Heldt: Most of it's all local.

President Shetler: Alright. Thank you. Other questions? Thank you, Judge.

Carl Heldt: Okay, thank you all.

President Shetler: Adult Probation, did we get that one yet? You got that one. Okay, alright. I thought so. Thank you.

**CLERK**

President Shetler: County Clerk? That is on page one. Good morning.

Susan Kirk: Good morning.

President Shetler: Anything, special requests that you would like to point out?

Susan Kirk: Well, I do have, I did put in the rationale Extra Help, but I'm sure we're not going to get that. Office Supplies will go up because our case load keeps increasing, which means more supplies, shucks, envelopes, things like that. Record Storage, I always ask for approximately the same amount of money, because that's what it is every year. Then I have to come back and ask, you kind of usually cut that, which is fine, we'll come back and ask for it again. The Clerk's budget is pretty, you know, reasonably easy to figure out. Not hardly any changes there.

President Shetler: Yours is, obviously, one of the larger departments.

Susan Kirk: Yes.

President Shetler: Let me ask you this, is it, supplementing your full-time help with part-time, is that something that would work in your office? I mean, as far as trainability, I guess, do you have positions in your office where you could put part-time people occasionally that would help supplement and maybe hold down the cost of adding new full-time employees?

Susan Kirk: You mean to add to my staff?

President Shetler: Yes.

Susan Kirk: We just thought if we had some part-time people, basically, to do filing, it's astronomical the filing over there, things that would free up the other staff to

actually do the computer work, show up to court, things like that. I can't say that, right now I don't deem it necessary that these part-time people be trained enough to where, you know, we put them into the computer system, things like that. It's just trying to free up time so that the full-time staff has more time to complete their work and not be in such a hurry. Because what concerns me is that, you know, sometimes when we do get in a big hurry we might make more mistakes. Of course, you know, society is very litigious, and we want to sue over everything. So, I just want to be sure that my staff can perform their duties in a reasonable length of time without having that added pressure of all the deadlines. Like I said, our business is thriving, unfortunately, so, I mean, we will make it without part-time help. We will make it, but the time is rapidly approaching to where we will not be able to get the job done in the time limits required by statute, and I really, it's too bad the judges left, I was going to say, you know, their staff, if they wanted to do more, but I don't think that that's, you know, they're busy too. So, that's why I asked for the part-time help. It's just to get someone in there to free up the other staff. That's it.

President Shetler: I guess, I'm thinking somewhat in lieu of that if we end up with, you know, a couple of vacancies that would occur in your office over time, obviously that's going to put you short handed. You know, are we being perhaps penny-wise and pound foolish here if we, you know, don't look at replacing with some of those full-time with some part-time that could allow the fewer full-timers that you have left to be able to take on more essential tasks and have those part-time people that you may be able to supplement with to be able to do some of the filing type work.

Susan Kirk: Well, part-time help, they would have to work, I forget, what is it, Sandie, 30, how long? There's a peak, they can't obviously work 40 hours.

Sandie Deig: 37.

Susan Kirk: 37, whatever, we actually need all of the hours that we can get. I did take a letter over to Council yesterday, I took it over to Sandie explaining why I gave numbers as to the case load. You know, we've cross trained several people in our office so that when, you know, one has the normal work day, which is extremely busy, we cross trained to where if someone just gets bombarded with something and move them over there, it's just, you know, I'm not saying it isn't possible, but I think that by taking away or not allowing us to continue on hiring our full-time staff, and eventually it won't be a matter of we think we can make it. It won't. If it keeps increasing like it has been over the years, the job, it will not be done. I mean, we're going to have lawsuits, and it's really going to cost the county money because of errors that could be made from just trying to work so fast. We're just, we don't have a seasonal office. It is busy every day from start to end.

President Shetler: This is, kind of, I guess, asking for a little bit of speculation on your part, and again, I don't know what your age range is within your office. Do you think, I'm presuming here, perhaps you may have some that might be close to 65 or older within your office, and again, maybe you don't. Do you feel as if, if the Council looked at some kind of incentivizing program that would encourage folks to take the Medicare program and then supply the supplement, and then somehow look at, you know, some kind of incentive to, you know, extra money if they chose that program, in other words, it would save the county some insurance monies, but then they would still be taken care of with a supplement and some other things, do you think that some kind of arrangement like that might be helpful?



Susan Kirk: I'm very glad that you brought that up, because I have for the last few years, I talked to the last Commissioners, I don't remember which Councilman, anyway, I think this is what would help the county, I asked Sandie about this, it's been back quite some time ago also, if everybody would do like the Sheriff's Department, well, I don't know about the Sheriff's Department, the firemen I know for sure, my brother was a fireman, and they pay a very small amount of money into insurance so that people who retire will have their insurance. They don't do like the county did to where if you've worked here ten years and then you quit, the county is going to pick up your insurance, or whatever that is. How long?

Sandie Deig: 20 years.

Susan Kirk: 20 years? If I started working here say at 20, I work 20 years and I'm 40 and I quit, you're going to pay my insurance, I don't know how that ever got started, but that's not good. Anyway, but—

Councilmember Raben: That's not—

Susan Kirk: —I do think that people would retire—

Councilmember Raben: That's not accurate. Hold on, though. That's not accurate.

Sandie Deig: You have to have 20 years and be at least 55 years old.

Susan Kirk: So, that would still be another five to ten years that we're paying insurance, which is still expensive. But, anyway, that's a big deal for people retiring, health insurance, big deal, and if everybody, I don't know the figures, as long as it wasn't too much, because, obviously, people need their paychecks, but if we paid into that to where it would at least help supplement those who want to retire, their insurance, even if it was, if you could give them \$200 a month, maybe not pay the whole thing, but something, I think you would see some of the people that have, you know, put their time in, worked hard, maybe retire early, which would, you know, free up that salary that they're getting for longevity, someone comes in with a little bit, you know, less time, quite a bit less money, I think that's, I mean, I've brought it up a few times but nobody ever does anything. So, but I think that would be a great incentive to do that. But, to try it, I don't know of any other way to, you know, I'm certainly not going to ask somebody to retire because they're 65, because—

President Shetler: No.

Councilmember Raben: Just a little clarification on the, since it was brought out there, on the insurance, it's 30 years after age 55.

Susan Kirk: What? So, it's not 20 years? Okay, whichever, I just, I still think it's a good idea to maybe see how much that would cost each person who works here, you know, as long as it was a small amount just to see if we couldn't supplement somebody's insurance. Like I said, maybe not the whole thing, but the supplemental Medicare, or whatever that's called.

Councilmember Bassemier: Tom?

President Shetler: Councilman Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Susie, on your Storage, you've got an increase of \$20,000. When was the last time that you checked out, it seems like that's a pretty good size amount of increase. I know that there's more paperwork.

Susan Kirk: It really isn't an increase, Ed. I always ask for the correct amount of money in my budget, which is this amount of money. When you take the \$20,000 and put it on top of what it is, \$100,000, that I request, because that's what it's been over the last few years. Then Council cuts it and I have to come back and ask for it. So, it's really not an increase, it's just, you know, we're all trying to save money, and we are trying to get rid of as many records as we can through the process of destruction of records. But, we keep getting more than what we can get rid of.

Councilmember Bassemier: Okay.

Susan Kirk: So, it's not an increase. It's the same amount. If you look back through the last several years you will see it's been exactly what I have requested, very, very close to that.

Councilmember Bassemier: For information purposes, where are we storing these records at? Refresh our memory.

Susan Kirk: We are storing our records at Kinder Moving and Storage out on Buchanan Road, and I've always invited everybody if you want to see a warehouse full of records, boy, that's the place to go. It is big.

Councilmember Bassemier: How many years have we been there? I remember back—

Susan Kirk: I think, I don't remember, I think it was when Marsha Abell took office the records were at Willard Library there for awhile—

Councilmember Bassemier: Yeah, I remember that.

Susan Kirk: —then that overflowed, and they took it out to the Garvin Park industrial area. She had noticed that the records were, well, deteriorating. It was bad. Homeless people were sleeping in the boxes and different things like that, so they had to come up with another plan because by statute, there's records, some of the records, we have to keep forever.

Councilmember Bassemier: Is there anywhere else that you can check out, other locations? Now, it's been several years, but maybe there's other places that would be less cost.

Susan Kirk: We did, Council brought that, actually brings that up almost every year. I did a cost analysis for them since being at Kinder Moving and Storage. They, of all the years that we've used them, hardly ever raise a price. When they do it is so minimal. They also do our scanning and our microfilming. It's, I mean—

Councilmember Bassemier: Oh, they're a good company.

Susan Kirk: They are, and, I mean, to even try to move all of that, I don't want to be the Clerk. Let me finish my term before you decide to move anything like that. But

they have, they've shown over the years that they are extremely fair. They go over and above, beyond the call of duty so many times for us. So, I personally feel—

Councilmember Bassemier: You're satisfied.

Susan Kirk: Oh, absolutely. Very satisfied. Very satisfied.

Councilmember Bassemier: Well, thank you, Ma'am.

Councilmember Raben: Mr. President?

President Shetler: Yes?

Councilmember Raben: I was going to suggest, we probably need to get moving because we're about a third of the way through our agenda—

President Shetler: Yes.

Councilmember Raben: —and we have some big offices yet to come up.

President Shetler: The next section, Susie?

Councilmember Kiefer: One last question, Record Storage, how big of a space do you, I mean, is that like a, how much square footage?

Susan Kirk: I'm not too sure exactly what the square footage is, it is a warehouse.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay.

Susan Kirk: A big warehouse with, you know, like 100 foot high ceilings or whatever. They are really tall.

Councilmember Raben: Anyone that's not been out there, she can get you set up with a tour of the facility. It's climate controlled, it's everything. I've been out there initially with them to do the tour, and it's pretty elaborate. It's a nice set up.

Susan Kirk: It is, I mean, it's, I was shocked when I saw it the first time.

President Shetler: Yeah, it's all controlled computerly, and then they also, it's charged by the box. Then, you know, if they scan something they charge for that, if they mail something back to you, whatever they do, it's all pretty well, you know, an incidental type of charge is how most of those file storage units are worked.

Susan Kirk: Yeah, every case is barcoded so that we know where to find it. But, there's times where they bring us things that they don't charge for, or, like I said, they really, I can't, I have no complaints with them.

President Shetler: Yes, Councilman Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: I assume you're doing everything you can to computerize records? I know you're constrained by state law on the old stuff.

Susan Kirk: Well, the whole idea of computers was not to have paper.

Councilmember Lloyd: Right.

Susan Kirk: Now, we have it on computer, on paper, on disk and on microfilm. That's what's ordered by the state. So, now—

Councilmember Lloyd: Oh, so you have to do that all by the state? Each one of those?

Susan Kirk: Oh, yes, everything, yes, uh-huh.

Councilmember Lloyd: It seems like there's a lot of duplication.

Susan Kirk: Then after, depending on the record, depending on what it is, there's a time limit. Then we destroy those records. But, there's a lot of records that the state says that you have to keep, you know, forever. Some of those we are going to ship up to them and let them take care of them.

Councilmember Lloyd: And the sheet you handed out, your cases up to 14,000, roughly 33 percent over eight years, so, almost 34 percent.

Susan Kirk: Yeah, with the same staff.

Councilmember Lloyd: Right. Okay, great. Thank you.

President Shetler: Alright, any other questions? You took care of both sections of your presentation? Both—

Susan Kirk: The Election Office.

President Shetler: Not Election Office yet, though, but, okay.

### ***ELECTION OFFICE***

President Shetler: The Election Office, and that's on page 62. Does anybody have any questions?

Councilmember Raben: I do have. Susie, the 2006 was a county-wide election.

Susan Kirk: Yes.

Councilmember Raben: Why are the numbers so much different? I mean, as an example, as you go through each line, Absentee Teams as an example, in '06 were \$5,800, this year we'll be pressing \$10,000. Election Assistant is double. There's a lot of these line items that are significantly more than '06.

Susan Kirk: Well, we have a few more people working in the Election Office because we have early voting sites now. So, that requires some more people. 2006 we didn't have any of that. Well, I take that back, we did, let's see, I believe in 2005 we had one library, and in 2006 we had three libraries, and in 2008 we had five libraries plus the Election Office. You have to remember the 2008 Presidential election, 2006 is what we call, it's coming up next year, usually when the President or the Governor or the Mayor's not running, things are a little quieter, we don't have as much voter turnout. So, things are going to be a little bit less.

Councilmember Raben: I guess, that's my point, or maybe my question. Let's, starting from the top, Election Assistant, in '06 we spent \$30,305. The request for '10 is \$60,000.

Susan Kirk: It is. I had to come back and get money because we started doing some, like I said, we started in 2006 with our libraries, which means I have to have two people at each library. Now we have five libraries for early voting in the General Election only. So, I've included it rather than coming back to Council and asking for the money, I just put it in there.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, but that is the expended number. You spent in '06—

Susan Kirk: In 2006, and we had only three libraries.

Councilmember Raben: Okay.

Susan Kirk: Now, we're moving up to five libraries like we did in 2008.

Councilmember Raben: So, we need another two thirds, I guess. Well, I mean, again, our mission here is to—

Susan Kirk: I agree, and—

Councilmember Raben: —cut this thing to the bare bone. When I look at this budget, if there's any fluff at all, we need to adjust those, and I would rather do it today with you—

Susan Kirk: Yeah.

Councilmember Raben: —than do it on my own arbitrarily, and may not be correct.

Susan Kirk: I agree. I'm very conservative, too. I mean, you can, that's fine if you want to cut that down, and if I need more I'll come back. It's kind of a guesstimate a lot of times, because we don't know how many people are going to show up and vote. Obviously, the more people that vote absentee, that's the big thing, and that's, oh, that's really becoming extremely popular. That's more work that my staff has to do. So, I take a guess, basically, and, hopefully, I'm reasonably close. Like I said, you're more than welcome to cut that back some, and if we see in the General Election that we're going to run short we can come back and get that.

Councilmember Raben: Okay. Again, I guess, maybe I'm going to weigh on you to possibly come back to us, because even when you turn the next page, and, again, I'm trying to make myself comfortable with these requests. But, you know, Contractual Services from \$10,000 to \$20,000, Janitorial Services from a little over \$2,000 to \$5,000, it looks like a lot of these numbers set are more, I don't know really what they are. But, reflecting back, even if you look at the Presidential year of '08, those numbers are significantly higher than—

Susan Kirk: Well, this is pretty well, I mean, when you go through and figure you have polling places, so many places that we rent, that's for both elections.

Councilmember Raben: But it shouldn't change much over '08, should it?

Susan Kirk: No, not too much, but I don't, are you looking at both elections, or are you looking at one?

Councilmember Raben: I'm looking at—

Susan Kirk: Are you looking at a primary or a general, or primary and general together?

Councilmember Raben: Well, I would assume that I'm looking at both elections.

President Shetler: Total amount spent during the year '08 period.

Councilmember Raben: So—

Susan Kirk: Well, this was pretty well, the only thing that I changed in '08, I added more for Election Assistants because I had to come back. We didn't have enough to complete it with the five libraries. Otherwise, there's so many judges, so many clerks, so many attorneys, most of that's pretty well the same.

Councilmember Raben: Again, I'm not trying to kick a dead horse—

Susan Kirk: I'll go back and....no, but my—

Councilmember Raben: — but, so you have an understanding of where I'm coming from, Printing in '06 was \$5,500—

Susan Kirk: Okay, the printing, I'll tell you, I don't know what that's going to be.

Councilmember Raben: Okay.

Susan Kirk: Because we are in the process—

Councilmember Raben: The request for this year is \$10,000.

Susan Kirk: It is, and I can't, I do not know, I put that in, as a matter of fact it's in red on my piece of paper here. We are in the throes of doing contractual agreements for our election support with ES&S. Russ, you were there, he's my liaison.

Councilmember Raben: Would you consider doing this for us, let's look at your '08, your '06 numbers, because it's a similar election, figure in the two extra libraries, and double check these numbers?

Susan Kirk: I will.

Councilmember Raben: Because, I think, to me it looks like they're way out of whack.

Susan Kirk: I will double check that. Absolutely, I certainly will.

Councilmember Raben: I would figure a slight, you know, two or three percent increase, maybe, on some of the other printing costs or something like that—

Susan Kirk: Like I said, printing—

Councilmember Raben: –but if it's like–

Susan Kirk: –until we get these contracts done, like I said, that's in the red on my sheet, because I don't know. I don't have a clue. That \$10,000 is what it was, that's what it's always been pretty well, because ES&S only covered so many ballots and then we had to pay for those over and above. Did Council get one of these from, did they get–

Sandie Deig: Yes, they have them.

Susan Kirk: Okay, so you have some kind of an idea of what these contracts may cost that are still in negotiations, because that's quite a bit that you need to have figured in your budget.

President Shetler: Now, the people running the election sites at the libraries that are part-time people–

Susan Kirk: Everybody is part-time in the Election Office except the Supervisor.

President Shetler: Are we required by law to have two people there, one of each party?

Susan Kirk: Yes, it's a constituted polling place, which falls under State statute that you have to have a Democrat and a Republican. It has to be bipartisan.

President Shetler: And what are those paid an hour?

Susan Kirk: They're paid \$8.50, I believe, \$8.00 or \$8.50.

President Shetler: By our normal standard that we have?

Susan Kirk: Yeah.

President Shetler: Okay. Alright, thank you.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, last point. Susie, I just calculated it, it's about a 24 percent increase over the '06 request, so–

Susan Kirk: Well, it would have been, because we had the added libraries and different things like that. But, I will go back and look at at least 2008 which was the last election that we had where we had all five libraries open.

President Shetler: Okay, Councilman Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Susie, just some food for thought, the airport has two fabulous warehouses out at the airport, secured, air conditioned, whatever, you might want to talk with Mr. Working and check out their storage area there. We've got two really nice buildings out there, huge buildings that would store anything that you have. So, you might want to check with him, and maybe work out a price. Just trying to save tax dollars, of course.

Susan Kirk: Okay, the only thing is that if Mr. Working would be willing to bring our files back and forth. Because even though we store the files out there, we are in them all the time.

Councilmember Bassemier: Well, that's something you could work out, whatever. Just food for thought.

President Shetler: I don't think it's a matter of, it's a competitor of mine in some respects, not totally, I don't get into file storage. The problem with it is it's not a matter of space that's the problem for the county, it's the matter of the service that goes along with it, actually. Renting that facility, well, it's not a one bear job. I mean, it's a pretty difficult thing to do, and you've got to have the other equipment, the computers, the bar graphing, all that stuff that goes with it.

Councilmember Bassemier: Okay.

President Shetler: It's a huge investment, as well as, you know, the actual management of that facility. It would require, I think, the county to hire full-time people, maybe a person or two, I don't know how many, to manage that, and then when it all comes out I don't know that we could do it any less expensively than contracting this out with someone else.

Councilmember Bassemier: Well, we're looking for cost savings, I just thought I would throw that out there.

President Shetler: No, it's a good point, Ed. I mean, yeah, you're right. As far as a place, if we just needed a place that you needed to store furniture into it, that would be adequate, but I think to manage those files, which is what Kinder is doing in addition to allowing a space there, he's managing those files for us, that's something that would be difficult to—

Susan Kirk: It is, and the bar coding and the scanning and all of that, too. Thank you, Mr. Shetler.

Councilmember Bassemier: Okay.

Councilmember Lloyd: I've worked with Susie Kirk on these contracts and they are a mess. It's just very difficult, and I know you've had to spend a lot of time on it. County Attorney, Ted Ziemer is involved, so we're trying to do the best that we can for the taxpayer, but I know it's difficult. I appreciate your effort on that.

Susan Kirk: Thank you very much. I think that you all should commend our Election Board members, because they are all doing this for free, because they didn't get any money this time. So, we've had the two members and our Election Board attorneys that have spent a lot of hours with these contracts at no cost to the county at all. So, they need to be commended.

President Shetler: Alright, thank you. Okay, thank you.

## **VOTERS REGISTRATION**

President Shetler: Next is Voters Registration. Connie? That's on page 64.



Connie Carrier: Good morning.

President Shetler: Good morning. Anything new? Anything added?

Connie Carrier: No, Sir.

President Shetler: Any questions or comments?

Councilmember Lloyd: Just a comment, I mean, this budget is down \$35,000 since '07, and it's up \$400. So, I mean, it's just flat. They're doing a good job with it. They've eliminated some positions, I don't know, I guess the workload has changed somewhat because of the license branches and the statewide network.

Connie Carrier: We still have to process what they bring in.

Councilmember Lloyd: Right. Okay.

President Shetler: Okay. Thank you.

Connie Carrier: Alright, thank you.

***DRUG AND ALCOHOL DEFERRAL SERVICE (DADS)***

President Shetler: Drug and Alcohol Deferral. That would be page 99.

Deloris Koch: Deloris Koch with the DADS program. The only increases, aside from two step personnel increases, the Rent, as you know we had a new landlord last year, or at the end of '07. We finally got a new lease last year which increased our rent. We had to come back for some additional appropriations earlier this year.

President Shetler: How many square feet do you have in that building?

Deloris Koch: Rough estimate about 2,000 in our space.

President Shetler: And, you can't go to the county, one of the county buildings, like county, like the Old Courthouse?

Deloris Koch: We discussed, Mr. Kiefer and Mr. Bassemier came over and we discussed some about the possibility of using space in the main Civic Center building. I believe the costs were going to be pretty high. Even though ours went up it's still relatively low. So, we're there for the time being, unless a better idea comes up.

President Shetler: How long of a lease do you have?

Deloris Koch: Just year-to-year.

President Shetler: And that is due when?

Deloris Koch: It would end December 31<sup>st</sup>.

President Shetler: A calendar year?

Deloris Koch: Yes.

President Shetler: Okay.

Councilmember Raben: I have a question.

Deloris Koch: Yes, Sir?

Councilmember Raben: On 3770, Treatment Costs, this year we budgeted \$4,500, you're again asking for \$4,500, history doesn't reflect that we need that much money.

Deloris Koch: That we've used that much? I believe that was cut last year also.

Councilmember Raben: It looks like it could be cut.

Deloris Koch: It probably could be. It's one of those items that it's difficult to estimate what you're going to need. Part of that comes from, we pay interpreters for people who have language barriers. We may contract with counselors at times, but in the past we have used that more than what we have. I believe we did cut that last year. I think it is one area that could be reduced somewhat, but I don't know from year-to-year exactly how much we will need. So, I guess it would be something that I may have to come back for more appropriations if necessary.

Councilmember Raben: Okay.

President Shetler: The, going back to that Rent one more time. The Old Courthouse, and why does that not work for you?

Deloris Koch: We have looked at some space over there. We would need a fairly, maybe not as much space as we have where we are. We would need a fairly large space, but one of the problems is having the individual counselor's offices private for the confidentiality problems that we have with the clients that are coming in. So, we would need each counselor's space to be pretty private. I don't know that just partitions would be enough with open space, as high as the ceilings are. We've looked at some wide open space, but it would need a lot of work. My question is, who would pay for the remodeling, and who would pay for the furnishing and all of those things? I'm not sure where that would come from, whether that would be worthwhile. As I said, it is still a possibility with a lot of improvements that they've made in that building in the last couple of years.

President Shetler: Yes, Councilman Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Do you need, or do you have security at your site?

Deloris Koch: No, no.

Councilmember Goebel: Thank you.

Deloris Koch: None.

President Shetler: Okay, thank you.

Deloris Koch: We, at this point, we are the only office on the second floor of this building. The only people that have access, other than the landlord, to that part of the building.

President Shetler: Okay, any other questions? Thank you very much, Ms. Koch.

Deloris Koch: Okay.

### **AREA PLAN**

President Shetler: Alright, next, Area Plan Commission. That's on page 68.

Brad Mills: Good morning, Brad Mills, Area Plan Commission. The budget basically is flat, except for one request to get two new computers for our front desk. I sent an e-mail to Mr. Kiefer describing our issue with that. When we switched from going from paper maps to having our information on the GIS, we put two computers out on the front counter, basically for our customers to go in and view the zoning maps. Since that time we have converted our permitting from the old Vax machine that we had down in the basement to a new CityView software, and with that we are using two old computers, which are, I think 2002 and 2003 that we're using now, but basically can't stay caught up with it. We've been working with Computer Services to try to get them to do everything they can. Basically, they've taken everything off the computers except for CityView and being able to get to the network so that we can view GIS, and they are just too slow. It makes our customers have to wait, and we would just like to have two new computers. Other than that I would be happy to answer any questions.

President Shetler: Councilman Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Mr. President, Sandie, do we have in our line, do we have funds available this year for those two computers? Okay. Brad, we might – talk to Sandie about that.

Brad Mills: Okay, that will be great. Thank you, Sandie. I appreciate that. There were two steps that we had, too, that I didn't mention for employees, but other than that, it's flat lined.

President Shetler: Okay, any other questions? I have a quick one. Down here you've got Zoning Administrator, an Investigator, and a couple of Enforcement Officers, are those calling in complaints that you would get and then you go out and inspect it? Or do you guys have, you know, kind of patrol it, or just have a, you know, every so often go out and check different areas to make sure that everybody's in compliance, where they're going to be?

Brad Mills: It is a combination of that. We do respond to complaints that we received from either citizens or from elected officials, but also we our, basically, we have the county divided into three different zones. We have the east side, the central and a west side. We have investigators that work in those areas, and they do go out and patrol, they do go out and look to see if we have any violations, and then we send out notifications to try to get them to be in compliance. So, it's a combination.

President Shetler: You know, we have, I guess, a lot of people that are out in the field, through the Assessor's office, you know, and various different departments. I'm just wondering if, do we have good cooperation between other departments that kind of help us do their work and we help them do their work on things like that?

Brad Mills: With that, I don't know that we have a lot of cross training, because our violations, our ordinance is so much different. My investigators aren't out all the time. They go out, each of them might go out once a week, because they also do work in the office. So, they help to run the counter, they do scanning that we do. So, they do a number of different things other than just go out and drive around. So, they're not out all the time.

President Shetler: I mean, do you think that that would be something that would be feasible, though? Let's just say if you have a County Assessor that's in the field and he's doing measurements and he's able to ask a few field type questions, and just by plain observance that there's a certain activity going out of a building that, you know, he should have all of that stuff on his sheet anyway of whether it's an R-1 or C-1 or whatever the classification is, and that he could just simply duly make those kind of notes? Then, if we had a better collaboration between—

Brad Mills: It's quite possible. I mean, we can talk to them and see if they would like to work with us. We do other things other than just go around and look for those violations. Whenever we get sign applications and things we have to go out to make sure that the signs are put up as per the code. We go out and do site visits for all the rezoning requests, or all the subdivision requests, so that we can take photographs so that we can put our staff field reports together. So, it's a number of different things that we are doing out in the field. But, I mean, I'm happy to do things. I mean, I do that myself on my own personal time, is I'll catch violations, and, you know, send myself a voice message so that I can remember to talk to the staff the next morning and say, hey, you need to go check this property out. So, I think we do a pretty good job of going around, obviously, some things get missed, but most of those we catch with citizens complaints. Or, when somebody comes in to say, hey, I want to expand my business, it's like, well, you know, your business isn't zoned correctly, or you don't have the correct permit. So, we've tried a number of different ways to make sure that people are in compliance.

President Shetler: Yeah, I don't, I'm not quibbling with the job you guys perform.

Brad Mills: Sure.

President Shetler: I think, you know, it is high quality. I guess, I'm trying to think of ways that we might be able to, I don't know if we have, particularly today when building is down—

Brad Mills: Uh-huh.

President Shetler: —that if we don't have, you know, maybe inspectors and people that are kind of coming and going all of the time over different, the same property, and if there's not a way to consolidate that a little bit and save some personnel.

Brad Mills: We do that with the Building Commission in particular.

President Shetler: Yeah.

Brad Mills: I mean, we will find things that they have that are violations, and we'll have them go out and do inspections. Vice versa, they do the same for us. They say, hey, we see somebody, they've got a business in there and we don't think it's licensed for that or permitted for that, and we will go out and investigate it.

President Shetler: If our people are cross trained in a way, could that all be done as a one stop deal? That, instead of them noticing something and then getting on the phone and then making a call and saying I think there's a problem here with the guy's electrical or plumbing or whatever, and, you know, you guys need to go out and make a further inspection on it. Is it possible to cross train some of those inspectors so that they could actually just stop right then and there and say, you know, I'm also noticing that you've got a violation on this, this, and this, and check it off and get it going?

Brad Mills: I mean, anything is possible. It would just take much more training to make sure that people are able to do that. Our investigators would have to, you know, help them to come up with it. So, I mean, any of that is possible. It's just going to take time from whatever that staff person is already doing if they're going to start doing work that we would do as well. Like I say, we're not out constantly investigating, you know, so that's just a small portion of what my staff does.

President Shetler: Right. Okay. Thank you. Any other questions or comments? Alright, thanks, Brad.

Brad Mills: Sure.

## **AIRPORT**

President Shetler: Next, is the Airport. Bob and Doug, that would be page 134.

Bob Working: Good morning, Bob Working, Evansville Regional. I submitted our budget to our board earlier this year, before all of the dialogue came out on the raises. Anyway, I'm here to answer any questions that any of you may have.

Councilmember Raben: This salary line that is requested, reflects what, then?

Bob Working: It reflects a union Teamster negotiations, firefighter negotiations of a three percent raise, is basically what it is.

President Shetler: And salaried then are left alone?

Bob Working: I'm sorry?

President Shetler: Salaried are zero?

Bob Working: Salary is, no, this was before that, so I added a three percent for salaried employees, non union.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, that's what I was getting at.

Bob Working: And the firefighters were at three, and the Teamsters followed the third year of their contract. Again, that was submitted before that information came out. I also, I guess I would just say that our revenues are substantially down this

year, compared to our expenses. We have seen nationally a reduction in the available seats in the airline industry. Our traffic is down about 24 percent this year versus last year. That correlates to about the same in revenues. The only thing that we increased last year on the revenue side was that we had a 17 percent increase in our parking lot rate, but our revenues are still down by being down 24 percent. Our airlines, we did hit them with a rate increase.

President Shetler: Yes, go ahead.

Councilmember Raben: Just a general comment, with that being said, I guess I'm shocked to see that there's any increases in any of these lines. I would think that we would be seeing some decreases just to help offset the decline in revenue.

Bob Working: Yes. Again, I guess, where I would come from in saying that in the past the Airport had, we have never been on the tax rate to operate. So, we had always been within our budget from an operations standpoint. This year, we hope to give you a zero effect by taking the money that we've been getting in our Cumulative Building Fund and putting into the General Fund. The raises, again, I'm just saying was from prior to the edict coming out on the raises. But, you know, Vectren isn't zeroed out, and, you know, the expenses or the price of gasoline hasn't zeroed out. So, there are items that, you know, we had very little or no control over.

Councilmember Raben: Granted, I understand—

Bob Working: Okay.

Councilmember Raben: —how these fees, for those who don't know at home, the fees are basically, this budget is charged back to the airlines, basically.

Bob Working: Yes.

Councilmember Raben: But along with that—

Bob Working: Well, that's what we've had in the past, yes.

Councilmember Raben: But, on the flip side, you know, we support those airlines by buying tickets. So, you know, any increase at all, you know, the lower we can get this budget, you know, hopefully that reflects a cheaper airfare. So, you know, there's a little give and take there with all of this. But, you know, as I look, as an example, Bob, you know, we understand Utilities, \$495,000 is what we budgeted last year, this year \$567,000. That may be what it needs to be, but Telephone is a \$7,000 increase, Contractual Services is a \$15,000, those are the items that I'm kind of singling out and asking you to double check those and make sure that there isn't room to maneuver those down a little bit.

Bob Working: Alright, Sir. How much? Since we haven't been on the tax rate before, and—

Councilmember Raben: I understand, but I'm just looking at the conditions that you mentioned when you opened.

Bob Working: Well, Sir, I mean, for 26 years I've operated with no, without ever coming to the Council and asking for any monies. You know, and this has been a tough year. Certainly we are trying our very best to maintain service, maintain the airport in the safe condition that it needs to be in. I'm, you know, we stay within our budget.

Councilmember Raben: I understand that.

Bob Working: Okay.

Councilmember Kiefer: Mr. Working?

Bob Working: Yes?

Councilmember Kiefer: What is Other Compensation? What all does that include, Other Compensation?

Bob Working: That is temporary employees that we hire during the summertime, and, I believe it's also overtime wages are included in that.

Councilmember Kiefer: Overtime and temporary employees?

Bob Working: Yes. Part-time valets that we have throughout the year and then the overtime. Sometimes I get a little confused on those because you group together different than what we do in our budgets. So, I have to go back, but yes, that Other Compensation should include those two.

Councilmember Kiefer: Just quickly, you said a number of flights are down, or the number of people flying are down. What's the numbers?

Bob Working: 24 percent.

Councilmember Kiefer: I mean, what's that represent? I mean, like how many people?

Bob Working: I would say, in a good year, Evansville, with this community and a robust economy and the airlines operating the way they should, we have about 240,000 passengers getting onboard airplanes, about 240,000 getting off. Right now, I think the last 12 months we're at about 167,000. If you'll give me just a second, I have, 169,000 for the last 12 months. 90,000 enplanements since the first of the year. That was through July.

Councilmember Goebel: Mr. Working, that is a national trend as well, isn't it?

Bob Working: Oh, yes, Sir. We're no different than 95 percent of our other airports. It's, certainly having Delta-Northwest merge has not been good for our community. Next month we see all service to Memphis will cease. We went from three flights to one flight to Detroit. I think we're going to get one of them back in September, but there certainly is a reshuffling of the industry right now.

Councilmember Goebel: Do you recognize any increase as of late, or it's pretty flat?

Bob Working: Increase in what?

Councilmember Goebel: As far as boardings go?

Bob Working: No, they're continuing that trend at this point in time. We were coming out of it when the flights were the same. From an economics standpoint, I think we had bottomed out, and we're starting to increase a little bit. But then, all of a sudden, you see a drop in the Delta flights, and that's just going to exacerbate that issue. As we see the seats go down, the tendency for the airline is to raise the price because of the scarcity of the resource. So, you're seeing the price go up and the opportunities to travel diminish.

President Shetler: Councilman Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: As of July 31<sup>st</sup> though, roughly what are revenue and expenses? I know I read the minutes that we receive as Councilmembers, and the last deficit I recall was roughly, you know, \$1.7 or \$1.8 million, something like that.

Bob Working: Doug, can you address that?

Councilmember Lloyd: So, we're looking at, were are we, half a year through, roughly?

Bob Working: I'll let the treasurer talk to that issue.

Councilmember Lloyd: That would be good. He's an expert.

Doug Joest: Hi, I'm Doug Joest, I'm the treasurer and finance manager of the Airport Authority. Year-to-date through July, our revenues were \$2.7 million versus three million last year. Like Bob mentioned, most of the, we had decreases in everything except the rates and charges that we charge the airlines and that's up five percent, or \$57,000. Our expenses, actually were down over last year in everything except Utilities. Just going through here, we're essentially, expenses including depreciation this year is about \$2,370,000, but the depreciation is \$2,143,000 of that. I can leave this with you. Or, I can get you a copy. It's not quite finished.

Councilmember Lloyd: So, the depreciation is over two million?

Doug Joest: Yes.

Councilmember Lloyd: Okay, and that's, the deficit is somewhere in that neighborhood, maybe a little bit smaller?

Doug Joest: Yeah, we're essentially breaking even in cash flow.

Councilmember Lloyd: Right.

Doug Joest: Because, as Bob mentioned, we've always stuck with our budget, and I would just like to emphasize, we always spend a lot less in our budget.

Councilmember Lloyd: Then, I guess, on personnel, have you had any reductions or eliminations?



Bob Working: We put, I was going to say, we put a freeze on the hiring almost a year ago. I lost my assistant this year back in June—

Councilmember Lloyd: Right.

Bob Working: —went to Peoria as the director there. We've not filled that slot. We also have a training director position that remains open. There's a third one too, isn't there?

Doug Joest: A part-time parking lot person.

Bob Working: Part-time parking.

Doug Joest: We lost the full-time and we just—

Bob Working: So, those right now would, I'm estimating would be somewhere in the \$160,000 to \$170,000 with benefits—

Councilmember Lloyd: Right.

Bob Working: —for those three slots.

Councilmember Lloyd: I mean, nationwide we are seeing that it's really a recession in the travel industry. It's rough. So, I commend you for trying to hold the line on pricing, because I think that's important, too.

Doug Joest: Yeah, we've got to be careful of the airlines. We can't put too much on them. There is fewer of them to spread that burden over now. You know, in the good old days we had about eight carriers here to spread that over. Now we're down to two. However, we're actively seeking others as well.

President Shetler: That 160 plus boardings, how many of those represent out of town, do you have a clue on that?

Bob Working: Normally, we see a split of about 70-30. It's 70 percent of the traffic originates in Evansville.

President Shetler: Okay.

Bob Working: Thirty percent from somewhere else.

President Shetler: So, we're bringing, we're attracting 50,000 people right now out of that 160 roughly?

Bob Working: Yes.

President Shetler: Rough numbers?

Bob Working: Right.

President Shetler: Any idea what the purchasing power or how much economic benefit that Vanderburgh County receives off of that 50,000 that comes in? Do you guys have—

Bob Working: Well, I can say that historically, and we've used very conservative figures, that the airport has a positive economic benefit to the community of about \$150 million a year. That, we do, every other year we do an economic benefit analysis for the airport.

President Shetler: But, if that 70-30 would hold true, then you're talking about roughly a \$50 million impact perhaps—

Bob Working: Right.

President Shetler: —from out of towners?

Bob Working: Yes.

President Shetler: The other, if we would, you know, exempt the contractual arrangements that you have with the bargaining groups, etcetera that are locked in for a three year contract, the salaried or non-contractual employees, and flat lined those at no increase, do you have an idea of how much that might save out of the budget?

Doug Joest: If we flat lined just the non-represented employees, it's only, their raises are only like \$13,800.

President Shetler: Okay, plus fringes, etcetera? So, we'd be dealing with about 17'ish.

Doug Joest: The fringes are pretty well fixed other than the PERF and the FICA.

President Shetler: Right, do you guys have about, I mean, are you on the same kind of plan the county is as far as sick days and all the holidays that we might have?

Bob Working: We're similar in some respects. I think we have three personal days, where the county has four. I think we both have 14 paid holidays. So, in that respect we're kind of similar in benefits. We, our health insurance, we do not have that process where you can continue on after you retire with your health programs. So, our health premiums are substantially less, I think, than what the county's is. But, other than that, we have, there's great similarities.

President Shetler: You're not on our county program at all?

Bob Working: No.

President Shetler: Are your contracted employees that are with Teamsters, are they on the Teamsters health program?

Bob Working: The Teamsters are under Teamsters, and the firefighters and non-represented employees are with Deaconess or the old Welborn Health Plan.

President Shetler: Okay, thank you.

Councilmember Bassemier: Tom?

President Shetler: Yes?

Councilmember Bassemier: I just wanted to say that we also lost revenues, I mentioned two buildings, we'd lost revenues out at the airport on two buildings, the foreign trade zone and also the Bristol Myers hangar. That's why I wanted to bring that up, if there is a possibility, even if maybe somebody knows a use for these two facilities that we sure would like to get them rented out again.

President Shetler: Right. Good point. Thank you, Ed. Anybody else?

Councilmember Raben: Can I have that number again, 13 thousand what?

Bob Working: For the eight individuals that aren't represented it's \$13,869.

Doug Joest: That's based on our current employment level. As Bob mentioned, we have some vacancies.

President Shetler: Not if you would fill those other two and a half positions?

Bob Working: Right.

Doug Joest: That's based on the people that we have employed today.

President Shetler: Right.

Councilmember Bassemier: Tom, one other thing, I would just like to, you know, consideration for our non-union employees too, because they work hard, too. Sometimes it's kind of unfair, so we ought to consider the non-union employees, too, because they need a raise, too.

President Shetler: Right. Thank you. Alright, anybody else?

Councilmember Goebel: I was just going to ask that if expenses are down this year, maybe you could go back and revisit some of the increases.

Bob Working: Absolutely. Sure.

Councilmember Goebel: Thank you.

Bob Working: Again, we don't spend it unless we absolutely have to.

Councilmember Goebel: I understand.

Bob Working: Our people are very conscientious. I've always been very proud of them. I tell them to hold the budget and they do a good job responding.

Councilmember Goebel: We're proud of the airport and everything it represents to—

Doug Joest: Just a for instance, since we've joined the co-op purchasing program that the School Corporation has, and, you know, the city-county has as well. We're doing stuff like that every day.

President Shetler: Alright, thank you.

Doug Joest: Thanks.

President Shetler: We're going to take a slight break here. I've got a time out motion on the field. So, we'll just take ten minutes here. Thank you.

**(TAPE CHANGE)**

**SURVEYOR**

President Shetler: Okay, thank you. We have a lot to do yet in a relatively short period of time here, so we're going to try to get moving along a little quicker. Mr. Jeffers is up with the County Surveyor's office, and that is on page 33. Bill?

Bill Jeffers: Yes. Good morning. Account number 1060, County Surveyor, General. I got your directive from Sandie Deig to submit the 2010 budget proposal identical to the 2009, and that's what you have in front of you.

Councilmember Lloyd: About as flat as you can get: zero.

Councilmember Raben: Good job, Bill.

Bill Jeffers: It was easy.

Councilmember Lloyd: Job well done.

Councilmember Goebel: Do you think you'll be able to live within that, Bill?

Bill Jeffers: I would have preferred to give my employees at least a token raise, \$500, or a thousand dollars, something like that, as a token of my appreciation for their service to the county, but I would think that would be unfair if all county employees couldn't get the same. So what you see is what you asked for.

President Shetler: Questions?

Councilmember Lloyd: I mean, I think hard-working employees, I think all of us would like to see them get an increase. It's just unfortunate. I guess it's not totally out of the realm, but it's probably not likely and I think we all regret that, but under these conditions, we're kind of strapped with what we can do.

Councilman Sutton: Bill, line 3700, can you tell us what is included? That's Dues & Subscriptions.

Bill Jeffers: That would be for the same kind of things that the County Commissioners or any other elected officeholder would have with regard to Indiana Association of Counties, IAC, the Indiana Association of County Surveyors, etcetera, a couple of magazines.

Councilman Sutton: That may be something we take a look at there, so I know you've been pretty consistent in terms of the amounts there, but during these times, those are the kind of things that we –

Bill Jeffers: I don't mind you taking a hard look at that, that's fine with me. I'll get you a – I don't know the exact extent of our obligations for 2009 or what we may have obligated in advance in 2010, but I can get you that figure, Councilman Sutton, and then I'll get that from Linda Freeman and you can get your meat axe out if you'd like.

Councilman Sutton: Thank you.

President Shetler: Other questions or comments?

Councilmember Raben: Just, Bill, every year I apply for that Party Chief's position. Am I getting any closer to being the Party Chief?

Councilman Sutton: You're still the Chain Man, Jim.

President Shetler: I can vouch for him.

Bill Jeffers: Yes, Sir. If you're ready to take that step, as long as you make a place for my employee to step up, you can fill that position any time.

Councilmember Raben: Thanks. Bill.

### ***SURVEYOR CORNER PERPETUATION FUND***

President Shetler: Surveyor Perpetuation Fund, page 166.

Bill Jeffers: Basically, Surveyor's Perpetuation Fund is the deed transfers, land transactions that take place in the Recorder's office. We get \$5 per deed that's transferred, where recorded, and that money goes into our perpetuation fund. As you may imagine, perpetuation fund is substantially down over the past two years and especially again this year due to the down turn in land transactions. So I left it the same, but I'm a little apprehensive about the collections there unless the economy picks up again.

President Shetler: Is that \$5 fee, is that the maximum by law or is it –

Bill Jeffers: That's by statute. I think there's around a \$17 fee collected for a deed transfer, we get 5 for our perpetuation fund, the County Recorder gets 12 or something, I'm not sure exactly what –

President Shetler: And that formula is by statute as well?

Bill Jeffers: Yes, Sir.

President Shetler: I mean, how it's distributed?

Bill Jeffers: Right, it says what we can spend that perpetuation fund on, which is establishing and perpetuating section corners to which all those deed descriptions are tied.

President Shetler: Alright. Okay.

Councilmember Lloyd: What, roughly, is it down by, would you say?

Bill Jeffers: Well, I remember years when there was 40 to \$44,000 a year coming into that, and now it's down closer to 20, 28, I think, last year.

Councilmember Lloyd: Pretty big.

Bill Jeffers: Yeah, well, it's how ever many houses are sold, and so forth.

Councilmember Lloyd: Right. Okay, thank you.

President Shetler: Okay, anything else from that fund?

Councilmember Raben: Thanks, Bill.

Bill Jeffers: Thank you. Good luck with the rest of the budget.

### **CONVENTION & VISITORS BUREAU**

President Shetler: Convention & Visitors Bureau, 175.

Marilee Fowler: I'm Marilee Fowler, with the Evansville Convention & Visitors Bureau. And as requested, this budget is submitted just like last years, no increases in any line items.

Councilmember Raben: Great job. Thank you.

Marilee Fowler: Thank you. This year is going to probably be a challenge in the fact that we have exciting things happening, but in the transition between now and then will present challenges of the groups that we have coming to Evansville in 2010, making sure that we can provide the accommodations with the uncertainty of the Executive Inn as to what will or will not be open. What will or will not be demolished. So our priority at this point is to make sure those people are well taken care of so that they will continue to come back for years to come when we have all new product to offer them.

Councilmember Lloyd: I wondered, do the sales people have an opportunity to earn commissions like if they bring in a big show or –

Marilee Fowler: No, we've never done commissions, it's strictly salary.

Councilmember Lloyd: Okay, thank you.

President Shetler: Anybody else?

Councilmember Bassemier: How are you coming along with the sports facility?

Marilee Fowler: Well, we'll be meeting with the Mayor probably next week to look at some opportunities for what can be done. We've been working with Mike Shoulders, the Mayor had commissioned Mike to put together a plan for a long-range strategic plan for Roberts Stadium. So looking at that, we're hoping that we can encompass those sports fields that we wanted to do and to make that really a pristine part of Evansville.

Councilmember Kiefer: What are included in matching grants? I mean, who are some – what kind of recipients are you talking about?

Marilee Fowler: In January, any not-for-profit organization can come to the Convention & Visitors Bureau to ask for funds. They could be special grants to help put on an event, or they can be matching funds for marketing and advertising. Two of the biggest recipients of that is Burdette Park when they put together their spring and summer advertising campaign, and the other one is Mesker Park Zoo. Each of those gets annually about \$10,000 a piece. So when you take that out of the

equation, the rest of it can go to – this year, we're helping the West Side Nut Club Fall Festival. We've been helping the YMCA with their half marathon, that brings in an incredible number of people into the community. So it's different events, different projects that the not-for-profits can ask and we will help them.

Councilmember Kiefer: Thank you.

Councilman Sutton: You've got a \$7,000 request on Motor Vehicles, 4230, not much motor vehicle can be bought for \$7,000.

Marilee Fowler: We have one company vehicle, it's a van. It comes in very handy when we're doing trade shows because many times we're taking trade show booths and brochures. It also is very helpful in the fact if we're doing site visits with people looking at Evansville for meetings, conventions, that type of thing, that we have plenty of room to chauffeur them around.

Councilman Sutton: So is this something that you're renting or –

Marilee Fowler: We lease it.

Councilman Sutton: Okay. And then on Office Machines, what are your plans there?

Marilee Fowler: That's usually upgrade of computers over the years. We try to upgrade them as needed as they've reached capacity. I get teased because mine's usually the fullest, the quickest, so it's upgrading our office machinery.

Councilman Sutton: Thank you.

President Shetler: Marilee, normally on most of the budgets we have a historical reference to go by, like '06's year to date, and '07's, and what's been spent in '08, and we don't have that on yours. Is it possible to provide that to us?

Marilee Fowler: Sure, you want to see year end for '06, '07 and '08?

President Shetler: Yeah, I mean, at least '07 and '08, I think that would give us some historical reference to what you've been spending in those line items if at all possible.

Marilee Fowler: Most of those line items have been pretty similar each year. There may be some small increases based on what we have looking ahead in the next year but most of those had been very similar, so I will get you those for '07 and '08.

President Shetler: Anybody else? Any other questions?

### ***TOURISM CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT***

President Shetler: The next then is on the Capital, through the Tourism. Any questions on Capital?

Councilmember Lloyd: Some of this came before the Council so it's, you know, they've shifted priorities towards the Transportation Center/Pagoda needed repairs and then the Sports Complex.

President Shetler: Okay. Thank you very much.

Marilee Fowler: You're welcome. Thank you.

**SHERIFF**

President Shetler: Sheriff Eric Williams. And that would be page 13.

Eric Williams: Good morning. Just to make sure, using Surveyor Jeffers' definition of token, I made a few marginal token adjustments to my budget, but after a healthy discussion with my liaison, he advised me that my tokens were the same as flat, so I think most of the adjustments in there end up being basically what they were last year with a few exceptions I'd like to point out, unless you have any specific questions that you need to address first.

President Shetler: No, why don't you go ahead.

Eric Williams: Okay. The FTO Incentive, 1050-1520 is basically the amount that we agreed to during the Council meetings this year to change how we handled our FTO payments. Clothing Allowance is just to adjust for the number of deputies that we have. Same with some of the others. I had put in a request for Tires & Tubes to go from \$12,000 to \$15,000, that was really just to handle the adjustment in the fleet and the number of tires we're using. We've also got some other options that may address that. I'd asked for an increase in the Training from 15,000 to 20,000. Basically, that's used to provide all kinds of training. That one, if you put it back in where it was, we'll be alright. The one that I do want to point out, 1050-3370 Computers, you'll see there is an increase in there. The actual amount for my computer line item would be the same as last year. The increase in there is to reflect an adjustment from the CIO's budget. He is taking the maintenance on all of our network switch and router gear at the jail out of his budget and told us that we need to put it in our budget, so you should see a similar reduction in his request for those monies, and that is the maintenance cost on the Cisco equipment in the jail. I'd asked for \$300,000 in the Vehicles line item. Traditionally we've put in for \$250,00. I put it in both places, both the Commissioners' CCD account and here to cover our bases knowing that one will make it and one won't usually. We asked for the increase this year because we need to replace approximately five of our unmarked paper server cars. We're currently looking at a Focus type vehicle, that kind of very entry level, high gas mileage type vehicle. One other thing that I wanted to point out, that there was an error or an omission in our budget request and that is 1050-3600, the rent, and that is the command post rent. It was inadvertently put in at zero. Last year the budget was \$123,500. Because of our new negotiation with the Airport, that number should be \$103,203, which is a \$20,000 reduction from last year's budget.

President Shetler: Is that a year to year?

Eric Williams: The contract?

President Shetler: Yeah?

Eric Williams: It's ten years.

President Shetler: There's an escape clause on that, though, isn't there?

Eric Williams: Yes, there are several –



President Shetler: It's pretty lenient?

Eric Williams: Yeah, I mean, if we found a better option, I think we could get out from underneath that if we had an option that made sense to us.

Councilmember Lloyd: Would you repeat that figure, please?

Eric Williams: It should be \$103,203, which is a \$20,270 reduction from last year's budget and that's due to the renegotiation of that lease agreement.

Councilmember Lloyd: Yeah, I had circled that zero, I thought, wow, what a deal.

Eric Williams: Yeah, it wasn't quite that good of a deal. I think the reason that it got put in at zero is we were still in the negotiation process when we budgeted or put in these numbers. So that was an error on my part.

Councilmember Goebel: What was that number?

Eric Williams: It is 1050-3600.

Councilmember Lloyd: Page 24 in our book. I guess one quick question while they're looking. The vehicles, the new vehicles, what are you replacing when you talked about the Ford Focus type –

Eric Williams: Right now, they're driving probably seven to ten year old Tauruses. You know, we're looking for an even smaller vehicle and even better gas mileage and the age vehicle is not getting that good of gas mileage. We had to take one out of service this last week, the cost to replace it or to repair it exceeds the value of the vehicle, so we're just going to make do without for a while.

Councilmember Lloyd: The Taurus, that would be close to clunkers, wouldn't it?

Eric Williams: And we've looked at that. We're eyeballing the idea of being able to get in on the cash for clunkers program with these cars because they would qualify.

Councilmember Lloyd: Wow.

Eric Williams: So that is something we're aggressively looking at.

President Shetler: Are there any other incentive programs out there by the federal government right now that you can piggyback on?

Eric Williams: There are a variety of programs. I don't know if there are any available for us to piggyback on, but we're going to look for the best rates we can. We're hoping to replace the full fleet of five of them and get some fleet purchasing incentives by doing it that way. You know, we looked at the hybrids, we'd love to do that, but the capital outlay on them right now with our fuel prices and the miles we put on them, it doesn't break even yet for us.

Councilmember Lloyd: Vehicles, mainly one person is driving?

Eric Williams: We have ten part-time paper servers, five of them work in the morning and five of them work in the afternoon. So there's five cars and they share them, so two people share that car every day.

Councilmember Lloyd: Okay.

President Shetler: That request is for \$300,000?

Eric Williams: Yes.

President Shetler: How many cars total, then?

Eric Williams: It would be, roughly, five paper server cars and then ten fleet marked vehicles.

President Shetler: Okay, so fifteen vehicles?

Eric Williams: Yes. One other thing that doesn't appear on here, just so you know it will be forthcoming, is we're in the process of changing out the dated phone system at the command post. The traditional system that we've got out there had dedicated lines going to all the phones. We are now with the increased fiber connection that the county has put in between our buildings, we're now able to piggyback the phone system at the command post on the jail system, so we'll be able to cancel all the phone lines that are out there, so that should be a significant monthly savings, we're replacing equipment using commissary dollars.

President Shetler: I'm going to go to the – there's a groundskeeper position, 1130-0212, it's on page 20 of our book.

Eric Williams: If it's the position I believe it is, and the gentleman that fills it is Mr. Magnus right now, he generally works at the training center and does a lot of our in-house mechanical and maintenance, he does a lot of things at the command post and kind of travels around, but he works out at the training center more often than not, does some of the small repairs on the facility, keeps the grass cut there, works on our cars periodically, things that we can do ourselves that we don't need to go to our dealer or the service center for.

President Shetler: Okay, so he's more than just a groundskeeper, he's a general maintenance guy?

Eric Williams: Yeah, we've added to his job description on a pretty regular basis.

President Shetler: And he is not involved in the – is he in the union?

Eric Williams: No, it is a non-union position.

President Shetler: Non-union position, and the – is that possible to do that through Community Corrections at least the grounds keeping part of it, you know, the grass cutting?

Eric Williams: We have really tried to stay away from having community service people using mechanized equipment: lawn mowers, weed eaters, and things like that because of some liability issues and problems we continue to run into. The community service people are a great tool for our community, we use them thousands and thousands of hours, but they're much more suited for painting guardrails, picking up trash on the side of the street, moving boxes, things that don't require them to get on a lawn mower or use something that is mechanical. It's very difficult to control who – we can't. Who is coming into community service and what

their skill levels are. It's, you know, every week it can change who you're going to get that's going to be working in community service.

President Shetler: Is that different than someone that attains the level of trustee or something like that in the jail?

Eric Williams: Well, community service is somebody that's not incarcerated, generally they're on work release and doing community service hours. An inmate worker is somebody that's actually confined to the confinement center, they're in jail and the only place they do any work is inside the walls of the jail, and they don't leave that facility for any reason under any condition. So they're two different categories of people.

President Shetler: And the Custodian, that's just a few spots down from there?

Eric Williams: The Custodian is assigned to the command post and does all the –

President Shetler: The command post only?

Eric Williams: Yes. Well, again, just like the maintenance, we use them where we need them. Generally, she works out at the command post doing janitorial services, cleaning, light bulb changes, and things like that.

President Shetler: Is that represented by organized labor?

Eric Williams: No, it is not.

President Shetler: How many custodians do you have at the – well, you don't have any, I guess, because that's all operated by the Building Authority at the Jail now.

Eric Williams: Correct.

President Shetler: I guess that's kind of going back, Jail House, that's a little bit of a 50's type thing.

Eric Williams: There's a lot of names for it and I usually recognize all of them.

President Shetler: Yes, Councilman Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: One other question, Sheriff, I know on page 21, I guess 1130-0236 to 238, the Court Screeners, is that the only three new positions we'd need for the new security or is there –

Eric Williams: Based on the model that we have begun with, now obviously, if there are going to be changes to that model and if you'll recall when I came and made that presentation, we made the absolute most conservative estimate we could make to try to make that work, with the knowledge that it may be more than those people can handle to do that and we may have to come back to the table. But I would much rather start it off on the low end and maybe work my way up as opposed to having too many and then never, you know, there's the saying in government, once you have them, they never go away. You know, you hate to have extra employees and just trying to find things for them to do.

Councilmember Lloyd: In this budget, it's just those three so far for the new plan?

Eric Williams: Right, since we've not implemented it yet, those positions are all still vacant. As I had said, I won't fill those until we're only about 30 to 45 days out from actually implementing it. There seems no reason to me to have those people on the payroll until I absolutely need them.

Councilmember Kiefer: Sheriff, on that, how did – I mean, we probably talked about this and I've just forgotten, how did the \$31,011, how was that price tag come up with for that position?

Eric Williams: The Court Screeners?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yeah.

Eric Williams: That was basically a Job Study position. We already had two existing Court Screeners so there are going to be three more of that like position. So that is the base salary established by the Job Study for that position.

Councilmember Kiefer: That's the base salary. And then one other question, the Computer (Data Management) jumped up a pretty good jump, what's –

Eric Williams: Which line is that?

Councilmember Kiefer: It's 3370, it went from projected 2009 of \$5,990 to 37,500, last line item on page 23.

Councilmember Raben: That's what you addressed –

Councilmember Kiefer: You already talked about that?

Eric Williams: Was that the Cisco switches?

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay, well, I didn't know if that was the same thing or not.

Eric Williams: Yeah, it should have been about a \$30,000 increase, roughly. I don't remember the exact dollars, but that was, you should see a reduction in the CIO's budget request for network maintenance by the exact same amount and we're putting it in ours because he wants the maintenance to be under our budget.

President Shetler: That Manager Information Systems, will that reflect over there as well, then, or is that –

Eric Williams: That's a person.

President Shetler: And is that 38,000 only, is that all they're getting paid or is that – there's nothing in another budget where they're being supplemented –

Eric Williams: No, that is a county employee and that's their salary. Our contractual IT services, there is a line item under contractual for that, we supplement that, the county picks up part of the tab, commissary picks up part of the tab and user fee picks up part of the tab to meet the contractual obligations for that position.

President Shetler: How many people do you have working in computer services?

Eric Williams: Two. One county employee and one contracted vendor. I would tell you, with that line of questioning just so you know, that's one of the areas that I'm the most proud of within the Sheriff's office, of the way we've been able to manage our IT services with the resources we have because we are not under the MRC contract or anything within this building. And I think when you look device per device and server per server, and user per user, we're probably substantially below the dollar per unit that is down here. And I'm not saying that they're wrong or what they're doing is inadequate or inaccurate, I just think that we've held the line pretty tight on that one.

Councilmember Kiefer: Sheriff, change back to those Court Screeners, when is that supposed to go into effect?

Eric Williams: You know, the time line right now, I know that the Building Authority has ordered the equipment, installation, those kinds of things. You know, one of the big issues is getting everybody credentialed. I'm getting the committee to issue the final statements on what we're going to allow. There's obviously been a substantial amount of feedback on how we're going to conduct that, and like I said, I've said before, there is no firm decisions on the exact policy. There are a lot of recommendations at this point in time. But I would say that, you know, best case scenario, 60 days at best.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay, thank you.

### ***JAIL/COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS***

President Shetler: Are we ready for the Jail? It's on page 25.

Eric Williams: I'll just take questions because there shouldn't be any changes in the Jail to speak of. I can tell you that today's population is 505: 71 females, 434 males, so we're just a hair below the capacity and we've held that number for a little while, so that's a good thing. Community Corrections is full at 200. We have approximately 10 to 13 on the waiting list. The GPS bracelets are going extremely well.

Councilmember Raben: Just one general comment on this budget: as we go through the process, one line that we typically cut is the 2660, which has just always been a line that we've used to help get us below the freeze. If we manage to make the cuts necessary to kind of flat line this budget, that's one that I would like to increase somewhat. I don't know that we'd do it to the \$675,000 that's requested, but we know that one always comes back to bite us in the butt. So, you know, if we –

Eric Williams: I assume that's Medical.

Councilmember Raben: No, that's Food. So depending on how good a job we do on everything else, this is one line that, you know, that I would recommend that we make an attempt to increase over last year while we'll probably never get it to the actual requested amount.

President Shetler: How many Confinement Officers do you have?

Eric Williams: Ninety-eight or ninety-nine.

President Shetler: And those are represented by the Teamsters?

Eric Williams: Teamsters.

President Shetler: The Teamsters offer a health program, that premium may be somewhat less than what we're currently paying. Would you see any conflict or problem if those employees were able to switch over to an alternative like that?

Eric Williams: I certainly can't speak for the employees or the bargaining unit, but I know that the bargaining unit and their representation had made mention that there are other insurance options out there and possibilities that are out there. Not being that I have any direct control over the insurance, I have not given it much thought, but I think if, you know, personally, I think if the coverage is similar to all the other county employees and the cost is less, it doesn't seem to me that there should be a lot of arguments about that.

President Shetler: I know I was asking for speculation on your part, but at the same time, I didn't know if you had a feel for some of those and might just, within your department, if they could create some –

Eric Williams: I found the staff to be extremely reasonable. You know, again, I think that most of them feel very fortunate to have a job right now and a steady job working in county government. And I think they'd be willing to talk about any issue to come to the table, if it makes sense for the county and for themselves.

President Shetler: Alright, thank you.

Councilmember Lloyd: Total, I guess, personal services are up only 1.25%, which is really low and then the total jail budget up 234,443, which is 5%, and part of that is in the Food account, so, I mean, I think this budget has really held the line versus the prior year although it's a huge budget, 4.8 million.

Eric Williams: I think that we've done a lot with a little. I really shouldn't say a little, 4.8 million is a lot of money, but when you look at the scope of services that are provided across the board by the Sheriff's office, I believe it's reasonable.

President Shetler: Yes, Councilman Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Just one other minor question, Sheriff. Training, you've increased that request, did you address that already?

Eric Williams: I just said that that was one that if it didn't get through, that we could accommodate that not being increased, however, training is one of those things that is continually increased for us by the state for our deputies. Just this year, they're going to roll out some new training requirements that we're going to have to meet. Fortunately for us, we've got a fairly capable staff that we can do a lot of the train the trainer, train one person and then we can train the rest of them in-house for the most part. But that's an area I always like to see enough resources in to provide the kind of training that we feel like the community wants us to have.

Councilmember Goebel: Okay, I thought that was the Sheriff's office, not Jail.

Eric Williams: The Jail is the same issue.

Councilmember Goebel: Thank you.

President Shetler: Other questions or comments?

***SHERIFF/DOMESTIC VIOLENCE***

President Shetler: Domestic Violence, page 32.

Eric Williams: That's the grant position that we discussed last year, and at this point in time we still don't know what the award is officially going to be from the state to fund the Domestic Violence Coordinator for the office. I wish I could give you a better or more definite answer, but that's kind of where we think it's going to be.

President Shetler: Does the city have one as well?

Eric Williams: I do not know. They have a unit assigned that does domestic violence and sexual assault crimes, but whether or not they fund theirs through a grant or partially through a grant, I'm not aware.

President Shetler: Alright, any other questions?

***SHERIFF/MISDEMEANOR HOUSING  
SHERIFF/MISDEMEANOR OFFENDER***

President Shetler: Jail/Misdemeanor Housing, page 169.

Eric Williams: That's a budget that's established by the state. They dictate the dollars that we get and that's how we divide them up.

President Shetler: Are there any revenue sources that are out there? You and I talked about this last week a little bit.

Eric Williams: We submitted the sheet that was required with all of our incoming revenue streams that are out there. For example, the sex offender registry, you know, we enacted the fee structure on that, which is helping to pay for the cost of the person that's running that. We quietus those dollars back into the General Fund to balance the increase that you saw fit to give us last year. I assume that there are probably other revenues that are out there, but in general, the group that we're dealing with trying to collect those revenues from are probably the least capable of paying, more often than not, and create more overhead in trying to collect than they do. I can tell you that from the Community Corrections side of it, that's a budget that we didn't address yet, but that budget is as flat as flat can be. And, in fact, that is one of those programs that does a great deal in funding itself and we've seen our collections continue to stay consistent over there even with the increase in costs with the GPS monitoring and some of those things. So we are aggressively trying to make sure that we're getting all the dollars that we can from all the legal and reasonable resources that are out there.

President Shetler: Someone that's pulled over for a DUI, it's mandatory for them to be taken down and processed I think, isn't it now?

Eric Williams: Uh-huh.

President Shetler: Do we get any revenue at all for that? You know, for the processing for that person?

Eric Williams: No, I think the way to phrase that is, that's a cost of doing business, being that the county is responsible for the Jail and we take everybody that's arrested on a state charge within the confines of this county. It's a cost of doing business. There are some statutes out there that allow you to charge some booking fees, housing fees, some of those things, but right now, the Indiana Sheriff's Association's Council is advising everybody to stay away from that right now because they don't think that's going to work out. And those have been on the books –

President Shetler: Constitutionally, it may not work out?

Eric Williams: There may be some issues with those. We've never explored in great depth charging the inmates a fee to be there. You know, you can get into a lot of philosophical discussion about whether that's right or wrong or not, whether we have the statutory authority to do it and then whether or not they can pay it or not, and where would you get those funds and would you then accrue numbers and go after them in small claims? I mean, there's just so many issues, and it's a big issue. I'm not saying it's not worth tackling, or at least continuing to discuss, but it's not one that we have ventured too far down with.

President Shetler: I recently saw a report on one of the networks that it talked about several communities across the country that were doing that and they were reporting an average of about 30% of people who are able to make some of those payments. And I'm really not speaking of those who are indigent or who are in a position not to pay them, nor am I trying to force someone to pay something when they're not found guilty, but perhaps after they've pled guilty to a crime like DUI or whatever, for the processing that we've gone through and the inconvenience and the cost that it's been to the community, another 40, 50, \$60 fee that may help us out along those lines is where I'm coming from.

Eric Williams: And I certainly don't disagree with you on – I happen to personally believe in user fees and if you use the system you should pay a greater weight than the average. You know, everybody pays a certain portion and know it exists, but if you're a frequent user then probably your rate of pay should be a little bit higher. And as we talked about, I think it would be a very interesting conversation to have with the judges on how that would work, especially looking at the – and not so much maybe the drunk driving arrests, but more the failure to appear arrests because that is a group of people that are significant and those are people that aren't being arrested because of the charge. They're being arrested because they failed to show up in court as they had promised or said they would or were directed to do so. And that's a pretty big pool of people and I think that would be an interesting one to look at in that respect. Today may or may not be the forum, but I would suggest that there's probably also some room to talk about assessing other agencies booking fees. For example, the county picks up the tab to hold prisoners, you know, I think there's room to talk about assessing the city a booking fee if their people are arresting until such time they go to court and become prisoners of the state. That's treacherous territory to talk about, but it would at least be worth maybe exploring at some point in time.

President Shetler: Alright, thank you. Okay, anything else? Anybody else have questions? Community Corrections.

Eric Williams: Again, I think that budget is flat. Again, I'm proud of our collection efforts in that area to stay firm on and making sure the people are paying their freight



when they're in those programs. And it is a fairly self-funding program with the exception of some grant dollars that come in there and some personnel costs that the county has provided.

Councilmember Lloyd: Plus \$40,000 on a 1.5 million budget, so that's 2.6%, so it's pretty flat. And that's just mainly step increases, I believe.

Eric Williams: Yes.

Councilmember Raben: Good job, thank you.

Eric Williams: Thank you, I appreciate it. Have a great day.

President Shetler: Thank you, Sheriff. Misdemeanor Offender?

Councilmember Raben: We're finished with all those.

### **BURDETTE PARK**

President Shetler: Burdette Park. It will be on 104.

Steve Craig: Steve Craig, Manager of Burdette Park.

Councilmember Kiefer: I have a question. It looks like a decent jump in Other Employees, and it looks like through June 30<sup>th</sup> you had spent this year \$188,000, well, if you multiplied that by two, it's a lot less than \$500,000. Is there a reason why, next year is something happening?

Steve Craig: Yes, the reason that I'm asking for this increase, one thing that doesn't reflect a good picture on it is because the way the part-time people are used. It's for the lifeguards and that, July and August, you know, that part of the time is usually our heaviest use. But the reason that I asked for this request is there is an old saying about timing, but the timing was wrong. But it was the minimum wage has went from \$5.85 an hour last year to \$7.25 now. And last year I went through the books and we had 70,000 part-time hours, and \$1.40 a raise, that reflects almost \$100,000 according to what we was running on that, we would have needed. This year I did not get any money at all, it was a 65 cent raise for everybody that was on the part-time account, not everybody, there was some people that was above that already, but we made several changes in hours. We made several changes in the way the people work, we split shifts up where we didn't have large shifts and we're trying to make it work. I didn't know if we could get through this year with it because you take the 65 cents and take it times it, and we didn't get a raise at all, but that's because there's going to be \$1.40 more than we were per part-time hour paid at the park. And if you break it down, it's probably 70 to \$80,000. And I'm asking for 25, I think I can make it work. I'm not telling you I won't come back next October or November begging for some money, but at this time I think some of the policies that we've done, that I can make it work with that.

President Shetler: Yes, Ed?

Councilmember Bassemier: On that Tires & Tubes, it jumped up a little bit from last year. (Inaudible – microphone not turned on) - we spent (inaudible) that's on 2220. Double that, is there a –

Steve Craig: That's actually only the bills that we got in and I save my money as much as I can. My explanation on that is we purchased one new vehicle in the last ten years. We get vehicles when they are surplussed from other departments and I don't have the prettiest fleet, but it does work for us at Burdette. And I've done that so that I wouldn't be buying new vehicles. I know some people get new vehicles all the time, but I guarantee you when I get those surplus vehicles, they need tires. And I've got school busses that we have to put tires on and I've got mowing equipment. We just replaced all their tires, they were six years old. I have farm equipment, tractors, backhoes and we have to put tires on them. And if you go out and buy four tires and divide it into 2,000, you don't get very many tires. And I've got several vehicles right now that I'm not comfortable with. When my people, I send them to town and they said, what am I going to drive because I'm not driving that one or that one because the tires aren't good enough, then that was one thing that I know we were supposed to flat line it, but it was just a safety issue to me.

Councilmember Bassemier: Okay, thank you, Sir.

President Shetler: Okay, Councilman Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Question on park revenue, how do we look this year compared to prior years?

Steve Craig: Okay at the six month point I gave you when I appeared before you for my transfer, we were, I think, 60,000 above last year. At the end of last month we were still ahead of last year and after having a July where it rained all four weekends, that was my bread and butter month, and I lost all my weekends, we're still ahead of last year. Even though the economy is where it's at, we've had an extremely good year. We're not behind. And the one thing that I want to bring out a point is that of this budget, I will return 70% of that money to the county coffers before the year is over through our revenues. So when you look at it, you may think that's a lot of money to run a park, but when I get my revenue and that, you know, I return it to the county, so I think that's something that we could look at, too.

Councilmember Lloyd: So in dollars, where are we at in '09, like as of July 31<sup>st</sup>?

Steve Craig: I've got that here. We've taken in \$665,549.09 as of the end of July.

Councilmember Lloyd: What do you attribute that to? I mean, that's a fantastic record to have an increase in this kind of economy.

Steve Craig: First of all, I think we put on a good show and we give people a good value for their money and I think our advertising, we've changed the way that we went with our advertising the last couple of years. Two years ago we sold 320 season passes. Last year, we sold 430, and this year we sold 560, and we targeted that with our advertising. Those are dollars in the bank before we even open up, we've got those season passes. And then, according to statistics, people that's got passes to get in spend 35 more percent at your concessions because they didn't spend any money that day when they came there. So I think things that we've been doing has helped us out. I think maybe people stayed a little bit closer to home, that may have helped us also, but I predicted that we were going to be a lot worse off than we are and I'm proud that we are where we're at.

Councilmember Lloyd: So the airport's problems are maybe helpful to Burdette?

Steve Craig: Well, we could look at it that way.

Councilmember Lloyd: The other thing, overall, this budget is up 43,808, 3%, but it's 100,000 lower than '08, so, I mean, this is a pretty tight budget, I would say.

Steve Craig: Well, I was looking, through my budget and I was trying to cut some money out and it was an interesting fact, in the last five years, I have 28 line items in the 200, the 300 and the 400 lines, and out of those 28 line items, 21 of them are the same or lower than they were five years ago. And when you get into repairs to equipment, get into sanitary supplies, chemicals, medical supplies, light bulbs and that, you know, if you're the same or less than you were five years ago, you know, I've not just been watching my budget this year, I've been trying to do it for the last ten years actually, but the five years do reflect that.

Councilman Sutton: Steve, what was that revenue number one more time through the end of July? 665...

Steve Craig: 665,549.09.

Councilman Sutton: And what was that through that same time period for last year?

Steve Craig: 665,306.48. There was a difference of about \$247 we're ahead of last year.

Councilman Sutton: Yeah, that is, given the climate, and some of the other factors that you had mentioned, I mean, that's a pretty strong showing on the park's part and you can be proud of what you guys have been able to do through these circumstances. So we definitely appreciate it.

Steve Craig: Well, thank you.

President Shetler: Yes, Ed?

Councilmember Bassemier: Are there any plans in the future about adding another attraction?

Steve Craig: We have several of them that I have submitted to the Commissioners for their review, which would come under CCD, Park & Recreation, part of the Commissioners. We have a plan, we have some drawings for a new water attraction, new playground. I'd like to build a new chalet, the timing seems to be right with materials and the building part right, they're a definite asset to the county, not only from the income they bring in, but from the visitors they bring in, the leisure hours. We actually, I got together with some of the people from the Visitors Convention Bureau, got some numbers on when people stay in your park that are using your facilities such as the Discovery Lodge, there's a lot of big weddings, people come from all over the United States. But when they use our chalets, according to the Visitors Convention Bureau, they spend \$92.30 a day in your county when they have leisure, it's called a leisure day, and that's actually direct expenditures. That's money that they spend, it's not no trickle down thing that you can get these reports, but this is actually how much -- they have a company called Certec that does the study on it and that's \$92.30 a day. And if each one of our chalets was rented 168 days last year, they were worth \$77,532 to Vanderburgh County.

Councilmember Bassemier: Has there been any talk about converting that regular pool into a wave pool? I don't know, you probably know this, if you convert a regular pool into a wave pool, I know that's a big attraction at Holiday World. I talked with Mark Tuley years ago and we were kind of working together on that, --

Steve Craig: Actually, we looked at that this year, went down and looked at a lot of the new things out. I would preferably probably put a wave pool in if it was the first thing, but there is a couple of things that – one of the things, they're the most dangerous pools there are. Second of all, we would have to probably take out one of our pools to make it work. They're very expensive, but there's all kinds of thrill rides out there and I've had to take looks over the years, do we want to try to compete with the, you know, Holiday Worlds and the Six Flags and that, because every year they come out with a new three million, five million dollar attraction and I'm not going to try to stay up with them. But we've looked at the wave pools, we've looked at the Master Blaster, there's all kinds of crazy stuff out there. Their life is not that long. Our slides are still very popular right now and one of them is 15 years old and one of them is ten, and the kids still use them every day. These other ones, after two or three years, the reason that they're buying brand new ones is because they get old.

Councilmember Bassemier: I know when (inaudible) did that feasibility study out there on the wave pool (audible) 35 to 40,000 people, if I remember correctly, but I don't ever remember it being a safety problem because there is no undertows or anything in all the information I received on (inaudible), it was the complete opposite. I don't ever recall any drownings that I've seen over the years in a wave pool so –

Steve Craig: Well, I think if we got the facts out on it now, they're finding out different. They actually even ask you to put cameras underneath the water and have people monitor them because as the waves come out, it's called an undertow. They can be safe to a point but when they get into the deeper parts and that, they have become a problem. Personally, like I said, that would be the thrill ride I would like to put in first, but as I've looked at them, it's just one of those things that, like I said, there's safety things, but there's a lot of them out there that are kind of dangerous, so you have to look at that point as well as the cost. And the cost to also staff them. We've looked at a new attraction a couple of years ago and we would have had to hire 24 new lifeguards to man the attraction.

President Shetler: Okay, Councilman Goebel, do you have a question?

Councilmember Goebel: Just looking over the salary increases, are those required by contract or –

Steve Craig: Those were the, I think, longevity pay was every three years, those are longevity pay for those employees that got them. As you can notice, the manager did not get a longevity pay increase even though he's been there longer than everybody else. But all the union people did get a –

Councilmember Goebel: But he's dedicated.

Steve Craig: But the union people did have a mandatory longevity pay that was included in these wages and that's why it reflects a raise this year for them.

President Shetler: It's a three year contract, I think, they're involved in. Are you finished, Mike? Alright, Councilman Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Just a brief lecture. You know, one thing that's always bothered me about, you know, we're talking about new, bigger, sexier pools and things like that, you know, we don't want to lose sight of what the mission is at Burdette Park, that it's inexpensive, affordable fun for everybody, and when you get into bigger, better pools, things like that, costs go up. You're talking more help, a tremendous amount of overhead, suddenly you're not an affordable for everybody park. I mean, I think we're already at the point that, I don't know that it's affordable for everybody. I mean, I would like to see us find ways of lowering our ticket price and maintaining the beautiful park we've got today. You know, I still believe that there's a lot of people that can't go out to Burdette on a weekend when they want to, so –

Councilmember Bassemier: (Inaudible – microphone not turned on) you get more people out there, (inaudible) and that's the only thing I was saying. I know you're going to (inaudible) because if it wasn't for the water slides now, (inaudible) the water slides wouldn't be doing the business it's doing now, but to a degree, I agree with you.

Councilmember Raben: I mean, it is a county park. We're not, Steve said it best, we're not competing with the Holiday Worlds or Six Flags or anybody like that. Let's keep it affordable, let's keep it well maintained, and keep the beautiful park like it is.

Councilman Sutton: Well, you know, something maybe we can be mindful of too, is we had the really nice land acquisition a couple of years ago, you know, we've got a lot of acreage to work with to take advantage of healthful living, people are, you know, we've got the trail, we've got a lot of things that we can do that could be good, clean, inexpensive activities for families, and we've got a lot of options from a property standpoint to make that happen. You know, we probably do need to take a look to see what the other plans are now for that new space that will allow people to maybe hike in those areas and the trails and things, but things that are inexpensive and I think Jim brings up a good point, you know, just keeping it a park that is accessible to the whole community, and a good fun experience, and I think all the reviews have always been real positive about what people bring and the experience they have at Burdette. But just being mindful of just other things that we can do. You know, we talked about the recreational activities as far as expanding softball and that type of thing in the areas, those don't necessarily cost a whole lot, but just some things that we can look at. We don't necessarily, of course, we're not competing against a theme park, we're not in that league, but –

Steve Craig: Well, one interesting thing, we don't compete against them, but in the Reader's Choice Awards for the last four years, we have been number one on the favorite place to be on a hot day, and Holiday World was second. So it does show you what the tri – I mean, that is the truth. And it does show you what the people of the tri-state, you know, maybe they can't afford that much money to go up there for the day and we do try to keep it cheaper, and that's where the family passes come in. If you buy a family pass and you take your kids out there ten or twelve times, it ends up being just a couple of bucks a day to swim, for the kids. So that's one of the things that, you know, I think we have going for us is the affordability of it.

President Shetler: Along those same lines, I don't know how sophisticated your accounting system is there, but do you break it down by areas or departments, like the swimming, how much revenue and how many expenses and then also your cabin rentals, etcetera?

Steve Craig: Yes Sir.

President Shetler: So maybe you could provide that information to us at a later point in time so that we could look at that.

Steve Craig: I'll give you as many years as you need. We have it broke down and --

President Shetler: Maybe the history of the past couple of years of where the revenue is coming in, the expenses for that specific project going out.

Steve Craig: We break it down to the utilities and the maintenance and everything for every department.

President Shetler: Alright, great. Thank you. Anybody else have any questions or comments? Okay, thank you, Steve.

Steve Craig: Thank you very much. You all have a nice day.

President Shetler: 911 Emergency Fund. Is that 173? Questions, comments?

#### ***LOCAL EMERGENCY PLANNING COMMISSION***

President Shetler: Local Emergency Planning Commission, page 171.

Councilmember Lloyd: This budget is another flat budget, same dollars as 2009.

#### ***LOCAL DRUG FREE COMMUNITY***

President Shetler: And Drug Free Community. Questions?

Councilmember Lloyd: Another flat budget, same as 2009.

President Shetler: Now with regards to tomorrow, we have Personnel? No, that's going to be on Thursday. Okay, so tomorrow we begin at 9:00?

Sandie Deig: No, the Personnel & Finance meeting at 8:30.

President Shetler: Personnel & Finance at 8:30, okay. And then we'll transition into this at 9:00 for budget hearings. So 8:30 tomorrow morning. Motion for adjournment would be in order.

Councilmember Lloyd: Recess.

President Shetler: Oh recess, I'm sorry, not adjournment. Alright, we'll see you all tomorrow morning at 8:30 for Personnel & Finance.

**(The meeting was recessed at 11:48 a.m.)**

**VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL  
BUDGET HEARINGS  
AUGUST 19, 2009**

The Vanderburgh County Council met in session this 19<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2009 in room 301 of the Civic Center Complex. The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m. by County Council President Tom Shetler, Jr.

President Shetler: Good morning. You’re at day two of the County Council budget review and we will call the roll real quickly. Thank you.

COUNCILMEMBER	PRESENT	ABSENT
Councilmember Sutton	X	
Councilmember Bassemier	X	
Councilmember Lloyd	X	
Councilmember Goebel	X	
Councilmember Raben	X	
Councilmember Kiefer	X	
President Shetler	X	

President Shetler: There being seven members present and none absent, we have a quorum, and we will resume our second part of the County Council review from day one, which was yesterday, that we recessed. First up is the Recorder’s office. Z Tuley? I’m not seeing the Recorder at this time, we’ll go on – I’m not seeing the Coroner, either. Oh, I’m sorry. There you are, I apologize. You’re small and behind a couple of other people there. We’re on page 35 of the budget book.

**CORONER**

President Shetler: Do we have a car, a vehicle?

Annie Groves: Yes, we do. Thank you.

President Shetler: And how are the other vehicles?

Annie Groves: Uh, not good. One is going to have to be towed away. It won’t run at all, the other van.

President Shetler: Did you trade in for a clunker deal?

Annie Groves: Ours wouldn’t qualify.

President Shetler: It wouldn’t qualify because...

Annie Groves: Our van wouldn’t, the year of it. It wouldn’t qualify. It was too old to qualify for what they wanted.

President Shetler: It was too old to qualify?

Annie Groves: Uh-huh. And then our other vehicle is nine years old.

President Shetler: I guess that's what they'd tell me, that I'd be too old to qualify, too. Any questions? Yes, Ed?

Councilmember Bassemier: Annie, on the Chief Deputy, how did you figure that salary? Do you have longevity figured in that or...

Annie Groves: Well, that's kind of a unique question because due to the fact that the way he retired from Sheriff's department, he had to bump all the way back to base, but he is in a POLE position, so technically, I mean, I just went ahead and took the salary from last year and put it in there.

Councilmember Bassemier: That's all I had.

President Shetler: Yes, Councilman Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Good morning. Assistant Coroner, is that more than one person?

Annie Groves: Yes.

Councilmember Lloyd: Okay, is that part-time?

Annie Groves: That's our part-time, that's 13 people.

Councilmember Lloyd: Oh, okay, so they're paid hourly or –

Annie Groves: They're paid hourly.

President Shetler: Now aren't they guaranteed a certain amount of time, those part-time?

Annie Groves: No, we pay them by the hour.

President Shetler: By the hour, but aren't they guaranteed so many hours per week?

Annie Groves: No.

President Shetler: It's just whatever hours they work?

Annie Groves: It's whatever hours we need, yes.

President Shetler: Wasn't there an issue on that last year that we talked about you having trouble attracting people –

Annie Groves: Yes, we are because –

President Shetler: What grade are you?

Annie Groves: The pay is so low. We only pay 8 an hour. And what I figured in this budget right now is if we could take it to that number right there, we could pay them ten dollars an hour. They haven't had a raise in nine years, but the law has changed twice in those nine years and they now have to go to school and get



certified, and then they have to have continuing education. In order for them to do that, they have to take their own vacation time from their full-time job to do this. So I'm very fortunate to have the staff that I have, but it's really hard now to keep people because of all the state requirements, and we have no choice but to follow the state laws.

President Shetler: With regards to autopsies, I know that was a question that came up last year and we got into a lengthy discussion about that, are you doing that locally today or is that still being done by outside contractor?

Annie Groves: Well, actually, our doctor has a couple of homes and he does live here, too, so he does live here and we do have a – the county has signed a contract this year with our doctor, so we now have the doctor under contract.

President Shetler: Okay. And is that contract per autopsy or is it a flat amount for the year?

Annie Groves: No, it's per autopsy.

President Shetler: And how much is that?

Annie Groves: Thirteen hundred dollars.

President Shetler: Thirteen hundred dollars per autopsy.

Annie Groves: Uh-huh.

President Shetler: And we do about how many?

Annie Groves: Right now we're up – we've had 120.

President Shetler: For the seven, eight months, whatever we've, seven and a half months we've gone.

Annie Groves: Uh-huh. Yeah.

President Shetler: So we're on track to do something in the neighborhood of 180 – \$190 then for the year? I mean –

Annie Groves: However, you know, you have to realize that two days ago, we worked three suicides in one day. I've already had 25 suicides this year. We've had 23 accidental overdoses this year.

President Shetler: What triggers a mandatory autopsy?

Annie Groves: In the state of Indiana, the only thing that's mandatory, if it's a child three years or under, that's mandatory. And then there is no other requirements. However, in our office, what we do, all homicides, fire deaths, if we don't know the cause, manner or mechanism of death, we will ask for an autopsy. Now if we have someone that's in the hospital, that's been in the hospital for like three weeks and we have all the medical records, then we don't autopsy unless it's a homicide, then we will.

President Shetler: But, like on a, and I guess I should be hesitant to say, an obvious suicide because to most criminal investigators, there's probably not anything that's really obvious, but something like that where there is no dispute about it with anything, we would still go ahead by practice to go ahead and do an autopsy?

Annie Groves: No, we would not. If we go out to an obvious suicide and we have a suicide note, etcetera, what we would do is, we would just do toxicology. You know, we'll do some toxicology, we will do x-rays to make for sure that the projectile, if it didn't exit out of the body that we locate the projectile, but we wouldn't do an autopsy then.

President Shetler: And is that, to do something like that, that's a separate cost that doesn't fall underneath this, contractual?

Annie Groves: In Diagnostic is where the toxicology comes out of. The X-Rays, we do in-house.

President Shetler: Okay, alright. Other questions? Yes, Councilman Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: I'm just looking at some of these supply item accounts. Are you looking to do more autopsies next year?

Annie Groves: I'm hoping not to. I'm hoping to do less.

Councilmember Lloyd: Well, you've got some increases here. You've got, you know, a \$500 increase in Gas & Oil, \$1,000 in Garage & Motor, these are off the prior year, 500 Office Supplies, 1,000 in Lab Supplies, 1,000 in Sanitary, 500 in Chemicals. So I just wondered if that meant you were looking to do more volume or –

Annie Groves: You know, I kind of prepare for that because every year our rate goes up. It's really hard to answer that, however, the reason I did the gas is because we've only had one vehicle this year, now we have two so I'm thinking we might have an increase. There's just, in the Garage & Motor, I don't think we need to increase there because now we do have a new vehicle so we don't have the wear and tear on the other ones. I am more than willing to live with the budget that you gave me last year, there's just a couple of items that I need to raise, but other than that, I think that we can make it.

Councilmember Lloyd: Okay. Then what about, go down to 3160 Radio/Pagers, you have spent zero, I guess, the first six months, but you're looking for \$2,000?

Annie Groves: Well, I'm going to transfer into contractual because we now take that into, instead of the pagers, we now have cell phones so I need to transfer that into contractual to cover the cell phone cost where it used to take care of the pager cost.

Councilmember Lloyd: Okay, and then 4,500 in Buildings and Equipment, 4122? Was that repair on the building or did you have some other plans for that?

Annie Groves: That was for the carpet and the flooring that we put in last year. Or, I'm sorry, at the beginning of this year.

Councilmember Lloyd: Okay. So the completion of that, because you spent \$9,000 so far?

Annie Groves: Well, what I did was, I encumbered money in that account from last year.

Councilmember Lloyd: Okay, thank you.

President Shetler: Alright, other questions?

Councilmember Raben: Annie, I didn't get that last part, what was...

Annie Groves: On what, the building?

Councilmember Raben: Yeah, the building equipment, the 4,500. Do you still need that for next year or you don't?

Annie Groves: No, I didn't put that in for this year.

Councilmember Raben: 4122 has 4,500.

Annie Groves: I think they just carried those numbers over from last year is what they did because in my actual request, I didn't put that down. And that's because the Commissioners have given me permission to go ahead and bid the rest of the building repairs. But if you want to give it to me, I'll take it.

Councilmember Goebel: On Maintenance Contract, what does that involve, do you know?

Annie Groves: It involves our X-Ray equipment, we have to have the processor, we have to have the chemicals changed all the time. We have our grass mowed and our refrigeration unit that goes out every other week.

Councilmember Goebel: Are any of these requests for copy machine lease or anything like that?

Annie Groves: No. Actually, we do lease our copier but that comes out of my Contractual account.

President Shetler: The Chief Deputy, is that a non-exempt, is that what it is, exempt employee or is that underneath our...

Annie Groves: My Chief Deputy is a POLE.

President Shetler: Okay, thank you.

Councilmember Raben: Annie, back to Contractual, that 3530, so the 9,000, that's going to have the copy machine, that's –

Annie Groves: Copy machine, cell phone, the alarm service, the bug spraying.

Councilmember Raben: Okay. So the Radio/Pagers, we can zero that out.

Annie Groves: You can delete that if we could put it into Contractual.

President Shetler: Any other questions? Alright. Thank you.

***PUBLIC DEFENDER***

President Shetler: Public Defender, that would be page 79. Mr. Owens?

Steve Owens: Good morning. The only thing I would have to say about our request is we'd flat lined this year's budget as requested. The only thing that has really changed since we submitted it, we have been informed by the Building Authority that the rent request for next year should be at \$56,875.57 as opposed to the \$55,000 that I've got in the request.

Councilmember Raben: The correct number is?

Steve Owens: 56,875.57.

President Shetler: Councilman Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Steve, you zeroed out one of your part-time and lumped those two together and made one full-time, is that correct?

Steve Owens: Yes, we did that earlier this year.

Councilmember Goebel: And that's reflected here, I guess?

Steve Owens: Yes.

President Shetler: Any questions?

Councilman Sutton: Steve, on the Travel/Mileage and on the Training areas, can you talk about those? Are those related to the annual training that you guys have to have to keep your license or is that something else?

Steve Owens: The training is – we have mandatory CLE, so all of the full-time lawyers in the office and all the part-time lawyers also have to have a minimum of six hours per year and it actually works out over the three year period, they have to have really twelve hours per year. So the training is what we're paying to send attorneys to CLE seminars.

Councilman Sutton: Locally, are you looking at options to take that training here? I know we had a couple of discussions yesterday from a couple of offices that are looking, at least one office is trying to do that, to reduce some of the cost.

Steve Owens: Well, we've already done that. We've already given some local in-house CLE seminars within our office. You have to have those approved by the CLE committee up in Indianapolis. Unfortunately, many of the seminars, virtually all of them, are out of town, so we go to as few of those as possible. But we're not really equipped to be able to give everybody the minimum number of hours per year locally. We're doing that to the extent that we can.

Councilman Sutton: Well, just trying to see, you know, I'm not necessarily saying that you guys put on the training, I'm just saying that offerings that may ordinarily have been in Indianapolis or if there are opportunities here or a little bit closer that could cut down on maybe some of that travel and mileage there, reduce our expense there.

Steve Owens: Well, the travel and mileage isn't really predominantly from training, the travel and mileage is predominantly from investigative expenses, mileage for the investigator to go out and do that. We have some travel and mileage that goes to people that are going out of town. We have a trial that's going to be held over in New Albany, so we'll have some travel and mileage for that. The training account is predominantly just for the CLE.

Councilman Sutton: Okay.

President Shetler: Councilman Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Just to follow up on that, some of the part-timers, they do their CLE like in their offices or whatever, I mean, you just verify that they get it, but do they all use the county or do they – I mean, the ones that have private practices, don't they do CLE on their own?

Steve Owens: The ones that have private practices will have to do CLE on their own as well. What we have been doing is, if it is a PD related sort of CLE for the part-timers, we're paying half of the registration fee and nothing else. They're picking up all of their travel, the other half of the registration fee. We have too many lawyers to be able to provide CLE for everybody at the full load.

Councilmember Lloyd: CPA's have to have 20 hours.

Steve Owens: I'm glad we don't have to have 20 hours a year.

President Shetler: Any other questions? Comments? Thank you.

### ***PROSECUTOR***

President Shetler: Next is the Prosecutor's office, page 41.

Doug Brown: Good morning. Essentially, our budget is exactly the same and we plan to try and stay within it.

President Shetler: Is there any areas that you feel might be difficult to do?

Doug Brown: Not right now.

President Shetler: Does anybody have any questions? Yes, Councilman Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: On page 39, you've got a Deputy that has a pretty significant decrease. Was that a retirement or did someone leave? It's 1380-1080, it went from \$62,373 to \$52,894.

Doug Brown: It's just switching someone around without the seniority.

Councilmember Lloyd: Okay, I figured that's what it was. I mean, the overall budget is only up \$7,000, which is less than 1% if you go to the – 1,731,420. Pretty small increase.

Doug Brown: We try.

President Shetler: Okay, anybody have any questions or comments? Alright. Thank you.

Doug Brown: Alright, thank you.

President Shetler: I assume we were taking all of those. Does anybody have any questions about any of the other parts of the Prosecutor's budgets while we're...yell now. Alright. Good.

### **COMMISSIONERS**

President Shetler: That gets us down to the County Commission. Mr. Tornatta? And he just stepped out. Let me just ask, is the Recorder back in yet? I haven't seen her. Commissioner Tornatta?

Troy Tornatta: How are you? Commissioner Tornatta. Good morning. I got a call right before you called me...73, is that correct?

President Shetler: Page 73, correct.

Troy Tornatta: Okay, looking down, first of all, any questions before I get into it? I would like to open up with a quick comment. It is refreshing to have the Commissioners office and the Council work so well together and I appreciate that from all the members of the Council. I also appreciate the fact that this is a County Council and a County Commissioners office are working together to live within the means of the county. And here again, I commend this Council on living within your means. The taxpayers might not know it now, but they will know it when it comes to looking at their tax rate from the county and it's a way that we're going to make sure that we have the money that we need over the next couple of years when others are not going to have those type of dollars and it's all because we're cracking down, asking our employees to do extraordinary things with some flat lined resources. So to do that, we all have to be in on it, not only employees, but the administration, I think, we are doing that, and so I applaud what you're doing and what the employees are doing to make sure that we get through some of these financial rough times. So, that being said, if you'll look at Southwestern Mental Health, 1300-3020, I believe that is a flat line because the CPI is flat. Sandie, I don't know if they gave you a different number or, Bill, did they give you a different number, but from what I understand, the CPI is flat so we shouldn't see an increase in that line. The same for Hillcrest –

Councilmember Lloyd: So you have three percent in here, of an increase, but you think that's not going to come about then?

Troy Tornatta: Right, and Marissa put that in before she got the number. It looks like the CPI is going to be flat or negative and I don't believe we'll hit – we'll adjust a negative number, but we'll stay flat. I know for a fact that the Washington-Hillcrest Youth Home will be flat. And we're signing a contract with Washington Youth Home

that will essentially say that their increase will only be the increase of our employee's salaries, or CPI, whichever is less. So it will be a new contract with them to adjust a little bit closer to how we run business here. Urban Transportation, I just wanted to maybe see if – I believe that's the MPO and maybe we can change Urban Transportation to MPO on the books in the future.

Councilmember Lloyd: 3090?

Troy Tornatta: 3090. And other than that, I don't really have anything from the Commissioner's office as a whole.

Councilmember Bassemier: Troy, on the Rent, that went down, didn't it? It's not reflected here and I think that went down, didn't it? 3600?

Troy Tornatta: Turn your mic on, Ed, if you would, please.

Councilmember Bassemier: 3600.

Troy Tornatta: Yeah, that was given to us from Dave Rector. It should be decreased to \$4,756,206 for 2010.

Councilman Sutton: So what figure do you have with that rent? I mean, I know what we have here, but what do you – is that in agreement with what you're anticipating? We've got \$5,890,710.

Troy Tornatta: I believe we requested 5,800,000 – is that what you were saying?

Councilman Sutton: Right. What is your figure?

Troy Tornatta: The figure is \$4,756,206.

Councilman Sutton: Troy, on line 3750 Purchasing Department, since a lot of those responsibilities are now shifted and there were a couple of positions that were eliminated but there's no difference in what they're looking for on the county side, is that figure in line with what the county is...

Troy Tornatta: This is a perfect segue to introduce the office, the people that help run the Commissioners office: Kristin Comer and Marissa Nichoalds are behind me. I will say, do we have, did they give us the number?

Marissa Nichoalds: I haven't seen it, but it should be a third, a third and a third. City, county and –

Troy Tornatta: Okay. That's a number probably carried over from last year.

Councilman Sutton: Okay, so in all likelihood, we're anticipating a –

Troy Tornatta: We would anticipate that it would go down.

Councilman Sutton: Okay.

Councilmember Lloyd: So it should be cut in half, basically, 69,000, or –

Councilman Sutton: Well, if we're dividing it a third with each entity, city, EVSC and the county, it may not end up being a half of this, but it shouldn't – definitely this is not the correct number.

Troy Tornatta: Right, I guess I would look to – between now and the time that we have to finalize this number, we should be able to get a correct number.

President Shetler: Yes, Councilman Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Let's go backwards a little bit. Line 3000 Bond & Insurance, 46,000 increase? I mean, you just mentioned it's to cover insurance premiums, so our carrier came back with that?

Troy Tornatta: 3000?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yeah, page 73, Bond & Insurance.

Troy Tornatta: Do you know about that? That's P & C.

Marissa Nichoalds: That's just a standard increase. I think I'd plugged in three percent as an increase there. Usually, we do see an increase and I had asked our insurance agent for some numbers, but I'm still waiting to get those.

Councilmember Lloyd: Okay, my calculation, that's 5%.

Marissa Nichoalds: Oh, okay. Is it?

Troy Tornatta: We should have the numbers back in the next couple of weeks. That's our hope. And I think before, we've always been delayed on those numbers. We try to make it a point that they have those numbers ready by this time but they are trying to project 18 months early and so, I mean, that's where we're always going to get a (inaudible).

Councilmember Lloyd: But that's the insurance on all the county buildings and –

Troy Tornatta: Correct. The only thing I will say is that I believe the new state statute actually says that we have to carry more liability on the buildings at a higher rate, so I would not be surprised to see this number go up per the state statute.

Councilmember Lloyd: So what we saved in rent, we may lose some.

Troy Tornatta: Yeah, exactly.

President Shetler: Liability per incident? If there's a –

Troy Tornatta: No, it's actually what we are mandated to carry as far as liability insurance. I believe there was a change.

President Shetler: Do you know what that's going to?

Troy Tornatta: I did. I can get back to you on that.

President Shetler: Other questions?



Councilmember Bassemier: I got one more question. Troy, we heard this yesterday with Craig with Burdette Park, and I understand it did very well this year compared to last year, are there any future plans for Burdette Park, any changes, and could you give the reasons if you do have any changes?

Troy Tornatta: Yeah, and if we could, if it's okay with you, let's get the CCD or we can go to that whenever, and when we go to CCD, I want to talk to you about some thoughts that we were throwing around.

Councilmember Bassemier: Okay.

President Shetler: Let me just ask you a question, kind of general here, and that is with regard to the health insurance, because that's contracted with you guys, is that a three year contract?

Troy Tornatta: It's a five.

President Shetler: Five year contract, okay. So we have four years to go on it?

Troy Tornatta: Right.

President Shetler: Are we – how locked in, for example, if a portion of our employees speaking in terms of our – the ones that are represented by bargaining groups out there, if they would do an alternative type of insurance policy or something, are we locked in to where that would not be allowed or... And I don't mean to put you on the spot right now, you might want to talk to the attorney and stuff and ask him.

Troy Tornatta: Yeah, that would have to go back. I mean, it's, to my knowledge that we picked up this particular carrier because of the incentive that we would get over the long haul and through the amount of employees that we have on the program or on the plan. And so I really, that would be a tough question to answer at this point.

President Shetler: If you could call Ted or someone and go back and check that out and find out if there is a little bit of room that we can look at, particularly, I'm thinking of the bargaining unit, you know, the ones that are represented by bargaining units out there, if there is an opportunity for them to do something else that might be of like kind, but save some money, that might be something we might be interested in.

Troy Tornatta: Yeah, the main reason why we went with this plan is because we believe that we'll see a continued savings. Will it hit the four to five million dollars that we once anticipated? It's going to be hard to say with the fluctuation in nationally what health care is doing and locally what health care is doing. I will tell you this, that our health care is running about 88% and that's on an expenses to cost ratio. Essentially, we want to be about 75% of what we spend out. That's the ratio we want to be, we'll even get some money back, and that's the deal that we cut. When we're up at 88% , that's not giving us any leeway and the next year, subsequent years, it's going to boost our rate potentially to the max. At 88%, we'll be at the maximum rate, which is 13%. Our goal is to be a healthier community and a healthier employer and try and get our employees to buy into the fact that we're all in this together even though we're not self-insured, so to speak, we're still

outlaying 8 to 11 million dollars on health insurance, and we need to make sure that we're doing our part, everyone is doing their part, to keep that number as low as possible. We're not saying don't go to the doctor, but make sure you read and know what the most effective and efficient ways are to help out, everyone out, because if we can bring that down at the end of the year, that's going to save us on health care costs. Right now we saved 400,000 over what we had in the past and that allows us to keep that 8% to our employees for health insurance and I think that's what we all want. We don't want to have a zero salary increase and then make them pay another 8 or 10% on their health insurance. So we want to make sure that we're doing our due diligence as a group. And right now, 88% is higher than a lot of other places that we checked.

President Shetler: Along those lines of, if you could check into, also if the contract that we're involved in would preclude us from looking at the option of having a clinic like the city is establishing and several other private businesses are engaging into today and saving a considerable amount of money by doing so. And if that contract would allow for some room to do that and cost savings as well.

Troy Tornatta: Well, I've been checking that avenue. I'm not sold, even though these clinics are out there, I don't know what that cost is to keep that clinic running. Much like the offices that we have in Vanderburgh County, they do cost an amount of money. And we can't discount the fact that we're saving \$25 per person at a time, yet we're spending 800 to \$900,000 for an office and we're checking into those numbers now just to see if it's something that would benefit the county. But right now, through several of our TPA's, I'm not real sure that I'm getting a fair answer. I know people are doing it, but that doesn't mean it's always right.

President Shetler: We have one other advantage that might be able to be utilized, and again, I've spoken very, very briefly with the health department about this earlier, but there may be a way, and all the other entities that I know of that are doing it, are saving a considerable amount of money. What they're having to do though, is to go outside and go to a third party privatization to actually do it, when we, in fact, have a lot of expertise right here pretty much, you know, in-house that we might be able to contract through the health department, a way for them to perhaps, I'm thinking that there may be a way here where they could actually have a division that would be "profitable" and help offset some of the other costs that we have and save the taxpayers in the long run here. So I don't know if there's a way of bridging this all together, with the resources that we currently have in play, that we might be able to do it. But the contract, I guess, is where we start to find out whether or not –

Troy Tornatta: Yeah, and we can do that. And all options are open. So I appreciate the comments and we'll check on it.

President Shetler: Alright, thank you. Councilman Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Troy, I commend you and the Commissioners for trying to keep the rates down for the employees because, obviously, they're not going to get a pay raise this year the way it looks, and the benefits probably outweigh a pay raise anyway, if we can maintain those. And I know you're exploring ways to save on healthcare, as you mentioned already, and as Mr. Shetler mentioned. Do we have, just one simple question, a differential rate for tobacco users and non-tobacco users in our county, do you know?

Troy Tornatta: No, and here again, we'd have to check legally if that's available. A lot of times there are reasons why we can't do such an act and it comes down to equal and fairness and how that's done, and there's a lot of lobbyists out there that work the other side, too, to make sure that everyone gets treated fairly. So, I'd be happy to check that, but I think, at this time, it wouldn't be an option.

Councilmember Goebel: Okay, well, you've taken some measures already to make Vanderburgh County employees more fit, more aware, and I think that seems to be the trend these days, too.

Troy Tornatta: I think that's what we need to do and that's where we all collectively need to have ideas and come up with things. Any idea is a great idea if it's dealing with a better fit employee base, and making sure that everyone gets into it, like we did our walking contest. One small thing, but a lot of people got good and hopefully there are people that kept up with their fitness, so that's only going to help us and bring that 88% down.

Councilmember Goebel: Thank you.

Councilmember Kiefer: Hey Troy? Commissioner? Does the health insurance company, when you talk about that 88%, do they provide you statistical information saying – I know they can't disclose certain things because of HIPPA laws and things like that, but do we understand what segment of our employee population – is it the – I mean, I just don't know what they're allowed to provide, but –

Troy Tornatta: They will provide RX, which is any prescription, how much we spent on prescription drugs, they will provide how much in-patient, out-patient, --

Councilmember Kiefer: But it's not a demographic that says the older population costs X, the –

Troy Tornatta: No. We do have some numbers and I can get that to anybody that wants it.

Councilmember Kiefer: Well, I was just curious because it might help us direct your planning when you're doing health and fitness programming, if you saw, hey, we really need to target this age group or this type of population for health programs. You know, and then one other question is, you said the city, and I think I read about this in the paper anyway, the city has their health clinic they're setting up. I mean, if they're already spending the money and have the expense of having that set up, I wonder how much, what the differential cost would be for county employees to be able to utilize that?

Troy Tornatta: And I've kind of floated that balloon over –

Councilmember Kiefer: Across the hall?

Troy Tornatta: Right. But I'm going to say that right now, we just have a little bit of an issue with the difference of insurance and providers. And then how will we differentiate and will that put more cost into the running of that office? And how will that be based and –

Councilmember Kiefer: No, I understand that. You're exploring it and...

Troy Tornatta: I think it's a great opportunity to look and see if that's a health savings situation, especially since we have more employees in this building, but at the same time we want that cooperation back and forth and I know they're working hard to get this thing set up so, --

Councilmember Kiefer: Just curious, where are they setting up that office? What part of the building?

Troy Tornatta: Dave Rector knows and I want to say --

President Shetler: Former purchasing, I think.

Councilmember Kiefer: Oh, I was going to say, because we've got 36,000 square feet, maybe we can rent to the city some of that.

Troy Tornatta: I think the president is right.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay, thanks.

President Shetler: Other questions? Yes, Councilman Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: We had Mrs. Townsend in here yesterday with Weights & Measures.

Troy Tornatta: Good deal.

Councilmember Lloyd: And she was talking about their move to 2901 East Morgan, which is the old National Guard storage building. Some of the questions she could not answer, but she mentioned your name.

President Shetler: A man prepared.

Councilmember Lloyd: This is all the answers?

Troy Tornatta: Okay. If you'll look through that sheet, obviously, you're going to see that there are several options and all the options would total \$41,931. The building would be at the old armory facility, and I believe everyone knows, right by McDonald's Golf Course, off Morgan Avenue. We were able to talk to the city and the Park's Department and get them enthused about this and been working very diligently to make sure that, although Loretta might be displaced at the end of the year, we're going to have her home and have it ready for when she's ready to get in there when she's displaced. As far as office renovations, it's a block building and the structure is in great shape, the inside is not and so we have to bring it up ADA compliant and do some things that are up to code. And that's really where we left it. We're going to slap some paint on the wall, potentially, on the outside of the wall, that's up to you guys. Inspect HVAC, make sure she has heating and air in the place, it's got a chain length fence, something that she needs, she'll have more security than she's had in the past, they'll be able to take all their equipment and put it inside and house it inside the building where I know they've been carrying it and had it inside another building where this will be a better structure. This will also be a block building, so it will be secure and we've taken precautions to put some type of plastic over the top of the windows so the golf balls don't come through. So I think we've tried to think of everything, but do it in a cost saving manner. This

would be a situation where I would ask the city to pick up 50%, even though we're 55/45, I think this is something that we're going to help the city out with. The city is also looking to make it a zero rent situation. So, and everything is subject to change, we know that. But as far as her budget, I believe we'll be very close if we take her rent line and put it in to some type of utility line, I think it will wash.

Councilmember Kiefer: Troy, did I understand you correctly, the city would not charge rent, the rent would be at no charge?

Troy Tornatta: That's what I'm to understand.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay, but she's responsible then or the county is responsible for the utilities and the maintenance and –

Troy Tornatta: Well, we're splitting that 55/45. So, at that point, if it's \$6,000 in utilities, we would only be responsible for \$4,000.

Councilmember Goebel: Great deal.

Councilman Sutton: One of the questions that I had for Loretta yesterday regarding this structure and the rent agreement, if there are maintenance issues, repairs that need to be made in the future, who is responsible for those?

Troy Tornatta: It would go along the budget lines, so if it's 55/45, and we have the lion share, then we would pay that amount. Obviously, there's going to be something budget-wise, they've had a sweet deal. We've got two or three offices that have had sweetheart deals and we've kept them there. This gets it kind of back in-house, so to speak, and allows her to be in the center of the community, allows her to be out and have facilities that are worthy of her job and in this case, we just build a different budget in; instead of a rent line, we might put some type of services line.

Councilmember Bassemier: Troy, we're going to pick up all the renovation costs?

Troy Tornatta: Split it. It's going to be my request that we split it 50/50 and do what we need to do. If we don't think we want to paint the outside, don't paint the outside, save the money.

Councilman Sutton: Of course, you'd also talked about just the moving costs from their present location to the new one, she wasn't really sure how that would occur. In her budget, that would cover that?

Troy Tornatta: Yeah, I'm going to say we're probably going to have to throw another few thousand dollars at her moving costs. It was my responsibility to get a build-out cost on what this would look like and what it would take to make sure that it was inhabitable and ADA compliant and state compliant code and whatnot. As far as moving her, I really hadn't thought about it besides the fact that when I talked to Loretta, she acted like it wouldn't be that big of a move besides come cabinets, at that point, we'd probably just bid that out.

Councilmember Raben: The county has got enough trucks to make that – I know you've exhausted a lot of time with this, and I think it sounds like a great program and it should be beneficial for both city and county, I appreciate it. Thank you.

Troy Tornatta: Thank you.

President Shetler: Is there room at the County Highway Garage?

Troy Tornatta: For her?

President Shetler: Yeah.

Troy Tornatta: We've looked and to try and find a segment and then to kind of block that down, I think is going to put us in a bind at the Highway Garage and it's also – it's not going to satisfy what I think our needs are for Loretta's access. Loretta should probably be in the center of town, I think, by putting her at this facility it puts her in the center of town. She has a gasoline unit that measures gas and other things. I really want that away from as much stuff as possible. This is a stand alone building, it's a block building. If there were a fire, you know, stranger things happen, it damages nothing at this property. It wouldn't even hit a house. I mean, it's far enough away from everything to cause a problem. So in this instance, for what her needs are, there's never been a better building for what she needs.

President Shetler: At the County Garage, though, they do have fuel pumps there and there is a gas station across the street, so as far as –

Troy Tornatta: Yeah, but she's constantly bringing gas into the property, out of the property. For liability purposes, I just think that that's not a set up that we would need and that's my personal opinion, and not of the other Commissioners, but talking to Loretta, knowing her office, being her liaison for as long as I was, I've been dealing with this for a while.

President Shetler: So like the Executive Inn, because that's where it's been before, pretty populous, I mean, as far as bringing all those kind of – that chemical and stuff in and out of there?

Troy Tornatta: I've not been a big fan of that location for the longest time. The monetary value and what Loretta, where she would have to go, her other alternatives, she would rather have stayed there and they had a bigger parking lot in the back that they could use. And that parking lot is a necessity. At the Highway Garage, there's so many trucks back there, she's not going to have the same situation.

President Shetler: Yes, Mike?

Councilmember Goebel: Troy, there's a security fence there already, is that correct?

Troy Tornatta: There is.

Councilmember Goebel: So we won't have to invest in that?

Troy Tornatta: With barbed wire, so it's actually a little bit better.

Councilmember Goebel: And the rent seems to be very good and Loretta seems to be quite pleased?

Troy Tornatta: She's fired up.

Councilmember Goebel: Well, I think that's important, too.

Troy Tornatta: You guys talked to her yesterday and I got to hear about it.

Councilmember Kiefer: Commissioner, while my preference is to see all of the county offices in county owned buildings, I think this is a good step. I mean, at least it's a government owned facility and we're not paying it out to some third party, so I think at least that's a good move. And if you can get the city to chip in 50/50, you know, that's comforting to know, too, and plus, zero rent is, I don't know how you can get much better than that.

Troy Tornatta: Well, hopefully, everything goes through as planned.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay, thank you.

Councilmember Bassemier: That would be a lifelong lease?

Troy Tornatta: I would assume that that's going to – that's where we're going to get a little attorney work in there, but we're working on an agreement right now.

Councilmember Lloyd: It will be a lease, but the Park's Department owns the ground, right?

Troy Tornatta: I believe so.

Councilmember Lloyd: Then that won't change.

Troy Tornatta: Right, and that's who we've been going through right now. Obviously, the Mayor has a lot to say with the Parks Department and Dan Shaw has been great to work with on this.

Councilmember Lloyd: Did you guys ever look at the Old Courthouse to move her?

Troy Tornatta: Yes. Security issues on vehicles and to start putting up gating around that place, I think we take away some of the aesthetic value. I didn't even want to go there with the Preservation group on trying to hit that angle, and her getting in and out is going to be so much better out in this area.

Councilmember Lloyd: I mean, I think this looks like a good deal for both parties.

President Shetler: Okay, we're ready to move on. Thank you. Go to the next one.

### **COUNTY COMMISSIONERS/CCD**

Troy Tornatta: Okay, any questions? Let me tell you, the Energy Savings Contract, although we see that's a pretty big number, runs through 2015, just for your information. As far as the Sheriff, Motor Vehicles, I did neglect to talk to the Sheriff, I know Marissa has talked to the Sheriff about this.

Councilmember Raben: I can speak to those. Just like years in the past, he has requested them both in the General Fund and in CCD. The \$250,000 will probably be ample to take care of his needs for cars but one of the – I would like to be able to add about \$25,000 to that because the equipment, the light bars and some of the

stuff, Ford is going to discontinue manufacturing that Crown Vic, police car version, so whatever the new version is, he won't be able to utilize his old equipment.

Troy Tornatta: He's actually requesting \$324,000.

Councilmember Raben: In the regular budget, total, right?

Troy Tornatta: Okay.

Councilmember Raben: And I'm advocating 250,000 plus 25,000 for new equipment.

Troy Tornatta: Okay. The one thing the Sheriff is doing that is something that I'm sure he has talked to you all about is, he's been able to get some engines, use some of the older cars, I say older cars, they're really new cars, new interior, everything is just spruced up, puts the engines in it, rebuilt engines, and he's able to get three cars or four cars for the price of one. So he's doing his best ability to keep these cars on the road and, I mean, we've never had that opportunity in the past, so I commend him for what he's doing. As far as looking at Park & Playgrounds, Ed, that's kind of where you were talking about. As far as Burdette Park, I think, obviously Steve Craig is doing a bang up job out there. He saves us a lot of money in how he's able to fix parts without having to go outside and hire extra help because of his knowledge and his staff's knowledge. And so that's been a bonus and that's saved thousands, probably hundreds of thousands of dollars. He submitted a budget request and there's a couple of things that I would like to look at. We do have a neat situation out at Burdette Park where we have the chalets. He's looked at building a turn-key chalet, at least one, I think that it might be something, because people are doing more "staycationing", they're staying in town. This might be an opportunity for us to continue the works that we're doing out there at the chalets. The chalet turnkey is \$198,000. Now with that, I think it's very interesting, we did a little research to find out that \$92.30 is spent in our community every night's stay per person. And so you start doing some quick math, if 12 people, there's 160 rentals with a maximum of 12 people, let's say six people are in one of the chalets in a year, that brings over \$88,000 to our community. When you start doing some bigger numbers, the total of all the chalets rented is over \$482,000 to our community. Now we keep saying that we lose money out at Burdette Park, but do we really? And it's kind of like at the Centre and some other locations, some other venues, do we really lose money because we actually get these people in our restaurants and in our community, they're servicing, and with those types of numbers, I mean, I think that we do see some benefit.

Councilmember Raben: Just a quick question on the chalet side, would we be better spending that money to rehab the existing chalets? I mean, the condition of those, what are those like? I guess some of those are what today, fifteen years old? Older than that, possibly?

Steve Craig: Steve Craig, manager of Burdette. Yeah, they're probably approaching that but as far as I'm concerned, they're in tiptop shape and I really don't have any major improvements to do. I do need to treat the cedar on the outside, it's at the point where it's drying out, that it needs some treatment, but as far as refurbishing them, I do not believe that it's needed at this time. Some new furniture every year or two, we put in them whenever it needs it. The one that Troy was talking about, we actually, several years ago had the site, we flattened it, we



brought the electric, the sewer, the water, everything sitting there so there's no infrastructure needed for the chalets, and it's due east of the present chalets, it's not 100 yards away from the other ones. So it's in a central locale. And the other thing that we have, these are all part of our ten year master plan. They had suggested building several more chalets because of the income that they do bring to Vanderburgh County. Yesterday Royce had asked me about the new 30 acres that we got and all the possibilities. That 30 acres does join up to our present chalets, and that's where that woods and that starts. And right now we're doing an infrastructure study on that to see where the road, where electric, where everything goes in that, and that will have the space for four more chalets at the northern part of the park in the next 20 or 30 years, of course. But there are places up there to expand for the chalets, where we can have up to ten chalets.

Councilman Sutton: So is what you're presenting here, is this like an extended stay facility or something? This turnkey chalet that you're referring to?

Steve Craig: The turnkey just meant that's everything included from the furniture, everything. That's just come in and somebody build it, and that's the cost that it would, you know, to get into the building. Cost may seem high but we do pay the wages that we are mandated that we pay. It makes them go up a little bit higher than probably you could get a house built. But that's what we're mandated to pay so that's what we do. That's ready to walk in and you'd rent it for the first time.

Councilman Sutton: I just remember the cost maybe being a little bit lower when we built them before. Of course, times change, building costs go up.

Steve Craig: Well, you were standing on the deck the first day that we got them done, but that's when my ground crew also existed of six or eight people. And if you remember, we had them framed out and my crew built the rest of the chalets. That made a difference. We no longer have that large a crew. Our crew is down probably to a maintenance crew now, and not a construction crew. And that's one of the reasons I try to hold the money back. We don't do a lot of construction anymore, we do a lot of maintenance. But yes, it was a lot cheaper back fifteen years ago and you was there the day we dedicated them. But they're still, I think, in great shape. I mean, if you walked into them, I don't think you could date them too much. But we try to keep them as clean and as functionable as possible.

President Shetler: Councilman Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Following Jim's question, do people shy away from any of the chalets? The ones I have seen are well kept and clean. Do people, when they take a look say, well, I don't, this doesn't fit my needs or what I hoped to have? Are any of them rented more than others, I guess, is the question?

Troy Tornatta: We do have a, kind of a sheet on chalet rental. In fact, I'll just pass this around.

Steve Craig: Yeah, it is kind of unique. Some years, one will rent more than others. The next year, the other one will rent, but they're pretty well all within probably of an amount of twenty in a year. I don't know why some of them change one year and some of them don't the other year. But they pretty well rent equally. Location with number one used to be something. It's set off a little bit by the side and people, if

they had first choice, they would probably take it just because it was a little bit more secluded on the one side.

Troy Tornatta: We did find out in just, they do questionnaires and find out about complaints or whatever, so we are adding cable t.v. to the chalets. When you have people that do stay in town, they want their services. So we are doing that. One other thing we did at the level, is we got with Steve and talked about where the pricing points were as far as the Discovery Lodge. We gave discounts during the week, we were able to boost our sales and future sales. We also were told that we would be hit between what, 20 and 40 percent this year in our stays, and because we adjusted, we're actually ahead of where we were last year on stays. The revenue is about the same, but we had to do that to make sure we kept turning those properties. So I think we made a calculated decision and its paid off and so we've had the volume through the park and it shows at the pool and whatnot.

Councilmember Goebel: I think there's no doubt about that. You know, Burdette Park is no longer a well-kept secret and wedding parties and things like that, you're doing a great job in that regard. Do we have out of town wedding parties stay on-site very often? I know you've talked about this in past meetings.

Steve Craig: Every weekend. Sometimes they rent all the chalets for three, four or five days and, I mean, they rent all six of them including the Hickory Lodge. The Hickory Lodge being twelve has become a popular venue with the weddings, with, like the girls from the wedding party might stay there for three days before and everything is on-site, and this just works great with the wedding. We bring people in from, I'll tell you who is happy, is the hotels over by us because we don't have enough chalets on the weekends to accommodate them and they end up staying in the local hotels.

Councilmember Goebel: Thank you.

President Shetler: Okay well, the only point I'd make is one I'd made yesterday, Steve, and that is I think it's important for you to get to us some kind of breakdown on the accounting, the revenue and the expense side of it so that we could look at each one of these particular projects that are going out there and do some cost accounting on it because it all sounds good, but I don't like to operate from the seat of my pants. I'd really like to know that we've got –

Steve Craig: I will have it to you probably tomorrow. We make them out every year and turn them in.

President Shetler: Alright, thank you.

Troy Tornatta: One of the things that we try to do with a lot of our offices that we oversee is to make sure that they get us revenue projections and hopefully we can convey that to you whenever it's needed. Real quickly, there was a sidewalk and curbing replacement. We are going to see if the Highway Garage, during their down time, if they have down time this year, can go out there and take care of that. It's about a \$35,000 project, hopefully we can take care of. There is a Burdette Park/USI pedestrian bicycle nature center handicap parking section to replace the one that's there. I probably would like to see that in subsequent years when we have a better ability to pay for that or if we have extra monies that are left over from what we're doing out there now. And then, the last one, there where the batting

cages, Steve sees a need to have an interactive playground which is ADA compliant and it's next to the concession stand, next to the Putt-Putt. If we do have something over there, we are going to attract people to that site. It does carry a \$210,000 price tag. Obviously, we're open for any suggestions on that, but it is a pretty substantial unit and that will go next to the Oasis Miniature Golf complex, and it is a vacant spot right now. And if people are over there, we do think we'll see revenues go up at the concession stand.

President Shetler: Alright, any other questions, comments?

Councilmember Raben: Mr. President, while we have Commissioner Tornatta here, do you want to go ahead and take the rest of his budgets then?

President Shetler: Yeah.

Steve Craig: I have one small comment. Of these projects and that, none of these will need any excess or new workers, or anything. That's something, whatever we're doing, if we added a chalet, I can accommodate that with my crew now and with this interactive playground, the batting cage used to have two employees there at all times, I will not need the employees stationed there paying them, so these projects are not going to add to our workforce.

### ***DRAINAGE BOARD***

President Shetler: Okay. Drainage Board. Anything? Doesn't appear to be.

### ***RIVERBOAT***

President Shetler: Riverboat.

Troy Tornatta: Riverboat I think is pretty self-explanatory. We have roughly 565,000 in our Economic Development line. We've been very cautious to spend that and any monies that we do accrue in there, obviously are toward that Economic Development side, and I've made it a point to let you know if we're going to expend any of those dollars. Infrastructure and Drainage has \$392,000 in that account and then Initiative Based and the Dental Clinic both have a zero balance.

Councilmember Lloyd: What was the Infrastructure balance?

Troy Tornatta: \$392,427.

Councilmember Bassemier: Mr. President? I've got a question on that Welfare to Work program or it's called Initiative Based Assistance program, what's the administrative cost? Do you know? The cost to run that program?

Troy Tornatta: I can get that. Can we...we'll get that to you.

Councilmember Bassemier: Yeah, if you could get me a rundown. I was hoping some time in the future that we could get whoever is the manager of that program or supervisor, whatever, can come in here and give us a little presentation on that.

Troy Tornatta: Oh, come on up.

Councilmember Bassemier: I don't know if we have time...got about five minutes or whatever? While I've got you here. I appreciate it.

Troy Tornatta: Sure.

Melissa Rynkiewich: Melissa Rynkiewich, with Lieberman Technologies, and we've managed the program since 1997. This is an Initiative Based Assistance program that you have to be working or enrolled in school full time to receive childcare assistance and/or car repair. It is not an on-going program. People who qualify come on and they have 52 weeks, if they remain eligible. Car repair is for those who are going to work, can't, their car is, you know, I'm telling you, these cars are like, nine, ten, eight years old. There are no new cars getting fixed. And one of the barriers to keeping a job is having reliable transportation. A barrier to keeping a job is also affordable childcare. Childcare for an infant in a licensed or accredited center is \$155 a week. That's not a lot of money left over if you are making minimum wage. So what this does, it's based on your income. As I stated earlier, you must be working and/or in school full time. And we can help you up to 52 weeks, and it's non-renewable. So if you've used it in the past, like five years ago, you can't use it again. It's not per child, it's per family.

Councilmember Bassemier: And what do you all charge, Lieberman, what's –

Melissa Rynkiewich: I believe the administrative cost is ten percent. It's ten percent. And we see those families at the minimum, three times a year. They have to be redetermined at least every six months. There are applications that they fill out. We enter the data. We track. We mail out initial interview letters to those individuals. We also mail out letters to get in and get re-certified so that they can keep their subsidy. So if a person comes on, we also do allow a 30 day job search. And that person has to show that they're going out and looking for a job. We have forms for them to fill out, so we have to see them in 30 days, and once they get a job, you have to see them 30 days later, so they can present pay stubs, so we can determine what their copay may be at that childcare center.

Councilmember Bassemier: What's the percentage of people after they finish the program and do they keep their jobs? How long do they keep their jobs afterwards?

Melissa Rynkiewich: I don't know that I can answer that, because I track them while they're on the program. I don't track them once they're off the program, but –

Councilmember Bassemier: How do you tell if the program is really working if they go out afterwards and they quit their job after, how do we know if the program is really working?

Melissa Rynkiewich: Well, I can't answer that. I mean, I feel that it is working because we've also, with the funding, the Prosecutor's office has been working, we fund a person to go out and actually have child support, where they can go in and file for the child support and then all those steps with that. And I found that those people that use that service and when they start getting child support, actually come off our program because if more of the families could receive their child support, you know, we could help more families. But the child support is a real issue when it comes to those families succeeding or not, being on welfare or being on a program like this. So what I have seen are those women who are getting, or men,

who are getting their child support finally, they'll come off the program because their income has come to a level where we can't help them any longer.

Councilmember Bassemier: Okay, thank you very much. I appreciate it.

Melissa Rynkiewich: You're welcome. Are there any other questions?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes, roughly, the number of participants?

Melissa Rynkiewich: I have that with me. Would you like to know from inception or...

Councilmember Lloyd: No, just last year.

Melissa Rynkiewich: Okay, right now, as of this year, we have 46 families and 61 children. To date, for this year, we have served 79 families and 119 children. With safety net, we just have one slot left for car repair. That's helped 28 families this year alone remain employed by having a vehicle that they can get to work with. And Prosecutor's office, they've done a total of 552 intensive assessments this year alone. They've done 246 established paternities this year alone and have established 189 support orders.

Councilmember Lloyd: Is that, for someone that wants to sign up, is that the Prosecutor's office is the normal place where they get that information or they –

Melissa Rynkiewich: Do you mean for child support, Sir, or do you mean –

Councilmember Lloyd: Either one?

Melissa Rynkiewich: No, they would come to our office and fill out an application or take it with them. And we have requirements they have to prove, 30 days of income, they have to show us if they are or are not receiving child support, they have to prove that the child is actually theirs, I mean, all those things.

Troy Tornatta: Tell your location.

Melissa Rynkiewich: We are located at 223 NW Second Street. Everybody calls it the Girl Scout building, but I'm on the third floor, we're on the bus route, and we're downtown.

Councilmember Bassemier: Now the car repairs, what do you allow on that? Are these major repairs, transmission, rebuilds, or just –

Melissa Rynkiewich: It's up to \$750 per vehicle and mainly what we see is tires, brakes, rotors, you know, struts, sometimes there are engine troubles, I mean, I have to rely on my husband when it comes to the cars, so, but they have to get estimates and it's not like, here's the money. There is like 28 vendors in the county that participate and the families go and get at least two estimates. And if they don't like those two estimates, they can go to all 28 vendors. If the car is not driveable, they only have to get one, but they have to get on the phone and talk and see who will come and tow the vehicle for them. And that is part of the \$750.

Councilmember Bassemier: Thank you. I really do appreciate your coming –

Melissa Rynkiewich: No problem, you kind of caught me off guard, but that's fine, that's why I'm here. Thank you.

Councilman Sutton: Troy, you had indicated, --

Councilmember Bassemier: Thank you, Mr. President, too.

Councilman Sutton: Troy, you had indicated there is a zero balance on the Initiative Based, now our book, you know, we run a little bit behind with maybe what the current figures are, we've got \$200,000, just a little over 200,000 showing left as a balance in that account.

Troy Tornatta: Yeah, they spend it down to zero, and that's every year. So we've never had a balance in that at the end of the year.

Councilman Sutton: I guess a key to that program is that first word, it's initiative based. If you don't meet certain qualifications, you can't participate in this program. The -- when -- the dollars -- do you have an idea when those dollars actually were totally expended in this line?

Troy Tornatta: No, I don't.

Councilman Sutton: Any idea?

Melissa Rynkiewich: Yes, they are encumbered funds. When I bring on a family in January, that goes, if they come on February, March, April, May, June, I, you know, I have to do that 52 weeks in anticipation. And that's visited every two weeks when we process the claims, there is a projection done and we know where we are and if we need to bring families on or not.

Councilman Sutton: Okay, so you come on in March and you have that certain amount set aside for that family through --

Melissa Rynkiewich: For those 52 weeks. Yes, Sir.

Councilman Sutton: Though it may show zero, that family still has their allocation set aside?

Melissa Rynkiewich: Yes, Sir.

Councilman Sutton: For them for that course of the program if they meet all the requirements?

Melissa Rynkiewich: Yes, Sir.

Councilman Sutton: Okay.

Melissa Rynkiewich: Any other questions before I sit down? Thank you.

President Shetler: Okay, anything else? Mr. Commissioner, since you said such kind words to us in the beginning, I think what we'll do is, we'll give you a little bit, we've got a couple of other ones that were in between you, but we'll just continue on with The Centre and The Convention Centre and get all the operations

underneath your belt out of the way first, and then we'll go back to the Health Department. Does anybody want to take a break before we get to that point or just keep on going for a few minutes here and then we'll –

Councilmember Lloyd: We could finish the Commissioners maybe?

Troy Tornatta: Okay.

### ***THE CENTRE***

Troy Tornatta: Superintendent of County Buildings, do you want to start there?

President Shetler: I think The Centre might be the next place, and that would be page 102.

Troy Tornatta: Alright. We have our management from The Centre here with us if it gets more difficult we can throw it to them.

Councilmember Bassemier: I've got a question, that 3537 –

Troy Tornatta: Hit that mic, Ed.

Councilmember Bassemier: I'm sorry. 3537, how did you all come up with that figure?

Darren Stearns: Darren Stearns, assistant general manager for SMG. That's based on the CPI as well, so we did not have the number, so if the CPI is zero, then it will go back to zero. It's increased by the CPI.

Councilmember Lloyd: Right now that's three percent, is what it's showing in the budget book.

Troy Tornatta: Okay, this is not the CPI, the CPI is like negative 9 or 97, something of that nature.

Councilman Sutton: Of course it depends on which, I mean, there's two or three different measures on CPI, so just which one you –

Troy Tornatta: Right, the index that most people go by is a negative this year and I think in all the contracts it agrees not to go backwards, but it will not move forward.

Councilmember Lloyd: I mean, other than that, this budget is flat. Good job.

President Shetler: Alright, any other questions, comments?

Councilmember Kiefer: I was just getting an idea on projections for revenue for 2010, does it look like it's going to be a good year or –

Troy Tornatta: I did ask Darren that, but let him kind of explain what he sees.

Darren Stearns: Right now we're not seeing anything major. We do have a few concerns, of course, with the hotel next door and depending on if that's going to be closed any time in the future, how that might affect some of the events that we'll

have there. It has kind of showed down this last quarter of this year. The first quarter was very good actually for The Centre, which was surprising to us, but it's kind of slowed down and we're hoping the last quarter is going to pick up. We have actually quite a bit more shows than we do normally in the last quarter for this next quarter. We're holding out on our Christmas parties, of course, as well, corporate Christmas parties will have a lot to do with the December month.

Councilmember Kiefer: That's why I asked the question because knowing the stadium project is going to be underway, how that was going to affect your 2010 revenue budget.

Darren Stearns: We're not real sure yet. None of the groups that we have scheduled for next year have cancelled. We did have a convention that we had bid on that has decided to go somewhere else just because they were concerned about the hotel and when they would be closed and the number of hotel rooms. But we haven't heard anything since then about any of the things that we have already on the books for 2010.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay, thank you.

Darren Stearns: Sure.

Troy Tornatta: I think one thing that we got ahead on was to talk to all the people at the Executive Inn that had contracts and we made those contracts work as much as possible at The Centre, and we tried to pick up that business. So we did see a bump there. I think we're going to see a decrease in some of this because you can't stay close to the convention center, you will see a decrease but then I think we're going to see a big bump after the stadium is built. So, you know, it's going to be, a be patient matter, but I think once we do, we'll see a nice bump.

President Shetler: What do you have, basically, six laborers there, currently?

Darren Stearns: Yes.

President Shetler: Okay, and are all of those six laborers on the same weekly schedule? Like Monday through Friday?

Darren Stearns: No, they're not.

President Shetler: They're staggered?

Darren Stearns: Yes, they're staggered. We have two that are Monday through Friday, seven to three, we have two that are Wednesday through Sunday, three p.m. to eleven p.m., and then we have two others that are Tuesday through Saturday seven to three.

President Shetler: Are you able to, if you have a couple of big weekend things coming up and know it's going to be real light Monday and Tuesday, for example, are you able to shift that schedule around pretty much?

Darren Stearns: My understanding is, I think there has to be a two week notice before you can move their schedule, --



President Shetler: But you usually have that by then, anyway.

Darren Stearns: Yeah, but then they have to stay on that schedule for a certain time frame, so the way I understand it is, you can't move them and then move them back the next week.

President Shetler: Do they need to work in pairs when they're working?

Darren Stearns: Per the contract, yes.

President Shetler: I'm just trying to think from a management perspective if there were ways to keep that overtime cost down and, obviously, you've been looking at that anyway. Alright, thank you. Any other questions, comments? Next, the Superintendent of County Buildings.

Councilman Sutton: Before we get too far away, back on The Centre, from a maintenance and repair standpoint, is there, where do we stand on The Centre?

Troy Tornatta: Right now, we've been putting roughly a million dollars into The Centre for maintenance and repair and add-ons and things that bring it up to date. And we've been pretty diligent to keep that going, and that's through the Building Authority. And so we'll get a capital improvement budget on The Centre. We'd be happy to pass that along if you want to look at it at any time. But it talks about if they say they need new microphone boxes, if they need new curtains, you know, replace part of the stage, try and upgrade the orchestra pit or window valances, or whatever they need, they put that in that capital improvement fund. A lot of it's electronic, getting the place constantly up to speed with what goes on.

Councilman Sutton: Well, I mean, I saw some pretty extensive projects here of recent on the exterior, don't know exactly all of what was going on, some of it was more landscaping type of things, but there was a lot of tearing out so I'm just trying to get an idea if those are the types of, if we're just beginning to level out, let's put it that way on the maintenance, the larger repair items or if there is some things that are kind of planned, coming up here.

Troy Tornatta: Darren, do you want to speak to that?

Darren Stearns: I think we are leveling off. I saw a lot of the CIP projects is, like he had mentioned, electrical, mics, pipe and drape, things that are revenue sources for The Centre now. Instead of having to go out and contract it out and bring it in, we actually have it in-house. But yeah, I think the majority, we just had the new cooling tower replaced last week, as some of you might know, but most of the major items that we've been coming up with are basically up to code that we know of. A lot of the things that we're getting now are just some of the smaller things that we could use as revenue sources, the monitors for the LCD monitors, replaced all the white boards. Those of you that's been in there before and it's been written on boards, that's what we have the LCD monitors for, for the meetings themselves. So I think we're rounding it into shape.

Councilmember Kiefer: One final question, in regards to the utilities, I believe the, like the Civic Center, we buy gas on the – we're able to use the NYMEX and fix our gas cost during, like right now, I think, natural gas is trading at a much lower cost than it will be come December, so we're able to do some future trading and things

like that, lock in through ProLiance and groups like that. Are you doing the same thing at The Centre or is that just, they're paying whatever Vectren's utility bill is?

Troy Tornatta: That would probably be a Dave Rector question.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay.

Troy Tornatta: Yeah, he would take care of that. We've got about \$8,000 left in that line item today.

Darren Stearns: Well, actually, utilities are paid out of a different fund than this budget, I think, the Convention Centre Fund budget, and actually, the numbers for gas are given to us from Dave Rector, because it is negotiated with the rest of the county.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay, that's all I was wanting to check on. I was looking ahead to the Operating Fund there, where it talks about utilities.

President Shetler: Alright, any other questions, comments?

### ***SUPERINTENDENT OF COUNTY BUILDINGS***

President Shetler: Superintendent of County Buildings. That would be page 83.

Troy Tornatta: Joe, I gave you a wrong number, I was on the Superintendent of County Buildings page. We have \$8,000 left in that line item on the utilities, so, sorry about that.

President Shetler: What kind of occupancy do we have in the Old Courthouse right now?

Marissa Nichoalds: I think we're probably still right around 40 or 50 percent. I know since the Commissioners signed the contract with Tucker back in June, we've gotten three new tenants since then.

Troy Tornatta: And we retained the rest, which is half the battle, right?

President Shetler: You know, I've been by several times but right now, I don't recall. The parking situation, has that ever been, because I know Dave Rector has had several different plans on that and we've discussed it for years.

Troy Tornatta: I've not seen a parking schematic, I know at one point they were going to look to do that. I think that our main focus right now is to see if we can develop the 35,000 square feet to the side of us and above us or below us on the second and third floor of the old jail. We want to make sure that whatever we do with that space, it's up, ready to go.

President Shetler: Any questions or comments? Thank you.

### ***VETERANS ADMINISTRATION***

President Shetler: Next, Veterans Administration. It's page 72.

Troy Tornatta: Any questions?

Councilmember Lloyd: I mean, this budget is only up \$269.

President Shetler: Yeah, I mean, Mark keeps it that way. In fact, they, in-house, he's actually doing a little bit more surveillance around the place and he's taking care of that, so, I mean, we've got a dedicated employee over there.

Councilmember Lloyd: The burial allowance, it looks like we're low on what we've expended in '09. That's 3060, I mean, we budgeted 40,000, so that may be a little high, but obviously, you don't want to have a big increase in use of that.

President Shetler: Did we increase that rate?

Troy Tornatta: I think we're going, I think that's a rate from the state, isn't it?

Councilmember Raben: One hundred dollars.

President Shetler: It's how much, again?

Councilmember Raben: One hundred dollars.

President Shetler: Any questions or comments?

### ***COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE***

President Shetler: Next, Co-op.

Troy Tornatta: Cooperative Extension. Just real quick, I really put their board to work trying to make sure that they had a place that was going to be fitting for the Cooperative Extension. Councilman Raben has, and it's in his district and he was working with them and with me to make sure that we had a good place for that group out there. We also wanted to work with Darmstadt, the town, and make sure that that was going to be a town that was going to keep rolling because they had people out in the area, (inaudible) as we've talked with them. What we've tentatively come up with is an agreement, the board president has signed an agreement, if conditions are met, they would like to stay in that area. The cost of staying in that area would stay the same from last year. It would not go up because the contract would have other (inaudible), so we feel like this is a win-win for both parties. If the conditions are met from the board of the Purdue Extension, we feel like we're going to have a place for the next three years that's going to be fitting for them. So hopefully everything works out with that and we're able to come up with a contract, then we'd do that before the end of next month.

Councilman Sutton: So are you saying that it's going to be in a different location than the –

Troy Tornatta: It will be the same location, but we'd keep the same rental rate as long as conditions are met from the board. They want to see some compliance and some code upgrades, and as long as they see that, they will recommend that we sign a contract.

President Shetler: So a continuation with the same lease for another three years with some improvements?

Troy Tornatta: Yes.

President Shetler: Any questions or comments?

Councilman Sutton: That's probably an example of an office where I know we talked about bringing them back in, trying to use the Old Courthouse or somewhere within this complex here, where they were here at one point in time. And given the nature of what they do, it does make a lot more sense to be in a location where they are close to the 4-H Center since a lot of what they do are rural related programs. They do, of course, a lot of school programs, as well, but I know this has been an issue just trying to find a suitable location for them. So I think they are pleased with their present location. They would like a little bit more space, but sometimes you have to move one way to get what you want.

Troy Tornatta: Exactly. And Susan Plassmeier, the director, out there and I are going to make a trip to Purdue at some point and just find out what their future plans are. And if there's any opportunities for us to partner with them, maybe they get on the 4-H Center grounds or another place that the county would own and make it more of a laboratory for what they do, general gardeners, trees, plants, home economics, that type of thing, that might even be a better situation. But we're ecstatic to be able to do this right now in Darmstadt, and we'll stay here as long as we're welcome and helping out.

President Shetler: Alright, thank you.

Troy Tornatta: Contractual Services, just real quick, I think it raised like \$316, and that's only in compliance with the 4-H Center. I did get a commitment from Susan that if the Office Supplies went up \$500, if we could just make sure the Contractual Services are there, they can probably try and save their pencils and use them extra to save the \$500 in the supplies line item. But that's their olive branch.

President Shetler: Anything else?

Councilman Sutton: Is that a maintenance agreement on 3370, that Computer (Data Management) or is that equipment?

Troy Tornatta: Royce, what page is that?

Councilman Sutton: That's page 67, and the line is 3370, Computer (Data Management).

Troy Tornatta: I believe that's their agreement with Purdue. They have a T-1 line and a computer agreement with Purdue.

Councilman Sutton: Thank you.

President Shetler: Anything else? Troy, are you going to be handling County Highway garage or Chris or...?

### **911 EMERGENCY SERVICE**

Troy Tornatta: Yeah, Chris. Do you want to do 911 Emergency Service real quick? Oh, you did that? Okay. Where did they come up? Did we say anything about the Reverse 911? I know it was requested at 100,000, but much like last year, I think we have 100,000 in that account, I don't really know if we'll have a need for 200,000 in that account.

President Shetler: Page 173.

Troy Tornatta: You budgeted \$100,000 last year in 911. We actually got a grant from the federal government so now we're looking to implement this but at the same time, if there's \$100,000 in there, I don't know why we'd throw another 100,000 at it.

Councilmember Raben: We can always throw it in later if need be.

Troy Tornatta: I don't think that's going to be an issue on that one.

### **HIGHWAY**

Troy Tornatta: Highway garage?

President Shetler: Highway garage, we're at 114. Have we gone back to the eight hour day?

Troy Tornatta: It should start in November.

President Shetler: In November?

Troy Tornatta: Uh-huh.

President Shetler: I thought we were trying to work at getting that back a little sooner.

Troy Tornatta: Well, November, in my estimation makes more sense because we still have warm days in October. November starts where you get the cool days, it starts to really taper off on the sunlight as well.

Chris Walsh: We should still be paving on into October.

Troy Tornatta: And this was something that, actually the November date was negotiated with Mike Duckworth at the time. He believed that that was a better date right before – I believe we were talking to do it before election day and then come after a major holiday. And that was trying to make it compensable with the other salaries.

President Shetler: How do we reconcile the holiday pay when it's, you know, everybody else is getting eight hours and then that group is getting ten hours, I guess.

Troy Tornatta: Well, over the course of the year, what we did is, we figured out with the union representatives and with Mike Duckworth and with their liaison, to find out

what the total number of days or hours that they would be shy of maybe a standard employee in the Civic Center. And what we found was we'd be looking at about sixteen hours shy and so what we've implemented is a training, sixteen hour long or eight two hour, depending on what the training cycle is, if it's thirty minutes, whatever they train on, they get credit for that amount of training. They're going to have that training, it's going to be two-fold. The first fold is going to be, obviously, we're going to make them better prepared to do their job; the second fold is they need to do the training to make up the hours for those days that we believe were deficient. And so far, it's been good, they've set up training sessions, they put that in a folder. We're looking to, right now, put that on a computer so that they'll have their training on computer with LTAP or all the associated training, INDOT, if they have training on computer, we'll send that down, they go through the form, they sign up for the training, they check it off, it's in their file and they have to have sixteen hours.

President Shetler: So they're doing that outside of the forty hour work week?

Troy Tornatta: Yes.

Chris Walsh: It's going to be a take home, and that's just in with the other training that we're doing. This particular training is just to address that sixteen hour issue.

President Shetler: I'm not necessarily speaking of just the guys that are within the bargaining groups, I'm also speaking of the, you know, management and others. And I know we've got Labor Day coming up, you've got Veterans Day, you have different ones that fall in the fall between now and, you know, election time and so, I didn't know what –

Troy Tornatta: We looked at those hours and we were able to get it to the sixteen hours by implementing the timing that we were talking about. I think it's the first full week after October 31<sup>st</sup> and then the last week after April 10<sup>th</sup> or something of that nature. We've got it written down. So we have to send something to the Teamsters thirty days ahead of time, so we're reviewing what those days are, rechecking our numbers, making sure that we're where we need to be. But as far as that goes, I think we've found a process that will work to get them the hours that we believe they need to make up.

President Shetler: Since most holidays, I guess, kind of fall on Mondays, would it make sense to negotiate that work week to go from Tuesday to Friday as opposed to Monday through Thursday and then that would have saved us on that?

Troy Tornatta: We actually threw out several ideas as far as how to tweak that. It came down to numbers and our numbers showed that at a time when we go from eight hours to ten hours, if we do it in the manner that we're proposing, we think it all works out no matter what. How we've had it the entire year, it does skew the numbers, there's no question about it. And that's what we look at. Where are the holidays, how does it work, how can we best fit them into a diagram that would match what our other employees are doing. And I think this has been the best opportunity and it works with not only the Teamsters representation, but the employees. And we don't want to jack with their schedules a whole lot. I mean, to find daycare, to find people to pick up their kids after school, and whatnot, we want to be able to work with those employees and not put them in a position where they're constantly changing back.

President Shetler: I'm not talking about changing week after week, I'm talking about that you establish from the get go, that they're going to be working Tuesday to Friday as opposed to working from Monday to Thursday. I mean, instead of Friday being the day off, Monday is the day off. And then you avoid the holiday pay altogether.

Troy Tornatta: We'll revisit it. I think just how we looked at it originally, it was more balanced.

Chris Walsh: On the other side of that, though, I did run some numbers on what some of the potential savings might have been. And, you know, with the price of gasoline fluctuating, I think what you have to look at is the gallon usage of your diesel and your gas. And potentially, these are preliminary numbers, we think we're saving in the neighborhood of around 48 to \$49,000 so far as opposed to last year at this time. It was started late in the year and it's kind of hard to come up with a good measuring stick for it, but we feel like in that – now on the therm usage and the electric usage on the building, it looks like it's about a wash. It doesn't look like it's –

President Shetler: What about overtime?

Chris Walsh: The overtime, I'd have to get back with you.

President Shetler: I mean, because when you get into having to call in people on Fridays and all that kind of stuff.

Chris Walsh: Our overtime is so weather related, it's kind of hard to do depending on, you know –

Troy Tornatta: And getting back to your point, I do want to mention this, getting back to your point, any time that there is a county holiday, they get the next day, so if it is a Monday holiday and they're not there, they're going to get Monday and Tuesday off. So that's kind of...

Councilmember Lloyd: Mr. President, I mean, on the overtime, I think it's going to turn out to be quite a bit higher at least based on the budget figures. In '08 we had 61,324 for the whole year, and halfway through the year we've got 42,709, so the ten hour days, it may just generate more overtime because you're having to call people in for things.

President Shetler: Do you stagger your employees at all so that some of them have to begin their work days on Wednesdays?

Chris Walsh: We do have some staggering. We have a second shift doing some maintenance work, which they can also go out and take care of some of the minor call-ins that we have, but if it's a major call and a tree is down, something of that nature, then we do have to call people in.

President Shetler: Rather than just actual shift, do you have any that actually begin their work week on say Wednesday and then go through to Sunday, or anything like that?

Chris Walsh: No, our work week is Monday through Thursday or –

President Shetler: Have you explored that as a possibility? Because I'm thinking, I mean, somehow these tornadoes don't know what day of the week it is, you know. So I'm just wondering if we did that, you know, for snow and ice and everything else that does come up, we'd at least have some people there during the weekend that would help keep down the overtime.

Troy Tornatta: And we can talk with the Teamsters about that. I just don't know what we'd be getting into at this point with their contract. But, I mean, we're open to do that.

President Shetler: How much is left on that contract?

Troy Tornatta: I think we just signed it last year.

President Shetler: So two years?

Troy Tornatta: Uh-huh.

President Shetler: Alright, thank you. Other questions? Comments?

Troy Tornatta: The one thing, let me mention this, and this is from Duckworth and I've talked to Chris just the same, the one thing that we do see out of these extended days, our tickets that are accomplished are sometimes two-fold of what we do in an average day. We're knocking a lot of stuff out and so that extra two hours, the one thing we can calculate because we can give you the claims, and when I talked to Mike before Chris took the job, he said the amount of tickets that we knocked out were far and away more than they have in their pre-eight hour days when they have longer days. So I don't know what that measure is and what that means, but I know it means a lot less on the complaint side and we are taking care of our citizens and that's why we have them out there.

Councilmember Raben: The crew is already out, the equipment is out, we're saving that drive time, that's the biggest difference.

President Shetler: Alright. Thank you. Any other questions? Comments? Yes, Mike?

Councilmember Goebel: This is on, I guess, preparation for the winter coming up. On 2530, am I jumping too far ahead here? Bituminous Materials, I think it's obvious we must stockpile and carry that over, because '06 we spent \$11,000, '07 we spent \$420,000, '08 we spent 34,000, and what is the situation right now? We've got a request for 80,000?

Chris Walsh: Bituminous Materials is a commodity that is actually ordered 24 hours in advance and they actually make it for us. And it's an oil driven commodity, so the cost does fluctuate. We've been pretty lucky this year, we haven't had much fluctuation in the price. Last year, I know there was quite a bit of fluctuation with it. So it's something that I have to order. To use on Wednesday, I have to order on Tuesday.

Councilmember Goebel: Okay, so you don't stockpile any of those materials?



Chris Walsh: Not able to really. There is a portion of it for pothole patching that's more of a temporary material. Now we will stockpile some of that in the winter months with the snow plows and when have potholes to address. But for the most part, we don't --

Councilmember Goebel: So that huge year just reflected the increase in the oil price and the asphalt?

Chris Walsh: Yes, Sir.

Councilmember Goebel: As far as Calcium & Chloride, 2580, similar, \$495,000 last year compared to 100,000 in '07. Do we have ample supplies?

Troy Tornatta: The price back then was right around 25 to \$35 per ton. Last year it got up to \$141 per ton. We actually bought at 125 on a deal. What we lobbied is to have the state put out the QPA for the materials. We were able to get that passed through the legislature and now we're looking at sixty to sixty-seven dollars per ton that we can buy it and have it delivered. So it's more than what it used to be, but, I mean, those are going to be the rates that I think we're going to see.

Councilmember Goebel: Do you intend to purchase more yet this particular year?

Troy Tornatta: We have a contract between 1,500, I think, and 2,500 ton. Anywhere in between there, we can get as much or as little as those numbers and they will add to what we have now, which 1,500 ton will be about 3,000 ton and it goes up from there.

Councilmember Goebel: For how long is that contract with the state?

Troy Tornatta: It will be a one year contract they'll go through. My anticipation is, they will do it, they bid it out every year. They will go through and bid it out again. If that's a successful bid and we want to get on their bid, we'll tell them what we expect, a min and a max, and then we'll get into the line for purchasing.

Councilmember Goebel: That's obviously more reasonable, thank you.

Troy Tornatta: We also have addressed the gas consumption with our Sheriff's department and other entities and have been locked down, I think the number was a buck, seventy-one this year, Bill, if I'm somewhere in that. So we did a good thing for the county. We saved thousands of dollars and we hope that we can also look to do that again next year to keep that budget so we know where it is and it won't be fluctuating like it has in the past.

President Shetler: Other questions or comments?

Councilmember Bassemier: I've got one. I noticed you have Equipment Lease & Rental in there, a zero in, in the future, now, we're talking about, of course, 2010, are you saying your equipment is all in good shape? You don't need any new equipment or...

Chris Walsh: We definitely could use more new equipment. I'm starting a more aggressive preventive maintenance program to extend the life of what we do have, but I know a gradall has been brought up in years past and, you know, I don't know

what the answer is with the funding. But that's definitely going to have to be addressed in the future at some point.

Councilmember Bassemier: From talking to some of your county employees, they're telling me you need a gradall pretty bad.

Chris Walsh: Yeah, and we haven't had a front line truck, a tandem axle in about three years. And if you have, say, eleven front line trucks, if you're not rotating that in, say, one a year, to keep every ten years, you know, have the fleet turned over, you start getting into a situation where I'm forced to do a good thing, which is get a more aggressive preventive maintenance program going, but on the other hand, we do need some new equipment.

Councilmember Bassemier: So you was planning on coming back, probably, in 2010 and ask for upgrades, so you're trying to keep it low now, but –

Chris Walsh: Most definitely. Just trying to work with the situation that we're given for this year.

Troy Tornatta: Do you know what the anticipated number in this budget would be for revenues?

Bill Fluty: County Highway?

Troy Tornatta: Yeah.

Bill Fluty: She'll get that right now, but historically, this budget exceeds the revenue. So it has to be offset by some other funding. Last year it was by COIT dollars, so it doesn't match.

Chris Walsh: One line item that may not be in there would be the job freeze, the line item is 1061, I don't know if that's addressed in this, but that's the one that has affected us for next year. \$41,067.

Councilmember Bassemier: Assistant Mechanic.

Councilmember Lloyd: You mean that position is open right now?

Troy Tornatta: That position is open.

Chris Walsh: Yeah, the position is open.

Councilmember Bassemier: And I understand you need that person.

Chris Walsh: Most definitely. I mean, if we get by this year, not only will I be coming back for equipment next year, I'm going to be coming back for – because we'll stretch to get through to get this done.

Councilmember Bassemier: Yeah, I was talking to one of your mechanics out there and he said definitely, he needs help. He can't do it all.

Bill Fluty: Tom, revenue is about 2,900,000.

President Shetler: So we put out about a million dollars out of COIT or –

Bill Fluty: That's correct.

Councilmember Bassemier: Mr. President, I am a little concerned about their equipment out there. I'm understanding some of it is getting where it's almost unsafe on some of it. Is that –

Troy Tornatta: Why don't we do an assessment, and I'm sure you do that, Chris, but maybe we'll put it on paper and get an age of the equipment and get that to the Council.

Chris Walsh: We're working on that right now and I'd like to put together a three to five year projection of what's going to be needed in the –

Councilmember Bassemier: I know years ago we did that with the Sheriff's department with their cars, it worked out very well. It was a cost savings by staying up with it instead of letting it completely wear out and then trying to get them fixed and whatever. It costs a lot more to go that route.

Chris Walsh: And I can just tell you from my own experience. I've been on the city side and the county side, the county has the most and the best equipment of any department I've ever been in, even though it is old, I mean, the abilities and the things we're able to do is quite a bit. The city calls on us quite a bit for some help.

President Shetler: In addition to that inventory list, if we could maybe get an explanation of what that piece is used for, and about how often it is used, whether that's by miles or hours, and then if there's even the ability to go outside and rent that particular item, and what that cost might be to do that.

Chris Walsh: We can certainly do that.

President Shetler: Any other questions or comments? Thank you.

### ***CUMULATIVE BRIDGE***

President Shetler: Let's see, Bridge Fund? Page 120.

Councilmember Lloyd: On page 121, you've got a \$10,000 increase in concrete and then on the next page, 3520 Equipment Repair, you've got a \$15,000 increase.

Chris Walsh: The Equipment Repair was in lieu of not getting any new equipment, was to keep up with the equipment. The concrete repair was something that I, you know, if you have to zero out or take back to last year's budget, we'll certainly work with that, but what we had in our mind was that I may be able to save John some money doing some small concrete projects with our Bridge crew and I could probably quantify that the savings, once we do a few projects with him as opposed to what it would have been.

Councilmember Raben: This is one account that, when possible, you use this to offset the other side because this is its own levy, so unless we have to, we normally don't –

Troy Tornatta: What's the revenue on this one? It's like...

Bill Fluty: Two million.

Troy Tornatta: Two million?

Bill Fluty: You've had an unappropriated balance in previous years to tap back into.

Troy Tornatta: Right, so real close on this one. And then, is there anything that didn't get done from last year that's going to cross over?

John Stoll: Not really. Basically, the new projects that are shown in the budget were either recommended by the latest bridge inventory book or they're just culverts that we found were in poor condition that were too large for the county crews to replace it so we'll have to put a contract out on doing that work. Other than that, it's pretty much the same projects, same way we've done things in the past.

Councilmember Kiefer: Question? John, when you guys do bridge inspections, who does that? Is that an employee or do you contract that out?

John Stoll: That's contracted out. You have to be INDOT certified to do those inspections. We don't have anybody to do that. In fact, INDOT keeps adding more and more regulations that inspectors have to comply with. The previous inspections have been done by, the last two inspections were done by Beam, Longest and Neff. We'll have to do a new RFP to hire a new consultant next year when the inspection is due again in 2010.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay, thank you.

President Shetler: Any other questions or comments?

### ***LOCAL ROADS & STREETS***

President Shetler: Local Roads & Streets, page 136.

Chris Walsh: I may have misspoke, this is the, well...

Councilmember Lloyd: They all look the same, don't they?

Troy Tornatta: One of the things that we are trying to do and I'm not sure if it's in this budget or one of the subsequent budgets, but Chris has been able to find where, instead of replacing the beds that hold the salt and the calcium that normally corrode and eat through those and we have to replace those beds for a pretty good rate, he's been able to find out that he can sandblast those, have those repainted and some of the preventive maintenance he can do while they're messing with the calcium chloride to be able to save these beds for two to three times the normal rate. And so, in that, we think that we'll see hundreds of thousands of dollars in savings for a nominal fee. And I say a nominal fee might be 7 - \$8,000 a year depending on how many beds you want to service. But we have it on a program and he'll get that to you, how we're going to implement and do one or two beds a year, go to the next one and try and make sure that we can get those, and they'll look like brand new when we're done.

Councilmember Lloyd: I see we have a \$15,000 increase in Sand & Gravel and then the other question I would have, Traffic Lights brought to zero. Question on that.

John Stoll: Based on previous encumbrances from year to year plus the number of signals have been dropped out of the county's budget because of annexation, it looks like the encumbrances would take care of the entire budget for next year, so that's why I put that in at zero. It will go up again next year, but it will be less than what we've paid in years past just because we lose probably, I think it's about ten traffic signals through the annexation that was done on the east side.

Councilmember Raben: That probably gets us down below ten, doesn't it?

John Stoll: Probably be right around that.

Councilmember Raben: You know, for the longest time, up until fifteen years ago, we only had one. Mill Road and St. Joe was it.

Troy Tornatta: And if we can help it, we're going to try and utilize as much as possible, roundabouts, to try and keep the signals at a minimum as it is, to try to keep the traffic flow moving forward. So we've addressed that out at the airport area and if it's possible and we have enough land to do it in other areas, we're going to continue that pattern.

Councilmember Lloyd: But Sand & Gravel, you anticipate –

Chris Walsh: Sand & Gravel, we anticipated, if you look at the 2007, it was 70,000, it's been 25, 25. The bottom roads next year are going to have to have quite a bit more attention for these farmers. I think we can get by this season until we hit winter, but starting next year we're going to have to – so we increased that with that in mind that we would have to be down there.

President Shetler: Anything else? Any other comments? Alright. Thank you.

Troy Tornatta: Thank you for your time.

President Shetler: Do we want to take five or keep going?

Councilmember Lloyd: Why don't we take five.

President Shetler: Just make it real quick, though. We're going to take a quick five minute break.

**(TAPE CHANGE)**

### ***HEALTH DEPARTMENT***

President Shetler: We'll go to the Health Department, and then after the Health Department and Dental Clinic we'll go back to, we'll go to the Recorder, because I noticed Z. Tuley is here now.

Gary Heck: Gary Heck, Vanderburgh County Health Department.

President Shetler: Page 128. Okay, anything that you want to point out in the budget that's different from last year? Or areas of concern?

Gary Heck: I think the only increases that we have in any of the 2000, 3000 or 4000 line items was the consumer price index that folks have talked about on the rent. It has been down, but ours is based on whatever it is when they publish it in October for September. Our only caution was we don't know what that figure might be yet. I think we plugged in, I want to say a half of a percent as an increase in the rent, plus to bring it up to what we're actually, you know, would be paying this year. We're certainly comfortable with whatever the Council wants to do on that. I just don't know that there may not be an increase.

Councilmember Lloyd: It's like five percent is what you plugged in.

Gary Heck: I think last year it was flat and we actually did have an increase over what, but we had some encumbrances in the Rent line item which is what allowed us to do that. So, this would actually make up, if it is five percent, then it would be what the true picture would be at our square foot rent for this year, plus a, and I think I used a half a percent increase. So, that's where the difference is. But, everybody, I think, when the Commissioners were reporting the consumer, ours is tied to the All Urban Consumer, which, and our landlord is the Southwestern Mental Health Foundation, or it's Behavioral Health, I think they had a name change. It's set by contract, so it's nothing we can particularly change.

President Shetler: How long a lease is that?

Gary Heck: Well, it's ten years initially, and then two five year options is what I recall.

President Shetler: And we're how far into it?

Gary Heck: We will be there, in September we'll be there five years.

President Shetler: Okay.

Gary Heck: We moved in in October of 2004.

President Shetler: Do you have any remote locations?

Gary Heck: We have the Dental Clinic, and then we have a lease with one of the Housing Authorities for a Fulton Clinic, and that's all in a different budget. None of that comes out of this budget. The Dental Clinic will come out of, when we get to the Dental Clinic budget.

Councilmember Raben: Which raises the question, are we getting anything from the hospitals today?

Gary Heck: We haven't received anything this year. The original grant agreement was for a two year period, and that time has come and gone. There was some discussions with the Commissioners about looking to re-negotiate something. I know the Health Department is working on a fund raising campaign with a lot of the faith based organizations, who initially came to local government with the issue about the need for the dental care. The one, the mailings that we've had so far have just been to a few small, and we have, we've received contributions back from those. But, we're in essence looking at every church there is in Vanderburgh County and making

an appeal. Since we do have clients that come from other counties, we're looking to build that data base within the service area that we have clients that come from and sending an appeal to those churches, too.

Councilmember Kiefer: Question, regarding the rent, I noticed that each year there's a bump in the rent. Is that the way the lease is written?

Gary Heck: It's tied to the Consumer Price Index that is released in October from September. So, yes, it is, it's whatever that increase in the Consumer Price Index is. It's just a standard contract.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay, so it may be less than the 386, then, because as we heard earlier the CPI is not really—

Gary Heck: I think what I said—

Councilmember Kiefer: —I'm sorry, I missed, I was, I apologize, I was delayed and looking at some other things.

Gary Heck: I think the difference is, we need to also have, last year we were able to keep it flat because we had money from the previous year encumbered to our landlord that carried forward, and that's what saved us last year. This year we're actually going to need about \$3,900 to actually pay all the rent, but I'll have that taken care of by December. So, we're going to need some amount of money in there is the answer. Whether it includes a five, a half a percent increase will remain to be seen. But, I can tell you exactly what our, you know, rent for this year is, it's \$384,266.96. So, if it stays the same, that's what I would need in that line item for next year.

President Shetler: We kind of jumped ahead just a little bit on that Dental Clinic, so I'm going to go ahead and continue there for just a, one second. What kind of participation do you, and I'm thinking in the beginning because I was involved a little bit three or four years ago on that, but we were getting some cooperation out of the dental community, the professionals, the dentists themselves, as far as contributing or helping out to some degree on that. Are we still tapping into that resource as a possibility?

Gary Heck: The original commitment from the Dental Society was to serve as a consultant to make sure that when the clinic was up and operational it would be a fully functional clinic. Then, last year they had an untimely death of a local dentist that they choose to honor by dedicating one of the operatories in his name, Dr. Raibley, and, so, they've made some contributions that way. The Dental Society from the get go never committed to financially be involved with it, just to, and they spent countless hours in coming to meetings, giving us advice, and then also soliciting equipment from other dental offices. We were able to actually have four operatories instead of three because of all of the extra dental equipment that was donated that was still, had many years of useful life.

President Shetler: Shortly Legal Aid is going to be coming up here, and, basically, they are funded because of, you know, largely, at least they got their feet off the ground initially, I think, from their fellow attorneys here in town that saw the need and kind of jumped in there and still to this day contribute fairly handsomely, I guess, for the most part, most attorneys do to the project. I didn't know if that was a resource

that we should tap into more financially rather than just, you know, the consulting that they've been doing.

Gary Heck: I couldn't speak to what the Commissioners or some of the other elected officials have done. I know there's been conversations back and forth. I know the Dental Society has always supported the project. I know last year there was some financial commitments to that, but the other Commissioners would probably have to tell you what their thoughts are on that.

President Shetler: Alright.

Councilmember Sutton: Councilman Shetler, the, in the initial start up phase, that was one of the hopes that we could get the local dentists to support it on a regular basis financially. I mean, that's not something they've ever really committed to, or that's not really happened. They were, as Gary was saying, very generous with being able to help out with the equipment and some of the equipment we were able to receive, otherwise it would have, the cost would have been really exorbitant. But, the First District Dental Society who represents the local dentists here, they have agreed to at least be a conduit of grants, opportunities out there, because there probably hasn't been a stone that hasn't been unturned by Gary, his staff, and many others in trying to find some potential sources of revenue for the clinic. But, the kind of catch 22 has been the sources either they couldn't give it directly to the clinic because it's a government entity, so the First District Dental Society has been making themselves available to do that, but, the resources out there are pretty limited. We've looked on the Federal level, the State level, looked at local foundations in addition to continuing to try to generate some additional interest from the local hospitals. It's an on-going concern, I guess, to that level so that that clinic can receive funding. I don't think there's probably any options that we would say that we aren't open to looking at to try to keep the clinic open. I mean, I don't know if Gary's got the numbers with him, but the number of, the patient levels that we've got there, I mean, it continues to be as fully used as it was the day the doors opened. There are days when the line is out of the building, and it is a very strong program, but trying to get adequate funding has been a challenge for the Dental Clinic.

President Shetler: Alright.

Gary Heck: There's currently over 3,000 active patients, and about 86 percent of those are from Vanderburgh County. So, and they continue to see new patients every month.

President Shetler: Mike?

Councilmember Goebel: I think when Councilman Sutton was originally instrumental in getting this thing established, we established it as a pay as able situation for the clients, is that correct?

Gary Heck: It still is on a sliding fee scale.

Councilmember Goebel: Okay.

Gary Heck: It's still, there is, as I alluded to a little bit earlier in your Personnel and Finance Committee, that the County Attorney did the research for us and we do have a Vanderburgh County established minimum pay rate, and then every other place



other than Vanderburgh County, if you reside any place else it's a slightly higher fee based on that.

Councilmember Goebel: I think, also, it's reduced emergency room visits by some of these very patients, is that not correct?

Gary Heck: Well, it's correct, but how you determine the exact number is always up to debate, I guess, but when the hospitals look at certain codes and they present themselves at an emergency room they can tell if they're there for an oral health related issue or something else. Those are the ones where we believe there has been some substantial number that don't have to go to the emergency room anymore because they're having their real root problem needs met by the Dental Clinic.

Councilmember Goebel: Thank you.

Gary Heck: Yes, Sir.

Councilmember Kiefer: Do you guys get reimbursement from Medicaid?

Gary Heck: If the client is Medicaid eligible and registered, yes, we can. Probably 78 to 79 percent of all the clients are in the lowest sliding fee scale, but if there are, and I would say of those little over 3,000 patients we've probably submitted almost 400 claims to Medicaid/Medicare. So, we knew going in that's a little more than ten percent. Ten percent was, and we think we're probably closer to 15 actually when you get into it, that we could actually do a little better than the ten percent revenues. But, the Dental Clinic, because of the uniqueness of it and that its primary purpose is to take care of adults who have, don't have an option to go anywhere else to get their teeth looked at. If you're a child under the Medicaid/Medicare program, or the Hoosier Healthwise as it's called, they pay a lot for a child when they have a whole life in front of them. When you look at an adult, there's a \$650 cap, unless it's for surgery. To extract teeth can be a surgical procedure, and there can be some charges for that. Otherwise, for the \$650 you're hard pressed to have an exam, x-rays, a cleaning, and then if you need any dental work after that, there's no money to pay for that under that system. So, that's part of the challenge is to, how do you find blended funding streams to make all of this work? We struggle with that, and we keep looking for that, grant opportunities. Councilman Sutton told you once before that when we look at revenue sources, funding and grant opportunities, you either have to be either a 501c3 not-for-profit, not associated with the government, or on the government side of things you have to be a federally qualified health center, like the Echo Community Health. If you're anything other than that, there's not a funding pot of money.

Councilmember Kiefer: Perhaps they can do like the School Corporation has done, they have set up organizations like the Education Foundation or something like that, the Public Education Foundation or something like that to be able to raise the money privately.

Gary Heck: Well, it can be a vehicle through which you have a collaboration and a partnership. Then, just finding the right grant opportunity, to apply and to get the money. Most of your funding sources don't want to pay for operational costs. The one thing that we have been looking for is to have a digital x-ray system. The Dental Clinic will be almost paperless with the accounting system that we have if, but we still have to take x-rays, and if we can get the x-rays converted to where they would go

directly into the patients file that would be a savings, and that would be a one time opportunity. That's, we've been looking and spending most of the time, because that seems to be where there could be some money that could support that. But, we've exhausted ourselves looking for opportunities for additional operating costs. The faith based churches are the next, is our next step. They're the group that originally raised the awareness of the issue and the conscience of the community. So, we're going to ask them to help fill that gap so that we can fill teeth.

Councilmember Bassemier: On page 128 you have one, the Director, that kind of stands out a little bit. It went up \$7,636 and some odd cents. Director of Laboratory.

Gary Heck: Well, I think this is a request we originally submitted that will have to do with part of a job study group that's going to be meeting. I'm not exactly sure why it's included in here other than to say it is a request that we've made for the job study.

Councilmember Lloyd: Job study is going to meet tomorrow and the Health Department is on the agenda to look at those.

Councilmember Bassemier: Okay, thank you, Russ.

Councilmember Lloyd: Based on the retirement of Mr. Elder and the reorganizing those other jobs.

Councilmember Bassemier: Okay.

Gary Heck: Any other questions? I know that you all asked for our revenue, we've provided you a ten year revenue trend study. Hopefully, that has helped. I know Dr. Nick would like to take just a moment to tell you a little bit about the wellness program we have and also address some of the concerns, there was a question about the smoking and your health insurance. I know the Health Department studied this with the county's insurance consultant, and the answer we received, now this isn't from an attorney at this point, but the answer from the insurance consultant was if the county were to change their policy, that basically said every employee would pay a higher rate than what we're currently paying, and then if you met these conditions you would receive a benefit back. If you smoked you wouldn't be eligible to receive them because that would be something that they can prove raises health costs. You can't turn it around the other way and say if you smoke we're going to charge you more, but you can charge everybody the same and then give discounts for behavior that saves the county money. One of those is to have a wellness program where if you, and Dr. Nick can tell you about what our program will do and how we've been gearing up to go county-wide with this whenever you all are ready for it.

President Shetler: Alright. Thank you.

Gary Heck: Sure.

Ray Nicholson: I'll try just to sum up a few things. We've been doing a pilot study this past year in the Health Department. We wanted to see how it worked as far as wellness was concerned and whether we could make an impact on our own employees before bringing it over to the Civic Center. It basically is based on five parameters; smoking, hypertension, blood sugar, which is, of course, diabetes, cholesterol, which is hyperlipidemia, and then our body mass index, which is weight. So, we've been doing this with our own employees and we hope to have the study

completed by the first of the year. If it looks like we've been successful in bringing some of these figures down with the Health Department group, we'll see what we can do about the, transferring that to some sort of program for the Civic Center here. That's basically it. I think it would affect insurance rates, and it would probably make a lot of difference. I would be glad to answer any questions.

President Shetler: Anybody have any questions?

Councilmember Sutton: So, Dr. Nicholson, are you talking about monitoring those, or are you talking about education programs that would be geared toward more healthful living to address those five different points? What would be done that would move employees toward improving in those areas?

Ray Nicholson: Well, basically, right now it's been an educational process with our people. Our educational department has been working with them and trying to instruct in weight reduction and so forth. They're, very briefly, you may not know this, but, at any age, it doesn't matter you can pick out a one year old, a ten year old, a 50 year old, it doesn't make a bit of difference, the five major reasons why people die at any age has nothing to do with disease or anything else, it has to do with lifestyle, how we live our life. How fast we drive our cars, whether you use seat belts or not, whether we have regular check ups, whether we keep our weight controlled, what we eat. The five causes of death at any age is our own lifestyle. If we want to reduce the health costs over the country, that's what has to be emphasized. So, that's what, the kind of thing that we're doing. Councilman Sutton, I don't know exactly all the things that Mary Jo Borowiecki has been doing, but she's been working with this group trying to get weight reduction and so forth. We had some incentives for that. How much of that we would try to arrange with the Civic Center, we don't know yet.

Councilmember Sutton: Well, we were talking about this, I guess, at our last regular Council meeting, and I was just making mention of just that importance as we talked about trying to bring down—

Ray Nicholson: Yeah.

Councilmember Sutton: —health insurance costs upon the county. That's really where it starts is finding a way to get us to quit eating as much, smoking as much, reducing stress, and exercising more. So, just—

Ray Nicholson: All those things, yeah.

Councilmember Sutton: —trying to find a way to, just trying to see what kind of things you're looking at if you're going to expand this from a pilot to a county-wide program, what things will be made available to employees that want to take advantage of this.

Ray Nicholson: I think that weight reduction is probably the most important thing. It's the major cause of an epidemic of Type 2 diabetes. I mean, that's the basis of almost everything. If you get the weight down...I heard of a program at St. Mary's yesterday on bariatric surgery, and it is just absolutely amazing where people that weighed 350 to 400 pounds taking 8, 10, 12 medications and so forth, you know, took off 200 pounds and didn't take a single medicine. Their diabetes was cured, their hypertension was cured. It's just absolutely amazing. Those kinds of programs would have to be put into place.

Gary Heck: The program is called "Know Your Five to Stay Alive". It goes back to staying within those accepted parameters. So, if an individual's blood pressure should be between whatever it is, let's say 110 and 70, then they get a baseline measurement, if it's outside those parameters they would work with you to get it to that. It could be controlled by medication. As Doctor said, when you're looking at the behavioral changes, what a lot of this is all about, and it's balancing, it's whether you do the right amount of exercise, you eat the right kinds of food, and Mary Jo's program and our health education program is to give you that education and support and then the constant little encouragement to try to meet those goals. Then, once you achieve the goals is when you start seeing the incentives, and that could be in the county's insurance program perhaps, when you get to that.

Ray Nicholson: The most successful programs have been where you've had incentives where you've had departments vying against another department as to who could lose the most weight, things like this. That usually works. We would have to be kind of innovative as to what kind of program to do, but it's very important and it should bring down your insurance rates.

Councilmember Raben: Okay.

Ray Nicholson: I would like to say a little bit about the H1N1, if I could. The H1N1 flu is going to be a pretty big affair this coming fall. Whether we have an epidemic or not, no one really knows. There's a lot of unknowns, but we do know that we're going to be faced with giving maybe up to 400,000 injections, immunizations here. It's going to take a lot of people to do that. We're going to be very, very short of nurses. We've already informed our people that all vacations may have to be cancelled and held off because of the need for the shortage. But, what I wanted to tell you all is we're having a town hall meeting a week from today. The town hall meeting is at Central Library, the Browning Room A and B, 9:30 to 11:30, and then a second one from 2:00 to 4:00, next Wednesday. Then, will be one in the evening on Thursday, August the 27<sup>th</sup> at the Deaconess Johnson Hall from 6:30 to 8:30. I don't know whether you all have received notices on this or not, but the press releases went out yesterday, and notices to the departments went out. We're gearing up for that. Did all of you receive this communication that I gave Commissioner Tornatta, about what the Civic Center employees should do and so forth? Did you all receive that? Okay. Because if not, we were going to be sure you get those as well, we'll e-mail those to you.

President Shetler: Let me clarify a point, did you say that there's 400,000?

Ray Nicholson: Yeah, potential shots that we have to give.

President Shetler: Is that the same vaccine?

Ray Nicholson: No.

President Shetler: I mean, that's a variety of different ones?

Ray Nicholson: We're going to have to give the regular human, traditional influenza injections this fall. The H1N1 has actually been manufactured, there's a lot of it that will be coming on to the market, but studies have not been done yet. It's not been released. Everything points to the fact that you're going to have to have two injections. So, we're talking about three injections for our population.

Councilmember Sutton: So, are you just talking about Vanderburgh County?

Ray Nicholson: Yeah, Vanderburgh County.

Councilmember Sutton: I mean, our population is 168,000 roughly.

Gary Heck: It's about 174 by the charts we have.

President Shetler: Right.

Gary Heck: But, anybody over six months of age, and if they have to get two of the H1N1, then you can do the math, that's going to be close to 350,000.

President Shetler: Well, when you said 400, that's why I started adding up...we're getting all of these outsiders coming in again? What's going on?

Gary Heck: No, when you look at the seasonal flu, pneumonia, and some of the other traditional shots that other residents would normally take, now, that's not assuming that every person gets every one possible, but you can see it still would be a major undertaking.

President Shetler: Is the two shots within 21 or 28 days of each other?

Ray Nicholson: Within 21 days. Every shot has to be accounted for. We have to put this into a computer, we have to account for every injection.

President Shetler: The, what's, just, I don't want to beat a dead horse here or anything, but let's go back to that, the pricing structure and fee structure that we're able to charge. When people come in from out of the county, is there, is that, do we differentiate between....I mean, I know we talked about that earlier that we don't necessarily now, but we are able to?

Ray Nicholson: No, the, by law, the H1N1 will be provided by the Federal government. We cannot charge anyone—

President Shetler: So, there can be no administration fee?

Ray Nicholson: Yeah, and they're even supplying the syringes and needles and so forth. We cannot charge any administration fee at all. So, there will be no administration fee for any of it. It will all be free. We're glad to provide that service.

Gary Heck: I know, at this point, they've talked about the vaccine, and we're getting the rest of the guidance, and, until...and it's a constantly moving guidance as you may suspect, because they're, they'll be smarter tomorrow than they are today. So, everything they give you is interim, and when they know a little more they give you additional information that can change some of what you're preparing to do. But, the bottom line is, if everybody over six months has to be offered that opportunity, it's going to be a major undertaking. It was a discussion point at the Board of Health meeting last week where the Board of Health was concerned about the one vacancy in the Public Health Nurses that we have that was funding the accrued payment buyout, and they wanted Dr. Nick to just explain to you today that we may be looking at a way to get some additional help. The money that we, the Federal government is channeling some money to the county to help pay for this, and there's a two phase payment that we're aware of right now. We're not sure that that would come

anywhere near to covering the actual cost of what that would be. We've shared that with the county officials, the money that we are anticipating receiving but we're going to know more tomorrow than we do today. We'll keep you informed of that. But, they were really concerned about the Public Health Nurse and that we may want to ask to see what we can do to potentially get that person hired sooner than later.

Ray Nicholson: We cannot do the job with the nurses that we have. We will have to hire outside nurses. When you hire outside nurses, it's much more expensive than when you're paying your own people for this. So, it's kind of essential that we have all of the nurses that we need. It's, we've calculated out how much it would take. For example, if you send five teams out the same day, and had two nurses with each team, and it would take that, in order for us to immunize all...we're going to have to go to 60 schools, businesses, it's going to be a very large undertaking.

President Shetler: Could we, have you had discussions like with the School Corporation and working with their school nurses? I don't know, do they still have them?

Ray Nicholson: They don't have any.

President Shetler: They dropped them out, didn't they, in that budget?

Gary Heck: They don't have full time, but they do have some, and we are in discussions with all of that. Part of the reason, part of this was the initial guidance that they had to be an RN or a physician were the only ones who could vaccinate.

Councilmember Raben: You know, I might interject something. We've actually got this room until 12:00 today. I don't whether or not anybody is scheduled to come in here after us or not, but we probably need to continue this discussion, because it's very important, but we've got about a third of our agenda to do yet today. If you want to stick around, anybody that can stick around afterwards that wants to hear more, you know, that would be great, but, for right now, I think we have to get back on track here with our budget.

Ray Nicholson: I just wanted you to know about the town meeting.

President Shetler: Alright. Thank you.

Gary Heck: Thank you, everyone.

## **RECORDER**

President Shetler: Let's go up to the Recorder. Anybody have any questions? That would be on page 12. Anything new, Z, to add?

Z Tuley: Z Tuley, Vanderburgh County Recorder. I apologize for being late this morning. I ran into the Convention and Visitors Bureau and got all fired up about trying to influence the Recorder's Association on an upcoming conference to be held here in Evansville. If we can, if I have that influence over the association, they're really pushing for it, and I'm sorry, I got all wrapped up. I know you can't believe I was out talking, but, that's what it was.

President Shetler: Alright, thank you. Anybody have any questions? Yes, Councilman Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Good morning.

Z Tuley: Good morning.

Councilmember Lloyd: I did receive your e-mail about the emergency replacement employee, and if this was a situation in the private sector they would be looking at ways to reduce head counts in your office due to your volumes being down by a tremendous amount. So, I mean, in my opinion, I'm not sure, I mean, I don't feel you need to replace that employee. I mean, that's something that the county needs to look at. We're always looking at our headcount, and this body has really questioned the Vanderburgh County Assessor about when he had employees come in from the townships, looking at ways to make things efficient. So, when your recording numbers are down 70-75 percent, I guess, I would question why you would need that employee, and if you would be able to re-organize your office without that one employee being replaced?

Z Tuley: I can pull the previous year's numbers, but we are up from January. Having started a project, which we are in a current contractual agreement with Phoenix, and for phase two we are looking at a second contractual agreement. The staff cannot keep up with the amount of workload that they are producing. This is a very vital project in the preservation and retention of records to get them online so that we have more people who are able to retrieve public records through the Internet, and to make it more accessible. Not just that, but the best way to preserve and retain records is to get people's hands off of them, in a physical sense, not a literal sense. Well, that is literal, but when they are coming in with the Purell on their hands for sanitation and they've got lotion on their hands because it's wintertime and they're going through our records, the paper is deteriorating. I've been gathering some estimates on the repair and restoration of some books that have crumbling pages and the pages are falling apart and they're wrinkled, and they continue to get wrinkled with usage. So, I need these records to be online so that the abstractors and the general public quits touching them. The only way to do that is to get it online, and going through the process that I'm doing. We also have about 16 books I believe it is that have termite damage. Once these records are lost, they are lost. It's not just the record itself, but it's history that is gone. There are pages that are ate up, and there are lines missing, or part of a line missing, and that is the battle. We are trying to not move too quickly, but at a responsible speed, so that what we are paying the Phoenix team to produce, the staff in return can do the verification process, which should be held accountable by Vanderburgh County employees and not necessarily a company. We could hire them to do both, but then that would be a lot of money. I don't want to spend so much money that I have so much money going out that's not being brought in on a monthly basis through the fees that I collect. I'm trying to find a decent balance.

President Shetler: Councilman, you alluded to the fact that it's about 70 percent less, do you have the numbers from the last couple of years? And what we're basically averaging today?

Z Tuley: I sent out the numbers.

Councilmember Lloyd: Right.

President Shetler: That's just for this year. I think we've got some numbers from the past couple of years that might—

Councilmember Lloyd: Well, the first six months, or, no, the first seven months, I guess, this year approximately, new recordings, approximately 20,556, does that sound right?

Z Tuley: I don't have that document in front of me, but it sounds right.

Councilmember Lloyd: Okay, then in 2008 approximately 84,040, that would be 75 percent lower in 2009.

Z Tuley: Where were these numbers obtained from, might I ask? I mean, I'm happy to verify the numbers.

Councilmember Lloyd: Either the Vanderburgh County Treasurer or the Vanderburgh County Auditor, one or the other. The Phoenix Imaging, is that something that has been contracted since you've been the Recorder?

Z Tuley: Correct.

Councilmember Lloyd: Or is that something that you inherited? That's new?

Z Tuley: Yes, because the previous Recorder had contracted to have the images scanned, now you have to go through the second part of the process. Once they are scanned, then they have to be put into a search engine. So, Phoenix is providing the first step in that search engine, and the staff is supposed to be providing the second step in quality control on the search engine part.

Councilmember Lloyd: Well, and anybody associated with real estate can tell you how difficult an environment it is, and how these recorded deeds would be lower. The, and I think most people would say 2010 is not going to be any better. That's why I would petition that this Council needs to look at not replacing that position.

Z Tuley: Well, previously, in those years, might I add, that there was no project going on. The scanning project was going on, yes, but that's by an outside firm and not internal. Now they have this additional workload.

President Shetler: Okay, we can, I guess we'll take that matter up at a different point in time when we, if you, it's an emergency we have a process to go through on that and talk to Council about that. Is there anything new in this particular budget, and I don't mean to be rushing you along—

Z Tuley: That's fine.

President Shetler: —but it is ten till twelve and I understand that the Parks Department is coming in at twelve.

Z Tuley: The only increase is from the FICA, PERF and step raises. That's it. Everything else is flat lined.

President Shetler: Okay, anybody have any questions?

Councilmember Bassemier: One question real quick.

President Shetler: Yes?



Councilmember Bassemier: Isn't this department pretty well self-supporting? You bring money back to us? I mean—

Z Tuley: Yes, there is a portion of the fees that is kept and retained by the Recorder for the restoration and the retention of the records, and then there is a portion that goes to the Surveyor, and then there is a portion that goes to the General Fund, I believe, there's something called the State Mortgage Fund and the Security I.D. There are four entities that every fee that I collect it's split among.

President Shetler: Okay, anybody else have any questions or comments?

Councilmember Lloyd: Well, I guess, my question would be, do you know roughly what the fees are in '08 versus '09, like through July?

Z Tuley: Yes, I did gather that information. '08 to date, well, I didn't total them because we have them split among the four. How do you want that, the General Fund?

Councilmember Lloyd: Well, any total that's representative.

Z Tuley: Okay, the portion that I keep, in '09 we had \$159,000 collected, and last year in '08, \$152,000 collected. I credit the increase of that \$7,000 based upon what we believe has been the stimulus package that came out from the finance where the \$8,000 home credit, which will expire December 1<sup>st</sup>, I believe, is what I have noted. It expires December 1<sup>st</sup>.

President Shetler: Okay.

Z Tuley: Then, I expect that it may taper off a bit again.

President Shetler: Alright, any other questions, comments? Again, I don't mean to be rushing you along—

Z Tuley: I understand.

President Shetler: —these Park guys are starting to come in here, so we need to...alright, thank you.

Z Tuley: Thank you.

## **LEGAL AID**

President Shetler: Next is Legal Aid. That will be on page 108.

Sue Hartig: Good morning, Sue Hartig, Director of Legal Aid. With me today are three of the attorney board members, Kathy Nestricks, Ted Barron, and Karen Heard. We have tried to keep this a flat line budget. We do have one employee with a step increase, and there are two additional decreases I can give you today that we didn't have any information before. 3140, Telephone, we can cut that back to \$1,200. That's increased a little bit, because for some reason many of our clients have Kentucky cell phones and we have to make long distance calls to call a client back. We can handle that with \$1,200. Malpractice Insurance, we just this week got the malpractice bid for this year. So, I'm always guesstimating a year ahead. So, today's

bill was \$4,269. So, presuming there might be an increase next year, we can safely cut that back to \$4,500.

President Shetler: Can you explain that Kentucky client to me just a minute?

Sue Hartig: No, they are Evansville clients. For some reason they have 270 cell phone numbers. I don't know why.

President Shetler: But we're certain that they are Vanderburgh County residents.

Sue Hartig: Oh yeah, we verify. We verify their addresses, oh yeah, uh-huh.

Councilmember Sutton: You said, back up to the malpractice insurance, so, it came in at 42 this year, so—

Sue Hartig: For this year.

Councilmember Sutton: So, you're wanting to estimate it at 45? So, basically, flat line from what you had last year?

Sue Hartig: Yes.

Councilmember Sutton: Okay.

Sue Hartig: I think the only increase we had was on Yellow Pages, and that's minimal, it's a half inch advertisement so that people know where to find us.

Councilmember Lloyd: Is your case load up?

Sue Hartig: Yes.

Councilmember Lloyd: By a lot?

Sue Hartig: Well, not a lot. A lot of the people that need our help are just over the guidelines. It's that next tier of people.

President Shetler: Okay. Anything else, anybody? Questions?

### ***LEGAL AID/UNITED WAY***

Councilmember Goebel: Susan, you've adjusted United, are we moving to that one?

Sue Hartig: United Way?

President Shetler: Yeah, United Way, if you could do that.

Councilmember Goebel: You gave us a hand out this morning with those adjustments, is that correct?

Sue Hartig: Are those, yes, uh-huh.

Councilmember Goebel: Where you zeroed out, so, we don't need to discuss that, I don't think.

Sue Hartig: Right, we've taken a big hit, United Way has taken fairly big hits on their campaign the last two years.

Councilmember Goebel: So, we can just make the adjustments in the book?

Sue Hartig: Uh-huh.

Councilmember Goebel: Thank you.

President Shetler: Alright. Thank you. Sorry to keep you waiting so long.

Sue Hartig: Thank you.

### **COUNTY ASSESSOR**

President Shetler: Next, County Assessor. You guys are all lucky that you don't get grilled like you, everybody could have been, right?

Jonathan Weaver: Good morning. Jonathan Weaver, County Assessor.

President Shetler: That would be on page 47. Okay, Mr. Weaver, anything that you've added?

Jonathan Weaver: Well, I guess, one glaring thing you'll notice is that our salaries have quadrupled, but that's because of what's happened with all of the assessor offices, you know, with the legislative changes last July and the referendum changes this past November.

President Shetler: So, it just wasn't that you were running around giving big, huge raises to everyone?

Jonathan Weaver: I would love to give raises to everybody. They work so hard. They make me look great, but, you know, they understand. They're not happy about it, but these are the times, I guess.

President Shetler: Anybody have any questions?

Councilmember Sutton: Everything else is pretty flat lined.

President Shetler: Questions or comments? Okay, alright.

Jonathan Weaver: Thank you.

President Shetler: Time was on your side.

### **PROPERTY TAX ASSESSMENT BOARD OF APPEALS/REASSESSMENT COUNTY ASSESSOR/REASSESSMENT**

President Shetler: President Shetler: Let's see, Property Tax Assessment Board of Appeals. Anybody have any questions on that one, on 144? The Reassessment was part of the – on page 142, wasn't it? Or, wait a minute.

Councilmember Lloyd: Page 142, Reassessment, I know we've got an increase, Level II Certifications and Extra Help are pretty substantial, then also Contractual Services.

Councilmember Raben: Those are – you've never looked at it until this year as one sum, so that's all the other, that's outlying's combined. So, this whole budget is going to look different.

Councilmember Lloyd: Right. Oh, because we've got certifications from all of these township people.

Jonathan Weaver: Right, now we're up to 25 Level II's in my office.

Councilmember Sutton: Does that include travel and mileage as well, bringing all of those together?

Jonathan Weaver: Yeah, I believe, if you added the three townships that were left last year, before the referendum, and the county office, we're down from \$12,500 as a whole to \$8,000. So, that's a \$4,500 savings in travel there.

Councilmember Lloyd: Is Contractual Services after the trending?

Jonathan Weaver: Contractual Services?

Councilmember Lloyd: 1090-3530, Contractual Services.

Jonathan Weaver: Yeah, what we have in there–

Councilmember Lloyd: Page 142.

Jonathan Weaver: –yeah, we have a vendor where we have our personal property software, we have our appeals software and we have our sales disclosure software. So, that's maintenance for that. That includes the Pictometry second year fee there, ESRI mapping software, that's what that includes. I believe that's it.

President Shetler: Okay.

Jonathan Weaver: Oh, and our PTABOA attorney, oh, and our assessing software, ProVal.

Councilmember Lloyd: It looks like you had, the Property Tax Board of Appeal, you moved money from there to the Reassessment Fund, is that correct? Well, because you had Contractual Services, \$42,800 for the Board of Appeals, I assume that's mainly the attorney, you moved that to the Reassessment Fund?

Jonathan Weaver: Yeah, we have, let's see, 2490-1091-1180, you'll see a \$7,000 decrease there. Yeah, we're putting the attorney fees up in the Contractual Service line.

President Shetler: Okay.

Councilmember Lloyd: Thank you.

Councilmember Goebel: Real quick, Jonathan, Pictometry, I know you put up, or you're having workshops on that, have you discussed with other groups that might be utilizing Pictometry as far as sharing the cost of that?

Jonathan Weaver: At this point in time, we've just assumed the cost.

Councilmember Goebel: I understand, but—

Jonathan Weaver: (Inaudible).

Councilmember Goebel: —I'm talking about in the future, is that still a possibility?

Jonathan Weaver: I forget what the maintenance is after this year.

Councilmember Goebel: Okay.

Jonathan Weaver: I think it's, well, I'm not, I'll have to look back at the minutes of the last meetings, but it's fairly, I believe, minuscule as compared to this sum.

Councilmember Goebel: Okay, thank you.

Jonathan Weaver: We have 65, roughly 65 county employees right now using Pictometry, all throughout the enterprise. So, we're really excited about that. We had someone in my office visit 11 homes in 15 minutes, which would have took her four hours if she was out in the field. So, we're realizing the changes already.

President Shetler: Alright, anybody else have any questions? Anything else for Mr. Weaver on any....okay.

Jonathan Weaver: Great, thank you.

President Shetler: Thank you, Jonathan.

Councilmember Lloyd: Thank you.

### **AUDITOR**

President Shetler: Auditor.

Bill Fluty: My budget, basically, the only changes would be step increases on the Auditor's, everything else is the same.

### **AUDITOR/REASSESSMENT**

Bill Fluty: It's the same as the Reassessment budget last year.

### **JAIL BOND**

Bill Fluty: The jail bond is just exactly what it is: payment for the bond payments.

### **BOND ISSUE**

Bill Fluty: Bond debt service for the USI, actually that loan is paid now and I will not need that \$480,000.

President Shetler: Questions?

Councilmember Lloyd: Okay, so that bond's paid off on USI?

Bill Fluty: That's correct.

Councilmember Lloyd: Wow!

President Shetler: Is it paid off currently, or later this year?

Bill Fluty: Honestly, it is, there is one payment to be paid in January, but we have, they're holding the money for that as they hold debt service. So, they have the exact amount to pay themselves on January 1<sup>st</sup>.

President Shetler: Okay.

Councilmember Lloyd: Great. Good news.

President Shetler: Any other questions or comments of the Auditor? You've done Jail Bond and Bond Debt.

### ***SALES DISCLOSURE FEES***

President Shetler: Sales Disclosure Fees? Okay.

### ***COUNTY COUNCIL***

President Shetler: County Council?

Councilmember Lloyd: Page 110, no increases in salaries, other than step. We reduced travel, \$1,000, which is on page 111, and we reduced Office Supplies and Other Supplies, \$100. Then Court Technology is 3315, that money was not needed. Or wait, \$12,000. Oh, part of that is from last year, we had those encumbered. That's it.

Councilmember Kiefer: Did you ask about the Computer Contractual? Just curious, that's up \$100,000. Or am I looking at the wrong thing? Hang on, on page 112, \$100,000.

Councilmember Lloyd: That, the computer budget, I'm the liaison to ITAC, and there was quite a bit more of an increase. \$69,000 of that is for the Treasurer and the Auditor's new software.

Councilmember Kiefer: Oh, okay.

Councilmember Lloyd: The rest of it is new equipment. So, I think the original budget was over two million dollars and we just cut it back to a \$100,000 increase.

Councilmember Kiefer: Oh, okay. Thanks.

President Shetler: Any other questions or comments? Do we adjourn today then? Oh, yeah, Mike, go ahead.

Councilmember Goebel: I just wanted to ask one question on the Copy Machines. Every department seems to have a request for it, have we gone any farther with getting a county-wide plan? Does anyone know, that would reduce? Matt Arvay was here a few weeks ago. We'll ask that later.

Councilmember Lloyd: Yeah, I know they're looking at it, and I'm not sure where they are on that. I think the city may be a little farther along than we are.

Councilmember Goebel: If we do incorporate that kind of plan, will each budget then be reduced by that amount? Like the leases and things that we have.

Councilmember Lloyd: Everyone that (inaudible) a copy machine, it should be reduced. I'm not sure where we are.

President Shetler: It may be a lateral transfer, I would think, you know, in the beginning anyway.

Councilmember Goebel: Okay. I'll move for—

Councilmember Raben: Second.

President Shetler: Alright, it's been moved and seconded for adjournment. Yes?

Councilmember Sutton: One quick item. I know every—

President Shetler: It's probably adjourn. We can reset it up, couldn't we? I mean, legally, does it matter?

Councilmember Raben: I'm listening.

Councilmember Sutton: Well, I'm just waiting for everybody to come back to the meeting. I know every year the budget is a little bit different in terms of what we have to approach, but, and I know that they've got a meeting coming up with the Parks Board so we really need to get out of here, but, probably two days, giving this structured format was probably not enough. You know, we've done it a couple of different ways, but I hate that the latter part of this meeting that we really rushed through some budgets and probably didn't get the chance to ask some questions that we really wanted to just for the sake of time. But, you know, the next time we get together isn't until September, and at that time we are making adjustments and starting to look to the point of finalizing budgets. So, you know, that's really the only time our department heads get a chance to talk about their budget, and for us to get the active feedback on their budget is during this period here during this week. So, it just, I don't know if we might want to give some thought of how we want to address that, but I just hate that we, I want to say just really zipped through several of those budgets there. We probably should have spent more time.

President Shetler: Alright. I think that was—

Councilmember Goebel: Could we allot from 8:00 and make it a little bit longer day?

President Shetler: Yeah, that's possible. I think this all came about through a committee of seven trying to gel their calendars together here somewhat more than anything else, because I think we had set it for a week earlier, then some conflicts arose on that. Then, you know, a week later and some things, and it all just kind of

got parceled into the two day thing. Anyway, I agree we've gotten pretty rushed. Yesterday, of course, we got out a little bit early, and we could certainly start a little earlier, but it is the one time that we have an opportunity to go through that exercise and find out exactly what is going on and what we can expect in the future, and it's a good opportunity for the taxpayers to see what they're spending their money on.

Councilmember Lloyd: Mr. President, the proper term is, we would recess the budget hearings.

President Shetler: Yes, right. So, we will recess until September the 2<sup>nd</sup>. I'll give you an update real quickly, and that is we have a Personnel meeting tomorrow at 9:00 in room 307. Job study, I'm sorry, Job Study.

**(The meeting was recessed at 12:09 p.m.)**



**VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL**

---

President Tom Shetler, Jr.

---

Vice President Joe Kiefer

---

Councilmember Jim Raben

---

Councilmember Mike Goebel

---

Councilmember Russell Lloyd, Jr.

---

Councilmember Ed Bassemier

---

Councilmember Royce Sutton

Recorded and transcribed by Teri Lukeman and Madelyn Grayson.

**VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL  
SPECIAL MEETING  
AUGUST 18, 2009**

The Vanderburgh County Council met in special session this 18th day of August 2009 in room 301 of the Civic Center Complex. The meeting was called to order at 8:47 a.m. by County Council President Tom Shetler, Jr.

President Shetler: Good morning. We have a special meeting that we've called to ratify the city's passage last night of the '09 Homestead Credit. So I'd like, first of all, to call the roll for attendance, please.

COUNCILMEMBER	PRESENT	ABSENT
Councilmember Sutton	X	
Councilmember Bassemier	X	
Councilmember Lloyd	X	
Councilmember Goebel	X	
Councilmember Raben	X	
Councilmember Kiefer	X	
President Shetler	X	

President Shetler: There being seven present and no absent, we have a quorum. The issue, well, first I'd ask for Councilman Sutton to lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance.

(Pledge of Allegiance was given)

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>APPROVAL OF 2009 HOMESTEAD TAX CREDIT ON FIRST AND FINAL READING</b></p>
--

President Shetler: Again, the subject at hand is the '09 Homestead Credit. Has everybody received copies of that? The '09? Okay, everybody has a copy of that in their packets. Now we will need a motion first to do this all – the motion needs to be said so that we can do this all in one, the first and final readings today, if that would be your desire. Again, in order to accomplish that goal, it must be a unanimous vote. So I need a motion if that would be your call to do this all in one.

Councilmember Kiefer: I'd like to make a motion that we do this in one, with one vote.

President Shetler: I have a motion.

Councilmember Lloyd: Second.

President Shetler: And a second on the floor. Do I have any questions about that motion? All in favor, signify – do we need to do a roll call on that? I guess we do. Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being seven ayes and no nays, the motion carries. That means we will be hearing the first and final readings of the Homestead Ordinance.

**(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)**

<p><b>A RESOLUTION OF THE VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL PROPOSING AN ORDINANCE OF THE VANDERBURGH COUNTY INCOME TAX COUNCIL ESTABLISHING THE PERCENTAGE CREDIT ALLOWED FOR HOMESTEADS FOR 2009 AND CASTING THE VOTES OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL ON SAID ORDINANCE RESOLUTION NO. CO.R-08-09-008</b></p>
---

President Shetler: Mr. Ahlers, do you have anything you want to add to it?

Jeff Ahlers: Thank you, Mr. Shetler. I wanted to point out one thing is that, there is a more recent draft of the resolution than what's in the packet. Mrs. Lukeman and I have the latest draft. The only difference is, the one that's in your packet, is the fourth Whereas clause. I think the ones that you guys have on your desks may say "may unanimously elect" in that second line. And "unanimously" should be stricken. In the version, in my conferences with the city to make sure that we were consistent, one of the words, that's the only change that we agreed to remove was to take out the word "unanimously" in that second line of the fourth Whereas. Which, like I said, the one that Mrs. Lukeman has that you're going to sign is correct, the one I have is correct. But some of you, in your packets, I was looking at my packet and I think it still has the word "unanimously", so there was just that one correction. Otherwise, what you need to do is just like on the 2010 Homestead, you're going to pass the resolution casting your votes as a portion of the Income Tax Council. You've got 28.517 votes. You'll cast those in favor of passing the ordinance and then pass the ordinance.

President Shetler: Any other questions or comments?

Councilman Sutton: I think there is a, in a sense it does relate to this, it doesn't necessarily affect our position on it, but I think what most people want to know by virtue of the action that we take here by approving this 2009 Homestead, putting that back in place, how will our taxpayers receive this credit? Are they going to receive a check in the mail, are they going to receive an amended or an adjusted bill in November? Those are the kind of things that I think, if we don't have those answers here today, it would be helpful if we could provide that so that we will know what that process is going to be for this because this is a very important action.

President Shetler: Alright, thank you. Yes, County Auditor, Bill Fluty.

Bill Fluty: Yes, Councilman Sutton, we've been working on that for the past month or so when it was believed that it would be passed, which I think after today it will be, working with our software vendor. It will be a credit to the fall bill. We'll send out information to the taxpayers basically telling them what their credit is and the amount they need to pay for November. Anybody that's paid in full will actually receive a check back. If you, for some reason, already paid your November bill, the credit will come in the form of a check. Then we'll also look at properties that transferred and make sure, those people may have to show proof of who paid, so those are kind of the three scenarios that we've talked about right now. So that's how that will be handled.

Councilman Sutton: I mean, do you have something that is in final form or is it just kind of in draft form?

Bill Fluty: We have something that we believe will make it as cost effective as we can. It will look similar to the bills, I believe, is our proposal, but we're working within the software system we have and I think we haven't finished it yet, but we're getting very close. So I think it will be something that's easy for the taxpayers to look at and see what they need to pay.

Councilman Sutton: Well, obviously, we're going to see, I guess, with this adjustment here, there's going to be a lot of mailings that are going to be going out here soon...

Bill Fluty: 48,000.

Councilman Sutton: Is the request going to come from the Treasurer, the Auditor, where are we going to get that request from on the additional appropriation needed for that mailing?

Bill Fluty: We may be able to handle it with the monies we have available. I think the Treasurer still has money in their account from the first mailing. Remember, of those 48,000, I think 19,000 of them are in escrow, and we'll communicate to them maybe a little differently than we'll communicate to the ones that need to pay. We also are going to do this in-house to decrease any costs as much as we can.

Councilman Sutton: Thank you.

President Shetler: Alright, thank you. Any other questions? Motion would be in order.

Councilmember Lloyd: Mr. President, I'd like to make a motion to approve A Resolution of the Vanderburgh County Council Proposing an Ordinance of the Vanderburgh County Income Tax Council Establishing the Percentage Credit Allowed For Homesteads for 2009 and Casting the Votes of the County Council on Said Ordinance, Resolution Number R-08-09-008.

Councilman Sutton: Second.

President Shetler: Motion and a second. Again, any questions on the motion? Does anybody in the audience have any comments or wish to respond? Alright, thank you. Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being seven ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

**(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)**

<p><b>AN ORDINANCE OF THE VANDERBURGH COUNTY INCOME TAX COUNCIL AMENDING THE PERCENTAGE CREDIT ALLOWED FOR HOMESTEADS FOR 2009</b></p>
--

President Shetler: Now we need a final motion on the ordinance to make final approval on it.

Councilmember Lloyd: I'd like to propose adoption of the Ordinance of the Vanderburgh County Income Tax Council Amending the Percentage Credit Allowed For Homesteads For 2009, which is before the members of the Vanderburgh County Income Tax Council. I'd like to make a motion to approve.

Councilman Sutton: Second.

President Shetler: It's been moved and seconded. Again, anybody in the audience wish to speak to the Homestead Credit? Hearing none, roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Glad we're able to do this for taxpayers for 2009. Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being seven ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

**(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)**

President Shetler: I guess at this time a motion would be in order to adjourn our special meeting for the Homestead Credit.

Councilmember Kiefer: Move that we adjourn.

President Shetler: It's been moved.

Councilmember Lloyd: Second.

President Shetler: And seconded. Thank you. Appreciate it, and I know the taxpayers do.

**(There being no further business to come before the Council, the meeting was adjourned at 8:57 a.m.)**

**VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL**

---

President Tom Shetler, Jr.

---

Vice President Joe Kiefer

---

Councilmember Jim Raben

---

Councilmember Mike Goebel

---

Councilmember Russell Lloyd, Jr.

---

Councilmember Ed Bassemier

---

Councilmember Royce Sutton

Recorded and transcribed by Teri Lukeman.

**VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL  
MINUTES  
SEPTEMBER 2, 2009**

The Vanderburgh County Council met in session this 2nd day of September 2009 in room 301 of the Civic Center Complex. The meeting was called to order at 8:40 a.m. by County Council President Tom Shetler, Jr.

President Shetler: Good morning. It's September 2<sup>nd</sup>, time for our regular scheduled meeting. I apologize for running a few minutes late here. We've had a few last minute details on the budget. So at this time I'd like to take attendance roll call please.

COUNCILMEMBER	PRESENT	ABSENT
Councilmember Sutton	X	
Councilmember Bassemier	X	
Councilmember Lloyd	X	
Councilmember Goebel	X	
Councilmember Raben	X	
Councilmember Kiefer	X	
President Shetler	X	

President Shetler: There being seven members present, we have a quorum. I'd like for Councilman Lloyd to lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance please.

**(Pledge of Allegiance was given)**

<b>APPROVAL OF MINUTES</b>
----------------------------

President Shetler: First we have several minutes that have been passed out to us: July 21<sup>st</sup> Homestead 2010 meeting, the August the 5<sup>th</sup> regular meeting, and the August 18<sup>th</sup> Homestead 2009 meeting.

Councilmember Lloyd: Motion to approve.

President Shetler: We have a motion on the floor. Do I have a second?

Councilmember Raben: Second.

President Shetler: I have a second. Any questions? Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?



Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being seven ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

**(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)**

<b>APPROPRIATION ORDINANCE</b>
--------------------------------

President Shetler: Next is the appropriation ordinance. Councilman Raben?

**TREASURER**

Councilmember Raben: Okay, thank you. Good morning. First, under Treasurer in the amount of \$28, I'll move approval.

Councilmember Lloyd: Second.

President Shetler: I've got a motion and a second. Any questions? Comments? Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being seven ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

TREASURER		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1030-1250-1030	Garnishment Clerk	24.00	24.00
1030-1900	FICA	2.00	2.00
1030-1910	PERF	2.00	2.00
Total		28.00	28.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

COMMISSIONERS

Councilmember Raben: Okay, County Commissioners, Unemployment in the amount of \$45,000 and Travel/Mileage for 5,000, for a total of \$50,000. I'll move approval.

Councilmember Bassemier: Second.

President Shetler: It's been moved and seconded. Any questions or comments? Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being seven ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

COMMISSIONERS		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1300-1930	Unemployment	45,000.00	45,000.00
1300-3130	Travel/Mileage	5,000.00	5,000.00
Total		50,000.00	50,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

HEALTH DEPARTMENT

President Shetler: Next, Health Department.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Institutional & Medical in the amount of \$26,777. I'll move approval.

Councilman Sutton: Second.

President Shetler: It's been moved and seconded. Any questions or comments? Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being seven ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

HEALTH DEPARTMENT		REQUESTED	APPROVED
2130-2241	Institutional & Medical	26,777.00	26,777.00
Total		26,777.00	26,777.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

LOCAL ROADS & STREETS

President Shetler: Local Roads & Streets.

Councilmember Raben: Local Roads & Streets, Tires & Tubes in the amount of \$10,000, I'll move approval.

Councilmember Lloyd: Second.

President Shetler: It's been moved and seconded. Any questions? Comments? Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being seven ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

LOCAL ROADS & STREETS		REQUESTED	APPROVED
2160-2220	Tires & Tubes	10,000.00	10,000.00
Total		10,000.00	10,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

SHERIFF MISDEMEANOR HOUSING

President Shetler: Sheriff Misdemeanor Housing.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, we have two adjustments to Confinement Officers and Insurance, for a total of 20,552, I'll move approval.

Councilman Sutton: Second.

President Shetler: It's been moved and seconded. Any questions or comments?  
Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being seven ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

SHERIFF MISDEMEANOR HOUSING		REQUESTED	APPROVED
2780-1360-2780	Confinement Officer	276.00	276.00
2780-1370-2780	Confinement Officer	276.00	276.00
2780-1920	Insurance	20,000.00	20,000.00
Total		20,552.00	20,552.00

**(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)**

<b>TRANSFER REQUEST</b>
-------------------------

President Shetler: Next is transfers.

## **TREASURER**

Councilmember Raben: Okay, we only have one transfer and it's for the Treasurer's office in the amount of \$2,666. I'll move approval.

Councilmember Lloyd: Second.

President Shetler: It’s been moved and seconded. Any questions? Comments?  
Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being seven ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

TREASURER		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1030-1200-1030	Delinquent Tax Collector	1,311.00	1,311.00
1030-1260-1030	Surplus Refunds/Liquor	655.00	655.00
1030-1270-1030	Tax Sheriff’s Sale Coordinator	700.00	700.00
To: 1030-1250-1030	Garnishment Clerk	2,666.00	2,666.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

AMENDMENTS TO SALARY ORDINANCE

President Shetler: Next, no repeals, amendments to salary ordinance.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, we have about five today. First under Treasurer, I move we amend salary line 1030-1250 Garnishment Clerk as previously adopted and prior transferred. Current employee is a Comot IV/Step 3, at an annual rate of 30,338. Under Sheriff Misdemeanor Housing, I move we amend salary lines 2780-1360 and 2780-1370 Confinement Officers as previously approved. Community

Corrections, in the Y account, to amend salary line 136Y-1180 Confinement Officer, setting the salary in at 41,040, in accordance with the union contract. In the Z account, 136Z-1190 Confinement Officer, setting the salary in at 41,040, in accordance with the union contract. And salary line 136Z-1110 at \$44,540, again, that's in accordance to the current union contract. I'll move approval.

Councilmember Kiefer: Second.

President Shetler: Moved and seconded. Any questions or comments? Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being seven ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

**(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)**

<b>CENTRAL DISPATCH REQUEST TO EXPEND CAPITAL FUNDS</b>
---

President Shetler: There's no old business at this time. Under New Business, we have a request from Central Dispatch to spend approximately \$18,000 from the capital account fund.

Jo Ann Smith: Jo Ann Smith, Director of Central Dispatch. In your packet you should have two letters requesting funds from our 911 capital account that was set aside, I believe, two years ago. It's a percentage of the telephone E911 money that is set aside for Central Dispatch for this type of unexpected expense. The tower expense, \$9,412 is as a result of the inspection to the tower this year for repairs that need to be made. The second request is for \$8,700 to supplement the integration of Pictometry into the CAD system. We have \$1,800 currently, and the \$8,700 will give

us the money that will allow us to interface that into our CAD system.

President Shetler: Okay, do I have any questions or comments? Yes, Councilman Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: What approximately is the balance in that fund?

Jo Ann Smith: The approximate balance is, as of August 17<sup>th</sup>, \$824,469.17.

Councilmember Lloyd: And those are expenditures that would be appropriate for the fund?

Jo Ann Smith: Yes.

Councilmember Lloyd: Alright. Thank you.

President Shetler: Other questions?

Councilmember Goebel: Is this connected with the Assessor's Pictometry?

Jo Ann Smith: Yes, it is. The Pictometry itself is not costing us anything. It's the cost to interface it into our CAD system. There is also an annual fee associated with that, that is \$1,350, I believe. That is going to be picked up by the IT department, the annual fee for that.

Councilmember Goebel: Thank you.

President Shetler: I know this is probably not a question for you. Perhaps, Jonathan even, later, but all the Pictometry, our general license agreement doesn't allow for all departments? We have to have separate licenses –

Jo Ann Smith: No, it's not that the Pictometry license is not allowed. It's that the interface with our CAD system is through OSSI, the company that provides our CAD system, there is a charge.

President Shetler: So is that a maintenance fee, or is that a license agreement?

Jo Ann Smith: It's an interface and then the annual fee to maintain that interface, those are two costs.

President Shetler: So it's both license and maintenance then as well?

Jo Ann Smith: Yes.

President Shetler: Alright, thank you. Other questions?

Councilmember Goebel: I was just curious if this cost of the Pictometry upkeep and all that might be shared since it's going to another department that has, I think, a relatively sound balance? You're getting the Pictometry at no cost, correct?

Jo Ann Smith: Correct.

Councilmember Goebel: And my question was, could that cost be shared out of the Reassessment Fund. I don't know if that's worth discussing now or not. Do you know what I'm saying?



Jo Ann Smith: Well, our money is a city/county pot, so that would be coming out of both city and county monies.

Councilmember Goebel: Okay, thank you.

President Shetler: And I think what you're saying is that this is not a Pictometry issue as much as it is trying to interface it with your current, and so it's really that side of it more than it is Pictometry at this point.

Jo Ann Smith: It's not the Pictometry side, no.

President Shetler: Right, it's just to make – obviously, I don't know the IT speak and the jargon here that I should be using, but conceptually, I think I understand what you're saying and that is not Pictometry's responsibility, it's your responsibility to get hooked up to it to take care of that linkage.

Jo Ann Smith: That's correct. Our CAD system has to, there's certain things that have to be done to allow the Pictometry to work with our CAD system. And that's an expense on the CAD system side.

Councilmember Goebel: I understand that. I was just thinking, you will be utilizing Pictometry, though, on a regular basis daily, correct?

Jo Ann Smith: Yes.

Councilmember Goebel: Thank you.

President Shetler: Okay. Any other questions or comments? Motion would be in order for approval.

Councilmember Kiefer: I so move.

Councilmember Bassemier: Second.

President Shetler: Alright, so we have a motion and a second. Any questions? We'll do a voice vote on this. All in favor, signify by saying aye.

**(All Councilmembers voted in the affirmative)**

President Shetler: Those opposed?

**(No opposing votes were cast)**

President Shetler: So ordered.

**(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)**

<b>RECORDER EMPLOYMENT REQUEST</b>
------------------------------------

President Shetler: Next Recorder, Z Tuley, on a request for employment .

Z Tuley: I'm Z Tuley, Vanderburgh County Recorder.

President Shetler: Z, you had a request for replacing the, I think a vacancy that

you're going to have soon?

Z Tuley: Yes, I didn't think we were going to do that today, so I'm sorry.

President Shetler: Well, you were still on the agenda and stuff, and I didn't know if you wanted to just pull that and leave it as it is, then? We discussed this yesterday afternoon late and the sense was that maybe replacing some of that permanent with some part-time people, perhaps. And then I think some of it is being done contractually through Phoenix, out of the Perpetual fund?

Z Tuley: I have them doing the project. I have hired Phoenix to do the project of getting the old documents on the computer system so that, not only are they retrievable, but they are also preserved. I do not have Phoenix doing any of the daily tasks.

President Shetler: Alright, does anybody have any questions?

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Z, I'm a little confused. It's my understanding the Commissioners signed a contract last night?

Z Tuley: Correct.

Councilmember Raben: With Phoenix, and that was going to fix all this. If you lost your employee, that the contract was going to allow you to have all the imaging done that this employee, was going to be most of their responsibilities.

Z Tuley: The tasks that are lined out in the contract with the Commissioners last night, there's going to be two, we have started, the deeds are now done and so they are all on the system. That was a finish-up project from '08. And now we have started doing the mortgages and the mortgage releases. And that's where we left it with Phoenix. I was able to trim down the contract because, I don't know, if I'm not going to have an employee, I don't know that the employees can keep up with the pace of three employees from Phoenix. So right now what they're going to do is, they're going to go ahead and index, which is the creation of the search engine, and we also have one designated employee from Phoenix to do the verification. But we don't expect that one employee can keep up with two that's doing the production, so that's what's Phoenix task, and that's what the contract calls for. Not any day to day things, but getting the old documents on-line and preserved. I have the contract with me if you would like a copy.

Councilmember Raben: No, no, no, because I don't know that I would know what I was reading if I saw it, frankly. Is this going to help in any regards to other employees within your office? I mean, this new contract, is it going to be taking any work away from any of the existing employees? So none of those people spend any time putting –

Z Tuley: Not at all. We have \$241,000 worth of images and that's Phoenix's task, and that's what they are expert at, is to get that document into a search engine database. And so that's what they have been contracted to do. It has nothing to do with the day to day documents. It has nothing to do with making copies. If for some reason, as we had with the deeds, we do have a different company that did this imaging. We are expecting better quality with the deeds. Sometimes the staff would have to stop what they were doing and re-scan a deed so that Phoenix's staff could read it. Sometimes on occasion you get a bad image and so we would have to re-image via microfilm. But no day to day tasks are being performed by Phoenix.

Councilmember Raben: I understand that. My question was, in everybody else's spare time, were they spending time with this project, you know, where they were actually –

Z Tuley: My staff?

Councilmember Raben: Yeah.

Z Tuley: Yes. They were supposed to be performing the verification, which is the quality control measure in the creation of the search engine. It's the second step. Phoenix was going through the first step with the deeds and I think that we had 68,000, I believe, deeds that -- 67,000 deeds were entered by Phoenix this year. And I think we didn't even get started until March and then Phoenix, after they imaged it, my staff did the verification portion.

Councilmember Bassemier: Tom?

Councilmember Raben: Okay, I guess, and maybe I can get with you later or stop by and visit because I'm just a little confused about the contract and what it's – the new contract, what –

Z Tuley: They have their own workstations and they're totally separate from...

Councilmember Raben: Okay, I might stop in after the meeting if I have an opportunity.

Z Tuley: I would love that.

Councilmember Raben: Okay.

President Shetler: Okay, other questions? Councilman Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: You suggested a while ago that you and Z have something worked out, something on the table about part-time or whatever. Is that still on the table or did –

President Shetler: What we had discussed last night –

Z Tuley: We had a discussion.

President Shetler: Yeah, and we talked about the possibility of using some part-time rather than creating or filling that vacancy back on a full-time basis. Basically, the thinking, again, to help keep the cost down, but the other is, that it would not be money coming out of the General fund but would be coming out of the Perpetual Fund where we collect the fees and stuff anyway, and where this contract is being fulfilled on the Phoenix Imaging.

Z Tuley: And as I stated last night in the Commissioner's meeting, these are state mandated fees. The state sets the rate, this Perpetuation fund is funded by those fees that we collect. This is not tax collected dollars that we are using to pay Phoenix with. And the County General also gets their portion of the fee that's collected. And so far to date, through August 25<sup>th</sup>, the General Fund has received \$307,998.41 from the Recorder's office.

President Shetler: Alright, Councilman Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: And that, I'm sorry, I didn't get to see the Commissioner's meeting, what is the annual cost of the contract, approximately?

Z Tuley: We didn't do it that way. We did it per image. Some images, might be nine - ten pages, but a search engine is just the standard data, the name, if there's a parcel number associated – not parcel number, if there's a legal description association with the document, then that is also referenced.

Councilmember Lloyd: So we're paying them per image scanned?

Z Tuley: Yes.

Councilmember Lloyd: Like, penny, nickle, quarter?

Z Tuley: Ninety cents.

Councilmember Lloyd: So if they, in '09 they did approximately 67,000 deeds, would that be times ninety cents?

Z Tuley: Yes.

Councilmember Lloyd: Did that contract go out to bid or did you check with other suppliers on that?

Z Tuley: I did.

Councilmember Lloyd: Okay.

Z Tuley: We did a bid. Well, actually, it was more like price quote, not a formal bid.

Councilmember Lloyd: Right, because it's a services contract, so – okay, and you checked with other image places and Phoenix was the best...

Z Tuley: Oh, I'm sorry, I thought you meant for the images. The scanning and the images, we got price quotes. For the task of indexing, no, I did not because the companies that bid for the images are not local and as far as I know, they, I didn't know of any other company that had the qualifications that Phoenix did.

Councilmember Lloyd: Okay, so, just to get an idea of the cost then for '09, 67,000 times 90 cents is roughly what that costs the county.

Z Tuley: Uh-huh.

Councilmember Lloyd: And this is –

Z Tuley: I have that dollar amount that we've paid them for that task. I don't know that I have it here...

Councilmember Lloyd: Well, approximately \$60,000, if you take that times 90 cents.

Z Tuley: In rough figures.

Councilmember Lloyd: And that would be since March, so that's roughly six months?

Z Tuley: It's very expensive.

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes. Okay, thank you.

President Shetler: That fund where that money is coming out, what all can that be used for?

Z Tuley: Indiana Code says that it is to be used for the purpose of preservation and retention of records, and it can also go for the equipment to do so. It says, the recorder may use any money in this fund without appropriation for the preservation of records and the improvement of record keeping systems and equipment.

President Shetler: Have we bought any new office furniture out of there recently?

Z Tuley: Bought any new furniture? I do not believe that we did, however, there was a wall constructed so that the Phoenix group could be isolated and not be disturbed by the general public coming in or out or the title searchers. So they all got work stations but I think that they were supplied with the computers that the Assessor surrendered with the merger because they weren't needed any longer at the out of office areas and I believe that the desks that we had and the chairs were also from within the office.

President Shetler: Alright.

Z Tuley: But our other supplies, our papers, our pens, all of that comes out of this fund. We don't have a supply budget that is supplied by the County Council, like other offices. We are self-supported except for the salaries and the insurance that you provide to the employees.

President Shetler: Alright, thank you. Any other questions or comments? Would anybody want to make a motion for approval at this point in time or, I think Councilman Raben had an idea to check it out further and stuff, and maybe bring it up at a later time then, but, --

Councilmember Bassemier: Jim, do you want to defer this?

Councilmember Lloyd: Wouldn't we take this up September 9<sup>th</sup>?

President Shetler: Yes.

Councilmember Raben: I would say let's defer this until September 9<sup>th</sup>.

President Shetler: Okay, is that satisfactory?

Z Tuley: Uh-huh.

President Shetler: Alright. Thank you, Z.

Z Tuley: Thank you.

<b>SHERIFF PENSION RESOLUTION</b>
-----------------------------------

President Shetler: Next is the resolution for Vanderburgh County Sheriff's Pension Board, and I don't think we have the resolution. I don't know if the Sheriff would want to address this? Have we gotten a copy of it?

Jeff Ahlers: I think there's a resolution that was in everybody's packet, this resolution

from the Vanderburgh County Sheriff's Pension Board. It's not a resolution for us and I'll let the Sheriff explain as well, but I've conferred with the Sheriff and the Pension Board's attorney, Charlie Berger, and this has just been sent over for us to place of record, to show the action that the Pension Board took in increasing the contribution of the deputies toward their pension fund. Mr. Berger advised me they were not requesting any action on Council's part and it's not requesting any funds from the General fund, so in that regard we don't need to take any action today. If the Sheriff wants to explain further, --

Eric Williams: I think you just summarized it pretty well for me. Basically, the Vanderburgh County Sheriff's Pension Board, at our regular meeting, took action to raise the deputies, the active deputies' contribution to the pension to the maximum allowable, allowed by law, which is 6% of their base salary. So we've taken that action to become effective October 1<sup>st</sup> or the first pay period in October. But the law requires us to at least make sure that you're aware that we've done that, and we wanted you to know that we're making the deputies put forth everything they can to keep their pension solvent.

Councilmember Lloyd: Unfortunately, the Sheriff's pension is not immune from the market, so I know we've talked before that you indicated kind of had a rough year last year.

Eric Williams: Yeah, I know we're not alone in that, but yes, it was a very rough year for our pension and our investment portfolio, but the last month's statement showed a little glimmer of hope for us. But it was a very tough year for us and we think it's time that we re-evaluate the pension. And it is a defined benefit plan, so we're going to address some of that and try to make it a little more realistic.

Councilmember Lloyd: Does it, I mean, I think, does this body, we just have to be made aware, but we don't have any reason to approve that or, do you remember that, Jim?

Councilmember Raben: (Inaudible – microphone not turned on)

Eric Williams: Yeah, we wanted you to be aware. And primarily, while the law requires it, we wanted to make sure that you were aware that the deputies were, we are going to force the deputies, and they were all very willing, to do everything that the law allowed them to do to help put their part into it, because I know they're very appreciative to have a good pension. So they're willing to do what they've got to do to make it stay...

Councilmember Lloyd: If there's any changes to benefits, is that something that, I guess, we would have to be made aware of that as well?

Eric Williams: It would be my intention, whether the law requires it or not, it would be my intention to make sure you're aware of it. And I don't think that would be wise for the financial body of the county to not be aware of what the pension benefits plan changed to.

President Shetler: Alright, other questions?

<b>SHERIFF EMPLOYMENT REQUEST</b>
-----------------------------------

President Shetler: Sheriff, since you're there, I guess that you're up next on the employment request and I think we have some for the Jail, is that right?

Eric Williams: Which...

President Shetler: Three positions, a couple confinement officers and an EMT.

Councilmember Raben: Do we want to break from our regular meeting?

Sandie Deig: These are vacant positions and you also have to vote to replace those.

President Shetler: This came in right after the hiring freeze, is that correct?

Eric Williams: Correct.

President Shetler: And so we've been taking these – this is really the second request. The first was –

Councilmember Raben: My point was, do we want to break from our regular Council meeting before we move into our budget meeting?

President Shetler: Well, this was actually part of the regular Council meeting, to make approval on this.

Councilmember Raben: Okay.

President Shetler: And it has to do with those three positions that, if I'm correct on that, two Confinement Officers and an EMT.

Eric Williams: Yeah, I plan to continue to try to fill and I'll come to you every time my Deputy slots, my Confinement slots and the Medical slots in the Jail, being that those are extremely critical to the ongoing operation and not having those spots filled will obviously create considerable amounts of overtime and hardship on the other employees. As for the other staff, you know, I won't come to you until the hiring freeze is over to replace those unless there is some kind of extremely out of the ordinary circumstance. But to run the Jail short staffed would be next to impossible without overtime. And we could do it, that's, but it just seems like you would be defeating the purpose.

President Shetler: I guess, unless we've made changes to eliminate these in the budget, you know, perhaps that would be integrated, but if they are going to be in the budget for next year, then it's appropriate to take it up now because it's in the current year and you have a question today.

Councilmember Raben: And, you know, while our resolution doesn't clearly spell it, it does address emergency situations. I think anything in regards to confinement, Sheriff Deputies, things of that nature, should always be considered as an emergency and, you know, I think the program goes on as it did. I mean, you know, if a vacant slot comes open and it needs to be filled, it gets filled.

Councilmember Bassemier: Jim, you make a motion to approve it, I'll second it.

Councilmember Raben: Well, I mean, I think we can do that, but I think that's – I'm just giving you my understanding of the resolution we signed, that it addresses emergency situations, and I think in either of those circumstances, that's clearly an emergency in the back of my mind. We would be taking a vote on what my perception is of a resolution.

President Shetler: And I think, basically, we're talking about a 24/7 operation, and if you don't fill these slots, you're going to have to use OT. And so we're going to pay for it one way or the other and perhaps more so.

Eric Williams: The union contract with the Confinement Officers has some minimum staffing requirements and I have to meet those minimum staffing requirements one way or the other, whether it's with on-duty personnel, with overtime personnel, you know, the staffing at the confinement center currently is probably where it needs to be when we're at full staff. We could always use some more people to adequately cover, but we do a pretty good job with that. Yes, I have to cover the slots one way or the other through the contract. The deputies' positions, you know, we're holding all of those right now. I probably won't try to replace any of those until after the first of the year so that there will be several accruals, I've got four openings now and expect to have a few more before the end of the year. But we'll hold all those until the first of the year.

President Shetler: So, a motion would be in order for approval on this request as we've outlined in our –

Councilmember Raben: I move approval.

President Shetler: It's been moved and –

Councilmember Bassemier: Second.

President Shetler: – seconded. Do I have any further questions? Any further discussion? We'll do a voice vote on it. All in favor, signify by saying aye.

**(All Councilmembers voted in the affirmative)**

President Shetler: Any opposed?

**(No opposing votes were cast)**

President Shetler: So ordered.

**(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)**

Eric Williams: Thank you.

<b>PROSECUTOR EMPLOYMENT REQUEST</b>
--------------------------------------

President Shetler: Is anybody here from the Prosecutor's Office? I see no one. Co-Op Extension?

Councilmember Lloyd: Mr. President, on the Prosecutor, that was for that one intern at \$10 an hour. So I would like us to go ahead and approve that or I would make a motion to do that. It's actually, I think, grant money that's not going to cost the county anything.

Councilmember Kiefer: Second.

President Shetler: Yeah, I think that's, you're right, --



Councilmember Lloyd: And he also requested back pay on that because I guess the individual has been working.

President Shetler: Yeah, we dealt with this at Job Study and I apologize.

Councilmember Lloyd: So I'd like to make a motion to approve the Prosecutor's request for hiring the intern.

President Shetler: This person was actually working prior to us even submitting that, and it is through an internship program at \$10 an hour. So we have a motion and a second. Do we have any other questions?

Councilmember Raben: So is...

Councilmember Lloyd: What happened on this, he was a law school student, worked in the spring, they didn't think he'd come back, so they terminated his employment. And then they found out, I guess, his second or third year of law school, he could come back as an intern, so they requested that he come back. But it's grant money that's not going to cost us anything, and I guess interns are a pretty good deal for the county in this situation.

Councilmember Raben: I think we're somewhat opening Pandora's box here and I'll tell you why, and I think we're going to run into similar situations. I wish I had a copy of our resolution in my hand now. Do we specifically address part-time employees?

Councilman Sutton: Part-time was included in the resolution.

Councilmember Raben: Was included?

Councilman Sutton: Was included.

President Shetler: I can weigh the issue, it's a little bit different, and I hear what you're saying and I know where you're going on this, but this person actually, I think went on the job in early July, prior to us actually passing that resolution so – and that's part of the problem that this would also include...

Councilmember Kiefer: You know, it's not costing the county any money. It's paid out of grant money. I think the intent of the hiring freeze is we're trying to reduce costs. I'm okay with this.

Councilmember Raben: I would like to be okay with it, but I'd also like to have some teeth in the resolution that we passed. And that's my point with this is, you know, immediately, I don't know if this falls under an emergency or extraordinary circumstance. But we are going to have to circle the wagons and make some exemption for part-time people because as we get into reassessment, as an example, the County Assessor is going to need to hire a lot of part-time people. They do every year. I mean, so we'll have to allow for that situation, but, you know, I don't know. I understand the situation within the Prosecutor's Office, but at the same time, again, I think we need to have some teeth in our resolution. And my example with the Assessor's Office is, by statute, he has to complete a reassessment process, so that would be an extraordinary circumstance or, you know, that may even qualify as an emergency. But in this situation, I don't know that we've got, he's not required by law to have this part-time person. I don't know, I'm just kind of torn here, so –

Councilmember Lloyd: Well, on the Assessor's Office, are you saying that when they have their part-timers to bring on, that they need to come here and get approval for all that? All those people, each one?

Councilmember Raben: Well, or we have to write the exemptions within this. I mean, again, if this stays in place next spring, you know, because we do address part-time people, Burdette Park hires probably 100 part-timers. So, you know, we might have to add some things to this resolution, maybe pass a new resolution at some point that further addresses this. But again, I'm not picking on the Prosecutor's office here, I'm just trying to balance it with the resolution we passed the 29<sup>th</sup> of July. So...

Councilmember Lloyd: I think those are good points.

President Shetler: Councilman Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: I think they are excellent points, but in this particular case, this is funded entirely through a grant? And for how long is this internship?

President Shetler: Ten weeks?

Councilmember Lloyd: He's not going to be here much longer, I don't believe. Through September maybe?

President Shetler: And again, I'm pretty certain that this person started before we actually passed that and the other is that as far as, you know, any exemptions to it, that's why we've requested that if someone does have a reason to exempt, to come before us and we are kind of the exempting body here, so, to make exceptions.

Councilmember Raben: Councilman Kiefer brought up an important point. In the very first paragraph it does say to control unnecessary expenditures from the County General Fund so, I guess that in itself, probably is a written exemption in this case. So, alright, enough said.

Councilmember Lloyd: There is a motion on the floor.

Bill Fluty: Just a quick comment. I'm on the Job Study so I heard a lengthy conversation about this from Doug Brown. This gentleman actually, the day that you passed the hiring freeze, he had already started, it's just the paperwork hadn't all flowed through, so he got caught in the bubble, so he's just asking if he should go forward with this. So I think he was right there at the same day you passed this.

President Shetler: Yes, that's correct. Anything else? We have a motion and a second. All in favor, signify by saying aye.

**(All Councilmembers voted in the affirmative)**

President Shetler: Those opposed?

**(No opposing votes were cast)**

President Shetler: So ordered.

**(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)**

<b>COOPERATIVE EXTENSION EMPLOYMENT REQUEST</b>
---

President Shetler: Next, Co-Op Extension.

Susan Plassmeier: Susan Plassmeier, County Extension Director for the Extension Office, and, Leah?

Leah Dozier: Leah Dozier, I am the Extension 4-H Youth Assistant at the Cooperative Extension. We are here today to ask permission to hire a part-time employee that will help us in teaching our Professor Popcorn Nutrition Program. It's for all Vanderburgh County students and this person will be completely funded with their salary through a St. Mary's grant that we've gotten for the fourth year now and it's a grant worth \$15,000, and salary out of that \$15,000 will be \$12,000. So the part-time employee will –

Susan Plassmeier: Split between two people.

Leah Dozier: Between two people. We already have one person right now. We previously had another person in this position, but she has gone off to continue her education in medical school, so it's a big program, it's a high demand for the teachers and so we really need this other person to come onboard to teach this nutrition program because it's actually part of a lot of the EVSC schools and parochial schools curriculum that they do every single year. So without the part-time person, we're going to be losing somebody that teaches 20 hours a week and 20 hours over a whole school year is a lot of nutrition education that is going to be missed for the Vanderburgh County students.

Susan Plassmeier: Okay, and I might mention, the County Council, we ask for an appropriation for this amount and then it is reimbursed by the St. Mary's grant. So that's how it's been handled in the past.

President Shetler: Councilman Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: So, this position requires, ultimately, no funding from the county because it's 100% funded, reimbursed, by St. Mary's?

Susan Plassmeier: Yes. Yes.

Councilmember Kiefer: And is there a termination date on this part-time employee?

Susan Plassmeier: No, they work all year, so they do the school year and then they do summer. So, I guess, at the end of the summer would be, I guess, officially their term would stop if we don't get the grant again.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay, thank you.

President Shetler: Any other questions or comments?

Councilmember Bassemier: Make a motion to approve.

Councilmember Lloyd: Second.

President Shetler: Any other questions then? All in favor, signify by saying aye.

**(All Councilmembers voted in the affirmative)**

President Shetler: Those opposed?

**(No opposing votes were cast)**

President Shetler: So ordered.

**(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)**

President Shetler: Alright, thank you.

Leah Dozier: Thank you.

Susan Plassmeier: Thank you.

President Shetler: At this time, a couple of other items, and then we'll get started on our other meeting in just a few minutes, a little bit late on that. I apologize. And then the final budget hearing will be on September the 9<sup>th</sup> at 9:00 in the morning, at which time I expect to start on time. So if I have a motion for adjournment?

Councilman Sutton: So moved.

President Shetler: It's been moved and seconded. We'll adjourn and then open up the meeting for the budget hearing.

**(There being no further business to come before the Council, the meeting was adjourned at 9:21 a.m.)**

**VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL**

---

President Tom Shetler, Jr.

---

Vice President Joe Kiefer

---

Councilmember Jim Raben

---

Councilmember Mike Goebel

---

Councilmember Russell Lloyd, Jr.

---

Councilmember Ed Bassemier

---

Councilmember Royce Sutton

Recorded and transcribed by Teri Lukeman.

**VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL  
BUDGET HEARINGS  
SEPTEMBER 2, 2009**

The Vanderburgh County Council met in session this 2nd day of September in room 301 of the Civic Center Complex. The meeting was called to order at 9:29 a.m. by County Council President Tom Shetler, Jr.

President Shetler: Once again, good morning, and at this time I'd like to convene the second stage of the budget cuts or budget session here. I guess that was a slip there, wasn't it? I would, first of all, like to start by saying, just to thank all of the elected officeholders and department heads. Everyone just really did an outstanding job this year of paying close attention to what I think the taxpayers are interested in and what we, the Council, is hearing also from the taxpayers in that we needed to keep the budgets down to a minimum and you all did that, and I greatly appreciate the efforts. And I know it was not easy to come up with zero lining your budgets, as you did. Today we're going to be restricting the comments from the podium until the conclusion of the meeting. There may be some dialogue that happens between the Councilmembers, and I encourage that, during Mr. Raben's presentation on some of the cuts that he's going to be recommending. We'll hold the other comments until the end, though, and with that, I'd like to take roll call and then we'll turn the mic over to Councilman Raben.

COUNCILMEMBER	PRESENT	ABSENT
Councilmember Sutton	X	
Councilmember Bassemier	X	
Councilmember Lloyd	X	
Councilmember Goebel	X	
Councilmember Raben	X	
Councilmember Kiefer	X	
President Shetler	X	

President Shetler: There being seven members present and none absent, we have a quorum and at this time -- yes, Councilman Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Sorry to interrupt, but the cuts pamphlet that we have here today, is that the very same as the one that we worked on prior?

Sandie Deig: (inaudible – microphone not turned on)

Councilmember Goebel: Is this, the one on our desks today, is this the same as the other one? There's no changes from the other?

President Shetler: There may be some from the floor today, but –

Councilmember Goebel: Is the printing on this the same as the printing in this, is what I'm asking? Because I've got all my notes in this one.

Councilmember Raben: With just a couple of –

Councilmember Goebel: Okay.

President Shetler: Alright, yes, Councilman Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Mr. President, I guess, right out of the gate, all salary lines including FICA, PERF and insurance will be set at our September the 9<sup>th</sup> meeting, so with that, that's standard throughout today. You know, as we bring closure to a budget or stop for a vote or something like that, I want that to be, you know, part of my standard motion throughout the day if I neglect to state that. And everyone has a copy of the 2010 proposed budget cuts. I'd like to work from those, it's a lot easier than working from the cumbersome book. And I'd like to begin a motion, I can stop at any point, if anybody has a question or doesn't agree with a cut, please stop me, we'll take everything up until that point and then we'll begin a new motion if that's agreeable to everybody. Is that...

President Shetler: One further point that I'd like to make and I'd neglected to address it earlier, I would, to help move things along a little bit, is to do a voice vote on it rather than doing roll call on each. And if there's a point where someone would like to have it recorded as a roll call vote, then we could certainly address that. But otherwise, if there's no objection from any of the members, then we will go on with the voice vote if there aren't any questions.

**CLERK**

Councilmember Raben: And before we start, I guess, to answer Councilman Goebel's first question, there will be a few amendments today as we go through that and I'll point those out, okay? And first, under County Clerk, which is account 1010, the first item is 1990, the request was \$26,010, I move that that be set in at zero; 2600 to be set in at \$60,000; 4210, zero; and what you don't have on your sheet, account 3603, which is Record Storage, the request was for \$100,000, I move that that be set in at \$90,000. Is everyone clear on that addition?

Councilmember Kiefer: What was the addition?

Councilmember Raben: 3603, set in at \$90,000.

Line Item	Description	Requested	Cut	Approved
1010-1990	Extra Help	26,010	26,010	0
1010-2600	Office Supplies	75,000	15,000	60,000
1010-4210	Office Furniture	1,000	1,000	0
1010-3603	Record Storage	100,000	10,000	90,000

**AUDITOR**

Councilmember Raben: Under County Auditor, 2610 \$5,000; 3141 \$500; 3520 \$600; 3700 \$1,500.

Line Item	Description	Requested	Cut	Approved
1020-2610	Copy Machine Supplies	7,000	2,000	5,000
1020-3141	Communications	900	400	500
1020-3520	Equipment Repair	1,000	400	600
1020-3700	Dues & Subscriptions	1,700	200	1,500

SHERIFF

Councilmember Raben: The next items for cuts are under the Sheriff’s Department: 1750 in the amount of \$133,750; 2210 \$225,000; 2220 \$12,000; 2230 \$80,000; 3310 \$15,000; 3600 is an addition \$103,203; 4230 zero; and 4290 zero.

Line Item	Description	Requested	Cut	Approved
1050-1750	Clothing Allowance	135,000	1,250	133,750
1050-2210	Gas & Oil	250,000	25,000	225,000
1050-2220	Tires & Tubes	15,000	3,000	12,000
1050-2230	Garage & Motor	100,000	20,000	80,000
1050-3310	Training	20,000	5,000	15,000
1050-3600	Rent	0	(103,203)	103,203
1050-4230	Motor Vehicles	300,000	300,000	0
1050-4290	Vehicle Equipment	24,000	24,000	0

JAIL

Councilmember Raben: Under Jail: 2260, this will appear different than what you have on your sheet, \$600,000; 3310 \$5,000.

Line Item	Description	Requested	Cut	Approved
1051-2260	Food	675,000	75,000	600,000
1051-3310	Training	20,000	15,000	5,000

SURVEYOR

Councilmember Raben: 3700 \$150.

Line Item	Description	Requested	Cut	Approved
1060-3700	Dues & Subscriptions	4,300	4,150	150

CORONER

Councilmember Raben: 1120 at \$52,574; 1210 \$61,067; 2210 \$4,000; 2230 \$1,500; 2600 at \$3,000; 2720 \$7,000; 2730 \$1,500; 2740 \$1,000; 3130 \$500; 3160 zero; 3200 \$13,500; 3310 \$2,500; 3520 \$1,500; and 4122 zero. Continue on? Is everybody...

Councilmember Lloyd: What was 3650? 3640, I’m sorry. No, 3650. Autopsy?

Councilmember Raben: As is. These are only the changes being made. Autopsies will be approved as submitted.

Line Item	Description	Requested	Cut	Approved
1070-1120	Chief Deputy	56,319	3,745	52,574
1070-1210	Asst. Coroners	64,000	2,933	61,067



Line Item	Description	Requested	Cut	Approved
1070-2210	Gas & Oil	4,500	500	4,000
1070-2230	Garage & Motor	2,500	1,000	1,500
1070-2600	Office Supplies	3,500	500	3,000
1070-2720	Lab Supplies	8,000	1,000	7,000
1070-2730	Sanitary Supplies	2,500	1,000	1,500
1070-2740	Chemicals	1,500	500	1,000
1070-3130	Travel/Mileage	1,500	1,000	500
1070-3160	Radio/Pagers	2,000	2,000	0
1070-3200	Utilities	16,000	2,500	13,500
1070-3310	Training	4,000	1,500	2,500
1070-3520	Equipment Repair	2,000	500	1,500
1070-4122	Buildings & Equipment	4,500	4,500	0

COUNTY ASSESSOR

Councilmember Raben: Okay, County Assessor: 1180 \$33,217; 1200 \$27,648; 1540 \$31,503; and 1630 zero.

Line Item	Description	Requested	Cut	Approved
1090-1180	Network Supervisor	38,230	5,013	33,217
1090-1200	RE/PTABOA Deputy II	28,959	1,311	27,648
1090-1540	Dep Assr PP/Data	30,071	(1,432)	31,503
1090-1630	Dep Assr Mobile Home	28,959	28,959	0

Councilmember Raben: Election Office: 1120 –

Councilmember Bassemier: Jim, on 1120, that \$60,000, that’s for the library voting? What’s that…

Councilmember Raben: Okay, we can discuss, let’s take a motion up until –

Councilmember Bassemier: I’m not going to change my mind, I just kind of wanted to make a little statement.

Councilmember Raben: We can go ahead and bring closure to the other lines.

President Shetler: Okay, we’ll stop it at this point and then again –

Councilmember Raben: I’ll clarify what the motion was. Again, the motion –

President Shetler: Let’s just say that we’ll have a motion to approve the recommendations from Clerk up to the County Assessor’s Office, and I’ll – have we gotten a second on that?

Councilmember Raben: Yeah. All other accounts will be as listed in the book.

Councilmember Lloyd: Second.

President Shetler: Alright, we have a motion and a second. And that's up to this point before we get to the Election Office.

Councilman Sutton: Did we miss a budget? The Recorder?

Councilmember Bassemier: It was zero, set in at zero.

Councilmember Raben: If we didn't address it, there wasn't a cut. All other accounts, all other budgets will be as submitted.

Councilman Sutton: Well, there is a cut there.

President Shetler: Well, salary –

Councilman Sutton: It's a salary line, so I didn't know if you were excluding it –

Councilmember Raben: We'll address, we'll pick up, we'll do the final salary ordinance amendments on the 9<sup>th</sup>. These are the ones that we picked up on to this point.

Councilman Sutton: Thank you.

President Shetler: Okay, we have a motion and a second on the floor. Any questions about the motion? Any questions? Comments? All in favor, signify by saying aye.

**(All Councilmembers voted in the affirmative)**

President Shetler: Those opposed?

**(No opposing votes were cast)**

President Shetler: So ordered. That was a unanimous 7-0 vote.

**(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)**

### ***ELECTION OFFICE***

Councilmember Raben: I guess to address the Election Office, these numbers really represent taking everything back to where we were in '06. I do understand that they're looking at possibly adding a machine in a couple more libraries, which is fine. When we need that amount of money, we'll make that additional appropriation, but, you know, I'm of the belief, you know, outside of those two extra voting opportunities, this budget should remain pretty close to where it was in 2006.

Councilmember Bassemier: Okay, I did talk to Mrs. Kirk yesterday and I think she had a good idea about voting in the libraries. For budget purposes, I'm okay with this for right now, but I said, you know, maybe later on down the road when we get closer, she can come back and request what she's asking for. But, like I said, I think she's got a very good idea about voting in the libraries and especially, it gets the people into the libraries. Not only can they vote, but they take out library cards, so I really do think it's a good idea. But I'm okay with the \$30,000 for now.

Councilmember Raben: And one thing to remember, too, you probably won't need as many voting machines at the same libraries you had in '06, because that was –

Councilmember Bassemier: And I understand that.

Councilmember Raben: That was an unprecedented amount of voters and I – you know, it would be great to see that in 2010, but I don't think we're going to see it again, as high as it was this past year.

President Shetler: Yes, Councilman Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: I think that Susan can come back as well, and I think it's a good idea to set the budget in today, but I think everyone here is pretty much in favor of the satellite voting places. We can see by the overwhelming response, that voters, how they utilized the early voting. I think it's going to forever change the way we vote in this country and also probably change the way candidates run for office because you can't go to the last minute any longer. It's going to extend the process somewhat, but I think anything that makes it more convenient for our people to vote, we have to consider, and we've definitely moved in that direction with the library, so it's a win-win.

President Shetler: Yes, Councilman Kiefer, did you have a point or question?

Councilmember Kiefer: I was just going to add to what Councilman Raben already said, that, you know, there's no way this election is going to have the same turnout that we had last year or the year before, so I'm okay with doing this, these cuts.

President Shetler: I think, basically, what we have in the back of our minds a little bit, is that maybe we can, certainly, if the general election, we'd need to hold with what we've done in the past and make sure that we have an ample supply of places to vote prior to the election, in the libraries, but, primary, maybe we can pare that back whether it be by the hours, by the days, by the places, I don't know, I'm not – I think we need to get together with our Clerk and try to work that out, and the Commissioners, and they formed a committee a few years ago that worked out very well as far as deciding on places and stuff and that might be something we could talk about. Primary election day, for those who have worked them, know that it's not near the demand that you have otherwise, in a general election. So I think, at least from my perspective, that's what I'm looking at, that we might be able to pare it down just a tad bit. I might say that I had entertained the idea of perhaps borrowing a few full-time employees from one department or another. I discussed that with a couple of the different department heads and I know that the Treasurer's Office is overwhelmed at that point in time because of collecting taxes and stuff, and I want them to collect taxes first, and not to be trying to save us a few nickels and dimes here on some part-time help. And I think it's unworkable for the Registration Office to get involved in it because they're extremely busy, so moving full-time people around within offices may be unworkable during election times and part-time may be our only resolve to it.

Councilmember Kiefer: I think the important thing is that we want to be prepared to handle demand, and if the demand is there, we'll be prepared to accommodate them. But if the demand is not there, there's no reason to spend taxpayer dollars for personnel and equipment if the demand is not there.

President Shetler: Yes, I agree, well said. Yes, Councilman Sutton?

Councilman Sutton: I think, you know, what we're attempting to do is forecast how many voters will show up at the polls next year and that's always difficult to do, to come up with an accurate number, but it is, based upon what's already been said, it is pretty much a given that the primary is not going to have near the numbers that your general is going to have, but I would think it would be appropriate for the Clerk to put together some type of proposal that she could present to us that would show, based upon the numbers what we are talking about here for supporting the early voting and how she would allocate those resources between the primary and the general. I guess I had a little bit of mixed emotions when this was first proposed primarily because we are all aware that, you know, years ago, they reduced the number of polling places that we have county wide, and in no way should we want to get to the point where we want to eliminate the opportunities or the possibility of people being able to exercise their right to vote. So, with that said, reducing the number of polling places, we've already experienced some savings from that, but we've also seen here over the last couple of elections, that people clearly are in favor of, they enjoy the early voting and it is kind of a new wave of how people want to vote. So perhaps if we look at the Clerk and put something together that shows how we can make sure we can fully provide those early voting opportunities in that general election and maybe not as much emphasis on the primary, that will help us a great deal. And the \$30,000 that's being requested here, I don't know how many people, how much time that allocates out there, but she can put something together for us that works around that figure, that will give us a good start and understand –

Susan Kirk: (Inaudible – comments not made from the microphone)

Councilman Sutton: Good, good. Okay.

President Shetler: Alright, thank you. Any other questions or comments? Councilman Raben? I guess we're ready to roll on here.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, real good. Moving on, I guess moving into Voters Registration, --

Councilmember Lloyd: We haven't done the Election Office yet. You only did one line.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, so do I need to go back through the cuts for the Election Office?

President Shetler: I think we stopped at 1120, so...

Councilmember Raben: Election Office, set in 1120 at \$30,000; 1130 at \$6,000; 1210 at \$2,500; 2600 at \$1,000; 2700 at \$5,000; 3120 at \$1,000; 3130 at \$1,000; 3410 at \$5,000; 3420 at \$1,000; 3530 set in at \$10,000; 3570 \$2,500; 3600 \$7,500; and 3630 \$1,000. Moving on to changes within –

Councilmember Lloyd: Just real quick on that. The total for that department then, is \$217,853, and that is about a \$1,500 increase over '06, so it's a slight increase over '06, for whatever that's worth.

Line Item	Description	Requested	Cut	Approved
1210-1120	Election Asst.	60,000	30,000	30,000
1210-1130	Absentee Teams	10,000	4,000	6,000

Line Item	Description	Requested	Cut	Approved
1210-1210	Ballot Aids	4,000	1,500	2,500
1210-2600	Office Supplies	2,000	1,000	1,000
1210-2700	Other Supplies	10,000	5,000	5,000
1210-3120	Postage/Freight	2,000	1,000	1,000
1210-3130	Travel/Mileage	1,500	500	1,000
1210-3410	Printing	10,000	5,000	5,000
1210-3420	Legal Advertising	2,000	1,000	1,000
1210-3530	Contractual Services	20,000	10,000	10,000
1210-3570	Janitorial Service	5,000	2,500	2,500
1210-3600	Rent	9,000	1,500	7,500
1210-3630	Equip. Lease & Rental	2,000	1,000	1,000

**VOTER REGISTRATION**

President Shetler: Voters Registration, unchanged.

**COOPERATIVE EXTENSION**

Councilmember Raben: We move into Co-op Extension Service. Account 2600 \$4,500; 3200 \$5,000; 3530 \$72,934.

Line Item	Description	Requested	Cut	Approved
1230-2600	Office Supplies	5,000	500	4,500
1230-3200	Utilities	6,000	1,000	5,000
1230-3530	Contractual Services	73,295	361	72,934

**AREA PLAN**

Councilmember Raben: Moving to Area Plan, account 4250 set in at zero.

Line Item	Description	Requested	Cut	Approved
1240-4250	Misc. Equipment	5,000	5,000	0

**DRAINAGE BOARD**

Councilmember Raben: Drainage Board, unchanged.

**VETERANS ADMINISTRATION**

Councilmember Raben: Veterans Administration, account 3600, set in at \$1,000.

Councilmember Kiefer: I think that's account 2600.

Councilmember Raben: 2600 at \$1,000, excuse me.

Line Item	Description	Requested	Cut	Approved
1270-2600	Office Supplies	2,283	1,283	1,000

COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

Councilmember Raben: Moving on to County Commissioners, and there was a loose document on everyone’s desk for County Commissioners, an amendment to the document that you have in place. The only change in this is the first item, 3000, so I will list the changes within the County Commissioners, account 3000 set in at \$928,305; 3020 \$850,059; 3040 \$18,962; 3080 \$214,316; 3100 \$184,022; 3130 zero; 3190 \$2,500; 3210 \$161,259; 3490 \$20,000; 3500 \$43,970; 3600 \$4,756,206; 3750 \$69,568; and 3760 \$25,000.

Line Item	Description	Requested	Cut	Approved
1300-3000	Bond & Insurance	974,721	46,416	928,305
1300-3020	S.W. Mental Health	875,561	25,502	850,059
1300-3040	Soil & Water	19,531	569	18,962
1300-3080	Emergency Medical	238,912	24,596	214,316
1300-3100	Animal Control	181,414	(2,608)	184,022
1300-3130	Travel/Mileage	20,000	20,000	0
1300-3190	Solid Waste Disposal	3,000	500	2,500
1300-3210	Emergency Mgmt.	152,422	(8,837)	161,259
1300-3490	YMCA	21,000	1,000	20,000
1300-3500	Human Relations	44,241	271	43,970
1300-3600	Rent	5,890,710	1,134,504	4,756,206
1300-3750	Purchasing Dept.	129,994	60,426	69,568
1300-3760	Occu/Med	30,000	5,000	25,000

WEIGHTS & MEASURES

Councilmember Raben: No changes within Weights & Measures.

PUBLIC DEFENDER

Councilmember Raben: Public Defender, line 1620 \$113,083; 3000 account \$2,672; 3310 \$2,500; 3600 \$56,876; 3943 \$12,000.

Line Item	Description	Requested	Cut	Approved
1303-1620	Ch. Pub. Defender	114,935	1,852	113,083
1303-3000	Bond & Insurance	2,500	(172)	2,672
1303-3310	Training	3,000	500	2,500
1303-3600	Rent	55,050	(1,826)	56,876
1303-3943	Pauper Expense	15,000	3,000	12,000

**SUPERINTENDENT OF COUNTY BUILDINGS**

Councilmember Raben: Superintendent of County Buildings, there’s one item, 2300 set in at \$500.

Line Item	Description	Requested	Cut	Approved
1310-2300	Uniforms	700	200	500

**CIRCUIT COURT**

Councilmember Raben: Circuit Court, line 3723 set in at \$1,000; line 3730 \$1,500.

Line Item	Description	Requested	Cut	Approved
1360-3723	Psych. Evaluations	2,000	1,000	1,000
1360-3730	Continuing Education	2,000	500	1,500

**COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS**

Councilmember Raben: Community Corrections, line 1850 set in at \$48,000.

Line Item	Description	Requested	Cut	Approved
1361-1850	Union Overtime	55,000	7,000	48,000

**SUPERIOR COURT**

Councilmember Raben: Superior Court, line 3250 \$26,000; 3520 \$3,000; 4210 zero and 4220 zero.

Line Item	Description	Requested	Cut	Approved
1370-3250	Law Books	29,400	3,400	26,000
1370-3520	Equipment Repair	12,500	9,500	3,000
1370-4210	Office Furniture	4,000	4,000	0
1370-4220	Office Machines	4,000	4,000	0

**DRUG & ALCOHOL DEFERRAL**

Councilmember Raben: Here is one that you do not have on your list: Drug & Alcohol Deferral, line 3770 \$3,500.

Line Item	Description	Requested	Cut	Approved
1371-3770	Treatment Cost	4,500	1,000	3,500

**THE CENTRE**

Councilmember Raben: Moving into The Centre, account 3537 set in at \$196,742.

Line Item	Description	Requested	Cut	Approved
1440-3537	Mgmt. Fee & Incentive	202,645	5,903	196,742

**BURDETTE PARK**

Councilmember Raben: Then we move into Burdette Park, line 2220 \$2,500; 3190 \$7,000; 3990 \$2,000.

Line Item	Description	Requested	Cut	Approved
1450-2220	Tires & Tubes	5,000	2,500	2,500
1450-3190	Solid Waste Disposal	7,500	500	7,000
1450-3990	Miscellaneous	3,000	1,000	2,000

**LEGAL AID**

Councilmember Raben: Next is Legal Aid, line 3140 \$1,125; 3450 \$1,500; 3680 \$4,500.

Line Item	Description	Requested	Cut	Approved
1460-3140	Telephone	1,600	475	1,125
1460-3450	Yellow Pages	1,900	400	1,500
1460-3680	Malpractice Insurance	4,900	400	4,500

**COUNTY COUNCIL**

Councilmember Raben: County Council, 3130 \$20,500, that's an addition. If you remember, we zeroed it out in the Commissioners. Per their request, we moved that into our budget. 3130 is \$20,500; 3315, zero. And that concludes the General fund. All other salary lines including FICA, PERF & Insurance will be set in at our September the 9<sup>th</sup> budget. All other lines as submitted, and I would like to make that in – I've already got a motion, but simply confirming what the original motion was.

Line Item	Description	Requested	Cut	Approved
1480-3130	Travel/Mileage	500	(20,000)	20,500
1480-3315	Court Technology	12,603	12,603	0

President Shetler: I guess that would take us from the Election Office through the County Council. So I'd need a motion and a second – I've got the motion.

Councilmember Kiefer: Second.

President Shetler: Alright, any questions or comments?

Councilmember Lloyd: This is strictly General Fund, that's where we stopped, the end of the General Fund?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Councilmember Lloyd: Okay, thank you.

President Shetler: All in favor, signify by saying aye.



(All Councilmembers voted in the affirmative)

President Shetler: Anybody opposed?

(No opposing votes were cast)

President Shetler: There being seven for and none against, the motion carries.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

Councilman Sutton: Do we have a total on those General Fund only adjustments?

Councilmember Raben: General Fund total?

Councilman Sutton: Yes, just the General Fund.

Councilmember Raben: Yes. Royce, I had a few last moment cuts there that were proposed by or asked to be set in, but the amount at this point should put us at 1.9 – let’s say \$1,920,000 at this point. That’s going to be give or take a thousand dollars, probably.

Councilman Sutton: Okay.

President Shetler: Okay, other questions? Okay, move on to County Highway.

**COUNTY HIGHWAY**

Councilmember Raben: Okay, County Highway, 3010, this is an addition, be set in at \$352,000.

Line Item	Description	Requested	Cut	Approved
2010-3010	Other Insurance	320,000	(32,000)	352,000

**RIVERBOAT**

Councilmember Raben: County Commissioners/CCD. Let’s go back a moment. No changes within the Riverboat.

**CUMULATIVE BRIDGE**

Councilmember Raben: No changes within Cum Bridge.

**COUNTY COMMISSIONERS/CCD**

Councilmember Raben: The County Commissioners/CCD account line 4230, set in at \$275,000.

Line Item	Description	Requested	Cut	Approved
2031/1300-4230	Motor Vehicles	250,000	(25,000)	275,000

Councilmember Lloyd: So that’s an addition?

Councilmember Raben: That's an addition. Basically, that's \$250,000 for the Sheriff's Department for cars plus \$25,000 for equipment. The Airport...let's see, no changes within the –

Councilmember Bassemier: Jim, before you, I just want the record to reflect that I'm going to abstain from voting on just that one, the Airport, since I work out there. So when you make a motion, exclude the Airport for me, because I need to abstain.

Councilmember Lloyd: Make a motion for everything up to now.

Councilmember Raben: Well, okay, we're not actually to the Airport yet.

Councilmember Bassemier: Why don't we do the Airport last – well, I kind of hate to do that since they're here.

Councilmember Raben: We're not actually there yet.

Councilmember Bassemier: Okay.

### ***HEALTH DEPARTMENT***

Councilmember Raben: The Health Department is unchanged. We'll skip over the Airport and we'll come back to the Airport.

### ***LOCAL ROADS & STREETS***

Councilmember Raben: Local Roads & Streets, unchanged.

### ***SURVEYOR MAPS***

Councilmember Raben: Surveyor Maps, unchanged.

### ***AUDITOR/REASSESSMENT***

Councilmember Raben: Auditor/Reassessment, unchanged.

### ***COUNTY ASSESSOR/REASSESSMENT***

Councilmember Raben: County Assessor/Reassessment, a few minor changes. 3130 \$500; and 4220 \$2,000.

Councilmember Lloyd: Question, Mr. Raben, did we, so we're not going to do anything with 1990?

Councilmember Raben: No, I think you'll see that 1990 – you'd have to go back and look at Knight, Perry, Pigeon, you have to look at them individually and see that that's probably an appropriate amount of money.

Councilmember Lloyd: Okay, so we just want to leave that unchanged?

Councilmember Raben: Unchanged. Okay, and I stated 4220 at \$2,000.

Line Item	Description	Requested	Cut	Approved
2490-1090-3130	Travel/Mileage	5,000	4,500	500
2490-1090-4220	Office Machines	14,000	12,000	2,000

**PTABOA/REASSESSMENT**

Councilmember Raben: PTABOA, account 2600 \$3,000; 3130 \$500,000 –

Councilmember Lloyd: No.

Councilmember Raben: No – \$500. 3130 \$500.

Councilman Sutton: Whew, that blows the budget.

Councilmember Raben: Man, I was really throwing around money there, wasn't I? Okay, \$500. All the other Reassessment accounts as listed.

Line Item	Description	Requested	Cut	Approved
2490-1091-2600	Office Supplies	7,500	4,500	3,000
2490-1091-3130	Travel/Mileage	5,000	4,500	500

**CIRCUIT COURT SUPPLEMENTAL ADULT PROBATION**

Councilmember Raben: Circuit Court Supplemental Adult Probation as listed.

**PROSECUTOR PRE-TRIAL DIVERSION**

Councilmember Raben: Prosecutor Pre-Trial Diversion as listed.

**SURVEYOR CORNER PERPETUATION**

Councilmember Raben: Surveyor Corner Perpetuation account, line 3700 set in at \$4,100 –

Councilman Sutton: And that's a new line?

Councilmember Raben: That's a new line that –

Councilmember Bassemier: You said \$4,100, is it –

Councilmember Raben: \$4,150. That's a new line that was requested, and that line will read, Dues & Subscriptions.

Line Item	Description	Requested	Cut	Approved
2650-3700	Dues & Subscriptions	0	(4,150)	4,150

**SHERIFF MISDEMEANOR HOUSING/OFFENDER**

Councilmember Raben: Sheriff Misdemeanor unchanged.

**LOCAL EMERGENCY PLAN COMMISSION**

Councilmember Raben: Local Emergency Planning, unchanged.

**LOCAL DRUG FREE COMMUNITY**

Councilmember Raben: Drug Free Community, no changes.

**911 EMERGENCY SERVICE**

Councilmember Raben: 911 Emergency Services, line 3893 zero.

Line Item	Description	Requested	Cut	Approved
3290-3893	Reverse 911	100,000	100,000	0

**SALES DISCLOSURE FEES**

Councilmember Raben: Disclosure Fees, no changes.

**CONVENTION & VISITORS BUREAU**

Councilmember Raben: Convention & Visitors Bureau, line 3200 – oh, I’m sorry. Convention & Visitors Bureau is unchanged.

**TOURISM CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT**

Councilmember Raben: Tourism Capital is unchanged.

**CONVENTION CENTER OPERATING**

Councilmember Raben: Convention Center Operating Fund, account 3200, that’s on page 179, \$450,000.

Line Item	Description	Requested	Cut	Approved
3650-3200	Utilities	475,000	25,000	450,000

**JAIL BOND**

Councilmember Raben: Jail Bond, unchanged.

**LEGAL AID/UNITED WAY**

Councilmember Raben: Legal Aid/United Way, line item 2600 zero; 3250 zero; 3280 \$2,043; 3410 zero; 3611 zero; 3700 zero; and 3730 zero.

Line Item	Description	Requested	Cut	Approved
4290-2600	Office Supplies	250	250	0
4290-3250	Law Books	250	250	0
4290-3280	Exam Records/Audit	4,000	1,957	2,043
4290-3410	Printing	250	250	0

Line Item	Description	Requested	Cut	Approved
4290-3611	Litigation	2,000	2,000	0
4290-3700	Dues & Subscriptions	300	300	0
4290-3730	Continuing Education	300	300	0

***BOND ISSUE***

Councilmember Raben: And last is the Bond Issue, 4204, I'm happy to say, zero. All other line items including FICA, PERF & Insurance will be set in at our September 9<sup>th</sup> meeting. All other line items as proposed, and I make that in the form of a motion.

Line Item	Description	Requested	Cut	Approved
4300-4204	USI	480,000	480,000	0

Councilman Sutton: Second.

President Shetler: It's been moved and seconded. Any questions or comments? Yes, Councilman Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Just note that the USI Bond Issue, \$480,000 was budgeted. That bond issue is scheduled to be paid off January 2010, and we don't have to budget because there is money in the fund to cover the rest of the interest, so that's good news for the taxpayers and that was certainly a worthy project.

President Shetler: Alright, thank you. Any other comments or questions? We have a –

Councilmember Raben: I'm sorry, we need to go back to the Airport.

President Shetler: Well, no, we're going to do this without the Airport. We're going to do this motion without the Airport. Okay, so any questions about the motion on the floor? All in favor, signify by saying aye.

**(All Councilmembers voted in the affirmative)**

President Shetler: Anyone opposed?

**(No opposing votes were cast)**

President Shetler: There being seven for and no against, the motion carries.

**(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)**

***AIRPORT***

President Shetler: Now, you want to go back to the Airport then?

Councilmember Raben: Okay, the Airport was 134 and it's account number 1100. The correct amount is \$2,493,030. All other accounts as listed.

Line Item	Description	Requested	Cut	Approved
2140-1100	Salary/W ages	2,506,899	13,869	2,493,030

President Shetler: Okay, comments, questions? Moved and...

Councilmember Lloyd: Second.

President Shetler: Seconded. Any questions or comments?

Councilmember Lloyd: I guess for Mr. Bassemier's purposes, we ought to do a roll call on this. I would request that.

President Shetler: Alright, thank you. Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Abstain.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being six ayes, no nays, and one abstention, the motion carries.

**(Motion carried 6-0/Councilmember Bassemier abstained from vote)**

President Shetler: Do you have anything further?

Councilmember Raben: I don't have a lot more to add. We'll see everybody back here on September the 9<sup>th</sup> to hear our last and final budget cuts and set this budget in for next year. If there's any, hopefully minor, changes that need to be made, we can make them at that point. Hopefully there will be very few, if any, and we'll set in the salary ordinance for next year and make all the final salary corrections.

President Shetler: Okay, thank you. Yes, Councilman Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Just for the sake of the public to understand, I think we're projected to be, our cost of county government is projected to be less in 2010 than it was in 2009, which, I think, is good for all the departments that did a great job with their budgets and for this Council. And I think that's important to note.

President Shetler: Alright, thank you. I had one other point that I wanted to bring up and I don't know if this is the appropriate time or if it comes later, the Reassessment fund seems like it continues to grow somewhat and, you know, that is on the local tax rate and it's separate. I didn't know if there was something we might want to look at to not apply so much of a tax rate to that or how we might want to proceed to slow the growth of that down a little bit. I know there's some restrictions on that money and it's, giving Homestead credits and all that kind of stuff is good, but if you can keep it from going out the door to begin with, you don't need to send it out and bring it back. So I'm wondering if we can't hold the line there and what the appropriate time to bring that up is.

Councilmember Raben: You know, maybe at some point, yourself, I, maybe the County Auditor, the County Assessor, we could sit down and revisit that, you know, as a whole and see if there is any adjustments that could be made within.

Bill Fluty: Often, a letter from the Auditor and the Assessor to the DLGF, and we would ask them to adjust that rate. And you would do that for two reasons: you're budgeting under \$400,000 and that's bringing in about that much, and there is a balance of about \$1.4 million. So it would be actually lowering that rate and spending that balance down is, I guess, what you're asking to do for a couple of years in light of these rolling reassessments, you probably don't need that big a balance in there. So that's something for you to discuss and direct us to send that letter, if that's what you'd like.

Councilmember Kiefer: Tom, that's a good point to bring up because I think, in effect, what you're doing is reducing, again, a tax to the county taxpayers because we have enough money in that fund. So I think that's a good point. I'm glad you brought it up.

President Shetler: Yes, Councilman Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Just for the record, checking with Mrs. Deig, the total cuts today, \$1,823,248. I don't know if that jives with what you had or not.

Councilmember Raben: Is that General fund?

Councilmember Lloyd: From all the funds: \$1,823,248.

Councilmember Raben: No that's, but we'll have an opportunity to –

Councilmember Lloyd: Right, we'll have a better chance to check it. We're sitting here on a –

Councilmember Raben: We'll spend some time checking our numbers again.

Councilmember Lloyd: Right, but anyway, we should be in that ballpark, so that,

from the requests, that's what was cut today.

President Shetler: Okay, any other – yes, Councilman Sutton?

Councilman Sutton: One other very important part of our business that we now have as a responsibility thanks to HB1001, the budgets for the other taxing units here in Vanderburgh County also need to have their budgets to cycle through the County Council. Just trying to find out if the others are prepared and have the material necessary for us to review those budgets and when that will occur.

President Shetler: I think that's going to be done at our last meeting in September, is that the 30<sup>th</sup>? And they have been – I think they have been sent, if not, you know, we've talked about – they've been sending in their things, so they're aware of the deadline on that and they need to be gotten to us by that point in time.

Councilman Sutton: Obviously, we're not necessarily going through and working their budgets like we're doing these others, but we may want to make that known, I guess, in some way or another because I didn't see it on our agenda necessarily, so that they are aware – are we going to have them make a presentation or are we just going to have their material? Are we just going to have their material and then approval. What's the thought process there?

President Shetler: My thought process is that they submit it, and that they're at least here for any questions that we might have, particularly if there are some that we may notice are not adhering to some of our county policies that we've established like flatlining the salaries. If some of the townships have gone beyond that, I think the public needs to know. So I think there may be some questions like that, that we would address to the different officeholder or department head that's out there, that needs to submit their budget to us.

Councilman Sutton: Well, and the good thing for those who are interested and the taxpayers as they look on their property tax bill, they see all the different areas where their tax dollars are portioned off here locally, but there's never ever really been any meeting convened where people can ask questions about the different other budgets unless they went to those individual meetings. So it will be a good process for us to get a chance to review all those.

President Shetler: Right, absolutely. I think we've sent the notice out informing them that it needs to be in to us and that the date of the meeting and the time of the meeting, and then we will also follow up with them, know that we want them here, present. Councilman Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: As liaison to Evansville-Vanderburgh Public Library, I know the library is in the process of finishing their budget, it has to go to their board, but I'm sure that they will be here September 30<sup>th</sup> for any questions that we have.

President Shetler: Anything else? Yes, Ms. Kirk?

Councilmember Raben: While she's on her way up, I think, you know, as we look at those budgets, I know our budget, when it's all said and done, should come in below last year's budget, and I hope we see that same thing within those other budgets. I mean, I hope the Library, the rest of them, I hope we see a smaller budget this year than what they, for next year, than what they're operating with this



year.

Councilmember Lloyd: Their budget increase was approximately 1.4% the last that I talked to them about it, and that was trying to hold everything flat, including wages. So that's a pretty small increase.

Susan Kirk: I think for the general public, we need to clarify something as far as elections go and it's something that we all know, but we haven't particularly brought up. Mr. Raben and all of you want to compare our elections now with 2006. But if you will remember, back in 2006, you granted a 50 cent per hour raise for each election office employee, which took effect in 2007. That's what makes that go up. It's not that, you know, I'm just sticking money in the budget. You gave them a raise, which was very nice and that's what's in there, and I think the public needs to know also that early voting, if we're open for fifteen days prior to the election, it would be right at \$9,000. If we're open for ten days prior to the election, it's right at \$6,000. So I think the public has a perception that early voting is costing \$30,000, and it's not. The reason things are going up from 2006 is a 50 cent per hour increase in wages, plus the early voting. And that's all I wanted to say.

President Shetler: Okay, I think, of course, now the minimum wage is what, \$8.25?

Susan Kirk: I'm not too sure. Councilman Lloyd and I discussed that and said there wasn't much you could do about that raise, but that's something that we're never mentioning as to why it's going up. You can't say well, let's do it just like we did in 2006 because they got a raise since then. So obviously, that does make a difference. So I just think the general public really needs to know why that is, and what does early voting cost. And it doesn't make any difference whether we have one machine or ten machines, that's not our cost at the libraries. That has nothing to do with it.

Councilmember Lloyd: In July, it went up to \$7.25, minimum wage.

President Shetler: Giving everybody another raise.

Susan Kirk: So anyway, and I just think the general public needs to know why that is rather than this concept of, yeah, why can't we go back to 2006? Because they got a raise and now we have early voting.

President Shetler: And I think, too, at least in my mind, as you know, you've been around for, you know, not very long, but you've been around long enough –

Susan Kirk: Now, you caught yourself pretty good.

President Shetler: Boy, what a fumble recovery. But, and you understand that in some cases, we don't have maybe, in some areas of the city and the county, we may not have primary opponents at all, a contest, and so it may be unnecessary, for example, to have a voting location set up on the east side when there's no contest, and so we could kind of wing that as it goes along and we actually do see what kind of contest –

Susan Kirk: Are you referring to early voting or –

President Shetler: Early voting in the May primary. Those are situations where I think that we can kind of adjust and look at and may be able to find savings by paring

the whole process back a little bit in the primary, from what we normally do in the general. And that's all I'm thinking at this point in time. Now it may not happen. We may have full contests up and down the line and thousands of people ready to vote, and if that's the case, then we'll have to appropriate more money to make sure it's taken care of.

Susan Kirk: Yeah, it's just one of those things Councilman Lloyd and I discussed about maybe when the candidates file for office, some of you will be filing, instead of going to the Election Office, and we have that manned, you'll come to the Clerk's office. The only difference is you'll have to call and make an appointment with me because we can't have news media and speeches taking up – we don't have any room over there at the front counter. So every candidate will just have to kind of give me a call and say, you know, be over there about 10:00 and file for office and then you'll have to do your other stuff somewhere else besides there. But that would save, I don't know, a couple thousand dollars, I guess.

President Shetler: Alright, Councilman Goebel? Any questions?

Councilmember Goebel: I was just wondering, Susan, do you think there will be shorter times during the day when people can early vote and the shorter length in calendar than we had last time in 2008, I mean?

Susan Kirk: Yeah, I gave a spreadsheet, and I don't know whether you all got it or not, but anyway, yeah, I think if, you know, fifteen days is what we normally did. We could cut it down to ten, we could cut it down to five days. We usually do the seven hours, daylight, and we have to be out of there like at 6 or so because the libraries close, and you want to try to let people vote after work and maybe people who don't want to drive at night, a little time during the day, so we can cut down as much as Council deems necessary as far as the early voting goes.

Councilmember Goebel: And do you plan to have the same number of sites at libraries or is there any intention to expand?

Susan Kirk: Well, no. we can't expand. There is, originally, I only wanted three libraries, but it caught on so quickly, we ended up with five. And we can't expand any more because we only have five libraries that are handicapped accessible, so five is it. We're not going any higher than that. And that worked out so well, we don't need to. So anyway, thank you very much for your time.

President Shetler: Alright, thank you. Yes, Councilman Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Sorry, one more update. That was all General fund and the total revised is \$1,832,248. There was an additional 9,000 we missed, but that is all General fund cuts. \$1,832,248, which was done today.

President Shetler: And that did not include all the personnel?

Councilmember Lloyd: The ones that were zeroed out, it did include.

President Shetler: Yeah, okay. Okay, any other questions or comments? Okay, we'll recess until next week at this time, at 9:00 in the morning, on the 9<sup>th</sup>. Thank you very much.

**(The meeting was recessed at 10:24 a.m.)**

**VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL**

---

President Tom Shetler, Jr.

---

Vice President Joe Kiefer

---

Councilmember Jim Raben

---

Councilmember Mike Goebel

---

Councilmember Russell Lloyd, Jr.

---

Councilmember Ed Bassemier

---

Councilmember Royce Sutton

Recorded and transcribed by Teri Lukeman.

**VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL  
BUDGET ADOPTION MEETING  
SEPTEMBER 9, 2009**

The Vanderburgh County Council met in session this 9<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2009 in room 301 of the Civic Center Complex. The meeting was called to order at 9:09 a.m. by County Council President Tom Shetler, Jr.

President Shetler: Good morning. I'd like to call the meeting to order, this being pretty close to the 9<sup>th</sup> second of the 9<sup>th</sup> minute of the 9<sup>th</sup> hour, on the 9<sup>th</sup> day of the 9<sup>th</sup> month of the 9<sup>th</sup> year of 2000. I think we'll call the meeting to order and take the roll call please.

COUNCILMEMBER	PRESENT	ABSENT
Councilmember Sutton	X	
Councilmember Bassemier	X	
Councilmember Lloyd	X	
Councilmember Goebel	X	
Councilmember Raben	X	
Councilmember Kiefer	X	
President Shetler	X	

President Shetler: There being seven members present, we have a quorum. At this time, I'd like to ask Councilman Goebel to lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance, please.

(Pledge of Allegiance was given)

President Shetler: This is our final budget hearing today and the purpose is to complete the adoption of the budget, to establish the salaries and all the employee benefits. We will be recommending to the state what the proposed tax rate should be. At this time, basically, we're going to be discussing among ourselves as Councilmembers, after the finance chairman, Council Raben, has finished going through the budget and if any department heads or elected officeholders or anybody has any questions or comments, certainly will be welcome to bring that or any corrections or additions to some of the comments that have been made up here. So at this time, I'd like to turn the mic over to Councilman Raben.

**2010 SALARY ORDINANCE, SALARIES FOR NON-UNION AIRPORT AND  
CONVENTION & VISITORS BUREAU EMPLOYEES, FICA AND PERF**

Councilmember Raben: Okay, thank you. Good morning. First I'd like to move that all eligible full-time county employees receive longevity and step increases as listed in the 2010 salary ordinance. All non-union eligible Airport Authority employees receive only step increases. All Convention & Visitors Bureau employees remain at the 2009 salary levels. And then I'll add that, move that all salaries and rates as listed in the 2010 salary ordinance be approved. And I would also ask that the salary ordinance be made part of the record. All FICA and PERF be adjusted accordingly. I make that in the form of a motion.

Councilmember Lloyd: Second.

President Shetler: We have a motion and a second. Do I have any questions or comments? Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being seven ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

**(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)**

<b>SALARY ORDINANCE EXHIBITS A THROUGH H</b>
--

Councilmember Raben: Okay, next I move that Exhibits A through H be approved as listed in the 2010 salary ordinance that everyone has been given a copy of. I make that in the form of a motion.

Councilman Sutton: Second.

President Shetler: It's been moved and seconded. Do I have any questions or comments? Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being seven ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

**(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)**

<b>LIST A/CORRECTED POSITION TITLES AND SALARIES</b>
--

Councilmember Raben: Okay, next I ask that all Councilmembers check the listing of salary and position title changes that are from the budget book and move to approve List A, and make that part of the record. Everyone has been given a copy of List A. Again, this is salary and position changes, title changes.

Councilman Sutton: And this list that we have, Jim, this List A, just reflective of just new information that we have gathered since maybe the budgets were initially presented or based upon maybe changes related to –

Councilmember Raben: Step increases, stuff like that.

Councilman Sutton: –step, that type of thing, yeah. Okay. Thank you.

President Shetler: Is that a motion, Jim?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

President Shetler: Alright, do I have a second?

Councilmember Lloyd: Second.

President Shetler: Any questions? Comments? Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being seven ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

**(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)**

<b>LIST B/ADDITIONAL CUTS/ADDITIONS/CHANGES</b>
---

Councilmember Raben: Okay next, everyone has been given a copy of List B. List B, or any changes that have taken place since our last vote last Wednesday, one of the, I guess, is recently, one of the hotter topics is the Election Office, and Council President Shetler would like to explain that change.

President Shetler: Yeah, the recommendation I'd make, somewhat of a compromise here, basically, in the year '06, which is a comparable election year, we spent \$30,000 to operate the Election Office. Since that time, and that works out to a total of, I think, 3,750 hours based on the \$8.00 an hour that they were paid. Since that time, we've given them a 50 cent raise, so if you take that 3,750 hours, a 50 cent raise would be \$1,775, I believe, something in that neighborhood. And then, if you would, or it's \$1,875, I'm sorry, I didn't add my numbers down here. \$1,875, add that to the \$30,000 that we spent in '06, the recommendation to use the libraries as a satellite for voting, the recommendation on that is \$8,930, according to the County Clerk, and that would provide 15 days prior to it. She's actually given us two alternatives: one was at a ten day level and the other one was at a fifteen day level. Given the maximum that she's recommending, which was the fifteen day level, \$8,930, add that to the \$1,875, we would come up with a total, and the \$30,000 we spent in '06, the total is \$40,805. So we're funding at the same level we did in '06, adding to that the satellite areas at the libraries.

Councilmember Raben: Additional libraries figured in there over '06, as well.

President Shetler: Yes, that's correct.

Councilmember Kiefer: That's plus a 50 cent increase per hour.

President Shetler: That's correct.

Councilmember Kiefer: Alright.

Councilmember Goebel: This is for fifteen days prior to?

President Shetler: That is correct. She had given us, basically, two different recommendations. One was a ten day at a cost of \$5,950, and one was at a fifteen day, which was at a cost of \$8,930.

Councilmember Goebel: And will the library voting places be open the same amount of time as they were in 2008?

President Shetler: Yes, seven hours per day, a total of one hundred and five hours with a total of ten people working those at five different locations.

Councilmember Goebel: I think we're all in favor of the satellite voting places, without a doubt. I wonder if fifteen days is necessary compared to ten on a midterm election, but I certainly won't oppose it.

President Shetler: Yeah, I think this is something we can monitor, and if it looks like it would end up being less than '06, then perhaps we can, you know, it could be scaled back, but I think that's to the discretion of the Clerk at this time.

Councilmember Goebel: Thank you.

President Shetler: Any other questions? Yes, Councilman Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Well, the other thing we don't know is, the primary, if there will be that many contested races in the primary, so, I mean, this allows for that. She would have that money in the budget and then if we see more contests for the primary, she can use this, these funds are allocated and then for the general, we could appropriate more money if necessary. So, I mean, I think that's a good compromise. So her request of 60, this is actually bringing us up to 40,805 total dollars for the Election Office.

President Shetler: Yes.

Councilmember Raben: The fifteen days represents October the 11<sup>th</sup> through October 29<sup>th</sup>. Okay, everyone clear on that? On Exhibit B?

President Shetler: We need a second on that.

Councilmember Raben: I can continue on before the second. Next I'd like to move that all other 2000, 3000 and 4000 accounts for the 2010 budget be adopted as previously approved, and I would like to list those budgets: 911 Emergency –

Councilman Sutton: Excuse me, Jim. Before you move on. I thought you were going to take action on that List B, like we did on List A or are you going to include that all in with this?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Councilman Sutton: Because I had a couple questions on that List B.



Councilmember Raben: Let's, I mean, if you would rather, we can take just this list.

Councilman Sutton: Okay, if we could. There were just a couple of things I wanted to ask on that, on that List.

President Shetler: Do you want the motion just to be on the B and vote on that, or you have a question?

Councilman Sutton: I would like for us to just vote on that List B and then move to the other items if we could.

President Shetler: Okay, so do I have a second on the List B?

Councilmember Lloyd: Second on List B.

President Shetler: Okay, it's been moved and seconded? Do I have any questions about that? Do you have a question about that one, on B?

Councilman Sutton: Yes. On List B, there is also, includes that position in the Records Office, that Mortgage Deputy position. And I know a few of the Councilmembers have had a chance to meet with the Recorder in discussions about this. And I guess here's maybe what my thoughts are and ultimately would like at the end of my thoughts, I'd like, my recommendation is that we suspend action on that, on that position and here's my rationale behind that. I think we all are trying to be sensitive to our, what we agreed to and that was on the hiring freeze. And when we look at a hiring freeze, I mean, typically what we think about on a hiring freeze is that you're not going to add any additional cost or additional burden to your budget and I think we've been trying to do that. But essentially, what we are doing maybe by this particular action here is in a kind of reverse kind of way, is that we are actually having a reduction of staff or a reduction in force that we haven't actually announced. And I guess maybe that's where I have a little bit of difficulty understanding maybe this approach to the hiring freeze or how we're going about that, because there might be a number of other offices that may have some adjustments in those positions out there. I think maybe the more, the better way for us to maybe look at this, if we want to really look at the number of salary lines that we've got out there and make adjustments, is we sit down and take a look at all those budgets, all the county budgets like we've done here, and if it is determined that there are positions or salary lines that might be duplications or areas where we can no longer, as a county, be able to take on those positions, then we need to evaluate that based on the whole picture rather than just the very small micro picture that we're looking at here, and I think I'm as sensitive to this issue as any of you guys are and trying to keep this budget in line, but I just don't think this is maybe the best approach for us to, based upon an employee leaving, to make a decision that that particular position is no longer needed. Now we did qualify our hiring freeze by saying that if it were an urgent or an emergency related position like a position in the Sheriff's Department or positions that are covered under contract, that we would not adjust those. But then all those that don't fall under that category, in fact, I even made mention of it. I mean, there are certain positions out there that we know are very essential positions toward county business. Can we go through and list all those? Probably could. Have we done that? No, we haven't. But just taking it by this approach, I feel like the more appropriate thing is maybe to suspend action on this – I feel like the more appropriate thing may be to suspend action on this until we get a better picture of what our true sense of where we are on this.

And I know you guys have met with – some of you guys have met with the Recorder, but I just don't think this is just the best approach. We may have other positions coming up along the way, which I fully anticipate that we will by the end of the year, I mean, is the decision here that we're going to eliminate every one of those positions that become open if we don't, if they aren't in some of those emergency positions, then I just think it's just a hit and miss and not necessarily a rational long-term approach that will benefit the greater good for the county.

President Shetler: Any other comments or questions? Yes, Councilman Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: I mean, I can understand, Councilman Sutton, what you're saying there. In this case, the Council added positions in the Recorder's Office several years ago due to the volume of mortgages and refinancings when you had the housing boom. Those volumes are down dramatically, and we – you know, in this case it looks like there's an opportunity here for the Council to take a position out. If housing turns around and we have larger volumes there, I think it has been mentioned to the Recorder that we could add that position back. But, I mean, there's an opportunity here to run a more efficient office and, I guess, run a more efficient county government. So I think it's a good opportunity to eliminate a position. And we've looked through the whole budget. I mean, there's other – there may be other possibilities, but we're in a little bit better position than the city, we don't have to just arbitrarily eliminate jobs. But here, it seems like an opportunity for the county to save money and gather some efficiencies. So, I mean, I would be in favor of eliminating.

Councilman Sutton: Well, Councilman Lloyd, I know we had some discussion about what those numbers are. I mean, you had one set of numbers, the Recorder had another set of numbers regarding the number of filings. But based upon the historic trends, I think what we're seeing is that based – even though this is seemingly a down market for housing, we're still on par due to the same number of filings that we had in 2008. And I think the last numbers, it was something like 7,200 filings and the total for last year was right at about 15,000 on filings. So we are right on par with what we had last year, so that's why I'm trying to get maybe some rationale, understanding of why we would just selectively just take one department rather than looking at the whole picture.

President Shetler: I, honestly, personally don't feel like it was arbitrary in any way, I mean, I really feel as if, looking at those numbers and citing the statistics that you're citing, that when you divide in the work, basically, they were operating with about 4,000 pieces or recordings per each individual. And today, they're something in the neighborhood of a couple thousand. So, obviously, the efficiency isn't quite there as it once was and there just is an opportunity. Now if it were a 24/7 operation and it was costing us overtime, if it were an emergency situation, I think that's a different ball game there. But it just so happens that the Recorder's Office happens to be one of the first ones that come up, I don't know that, I certainly would not act any differently whether it would be the Clerk or the Treasurer or the Auditor, or whoever it may be if I saw their caseloads decrease and that each individual person wasn't being as efficient as they once were, that I would think that would be a triggering mechanism for me, anyway.

Councilman Sutton: And I think that's perfectly sound, but when we think about a mortgage and what we do on the county's end, there's several offices that are affected or touched by the Recording of a mortgage. You've got the Assessor,

you've got the Recorder, you've got the Treasurer, you've got several offices, so if those are down, wouldn't that touch on more than one office, I guess, rather than just one?

President Shetler: Well, in addition to that hiring freeze, we also said that we wouldn't go out and really slash jobs, but as they came available, that we would do it through attrition. And that's kind of what I'm looking at here. Councilman Raben?

Councilmember Raben: A few comments –

Councilmember Bassemier: Tom? You talked with Ms. Tuley, you was going to address this sometime after the first of the year again about if she needs that employee. Is that what, was that your conversation?

Councilmember Raben: Yeah, I can elaborate on that just a moment. I did have the opportunity to discuss this along with Councilman Goebel with the County Recorder. And I think both of us expressed concerns about the future and I know, for one, that I made a commitment that if we see a big turn in filings, that she has my support on revisiting this issue for sure. One thing you've got to look at, and everybody makes very valid points here today, is housing starts are down and, you know, interest rates for a number of months have been at a real low. So I don't think you're going to see a huge increase in housing starts particularly if interest rates go back up. I mean, you should see more today than you will when interest rates go up a point or two or, who knows, it could go up five points. So, and again, because the interest rates have been low for quite some time, a lot of the refinancing, you know, has taken place. So again, when interest rates go up, you're not going to see a lot of refinancing either. So it's kind of, you know, nobody knows. Nobody can see into the future, what's really going to happen in regards to that office, but as long as everybody is understanding of the fact that just because it's low today doesn't mean that it will be low a year from now or even six months from now. We can readdress this issue when we need to. And, you know, she certainly has my word on that, that if things change, we'll revisit this. And that's all I've got to add.

Councilmember Goebel: This position is not going to be filled at this particular time according to what we have at our desks, is that correct?

President Shetler: That's correct.

Councilmember Goebel: But it –

President Shetler: But it will also be eliminated from the salary ordinance at this point in time.

Councilmember Raben: The salary line will not be set in. It will be set in at zero.

Councilmember Goebel: But if it's brought before us again, this position can be recreated just as it was before the opening.

President Shetler: That is correct.

Councilmember Goebel: And I believe the Recorder is planning on coming to us at a later time yet this year to try to fill it, so we would still be able to revisit at that

particular time?

Councilmember Raben: And, you know, I did forget to mention one thing, you know, the Commissioners have just a week or two weeks ago, signed a contract with a firm to do some of the in-house things that, I don't know if they were part of this individual's responsibility or not, or whose within that office, but there has been a contract signed to have some in-house things done that might free up some other time for other individuals.

Z Tuley: It's not for day to day, it's just the project.

Councilmember Raben: Yeah, it's for a special project for –

Z Tuley: The contract has nothing to do with this position at all, whatsoever.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, I mentioned that, that I didn't know if it had anything to do with this position, but it could possibly have something to do with other positions. So again, nothing is forever, you know, she has my commitment that, if things make a drastic change, that we'll definitely look at putting this back on the table.

President Shetler: And I do want to remind everybody that we do have that – I don't know the exact title, is it perpetual fund, or whatever, the money that keeps accumulating off of filings and stuff that is set aside, that we cannot use in the general fund per se, but can be used for part-time to get things ready for the contract. And so, that does shift a lot of that burden off of regular, every day workers and shift it to part-time people that can get that work on to it, and as that's more automated and digitized, that's going to save a tremendous amount of time and effort, I think, in the long run as well as the employees, so it should make the whole operation of the office even more efficient as time goes on. Okay, any other comments or questions? Yes?

Councilmember Lloyd: Can we make an addition to List B? I would just want to take a look at page 142, 1090-1990 Extra Help for the County Assessor/Reassessment. I just wondered about, we had set that in at \$40,000, I'd like to hear discussion on that, but I –

Councilmember Kiefer: What page was that?

Councilmember Lloyd: Page 142 in your budget book. The Extra Help, I would propose that we cut that \$20,000.

President Shetler: So that's line 1990?

Councilmember Lloyd: 1090-1990 Extra Help for County Assessor/Reassessment, I would propose to cut that \$20,000, and make that \$20,000 even.

President Shetler: So you're asking to amend the motion that's on the floor to approve List B to add this to?

Councilmember Lloyd: Right, to add this cut.

President Shetler: Okay, do I have a second to that amendment?

Councilmember Kiefer: Second.

President Shetler: We have a motion and a second. Okay, any questions about the amendment?

Councilman Sutton: Yeah, we hadn't discussed that before, what's –

Councilmember Lloyd: Well, if you go back to prior years, we spent \$14,000 in that account in 2008, so this would be a pretty healthy increase, a budget request of \$40,000, to me, seemed excessive. That was, as we went through this budget last week, that may have been an oversight.

Councilmember Raben: I might, do we want to call the –

Councilman Sutton: Councilman, have you spoken with the Assessor or anybody on –

Councilmember Lloyd: I have not spoken to the Assessor.

Councilman Sutton: Okay. It looks to me, I guess at this stage, you know, we've been dealing with this budget almost a month, this is the first time I'm hearing –

Jonathan Weaver: Good morning, Jonathan Weaver, your Vanderburgh County Assessor. This is the first I'm hearing about this idea, too. I will say that in prior years or at least for 2009, there was \$75,000 budgeted for part-time help, now when we had all the separate offices, and what we're proposing is a \$35,000 savings, with this \$40,000, and we have the Reassessment coming up. I think Councilman Raben eloquently put it, well, last week, saying the Reassessment is starting July 1<sup>st</sup>, 2010.

Councilman Sutton: So what you're saying is, this \$40,000 number that we see requested for 2010, and just kind of looking at the historic patterns in there, and it's 14, \$10,000, around that range, the historic, the older patterns are based on just the Assessor's office, the County Assessor's office, whereas the \$40,000 here, now you're taking in those new offices and the amount that they had for this particular expense is now being (inaudible) but you're saying now, that's \$30,000 less than if you would total up all those offices –

Jonathan Weaver: I didn't hear the numbers Councilman Lloyd mentioned and I don't have those off the top of my head, but what we proposed for this 2010 budget was a savings of \$35,000 when you accounted all the Assessor offices, the four prior to the referendum, the three big townships and myself, was \$75,000 for 2009. And we're asking for 40,000, which is a \$35,000 savings.

President Shetler: Councilman Raben?

Councilmember Raben: I don't want to make false assumptions here, but is one of the concerns here that Reassessment doesn't begin until July 1, that we'll bring staff on much earlier than that?

Councilmember Lloyd: That was one of my concerns, that we're really only looking at half a year.

Jonathan Weaver: Well, we're also getting an early start on reassessment, too, we have permission from the state to begin early and that's what we're – it's called a rolling reassessment, and that's what we're doing right now, we're in the process of revamping.

Councilmember Bassemier: Jim, I'd like to leave it as is, and then if he don't need it, he won't use it. I mean, he's not going to waste it. I mean, we're taking all of them in account now, instead of just one since they've all combined now.

President Shetler: Yes, Councilman Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: I just wanted to ask, Jonathan, on that, I mean, have you done a calculation on your man hours on what you're going to need and do you feel comfortable with the 40,000, is what you're saying?

Jonathan Weaver: I think it's a good start considering what we put in the Assessor plan for you guys earlier this year and implementation of Pictometry, I think we're off to a good start with that 40,000, yes.

Councilmember Kiefer: You mean, you think you might need more than 40,000?

Jonathan Weaver: You know, it's hard to say at this point in time, but I would hope not.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay, so you'll be able to keep 40,000 or less, is what you're saying?

Jonathan Weaver: That would be my goal. We'll work with the budget.

President Shetler: In years past, the assessments were kind of done somewhat sporadically, but they were supposed to be like every five or ten years or something. And it seemed like there was a large surge then of manpower that needed to be done, obviously, because if it were done once every ten years or whatever it might be, you'd need a lot of field people to go out and measure and do the various different things. But now we're on a rolling deal where, essentially, all properties are kind of reassessed or re-evaluated about every three years or so. So it's more of a continual perpetual thing that's going on as opposed to that surge, is it not?

Jonathan Weaver: Prior, there was a surge, prior to my term. Now we're getting on a rolling, so this is the beginning of a rolling theory.

President Shetler: I'm wondering, you know, because now we also have Pictometry, I was thinking that that was a part of the Pictometry thing, was that we'd have people that would be able to, with a lot more precision, be able to measure those properties and the houses and detect new things that were built that we didn't have knowledge of prior to.

Jonathan Weaver: We figured it would be, without Pictometry, it would cost nearly \$100,000 in field work. So it is saving. The savings are there.

President Shetler: In the – now, since we're doing this rolling, are you suggesting that you may need 40,000 in extra help annually or is this a one-time shot?

Jonathan Weaver: I'm saying, like, we're requesting \$40,000 for this, for 2010, and we'll see how it goes and I'll get back to you.

President Shetler: Okay, thank you. Alright, any other questions or comments?

Councilmember Lloyd: Just flipping through here, in prior years it looked like 21,000 for Knight last year and 30 for Pigeon, roughly, and those are the two big ones, the other ones were pretty marginal. So –

Jonathan Weaver: For 2009?

Councilmember Lloyd: 2008.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Mr. President, actually, I think we need to wind the tape back just a moment. First there was a motion made. I made the original motion so I would have had to make the motion to modify the original motion, so we need to unwind that.

Councilmember Kiefer: I can rescind my second.

President Shetler: Well, you could take the questions separately, and add that to it as amending, and that's what in effect we were doing.

Councilman Sutton: Jim, that's right, there was a motion on the –

President Shetler: There was a motion on the floor, correct.

Councilmember Raben: So, yeah, --

President Shetler: Do you guys want to pull yours and then –

Councilmember Raben: We use a modified –

President Shetler: Do you want to amend – do you wish to amend your motion then?

Councilmember Raben: No, I think we need to allow it to stay, the original motion.

Councilmember Lloyd: Well, then, we can just vote on the other one separately. So I'll withdraw my motion to make it separate after our vote on the first – List B.

President Shetler: I think we ought to probably, actually, in order –

Jonathan Weaver: Do you need me anymore?

Councilmember Raben: You're not on this motion now.

Jeff Ahlers: I might suggest, in order to clarify through all this that perhaps Mr. Raben ought to just restate his original motion just so that the record is clear as to what we're voting on, which I understand is just List B, as originally stated. Now whether or not to clarify, you want to go ahead and read those four items on there so the record is completely clear as to what everybody is voting on and then you can take the Assessor issue as a separate motion next, is that what you want to

do?

Councilmember Raben: That's fine, as a matter of clarification, the original motion was for List B, which included the Recorder, the Election Office, Superintendent of County Buildings and County Council.

Councilman Sutton: And I would ask if we could take that Recorder separate from those other three. I don't have any problems with the other three.

Councilmember Raben: Alright, so I will amend my – now we've got another amendment. Okay, --

President Shetler: I think it would make more sense to withdraw the motions, allow them to make separate amendments to that, vote those up or down, and then make the whole thing as it's done after the amendments are done.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, I will withdraw my original motion.

President Shetler: Do I have any amendments that anybody would like to – would you want to put that in the form of a motion to put the Recorder position back on there?

Councilman Sutton: What I was going to do is, if we could – I would offer –

President Shetler: You want to take it as a single item.

Councilman Sutton: I'd ask that we – my motion would be to set the Recorder in with no change, so right now, it's being placed in at zero, but my motion would be at the \$25,235.

President Shetler: Essentially, to restore that position.

Councilman Sutton: Correct.

President Shetler: We have a motion, do I have a second?

Councilmember Bassemier: I'll second.

President Shetler: It's been moved and seconded.

Jeff Ahlers: (Inaudible – microphone not turned on) Right, all I was saying was, as a matter of point, that until List B is voted on, it hasn't been cut so there's no need to restore anything, correct? I mean, as it sits right now, --

Councilman Sutton: My motion then is line item, there would be no change made to that line item for 2010.

Jeff Ahlers: Right, well, okay. Does it make it easier, do you want to just vote on all of them separately? Is that easier or do you just want to make a new motion and state exactly what we're voting on so that it's clear?



Councilmember Raben: Just so I understand, the motion is to approve the 1040-1150 as listed in our proposed budget book.

Councilman Sutton: As listed, right.

President Shetler: So we have a motion and a second to restore the position in the Recorder's office. Roll call please.

Councilmember Goebel: I have a question.

President Shetler: I'm sorry?

Councilmember Goebel: If this is restored now, then the Recorder will have the opportunity to fill it or will the Recorder have to come back to us before the filling?

President Shetler: They would have the opportunity to fill it –

Councilman Sutton: Well, we're not moving to restore it because this hasn't been – restore means it's already been eliminated. The action is to not take any action.

President Shetler: For '09, I would say that she would probably need to come in and discuss it with us, given the resolution that we passed a few weeks ago on the hiring freeze. Come the year 2010, that position is there, and it allows the opportunity to fill that.

Councilmember Lloyd: Councilman Sutton is asking to take this off of List B, basically.

President Shetler: Yes, that's right.

Councilmember Lloyd: So a vote, if you vote aye, you're agreeing to take it off List B, if you vote no, you want to keep it on List B. Is that right?

Councilmember Raben: Vote yeah, you're not doing anything, it's as listed as submitted in the budget.

Councilman Sutton: Correct.

President Shetler: Okay, any other questions? Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: I talked with Z, I think she really needs it. I'm going to vote yes also.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: I don't mind restoring for next year. I do not think we should fill it at this time this year, so I vote yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

President Shetler: Do you –

Councilmember Goebel: I'm (inaudible) no.

Teri Lukeman: So your vote is no?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: This has been a really complicated question, but considering the fact that you guys have had extensive conversation with the Recorder and considering the fact that there is a commitment to fill that position later if it's needed, I'll vote no.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: No.

**(Motion fails 2-5/Councilmembers Lloyd, Goebel, Raben, Kiefer & Shetler opposed)**

Councilmember Raben: Mr. President, I would like to take the –

President Shetler: So the motion fails then. I think it was 2-5: two for and five opposed.

Councilmember Raben: I would like to make a motion on the other three items on List B, which are the Election Office 1210-1120, Superintendent of County Buildings 1310-2300 and County Council 1480-1920 as listed on List B.

Jeff Ahlers: You're going to need to include the Recorder, too, because it wasn't removed, right?

Councilman Sutton: I think what he's trying to do is just do those other three – I was assuming you're just going to take that Recorder separately since we don't have any action on that.

Councilmember Raben: As it is now, yeah, we will have to come back to the Recorder, so we'll take these three because, again, we're going to end up wanting to exempt it again, so we'll have to take these three separate.

President Shetler: Councilman Goebel, did you have a point?

Councilmember Goebel: No.

President Shetler: Alright, we have a motion and need a second.

Councilmember Lloyd: Second.

President Shetler: It's been seconded. Do I have any questions or comments? Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being seven ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

**(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)**

Councilmember Raben: Okay, now I'd like to make a motion for Recorder 1040-1150 be set in at zero.

Councilmember Lloyd: Second.

President Shetler: It's been moved and seconded. Do I have any questions or comments? Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being four ayes and three nays, the motion carries.

**(Motion carried 4-3/Councilmembers Sutton, Bassemier & Goebel opposed)**

Councilmember Lloyd: Okay, I'd like to make a motion, County Assessor/Reassessment 1090-1990 Extra Help be cut \$20,000 and be set in at 20,000.

President Shetler: I have a motion, do I have a second for that, please?

Jonathan Weaver: I mean, we –

President Shetler: Hold on a minute, Mr. Weaver. Do I have a second on the motion?

Councilmember Kiefer: Will you restate the motion please?

Councilmember Lloyd: County Assessor/Reassessment line item 1090-1990 Extra Help be cut \$20,000, so it will be set in at 20,000.

Councilmember Kiefer: Is there a second?

President Shetler: We don't have a second. We're asking if anybody would second that.

Councilmember Raben: I'm going to second just to get it on the floor.

President Shetler: We have a motion and a second. Do I have any questions? Any comments?

Councilmember Goebel: I have a question. Jonathan, this will, the rolling

reassessment, next year all properties will be assessed, is that correct?

Jonathan Weaver: That is the goal. We have until March 1<sup>st</sup>, 2012 to complete it. And I'd like to say, we've given back two full time positions this year to the county. We feel we've done our part to help save close to 200,000 for the 2010 budget. And to have to come back next year if we were to need that money is just, you know, it puts, you know, it wastes my time and it wastes your time. We understand we're in a budget crunch, but we are the office that brings in the revenue. And I need the resources to be able to do that. And like I said, this saves, the original requested amount of \$35,000 lower than this year's.

President Shetler: So this money is until 2012? I mean, the Reassessment is not due until 2012?

Jonathan Weaver: Yes, we have –

President Shetler: So we can expect this in the 2011 budget as well and –

Jonathan Weaver: As we said when we met last November with the referendum and the consolidation, that this is a work in progress. You know, we went from nine offices to one. And I feel we're doing our part to streamline and become efficient and save taxpayer dollars. I mean, we've cut, we gave back a position in January that saved roughly 28,000, I mean, we just gave you back a position a couple of weeks ago that saved roughly another 27,000. And all we are asking for – all we're asking for is part-time help, and we didn't have any part-time help money this year.

Councilmember Lloyd: Was that a hardship to not have it?

Jonathan Weaver: We made do, but we do have that reassessment coming up.

President Shetler: Is that length of time that you're going to have to do the assessment, is that longer than what it's been in the past years? Because it seems like it was always done within a nine or twelve month period of time.

Jonathan Weaver: Originally before this passed, July it was, it was until July 1<sup>st</sup>, 2011. Now they've pushed it back a year so it's 2010 to March 1<sup>st</sup>, 2012.

President Shetler: Now, my point is that, and perhaps you don't have the history on it as I don't, and I'm thinking ten years ago when we had another form of assessments that we actually worked under, when we had the surge kind of an operation, it seemed like that was a brief period of time, you know, like a nine months or twelve month period of time that they had to get that operation completed. And now I guess we're learning that it's a twenty-four to thirty month, which, what that's telling me is that the need for creating with temporaries may not be quite there as it was in the past because of the way the state has redrawn the whole idea on reassessments, on being in this more rolling method.

Jonathan Weaver: You know, I don't know the history on the time-frame with the past reassessments, but I will say that the numbers are there. As Councilman Lloyd mentioned, in 2008, Pigeon and Knight had their part-time budgets just for those two townships are more than what I'm originally requesting for 2010.

President Shetler: I don't know, Jim, I don't know if you or Royce could give, you know, years past on the time that we did assessments and if it was drawn out for a long period of time like this is or I was thinking it was a short period of time.

Councilmember Raben: No, it's typically drawn out, you know, the whole duration. I mean, that's pretty much how it has been in the past. But I think what may be concerning here to Jonathan is, is this 40 just until July or are you going to come back for 40 more? You had stated earlier that you thought you could make it all happen with this 40 and, I mean, is that your intent, to go the balance of the year on this 40?

Jonathan Weaver: That's my goal. Yes.

Councilmember Raben: Okay. I mean, that, to me, that makes a big difference. If you think this 40 is it, you know, then we're not looking at 40 more down the road, then I'm comfortable with 40.

Jonathan Weaver: Are you talking about, for the rest of 2010 or 2011, I guess?

Councilmember Raben: 2010.

Jonathan Weaver: Okay, this is my plan at this second for 2010.

President Shetler: Okay, any other questions or comments? Roll call please.

Councilmember Bassemier: Go over the motion, please.

Councilmember Lloyd: The motion was to take the County Assessor/Reassessment Extra Help 1090-1990, we had set it in at \$40,000 a week ago, I would cut that \$20,000 and set it in at \$20,000. That's the motion and then there was a second as well.

Councilmember Bassemier: Okay.

President Shetler: Any other questions or comments? Roll call please

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: I vote no.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: I'm going to vote with the consideration that you're not going to come back in July and that the whole 40,000 is going to get the job done. I'll vote no.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being two ayes and five nays, the motion is denied. Thank you.

**(Motion fails 2-5/Councilmembers Sutton, Bassemier, Goebel, Raben & Kiefer opposed)**

<b>2000, 3000 AND 4000 ACCOUNTS</b>
-------------------------------------

Councilmember Raben: That concludes List B. Next, I move that all other 2000, 3000 and 4000 accounts for 2010 be adopted as previously approved for the following: 911 Emergency Services, Airport Authority, Area Plan Commission, Auditor, Auditor/Reassessment, Bond Issue, Burdette Park, Circuit Court, Circuit Court Supplemental Adult Probation, Convention & Visitors Commission, Convention Center Operating Fund, Coroner, County Treasurer, County Assessor, County Assessor/Reassessment, County Recorder, County Clerk, County Clerk IV-D, County Commissioners, County Commissioners/CCD Fund, County Council, County Highway, County Co-Op Extension, County Surveyor, Cum Bridge, Disclosure Fees, Drainage Board, Drug & Alcohol Deferral Services, Election Office, Health Department, Jail, Jail Bond, Legal Aid, Legal Aid/United Way, Local Drug Free Community, Local Emergency Planning Commission, Local Roads & Streets, Property Tax Assessment Board of Appeals, Property Tax Assessment Board of Appeals/Reassessment, Prosecutor, Prosecutor Fees, Prosecutor Check Recovery, Prosecutor Drug Law Enforcement Program, Prosecutor IV-D, Prosecutor Pre-Trial Diversion, Prosecutor Stop Domestic Violence, Prosecutor Victims/Witness Assistance Program, Prosecutor Forfeiture Fund, Public Defender Commission, Riverboat, Sheriff, Sheriff/Community Corrections, Sheriff/Misdemeanor Housing, Sheriff/Vanderburgh County Community Corrections, Misdemeanor Offender, Sheriff/Domestic Violence, Superintendent of County Buildings, Superior Court, Superior Drug Court, Superior Court Supplemental Adult Probation, Surveyor Maps, Surveyor Corner Perpetuation Fund, The Centre, Tourism Capital Improvement, Veterans Administration, Voter Registration, and Weights & Measures.

Councilmember Bassemier: Jim, before you get a second, would you leave out the Airport? Just the Airport, I'm going to abstain from the Airport.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, I would like to remove the Airport from the list of budgets in my prior motion.

Councilmember Lloyd: Second.

President Shetler: We have a motion and a second. Any questions or comments? Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being seven ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

**(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)**

<b>AIRPORT 2000, 3000 AND 4000 ACCOUNTS</b>
---

Councilmember Raben: And then I would like to move that all other 2000, 3000, and 4000 accounts be adopted as previously approved for the Airport.

President Shetler: Pardon me, do you want to go back to the Airport?

Councilmember Raben: That's what the motion was.

President Shetler: Alright.

Councilmember Raben: I will restate it again. I move that all other 2000, 3000, and 4000 accounts be approved for the Airport.

Councilmember Lloyd: Second.

President Shetler: It's been moved and seconded. Any questions?

Councilmember Bassemier: Now is the Airport involved in this one?

Councilman Sutton: This is the Airport.

Councilmember Bassemier: This is just the Airport. Okay. I couldn't hear over



here.

President Shetler: Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Abstain.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being six ayes, no nays and one abstention, the motion carries.

**(Motion carried 6-0/Councilmember Bassemier abstained from vote)**

<b>2010 INSURANCE BUDGET</b>
------------------------------

Councilmember Raben: Okay, next, all Councilmembers have been given a copy of the final insurance data. I move that the County Council approve the 2010 budget as listed. These figures represent the County's share of the county's three current health plans, with a total employee contribution of 8%. The figures are for full-time county employees and do not include insurance for Superior Court Magistrates. I would like to make this insurance budget listing made as part of the record. I make that in the form of a motion.

Councilmember Kiefer: Second.

Councilmember Raben: Let me, real quick, I need to make – along with this motion, if you turn to your insurance data, I need to make one – there is a typo. It's on the first item, County Council/ General Fund insurance, the correct figure is \$9,800,116, so it's \$20,000, there's a \$20,000 typo there.

Councilman Sutton: One more time, Jim, on that?

Councilmember Raben: It's on your insurance – it's the 2010 approved insurance. It's not that one.

Councilman Sutton: Gotcha. Okay.

Councilmember Raben: The first item under County Council General Fund, there is a \$20,000 typo. Omit \$20,000 from that, should be \$9,800,116. And with that, I'd like to make that in the form of a motion.

Councilman Sutton: Second.

President Shetler: I think – did Joe make it earlier?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yeah, I had made a second.

President Shetler: Alright, we have a motion and a second on the floor. Any questions or comments? Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being seven ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

**(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)**

<b>COUNTY TAX RATE</b>
------------------------

Councilmember Raben: Okay, next, I move that the Council set a tax rate as deemed appropriate by the State of Indiana Tax Commissioners following a review of our final budget.

Councilman Sutton: Second.

President Shetler: We have a motion and a second. Any questions or comments?  
Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being seven ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

**(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)**

<b>CUMULATIVE BRIDGE TAX RATE</b>
-----------------------------------

Councilmember Raben: Next, I move that we set the Cum Bridge Tax Rate at .03 cents per \$100/assessed valuation.

Councilmember Lloyd: Second.

President Shetler: It's been moved and seconded. Any questions or comments?  
Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being seven ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

**(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)**

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>COUNTY OPTION INCOME TAX DESIGNATION TO LOCAL ROADS &amp; STREETS AND COUNTY HIGHWAY FUNDS</b></p>
--

Councilmember Raben: And next I move that we set \$1,000,000 in COIT into Local Roads & Streets and \$1,000,000 in COIT into the County Highway Fund. I'd like to make that in the form of a motion.

Councilmember Bassemier: Second.

President Shetler: It's been moved and seconded. Do I have any questions? Yes, Councilman Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Those are the same figures as 2009, is that correct? And based on the COIT numbers coming in, that would be adequate, that we have adequate funds for that?

Councilmember Raben: Correct.

President Shetler: Any other questions or comments? Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being seven ayes, no nays, the motion carries.

**(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)**

Councilmember Raben: Okay, that, as far as our regular business, takes care of my part. I'd like to thank everybody for their hard work and effort and the spirit of cooperation that all of us – we worked very well together again this year as we always do, and I'd like to thank everybody. Just to give you an idea where we ended up today, the cuts that have been voted upon represent \$2,562,864. The total approved budget after today is \$63,561,053. So when it's all said and done, that represents almost 47,000 budget less than last year. So we were able through everybody's hard efforts to bring this monster in under last year's figure and with that, the taxpayers, you know, I think it was everyone's intent for them not to see a rate increase and we've done everything possible we could to make that happen, and it's, you know, everyone's hopes that that's what's going to happen. And it may possibly even see a reduction and, again, thanks to everybody. And if you have any questions, I'd be glad to answer them.

President Shetler: I would like to also add to that, Jim, and point out, with Mr. Weaver out there, and Z out there, and the Sheriff, Sheriff Williams, and seeing Rick, different department heads, elected officeholders, without these guys being involved and Gary, different ones being involved and really working hard at doing their part, it's been a team effort. And it certainly hadn't been the Council sitting here with an axe wacking away at it. They came in here ready to make our jobs a lot easier and I certainly greatly appreciate that. And appreciate the effort that all of us have put into it, the amount of time and effort. I know in the beginning, I passed out the pencil sharpeners and I think everybody was reminded constantly that this is a time of sharpening those pencils, so I appreciate it. Yes, Councilman Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes, I'd just like to say, I really pondered a long time. I really wanted to give the county workers a two percent raise, and, you know, I brought it up about three weeks ago and I know we're going to come in some hard times, and I'm really saddened by the Whirlpool layoffs, and I really wish we could have gave the employees a two percent raise, but I didn't think it was there. Here at the end, I thought maybe we could find it for them, and I surely hope next year that we can find it for them and I know last year the county officeholders, they gave up their raise and I really, really wanted to give it to them. My heart was in giving it to them but I was just afraid, with, I know the economy is going to be really tough

next year, going to get tougher, you know, with the property tax cuts and stuff like that, so like I said, my heart was in giving the county employees, the hard working county employees a two percent raise, but I was afraid to right now. That's all I have to say. Thank you.

President Shetler: I think Councilman Lloyd and then Councilman Sutton.

Councilmember Lloyd: I wanted to also echo what Councilman Raben, Shetler and Bassemier have said. I think bringing this budget in below last year is quite a feat and I commend all of you for your hard work and depending on where the assessed valuation falls, we don't know if the rate would go up or down a little bit. I think the County Council has certainly done their job to try to keep that rate as low as possible for taxpayers. Thank you.

President Shetler: Alright. Councilman Sutton?

Councilman Sutton: Again, without being redundant, I think this Council has done a tremendous job in bringing this home. Jim, leading the way as finance chair and making some very hard choices in some places and the department heads, from the very onset being very agreeable and bringing to us workable budgets that were I think reflective of not just the economic times, not just the changes that we've had to adjust to from a tax standpoint from the state, but reflective of what the community needs to deal with from a county side. So I'd just like to commend everyone for their hard work. I think what we're going to find is this is a budget that will work for Vanderburgh County. It's a budget that, it's, we'd like to have done some other things, I think we are still, continue to be supportive of visionary measures, you know, we continue to put money into projects or money aside for future projects that will build potentially jobs for this community. We're continuing the support the dental clinic, which I'm very proud of, and continue to support the Initiative Based Assistance Program, which is providing day care for thousands of families, or has provided for thousands of families throughout this community. So we're doing some very creative things while at the same time I think we're being very prudent and as we're looking at things, since we had the lengthy discussion about hiring freeze, things we're continuing to take that a step at a time, and I think we'll grow and find the best fit for what works for the county. So, Mr. President, I just commend you for working us through this whole process.

President Shetler: Thank you. Yes, Councilman Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: I'd like to also thank Councilman Raben for his leadership and all the members of this body for working within our means. And as Ed mentioned, it's unfortunate we couldn't grant pay raises, but we did preserve jobs and benefits, and in today's economic situation, I think we've done that under last year's budget, so thanks also to the department heads for coming in with a flat lined. Thanks, everyone here.

President Shetler: And Bill, I didn't mean to overlook you, and I apologize, you're over to my left here, and harder to see. Alright, anybody else, any questions or comments? A motion for adjournment would be in order.

Councilmember Lloyd: So moved.

Councilmember Raben: Real quick –

President Shetler: Hold on.

Councilmember Raben: We had a lot of accolades for everybody, which was truly deserved, but I forgot Sandie and Sarah Nunn, also, Teri, everybody that's behind the scenes doing a whole lot more than what we even want to think about.

President Shetler: Thank you, Jim. You're right. The next meeting is September 30<sup>th</sup> at 8:30, our regular scheduled meeting.

**(There being no further business to come before the Council, the meeting was adjourned at 10:12 a.m.)**

VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL

\_\_\_\_\_  
President Tom Shetler, Jr.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Vice President Joe Kiefer

\_\_\_\_\_  
Councilmember Jim Raben

\_\_\_\_\_  
Councilmember Mike Goebel

\_\_\_\_\_  
Councilmember Russell Lloyd, Jr.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Councilmember Ed Bassemier

\_\_\_\_\_  
Councilmember Royce Sutton

Recorded and transcribed by Teri Lukeman.



**VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL  
TAXING UNIT BUDGET REVIEW  
SEPTEMBER 30, 2009**

The Vanderburgh County Council met in special session this 30th day of September 2009 in room 301 of the Civic Center Complex. Present were Councilmembers Royce Sutton, Ed Bassemier, Russell Lloyd, Jr., Mike Goebel, James Raben, Joe Kiefer and Tom Shetler, Jr., County Auditor Bill Fluty, County Council attorney Jeffrey Ahlers, Executive Assistant Sandie Deig, and Recording Secretary Teri Lukeman. The meeting was called to order at 9:21 a.m. by County Council President Tom Shetler, Jr.

President Shetler: Alright, we're ready to convene this portion of the civil taxing units and, Marsha Au, the Library.

<b>LIBRARY</b>
----------------

Marcia Au: Good morning, Chairman Shetler, Councilmembers and other esteemed administrators. The library did meet with Councilman Russ Lloyd a number of weeks ago, went over our budgets, that's plural because in your packets you will see that we have four, and answered any of his questions. We did submit all the required paperwork and I did ask if there was anything else that we might be able to give you, and certainly would be happy to answer any questions this morning and provide any other supporting documentation or information that might be required of by Council. In what we did send you, we did supply both the 2008 budget numbers, the budgeted amount for 2009, and projected expenditures for 2009, and the proposed budget with any increases or decreases for 2010. I do have with me here this morning, Greg Hager, who is the director of Willard. And in 2005, the legislature removed the money, the tax levy from the city and transferred it to the county library system to raise the taxes for Willard. So we have been working together these past several years on submitting our information together. I would like to point out that we've asked for a very minimal increase. We have been streamlining operations at the county library for the last several years. We have, through attrition, diminished employee personnel costs by seven full-time positions and we have moved three others to part-time. Utilities and facilities, operations, have stayed as stable as we can make them. Utility costs, as Councilman Kiefer noted, continue to rise and part of that is the demand cost for electricity and we have noted a huge increase over the past year and a half between what we were paying and what we are paying in terms of just the demand costs and not just the use. I would be happy to –

Councilmember Kiefer: I have a question, please. You know, when you talk about utility costs, are you working with Vectren or any of their companies, one of the Vectren companies? I know you can buy gas on the unregulated market where you can fix positions, and I know that the – they do this here at the Civic Center – you know, they can lock in their prices, control their budgets. I don't know if that's something you've thought about or – because you can aggregate all your libraries and purchase natural gas and you can talk to ProLiance, I know that's one of the companies and there are several others. But that's one of the companies that does that. And you can lock in your prices and right now would be a good time to do that only because gas rates are so low. Something to think about.

Marcia Au: That's a great idea and certainly we will follow up on that. No, I was not aware and I don't believe my administrative assistant was either. So we will call and follow up –

Councilmember Kiefer: Yeah, you might talk to Karen Richert, over at ProLiance. That's one of the Vectren companies and there's other companies that do it as well.

Marcia Au: Okay. We do talk to Vectren on a regular basis about utility costs and they usually give us the percentage increase or decrease for the next year. And so that's where we get the numbers that we plug in, but we will certainly follow up on that. Anything we can do. We're also looking at a grant for solar energy to help offset some costs.

Councilmember Kiefer: Oh, that's a great idea.

Marcia Au: It would be – and we've just, in fact, just submitted the end of last week, that grant to the state, and which they would pay for half of the cost and we would take the other half from our Rainy Day Fund.

Councilmember Kiefer: Mr. President, is there, are you utilizing some protocol in how we ask questions or can we, if we see something, can we just ask away?

President Shetler: Feel free, ask away.

Councilmember Kiefer: On the Rainy Day Fund, I notice there is a 59.06% increase from your budget of 2009 to your proposed budget of 2010. Can you tell us a little bit about that and, you know, what exactly your Rainy Day Fund is used for and why you are budgeting almost a 60% increase?

Marcia Au: Well, because we're not sure where the shortfalls will be for next year. We know what LSA has told us about what we can expect not to get, which for our combined budgets is about 408,000 and odd dollars, and we have rainy day funds, which is made up of appropriated but unencumbered monies from the year previously, and end of year county option income tax – if we get an extra payment, that can go into that. We can put insurance settlements into that, I believe. I'm looking at my bookkeeper. So that's where that money comes from. Now in terms of what we budgeted, we budgeted so that we could spend that money. We could also spend it as an additional appropriation, but we have some work going on currently on the parking deck and we also have some technology implementation for RFID, which is a radio frequency program to identify, to help us identify and track materials. So that's the increase there. We are increasing, basically, to cover shortfalls.

Councilmember Kiefer: But that's on capital projects then? It sounds like, you know, technology, parking deck, that's not on like...operating funds such as salaries and other things?

Marcia Au: No, Sir, it's not. It could be used for that. It's set up with the same sort of outline as any of the other funds that we have. But we basically put it into services and equipment.

Councilmember Kiefer: Thank you.

President Shetler: Councilman Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: I'd like to back this process up a second. We have these appointed board review forms. It's my understanding this Council has no authority

to make any changes. All we can do is approve or not approve these budgets or we can recommend changes, and I don't know if there's any other thing you wanted to add to that or if our attorney needs to elaborate on that. Is that correct?

Jeff Ahlers: Yes, I mean, in the sense of what you're doing is, you're doing a review and it's, you know, from the standpoint that it has no binding effect, it's simply a recommending process, so you can either recommend approval of the budget or you can recommend either not approval or also recommend changes, which as you can see on the form, there are lines there if you want to make notations as to what you think ought to be changed in the budget as you go down through these columns or make remarks up at the top. So it's basically whatever you want to do and then it will be, those recommendations will be taken into consideration by the library, other taxing units and then they can take those into consideration as to whether they want to modify their budget and ultimately, regardless of what they do, this information will go on to the state and the state will take that into consideration as to what they do.

Councilmember Lloyd: I'd also like to commend our director, Marcia Au, who received the Distinguished Hoosier Award, so congratulations.

Marcia Au: Thank you.

Councilmember Lloyd: And the article in the newspaper noted several awards the library has received, both for the building and for the programs that they have implemented.

Marcia Au: Thank you.

President Shetler: Yes, Councilman Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Within this budget, are there any increases for salaries and wages?

Marcia Au: We have a one percent increase across the board, but you will note that our personnel costs are down two percent. We've actually reduced personnel costs for the library system. And in explaining that to the board, in talking to Councilman Lloyd, we felt 1%, which will basically probably not cover the increase in insurance costs as far as we know. We've limited it to that.

Councilmember Raben: So your 1%, it's all lumped into one calculation then? Insurance, employee benefits are part of that 1%?

Marcia Au: Yes, they are. And because we reduced staffing by seven full-time positions, you'll note that the savings under personal services and employee benefits is almost \$150,000.

Councilmember Raben: Will anyone as an employee of the library get a pay raise for 2010?

Marcia Au: Everyone will get 1%.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, I thought the 1 – okay, so that is, that's given directly in the form of a payment or payroll, then, it's not making up for any increases within

the insurance line item?

Marcia Au: No, Sir.

Councilmember Raben: Mr. President, this may or may not be the time, but my recommendation would be, as we begin this process this morning, that we be consistent with the action we took in August for all county departments, that – I would like to pass on or send a message to the state that whether or not we approve the other line items, that throughout these budgets, that the state not approve any pay increases. Anybody agree? Disagree?

Councilman Sutton: Is that a motion or a recommendation? How are you phrasing that?

Councilmember Raben: I would say, I can make that in a motion if that's...

President Shetler: Why don't we do it this way, make it specific for each department because we'll have to vote on each one, I think, independently.

Councilmember Lloyd: Yeah, I mean, in this case, we would just vote either yea or nay, recommend approval as submitted or recommend changes.

Councilmember Raben: Okay. I had one last question. Can you explain to us the Willard Special Library fund? Tell us what that's all about.

Marcia Au: I'll be happy to let my colleague, Greg Hager, explain that.

Greg Hager: In 2005, we moved what had been a city appropriation for Willard Library into a county-wide tax and the Evansville-Vanderburgh Public Library became the taxing authority, so, in essence, passing that levy through their authority to Willard, at which point we added an appointment to our board from the County Council and another appointment from the Evansville-Vanderburgh Public Library. So that's the history of that change.

Councilmember Raben: So it's strictly its own levy, I understand that. Thank you.

President Shetler: A couple of questions that I had: are you guys involved in that joint purchasing agreement with the city, the school corp, county?

Marcia Au: No, we've not been asked and, frankly, we'd be happy to work with anyone. We do as much, because we have the whole system, we get a fairly decent discount. If we can better our discounts, we're always happy to look at that.

President Shetler: Okay, because it looks like you're going to be purchasing a couple hundred thousand dollars worth of supplies and parts and pieces and –

Marcia Au: Parts and pieces, yes, Sir.

President Shetler: The other question, and I hope the people in the city are taking note there and running back and telling somebody after while because I think that's one more component that could save us all some money. The other thing: health insurance, how many employees do you have that's on your health insurance program at the present time? Do you have an idea?

Marcia Au: Let me look here. I think about – we have about 160 full-time, FTE, and I don't think I have numbers of people here. I could certainly supply Council that when I get back.

President Shetler: Well, I'll tell you where I'm going on this particular question is that, and there may not be a way for us to do it, but I'm looking at, you know, perhaps there's a way for the library to pool into the county's resources here and be able to, again, help drive that cost down because of our numbers, you know, that whole pool going up, and it might be a way of saving a few dollars, again, for the taxpayers. The next question I have is on the dental and vision. Am I reading that correctly, do you all pay for some of the dental and vision?

Marcia Au: A very small percentage, yes, we do. And that is, generally speaking, is a fairly small amount, total.

President Shetler: Not that I have a problem, per se, but I think it would be a good idea is, as much as we can, to get some parity here between the county and what you guys are doing, particularly with the number of employees that you have at 160, I mean, that's substantial. And I would like to see us to get to some, I guess it's the second largest department we'd have, behind the Sheriff's department, pretty much behind it.

Councilmember Lloyd: I'm not sure they could afford what the county has, Mr. President.

President Shetler: And it may be, yeah, that's true. But I'd like for us to look at that and see if it could help our purchasing power somewhat here.

Marcia Au: Certainly, if it's a savings, we'd be happy to look at that. We are on a three-year contract which will help keep our health insurance lower. But at this point, we don't have a final number and we won't have a final number from the insurance plans until November.

President Shetler: You're getting ready to engage in a three-year contract or you –

Marcia Au: No, we entered into one last year, which took our rates from almost 20, down to about 11.

President Shetler: Okay, so you'll be at a second year – in your second year?

Marcia Au: Yes, Sir.

President Shetler: Alright, thank you. Anybody else have any questions or comments?

Councilmember Lloyd: Just based on the fact that I think their employees are going to have to pay more for health insurance, I can appreciate what Councilman Raben is saying, I would just like to see us recommend their budget with no changes.

President Shetler: What I'm going to need is a motion for approval, and if you want to make exceptions to it or recommendations for the state, then maybe you could word that into your motion for approval on the whole budget or if there's not a

motion, then –

Councilman Sutton: Well, I've got a couple of questions. On your debt service that you're showing, how many different instruments do you have out there and what's the shortest, the one that has the shortest length and the one that has the furthest in terms of payoff?

Marcia Au: Actually, we have three instruments: we have general obligation bonds for Oaklyn and North Park that will be retired in 2021, and the central lease corporation bonds in 2023, we refinanced those about – in 2005 – and shortened both the time frames on both of those at a better rate.

Councilman Sutton: Is that something that you guys keep an eye on as far as looking for even additional refi opportunities for you, because the rates have dropped significantly? And I don't know what kind of rates you may have gotten back in 2005, I would imagine it would be lower.

Marcia Au: I just talked to the financial advisor on our financial vehicles in this budgeting process, during the budgeting process, and he assured me that he is watching those very closely. And as soon as it makes sense for us to do that, we will do that again.

Councilman Sutton: Okay, and your total budget change from what you're operating under now to what you are proposing for 2010 is a 1.6% increase. Is that –

Marcia Au: That's correct, and that includes both the library improvement reserve fund, LIRF, and Rainy Day, and the Willard.

Councilman Sutton: And then my last question, the seven positions that you mentioned that had been eliminated, when did that occur?

Marcia Au: Throughout the year. Those were by attrition, --

Councilman Sutton: This year?

Marcia Au: Yes. And they went from a senior administrative post to a full-time custodian, so it was across the board.

Councilman Sutton: Thank you.

President Shetler: Councilman Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Do you foresee any more loss of employees through attrition or are you down to bare bones right now?

Marcia Au: No, Sir. We look at every position as it comes open to see whether or not it makes sense to rehire that position or if it makes sense to hire it at another level or to move it to part-time. So we are constantly looking at ways to operate efficiently. The RFID program which we're instituting should be a labor-saving device and any time that we can do something smarter and better, we do.

Councilmember Goebel: Thank you. I'm sure you do.

Councilman Sutton: I'm sorry, there was one more question I did have.

President Shetler: Yes, Councilman Sutton?

Councilman Sutton: On your Rainy Day Fund, are you, by state statute required to keep a certain percentage aside for Rainy Day or is this by action of your board that they've decided to develop this Rainy Day Fund and how often are you putting dollars into the Rainy Day Fund?

Marcia Au: Okay, let me back up. We haven't had it very long. It was given to us, libraries in the state, about eight years ago. The only money we can put into it, or the monies we can put into it are limited. So we look at our balance at the end of the year and determine, we can put up to 10% of the total budget if it is encumbered – I'm sorry, appropriated but unencumbered. We tend to not take our cash flow down quite so low, so at the end of the year, beginning of next year in 2010, we'll look at what we've carried over and determine if there is anything to go into Rainy Day. The library does not have a capital improvements fund at this time. The only other fund we have is library improvement reserve, and again, from a legislative standpoint, that gives us the opportunity to put some money aside in each budget. So it funds both planned and unplanned expenses if we have large equipment purchases or a new roof that we have to do. We have to determine which of those funds can carry that. When we were in the building program, we actually purchased land from the LIRF fund, because that kept it out of the bonding pot.

Councilman Sutton: With what we show here through June 30 when you had 1,114,000 in that Rainy Day Fund, I mean, that's a very wise part on your board to make sure you're protecting your investments that you've made and to prepare for the eventuality of something occurring.

Marcia Au: Something occurring, that's correct. And the state doesn't tell us how much we can, they tell us how much we can put in, in terms of percentage of our budget. At one time I think DLGF was telling people they should have ten percent of their annual budget in Rainy Day. I don't know that we could ever do that, but we'll keep it where we can for those emergencies and shortfalls.

President Shetler: Yes, Councilman Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Marsha, back on this Rainy Day Fund, because it's just a little foggy to me, because it sounds like you're using some of this for just doing different projects and doing different things that need to be done, is there so much of that Rainy Day Fund that has to be there at the end of the year, like you cannot spend below – like you have to leave so much in there in case there is a true emergency?

Marcia Au: No. The state doesn't require us to do that and the board – my recommendation to the board is that we always try to keep some money in that fund. For instance, we had to re-roof McCullough this past year. And without monies in either Rainy Day or LIRF, then we have to –

Councilmember Kiefer: It sounds like it might be better to have a capital fund or something because it sounds like to me you're using the Rainy Day Fund to do capital projects.

Marcia Au: We are but that was at the behest of a former Council who had asked us not to apply for capital projects. And now, that – because the rules have changed, if we did that, that would then fall within this total amount that we can raise the budgets for. It would become another budget in other words, if we did that.

Councilmember Kiefer: Yeah, I understand that.

Marcia Au: At this point, it's about six of one, half a dozen of the other.

Councilmember Kiefer: Yeah, I understand that, I just –

Marcia Au: If the Council would prefer, we can come back with a capital project request. That has to go before this group in May, I believe, for approval and we'd be happy to look at that.

Councilmember Kiefer: It just seems like it would make more sense than just having this Rainy Day that is really – seems to me to be more of a slush fund but I don't know, maybe I'm wrong on the way I'm looking at this.

Marcia Au: Well, we pay for a lot of our technology. Many libraries around the state in the past have had capital project funds specifically for technology, computer replacement, additional servers, the computer furniture, those –

Councilmember Kiefer: Yeah, that would be a capital – that seems like that would make sense to be a capital fund instead of a Rainy Day Fund.

Marcia Au: And we really have, I mean, it's not slush in the sense that we just use it for anything. We have to budget for it as you can see here and we do use it for technology, which is what we would have done if we'd had a capital project fund.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay, thank you.

Councilmember Raben: I'm really confused now because as you – if you drill down to the more defined budget items, I mean, while we discussed that we're paying for those repairs out of the Rainy Day Fund, you're actually budgeting, let me get back to it, under buildings 175,000, and equipment 226,000, that's repair & maintenance, so, I mean, if we're spending roof repairs and stuff like that out of Rainy Day Fund, why do we budget, why do we have different budget items for making those repairs?

Marcia Au: We do a lot of our own internal repair work. When you have eight facilities and they're not all new buildings, and, in fact, even with the new buildings we've had some substantial payouts for repairs on HVAC, particularly some of the older branches and we've had to replace servers, those kinds of things can be taken out if we have the money budgeted for, and then, for instance, the RFID will be coming out of the Rainy Day.

Councilmember Raben: I understand, but there's about \$400,000 there. And just one last general comment, because I think the library, all these other budgets as we come to them should be held to the same standards that, again, we are within the county, the entire state, that you're really not exempt from the recession and I think we need to do whatever we can to cut as much growth or – you know, while we might say we're only looking at a one percent increase, you know, I think a real



pat on the back to say you've got a ten percent decrease on the overall budget. Because we are, we're in tough economic times and, you know, we just saw a ten or fifteen minute presentation on the average of homes within the county are going to see about a thirty or what did he say, a thirty-three percent increase overall in their property taxes. You know, I look at furniture and equipment, today, those aren't necessities. I'd say, you know, if a tube of glue or a nail repairs a piece of furniture, that's what we need to do because that's what people are doing at home, that's what I'm doing in my business, that's what the business community is doing, so you know, I would really like to see us look – and I know it's probably too late this year, but I think, you know, I would have been proud to have looked at this and seen a significant decrease and not any increase.

Marcia Au: Well, we certainly do agree with the fact that we are in economic hard times and we are paring back and we continue to do that. I have to say though, that this budget year has been a real difficult one to get through not knowing what you were looking at down the pike. And as we get further down, we'll be able to tighten things up and present, hopefully, an even more efficient and economic budget to you. We took down as much as we could in terms of feeling comfortable and being able to maintain both our service which is exemplary and the cost of that.

Councilman Raben: Well, again, and not to preach here, I mean, we've maintained or we're responsible for budgets for about sixty different departments. A budget that is in excess of, it's, you know, 65,000,000 just General Fund, much larger than that if you look at all the other levies and funds. And we were able to cut our budget and that's 650 or 700 employees, our budget was about a quarter of a million dollars less this year than last year, so, you know, on a much larger scale, we're able to do it and I, again, it's probably too late this year, but next year I think every department, every office that's here today, I'm going to be looking to see some of that action happening next year.

Marcia Au: And we can certainly work on that.

President Shetler: Alright, any other comments or questions?

Councilmember Lloyd: I mean, I can agree with what Councilman Raben is saying. I think it's been a tough budget year for all of us. I guess at this time, I would just like to recommend approval of the budget as submitted, as a motion.

Councilmember Bassemier: I'll second it.

President Shetler: It's been moved and seconded to approve the budget as submitted. Do I have any questions? Yes, Councilman Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: If we have reservations about the salary increase for one thing, what are we – are we going to vote no and then send to the state why or –

President Shetler: I think that's an option to vote no, and then if someone wants to make a new motion with some caveats on it, that points out the recommendations that we would make, then I think that might be appropriate, if that would get voted down.

Councilmember Bassemier: Tom, I just want to say that you all have a seven member board on the library board, --

Marcia Au: Yes, we do, Sir.

Councilmember Bassemier: Seven members, and I know they went through this with a fine tooth comb, and I know that they really looked into this and that they made all the cuts and run the libraries more efficient. I know they did what they had to do, so, and that's the reason why I think it should stay as it is.

Marcia Au: Thank you, and they did do that.

President Shetler: Okay, what I'm going to do to try to keep us a little bit on schedule, is ask for a voice vote if it appears that this may be a little bit mixed anyway.

Councilmember Kiefer: I'd just go ahead and call individual votes.

President Shetler: We'll do a roll call on this one because this one looks like it's going to be mixed anyway. So roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: I think we must be consistent with the salaries, so I say no.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: I echo Councilman Goebel's remarks and I vote no.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Wow, I get to break a tie here. I'll vote no because I think we need to stay consistent on the zero percent increase. I have no problem with the budget otherwise, so motion is denied 3-4.

**(Motion fails 3-4/Councilmembers Goebel, Raben, Kiefer & Shetler opposed)**

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Mr. President, I'll make a motion that we pass on to the state our acceptance of the budget with the caveat that no salary increases be granted, that salary lines be flat lined to 2009's figures.

President Shetler: And keep in mind, this is a recommendation to the state governing body on it, so we have a motion on the floor.

Councilmember Kiefer: Second.

President Shetler: Any questions about the motion? Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Repeat that motion again.

President Shetler: I think the motion –

Councilmember Raben: Approve the budget with the exception of no salary increases. No salary increases, everything else, we're okay with.

Councilman Sutton: And this is a recommendation?

President Shetler: That is correct.

Councilman Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: To be consistent, I'll vote no.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being five ayes and no nays, the motion carries – two nays, I'm sorry. Motion carries. Thank you very much, Marcia.

**(Motion carried 5-2/Councilmembers Bassemier & Lloyd opposed)**

<b>SOLID WASTE</b>
--------------------

President Shetler: Next is Solid Waste, Joe.

Joe Ballard: Thank you. We'll try to make this a little simpler with the Solid Waste budget. It's not quite as extensive. I'm Joe Ballard, the director of the Solid Waste District. With me is Susan Jeffries, back there, our administrator, and then also Jenny Collins, the City Controller, who is our controller as well. And Councilman Russ Lloyd is the Council appointment to the Solid Waste board. We approved our budget last Tuesday of \$426,000...one moment, 426,820, which is a 15.5% decrease from last year's budget. We have also, and the way we are funded is not through property taxes but through a fee on waste that goes into the landfill. We increased our fee from \$1.50 to \$2.00 effective January the 1<sup>st</sup>, which should bring in, based on what's happening right now, should bring in around \$434,000, about 435,400, so that should cover our expenditures. As I said, we've reduced the budget by \$78,000 or 15.5%. I can take any questions if you'd like.

President Shetler: Joe, should the economic downturn, and most people don't realize that it affects waste and garbage and everything as much as it does anybody else, so you've been down on what you're able to receive, should that continue and you don't receive the 430 and change that you just spoke about, at 426, who is going to make up that difference?

Joe Ballard: Well, a lot of our budget is based on programs such as the Tox-Away Day, which was September the 12<sup>th</sup>. That cost us about \$80,000. Next September, if we don't have the money, we may not get to do that. I mean, that would be one thing. I guess the other alternative would be to raise our fee again. We can go up to \$2.50 per ton of waste. I would hate to do that, but that's an option.

President Shetler: If there is a deficit, you don't tap on the city taxpayers or the county taxpayers?

Joe Ballard: No, that is correct. We do have in our General Fund, if you will, about \$430,000, I think, now, approximately \$430,000 that we have saved, although that has been dwindling in the last two years, if you will. So we have some money. We'd like to save, you know, good budgeting practices, financial planning practices, would say you should have one year's budget saved in case of problems, and I think that's where we are right now. That's been dwindling, like I said, and we're down to about 430,000. But that's correct, the waste that goes into the landfill, and that's how we're funded, this landfill at Laubscher Meadows is about 75% of the waste that goes into that landfill is industrial and commercial. And so, and Whirlpool would be one example of what we won't get there. But when the economy has a downturn, industry doesn't produce as much, and when industry doesn't produce, they don't generate some waste. They do recycle or reduce their waste, but they don't generate as much waste and it doesn't go in the landfill and therefore, we don't get paid. So that is a problem. We've been in existence since 1993 and it has not been a problem with funding until the last year, year and a half or so.

President Shetler: Alright, thank you. Yes, Councilman Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: The Solid Waste board, this has been a difficult situation and we've had to wrestle with this and, you know, our philosophy is you don't want to put all this on industry, either. I mean, but the Solid Waste District has always been funded that way. One of the things that the board is looking at is the possibility of charging vehicles that come through the Tox-Away Day and the tire recycling day where you would charge like a dollar per vehicle or things like that

where they would collect some money. But that's not going to be large amounts of money, but the board and the citizen's advisory committee is looking at all ways possible to get in more revenues, so it's difficult. And they did reduce in next year's budget, a full-time staff member has been deleted. So, you'll be down to two, right?

Joe Ballard: Right, that's correct. We have three positions right now; we'll have two positions next year.

President Shetler: Okay, questions? Yes, Councilman Raben?

Councilmember Raben: As far as salary increases, are there any salary increases calculated in this budget?

Joe Ballard: No, there aren't.

Councilmember Raben: Great.

Joe Ballard: In fact, I guess I will make a comment. We contract with the City Controller, so we follow city personnel and purchasing practices, and next year, the city, for the last twenty years or so, has funded all departments' PERF, the retirement fund. That's going to be discontinued next year and we have to pay for our own three percent –

Jenny Collins: For non-bargaining units.

Joe Ballard: For non-bargaining units. So, in effect, we have a net decrease in payroll.

Councilmember Kiefer: Joe, thanks. Appreciate the big reduction there in your budget. Thank you.

Joe Ballard: No problem.

President Shetler: Okay, yes, Councilman Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: I want to say thanks for providing those Tox-Away Days and the tire days and things like that. I think it's a great service to the entire community. Thank you.

Joe Ballard: Thank you. I will say, Tox-Away Day, we don't have the bill from the September 12<sup>th</sup> program and that's how our – that's kind of what we do, and then of course, how much we pay is based on how many cars come. We advertise some, and we had 1,853 vehicles that came through, which is kind of a, just a regular day for us, but that will probably cost us about between 80 and \$90,000.

President Shetler: Alright. Thank you. Any other questions? Motion?

Councilmember Raben: I'll move approval or send our blessing on to the state.

Councilmember Lloyd: With no changes?

Councilmember Raben: No change.

President Shetler: It's been moved and seconded. All in favor, signify by saying aye.

**(All Councilmembers voted in the affirmative)**

President Shetler: Anyone opposed?

**(No opposing votes were cast)**

President Shetler: So ordered. Thank you, Joe.

**(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)**

<b>CITY OF EVANSVILLE</b>
---------------------------

President Shetler: Okay, Jenny Collins, City of Evansville.

Jenny Collins: Hi, I'm Jenny Collins, City Controller. I also have Elizabeth Barnes, she's the Deputy Controller. I will just echo the fact that this has been a very difficult budget year. Just going through, no pay increases for 2010, in order to keep our health care budgeted at the same level to deal with the industry average increases, we had to put that burden on the employees and we are looking for a 20% increase on our employees for health care coverage. In addition to that, we increased our co-pays for our doctor's office visits. Our medicine deductibles have increased also. Like Joe mentioned, we did, for the non-bargaining units, the city will no longer provide that 3% state mandated PERF coverage. The employees will have to make that contribution. And we've made substantial changes to our vacation policy. The most that a city employee can earn will be four weeks. We will no longer allow carry overs. In the past, we used to allow them to carry over half of that vacation if they didn't use it in a given year. Starting January 2010, there will be no carry overs for vacation. They can only earn a maximum of four weeks instead of the six weeks. We're hoping that this may be able to reduce some employees because we have a very aged population of workers and when you have someone who has, like an office of mine, I have three employees that earn the max, six weeks each, it becomes very difficult to staff your office and be efficient.

Councilmember Raben: Question on that: you're doing that with the current employees or new hires?

Jenny Collins: Current employees, across the board. We also, for health insurance, we've enacted the spousal rule, so if an employee's spouse is able to get health care coverage at their place of employment, they are required to do that now. Of course, we would become their secondary insurance, but we hope to see some savings there and we've eliminated one of our programs also, for our health care plan.

Councilmember Raben: I know the media has done a good job keeping us informed with your struggles and preparing and approval of your budget. And I know the city has done a great job getting where they have to be to meet their shortfalls that they're going to see next year, so, Mr. President, I'll move –

Councilmember Kiefer: Mr. President, I have a question.

President Shetler: Yes?

Councilmember Kiefer: A couple things: there's been a lot of talk in the media lately about sewer problems and the city is getting sued, I guess. And I know that is a fee based, you know, program because it goes through the water and sewer and paid that way. Is that reflected at all? I mean, you don't have anything reflected concerning that for next year because these budgets were all done prior to that concern coming about.

Jenny Collins: As far as like, litigation cost or...

Councilmember Kiefer: Well, just as far as, I mean, I'm just trying to figure out what the city is going to do in response to that, you know, litigation –

Jenny Collins: I would have to defer and get that answer for you because I would have to go to the water and sewer department –

Councilmember Kiefer: And then I also understand the rates are being increased and –

Jenny Collins: There is a proposal to increase the water and the trash rates.

Councilmember Kiefer: Is the city shopping their –

Jenny Collins: Yes, we are currently out for RFP for the water and the sewer both.

Councilmember Kiefer: And trash pickup, are you getting multiple bids on trash pickup?

Jenny Collins: I'm not sure on the trash, I would have to defer and get that answer for you. But I do know that we are out for RFP for the operations in the water and sewer department.

Councilmember Kiefer: I'd also be curious about that trash pickup because I know that's a big complaint people are expressing right now about –

Jenny Collins: And I know it's in front of our City Council currently. I believe they met with them this week for the proposal, so...

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay, thank you very much.

President Shetler: Councilman Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Just a comment: from our standpoint, the county, we're obviously in better shape and for you people in the city, all I can say is, ouch, because those employees are taking a hit and I think maybe it's more understandable now, why we're asking all the other entities coming forward to also zero their salary increase because things are tough all over. And I feel for you, and good luck.

Jenny Collins: Thank you. I would like to mention, also, we did eliminate through layoffs and attrition for budget year 2010, eight employees, and also numerous temporary and part-time.

President Shetler: You also have a hiring freeze as well, don't you?

Jenny Collins: I don't know that it mirrors your hiring freeze, though, I don't think that we have a – we have a SAC committee that approves any new positions, but I don't think we have a hiring freeze at the level that you do.

President Shetler: Alright, thank you. Councilman Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Talking about the litigation, I have a little bit of expertise there, I don't think they budget any reserve for that, I guess, unless you had an imminent situation where you knew you were going to lose a case, so this thing could probably take maybe several years. Other than the attorneys, I mean, you have to pay them ongoing.

Councilmember Kiefer: One last question: on debt service, you know, on debt service, I noticed that's gone down quite a bit, I mean, what all does that debt service – that's all the bond payments, everything? Is that –

Jenny Collins: Yes.

Councilmember Kiefer: So does that include anything that will be done with the stadium project, too, or is that in future years, like 2011?

Jenny Collins: That would be in future years. There's nothing on there that relates to the stadium.

Councilmember Kiefer: So no debt service starts for the stadium project, and if there is debt service for sewer projects, that would come under a different budget?

Jenny Collins: Right, it would come under the water and the sewer.

Councilmember Kiefer: Yeah, that's what I was wondering, why the water and sewer, I didn't see a line item or water and sewer on this page.

Jenny Collins: Because there's no taxes that are raised for that. It's a fee based –

Councilmember Kiefer: Yeah, I know, I understand that, but still, --

Jenny Collins: And if you...

Councilmember Kiefer: I still think that's a concern of citizens every time a fee is increased. I mean, the number of calls I get for that trash pickup increase is amazing, you know, it's just people are concerned about that and that's why I asked those questions, even though it wasn't on this line item. So thank you.

President Shetler: Any other questions? Yes, Councilman Sutton?

Councilman Sutton: Yes, on your Local Roads & Streets line, can you talk about the substantial increase there? Is this related to capital projects that you guys have going on, kind of why that's increased?

Jenny Collins: That's shifted. Local Roads & Streets had a little bit of a cash balance. We had previously, in the past have funded a lot of road paving and so



forth out of COIT dollars. And with the COIT dollars going down with the economy and so forth, we thought it would be a better use of the funds to use the Local Roads & Streets money because it can be used for those type items.

Councilman Sutton: Well, I see you do have a balance of almost 6.7 million there and you're budgeting for next year, for 4.1 million out of that fund, so, I mean, there's no impact necessarily from a General Fund standpoint, but just wondering how you came up with such a large increase.

Jenny Collins: Just really redirected some projects also from Riverboat to the Local Roads & Streets due to the fact that it had a healthy cash balance and it could support some projects out of there.

Councilman Sutton: And you mentioned Riverboat, that was my next question. How do you guys use those dollars? I mean, you guys have an 18 million dollar balance.

Jenny Collins: Riverboat is used for capital purchases only. We don't fund any operational costs out of Riverboat at all. The City Council adopted an ordinance when the riverboat was put into place to only use that fund for capital improvement line items.

Councilman Sutton: Is there even some definition on the type of capital projects that that can only be used for?

Jenny Collins: Lease cars...

Councilmember Kiefer: Police vests.

Jenny Collins: Police vests.

Councilmember Lloyd: Fire trucks.

Jenny Collins: Fire trucks, yes...you know, building repairs.

Councilman Sutton: Okay, thank you.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Mr. President, I will move that we send our approval of the budget on to state.

Councilmember Goebel: Second.

President Shetler: It's been moved and seconded. Any questions or comments?

Councilmember Lloyd: Approval with no changes, correct?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yeah, the only comment that I'd make is that I know the water and sewer department is fee based, but I really think that's such a huge budget item, that it should be something next year they should allow us to review, but of course, I understand the state makes that decision. But that is a very, very big budget item that's fee based, but I don't know too many people in the city that can go without water and sewer service. Just a comment.

President Shetler: Okay, any other questions or comments? Alright, all in favor,

signify by saying aye.

**(All Councilmembers voted in the affirmative)**

President Shetler: Those opposed?

**(No opposing votes were cast)**

President Shetler: So ordered.

**(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)**

Jenny Collins: Thank you. And I did get Ms. Au's phone number to contact Jim Harris with the EVSC for the combined purchasing.

President Shetler: Because you guys eliminated a person or two, didn't you, yourselves?

Jenny Collins: Two employees.

President Shetler: So if they're able to do the same, it would help reduce their costs just immediately plus purchasing power.

Jenny Collins: I will be sure that I pass along that.

President Shetler: Alright, thank you. Appreciate it.

<b>LEVEE AUTHORITY PORT AUTHORITY</b>
---

Jenny Collins: I'm also here for the Levee.

President Shetler: Oh, Mr. Mangold isn't going to --

Jenny Collins: Well no, Mr. Mangold is no longer with the Levee Authority.

President Shetler: Oh, he's not?

Jenny Collins: He's retired.

President Shetler: Well, congratulations.

Jenny Collins: But I may refer to him for some questions.

Councilmember Raben: Well, there's a substantial increase here. I'm sure you're ready to speak to that.

Jenny Collins: I am ready to speak to that. Again, there is, the Levee follows the same as the city, no pay increases. The changes to the health care is enforced on them. The increase that you're seeing is, I think it's roughly about 300,000 and it is for, we are in the process of being re-certified as the city for the levees. We are in need of making some substantial repairs to the levee, and I believe -- I'm going to speak out of turn --

Councilmember Raben: I remember this now from our joint budget hearings --

Jenny Collins: The Pigeon levee is in need of repair. Initially we thought that was going to cost a lot more but we found out that we can make some repairs that will last I think approximately ten years at a cost of only 300,000, and that's the road that we decided to go.

President Shetler: These are being mandated by the Army Corps of Engineers?

Jenny Collins: Correct. In order to get certification for the city, we are having to make these repairs.

Councilmember Raben: Do we also, are you handling Port Authority as well?

Jenny Collins: I am here on the Port Authority.

Councilmember Raben: And there's really no --

Jenny Collins: There's no salaries at all. It's merely operational cost.

Councilmember Raben: That appears to be, I mean, if you look at this sheet I'm looking at here, as if that's a new account or possibly a new --

Jenny Collins: Well, and there was some confusion and Teri called me on that, too. I merely brought it to you guys because I wanted to be sure that I was covered. I don't think that it came to you last year, but the Port Authority, I think it's been in operation for three years. But I just wanted to make sure I had all my i's dotted and my t's crossed.

Councilmember Raben: And you did. Thank you. Mr. President, again, I'll move that we send our unofficial nod yes to the state with no changes on the Levee Authority and Port Authority.

Councilmember Goebel: Second.

President Shetler: Do I have any questions about the motion? All in favor, signify by saying aye.

**(All Councilmembers voted in the affirmative)**

President Shetler: Those opposed?

**(No opposing votes were cast)**

President Shetler: So ordered.

**(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)**

President Shetler: You did both: did you do Levee and Port?

Jenny Collins: Yes.

President Shetler: Alright.

Jenny Collins: Thank you.

<b>TOWN OF DARMSTADT</b>
--------------------------

President Shetler: Town of Darmstadt. Mallory Lowe?

Councilmember Raben: No one here? Mr. President, I guess with this one, I will make the same motion as one of the prior motions, that we send our okay on to the state on this budget with no salary increases to salary lines and outside of that, we accept the budget.

President Shetler: Do we know if there are any?

Councilmember Raben: I can come back to you on that, but this will certainly, if there are, it certainly expresses our displeasure. Part of Joe's point, there's no historical figures to go by as we look at these, but again, with that standard motion, if there are, we're saying we don't approve of them.

President Shetler: Jim, just a suggestion here and by legal counsel, that maybe we might say that the salary levels will be set in at the '09 levels, spell that out.

Councilmember Raben: For clarification, my motion will be that this body approves the 2010 town of Darmstadt budget with salaries set in at the 2009 levels.

President Shetler: Okay, we have a motion.

Councilmember Kiefer: Second.

President Shetler: And a second. Do I have any questions? Comments? All in favor, signify by saying aye.

**(All Councilmembers voted in the affirmative)**

President Shetler: Anyone opposed?

**(No opposing votes were cast)**

President Shetler: So ordered.

**(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)**

President Shetler: Now we'll go to the townships. I don't know if the township folks would like to come up to the front row. Some of it we might be able to take more in a grouping, particularly on some questions. I don't know if that might make things a little bit easier in the transition and easier for you to make your way later to the podium anyway. Again, we're going to go in alphabetical order and, lucky you?

<b>ARMSTRONG TOWNSHIP TRUSTEE</b>
-----------------------------------

Joyce Kron: Some year, we should do this backwards. I'm Joyce Kron. I am the clerk in the Armstrong Township Trustee's office. The Trustee, Randy Kron,

couldn't be here today, since the fields and the corn have finally dried. He's doing his full-time job today and asked me to come in his place. I'll start by, our township fund, we did put in a two percent raise increase and the reason we did this, what we traditionally have done, our advisory board has told us to put in a pay increase and then at their last meeting, they decide what the pay will be. And they have always based that on what the County Council did. And we have done this for as long as I can remember, even before you had approval, they always followed what the County Council did. So while we have a two percent raise increase in there, regardless of what you do today, if you – upon approval of our budget, if, overall on your budget, you say no pay increases, that's what our township will do, that's what we have always done. The only substantial increase that I have in my budget is our fire fund and we are contractually obligated, well, we are required by law to provide fire service for our township. We are under contract with German and Scott Township Fire Departments and this is what our contract says that we need for next year, so that's really our only other increase. So does anyone have any questions for me on this?

Councilmember Lloyd: What was that increase on the fire fund?

Joyce Kron: Five.

Councilmember Lloyd: Five percent?

Joyce Kron: Yes. It's about \$4,000.

Councilmember Raben: Do we want to – are there any questions?

President Shetler: Anybody have any questions?

Councilmember Raben: If not, I'll make the motion that we send our official nod to the state with the budgets being set at 2009's rates or salaries set at the 2009 rate and all other budget items we accept and approve.

Councilmember Lloyd: Second.

President Shetler: It's been moved and seconded, do I have any questions about the motion? Comments? All in favor, signify by saying aye.

**(All Councilmembers voted in the affirmative)**

President Shetler: Those opposed?

**(No opposing votes were cast)**

President Shetler: So ordered.

**(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)**

<b>GENERAL DISCUSSION OF TOWNSHIP TRUSTEE BUDGETS</b>
---

Councilmember Raben: If anyone has any questions, I guess since we're dealing with just different officeholders, different townships. If anybody's got any general questions, we might just ask them as groups so we don't ask the same questions

two or three times, and if anybody wants to speak to them, you can. I meant to say that earlier. But, you know, just a brief summary of what township trustees do might be good because we are being recorded, you know, for the folks at home that may want to know what your offices do. Some of the criteria that – and whoever wants to speak for it, whoever wants to volunteer to do that.

Councilmember Kiefer: Before they get started, if you could add in just some explanation between Fire and Cumulative Fire, because those are two different line items. If you can kind of speak to the differences between those two budgets.

Mary Hart: Okay, first of all, the township trustees are temporary emergency assistance for low income clients in our townships. Right now, we're filling in a lot of the gaps with the state modernization program, so we have seen an increase in our clients. Most of us have tried to keep our 2010 budgets the same at 2009 levels. The difference between the Fire Fund and the Cum Fire, the Cum Fire can only be used for the purchase of equipment. The Fire department budget itself provides the fire service...equipment, land and building.

Councilmember Raben: And as far as relief, is there a standard set of guidelines that each office has to go by that is provided by the state? And just, I mean, you know, again, because I don't know enough about –

Mary Hart: Each township trustee has their guidelines posted with the County Commissioners. We do have a set of written guidelines that we go by that are with the County Commissioners and also posted in our office.

President Shetler: And are those uniform and standardized between the townships?

Mary Hart: Pretty close but not always because the costs in different townships are going to vary a little bit, but they're pretty close to being as uniform as we can get them and stay within our budget limits.

Councilmember Lloyd: So are we going to take Pigeon since Mrs. Hart is up here?

President Shetler: Right now we're kind of going through some general questions.

Councilmember Kiefer: It was mentioned earlier to the libraries that, because we have EVSC, city and county doing, we have one purchasing department now, source, have any of the townships discussed this as possibility for purchasing being sourced through that same entity now that does EVSC, city and the county?

Mary Hart: We haven't because our forms are having to be approved by the State Board of Accounts, the forms that we use. They have approval with a couple of our printers that we actually all purchase our forms from the same printer. Because they have to be approved by the State Board of Accounts, we can't just go to any vendor that...

President Shetler: When it comes to health insurance, do you all have some kind of pooling agreements or arrangements through the state or, is it all done independently and on your own?

Mary Hart: We actually pool with the county in the township trustee's office. We pay the full premiums out of our budget, but we are pooled into the group with the

county.

President Shetler: Alright.

Councilmember Kiefer: One last question about this purchasing stuff. So if you guys buy some new equipment like fire equipment or new helmets, new anything that you need to purchase, each individual township just is responsible for making those – there's no joint effort in acquiring any equipment?

Mary Hart: Joe, I need to bring someone else up here that deals with the fire department, I contract with Center so I can't answer those questions.

Councilmember Lloyd: Get an expert up here.

David Mosby: And I know where you're coming from. Basically, what we do is, we contract to Perry. Perry does all their own buying and I have a contract with Perry to provide \$256,000 a year. And we do that in two payments per year but they actually buy their own equipment. If they're going to buy a truck, they go out, they get the bids, they get whatever supplies they want on that truck, and as far as their fire fighters, I mean, they buy their own stuff.

Councilmember Raben: Outside of your 250, everything else you have to raise, right?

David Mosby: Yeah, through businesses, how ever.

Councilmember Raben: In Perry Township, I'm thinking, what is there, three stations?

David Mosby: We've got Williams Road and Rollett Lane or Johnson Lane, and then we also have a truck down in Union Township now that is providing service to Union. I think they have six or seven trucks actually because they're housing about three trucks on Johnson Lane, which is made for one, but they're housing three.

Councilmember Raben: The 250 that you provide is outside of what they raise and when they do barbecues and stuff like that, I mean, that's –

David Mosby: And I agree, they do a terrific job. I don't know how they do it with the amount of money they do –

Councilmember Kiefer: I was just looking to see if, like from your experience as a City Council person, all those years of, like if a policeman gets a new vehicle, they go through a statewide, there's like a statewide system and I just was seeing if there was opportunities to reduce cost by pooling instead of each individual one doing their thing, pooling it together through either the state or through this new purchasing program that we have with EVSC and the county and the city.

David Mosby: I do know Perry talks with the same people that the city talks with. I know that for a fact because one of the guys has a brother that works out there. And they have went and refurbished, they found that it was cheaper for them to refurbish a couple trucks.

Councilmember Raben: I think Joe was talking more in general. We kind of got on

the fire and so he's talking about if you need a new copier or if you need, you know, pens and pencils, are we utilizing our city/county purchasing staff that –

Mary Hart: Well, we haven't but most of us are using copiers and printers that are 20 years old so...

Bob Harris: In Scott, unlike the other townships, Scott Township Trustee, we buy the truck, they're titled to the township rather than the fire department, so all the buildings and all the grounds, all the fire equipment, all the equipment in the fire houses are township equipment. And actually, –

**(Tape changed)**

– when I buy a copier or anything for the fire department, I contact purchasing and see where they're getting their best bids and that's what I go by.

President Shetler: Alright.

Councilmember Kiefer: Again, I was only expressing like at the beginning of the year, if you knew you were going to do something and the city, county and the school corporation, they were going to buy ten, you add yours on, you know, now you're getting eleven, you know, you just get a little better discount. And if you guys are out talking to them, and exploring that opportunity, I'd appreciate it. Thank you.

President Shetler: Yes, Councilman Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: If we're going across the townships in a blanket form, I guess, are we going to bring them up individually?

President Shetler: Yes, we are. I was kind of, the general questions to get out of the way before we get into specifics about someone's budget, then I think we need to go back.

Councilmember Goebel: Excuse me, but maybe if anyone has a zero line increase for salaries, you could let us know that right away so we don't have to ask.

Mary Hart: I can tell you right now, my 2010 budget is identical to my 2009.

Councilmember Goebel: No pay increase?

Mary Hart: No pay increase.

President Shetler: And this is a general question that I had and I served on the Center Township board for several years and I know Bob Orr always kept a part of his resume, the fact that his politics started at the Center Township board and he was very proud of that being part of his references there. I don't expect to end up where he did, but anyway, I do appreciate the work that's being done. The fire department, one of the issues that I know we came up with a few years ago at Center Township, volunteer firemen and how many would come out to emergency runs and all that kind of thing, is there any kind of standardization or any kind of set rules on that between, or is that just up to the individual townships as far as what they pay per run and how many people can get paid and the like, because I think we had a couple situations like that? And the second question that I had in general



was on burials, because I know we also had some issues on pauper burials and they were getting to be fairly costly to our township and I didn't know if there is a standard rate on that, again, between townships or how that's done.

Mary Hart: As township trustees, we have met and we have worked with the funeral homes and we have a set standard that all township trustees on pay on burials, which is the same. It's \$2,000 for a pauper's burial, \$600 for cremation. And we all pay the same amount on burials. And we've worked with the funeral homes and they work with us.

President Shetler: And all city funeral homes are involved in that process then?

Mary Hart: Just about all of them will accept what we pay on the burials and bury our members.

President Shetler: Okay, emergency runs? Can anybody address that as far as –

Bob Harris: Before we go on a run, we have to have four firemen on the scene before they can make an entrance to a house. On emergency runs, I guess Scott Township is the only one that has their own ambulance service. We have a full-time paramedic and EMT on duty 24/7. And so they make the medical runs. And we do – Darmstadt, we do all the medical runs in Armstrong and the German Fire Department and Scott Township does the runs in Armstrong.

President Shetler: Alright.

Councilmember Bassemier: That's a state law. You have four people there, two in and two out.

Bob Harris: Right, right. So I think most of the fire departments now have people on during the day. I think Scott's the only one that has people on 24/7.

President Shetler: That's one thing I've noticed looking through all these budgets is that, and I know it's been a few years ago since I had actually served, but the cost of fire protection is definitely increasing.

Bob Harris: We're in a real bind out in Scott with the new school being built out there. We're going to have to put on some men during the day to protect the school and I've been working on that.

President Shetler: Alright. Any other questions?

Councilmember Raben: Again, back to – I don't care who answers it, --

James "Tiger" Ritter: I want to say something about the fire department. We contract with the McCutchanville Fire Department for serving Center Township, which is a big area. And with the volunteer fire department, we've had to hire four regulars in the last two years, and that's why you'll see on my budget, I have 50,000 more than last year, and it's because we need the fifth person. So I just wanted to explain that.

President Shetler: Alright, thank you, Tiger. Yes, James?

Councilmember Raben: Again, I'm still trying to give the folks at home – somebody tell me just, some of the different types of relief that are available, and again, I come in for relief, what guidelines or what criteria do I have to meet?

Mary Hart: Well, each case is handled case by case, Jim. We assist with food, non-food items, rent, utilities, medical, burial, just about anything that's a basic living necessity, we deal with through the trustee's office. But each case is handled case by case. I mean, it depends on what the client's need is when they come in as to how they're – what services they will receive. It just depends on what their need is at the time that they apply. It could be for rent, it could be for utilities. We're seeing a lot of the bleed over from the state modernization program where medical benefits have been discontinued for the loss of paperwork, so we're picking up medicines and testings until the Medicaid can get straightened out. TANIF benefits have been cut off, so we're assisting with rent, utilities because those benefits have been cut off for lack of communication with the state modernization. Food, we're seeing a lot of food orders that we're having to issue because food stamps have been discontinued for a minor problem with the state modernization program. So, I mean, that's what we're there for. We're kind of a fill gap for any of the state programs that they have been taken off of, no failure of their own.

Councilmember Raben: Do you have a means in which to verify (inaudible – microphone not turned on) somebody that really needs your assistance? I mean, what do you do to verify that the situation is what it's said to be?

Mary Hart: Each township trustee has an investigator that investigates and verifies, we verify through the child support division on the income, if they're receiving that. We have a connection with the state modernization program that we can email and get information back that those benefits were stopped and for whatever reason, but we do have investigators that investigate each and every case and determines whether or not that need is truly there.

Councilmember Raben: Every case is investigated?

Mary Hart: Each case.

Councilmember Raben: That's great.

President Shetler: Councilman Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Mary, with the modernization problems we're having, and maybe you picking up at the township level some expenses you wouldn't normally have, is there any recourse for the township to get reimbursement?

Mary Hart: No, because that's really what we're there to do, is to assist the clients who fall in the gap or while they're waiting to apply or be approved for state programs.

Councilmember Goebel: Are some of these existing qualifiers who, simply because of the state issues that have fallen back to you, that might be qualified for both township and state?

Mary Hart: Well, they qualify for our assistance in between time that they have been taken off of the state system. And we will assist that client until they can get the

state program back in place, but we do assist them in getting the state program back in place, also.

Councilmember Goebel: Okay, just for general information, since the state is not very forthcoming with information about the modernization, have you noticed a change in improvement at the state level?

Mary Hart: It is getting better here locally. We're not having near the problems that some of the states are having, some parts of the state. They have just put in two actual troubleshooters in our local office, so we are seeing some improvement with that program here.

Councilmember Goebel: Thank you.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, we want to –

President Shetler: I think Councilman Kiefer had a question.

Councilmember Kiefer: One question: just out of curiosity, I noticed all the trustees, I mean, it seems like the salaries are different, the boards are paid different, is that all just established through each individual board and they establish what the salaries have been and what the board is paid and what the – there's no like, real formula based upon the size of the township or anything? It's just kind of established by each individual board?

Mary Hart: Well, if you notice on some of the township budgets, the trustee makes less than their employees because they're considered part-time positions.

Councilmember Kiefer: I mean, I don't think, you know, like I'm looking at German here, you know, it's not, you know, 13,100 is not, there's a vast difference from other trustees and I was just curious how they came up with it.

Mary Hart: Some of those, when you see the salaries that low, they're considered part-time positions, so they're not paid a full-time salary, so, I mean, their employees may make more than they do.

Councilmember Kiefer: I'm sure it's like the mayor, you know, each mayor from every city, the Council appropriates that, so –

Mary Hart: Each township has a three-member advisory board that approves our budget, so there may be a difference and variation in salaries. I know that all of us have met and tried to get our budgets the same, but sometimes our tax rates won't allow us to do that. So we get it as close as we can to be uniform within the county.

Councilmember Kiefer: I'm sorry, I'm just trying to better understand how it works. Thank you.

<b>CENTER TOWNSHIP TRUSTEE</b>
--------------------------------

Councilmember Raben: Okay, on Center, Mr. President, I'm going to move that we send our –

(Inaudible)

Councilmember Raben: I'm going to make that in a motion. I think we've asked that question or maybe we did not. On Center Township, are there salary increases calculated into this budget?

Mary Hart: Tiger, do you have any salary...? Yes, there is.

Councilmember Raben: At what rate?

James "Tiger" Ritter: Three percent.

Councilmember Raben: I'll move that we send our approval on all budget items with the exception of salaries, and salaries be set at the 2009 rate for Center Township.

Councilman Sutton: Second.

James "Tiger" Ritter: I want to say something. My people are working harder now than they have ever worked since I've been there fifteen years. And we even thought we, at one time, I needed to put a part-time person on. We've done 200 new applications this year, and right now on just the poor relief alone, we've done 90,000 more than last year. And so they're doing their job and I think they need a raise. So that's why we did that.

Councilmember Raben: And I understand that and appreciate that, Tiger.

President Shetler: There is a motion and a second. Let me just ask you real quickly, Tiger, your hours of operation, what time do you guys start in the mornings and what time do you finish, and is it five days a week or what?

Mary Hart: It's eight to four, five days a week. Let me explain the reason that he, as most of you know, the new county jail is now in Tiger's township, so the 300 clients that I was seeing on a monthly basis are now in Tiger's territory, so I'm sure he probably does need another full-time person. And they are working a whole lot harder.

President Shetler: Okay, we have a motion and a second on the floor. Any questions about the motion? All in favor, signify by saying aye.

**(All Councilmembers except Councilmember Bassemier voted in the affirmative)**

President Shetler: Those opposed?

Councilmember Bassemier: I oppose. I'm –

President Shetler: Let's do a roll call.

Councilmember Bassemier: Tiger comes up here and says he needs that increase, I'm going to give it to him.

President Shetler: We'll do a roll call vote, please. Let's do a roll call, then.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being six ayes and one nay, the motion carries.

**(Motion carried 6-1/Councilmember Bassemier opposed)**

<b>GERMAN TOWNSHIP TRUSTEE</b>
--------------------------------

President Shetler: The next township, then, is German Township. Anybody here for German? Any specific questions?

Councilmember Lloyd: That would be, Mr. Fred Happe is the Trustee.

Councilmember Raben: This budget appears as if it's, request is 10,000 less than last year, well, actually a little over 11,000. Okay, well, Mr. President, I'll make the same standard motion that salary items, we only approve the salary items set at 2009's figures and all other budget items we're okay with. That's my motion.

Councilman Sutton: Second.

President Shetler: It's been moved and seconded. Any questions, comments? All in favor, signify by saying aye.

**(All Councilmembers voted in the affirmative)**

President Shetler: Those opposed?

**(No opposing votes were cast)**

President Shetler: So ordered.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

<b>KNIGHT TOWNSHIP TRUSTEE</b>
--------------------------------

President Shetler: Knight Township. Linda? I guess I'll ask you the question that Mr. Raben has been asking all night, afternoon, morning, whatever it is. It seems like it's afternoon. But anyway, and that is, do you have any rate increases in here?

Linda Durham: We do have a three percent rate increase in our salaries. We also have some rate increases in our poor relief, that has increased substantially over the past year given the fact that we have seen a lot of job losses in our area, clients that were previously financially stable, they're losing incomes and not being able to pay rent, utilities, basic necessities, and they're now applying to us. We've had over 500 new cases this year alone, in addition to a lot of activations or reactivations of prior cases. I'd say we have probably about 600 to 700 new cases or reactivations this year. So our poor relief has went up, however, our fire has went down by \$40,000.

President Shetler: Okay, yes, Councilman Kiefer.

Councilmember Kiefer: A little bit more specific to Knight Township, because I know a lot of your area was annexed, how much – I guess, how much territory is now no longer, is not in the city? How much of Knight Township is outside of the city limits?

Linda Durham: We only lost to the annexation about a five to six mile square radius. We lost what's called the commercial block and that's the area between Morgan Avenue and the Lloyd, Burkhardt to the county line. And that's all we lost. However, that money really wasn't, we didn't lose any net valuation for that area because it was already in our TIF bond.

Councilmember Kiefer: I was just curious because I was trying to understand what was left in Knight Out, and as far as I can think of, it's that area over between Covert and Riverside, east of Green River Road, somewhat back in that area.

Linda Durham: Uh-huh.

Councilmember Kiefer: But is there any other area that's in Knight Township Out?

Linda Durham: We have the area north of Morgan to Lynch, and then Burkhardt again being the line.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay, thank you.

President Shetler: Burkhardt to 64.

Councilmember Raben: The city did take over a fire station, right?

Linda Durham: No, we still have two operational fire stations. We have one that is a 24 hour station, and then we have one that is a home response station. The home response station is the one on Pollack and our 24/7 station is out on Burkhardt.

President Shetler: Okay, any other questions?

Councilmember Lloyd: I know, and this was in the media about your fire coverage, was the amount that you decreased it, is that a one year contract with –

Linda Durham: Yes, we are – because of the annexation, we thought it financially feasible to operate on a one year contract at this time.

Councilmember Lloyd: So that will come up for review or is it being reviewed now?

Linda Durham: We're reviewing it right now. We are actually in agreement on the terms, the \$260,000, some of that being Cumulative and some of that being contractual amount. We're in agreement for that term for the 2010 year.

Councilmember Lloyd: Okay, well, that's good news, I think, for Knight Township taxpayers. Thank you.

Councilmember Raben: One last question, and I just caught it. I didn't see this before while reviewing this and looking back, I don't see it on the other budgets, one of the line items is, under other personnel services is a cleaning man, cleaning and maintenance man for 3,000. Can you explain that?

Linda Durham: We have added, in the past year we added a cleaning and maintenance man to do small repairs around the office and to clean the office on a weekly basis, take the trash out, stuff like that. And this past year, we took it out of the repair and maintenance fund. But as the building ages, we're requiring more and more maintenance and we thought it would be financially more feasible to have a maintenance man already on staff rather than contract with agencies to come in and do those repairs.

Councilmember Raben: So does everybody clean their own office or who contracts and who cleans their own?

David Mosby: I contract.

Mary Hart: I contract.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, so it's about half and half. Okay. I was just curious who does and who doesn't contract on that. Alright, Mr. President, I'll move the same standard motion: no salary increases, that our recommendation is the salaries be set at 2009 figures and we approve of all other line items.

President Shetler: I have a motion.

Councilman Sutton: Second.

President Shetler: And a second. Quick question: hours of service?

Linda Durham: We are open Monday through Friday, eight to four, we're closed twelve to one for lunch. But we do have an answering machine on at that time that takes calls, and then we call them back after lunch.

President Shetler: Okay, thank you. We have a motion on the floor. No questions, comments? All in favor signify by saying aye.

**(All Councilmembers voted in the affirmative)**

President Shetler: Those opposed?

**(No opposing votes were cast)**

President Shetler: So ordered. Thank you.

**(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)**

<b>PERRY TOWNSHIP TRUSTEE</b>
-------------------------------

President Shetler: Next is Perry Township. Mr. Mosby.

David Mosby: Good morning. Yes, we do have some raises in our budget and are across the board, \$500. Didn't do percentages –

President Shetler: Flat amount?

David Mosby: \$500 per employee, and the reason we did that, and if you've got the information from other townships and I have researched this and also researched it through the state with a couple other trustees, our employees were lagging behind per se, pretty far, so what I've tried to do is just catch them up over a period of time, and that's why we're going with across the board rather than percentage raises. And yes, I do have a janitor that comes in after we close in the evenings and just works a couple of hours and cleans the office and vacuums, and stuff like that so it's ready for the next morning.

President Shetler: Well, I will say this, particularly for full-time employees, that your office and whether it be Pigeon or any of them, or Center Township, and the one thing that I have noted, that most of the salary levels are a little bit lower than you might find other places in government. But my gut feeling is, unfortunately, this isn't the time to try to get those things on some kind of level of parity here.

David Mosby: You know, and I just went off of what, like in the city when I used to sit on the salary administration committee, and I heard the controller refer to that earlier, and I know in the county when I was commissioner, I know how they did things and brought it front of you all, from that knowledge and just looking at the salaries when I got to the trustee's office, they were well lower than what I was used to seeing through the city and county. So that's why I did it and there's – you know, I'm not apologizing for it because the girls work very hard, they run a very good office. I'm not there all the time, I am a part-time trustee, I still work at the fire department, but I can assure you one thing, the citizens of Perry Township are served very well.

President Shetler: Alright, any other questions or comments?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yeah, you might want to take a vote again. I'm going to vote as submitted, so...

Councilmember Kiefer: I'd like to make a comment. Dave, I really do agree with you. I know your employees as well as the other township employees, you know, I know they work hard and so do the city employees, the county employees, there's



a lot of hard working folks in local government, and so when we vote that we're trying to do this, we're trying to stay consistent and we're not saying that one group doesn't work as hard as another group. There's no indictment here against the employees. We really feel like we've got a great group of employees and we're not, by doing a zero pay raise, we're not saying that they're under performing or anything like that. That has nothing to do with it at least from my perspective, it's more economy driven than it is anything.

Councilmember Bassemier: Joe, and I agree with you, but I think Dave is just trying to catch up –

David Mosby: And I understand that, and like I say, you know, as far as the trustee, I don't have a salary administration committee or, you know, a committee of the City or County Council to go to throughout the year. I mean, you know, the city or county could throughout the year sometimes go in and raise an employee's salary if something changes. I don't have that alternative. I can only do it at budget hearings, and I can assure you, you know, in conversation with my board and everything, they have no problem with it, they understand what I'm trying to do and we started this a couple of years ago. As far as my board employees, they've been making \$599 a year for the last 100 years, and they don't want a raise. They flat tell you, it's a service to the community, it's a service to the citizens of Perry Township, and they don't want a raise. And I've offered them a raise just for gas money and they said no, and we'd rather give it to the employees.

President Shetler: Councilman Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: I just want to say also, with a zero pay raise, it's pretty obvious that most of your offices are having many more demands now than under normal times, but these are not normal times. And we appreciate the work you do, but once again, consistency. Thank you.

Councilmember Raben: Okay. Mr. President, I will move that Perry Township's salary lines or salaries be set at 2009 rates, with no salary increases. All other items within this budget meet our approval and I make that in the form of a motion.

Councilmember Lloyd: Second.

President Shetler: It's been moved and seconded. Let's take a roll call because I think Ed made an indication we might have a ...

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: I'd like to see his employees get a \$500 raise across the board. I vote no.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being six ayes and one nay, the motion carries.

**(Motion carried 6-1/Councilmember Bassemier opposed)**

<b>PIGEON TOWNSHIP TRUSTEE</b>
--------------------------------

Councilmember Raben: Okay, in Pigeon, I think Mary spoke a lot and thank you for taking the reins this afternoon or this morning. Well, it seems like this afternoon, we've been in here so long. I'm going to move that all salaries be set at, our recommendation is that –

Councilmember Kiefer: She flat lined hers.

Councilmember Raben: Just as a matter of record, that they remain at the 2009 levels and we approve everything else within this budget.

Councilmember Lloyd: Second.

President Shetler: We have a motion and second. Any questions?

Councilmember Lloyd: Couple of questions for Mrs. Hart. I noticed under your township assistant, you have seven employees. Has that number been consistent or have you had to add?

Mary Hart: Two years ago, we went from nine to seven. We're at bare staff now. I can't decrease any more. I have three investigators and I have two clerks. Those three investigators are handling right at 500 cases a month each. So I'm at bare minimum.

Councilmember Lloyd: It looked like your assistance fund was down quite a bit two years ago, but since then it's really jumped up and I guess that's the economy. Do you have a percentage of what your case load has gone up? Roughly over two years?

Mary Hart: In '07 we were right at 1,100, in '08 we were at about 1,200, and we're averaging about 500 cases a month now. So it's gone – or 500 cases more. So it's gone up quite a bit.

Councilmember Lloyd: So 40% plus, it sounds like.

President Shetler: Okay, any other questions? I think we have a motion. We had a motion on the floor, didn't we?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yeah.

President Shetler: So all in favor signify by saying aye.

**(All Councilmembers voted in the affirmative)**

President Shetler: Those opposed?

**(No opposing votes were cast)**

President Shetler: So ordered.

**(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)**

<b>SCOTT TOWNSHIP TRUSTEE</b>
-------------------------------

President Shetler: Next is Scott Township.

Bob Harris: I do have a three percent raise in for salaries, but my board does like Armstrong does, we usually go with what the county gives for that year. So it is what it is.

President Shetler: Alright, thank you. Anybody have any questions?

Councilmember Raben: Yeah, Bob, the fire equipment debt, that looks like a new line item and might be the reason why the budget is up 28%.

Bob Harris: Right, we just bought a new aerial ladder truck this year, \$700,000. We signed the contract for it about three weeks ago.

Councilmember Bassemier: Bob, it's a nice truck. Really nice truck.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, other than that, it looks like everything is fairly consistent. The Rainy Day Fund, is that something that, I mean, we hit on that –

Bob Harris: That's excess tax monies we've gotten in the past and we just haven't spent it.

Councilmember Raben: And that's what your balance is in the Rainy Day Fund?

Bob Harris: The 10, yeah.

Councilmember Raben: Okay. Mr. President, I'd like to make a motion that Scott Township salaries be set at this year, 2009's rate, so there's no increase, and recommend approval for the rest of the items.

President Shetler: It's been moved and seconded. Any questions or comments? Yes, Councilman Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: I still had a couple of questions. Your township does quite

a bit between the fire, emergency, ambulance, and parks, you have the one park. Is your fire contract, is that multi-year or do you just go year to year?

Bob Harris: Year to year.

Councilmember Lloyd: And I know you indicated a lot of concern there, just the escalating costs. And you've got a new line item, fire equipment debt, so you had to borrow to get a truck?

Bob Harris: Yes.

Councilmember Lloyd: Okay. That's all I have.

President Shetler: Bob, just real quickly, on the emergency runs, for example, in Center Township it seems to me that the McCutchanville Fire Department, a few years ago, was charging \$15 or something like that for everyone who showed up at an emergency run, --

Bob Harris: We don't pay that.

President Shetler: But you don't have that because you've got your permanent --

Bob Harris: We (inaudible) the volunteers. They show up, but we don't pay them per run.

President Shetler: Okay, they don't get paid for anything when they show up for a fire or anything at all.

Bob Harris: It's volunteer.

President Shetler: Alright.

Bob Harris: And they're very dedicated volunteers.

President Shetler: Alright. Anything else? We have a motion on the floor. All in favor, signify by saying aye.

**(All Councilmembers voted in the affirmative)**

President Shetler: Those opposed?

**(No opposing votes were cast)**

President Shetler: Motion carries. Thanks, Bob.

**(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)**

<b>UNION TOWNSHIP TRUSTEE</b>
-------------------------------

Councilmember Raben: And last is Union Township. I don't think there's anyone here. I'm going to make the motion that the state not grant any salary increases for 2010, that salaries be set at 2009 levels. All other items within this budget meet our approval.

President Shetler: I have a motion.

Councilmember Lloyd: Second.

President Shetler: Second. Do I have any questions about the motion?

Councilmember Lloyd: Comment. One question I would have for them, I know they had carried a negative cash balance in 2009, but they'll obviously bring that back up this year. But anyway, it's one of the most rural townships and it's a pretty small budget.

Councilmember Raben: Yes, it is.

President Shetler: It gets kind of soggy down there, too. Okay, any questions about that? All in favor, signify by saying aye.

**(All Councilmembers voted in the affirmative)**

President Shetler: Those opposed?

**(No opposing votes were cast)**

President Shetler: So ordered.

**(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)**

President Shetler: That concludes our agenda that we have unless anybody has anything else to bring up about anything that we dealt with today. If not, yes, Councilman Sutton.

Councilman Sutton: There is something. This will be, I guess we'll pick it up next week, this was from our regular meeting. Assessor Weaver has indicated that he would be fine on that plotter/printer taking it out of the Reassessment Fund as opposed to the General Fund, so I told him just to show up next week and we'll --

President Shetler: With his checkbook and we're happy. Yes. Thank you. That's good news. Well, he was one of the guys I had in mind for his funds.

Councilman Sutton: He said he gets use out of that plotter/printer, too, so --

President Shetler: Yes. Alright, good, great. Alright, anything else? Motion for adjournment would be --

Councilmember Raben: So moved.

President Shetler: Thank you. Alright, we'll see you next Wednesday.

**(There being no further business to come before the Council, the meeting was adjourned at 10:56 a.m.)**

**VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL**

---

President Tom Shetler, Jr.

---

Vice President Joe Kiefer

---

Councilmember Jim Raben

---

Councilmember Mike Goebel

---

Councilmember Russell Lloyd, Jr.

---

Councilmember Ed Bassemier

---

Councilmember Royce Sutton

Recorded and transcribed by Teri Lukeman.

**VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL  
MINUTES  
OCTOBER 7, 2009**

The Vanderburgh County Council met in session this 7th day of October 2009 in room 301 of the Civic Center Complex. The meeting was called to order at 8:32 a.m. by County Council President Tom Shetler, Jr.

President Shetler: Good morning, it's October 7. My clock says 8:30, the one back there says 8:32, but anyway, it's time for the County Council meeting. I'd like to call it to order and ask for an attendance roll call please.

COUNCILMEMBER	PRESENT	ABSENT
Councilmember Sutton	X	
Councilmember Bassemier	X	
Councilmember Lloyd	X	
Councilmember Goebel	X	
Councilmember Raben	X	
Councilmember Kiefer	X	
President Shetler	X	

President Shetler: There being all seven members present, we have a quorum. I'd like now to ask Councilman Goebel to lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance.

**(Pledge of Allegiance was given)**

<p style="text-align:center"><b>APPROVAL OF MINUTES AUGUST 18 &amp; 19, 2009 BUDGET HEARINGS SEPTEMBER 2, 2009 BUDGET HEARING SEPTEMBER 2, 2009 REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING SEPTEMBER 9, 2009 FINAL BUDGET HEARING</b></p>
--

President Shetler: Thank you. Next is a motion for approval of the minutes of several of our meetings that came through the budget process: August 18<sup>th</sup> & 19<sup>th</sup>, September 2<sup>nd</sup> budget meeting, September 2<sup>nd</sup> regular meeting, and September 9<sup>th</sup> final budget minutes. I think we can make one motion to approve.

Councilmember Lloyd: Motion to approve.

Councilmember Sutton: Second.

President Shetler: It's been moved and seconded. Do I have any questions? Any comments? Any changes? We'll have a roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being seven ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

**(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)**

<b>APPROPRIATION ORDINANCE</b>
--------------------------------

President Shetler: Next is the appropriation ordinance and, Councilman Raben?

**CLERK**

Councilmember Raben: Good morning, thank you. First on the agenda under Clerk, Record Storage, in the amount of \$30,000, I'll move approval.

Councilmember Lloyd: Second.

President Shetler: Motion and a second. Yes, Councilman Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Did we not discuss, maybe cutting that?

Councilmember Raben: Oh, that's correct. Excuse me. Susie, could you step forward?

Susan Kirk: Good morning.

Councilmember Raben: In your IV-D money, do you have, we budget like \$15,000 every year, have you used it yet?

Susan Kirk: Yes.

Councilmember Raben: So we've spent the 15 out of the other –

Susan Kirk: Yeah, we're down to the nitty-gritty now, yes.

Councilmember Raben: Okay.

Susan Kirk: We pretty well – any money that we get, yes, we're using it.



Councilmember Raben: Okay. Are you sure because through a few weeks ago, but you might have paid some bills. But you're confident that there's nothing –

Susan Kirk: We have some upcoming things that we've already got planned for some of that money, so you know, I can look into it next year, but we keep getting less all the time. The state keeps taking more of the money and we keep getting less, so it's a little difficult sometimes to foresee what we can do next year because, like I said, we keep getting less money all the time.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, I guess maybe I've confused everybody here. I was not referring to the actual IV-D fund itself, but we do approve a line item in the budget every year for record storage, and that line has been depleted. Is that –

Susan Kirk: I always – our bills for the last three years have been right at \$100,000. I always put that in my budget, and that's what I request, and then I get less, and then we come back every year to finish out the year and get the money that we need.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, thank you.

President Shetler: Councilman Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yeah, Susie, somewhat new to this process with the Record Storage. I know at the budget hearing I discovered it's much more complicated than I ever thought it was. I didn't realize it was, you know, a retrieval system and all the different methodology that they use to store this. I always had envisioned it was just some warehouse somewhere, you know, they just trucked this stuff off to. Is this something that – are there other competitors that you can put this thing out for – I mean, I think you've probably already settled in for 2010, but I'm just saying, is this something that you really are limited to one vendor on this or is there such a specialized area that only one person does it?

Susan Kirk: No, I'm sure there's probably someone else that could do it, it's just that we save money because Kinder, who does our storage, they not only store, but they scan and they microfilm. Okay? So if you store it someplace, then you have to have it microfilmed and scanned and then you move – every time you move something, it costs more money. And I know Councilman Sutton had asked, oh, what, three years ago, about was the price going up at Kinder? And I gave everyone a spreadsheet showing that they have been extremely fair to us, extremely. They over and above – I just, I'm very satisfied and that takes a lot. I don't satisfy that easy.

Councilmember Kiefer: Just out of curiosity for myself and probably for the viewing audience so they understand the magnitude of what you're talking about, how much storage does this thing comprise of?

Susan Kirk: I don't remember the exact cubic feet, but it is a great, big warehouse. It's – oh, I don't know, Tom, you've seen it. Have you got any idea?

President Shetler: I'd say probably at least 100, he's got four buildings and about 100,000 square feet at least.

Susan Kirk: It's a lot. Everything is bar coded, every file that goes out there is bar

coded because, it's amazing, how many times – I mean, we have them deliver twice a week, the files the judges need, attorneys need, someone is requesting, it's – and we go by a bar code and –

Councilmember Kiefer: So they do 100,000 square feet, that's not counting how tall the buildings are –

President Shetler: Well, that's not our business, though, I mean, they're doing it for most all the companies in town.

Councilmember Kiefer: Oh, okay, I thought maybe we had 100,000 square feet of storage.

President Shetler: No.

Susan Kirk: I'm trying to think of a building that could – I mean, you really need to – you know, I've said this two or three times – you all really need to go out there and look at it. You really do, because it's – I mean, I was pretty shocked when I took over as Clerk that we had that kind of storage. Now, I do want to tell the Council that since I've become the Clerk, we do destroy records and I don't mean just a few. We have records probably every year the size of half of this room here, right here, that we destroy. It's just that we're destroying them but the caseload, unfortunately, our business is thriving, and even though we get rid of a roomful of files, we're getting more than a roomful of files. We're getting in more than we can get rid of because we have to go by the state retention schedule and for the most part, our records, we have to keep forever.

Councilmember Kiefer: So it's not a paperless society?

Susan Kirk: No. Computers, I think, were supposed to make it paperless. Now we have computers, paper, microfilm and scanning on disk. So we have –

President Shetler: This is probably only a small part of it but just kind of a question that – do they scan every record as it comes in, then?

Susan Kirk: Yes. Everything that comes in.

President Shetler: So is it – like if a judge has a question about a specific case, for example, that would be somewhere on electronic file somewhere that they could – I assume that sometimes they need to actually touch the original documents?

Susan Kirk: Yes.

President Shetler: And that's why they have to retrieve those. But otherwise, if they need to just look up different points and go back on a certain part of the trial, then I guess they could just look it up electronically and pull that off, as well.

Susan Kirk: Yes, we do. We've got –

President Shetler: – case where they have to actually put their fingertips on that file and get the old one back, the original back into their possession.

Susan Kirk: Yes, the staff, when a case is filed, what they do, they put minutes into the computer and it will be, you know, appearance, bond served, what's owed, but

as far as the details of what actually took – obviously, that would take forever, the details of that case, no, you have to get the paper form. The scanning is basically the case file and then, of course, we have the minutes that documented, but the actual, like I said, if you really know, if you need to know what's going on with a case, you've got to get the shuck or box, depending on the case, so that the judge or whomever can look at it and actually see, you know, they can read the police reports, any depositions, all that type stuff. That stuff is not on the computer.

President Shetler: Yeah, are you just saying that certain documents are scanned and not the entire file?

Susan Kirk: No, right. They don't scan every piece of paper in a file, they don't scan every piece of paper. They scan, there is a piece of paper that pretty well is a Reader's Digest version of the case, that is, but, oh my gosh, no, we'd have like – I don't even want to think about how much that would cost. And the scanning and microfilming, you can't just do that anywhere, it has to be approved by the state. So it's not like you just whiz it over to some company and have it done. They have to be approved by the state, there's certain guidelines.

President Shetler: Councilman Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: I'd like to take it back if we could, to the original question. On IV-D, you had appropriated 15,000 for record storage, has that fund been exhausted? That's what's kind of unclear here, because we were going to maybe reduce this and let you use that fund to help.

Susan Kirk: Off the top of my head, I'm not sure what it's down to, I'm not sure. I'll check with Tracy and I can email all of you and let you know what we have left in that account if it isn't already in there to help pay for this.

Councilmember Goebel: Your thinking is that it's almost exhausted now at this point?

Susan Kirk: I think that we've already taken that into consideration of using that plus we're going to need the appropriation, but I will check with Tracy and I will get the exact dollar amount or email every one of you so that you will know exactly what that is. So if you want to wait and make your decision next month, you can do that.

Councilmember Goebel: Well, I think if there are funds available, maybe we could at least wait a portion –

Susan Kirk: We can wait, that's fine –

Councilmember Goebel: – do you need a portion of it now to get through the month?

Susan Kirk: Kinder knows they'll get their money.

Councilmember Goebel: Okay.

Councilmember Raben: Well, we could set in \$20,000.

Susan Kirk: That's fine.

Councilmember Raben: Mr. President, I'll move to amend my motion 1010-3603 be set in at \$20,000.

Councilmember Lloyd: Okay, I was the second, I'll agree.

President Shetler: Okay, any other questions or comments? Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being seven ayes and no nays, the motion carries.

CLERK		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1010-3603	Record Storage	30,000.00	20,000.00
Total		30,000.00	20,000.00

**(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)**

#### **AUDITOR**

Councilmember Raben: Okay, next under Auditor 1020-1160-1020 in the amount of \$4,831, I'll move approval.

Councilmember Lloyd: Second.

President Shetler: We've got a motion and a second. Any questions?

Bill Fluty: Bill Fluty, County Auditor.

Councilmember Lloyd: Mr. President, I know we had some discussion on this and you had indicated this is a critical position in the Bookkeeping area, maybe just

reiterate some of that.

Bill Fluty: This actually, recently I've had an employee retire that's been there 15 years and done payroll most of that time. It was a two week notice, so I had very little time to prepare. This is actually putting, she had a buyout and comp time and years of service, and that is a position that gets, I think she had 70 hours of comp time. It's just the nature of the position, how the holidays fall, how the end of the year falls where we do payroll, moving the budget, open enrollment, W-2's and those things. So with that said, the buy-out took what was in that line item. There's some transfers on the back that clean up the rest of it, this is actually to put money in that line item to hire somebody to come on board as quickly as possible to learn the process at year-end, which November, December, January and February is the busiest time for payroll and bookkeeping. Currently, we have six people in bookkeeping, which is doing all the county business, over 600 million flows through there, 30 million in payroll, deadlines, state, local, federal, PERF. We'll have open enrollment in November, we'll be touching everybody's salary and we'll be moving the budget over. The last time we cut a position, it was in bookkeeping, so it came from seven to six. I feel that we are at the correct number. We are down to four right now because we have one on Family Medical Leave, so they are actually taking, they're doing the one that's left through retirement and they also do the work of one who's on Family Medical Leave. We had two earlier this year on Family Medical Leave. I don't know if we call that an aging work force, but they've had some things going on this year that they've had to do, so they back up each other. And I think this is a critical position, so I'm trying to move somebody in there as quick as they can to see what happens through November, December, January and February where the transition period happens. Before there were tax caps and budget crunches we've been cutting staff. Three people have been cut in the last fifteen years, that's surely over a million dollars in savings to the county, but the last position was cut in bookkeeping. So this is a request to fill that position. I don't have a backup – I have kind of a backup, but I only have one person right now. Anything happens to that one, somehow I hope we can get through, but it's going to be difficult. I think anytime you have a new coach you have a quarterback and a backup quarterback, and I think you have a –

Councilmember Goebel: Are you sure of that?

Bill Fluty: Well, you may be in the same position I'm in then if things don't go well.

Councilmember Goebel: We'd like to hire some new ones. No, they're working hard.

Bill Fluty: So I believe this is a critical, key position that – and I wouldn't be up here if I had a different plan or if I had some other way I think I could do this, I surely would. But I think this is the right thing for our office and the right thing for the county employees.

Councilmember Lloyd: One other point, I know, working with business clients on the payroll taxes, if you're even late a day, it's a five percent penalty from the federal government, so it's not a position – I mean, you need a capable employee and you can't just put an entry level person in there necessarily, I mean, you need someone that's experienced in bookkeeping. So this is a replacement, it's not a new employee, so, I mean, I think in this situation with the critical need here, I would be in favor of that.

President Shetler: Did I see a hand? The question I have then, Bill, real quickly, I'm sorry, the person that has left the office, approximately what were they getting paid?

Bill Fluty: It's a COMOT VI position, and that comes in at about \$26,000.

President Shetler: Well, I'm talking about the old position. I mean, what –

Bill Fluty: What were they getting paid?

President Shetler: Yes.

Bill Fluty: They had been there fifteen years. I don't have that in front of me, do you have that, Teri?

Teri Lukeman: I think she was making \$36,382. That's what was budgeted in 2009.

President Shetler: Okay, so around 36 and then a new one coming in would be making about 26...27?

Bill Fluty: I believe that's correct, in that range. Is that correct, Sandie?

Sandie Deig: 30,179.

Bill Fluty: Oh, it's gone up, so –

President Shetler: So we're looking at a savings of roughly \$6,000 between a senior employee versus a new one on that?

Bill Fluty: You could put it that way, yes.

President Shetler: Alright, thank you. Yes, Councilman Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: I think we've got a little bit of an issue here, not necessarily with your position, Mr. Fluty, but just in general. Councilman Sutton brought it up at the last meeting, I think I brought it up before, in my mind, replacement and a hiring freeze maybe don't exactly go together if there is a qualified or if there is a definite need for a replacement. To me, that's not hiring new employees, that's – and that doesn't violate the hiring freeze. I don't know, maybe I'm way off on that. But it's awfully difficult for this group to know when department head A comes in and says he needs a replacement, or she needs a replacement, critical position, it's hard for us to know unless we're inside that office, how critical that position is and obviously, this is a critical position, and then when department head B comes forward and says that position in department A is not that critical, but my position in department B that I need a replacement for is very critical. So we're going to be faced with this problem nonstop, and I don't know how this group determines it with our connection because there's always going to be that fight, I believe.

Councilmember Kiefer: I'd like to add on –

President Shetler: Somehow, I guess we're going to become judge and jury on it and it's difficult, but it's...

Councilmember Kiefer: You know, Mike, kind of tagging on what you're saying here, I pulled this resolution up just because every time I read it, I get a different sense

of what it's trying to say. And I do agree that, you know, the big issue is controlling the growth of the county workforce and payroll, because that's what it says, whereas the Vanderburgh County Council believes that it's necessary to control the growth of the county workforce and payroll. But then it goes on to say, not to hire any additional full-time. And either we need to amend this thing, I think to say, not to hire anybody, replacement or additional, or we need to rethink how we approach this because our resolution says, not to hire any additional full-time county employees except in the case of an emergency or extraordinary circumstance. And I tend to agree that your position here is probably an extraordinary circumstance because I don't want to be in a position where we're missing payroll, we're missing a deadline and then we're getting five percent fines, either. So it is challenging trying to follow this sheet here and I wonder if we shouldn't revisit this thing to clarify what we're trying to accomplish here a little bit more specifically.

President Shetler: Councilman Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: I don't think we're growing county government when we hire replacements and evidently, there's been merit for most of these positions to have been established over the years. What we're doing now with not hiring replacements is, we're reducing the workforce and I'm sure there's room for that, but it's awfully, once again, difficult for us to make that determination. I really don't know how important your position is. I don't know how important some of these other positions are from people coming up. We can ask around, we can try to determine, we can look at job descriptions, but in the end, it's difficult for us to determine who really is important and who is not because all department heads are going to find their people very important.

Bill Fluty: Just for our office, there would be times, there are groups, different departments in our office that I might not be up here asking for one, if one retired tomorrow. But the deadlines and their scope of work is different, and very specific duties, not general to the office and maybe – billing is a year-long process, payroll is a daily process, so there's a difference, what I'd be up here for. If something else in a different department, I wouldn't be up here. I would only be up here for what I believe is the most critical, so that's why I'm here.

Councilmember Raben: This is probably one of the few requests where, if the paper piles up, we'll get it during the slow period, doesn't work. I mean, to Bill's point, each week is a new deadline, and believe me, in fact, I think we've probably argued quite a bit about this request and I think, you know, I think this is one that merits allowing him to replace this employee.

Bill Fluty: I believe this is a key position. I'm up here to just point out how I believe and it's your decision to make that.

President Shetler: Councilman Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: When this request came before us last week, I guess I was a little surprised with how silent it was on the floor. Nobody asked questions. Nobody had anything to say. I did ask some questions on the request and Bill did provide some answers for us on why he was making the request. But I'm looking down at the latter part of our agenda on item ten, where we've got, this is including the Auditor, you know, we've got three other departments that are requesting positions. I know I didn't go down to Bill's office and visit to see what his operation is like to see the critical need that he's requesting here or whether it's critical or not,

and I don't know if any of the other Councilmembers visited down to his office to determine whether this is something that needs to be filled. But I think when we discussed this whole hiring freeze back in July, at that time, I asked that there was some additional language that would be put into that resolution that was not included. And that language included some opportunities for us to, on a case by case basis, evaluate requests that would come before us. But this Council was very clear that it wanted to put on a hiring freeze, we wanted to control costs, that's fine, that's understandable, so here we are now, back in a subjective situation trying to merit, trying to weigh the merits of his request as opposed to a request we may have gotten last month, the requests we're going to get the month after, and the request that we – the additional requests we have here today. How do we judge one being more favorable than the other, making the decision that this one should be approved, that one should not be approved? I think we just, we put ourselves in a position by beginning to say yes on one, no on another with nothing before us that justifies our position of really seeming to not really having a balanced process in relation to what we've already approved. What we said was, we were going to freeze on hiring, and if there were openings that occurred, that those were going to be frozen as well. And I'm not saying that his request, Bill's request, is weaker or stronger, I'm just saying, based upon what we said, what is the justification now of changing the policy that we just approved no more than eight weeks ago?

Councilmember Kiefer: Councilman Sutton, I think the public, if we asked or did a poll, the public is in favor of reducing workforce if it can be done without reducing service, and you know, we have to be somewhat subjective and every vote we make, we're being somewhat subjective. But, I mean, it's imperative for the department heads to show us, you know, they're in it day in and day out and they need to demonstrate to the Council that this is a critical position and hearing somebody say that, hey, we're going to miss, we could possibly or potentially miss critical deadlines or we could be fined five percent if we're late on something. To me, that somewhat demonstrates – I'm relying on the department head and what he's telling us, but if it's a situation where it's not a critical deadline, you've got other employees that could possibly pick up the work like Councilman Raben said, you know, the work stacks up but maybe they can get it done at a later date, then I'm subjectively saying, okay, well, maybe they can get by, but if they can't, and they came back for a second request like we told the Recorder, we told her and said, hey, if it's not working out, come back to us.

Councilmember Sutton: But, you know, I don't disagree with anything that you're saying. What my point is, how do you make that assessment? Every single officeholder will tell you everyone in their department is important, is essential to the functions of their office. Maybe they are. Maybe they aren't. How do we make that determination other than the officeholder coming before us and making a request, whether it's a request we have there today or a request we may have down the road, we're going to base a decision subjectively. And I'm just saying that there is some serious flaws in that mechanism in terms of how we're doing that.

Councilmember Kiefer: Maybe it should be done like a tax phase in where the personnel committee scores each one of these and we've got to develop a scoring system then. I mean, I don't know the answer.

President Shetler: Well, I think, the bottom line is here, it's going to be somewhat subjective, but by the same token, I mean, I think we have used some objective measures. You know, for example, one of the requests that we had a few weeks back, we discussed the number of recordings that actually have been made five



years ago and the staffing levels they had then, versus work, the staffing levels are today and the amount of recordings that they have today. So we made that kind of a comparison to where we are. We haven't asked that specific question, I think, to Mr. Fluty in this case, but my guess is we have basically the same number of employees, he's got about the same amount of work in front of him in the payroll department as he had five years ago. And yet, he's already indicated that since that time, he has eliminated one person out of that office. So I think that there, yeah, as I mentioned earlier, we're going to be judge and jury on all of this. It's a matter of doing our homework, one; two, asking the right questions; and then three, just the presentation that they made and how they convince each one of us on the need for that additional employee. But I think them coming in one by one and explaining that and their needs is the only way that we can effectively do it. We could write new language, we can write new words into it, but bottom line is here, they're going to have to come in and I think explain to us what is going to be needed in their office and what isn't going to be needed. They're going to have to plead their case. Yes, Councilman Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: I guess Royce brought it up, did any of us talk to Mr. Fluty or go down to his office? I'd just like to say that Mr. Lloyd and I did meet with Bill last week after meeting, telling us how critical this position was and, Bill, I know, wouldn't be asking for this position if he didn't need it and I told him I would support it. But I just wanted to let Royce know that we did, Mr. Lloyd and I did go down and we did talk to Mr. Fluty after the meeting last week about his position.

Bill Fluty: I have to remind you all, this is new for the officeholders, too. Honestly, we don't really grow our staff that often and I haven't ever had that happen in the Auditor's office. If it's done, it's normally done at budget time. But replacing somebody that leaves is – so this is new for all of us, too, so we don't know what the steps are more than coming up here and just talking to you and giving out information, so it's brand new for us.

President Shetler: Alright, any other questions, comments?

Councilmember Sutton: So are we...I mean, if...as we're talking about this...so next month we get a request, what's going to be the process? Is it going to be any different than what we're talking about right now?

President Shetler: Do you mean, we get a request from a different department or office or just –

Councilmember Sutton: Different department, maybe we've got one, maybe we've got six requests sitting here, are we going to handle it any different next month than we're handling it right now and does the resolution speak to what we're calling a hiring freeze?

President Shetler: I mean, I'm open if anyone wants to change the language in it. I think, ultimately, no matter how you change the language, change the wording in it, that my feeling is that we still want people to come before us and explain why, and there is going to be some that are going to get it and some that aren't. And it's a matter of us doing our homework and finding out ahead of time how we feel about it, asking good questions to penetrate into their plea to make sure that it is what they're saying it is and from there, we have to make a decision and we will become the judge and the jury on it. And it's part of what we get paid for and it's our responsibility constitutionally, I guess. So that's what it's all about to be Councilmen

and I think in these economic times, we just, we're going to spend a little bit more time down here and that's what's going to be important for the taxpayers that we do that. So, Councilman Goebel?

Councilmember Sutton: So no change, is that what you're saying?

President Shetler: I'm saying I'm willing to listen to any changes that anybody has in their resolution we put forward. But I don't know that that's really going to change the mechanics of what happens in this discourse that we have in front of the Council. Yes, Councilman Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Well, Mr. Fluty, are you going to transfer someone in your office now to take over these duties or are you going to hire someone new?

Bill Fluty: I can't transfer anybody into that position, there's no money available in that position.

Councilmember Goebel: You're going to fill it with a new person, then?

Bill Fluty: I could. Resumes will start to come in if you allow it. I haven't started the process because I don't really know what your decision is. We may find the best fit within our office for payroll, and then again, I may not. I can't answer that question now. But we'll get the best fit to do payroll.

Councilmember Goebel: No one doubts that this is an extremely important part of your office and things have got to be in, in a timely fashion and we don't want to deny you, but if there's someone in the office you can move over or something like that for the time being until we resolve our mechanism here, because I'm not comfortable with the way we handle this part. In these meetings, we're going to have, for every position coming up, we're going to be here a long time trying to decide which positions are truly important and which ones, maybe we can get by without, with a reduced staff. So I think it's going to be difficult to say yes, in my mind, today with the voting or with the resolution that we have in place. That doesn't mean your position is not important, because I truly believe it is.

Bill Fluty: I'm not going to take it personally. Just, the vote is the vote.

President Shetler: Councilman Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: I also want to ask, Councilman Lloyd, with the Personnel Committee, you guys only review new hiring, not replacement hiring, right? Like this position here was not necessarily reviewed through the Personnel Committee.

Councilmember Lloyd: No, that's a Council function. We just review existing and would rate new positions up or down, existing could be up or down, depending on changing responsibilities, but we have no effect on whether you add or subtract a person.

Councilmember Kiefer: Well, the only reason I'm asking, it's not that I want to put any additional workload on you, because, I don't know, I may be in your shoes next year, so as far as that goes, but I'm only suggesting that since this is so critical and to address Councilman Goebel's point of view, you know, maybe these are positions that should be reviewed in the Personnel Committee, so that way there could be a determination and a study done on each replacement or each hire,

period. And then we could get a recommendation from a committee that's actually investigated this and given it some thorough consideration.

President Shetler: Well, really, we talked about that at one time and that is fine, but the only thing is, we may be just duplicating the efforts. We will go through that same debate in Personnel Committee, and then we will bring it back here and we will, because that's only a recommendation, and then we will have to end up having to debate those same issues over again on the floor of Council. So rather than to do that twice, I felt that it's probably better to go ahead and just do it the one time on Council floor. I mean, I don't know how many people did, I talked to Bill at length to try to determine exactly what the needs were, if there were any alternatives, what we could do to switch people around, any of that kind of thing.

Councilmember Kiefer: I agree with you – I talked to Bill at length, too, but I didn't get a chance to talk to Susie, I didn't get a chance to talk to the Health Department, and I didn't get a chance to talk to some of the others, whereas, if those positions were reviewed through Personnel, there might be some insight that was extracted and revealed that otherwise might not be revealed. But perhaps now is not the –

Councilmember Bassemier: Mr. President, I call for the vote.

President Shetler: Okay, anything else?

Councilmember Lloyd: Second.

Councilmember Sutton: Before we, are we going to have an opportunity to talk about what your request, any changes to that language on the resolution? Because, I mean, if we just leave, we vote on this and leave this topic, you know, we've wasted a valuable moment. I did suggest some language back in July on this related to positions, essential positions, you know, if you've got an office where you've got four people, you lose one, that's a pretty major hit, you know. And then also positions that were related to the financial underpinnings of the county and the essential functions putting them in a different classification, if you guys could remember that. Now I don't remember the exact language that I used, maybe, Sandie, if you could pull up those minutes, but I asked for that to be included. Councilman Lloyd, do you recall that discussion?

Councilmember Lloyd: I recall –

President Shetler: I recall, and why don't we go ahead and take a vote on this and we can deal with that question, I think, underneath old business and, like I said, I'm very open to new language and us dealing with relooking at the resolution we passed before, but we have a question here unless there's any questions directly to the motion at hand, I call for a roll call then.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Just based on what I've already said and so that we're not creating a totally subjective situation, I really must vote no on this.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: I think you made a great argument, Mr. Fluty, and I think every department head that comes before us is going to have that same type of fight to fill positions in his office, but I think under the resolution, I'm still going to vote no.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: I'm going to vote yes and I'd like to make one brief comment as to why, and I would certainly like to follow suit with the nay votes, but I guess if there is one other person that's able to run payroll, if that person is sick or something happens there, I think the employees are going to expect to get paid, so we are kind of in a box here. But I do vote yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: I'd like to comment on Councilman Sutton's remarks. I agree, I think while we're doing this subjectively and maybe that's our only choice, I would like to have some more objective analysis. You know, I hate being put in a position where I'm making a decision that I'm not 100 percent comfortable knowing what the right outcome is, but believing that this is a critical position and that we could potentially miss deadlines, state required deadlines, potentially miss a payroll or something, I feel compelled that I have to vote yes, but I would like to get further analysis on how we can address these other votes in the future. So with that, I vote yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Aye. There being five ayes and two nays, the motion carries.

AUDITOR		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1020-1160-1020	Bookkeeper/Payroll	4,831.00	4,831.00
Total		4,831.00	4,831.00

**(Motioned carried 5-2/Councilmembers Sutton & Goebel opposed)**

## **AREA PLAN COMMISSION**

Councilmember Raben: Okay, next under Area Plan, at this time I would like to set this in at zero and ask that this come back on our agenda next month, and the reason with that is, is the Recorder's office is wanting to help with this project and there is a plotter that is more suitable for her office that will also tie in with this request. And then the County Assessor would like to pick up the balance with Reassessment funds. So because its not been advertised in that manner, we have to zero it out today and deal with this request in November.

Councilmember Lloyd: Second.

President Shetler: We have a motion and a second, all in favor, signify by saying

aye.

**(All Councilmembers voted in the affirmative)**

President Shetler: Any opposed?

**(No opposing votes were cast)**

President Shetler: So ordered.

AREA PLAN COMMISSION		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1240-4250	Misc. Equipment	5,000.00	0.00
Total		5,000.00	0.00

**(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)**

**SUPERINTENDENT OF COUNTY BUILDINGS**

Councilmember Raben: Next under Superintendent of County Buildings, Utilities in the amount of \$50,000, I'll move approval.

Councilmember Bassemier: Second.

President Shetler: Any questions, comments? All in favor, signify by saying aye.

**(All Councilmembers voted in the affirmative)**

President Shetler: Opposed?

**(No opposing votes were cast)**

President Shetler: So ordered.

SUPT. OF COUNTY BUILDINGS		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1310-3200	Utilities	50,000.00	50,000.00
Total		50,000.00	50,000.00

**(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)**

**CIRCUIT COURT**

Councilmember Raben: 1360-2270 and 1360-3723 for a total request of 4,000, I'll move approval.

Councilmember Bassemier: Second.

President Shetler: It's been moved and seconded. Do I have any questions or comments? All in favor signify by saying aye.

**(All Councilmembers voted in the affirmative)**

President Shetler: Any opposed?

**(No opposing votes were cast)**

President Shetler: So ordered.

CIRCUIT COURT		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1360-2270	Juror Meals/Lodging	2,000.00	2,000.00
1360-3723	Psychological Eval.	2,000.00	2,000.00
Total		4,000.00	4,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

**SUPERIOR COURT**

Councilmember Raben: Vanderburgh Superior Court, Office Machines, 1370-4220 in the amount of \$6,500, I'll move approval.

Councilmember Sutton: Second.

Councilmember Goebel: Did we not zero that out?

Councilmember Sutton: Oh yeah.

Councilmember Raben: Trying to make back up time, I think. Yes, that's zero. I'd like to amend my motion.

Councilmember Sutton: I'll amend my second.

President Shetler: It's been moved and seconded. Any questions or comments? All in favor, signify by saying aye.

(All Councilmembers voted in the affirmative)

President Shetler: Those opposed?

(No opposing votes were cast)

President Shetler: So ordered.

SUPERIOR COURT		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1370-4220	Office Machines	6,500.00	0.00
Total		6,500.00	0.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

**CIRCUIT COURT SUPPLEMENTAL ADULT PROBATION**

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Circuit Court Supplemental in the amount of \$17,028. Let me make sure...I'd like to make that in the form of a motion.

Councilmember Sutton: Second.

President Shetler: It's been moved and seconded. Do I have any questions?

Councilmember Lloyd: This was money coming from the Circuit Court Supplemental fund. I mean, we had a good presentation from Judge Heldt last

week.

President Shetler: Alright, any questions, comments? All in favor, signify by saying aye.

**(All Councilmembers voted in the affirmative)**

President Shetler: Those opposed?

**(No opposing votes were cast)**

President Shetler: So ordered.

CIRCUIT COURT SUPPLEMENTAL		REQUESTED	APPROVED
2600-2210	Gas & Oil	1,000.00	1,000.00
2600-3130	Travel/Mileage	2,000.00	2,000.00
2600-4230	Motor Vehicles	14,028.00	14,028.00
Total		17,028.00	17,028.00

**(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)**

#### **LOCAL EMERGENCY PLAN COMMISSION**

Councilmember Raben: Next under Local Emergency Planning Commission, Emergency Management in the amount of 3,000, I'll move approval.

Councilmember Sutton: Second.

President Shetler: It's been seconded. Any questions or comments? All in favor, signify by saying aye.

**(All Councilmembers voted in the affirmative)**

President Shetler: Those opposed?

**(No opposing votes were cast)**

President Shetler: So ordered.

LOCAL EMERGENCY PLAN COMMISSION		REQUESTED	APPROVED
2861-3210	Emergency Mgmt.	3,000.00	3,000.00
Total		3,000.00	3,000.00

**(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)**

#### **CONVENTION CENTER OPERATING FUND**

Councilmember Raben: Convention Center, again, Utilities in the amount of \$25,000, I'll move approval.

Councilmember Kiefer: Is there somebody here from the Convention Center? Yeah, because I had a question last week about utilities –

President Shetler: I need a second.

Councilmember Lloyd: Second.

Councilmember Kiefer: – clarification and then discussion.

Darren Stearns: Hi, Darren Stearns, Assistant General Manager with SMG.

Councilmember Kiefer: Just out of curiosity, you know, the 25,000, that's what you need to get through the rest of the year because utilities are so much higher than you anticipated?

Darren Stearns: Right, we had some funds that we did not encumber from last year, so that's kind of what's put us in this predicament. Otherwise, we would have it, and we're depending on our budget that we have for next year, that's why when we did the budget in 2009, you saw that the number jumped at a little bit for next year.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay, do you guys work with the Civic Center in buying your gas?

Darren Stearns: Yes, Dave Rector gets us the rate for the gas.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay, thank you.

Darren Stearns: Sure.

President Shetler: Alright, any other questions or comments? All in favor, signify by saying aye.

**(All Councilmembers voted in the affirmative)**

President Shetler: Those opposed?

**(No opposing votes were cast)**

President Shetler: So ordered.

CONVENTION CENTER OPERATING		REQUESTED	APPROVED
3650-3200	Utilities	25,000.00	25,000.00
Total		25,000.00	25,000.00

**(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)**

<b>TRANSFER REQUESTS</b>
--------------------------

## AUDITOR

Councilmember Raben: Okay, on transfers, does anybody object to lumping all the transfers into one motion? Does anybody want to single any out?

Councilmember Sutton: If we could single out the first one and lump in the rest of them.



Councilmember Raben: Okay, on transfers, I'll move that we approve under Auditor, the transfer in the amount of \$12,082.

Councilmember Lloyd: Second.

President Shetler: Any questions or comments? Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Could somebody restate this? I –

Councilmember Raben: Just, we're taking this...

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay, yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being five ayes and two nays, the motion carries.

AUDITOR		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1020-1210-1020	Transfer Supervisor	700.00	700.00
1020-1310-1020	Admin. Secretary	780.00	780.00
1020-1160-1020	Bookkeeper/Payroll	8,902.00	8,902.00
1020-1910	PERF	1,700.00	1,700.00
To: 1020-1971	Accrued Payments	12,082.00	12,082.00

**(Motion carried 5-2/Councilmembers Sutton & Goebel opposed)**

Councilmember Sutton: You've got to multi-task, Mr. Kiefer, talk, listen and write.

SHERIFF  
CORONER  
COOPERATIVE EXTENSION  
COMMISSIONERS  
LEGAL AID  
REASSESSMENT/CO. ASSESSOR

JAIL  
COUNTY ASSESSOR  
AREA PLAN COMMISSION  
SUPERIOR COURT  
COUNTY COUNCIL  
LOCAL EMERGENCY PLAN COMM.

Councilmember Raben: Next, Mr. President, I'll move that all other transfers be approved as listed.

President Shetler: Do I have a second?

Councilmember Lloyd: Second.

President Shetler: Its been seconded. Questions or comments? All in favor, signify by saying aye.

(All Councilmembers voted in the affirmative)

President Shetler: Those opposed?

(No opposing votes were cast)

President Shetler: So ordered.

SHERIFF		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1050-1750	Clothing Allowance	1,000.00	1,000.00
To: 1050-1210	College Incentive	1,000.00	1,000.00

JAIL		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1051-1130-0309	Confinement Officer	4,000.00	4,000.00
To: 1051-1301	Civilian Overtime	4,000.00	4,000.00

CORONER		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1070-2410	Body Transport	500.00	500.00
1070-2710	Color Film	1,000.00	1,000.00
1070-2720	Lab Supplies	500.00	500.00
1070-3190	Solid Waste Disposal	1,000.00	1,000.00
To: 1070-3530	Contractual Services	3,000.00	3,000.00

COUNTY ASSESSOR REQUESTED APPROVED

From: 1090-1630-1090	Deputy Assessor Mobile Homes	440.00	440.00
To: 1090-1540-1090	Deputy Assessor PP/ Data Analysis	440.00	440.00

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION REQUESTED APPROVED

From: 1230-4220	Office Machines	799.00	799.00
To: 1230-3530	Contractual Services	361.00	361.00
1230-2600	Office Supplies	438.00	438.00

AREA PLAN COMMISSION REQUESTED APPROVED

From: 1240-2700	Other Supplies	75.00	75.00
To: 1240-3550	Repairs to Buildings & Grounds	75.00	75.00

COMMISSIONERS REQUESTED APPROVED

From: 1300-3020	Southwestern Mental Health	32,400.00	32,400.00
To: 1300-3460	Consultant	2,400.00	2,400.00
1300-3140	Telephone	30,000.00	30,000.00

SUPERIOR COURT REQUESTED APPROVED

From: 1370-3520	Equipment Repair	6,500.00	6,500.00
To: 1370-4220	Office Machines	6,500.00	6,500.00

LEGAL AID REQUESTED APPROVED

From: 1460-3000	Bond & Insurance	200.00	200.00
1460-3010	Other Insurance	217.00	217.00
1460-3680	Malpractice Insurance	237.00	237.00
To: 1460-2600	Office Supplies	437.00	437.00
1460-3140	Telephone	217.00	217.00

## COUNTY COUNCIL

**REQUESTED**

**APPROVED**

From: 1480-3530	Contractual Services	7,000.00	7,000.00
To: 1480-3370	Computer (Data Mgmt)	7,000.00	7,000.00

## REASSESSMENT/COUNTY ASSESSOR

**REQUESTED**

**APPROVED**

From: 2490-1090-3700	Dues & Subscriptions	1,000.00	1,000.00
To: 2490-1090-1972	Level II Certification	1,000.00	1,000.00

## LOCAL EMERGENCY PLAN COMMISSION

**REQUESTED**

**APPROVED**

From: 2861-3310	Training	500.00	500.00
2861-3313	Education & Public Outreach	150.00	150.00
2861-3370	Computer (Data Mgmt)	100.00	100.00
To: 2861-3210	Emergency Mgmt.	750.00	750.00

**(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)**

## AMENDMENTS TO SALARY ORDINANCE

President Shetler: No repeals...Amendments to the Salary Ordinance.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, under Auditor, I move that we amend salary line 1020-1160 Bookkeeper/Payroll Clerk. The employee is to be set in at a COMOT VI, Step 1, initiation salary at \$30,179. I move that we amend salary line 1020-1971 Accrued Payments in the amount of \$12,082 as previously transferred, and that's for the buy-out for the former Bookkeeper/Payroll Clerk. Jail, move that we amend salary line 1051-1301 Civilian Overtime as previously approved. County Assessor, salary line 1090-1540 Deputy Assessor Personal Property/Data Analysis Tech as transfer previously approved. The current employee is a COMOT V, Step 2, with an annual salary of \$31,503 and last, under County Assessor salary line 2490-1090-1972 Level II Certification as previously approved. These Level II's were approved earlier in the year. And that's it, and I'd like to make that in the form of a motion.

Councilmember Lloyd: Second.

President Shetler: It's been moved and seconded. Do I have any questions or comments? All in favor, signify by saying aye.

**(Councilmembers Bassemier, Lloyd, Raben, Kiefer & Shetler voted in the affirmative)**

President Shetler: Any opposed?

Councilmember Sutton: One.

President Shetler: Let's do a roll call vote then.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: I have to follow. No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being five ayes and two nays, the motion carries.

**(Motion carried 5-2/Councilmembers Sutton & Goebel opposed)**

<b>TRAVEL REQUEST</b>
-----------------------

President Shetler: Underneath old business, Councilman Sutton, do you want to take up that task on that hiring freeze resolution or...

Councilmember Sutton: Let me add one thing from kind of an old business, and I don't know if Auditor Fluty has gotten away from us – oh, there is he. I thought maybe you had stepped out that way. Last week I did mention about an issue and I did want to express that I had some questions about a travel situation with Auditor Fluty, and he and I did get a chance to talk about that, and the way in which I may have asked the question and what I believe may have been, not necessarily the best way to use the travel policy. That was not necessarily the case. The employees that I had mentioned about on that Friday, taking off, they did use vacation time strictly, and that is fine under county personnel policy. And they did arrive back in what would still be considered a timely fashion. So there really was no excessive use of county funds on that trip. So I did want to make sure I got that on the record, since I did ask questions about that and there was some information maybe one way that that wasn't the case, but he's clarified that, and so I just wanted to make sure we got that on the record, and any apologies that I can offer to his office and his staff for any misunderstandings that may have been communicated there.

<b>HIRING FREEZE RESOLUTION</b>
---------------------------------

Councilmember Sutton: But on the other issue, Sandie, I don't know if you had the suggested language that I had on the resolution that would include on the hiring freeze, the positions that affect the financial workings of the county and I – because I can't remember the exact way I phrased that, so if you could maybe provide some – Sarah can pull up our archives and help us with that. I think it's very appropriate with the way we put together the hiring freeze resolution about emergency personnel, but perhaps maybe we can have some inclusive language that addresses some of these other things. I'm not quite sure on the process, if we should include that in on this resolution. Perhaps, maybe, that's something separate so it doesn't cloud up the resolution any further than it already is, but maybe tighten up that language, we can make that distinction as well between what is a new hire and an existing position. I would, I guess, the sense that I believe from this Council is that we don't want to take on any new hires, we're very clear on that. But it's the retention issue of existing staff that we need to clean up that language on that resolution. Councilman Kiefer, could you read that resolution for us? You've got it there with you.

Councilmember Kiefer: Well, apparently, the one I had was an earlier copy because Counselor Ahlers came over and gave me the corrected one that had all the signatures on it, so it does say, whereas the County Council believes that it is in the best interest of the county not to hire any full-time or part-time county employees except in the case of emergency or extraordinary circumstances, and then it goes, therefore be it resolved by the Vanderburgh County Council that no full-time or part-time employees shall be hired in any county office or department in 2009 except in the case of emergency or extraordinary circumstance. So the one that I cited earlier saying additional was incorrect as the counselor pointed out to me.

President Shetler: Let me do this first. Let me ask Mr. Ahlers to perhaps point out or to give us a brief description of what statutorily we, as Councilmen, are required to do and what our job responsibilities might be, particularly in this particular matter. And that might lay some groundwork here to establish just exactly what does need to be put into the language here.

Jeff Ahlers: Thank you, Mr. Shetler. I have, over the years, I think from time to time some of these issues have come up and I have sent you copies of the statute and I can email that to all of you again today. But by Indiana statute, I mean, County Council is vested with the authority to determine the number of county employees, the classification of county employees and the compensation of county employees, and that rests with County Council. So ultimately, regardless of what committee things go through, regardless of what officeholders say, the buck stops here by statute. So ultimately, that is your decision to make that determination. Now whether you say it's subjective, objective or however you reach that decision, ultimately, it's a vote of this body regardless of how you reach that determination as to the number, classification, and compensation of employees. We had, in the past, I know a number of years ago, and some of you were on Council then, had done a similar hiring freeze and what I understand the backdrop of this to be, is that and as I'm sure you've all read, that there is many municipalities and governmental entities that have, in fact, had to downsize. There's a city up north – I don't know if it's Elkhart or South Bend, I read, I think they had to cut like fifty employees. And fortunately, you're not in a position to have to do that. And, as I understand, when you passed this resolution, what you did want to do, though, was to say, any time there's an open position, you want to evaluate whether or not the position gets filled. Now, whether there's a delay in refilling the position, or however you want to do that,

that you wanted to retain that control to evaluate these positions as they come open. I mean, as I read this resolution, what you're basically saying is, and keep in mind, too, a resolution is not like an ordinance: it's not a law, it's not binding. There's nothing that says you guys can't change it, but merely you wanted to have a written resolution to send to the officeholders, a manifestation of your intent to say, when these positions come open, don't fill them, we want you to come before us and we'll determine whether they get refilled now, in a month, three months, six months, whatever. And so what this resolution is essentially saying is, that no employees will be hired except in the case of emergency or extraordinary circumstances. And I guess that's where we come into, whether or not you want further definition, I mean, I guess there's good and bad in anything. As to what's extraordinary and emergency, I mean, I guess leaving it where it is gives you that discretion to determine on a case by case basis what it is. If you think you need to have further guidelines, I mean, Council is certainly free to do that. But, --

Councilmember Kiefer: Does BKD in their study, do they do any kind of audit of various departments to see whether or not they're understaffed or overstaffed? I mean, it might be interesting to see what an outside audit might show of each individual department and see if, you know, we might discover that they're overstaffed or you might discover, no, they're just perfect the way they are. But I sure would like to have some type -- you know, all this begs the question, you know, maybe we need to do an audit of each department and see if they're staffed appropriately. And maybe not rely totally on the input from the department head, have it done independently.

President Shetler: I actually did discuss this with BKD about four months or so ago when the economic situation appeared obvious that we were going to have to look at doing some things here to hold the line. And there are firms out there that do specialize in government type of accounting that could do --

**(Tape changed)**

President Shetler: -- as well as they could, within their own means, but you're talking about a pretty pricey deal. And I'm not so sure that by the time we'd netted everything out back and forth, that it would actually become a true savings for the taxpayers. So I was concerned about that.

Councilmember Kiefer: But when you add in all the other compensation that goes to an employee, PERF, retirement, all these things, they snowball, there's a snowball effect that accumulates over many, many years. I'm not saying, you know, maybe -- I'm not saying that we should do this, but it should at least be a discussion item.

President Shetler: I agree. Again, the feeling that I walked away with from them, it would be a fairly pricey deal and that, yes, if we were able to eliminate a number of employees over a period of time, it would save us some money, but in the short run, it could be more costly. And I'm talking about in terms of, you know, something of about a quarter of a million dollars or so to run it. Because you'd have to have a -- some kind of benchmark, some kind of floor there to establish and they'd have to go in and actually audit each office to do that. That would be quite expensive, and then to review each and every time that they would come in to do it. You know, position and personnel that's involved there, it's not going to be an inexpensive venture. So I, myself, just categorically kind of rejected it based on the cost of it. And also there are things that are out there, whether it's the Farm Bureau Co-Op, and other groups that are out there that have information that can tell you, you know, like, for example, the number of residents you have inside the city, outside the city, the number of

Sheriff Deputies per age, how many road miles and different things like that. So we have in our own midst here information that we can grab hold of that might help us in some of the areas that may say to us that well, generally speaking, with this many crimes, you know, a Clerk's office ought to be able to handle so many things at such and such, with so many people and stuff. So there are some guidelines that we can use by looking at other counties and around the state of Indiana. And I've used some of those resources myself on some of them. So that was one of the things that, you know, we have looked at with the Sheriff's department and their manpower, for example. But, ultimately, no matter what we use, it still boils down to coming right back here, we've got to make the decision and it's a tough decision.

Councilmember Kiefer: I agree, I mean, like Jeff said, you know, the buck stops here but it sure helps having good information to make a decision.

President Shetler: Councilman Goebel, it looked like you were going to –

Councilmember Raben: I was just going to recommend we move down the agenda.

President Shetler: Is that alright with you and then come back to this?

Councilmember Sutton: I did have a suggestion on some language. Does everybody have a copy of this here? The resolution? And hopefully we're all working from the same page.

Councilmember Kiefer: I have a copy with the signatures on it now.

Councilmember Sutton: Okay, good. Your signature's not on there, Kiefer, Councilman Kiefer, so I don't think you can participate in this. Under that third paragraph where it says, whereas the County Council believes it is in the best interest of the county to not hire any full-time or part-time county employees except in the cases of emergency or extraordinary circumstances, decisions to retain existing employees will be evaluated by the County Council on a case by case basis – that's my language there. And then on to the next addition I'd like to make is, priority consideration will be given to retain existing financial control or revenue generating positions.

President Shetler: I think, I personally have no problems, but is that a motion then?

Councilmember Sutton: That would be a motion.

President Shetler: Alright, I've got a motion on the floor. Do I have a second?

Councilmember Kiefer: Second.

President Shetler: Got a second. Any questions about it? So do we need to – that was a motion to amend our existing resolution?

Jeff Ahlers: Yeah, well, I guess the question is, yeah, I mean, you can certainly do that. I guess the question is whether we want to get that in writing or you want to reread it in total to make sure everybody knows what it is.

President Shetler: Did you write that down?

Councilmember Sutton: I wrote it but I don't think you can read what I've written.



President Shetler: Well, I was going to say, why don't you clean that up and then get it to Mr. Ahlers? I think we all understand the intent, so why don't we vote on the motion before us and then get that to Sandie or Mr. Ahlers or whoever and then they can get the formal language right.

Councilmember Sutton: Sure. Do you want me to reread that or –

Councilmember Raben: Well, or would you like to just create a new resolution with that language and just vote on it next month? I mean, insert it into the –

Councilmember Sutton: That would be – that would be fine. That would give us a chance to see a cleaned up copy.

Jeff Ahlers: If Mr. Sutton wants to send me that language, I can pull this up, incorporate it, send it back out to everybody and then if you guys want to discuss changes, additional stuff, whatever, and then you'll have options or this one or something to vote on next time.

Councilmember Kiefer: Do we need to rescind our motion then?

Councilmember Raben: Yeah.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay, I'll rescind my second.

Councilmember Sutton: Rescind my motion.

President Shetler: Alright, so that issue is resolved for the time being.

<b>HEALTH DEPARTMENT EMPLOYMENT REQUEST</b>
---

President Shetler: Next, underneath new business, Health Department request for a new employee. Thank you very much.

Gary Heck: Gary Heck, Health Department. I'm really not asking for a new employee. What we're trying to do is, we have three vacancies right now and if we are allowed to do what we are requesting, we're going to have three vacancies when we stop. But I have a vacancy in a finance officer and I would like to promote from within the Health Department to fill a higher priority need for the Health Department right now. And once that's done, leave the vacancy from where the promotion takes place so we start out with three vacancies at the beginning and we'll end up with three vacancies at the end, they just won't be the same positions.

President Shetler: Are any of those vacancies that you have critical, particularly in delivering health services? I'm speaking specifically now of the flu shots and those services that we need to make sure that they get out to the public.

Gary Heck: They're in the finance that's critical because we have three grants that we're expected to administer under the H1N1, which requires an individual to be able to oversee that, and that's what this – if this position gets filled, that's what this person would be doing.

President Shetler: Councilman Sutton, I'm kind of getting a feeling that they heard your language and they're all going to be financially related now, here.

Gary Heck: My request was submitted long before you all talked about it.

President Shetler: I'm teasing.

Gary Heck: This really is a critical position for the Health Department especially at this time. The grants that we have received are monies that flow from the federal government to the state and then on to every local health department and there is planning and preparation grants are the first two phases and then the third phase is the implementation. And we're just now starting the flu season, we've been having our seasonal flu clinics all along. We've already conducted them at the Health Department. One special one and then we have daily folks walk in for their seasonal flu shots. And we just got our first shipment of the H1N1 and we're going to have a clinic this Friday. It's part of the Fall Festival and the schools were already out so you have the opportunity to have parents bring their kids to the Health Department and it just couldn't have been a better timing from that standpoint. So these positions are critical and that's what we're actually – we don't actually view it as violating the hiring freeze, we do look at it as shifting the vacancies. And I'd be happy to answer any specific questions to try to help you understand and support this request.

President Shetler: Alright, Councilman Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Actually, I will not ask because you just answered the question. You're not going to bring on anyone new, you're just going to move people around?

Gary Heck: That's correct.

President Shetler: So we could actually repeal those other three positions? Or some time in the future do you expect to come back here to fill those?

Gary Heck: Certainly, I do. Every position we have in the Health Department is critical, but we're trying to honor the Council's request, which was don't bring you requests to hire anybody new. I'm not asking to hire anybody new. I'm just asking to move our people around to fill a higher priority position that happens to be vacant.

Councilmember Raben: How long has the position been vacant?

Gary Heck: Since August 1<sup>st</sup>.

Councilmember Sutton: So the net gain will be how much as a result of shifting and moving these positions up? I mean, we had a similar situation, I guess, last month, month before, --

Gary Heck: You have three --

Councilmember Sutton: -- moving around --

Gary Heck: The Health Department has three vacancies right now and we'll still have three vacancies when we're done, they just won't be the same positions.

Councilmember Sutton: Not in terms of number of positions, but the dollar amount, because sometimes as you move people around, someone may come in but they may not have, of course, the seniority that the previous person had so they come in at a lower rate of pay than the previous person that had the position. Have you had a chance to take a look at what the impact might be by shifting those around?

Gary Heck: There wouldn't be any increase in any of those line items and the funds

that are currently in place would, there's adequate funds in place to handle those requests.

President Shetler: Well, okay, I think what Councilman Sutton may be driving towards is that when Mr. Elder retired and you took his place, there was some – was there some –

Gary Heck: There was no money left in the line item because of the – well, excuse me, there would have been an accrued buy-out –

President Shetler: But he was being paid at what level?

Gary Heck: At the highest step on the Executive I classification.

President Shetler: Which is, roughly?

Gary Heck: 77,000.

President Shetler: Okay, and you are being paid...?

Gary Heck: Something less than that. At the 43 – 44,000 level.

President Shetler: Okay, so there is a considerable savings in that position alone.

Gary Heck: That's correct.

President Shetler: And then the person that's moving from wherever to your old position...

Gary Heck: I think it would be comparable because I don't have – we still have to post it. I'm sort of in the same position that Mr. Fluty was in, in that I have somebody in mind within because I know my department pretty well, but the County Personnel asks you to post it and then conduct interviews within. So there could be two or three candidates, but the most senior or the one that would be there, would be, in essence, right at about the same because –

President Shetler: So there may not be any real net savings.

Gary Heck: There wouldn't be in that position at all, I wouldn't think, because they probably have been there – I've been at the Health Department five years. I believe they've been there longer than that.

President Shetler: The other three critical, or the other three positions that are vacant, you said they will remain vacant, how long will they remain vacant? But you expect to fill them sometime in the future?

Gary Heck: Well, one of them is a Public Health Nurse and the Board of Health has gone on record that they consider that position critical.

President Shetler: I would concur.

Gary Heck: But there is a – because of the transfer to accommodate the accumulated payment, that's just part of doing business with the county, there's just no other way around that particular one unless we came back and were to ask for an additional appropriation to try to fill it. The Deputy Registrar position will probably

become critical in January, but I would at least like to wait to see instead of telling you right now that I know it will be. There was a state law that was changed that will require individuals to take a birth certificate to renew your driver's license. And that hasn't been on the books before and it's a brand new requirement, and we believe that that will be a major increase eventually at the Health Department. It may not happen immediately, but some time that it will, and we intend to track that so that we can come back to you and say, this will make your decision a little bit easier, we've had an increase in requests 25 percent.

President Shetler: That's a fee based service?

Gary Heck: It is.

President Shetler: And it's how much?

Gary Heck: It's \$10 for a birth certificate, \$10 for a death certificate, but we also collect \$1.75 for the Coroner's education fund.

President Shetler: That money goes into...

Gary Heck: The Health fund.

President Shetler: The Health fund?

Gary Heck: Right, the Health department is not part of the General fund, so everything we do comes from the Health fund or through grants that are received and we do have several grant employees at the Health department as well.

President Shetler: Alright, thanks.

Councilmember Raben: Back to the three vacant positions, Public Health Nurse, Deputy Registrar person, what's the title or the name for the third one?

Gary Heck: Well, what we have or what I'm asking for is what we approached the Personnel Committee with previously as a way of saving money for the county. Since I'm still with the Health department, I don't believe we continue to need the Chief Operating and Finance Officer, which was a PAT VI, and we requested to, in essence, reclassify that position back to an Office Manager Finance Officer, which was a PAT V. And that's what we would intend or request to be able to fill the position with at this time. So there would be that savings just going from the difference in the classification.

President Shetler: About \$3,000 roughly, or so?

Gary Heck: It's – I'm not sure, 2,400 to 3,000. It depends on where you are on those classifications.

President Shetler: Councilman Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Okay, so do we have three or four vacancies?

Gary Heck: Three. There's the Public Health Nurse, the Deputy Registrar and then the 2130-1320 and it's currently listed as the Chief Operating Finance Officer at a PAT VI, and I'm suggesting that when we fill it, we would like to fill it as the Office Manager Finance Officer at a PAT V level.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, and how many total employees are there in the Health department?

Gary Heck: There is approximately 68 full-time, equivalency with 45 or 46 that comes from the Health Fund, the 2130, and the rest comes from various grants.

Councilmember Raben: (Inaudible – microphone not turned on)

Gary Heck: About 68, yes.

Councilmember Raben: (Inaudible – microphone not turned on)

Gary Heck: No, there's 45 of that 68 come from the Health Department's fund, the 2130 and then the balance, what's that 20 something –

Councilmember Lloyd: Twenty-three.

Gary Heck: Is going to come from various grant funds, and there are – several.

Councilmember Raben: What are we doing here today? Are we going to take motions on the request or are we going to table them until next month? What's the thought process here?

Councilmember Kiefer: I think we ought to go ahead and move on taking action on this because my understanding is, this person, this position is going to be involved in securing grants to help with the H1N1 virus and I don't want to be the one to say that hey, we ill-affected the community because we didn't – and he's not asking to for additional positions, just shifting employees around. I think we ought to do it.

Councilmember Raben: Well, let me tell you the problems with doing that or the problems that I see just on the surface is, number one, we don't know – we don't have anything as far as what the position's base is, do we?

President Shetler: What the base is?

Councilmember Raben: Yeah, do we have job titles for everything? Do we have what the initiation salary is? Do we have all that –

Councilmember Lloyd: This was approved at the – yeah, this was approved at Job Study in August. We changed three of the classifications of the Health department in anticipation of Mr. Elder's retirement. So we did shift around these positions, so that's why he's got a line through here, that was changed at Job Study. So it was re-rated and has (inaudible) salary.

Councilmember Raben: I understand, but we're approving...

President Shetler: I think we're only approving – if we – depends on how the motion is written or stated, but I would assume that we'd only be approving an internal transfer to that position only and not for the other then three positions that would be vacated, that are vacated at the current time, that we are not approving those at the moment.

Gary Heck: I think in my request, I don't know if you all have a copy of that in front of you, – oh, I'm sorry. I envisioned that it would actually involve two switches and that was from a position to the Office Manager Finance and, once again, until we go

through the posting, I'm not sure who all would apply, but I know my department and I would envision that there is one person who will get that position. They're in a critical position, too, and I would like to fill that position, so that those two positions, they're both employees of the Health department, all of them are in the 2130 account, and at the end of the day I would say, this is the position that is now vacant until we can move forward because that two positions that have moved up would be the ones that we need at this point, they're critical to the Health Department in order to be able to function. And then we would still have three vacancies, and –

President Shetler: You're asking for two internal transfers, in essence, and there would still then be, at that third level down, a vacancy plus the other two –

Gary Heck: That already exist, and there will remain –

President Shetler: As a Nurse and the Registrar.

Gary Heck: That's correct. It will be a Nurse, a Deputy Registrar and a vacancy yet to be named from a two move, internal move within the Health department from existing personnel.

President Shetler: My own opinion, and I don't mean to interrupt here, but my own opinion is, on the hiring freeze, that I do have somewhat of an issue here with – if you look around at private business and you see it all over town and all over the state and all over the country, middle management and upper management is where you're really trying to thin the ranks the most. And so I think somewhere in that level, and the people out there like the Nurse and the Registrar that are really doing a lot of that grunt work, we can't afford to lose, you know, a whole lot of those folks, but sometimes we can thin ourselves in the middle management area and upper management levels in order to be a lot more efficient. And that's why I have a little bit of concern is that, at the end of the day, I want to just make sure that we're able to save in that area. Now, moving a couple people up along the line, I don't have as much problem with that, but I want to see something that is going to show some savings in that management level. Again, that's my own personal opinion.

Gary Heck: And maybe I didn't read that into the – I couldn't tell from the distinction from the resolution that it meant management versus –

President Shetler: No, it didn't and I'm pointing out where I'm coming from today is not as opposed, and that's why I said we could put all the words we want in that resolution. You know, bottom line is, when it comes back here, it's going to depend on how each one of us really do feel about saving the taxpayers.

Gary Heck: And I guess I also need to tell you that managers within the Health Department are still doers. They don't give a letter to someone to have it typed, they produce it themselves. Now there are some circumstances where we do have a Clerk Typist who is responsible for issuing permits and some things like that. But the management positions and the finance that I'm talking about, they all do all of their own work. They fax their own papers, they call and get the quotes, they're the ones that are personally responsible for making sure that the money that the Health Department is entrusted with is spent wisely and that we get all the savings. And that's what I'm trying to do here is to get the best people in the right positions where we need them.

Councilmember Kiefer: Mr. President?

Councilmember Lloyd: Mr. --

President Shetler: I think Councilman Kiefer --

Councilmember Kiefer: I was going to say, perhaps Dr. Nicholson might make some comment. I'd like to get some input since he's the chief medical officer on whether this, you know, the criticalness of this.

Councilmember Lloyd: I was going to indicate, yesterday, I spoke to Dr. Nicholson. He's here, that he thought this was an important move. Their workload is increasing.

Councilmember Kiefer: We were thinking along the same lines.

Dr. Ray Nicholson: We are at a crisis with this H1N1. We meet every day, some days we meet the entire day over this issue. I look at the Nurse position as very, very important. We are really short-handed. If we're going to pull off and give all the immunizations that we need, we're going to have to hire extra nurses. A full-time nurse in that position that's vacant would actually be cheaper than renting a part-time nurse, the more expensive it gets. So I feel very strongly that that nurse's position needs to be filled. As far as the others are concerned, I agree with Gary that the middle management do their own work and they're very productive. I feel bad every time I walk in their offices because they're sitting there just working away and I feel like I'm interrupting every time I walk in. I never catch them doing anything else other than work. And they're very productive in the work they do, they keep a hand on the finances that we're doing right now is very, very important. Every time we meet it's a command structure, and the finance officer has one of the biggest reports of what we're doing in trying to keep in line all the expenses that we have. So I feel it's very important.

Councilmember Kiefer: Why have you not come before with the request to fill the Nurse's position then? I'm concerned that there is people out there that won't be getting vaccinated because we have that vacant nursing position.

President Shetler: Basically, they had to do a buy-out on their retirement stuff, so they used up the amount of money that was in that account. So they don't have the monies to do that at this point in time. They could ask for an additional appropriation but --

Gary Heck: I don't know that state law would even allow us to put money back in that salary ordinance this year.

Councilmember Kiefer: I'm just concerned, I mean, talk about critical need. Out of all the departments that we have, I mean, I would think, you know, how many people would this nurse vaccinate in a single day's time?

Gary Heck: Well, if you look at 25 vaccinations an hour times eight in a normal workday, but was that 200?

Councilmember Kiefer: If we were ever to spend money, this is wisely spent money for the community.

Councilmember Lloyd: That assumes that you have the vaccines available.

Dr. Ray Nicholson: That's right. I think that it's important to understand that there is a number of vaccinations that have to take place if you didn't have the flu that the

other department, that is one of the busiest departments in the area, it's just constantly giving vaccinations. Two nurses give these all day long, five days a week. If they are pulled off to give other vaccinations, then we're going to fall short of being able to carry on our mission as it exists, our daily mission. And right now we're going to have a walk-in clinic so that extra people will be coming in. We have a person right now assigned, that comes down and controls the traffic. The traffic is backed up in the hallway with people waiting to be vaccinated. That's happened every day this week. And we're getting our first shipment this Friday, I can't imagine what the lines are going to be like. We're going to have to have traffic control and empty the parking lots and so forth in order to accommodate the people and we've only got 1,000 doses. We were supposed to have gotten 20,000 doses and we only got 1,700. So as you point out, when the vaccine rolls in, we are really going to be affected with a very heavy logistic problem.

Councilmember Raben: If we have the vaccines.

Councilmember Bassemier: Do we know – how are we going to vote on it? Are we going to vote on this today?

Councilmember Raben: And again, we're only approving one person and this person is called a Public Health Nurse?

President Shetler: No, the request is to actually fill the finance office manager position and then the vacancy that would be created from that person moving up to that and filling that vacancy, that's where there's – there's actually two positions as internal transfers that are being requested.

Councilmember Raben: Internal transfers so back to what I originally said, we're still going to have three vacant positions.

Gary Heck: That is correct.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, let's move on.

President Shetler: We've got a motion to approve it.

Councilmember Lloyd: Second.

President Shetler: We have a second. Do I have any questions specifically about the motion? All in favor, signify by saying aye.

**(All Councilmembers voted in the affirmative)**

President Shetler: Anyone opposed?

**(No opposing votes were cast)**

President Shetler: So ordered.

**(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)**

Gary Heck: Thank you. I appreciate the position that you all are in with this, but we do appreciate the opportunity to come and at least plead our case and I thank you for your support on this today. The community will be in a better position because of your vote. Thanks.



President Shetler: Alright, thank you.

Councilmember Lloyd: I was going to say, they may want to look at that Public Health Nurse, have your attorney look at that. I mean, that might be something we need to – I mean, depending on when the vaccines come in, if that would be a need.

Gary Heck: Okay.

Councilmember Lloyd: I mean, I don't know how the Council feels.

Councilmember Raben: Let's don't get into overstaffing with H1N1. Let's find out that we're going to need to be there.

<b>LEGAL AID EMPLOYMENT REQUEST</b>
-------------------------------------

President Shetler: Okay, Legal Aid.

Garvin Senn: I'm Garvin Senn, I haven't met many of you. I'm a staff attorney at Legal Aid and I'm here this morning with Legal Aid's request for an exception to this hiring policy that we've been talking about.

President Shetler: And your request basically is that you have a full-time person that has left employment and they were –

Garvin Senn: Her employment's not been terminated yet, she's been away because of an illness. We've kept her position alive but she's basically on unpaid, extended absence at this point. What we would like to have is we would like to have permission to bring in just a temporary position that wouldn't allow or pay benefits to keep the office functioning. We're a small office in the justice for all business. There are three attorneys paired with three legal secretaries and that's our sole staff. So without one of our legal secretaries there, we're down considerably in our ability to manage the work of the office. The hope is that, the legal secretary that is out will be back, that she'll get well and she'll come back. But at this point, she's absent without really any compensation. She's just, we've kept her position open, but we don't know, we don't have any guarantee that she will be back.

President Shetler: Now is she receiving benefits?

Garvin Senn: I don't think so. I think she's outside the time of her – I think she's outside the time of her benefit eligibility.

Councilmember Bassemier: Mr. President?

President Shetler: Yes, Councilman Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Now if she would come back from extended sick leave, just say if she would, now would you let go of the part-time person?

Garvin Senn: Yes, it would be purely a temporary position that would be the proviso. This person would be coming in understanding that this is strictly a temporary position, this is not a permanent hire, and that it's at a reduced compensation basis without benefits and eligibility.

Councilmember Raben: You know, Mr. President, speaking for – were you next? I don't think there's any – we're not bound to this position for any reason. There's no

statutes that say, you know, that Legal Aid needs to, has to work with this many people. In fact, they can pick and choose, to my knowledge, the cases that they're asked to take on. I know we've gone against the grain twice today, that I had never intended to do since passing the resolution back in July and I don't want to start walking down that road. I think Legal Aid, unlike a payroll clerk or somebody dispensing flu shots, that's different. But, you know, in this case I think we need to give them the opportunity to figure out a way to work without this individual for a while and maybe revisit it after the first of the year.

Councilmember Bassemier: Did you say put it off?

President Shetler: Apparently, the person that occupies it in a permanent position, but is not there, is receiving, I guess, health benefits at the present time from what our understanding might be. But –

Sandie Deig: She pays her portion.

Garvin Senn: She does?

President Shetler: So is she on a COBRA deal? She pays the county's portion then or just hers?

Garvin Senn: This is Karen Paulin, she's our senior legal secretary.

Karen Paulin: Karen Paulin, senior secretary. She has exhausted all of her benefits for the year. She's been through her FMLA and as far as I know, she is paying her own portion of her insurance at this time. And she's been –

President Shetler: By her portion, do you mean what all employees pay or are you saying that she's also paying the county's portion?

Karen Paulin: I don't know how all that works. I'm sorry, I don't know how that works, but I know she is still insured at this time through the county. What portion she pays, I don't know. But she's been off since May.

President Shetler: She's apparently not on COBRA, she's paying her own...

Bill Fluty: I believe, I haven't seen the pink slip but I believe she is on a leave of absence with insurance, so she's – we don't have the ability to take her portion out of her check so she's actually just sending her eight percent in, but the county is picking up the rest of that, as I –

Karen Paulin: As far as I know.

Bill Fluty: Yes. So she does have full coverage insurance.

Councilmember Bassemier: Mr. President? On this part-time employee, now, if we decide to postpone it, now if I understand it, the city picks up 32%, United Way picks up 36%, if we deny it right now and put it on hold, who will pick it up if the city and United Way decides to go ahead and pay this employee? The part-time person? Am I reading this right?

President Shetler: Well, it's a county –

Councilmember Bassemier: The county pays 32%, the city pays 32%, United Way

pays 36%, and the finance chairman just said that he'd like to postpone it, so –

Karen Paulin: Then we would do without?

Councilmember Raben: I think we're the – the action we take – you know, in this situation, we're speaking on behalf of the city. So if we say yea or nay, the city can't come in and do what they want.

Councilmember Bassemier: Okay, I understand now.

President Shetler: Okay, Councilman Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: For how long has this employee been not able to work?

Karen Paulin: She's been off since May, the first week of May.

Councilmember Lloyd: My discussion with Mr. Senn, this has been going on for a couple of years, the person has had health problems for quite a while, I mean, without getting in to personnel policy, that's why she's exhausted all her time.

Karen Paulin: Yes.

President Shetler: Okay.

Garvin Senn: And, of course, with respect to the Council, the work that we do is typically really the most vulnerable families in the community, so we like to think that the work that we're doing is helping families and children that are most vulnerable and for that reason it's critical that the work continue. We've, you know, I think us being here this morning is a really good example. You would normally have our executive before you, Ms. Hartig, who I'm sure you've all met. She's away. She's attending a seminar. Mr. Gibson, who is the more senior of the staff attorneys might be here, but he has appearances in court that he has to make. Karen and I are here with this presentation. Sonia is out on extended sick leave, that leaves one other secretary, who is potentially manning the office this morning and she's got a sick grandbaby, that really is our concern. Because of the fact that we're such a small office, with a person out, managing lunches, managing mandatory instruction for us to keep our law licenses, it gets to be desperate at times for the work that we do to continue. We have some exposure if we don't maintain the function of our support staff in regulating us and, as attorneys, making sure that we're aware where to be. We have to be able to do that. It's not like we can ask the attorneys to do the job of the secretaries. That won't satisfy our malpractice providers. We would have some exposure if we started missing court dates if we were handling things and...

President Shetler: Is it, well, I guess, basically, since this has been going on since May, what have you been doing? Just going day by day, minute by minute?

Garvin Senn: I think there was a time when we were permitted to have a temporary person and we had a temporary secretary for some time.

Karen Paulin: Sonia was out for eight weeks before we were allowed to hire a temporary person. She was with us for approximately 90 days. It was not a good fit, so we did let her go, so we are asking to hire somebody in at the initiation rate of a COMOT IV, which is about \$12.64, to help us out between this time and January until we see if Sonia can come back.

President Shetler: Are you guys, are you on the second floor?

Karen Paulin: First.

President Shetler: First floor. I mean, have you worked like with the Public Defender's office where they could send somebody down at lunch time, for example, to cover phones or do things like that, or is that not at all feasible?

Karen Paulin: It's never been suggested to us. I've never thought it would be feasible, though, since we're two separate businesses. They handle the criminal and misdemeanor, we're strictly family related civil matters, so I don't know that they would understand exactly what we do.

President Shetler: Yeah, I mean, I understand the differences between the two, I just didn't know if, since, you know, I guess the requirements for the jobs are very similar, and if there were people from there that from time that at least could cover the phones and they could bail you out at least while somebody is at lunch and particularly if you've got somebody that's out sick and you're down to one and somebody needs to run to lunch for a half hour, you need somebody that is capable to man the office for a little bit, if that kind of thing worked out for you or not. But, okay. Councilman Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: With Sonia, I believe, if after the beginning of the year, she won't be able to continue, unfortunately, will she then go on disability and leave the county or is there any kind of plan or length of time that you're going to hold the position open?

Karen Paulin: She's been through FMLA, she's been through one session of sick leave approved by you all, she's on her second three month period now. So her time is up in January, either she comes back to work or she will have to be terminated. If she comes back, fine. If she doesn't, we do hope that she goes on disability.

Garvin Senn: We all hope she comes back. We're really hopeful that she'll come back. We'd really like for her to come back, a lot.

President Shetler: Okay, do I have a motion – any other questions or...do we have a motion for approval?

Councilmember Raben: To postpone.

President Shetler: Alright, we've got a motion to postpone.

Councilmember Lloyd: Second.

President Shetler: We have a motion and a second. Any questions?

Councilmember Sutton: When you say postpone till...

Councilmember Raben: Postpone, deny, I mean, it's one in the same. Let's say deny and they'll have a decision or it sounds like they'll know a little more in depth in January, anyway, if they're talking about a replacement or what.

Councilmember Lloyd: So if you vote yes, it's to deny?

Councilmember Kiefer: If you're against it, vote no.

Councilmember Raben: Well, that's fine. Then the motion is to approve the request and if you're against it, vote no.

Councilmember Bassemier: Let me hear again how much of a hardship it's going to put you in until the first of the year.

Karen Paulin: Well, there are two of us now doing the whole work of three people. I have two and a half to three more weeks of vacation, which leaves one person in the office for that period of time. We're used to having three people, so that takes us down to one person doing the job of three people. It's a hardship, yes. It backs up cases, it backs up the whole system. If we miss a court date, that's a problem. If we miss filing dates, that's a problem.

Councilmember Bassemier: And at this \$12 and something an hour from this point on, if you hire them next week until the first of the year, how much would it cost? What's the cost to that?

Karen Paulin: I have not figured that up.

Councilmember Bassemier: Well, was it 12 something an hour?

Karen Paulin: It's \$12.64, I believe. It's initiation for a COMOT IV.

Councilmember Bassemier: Okay, thank you.

President Shetler: What about a part-time person that would be, you know, 20 hours or something like that?

(Inaudible)

President Shetler: Oh. No, I'm saying somebody could only work 20 hours rather than 40 hours. I don't think you would –

Karen Paulin: That would be helpful. Our normal procedure is that we take our phone applications in the morning between 8 and 11:30. That's a very, very busy time for us. We try to schedule appointments in the morning and afternoon, but afternoon is more of getting our work done and seeing people and not having the phone.

President Shetler: So your request is actually – it was for 40 hours, part-time per week?

Councilmember Bassemier: 39, wouldn't it be 39? I mean, 40 would be entitled to –

Karen Paulin: Well, part-time, yes, whatever –

President Shetler: You were asking, well, for a full-time temporary person and what I'm suggesting is a part-time temporary that maybe would work 20 hours a week. And that would be helpful and satisfy a lot of your needs and be able to accomplish some things.

Karen Paulin: If she had skills to do some things, yes.

Garvin Senn: Yes.

President Shetler: Alright, we have a motion on the floor and did we have a second, because it got changed around.

(Inaudible – several speaking at once)

Councilmember Goebel: Wait a minute. Excuse me. You just came up with another proposal, did you not?

President Shetler: Well, I – there was a motion on the floor, so I was going to let that fly first and then –

Councilmember Goebel: Are you going to bring that motion back after the vote on this?

President Shetler: Well, I can't, but I'll ask for it to be.

Councilmember Bassemier: You can, Mike.

President Shetler: Well, where I'm coming from is to split the baby here, a little bit and that is to say go with a part-time temporary which would be at 20 hours a week, that we could, you know –

Councilmember Raben: Okay, I'm going to amend my first motion that we approve the use of temporary help for up to 20 hours per week. And do we have a rate or – \$12.50?

Jeff Ahlers: You have to set the rate today at this meeting, so whatever you guys decide that rate is, is what it will be.

Councilmember Raben: Right, so we have to set that, so at a rate of \$12.50, I make that in the form of a motion.

Councilmember Lloyd: Okay, I'll amend my second and agree to the new motion.

President Shetler: Okay, now we have a motion on the floor. Any questions about the motion? All in favor signify by saying aye.

**(Councilmembers Sutton, Bassemier, Lloyd, Goebel and Shetler voted in the affirmative)**

President Shetler: Anyone opposed?

**(Councilmembers Raben & Kiefer cast opposing votes)**

President Shetler: Let's do a roll call.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: No.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being five ayes and two nays, the motion carries.

**(Motion carried 5-2/Councilmembers Raben & Kiefer opposed)**

Garvin Senn: Thank you for your help.

President Shetler: Thank you.

<b>EMPLOYMENT REQUEST COUNTY CLERK</b>
--

President Shetler: The next is County Clerk's office.

Councilmember Bassemier: Who's on first?

Susan Kirk: We can make this really fast because I've listened all this time. I have an employee who has found another job that she's going to. You had discussed about the Recorder's office didn't get their employee because their numbers are down. I have already given all of you Councilmen, during budget, where our numbers are up and growing. We've already done as many traffic tickets at the first of September as we did all last year, and I can give you all kinds of numbers. So, please grant me to keep this position filled because if we don't, then you guys can deal with the judges.

Councilmember Lloyd: I guess a question for Madam Clerk, what is the position that's leaving and, just generally, what are the things they do?

Susan Kirk: She's, I don't remember her exact title, we have so many titles with 54 of us, but she basically organizes, helps with certified mail, takes care of – and when I say certified mail, that's not – I'm talking baskets full. She helps with small claims, and she also helps the administration department filling in by answering phones, filing, like I said, well, certified mail and helps a little bit in the cashier's office when they have to take their lunch. So, she's very busy just like all of us are. But I think the numbers pretty well does it. Our numbers are up and growing, unfortunately.

Councilmember Lloyd: They don't answer or they're not at the front desk, though?

Susan Kirk: No, she's not at the front counter, she's midway back.

Councilmember Raben: Susie, is this person already gone, that you're wanting to

replace?

Susan Kirk: No. She will be leaving the 9<sup>th</sup>, so then we're going to be, you know, --

Councilmember Raben: Mr. President, I'm going to make a recommendation only because I've got an appointment I need to make, but, you know, I think this is one that I would really like to see us try to work through for a period of time and see if we can get by without replacing this person because, you know, I'm kind of losing -- I think everybody is losing sight of what the original intent was --

Susan Kirk: Well, Councilman Raben, then if I may, I feel like that, by listening to this, that because you voted yes for one, now you feel like you just need to vote no to kind of justify what you guys have come up with as far as your ordinance. I asked for part-time help, and I'm telling you now, with vacations, people off sick, and different things like that, that we're not going to be able to make it. We will not be able to get -- everything in our office is time sensitive. Everything. I don't care if you're the highest paid, if you're turning in the payroll, or if you're the one putting the files in. Everything is time sensitive. And if we cannot keep the staff that we have, there has not been a new person in that office -- we'll go back, I mean, it wasn't Helen Kuebler or way back even before that, Joe O'Day -- there has not been a new person. And this staff has tried to keep up and we are to the point where it is not going to happen. It's not going to happen. So like I said, you guys can deal with the judges because when these things are due, people want their files, the cases need to come before the courts and it's not ready, I'm not taking responsibility for that.

Councilmember Raben: And, Susie, respectfully, I understand what you're saying. But, again, this person has not even left -- I mean, we've not even made the attempt yet to work without this person in this role. And again, I'm one of many up here, so I'm probably not going to affect this either, but I felt, looking at the bigger picture, that the intent was is to ask everybody to make that, you know, where possible, to make that effort. But --

Susan Kirk: Well, I just don't want the county to face lawsuits because we can't get our job done. But that's up to the Council.

Councilmember Bassemier: Are we going to vote on this, Jim?

President Shetler: Yes, well, we need probably a motion for --

Councilmember Bassemier: If you made a motion, Jim, I didn't hear it.

Councilmember Raben: I didn't make one --

Councilmember Kiefer: I'll make a motion that we move to approve.

Councilmember Bassemier: I'll second it.

President Shetler: Got a motion and a second. Any questions about the motion? Anybody have any questions of our Clerk?

Councilmember Sutton: You know, I...I think it's very difficult for us to really make an evaluation but to a certain extent, to Councilman Raben's point, everybody is working on less and more is being demanded of them. And so at some point in time, I think every single request that we get, there's going to be some reasonable, rational justification of why we ought to go ahead and approve them. And I guess



in this situation, it's – I find it difficult for us to, at least on my end, to – the way some of the other requests, the first request we got from the Health Department, ultimately, the net effect would likely be some savings to the county. The other request, we ended up altering that. Actually, it's going to reduce in terms of we went to a part-time position and that's a smaller office, kind of back to the situation I talked about earlier. Being that this position hasn't opened up yet, so we don't really know and I think maybe we can leave the door open to see what the impact ultimately may be and I think that's what we've tried to do on the others as well. I guess I'd find it hard on my end to vote to approve it, just kind of weighing out all those different things.

Susan Kirk: So it doesn't make any difference that our numbers keep raising every year, every month? That we have more work, prove it, gave you the numbers just on part of it? So when an officeholder comes up here and can prove that they have more work generated every year and you're going to deny it?

President Shetler: I don't think that's the only criteria that Council is using to determine, I mean, that's one criteria, certainly. I think the size of the office, for example, if one has four people in the office and one is gone, that assumes that you're going to pick up 30% more work than what you had before. If you have 50 in your office and one is gone, that assumes you're going to pick up 2% more work. So there are other criteria that I think we can use rather than just simply saying, you know, the workload has increased or decreased or whatever it might be. I think the point of this is, is to try to see if we can't do more with less is what the ultimate outcome is.

Susan Kirk: That's just it, we already are. And like I said, if there's lawsuits, don't look my way if we can't get the job done.

Councilmember Sutton: I would say that I don't think we'll have one office that comes in here in light of what we've discussed, because their workload is lighter, who will come in and want to give up a position. I don't think we'll get one that comes in, and I'm not saying that your workload hasn't – I mean, you've indicated with your numbers here, but just (inaudible) how many people do you have in your office?

Susan Kirk: There's 54 of us altogether, and that's just in the Clerk's office. That doesn't include the Election Office.

President Shetler: And I will say, I mean, you mentioned the Clerks over the years, and stuff, and I appreciate that, but there have been several things in our nation that have taken place over the course of time as well, new computers with record storage folks, that are able to put that – scan it, put it on line and stuff, where people can just simply go to it and look it up rather than have to run back to a file room. Heck, we used to have people run downstairs at the old courthouse and grab files out and that was –

Susan Kirk: We go downstairs, we go several different places to get what we need. But I just, you know, I'm just telling you.

President Shetler: So you have been able to institute some improvements and some good management practices that have allowed some efficiencies over time as well, too.

Susan Kirk: We have, it's just – and, I mean, the Clerks over the past years have done that because the workload has increased. It's to the point, though, to where, you know, we've exhausted everything that we can. And like I said, I just, you know,

it's up to you, you make the decision, but of all the offices that can show the time sensitive, the importance, this would be the one. This would be the one. And I just feel like that we're leaving ourselves open for some problems if that staff can't continue at the number that it is. And believe me, we all work. There's no, you know, Clerk coming in two hours a day and leaving and – we all work. Every one of us. And it's – like I said – it's up to you.

President Shetler: Alright, thank you.

Councilmember Lloyd: Quickly, if for some reason the Council denies this request and you would have to go several weeks without that employee, you could come back at the November meeting as well. I mean, I guess that's another possibility just to think about.

Councilmember Bassemier: Susie, were you going to replace it right now or were you going to wait until the employee –

Susan Kirk: Well, we wanted to, she's leaving on the 9<sup>th</sup> and I was hoping to get approval today so that we could go ahead and go through the process and get someone in there. I've got two, three pregnant, different things like that. I mean, and using the scenario of four people in our office and 54 people in our office, the workload is still per person, big. So I don't know that that scenario works. I'm just –

Councilmember Bassemier: (Inaudible – microphone not turned on) of course, we're not giving her or any of her employees a pay increase, they're still working at the same level, we're asking them to do more work that she says she can't get done, so I think we're really putting a hardship on Susie and her department.

Susan Kirk: Well, it is, and the thing of it is, I think the lawsuits, if you can't get things done on time, people, nowadays, it doesn't take anything. They can sue over anything and then we've got to pay, you know, the attorneys and all that stuff to go through all that, which that costs a fortune and – whatever, I'll be quiet. You guys go ahead and make your decision.

President Shetler: Alright, we have a motion on the floor. Any other questions or comments? Roll call please.

(Inaudible – microphone not turned on)

President Shetler: Yeah, Joe did. Alright, roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Now I would be open to reconsidering this, but right now, my vote would be no.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Again, let's try for a period of time and see if we can make it work without and then I'll be open to revisiting it later, no.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: I echo Councilman Sutton's sentiments, and I'll vote no.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: No. So we're talking about two ayes and five nays, the motion is denied.

**(Motion fails 2-5/Councilmembers Sutton, Goebel, Raben, Kiefer & Shetler opposed)**

Susan Kirk: Okay, I won't be back.

President Shetler: Okay, we've already dealt, I think, with the Auditor's position unless anybody wants to re-bring that up, but that's really all been dealt with, I think, in the appropriation.

<b>BKD LETTER OF ENGAGEMENT</b>
---------------------------------

President Shetler: So the next would be approval for BKD's letter of engagement. I think you all received copies of that. Do you have any questions about it? Motion would be in order.

Councilmember Kiefer: It looks like a standard letter of engagement and they are requesting to move their operation to draft job descriptions for Superior Court and Circuit Court. I mean, I read it and it looked like their standard engagement. I believe the cost was \$11,480. Estimated cost.

President Shetler: Okay, any other questions? Comments? Motion would be in order.

Councilmember Kiefer: Move to approve.

Councilmember Lloyd: Second.

President Shetler: And seconded. All in favor signify by saying aye.

**(All Councilmembers voted in the affirmative)**

President Shetler: Anyone opposed?

**(No opposing votes were cast)**

President Shetler: So ordered. We've already done the taxing things. So, okay,

anything else?

Councilmember Lloyd: Just real quickly, looking at Vanderburgh County Personnel Administration Job Study meeting would either be after the Personnel & Finance October 28<sup>th</sup> at 10:30 or the Thursday afterwards, October 29<sup>th</sup> at 8:30, and I'll check with other members to see which time works better.

President Shetler: Afterwards is fine with me. The 28<sup>th</sup>. Okay, anybody else? Anything else?

Councilmember Kiefer: Motion to adjourn.

Councilmember Lloyd: Second.

President Shetler: Alright, thank you very much.

**(There being no further business to come before the Council, the meeting was adjourned at 10:31 a.m.)**

VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL

\_\_\_\_\_  
President Tom Shetler, Jr.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Vice President Joe Kiefer

\_\_\_\_\_  
Councilmember Jim Raben

\_\_\_\_\_  
Councilmember Mike Goebel

\_\_\_\_\_  
Councilmember Russell Lloyd, Jr.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Councilmember Ed Bassemier

\_\_\_\_\_  
Councilmember Royce Sutton

Recorded and transcribed by Teri Lukeman.

**VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL  
MINUTES  
NOVEMBER 4, 2009**

The Vanderburgh County Council met in session this 4<sup>th</sup> day of November 2009 in room 301 of the Civic Center Complex. The meeting was called to order at 8:34 a.m. by County Council President Tom Shetler, Jr.

President Shetler: Okay, if we could call the meeting to order. Hopefully, Royce will be here shortly. It's November 4<sup>th</sup> at 8:34, and time for our County Council meeting. We'll have the attendance roll call please.

COUNCILMEMBER	PRESENT	ABSENT
Councilmember Sutton		X*
Councilmember Bassemier	X	
Councilmember Lloyd	X	
Councilmember Goebel	X	
Councilmember Raben	X	
Councilmember Kiefer	X	
President Shetler	X	

\*Arrived during discussion under Sheriff: Court Screeners.

President Shetler: There being six members present and one absent, we have a majority here, so if I could ask Councilman Lloyd to lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance.

**(Pledge of Allegiance was given)**

<p style="text-align:center"><b>APPROVAL OF MINUTES SEPTEMBER 30, 2009 CIVIL TAXING UNITS BUDGET REVIEW OCTOBER 7, 2009 REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING</b></p>
---

President Shetler: Thank you. Next is approval of the minutes for October 7<sup>th</sup> and September 30<sup>th</sup>. Do I have any questions about the minutes?

Councilmember Lloyd: Motion to approve.

Councilmember Bassemier: Second.

President Shetler: We have a motion and a second. All in favor, signify by saying aye.

**(All Councilmember voted affirmatively)**

President Shetler: Anyone opposed?

**(No opposing votes were cast)**

President Shetler: So ordered.

**(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)**

<b>APPROPRIATION ORDINANCE</b>
--------------------------------

President Shetler: Next is the appropriation ordinance, Councilman Raben.

**SHERIFF  
JAIL**

Councilmember Raben: Okay, thank you. Good morning. First on the agenda under Sheriff, 1050-3200 Utilities in the amount of \$6,000. Then we have under Jail 1051-2240 Medical in the amount of \$150,000. I'll move approval.

Councilmember Lloyd: Second.

President Shetler: We have a motion and a second. Do I have any questions about the motion? All in favor signify by saying aye.

**(All Councilmembers voted affirmatively)**

President Shetler: Anyone opposed?

**(No opposing votes were cast)**

President Shetler: So ordered.

<b>SHERIFF</b>		<b>REQUESTED</b>	<b>APPROVED</b>
1050-3200	Utilities	6,000.00	6,000.00
Total		6,000.00	6,000.00

<b>JAIL</b>		<b>REQUESTED</b>	<b>APPROVED</b>
1051-2240	Medical	150,000.00	150,000.00
Total		150,000.00	150,000.00

**(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)**

**COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE**

President Shetler: Next is Cooperative Extension Services.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, we have three requests, Utilities, Travel/Mileage, and Equipment Repair, for a total of \$1,850, I'll move approval.

Councilmember Lloyd: Second.

President Shetler: Motion and a second. Do I have any questions about the motion? All in favor, signify by saying aye.

**(All Councilmembers voted affirmatively)**

President Shetler: Anyone opposed?

**(No opposing votes were cast)**

President Shetler: So ordered.

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1230-3200	Utilities	450.00	450.00
1230-3130	Travel/Mileage	1,000.00	1,000.00
1230-3520	Equipment Repair	400.00	400.00
Total		1,850.00	1,850.00

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

THE CENTRE

Councilmember Raben: Okay, under The Centre we have several requests. In fact, Mr. President, well, we'll keep them separate. These are salary adjustments based on the union contract for a total of \$11,755. I'll move approval.

Councilmember Lloyd: Second.

President Shetler: We have a motion and a second. Do I have any questions? Any comments? All in favor signify by saying aye.

(All Councilmembers voted affirmatively)

President Shetler: Anyone opposed?

(No opposing votes were cast)

President Shetler: So ordered.

THE CENTRE		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1440-1130-1440	Lead Man	877.00	877.00
1440-1140-1440	Custodian	209.00	209.00
1440-1150-1440	Custodian	303.00	303.00
1440-1160-1440	Maintenance	1,028.00	1,028.00
1440-1170-1440	Custodian	1,342.00	1,342.00
1440-1190-1440	Custodian	189.00	189.00
1440-1850	Union Overtime	6,000.00	6,000.00
1440-1900	FICA	762.00	762.00
1440-1910	PERF	1,045.00	1,045.00
Total		11,755.00	11,755.00

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

BURDETTE PARK

Councilmember Raben: Burdette Park, the same, for a total of \$29,413, I'll move approval.



Councilmember Lloyd: Second.

President Shetler: I have a motion and a second. Do I have any questions or comments? All in favor signify by saying aye.

**(All Councilmembers voted affirmatively)**

President Shetler: Those opposed?

**(No opposing votes were cast)**

President Shetler: So ordered.

BURDETTE PARK		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1450-1210	Bookkeeper/Day Camp Admin.	1,280.00	1,280.00
1450-1220	Maint/Mechanic	1,241.00	1,241.00
1450-1240	Secretary/Recept.	61.00	61.00
1450-1250	Maintenance	215.00	215.00
1450-1260	Maintenance	1,127.00	1,127.00
1450-1270	Carpenter/Iron Worker	627.00	627.00
1450-1280	Office Assistant	3,415.00	3,415.00
1450-1900	FICA	610.00	610.00
1450-1910	PERF	837.00	837.00
1450-3200	Utilities	20,000.00	20,000.00
Total		29,413.00	29,413.00

**(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)**

President Shetler: That was easy, Steve.

**COUNTY COUNCIL**

Councilmember Raben: County Council, Accrued Payments, FICA & PERF for a total of \$14,096, I'll move approval.

Councilmember Lloyd: Second.

President Shetler: Motion and a second. Do I have any questions, comments?

Councilmember Lloyd: Just a comment. This was for, I believe it was a County Clerk employee that left – is leaving, and those are the accrued payments to pay out the remaining vacation and other time. It's a standard thing that we run through County Council.

President Shetler: Okay, any other questions or comments? All in favor, signify by saying aye.

**(All Councilmembers voted affirmatively)**

President Shetler: Any opposed?

(No opposing votes were cast)

President Shetler: So ordered.

COUNTY COUNCIL		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1480-1971	Accrued Payments	12,240.00	12,240.00
1480-1900	FICA	937.00	937.00
1480-1910	PERF	919.00	919.00
Total		14,096.00	14,096.00

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

HIGHWAY

Councilmember Raben: Again, salary adjustments under County Highway for a total of \$23,489, I'll move approval.

Councilmember Bassemier: Second.

President Shetler: I have a motion and a second. Do I have any questions or comments? All in favor, signify by saying aye.

(All Councilmembers voted affirmatively)

President Shetler: Those opposed?

(No opposing votes were cast)

President Shetler: So ordered.

HIGHWAY		REQUESTED	APPROVED
2010-1020	Truck Driver	627.00	627.00
2010-1021	Truck Driver	610.00	610.00
2010-1022	Truck Driver	251.00	251.00
2010-1023	Truck Driver	922.00	922.00
2010-1024	Truck Driver	720.00	720.00
2010-1025	Truck Driver	752.00	752.00
2010-1026	Truck Driver	1,128.00	1,128.00
2010-1027	Truck Driver	1,197.00	1,197.00
2010-1028	Truck Driver	1,280.00	1,280.00
2010-1029	Truck Driver	125.00	125.00
2010-1030	Equipment Operator	376.00	376.00

(Table continued on next page)

2010-1031	Equipment Operator	501.00	501.00
2010-1032	Equipment Operator	1,089.00	1,089.00
2010-1033	Equipment Operator	410.00	410.00
2010-1035	Equipment Operator	251.00	251.00
2010-1036	Equipment Operator	152.00	152.00
2010-1037	Equipment Operator	1,253.00	1,253.00
2010-1038	Equipment Operator	839.00	839.00
2010-1042	Laborer	125.00	125.00
2010-1044	Laborer	189.00	189.00
2010-1046	Laborer	251.00	251.00
2010-1047	Laborer	125.00	125.00
2010-1050	Trash Container Driver	693.00	693.00
2010-1051	Trash Laborer	1,002.00	1,002.00
2010-1060	Mechanic	1,282.00	1,282.00
2010-1062	Asst. Mechanic	458.00	458.00
2010-1063	Grease Man	958.00	958.00
2010-1064	Tool Crib Clerk	1,378.00	1,378.00
2010-1065	Lead Man	859.00	859.00
2010-1066	Maintenance & Utility	1,253.00	1,253.00
2010-1067	Tool Crib & Janitor	1,002.00	1,002.00
2010-1068	Gas Man	1,431.00	1,431.00
Total		23,489.00	23,489.00

**(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)**

### **CUMULATIVE BRIDGE**

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Cum Bridge, for a total of \$4,455, I'll move approval.

Councilmember Kiefer: Second.

President Shetler: It's been moved and seconded. Do I have any questions or comments? All in favor signify by saying aye.

**(All Councilmembers voted affirmatively)**

President Shetler: Those opposed?

**(No opposing votes were cast)**

President Shetler: So ordered.

CUMULATIVE BRIDGE		REQUESTED	APPROVED
2030-1200-2030	Laborer	501.00	501.00
2030-1170-2030	Truck Driver	818.00	818.00
2030-1190-2030	Laborer	756.00	756.00
2030-1180-2030	Truck Driver	752.00	752.00
2030-1140-2030	Operator	1,628.00	1,628.00
Total		4,455.00	4,455.00

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

REASSESSMENT/AREA PLAN

Councilmember Raben: Under Reassessment/Area Plan, Miscellaneous Equipment in the amount of \$6,500, I'll move approval.

Councilmember Lloyd: Second.

President Shetler: We have a motion and a second. This is for that blueprint printer that we've talked about coming out of a couple of different, rather than general fund. So any other questions? Motion and a second. All in favor, signify by saying aye.

(All Councilmembers voted affirmatively)

President Shetler: Those opposed?

(No opposing votes were cast)

President Shetler: So ordered.

REASSESSMENT/AREA PLAN		REQUESTED	APPROVED
2490-1240-4250	Misc. Equipment	6,500.00	6,500.00
Total		6,500.00	6,500.00

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

TRANSFER REQUESTS

- SHERIFF

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE

HIGHWAY

LOCAL ROADS & STREETS

COUNTY COUNCIL (LATE)
- JAIL

CIRCUIT COURT

CUMULATIVE BRIDGE

CIRCUIT COURT SUPPLEMENTAL

Councilmember Raben: Now I'll ask, is everyone comfortable with all the transfer requests? No objections to any transfer requests? Okay, Mr. President, I'd like to make a motion to approve all transfers as listed.

Councilmember Kiefer: Second.

President Shetler: Motion and a second. Any questions, comments? All in favor, signify by saying aye.

(All Councilmembers voted affirmatively)

President Shetler: Any opposed?

(No opposing votes were cast)

President Shetler: So ordered.

SHERIFF		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1050-1130-0081	Deputy Sheriff	30,000.00	30,000.00
1050-1130-0015	Lieutenant	12,248.00	12,248.00
1050-1130-0024	Sergeant	11,569.00	11,569.00
To: 1050-1971	Accrued Payments	53,817.00	53,817.00

JAIL		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1051-1130-0343	Confinement Officer	7,000.00	7,000.00
To: 1051-1301	Civilian Overtime	7,000.00	7,000.00

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1230-3530	Contractual Services	361.00	361.00
To: 1230-4220	Office Machines	361.00	361.00

CIRCUIT COURT		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1360-3902	Grand Jurors	1,900.00	1,900.00
To: 1360-3903	Petit Jurors	1,900.00	1,900.00

HIGHWAY		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 2010-2230	Garage & Motor	3,500.00	3,500.00
To: 2010-2300	Uniforms	3,500.00	3,500.00

CUMULATIVE BRIDGE		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 2030-2000	Materials	24,000.00	24,000.00
2030-2230	Garage & Motor	1,000.00	1,000.00

(Table continued on next page)

To: 2030-4250	Misc. Equipment	24,000.00	24,000.00
2030-2300	Uniforms	1,000.00	1,000.00

LOCAL ROADS & STREETS		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 2160-2580	Calcium & Chloride	8,500.00	8,500.00
To: 2160-4310	Road Equipment	8,500.00	8,500.00

CIRCUIT COURT SUPPLEMENTAL ADULT PROBATION		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 2600-3510	Other Operating	475.00	475.00
To: 2600-3600	Rent	475.00	475.00

COUNTY COUNCIL		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1480-2600	Office Supplies	50.00	50.00
To: 1480-3700	Dues & Subscriptions	50.00	50.00

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

RESOLUTION TO TRANSFER FAMILY & CHILDREN’S FUNDS  
FROM THE LEVY EXCESS FUND TO THE RAINY DAY FUND

Councilmember Raben: Mr. President, we need to first move into Old Business/New Business, before we approve the amendments to the Salary Ordinance today.

President Shetler: Okay. We have no Old Business but under New Business, resolution to transfer the Children’s Fund/Excess Levy to Rainy Day Fund. This has kind of been outlined by statute in order to recover what is it, approximately half a million dollars or something, Bill?

Bill Fluty: \$522,233.28.

President Shetler: Alright, and what we need is a resolution to get that transferred into our general fund. Do I have any questions? Yes?

Councilmember Lloyd: Just a comment. This was something that came about from the property tax legislation from the state legislature where the county no longer has to collect for this. And the legislature allowed local government to recapture those funds. So that’s what this would be about. This would be the balance in the Children’s Fund for, I guess, welfare payments or whatever, and then what the county is looking to do is transfer that to the Rainy Day fund for emergencies or other expenditures in the future.

President Shetler: Okay, do I have a motion for approval of the resolution?

Councilmember Raben: So moved.

President Shetler: It's been moved.

Councilmember Lloyd: Second.

President Shetler: And seconded. Do I have any questions about the motion? All in favor signify by saying aye.

**(All Councilmembers voted affirmatively)**

President Shetler: Any opposed?

**(No opposing votes were cast)**

President Shetler: So ordered.

**(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)**

<b>CIRCUIT COURT BAILIFF INTERNS</b>
--

President Shetler: Vanderburgh County Circuit Court Bailiff Interns.

Councilmember Bassemier: Make a motion to approve.

President Shetler: I have a motion for approval.

Councilmember Lloyd: Second.

President Shetler: We have a second.

Councilmember Lloyd: Just a note that this is being paid out of, what was it, court miscellaneous fees, it's not going to affect the general fund and it's something I believe we'd approved in the past. So it seemed like a good use of the funds.

President Shetler: Do I have any other questions or comments? We have a motion and a second. All in favor signify by saying aye.

**(All Councilmembers voted affirmatively)**

President Shetler: Any opposed?

**(No opposing votes were cast)**

President Shetler: So ordered.

**(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)**

<b>PUBLIC DEFENDER EMPLOYEE CHANGE</b>
--

President Shetler: Next is Public Defender, employee change. I think this came out

of Job Study last week. Is this taking the part-times and –

Councilmember Lloyd: Right. This would be where the – actually, there is a possibility of saving the county money, but you take two part-time public defenders that are actually treated as full-time employees for benefit purposes: health insurance, pension. And what Mr. Owens requested was one full-time employee to replace those two part-time. So we would actually save some money on FICA and health insurance, things like that. But in conversations with him, he mentioned that as a full-time public defender, he would not be allowed any outside law practice, whereas the part-timers are allowed to have. So that's one difference. But anyway, this was something, all these requests here were approved by Job Study.

President Shetler: Okay, anybody have any questions or comments? Did we do a motion for approval on that yet?

Councilmember Lloyd: Motion to approve.

President Shetler: Okay, second?

Councilmember Raben: Second.

President Shetler: Alright, it's been moved and seconded. Do I have any questions about the motion? All in favor signify by saying aye.

**(All Councilmembers voted affirmatively)**

President Shetler: Any opposed?

**(No opposing votes were cast)**

President Shetler: Motion carries.

**(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)**

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>PROSECUTOR GRANT POSITIONS APPROVAL</b></p>
---

President Shetler: Next is in the Prosecutor's office, grant position approval. That, again, was approved by Job Study and in essence, we're getting some federal money in and trying to utilize that for a Chief Deputy position in the Prosecutor's office, I believe.

Councilmember Raben: This is for 35 hours a week, at \$15.00 an hour.

President Shetler: Do I have any –

Councilmember Raben: Move for approval.

President Shetler: It's been moved and do I have a second?

Councilmember Lloyd: This grant, I believe it was over \$100,000. It was for a Deputy Prosecutor Executive II, and the Council stipulated in the past when the grant runs out, the position would run out unless the Prosecutor makes some other arrangements.



President Shetler: Thank you, gentlemen. I appreciate brevity.

Councilmember Lloyd: But the position is fully funded by a grant in the Prosecutor's incentive fund and the Job Study did approve it.

President Shetler: Alright. Okay, do I have any questions about it, then?

Councilmember Lloyd: It was full-time, it's not part-time. It's a full-time Prosecutor.

President Shetler: But it was at 35, wasn't it?

Sandie Deig: No, that's the next one.

President Shetler: Oh, that's the next one. I'm sorry. Okay, we have a motion for approval and I need a second then, on that motion.

Councilmember Goebel: Second.

President Shetler: Okay, Councilman Goebel seconded. Do I have any other questions about the motion?

Councilmember Kiefer: I had a question. What happens when the grant money runs out? This position is gone, too?

Councilmember Lloyd: The position will be eliminated unless they find some other grant or some other method of funding the position. But it would not go on to the general fund for the Council.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay, thank you for clarifying that.

Councilmember Lloyd: We have Mr. Brown here if you had any other further questions.

Councilmember Kiefer: No, that's it. Thank you.

President Shetler: Okay, are there any other questions? All in favor signify by saying aye.

**(All Councilmembers voted affirmatively)**

President Shetler: Any opposed?

**(No opposing votes were cast)**

President Shetler: Motion carries.

**(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)**

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>SHERIFF COURT SCREENERS</b></p>
---

President Shetler: Next is on the Sheriff, three Court Screeners – did I skip one? Yeah, Sheriff, three Court Screeners to start off at a Step III. Two of them would start off with a Step III placement. Again, this was discussed at Job Study. In

essence, it has to do with the fact that we are having a couple Sheriff Deputies who have retired from the Sheriff's department and are moving over to be Screeners and their additional pay because of their experience in law enforcement. The fact that they're basically ready to go on the job, we felt at Job Study that those positions, those individuals needed, perhaps deserved a little bit of extra pay because of that, and that's why the Step III placement on it. This is not uncommon, and it's not breaking with new precedents, it's been done in the Prosecutor's office, it's been done in the Public Defender's office. In those cases, we hired retired Sheriff Deputies and there may be some cases of city police officers with the same thing. But what we've done is stepped them up because of their experience as investigators in those offices, so this is following the precedent of what we've done in the past. Again, this went to Job Study and it did pass, and I don't know if, Councilman Lloyd, you want to elaborate on that any further, but...

Councilmember Lloyd: At the Job Study, the Sheriff did indicate that the 20 plus years, I guess, law enforcement experience that these employees have would be beneficial to the positions of Screeners in the mission of security for the Civic Center, so based on that, based on their experience, the Job Study was comfortable with bringing them in at a higher level than a starting salary Court Screener that you would just hire off the street. So that's where the PAT III came from.

Councilmember Bassemier: I'll make a motion to approve.

President Shetler: It's been moved and....seconded...?

Councilmember Kiefer: I was going to ask another question.

President Shetler: Let's go with a second here first.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay, I'll second.

President Shetler: Now we'll answer your questions.

Councilmember Kiefer: I had a question for the Sheriff. I thought you were getting kind of lonely back there and you wanted to come up here.

Eric Williams: I'm going to try that new tactic of waiting till you're done with me and then show up.

Councilmember Kiefer: Of course, I know it's been up in the air whether or not all people get screened as they come through the Civic Center or not, but if for some reason there is less than 100% of the people entering, is the need for the employees, whether you have 100% of the employees come through the screening or just everybody but employees, does that affect the number of people that you need? I mean, say there is 600 fewer people coming through if they don't screen employees, how does that affect the number of people that you would require?

Eric Williams: I can't say definitely that yes it does affect it, but I think the answer would be yes, but it's going to be the reverse. The numbers that we requested were based on the plan that was recommended last night, that employees go through the turnstile screening as opposed to complete screening. Should we be in a position where we start screening all employees all the time, that may put us in a position where we need some additional help. This plan, these numbers were put together with the recommendation in mind that was made last night.

Councilmember Kiefer: Could you, like, briefly summarize your recommendation?

Eric Williams: Wow.

Councilmember Kiefer: I mean, one minute or less, I guess, or a couple of minutes?

Eric Williams: We're going to basically, the plan that was in place that was recommended by the ad hoc committee that was put together that consisted of myself, the Chief of Police, Circuit Court Judge Heldt, Superior Court Judge Pigman, Commissioner Tornatta, Superintendent of County Buildings Dave Rector, Security Manager Bruce Hargrave, members of Council had sat on the committee from time to time, the Mayor. Basically, the recommendation was that we duplicate what we've been doing in the courts into the Civic Center as quickly as we can. And that included a three tier level of screening. The first level being general public, basically the members of the general public would go through complete screening, magnetometer, X-raying their stuff. The second level would be the general employee screening which would be card carrying, swipe it, confirm the card is valid, go through the turnstile, still going through the three major checkpoints into the campus. And then the third tier is that alternate access and for those individuals because of the job position, security personnel, delivery contractors, officeholders, judges, that have to make entrance into the building from an alternate entrance other than those three. And they would do that electronically. All those entrances and exits are going to be recorded electronically, they're all going to be on camera, everybody will be screened, it's just your definition of screening and to what level they'll be screened. That was the recommendation.

Councilmember Kiefer: Thank you. That was pretty good.

Councilmember Bassemier: Mr. President, Sheriff, I thought you did a real good job last night explaining how this process would work. You did a real good job.

Eric Williams: Thank you. I appreciate that.

Councilmember Bassemier: You really did. I feel very comfortable with your recommendation and the board's.

President Shetler: Anybody else have any other questions, particularly, about these positions? Councilman Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: I agree with all the positions and I think they need to be filled. I just have a little issue with the starting salary. So are we voting on them separately or –

President Shetler: Yeah, I can do a roll call vote on it.

Councilmember Goebel: Thank you.

President Shetler: Alright, thank you. Any other questions or comments? Let's see, I think we did have a motion and a second.

Councilmember Goebel: There is no doubt that the individuals coming in have paid their dues. Sheriff Williams recommended them very highly and that carries so much weight, but the salary issue is one that bothers me.

President Shetler: Alright, thank you. Yes, Councilman Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: So I guess the staff is going to be seven – is it going to be seven Screeners?

Eric Williams: I think we're confusing issues. We were hiring three new Screeners, which adds to my two, which would be a total of five civilian security Screeners assigned to both the courts and the Civic Center to complement the contingent of deputies that are assigned to secure the courts.

Councilmember Lloyd: And these two are going to be paid at a higher level based on their prior law enforcement experience?

Eric Williams: Yes, the three new positions that came in when I appeared before Job Study, one of them is basically off the street, they were a prior employee of the Sheriff's office but their experience with the Sheriff's office didn't equate to better experience over in the courts. But the two that are retiring as Deputy Sheriffs, their 20 plus years of experience, I think, do very well equate to being a better qualified, and a quicker learner, more adept at being able to handle that job much more quickly. They've got all the security training that we would need, they know the routines, they know the personalities, and they've been out on the streets for years being able to defend themselves, so I think they're a perfect fit for that position.

Councilmember Lloyd: And they're under, is it Sergeant Goedde?

Eric Williams: Yes, Sergeant Goedde is their immediate supervisor.

Councilmember Lloyd: Is he just the Civic Center or is he both sides?

Eric Williams: He's going to handle both. There was no value to us in being able to expand and create two different units, so we're going to create – we're just going to expand it into the Civic Center because there's going to be some ability, that way the Civic Center can draw from extra resources that may make themselves available in courts on slow days and vice versa. You know, we can load balance a little bit between our employees, too, by making that one unit as opposed to separating the units.

Councilmember Lloyd: Okay, great, thank you.

President Shetler: Mr. Rector, a question came up and I know you were there last night, I don't know if you stayed through the duration or not, but I guess a question came up by Councilman Lloyd or a point, several voiced a concern about staying out and it's happened to me before in the court building. In inclement weather trying to get through the security, if perhaps we could contact, you know, I'll promote a local vendor here that's a pretty good manufacturer of canvas, Anchor Industries, for example, who we might be able to get some vendor to come in and install some kind of canopy or whatever in those two entrances, the one on the court building existing today and then the back door here that would extend that out a little bit so we could keep the public out of the inclement weather as best as possible. Is that feasible or could you check into that for us?

Dave Rector: That is certainly feasible. I think this is going to be new to all of us, we're going to have to see how the flow goes, what the queuing is, how we stack up and in the inclement weather, I think, obviously we do need something for cover for the building. We want it to be attractive to the Civic Center, but I will explore some opportunities to do something for some covering at those locations if, indeed, it starts that we have people standing out in bad weather.

President Shetler: Well, like I said, I think it exists already at the other – in the court building per se, so it might be something we'd look into because it's relatively inexpensive, I think, in the whole scheme of things here, so if we could – you know, for a few thousand dollars, a few small thousand dollars there, I think we could protect the public from inclement weather, I think that might go a long way.

Dave Rector: I'll get some estimates for you.

President Shetler: Alright, thank you.

Councilmember Raben: You know, would you, Dave, today, I mean, if you're going to come and go through basically one door now, today, right? I mean, you don't want people exiting the building that could allow somebody to come through where people are exiting, so we've got large foyer areas that you can probably put some of those, you know, where you wrap lines?

Dave Rector: Actually, we'll have three entrances: the courts building existing and then the two entrances to this building. But if you've noticed in the front of the building, Martin Luther King side, it is immediate. As soon as you come in is where we have the metal detector and X-ray machine and I think there's a good opportunity, we may have some people stacking up outside.

Councilmember Raben: But the doors as you – walking into that building, that's set up on the far left side of that entrance area, the doors to the right and there's multiple doors there, those will now be locked, right?

Dave Rector: There will be an exit only and we'll have a tensile barrier across there to prevent the public and visitors and employees so that they can't come in straight up the stairs, they'll have to go through screening of some sort. So those doors really won't be available to set up a queuing stand.

President Shetler: Okay, any other questions or comments? Yes, Councilman Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Mrs. Deig reminded me, the two Court Screeners are currently being paid at the entry level salary and it would be up to this Council to approve moving them to the Step III. So as of right now, they're all being paid the same and that's depending on our action.

President Shetler: And that's what this motion is for, to move them to a Step III.

Sandie Deig: In the past, they've all started at the initiation (inaudible, microphone not turned on)

President Shetler: Right. Do we need to clarify the fact that this is going to be retroactive or is that assumed?

Sandie Deig: (Inaudible)

President Shetler: Okay, so the motion might – who made the motion, I'm sorry?

Councilmember Bassemier: I made it.

President Shetler: Yes, Ed, we might want to amend that motion to include some wording in there that makes it retroactive because these gentlemen started the

second?

Eric Williams: October 19<sup>th</sup>.

Councilmember Bassemier: I'll amend it and Joe seconded it.

President Shetler: And Joe seconded, so is that alright with you?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yeah, I'll amend it to say it's retroactive to the (inaudible)

President Shetler: Okay, alright. Does anybody have a question about that or comments?

Councilmember Goebel: This is just for the two –

President Shetler: Those are just for those two, that's correct. Councilman Sutton, do I need to bring you up to, I mean, you've caught most of the discussion here?

Councilmember Sutton: We had discussion last week and the material that the Sheriff provided to us was pretty helpful, so I'm fine.

President Shetler: Alright, thank you. Anything else? Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: I'll vote yes but with some reservation on this, but I will still vote yes, thanks.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Aye. There being six ayes, one nay, the motion carries.

**(Motion carried 6-1/Councilmember Goebel opposed)**

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>SHERIFF SEVEN CONFINEMENT OFFICERS</b></p>
--

President Shetler: The next is on the seven Confinement Officers. Do I have a motion for approval?

Councilmember Raben: I'll move approval.

President Shetler: It's been moved and...

Councilmember Lloyd: Second.

President Shetler: Seconded. Do I have any questions about the motion? All in favor signify by saying aye.

**(All Councilmembers voted affirmatively)**

President Shetler: Any opposed?

**(No opposing votes were cast)**

President Shetler: Motion carries.

**(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)**

Eric Williams: Thank you.

President Shetler: Thank you, Sheriff.

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>SHERIFF PART-TIME SEX OFFENDER REGISTRY CLERK</b></p>
---

Councilmember Raben: Tom, could we go back to –

Councilmember Lloyd: On the Sheriff, there is also a part-time Clerk replacement, Sex Offender Registry Clerk, I don't believe it's on the agenda, \$9.00 an hour for 20 hours.

Councilmember Goebel: That is one where you've actually reduced the time, is that correct?

Eric Williams: Yes. That's the part-time position that we have that handles all the registry entries for the sex offender registry. That part-time person is one of the new Court Screener positions. That position used to carry, I believe, 32 hours a week at a rate of about 10 something an hour. In the meantime, while she was in that position, our being able to automate some things, we've gotten this down to a fairly fine science. It's fairly well automated. The need for the hours is not the same nor is the value of the experience in there, so I felt very comfortable reducing that to 20 hours a week and reducing the salary back to the normal part-time range within the county. But we do need the help to keep that registry up to date.

President Shetler: Yes, Councilman Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: And this is funded through the fees collected, correct?

Eric Williams: Yeah. When we asked for this position originally, it was shortly before we had asked for you to implement and the Commission to implement the sex offender registry fee that's allowed by law. So basically, the fees we collect we return to the general fund to help fund this position. And I think last year we turned in about 16,000, which should cover the position.

Councilmember Goebel: Well, I think the program you've initiated here has brought a lot of very good reception from the general public because it's something needed and I think you're doing a great job in this regard.

Eric Williams: Well, I appreciate that. One of the things I am very proud of is the sex offender registry. The model that we started several years ago when this first became an issue for the Sheriff's office is really the model now that's used across the state. We have many, many agencies from around the state and the country that ask us for our system that we have in place, our forms that we use and how we hold our offenders accountable in our community. So I am proud of the work that Corporal Wedding and the staff have done on that.

President Shetler: Okay, any other questions? I think we need a motion for approval on that.

Councilmember Lloyd: Motion to approve.

Councilmember Goebel: Second.

President Shetler: It's been moved and seconded. Do I have any further questions on the motion?

Councilmember Sutton: You said we don't have it on the agenda, where do we have that?

Councilmember Lloyd: The last page of the salary ordinance amendments, page 4, and it's under the Sheriff, the third item, approving a replacement of a part-time clerk, Sex Offender Registry Clerk, at \$9.00 an hour for 20 hours.

Councilmember Sutton: Okay, okay.

Councilmember Lloyd: So I make a motion to approve that as noted.

Councilmember Raben: We'll actually pick that up with document itself or we can – the motion is out there, that's fine.

President Shetler: Okay, so we've got a motion and a second. Any questions about it? Any further questions? All in favor signify by saying aye.

**(All Councilmembers voted affirmatively)**

President Shetler: Any opposed?

**(No opposing votes were cast)**

President Shetler: Motion carries.

**(Motion unanimously approved 6-0/Councilmember Kiefer was out of room)**



<p><b>PROSECUTOR PART-TIME VICTIMS OF CRIME ACT/ASSISTANCE RECOVERY ACT GRANT EMPLOYEE</b></p>
--

President Shetler: Okay, you wanted to go back?

Councilmember Raben: We need to go back to the Prosecutor.

President Shetler: For the part-time?

Councilmember Raben: We probably didn't need to approve those individually, but the approval of the part-time, and I'll move approval.

President Shetler: And this is a part-time position in the Prosecutor's office?

Councilmember Raben: At 35 hours a week at \$15 an hour. This will be funded by the grant in the Prosecutor's Incentive Fund.

Councilmember Goebel: Second.

President Shetler: It's been moved and seconded. Do I have any questions?

Councilmember Lloyd: Just a note that the Personnel Administration Committee did approve this.

President Shetler: Okay. All in favor signify by saying aye.

**(All Councilmembers voted affirmatively)**

President Shetler: Anyone opposed?

**(No opposing votes were cast)**

President Shetler: Motion carries.

**(Motion unanimously approved 6-0/Councilmember Kiefer was out of room)**

<p><b>HIGHWAY SUPERINTENDENT VEHICLE PURCHASE</b></p>
---

President Shetler: Next is County Highway Superintendent.

Councilmember Lloyd: You missed the Health Department.

President Shetler: I've got F, for the County Highway Superintendent next.

Chris Walsh: Chris Walsh, County Highway department.

President Shetler: Does anybody have any questions?

Councilmember Goebel: Do we have any information on this?

President Shetler: Okay, what is this – it's a request for buying a couple or purchasing a couple of vehicles, is that correct?

Chris Walsh: Correct.

President Shetler: I don't know if anybody, because I'm just now seeing – has anybody gotten a copy of this? Basically, it's a request to purchase a Ford Expedition 2010?

Chris Walsh: Two vehicles, yeah. An Expedition and a four wheel drive. It's part of the rotation of our fleet. Both vehicles are about ten years old and we've put in motors and transmissions and they're just in pretty bad shape. And this was the year that those two came up.

President Shetler: So what you currently have is a Ford Expedition, it's a year 2000?

Chris Walsh: '99 or 2000, correct.

President Shetler: And you have a Ford or a 150 pickup truck?

Chris Walsh: Again, I think a '99 or a 2000.

President Shetler: Okay. I noticed both – and I'll pass this around, I apologize. I'm just seeing this for the first time myself. But the Expedition, I noticed it's an XLT and I noticed the –

Chris Walsh: And that was the cheapest that came in as far as you can't get any cheaper packages, apparently to get a four wheel drive in that. Dollar wise, we wound up coming in under that part of the budget and that was the only vehicle that really worked for what we were looking at.

President Shetler: Do we have mechanics on duty out there at the county garage that work on and service them?

Chris Walsh: Yeah, we run 99 percent of all that through our department. We did get one mechanic's slot, I guess, funded for 2010.

Councilmember Bassemier: You've got a vacancy right now, don't you?

Chris Walsh: Right. Correct.

Councilmember Bassemier: And I understand he's working very hard in order to keep up.

President Shetler: How many miles do those vehicles have on them?

Chris Walsh: The odometer broke on the one I'm driving. Its got somewhere around 100,000. When it does come on, it comes on different mileage half the time. It's been a good vehicle. Both vehicles have been good. We've stretched them out as long as we can. If we hold the rotation off, next year I need one more four wheel drive and then we were looking at the bigger trucks. It will knock me out of my rotation to keep the fleet up and running.

President Shetler: I think Weights & Measures would feel like they got new Cadillacs or something.

Councilmember Goebel: Aren't we knocked out of rotation somewhat anyway in light of the economy?

Chris Walsh: Yeah, and we've adjusted in many other areas. This was funded in the 2009 budget so we have put in for those two vehicles at this time. Both these vehicles are running on their last legs. I'm just trying to keep the fleet up and going.

Councilmember Kiefer: Mr. President, you said, Chris, you said they're running on their last legs so they are not running properly now? I mean, they're having some problems?

Chris Walsh: Yeah, we just put a motor, transmission, and these vehicles go under a tremendous amount of – we're on-road, off-road, in all kinds of weather, over trees, they have a rough life. I mean, --

Councilmember Kiefer: Is there a possibility for like, these are just trucks, pickup trucks, they're not –

Chris Walsh: One is a four wheel drive pickup truck and one is a replacement for the Superintendent's vehicle.

Councilmember Kiefer: But it's not got, like, extra equipment on it that causes –

Chris Walsh: The packages, the way they do them anymore, the only way you can get an Expedition is to get that package. They have higher packages, that's –

Councilmember Kiefer: No, no, no, what I meant was they don't have extra things on it for your job. You know, --

Chris Walsh: No, not at this time. I'll have to fit the trucks when they come in, but we'll just refit them with the radio systems and that.

Councilmember Kiefer: Yeah, I guess what I'm asking is, can, have you explored any opportunities for like maybe rebuilt engines or –

Chris Walsh: One truck has been through and the under carriage, it's just on it's last legs. I mean, it's –

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay, so you've explored other options, then?

President Shetler: Councilman Raben?

Councilmember Raben: I mean, I don't necessarily question the need for replacement of a 100,000 plus mileage vehicle that's used to haul and basically never gets out of the county, that's probably the equivalent to 250 on a vehicle that gets some highway use, but I guess I do kind of question the need, whether we need Expeditions and stuff like that, and I don't know how we ever got into those. But it seems like the more practical use for the County Highway would be pickups. You can put shovels and equipment and –

Chris Walsh: Well, the Superintendent's vehicle is used for travel, for training, we go to road school, we go to different training seminars, and not only myself, but my personnel will use that vehicle. It's really not always used just for myself. It's the vehicle that if three or four people are going to Louisville to a snow rodeo or snow exposition, that's the vehicle we use because it's the only one in the fleet that can carry that many people.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, I did see a third row seat on that proposal that was

an extra 800 and something, which –

Chris Walsh: I didn't want the third row seat, I think it came with it.

Councilmember Raben: Okay.

Chris Walsh: We would never use the third row seat to be honest with you.

President Shetler: Did we go through normal procedures on this? I mean, go through Purchasing and put it out for public bid?

Chris Walsh: Correct. We followed the purchasing outline that's always been followed under my understanding of how this department has always done.

President Shetler: This was advertised and we had several different dealers and –

Chris Walsh: In the purchasing outline, less than \$50,000 expenditure is three informal, verbal or written quotes and that's what we did. We actually had one or two more that didn't respond, which you would think would respond in this economy, but...

Councilmember Raben: Another question real quick, as we look at replacing vehicles like this, this predates you so I'm just wanting a little update. I guess we've had discussion a few different times on a need or a want for replacing a gradall or gradalls. Has that situation cured itself or –

Chris Walsh: No, the situation was, when I came before you last, that mini excavator is supposed to help give us a little different look at how our construction needs are being met. The construction needs are changing as well with the addition of all the different subdivisions within the last twenty years. We have a greater need to get off the road and get into the right-of-ways between homes and that. That mini excavator is going to take the load off of some of these gradalls, is our hope. So I'm not necessarily not in need of a gradall, but this is, that mini excavator is a tool to help us relieve the load on the gradall.

Councilmember Raben: So equipment-wise, we're not really looking at any big needs or requests now with the addition of the –

Chris Walsh: We're going to get this mini excavator and try and utilize it in place of the gradall whenever possible, which will extend the life of the gradall, hopefully.

President Shetler: Councilman Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: President Shetler, I don't know if we're ready to make a vote on this today with just getting the information. Can we postpone it until our next meeting when we've had time to maybe get a rationale for the need and things like that?

President Shetler: If that's the pleasure of the Council, I have no problem. Will that cause a problem for you all as far as purchasing is concerned and pricing or –

Chris Walsh: It shouldn't. It shouldn't in that regard. I just want to – as long as – is it going to be like next week or I think the bids will still be good for another week or two. I don't know when your next meeting is.

President Shetler: Councilman Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: I guess one point, for some reason, you guys didn't go through the joint purchasing department and I just wondered why.

Chris Walsh: We just followed the guidelines that were given to me when I came in on how to purchase equipment and that's what we've tried to go by. If there has been some changes that I'm not aware of, I certainly apologize.

Councilmember Lloyd: Well, they also use a state vehicle QPA.

Chris Walsh: And we looked that up on the computer and there was not, the vehicles that we were looking for weren't on there.

Councilmember Lloyd: Okay, so they had a list and not what you were –

Chris Walsh: Correct. Correct.

Councilmember Lloyd: I also wondered about the joint purchasing, though, I mean, I think for vehicles or for large purchases, it may be different for a gradall, but I would think that they would be helpful.

Chris Walsh: That would have fell into a different category.

Councilmember Kiefer: Just a question to clarify, you know, on the Expedition, you know, on the point that Councilman Raben brought up about the type of vehicle you need. Is the Expedition, is the reason you need that is because when you do travel, you need that extra space?

Chris Walsh: Yeah, we take, you know, it's not just for myself, it's for – and one thing, we're trying to do more and more training, which is going to put us more and more, the training isn't here locally, it's Louisville, St. Louis –

Councilmember Kiefer: Just out of curiosity, how many trips a year would that be? Is it one or five or ten?

Chris Walsh: In the past there hasn't been that many – three. I'd like to, depending on the expenditures, how much I can put towards training, I'm all about training and we want to get as many trips as we can. I'd like to see, you know, eight or nine trips.

Councilmember Kiefer: Just a thought or an idea, would you consider maybe downsizing your vehicle and then when you take your trip, just turn in mileage, drive a personal vehicle and turn in mileage because I think that might be cheaper than paying for the upsize in the vehicle. It's just a consideration, you know, if we're going to postpone this, might be worth the savings to turn in mileage to drive to Louisville or Indianapolis or wherever and just drive a personal vehicle.

President Shetler: I have a recommendation on the floor of postponing this to the next meeting. Do I have any objection to that?

Councilmember Lloyd: That would be December 2<sup>nd</sup>.

President Shetler: Yes. Or we –

Councilmember Bassemier: Are you sure these quotes will hold up because our next

meeting is about three weeks away, end of this month.

Chris Walsh: I hope so. I'd have to check with Dave Hudson who takes cares of all the bids on our vehicles and our equipment and that to be sure that the quotes will still be good.

Councilmember Raben: These were approved by the Commission, correct?

Chris Walsh: The Commission was aware of...

Councilmember Raben: I don't know, I see Commissioner Tornatta is in the audience. They oversee the garage, just his thoughts.

Councilmember Lloyd: I guess another question would be, would we want to have them go through joint purchasing and see if they get a better price on these vehicles.

Councilmember Raben: Looking at the Expedition, that looked like there was 10 or 11,000 off of sticker, it might be difficult to find anything close to that. I mean, I don't think the state's QPA is a better deal than that.

Councilmember Sutton: Yeah, you've got one vehicle, you've got 10,000 off. The other, 8,000 off. So finding something more favorable would be pretty tough to find.

Councilmember Raben: I don't question the competitiveness of those quotes whatsoever. You know, the only other question I had was on the need on the Expedition, but –

Troy Tornatta: Commissioner Tornatta. You know, one way I look is, let's say we downgrade Chris to a, I don't know a downgrade to what, but you put him in a pickup truck, take the difference in the two costs, and then we're having a need on, obviously, in the county is when people do go and travel, do they take their own personal vehicles or do they end up renting a van? Or does the county buy a van? Those are some opportunities that we have outside if we put somebody in just a two cab situation. I think what I'd look at is the difference in the price between say an Expedition and another vehicle. And if we think that there is that big a difference, factoring in renting a van or renting some vehicles when they have to go to other places, which is what I would almost expect to do, then I think you have more of an answer.

President Shetler: Well, the difference is about 6 or \$7,000 savings and if we're amortizing it ten years, you're talking 6 or \$700 a year. So I don't know that you're going to necessarily recoup that per se.

Chris Walsh: That vehicle is used for other things as well, say in the event of a, not even a disaster, but a big wind event, Councilmembers, Commissioners, that vehicle is used to take officials, more than one. Our pickup trucks are really geared for just one other passenger, where this vehicle can take three or four people, get to the scene, show them what we have, let them make a determination.

Troy Tornatta: But the key is, it has to be four wheel drive and it has to have some type of clearance, and I think that's where the Expedition has it that some of the other vehicles for–

President Shetler: The only, I guess, point in going along with Councilman Kiefer is that if we went with like an Explorer, it still seats seven or eight people, then you

have accomplished both ends. You've lowered your cost 6 or \$7,000, you've accommodated your out of town meetings, and you're able to get people transferred around town and stuff on job sites when you need to. And I guess that would be the other alternative as opposed to a two or three seat type pickup truck.

Troy Tornatta: And I don't know the cost –

President Shetler: And I don't know if they're heavy enough.

Troy Tornatta: – \$6,000, that's my thing. I'm thinking at the max, it's 3,000 and that just depends what their product is on the –

Councilmember Kiefer: You might want to consider fuel economy, too, because if you go with an Explorer and maybe it gets 10 percent better gas mileage over 100,000, you're talking 25,000, you know.

Troy Tornatta: Right.

Councilmember Kiefer: You know, so there's some – at \$2.50 a gallon, you know, there might be some consideration in that, too.

Councilmember Bassemier: Mr. President? Explorer is a lot smaller car. That Expedition, we use one out at the Airport. I mean, you can fold those seats down, we can get a lot of tools in that Expedition. Not only that, but you know, you can drop the seats down and we had an Explorer before and it was small. It was real crowded if you're wanting to transport anything and –

Chris Walsh: And in our estimation, and in ten years of looking at this vehicle, it is too small to –

Councilmember Bassemier: Yeah, in fact, I picked up some furniture yesterday in my Expedition, you can put a lot of stuff in when you drop the seats down. It's almost equivalent to a small pickup truck and it's enclosed, so.

Troy Tornatta: And I just want to say, is I totally understand the gas economy, what we're looking at there. I mean, I get that. I think the difference is, for the practicality of what we have to do and the terrain that he has to go over, it most mimics the pickup truck where the Explorer most mimics more of a personal or smaller SUV. But what he's doing, I believe it most mimics that pickup truck.

President Shetler: You currently have an Expedition or an Explorer?

Chris Walsh: Explorer.

President Shetler: You currently have an Explorer?

Chris Walsh: That's what –

President Shetler: And that's served the needs for the last ten years?

Chris Walsh: It's been used for the last ten years. It hasn't always served the needs, it's been too small, it can't carry as much people and you can't put as much in it.

President Shetler: Alright, Councilman Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: I still move that we postpone and, Chris, I know this is relatively new for you, but maybe you could come up with a rationale and give us the copies of the bids that I think we have one copy here today so we can look at it further. Maybe if we have questions, we can call you on that and move it to the next meeting so we can move on.

President Shetler: Yeah, we do have a recommendation, we can make that in the form of a motion, but if everyone pretty well agrees then we could just postpone it without a motion. Do I have anybody objecting to postponing this to the next meeting? It sounds like it is not going to handicap you all from performing your duties, so alright –

Councilmember Bassemier: Chris, why don't you get a price of a four wheel drive pickup truck? I tell you, we got a heck of a deal on our Expedition.

Chris Walsh: Sure, there's two vehicles in question and one is a four wheel drive.

President Shetler: And there's no doubt, the prices are good, but we would like to – yeah, even the Explorer. I think the Explorer, because you're using that today or something equivalent, and I really hate to keep pushing the Ford product per se, because, I mean, there's other places to go like GM, Chrysler.

Chris Walsh: Municipal bidding has always made them a lot more aggressive, that's why you'll see such a big difference between them and some other ones.

Councilmember Lloyd: Okay, the only thing I would add, I would still question whether you'd want to go through Purchasing and see if they could find a better price for you.

Chris Walsh: Oh, I just want to follow procedure and my estimation was, I was following procedure to the letter. So if I'm not, I will.

President Shetler: Okay, thank you.

<p><b>COOPERATIVE EXTENSION EMPLOYMENT REQUEST</b></p>
--

President Shetler: Alright, let's go on to the next item which is Coop Extension. And we have an employment request.

Susan Plassmeier: This is to replace a person that's on a grant, so the money is there for that position. We came before you a couple of months ago and you approved a new hire in a position that was for that grant also. We have two part-time people, it's a grant through St. Mary's.

President Shetler: And none of it comes from the general fund, it's all totally funded within that grant?

Susan Plassmeier: Yes.

President Shetler: Do I have any questions? Yes?

Councilmember Goebel: For how long is the grant?

Susan Plassmeier: It goes through next summer.



Councilmember Sutton: How long have you had this particular grant or this position funded through a grant?

Susan Plassmeier: This is the third year.

President Shetler: Okay, any questions? Motion for approval would be –

Councilmember Raben: I move approval.

Councilmember Lloyd: Second.

President Shetler: It's been moved and seconded and do I have any other questions about the motion? Comments? All in favor signify by saying aye.

**(All Councilmembers voted affirmatively)**

President Shetler: Anyone opposed?

**(No opposing votes were cast)**

President Shetler: Motion carries. Thank you.

Susan Plassmeier: Thank you.

**(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)**

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>HEALTH DEPARTMENT TITLE CHANGE</b></p>
--

President Shetler: Next is the Health department title change and, again, this went before Job Study. Councilman Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Okay, this is a request, the funding for 2010 is already in place. The position is Executive I, I believe, is what the recommendation was and that's what Mr. Deisher, the consultant to the Personnel Committee and the County Council, came in, factored in, he said it was close to a one or a two, and we came in with the one. But we would ask, request that the position title change be made from Health Department Executive Director to Health Department Administrator. Make that in the form of a motion.

Councilmember Sutton: Second.

President Shetler: It's been moved and seconded. Do I have any questions about the motion? All in favor, signify by saying aye.

**(All Councilmembers voted affirmatively)**

President Shetler: Anyone opposed?

**(No opposing votes were cast)**

President Shetler: Motion carries.

**(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)**

<b>AMENDMENTS TO SALARY ORDINANCE</b>
---------------------------------------

President Shetler: Let's go back to the amendments to the salary ordinance, then, because I think we've covered everything.

Councilmember Raben: We've got, what is it, four pages of amendments to the salary ordinance. I'm not going to read these out individually, I'm going to move that we approve the four pages of salary amendments and ask that they be made part of the minutes.

Councilmember Sutton: Second.

President Shetler: We have a motion and a second for approval of the salary ordinance. Do I have any questions? Any comments? All in favor signify by saying aye.

**(All Councilmembers voted affirmatively)**

President Shetler: Anyone opposed?

**(No opposing votes were cast)**

Councilmember Goebel: Does this include the one we already voted on?

President Shetler: It would, so roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. There being six ayes, one nay, the motion carries.

**(Motion carried 6-1/Councilmember Goebel opposed)**

<b>HIRING FREEZE RESOLUTION</b>
---------------------------------

President Shetler: Next, then, is we have a recommendation on the resolution that we passed back in July on the hiring freeze, to amend that and with some new wording. Councilman Sutton, I think, originally had recommended that. I don't know if Councilman Sutton wants to start off with this or how we want to proceed on it.

Councilmember Sutton: Well, hopefully, everyone has had a chance to read over the adjustments that we've made to the resolution and to reflect on a couple of different issues – clarify some issues, maybe I should put it that way. In this particular resolution, we are –

**(Tape changed)**

– in that this covers full and part-time positions that may be requested in addition to the number of employees that we have now, clarifying that, and then the paragraph below makes a distinction between the existing or the requested position and then the existing position. The existing positions reflecting the pleasure of this Council in having any requests that come before us, that it would be to the Council's discretion to grant or not to grant position vacancies that may occur among the various offices. So just try to clean up the language a little bit. I don't know if there's any – I haven't heard any other recommendations or suggestions on it. If so, this would be a good time for us to talk about those recommendations.

President Shetler: I guess the question I have, when we change the wording around from employee to position, when an employee leaves, that position is not really vacated so there would be no reason for anybody to come back here to fill that. And what we were trying to accomplish in July was that when we have employees existing, that we control the size of county government somewhat. So that would be back to the department heads to go ahead and fill that position because there is no vacancy in the position, only in an employee. So, I mean, is that the intent?

Councilmember Sutton: Well, the intent is to take the focus off a person and put the emphasis on the slot that they hold, the position in themselves. So rather than Jim Jones or Terry Martin, or whatever, it is the actual – so here, we're making a distinction between the present positions that we have and then even positions that may be requested over and above what we may have already listed in our salary ordinance.

President Shetler: Okay, we have a nurse in the Health department, for example, that retires. That employee has vacated and is gone, and severed her role, but the position remains, so the health officer would be allowed underneath this scenario to go ahead and fill that position without coming to Council?

Councilmember Sutton: No. Under this scenario, that officeholder, if you're using the Health department, they would still have to come before Council to fill that position.

Councilmember Kiefer: Comment: you know, under this language here where it says retain, I see where Tom gets confused because it says retain those positions. Maybe you just change that word retain to fill. You know, decisions to fill those positions or refill or however you want to say it.

President Shetler: See, there is a distinction between an employee who occupies a position and a position in and of itself, there is a distinction between that, because while an employee may leave, the position itself has not been vacated. We haven't really vacated that and we've required people to come back.

Councilmember Kiefer: Well, I know, and that's why I'm saying, you know, the fill, you could have a position, but it could be unfilled.

Councilmember Raben: Just a – if you read the fourth paragraph, I think it's potato/potahto here, really, because it says: Whereas the County Council believes that when vacancies in existing county positions occur, decisions to retain those positions will be evaluated by the County Council on a case by case basis. So we're still not opening up the door for anyone to rehire either, Royce's term, that slot, or your term, that person. I mean, we still have that, we're still saying that regardless of the situation, you know, you have to come before us first. So I don't think we're really giving or losing or getting anything here. I think, you know, it's clear, that we still have the final say.

President Shetler: Jeff, do you have any –

Jeff Ahlers: My only observation was, I guess as you pointed out, was the difference between the word positions or employees is whether it could be misinterpreted. I mean, I guess as long as you clarify it in there or you can do whatever you want to do is that would be the only thing, is that a position is really not eliminated unless it's taken out of the ordinance and a salary line item. So the position still remains. So the questions is whether you're saying there will be no new positions or whether it's no new employees. So that would be the only thing is that I think that on a hiring freeze, it's probably clear what the use of the word employees, but I mean, I guess, if you clarify, I mean, you can do whatever you want to do.

Councilmember Raben: The only other thing you could say is positions/employee or something. I mean, if you want to completely clear it up, that takes care of both sides.

President Shetler: I think it does. Does that, do you have a problem with that, Councilman?

Councilmember Sutton: No, I'm – I mean, as long as when we – whatever we vote on, I want to make sure that one: we're clear what this resolution should say but then we can communicate that because there does appear to be a lot of misunderstanding and misinformation that's out there among the department heads. So as long as we can also make that clear to them.

President Shetler: Yeah, and I applaud you and I appreciate the fact that you've tackled this pretty monstrous type of thing that we've created here, but I just want to be clear on it because I don't want somebody to come back to us later and say, I didn't eliminate a position, there is no need for me to come here. I eliminated an employee. And so, therefore, I filled it on my own. And as long as we have that clear language in there, that they must come back, then I have no problem. And do you think that resolves –

Jeff Ahlers: I mean, if you want to make it absolutely clear, what you could do is basically, like Councilman, because I looked at this as Councilman Kiefer suggested. In that third Whereas clause, when it says: decisions to retain those positions, you could say: to retain or fill those positions. And then the: Be it resolved paragraph,

down there in that second line where it says: no new full-time or part-time positions, you could say: or employees shall be hired and retention of existing, and then that way it's absolutely clear and I guess is the best of both worlds, if that's what you want to do to make it absolutely clear. And then the other thing is, is that, I guess, in doing this at the last minute, what I would suggest is, at the top, under the title, take out full-time, because we're really talking about all employees. So in the title, I would take out full time, and then I think it seems to accomplish what everybody is wanting to do.

Councilmember Sutton: Let me repeat back what you just said just so that we're all clear. So starting with the title of the resolution, amended resolution to suspend the hiring of all county employees?

Jeff Ahlers: Yeah.

Councilmember Sutton: In 2009.

Jeff Ahlers: Yes, or you just say, of county employees or if you want to say all.

President Shetler: Suspend the hiring of county employees.

Councilmember Sutton: Okay, alright. Then we skip down to the fourth paragraph or fourth Whereas, and the second line: decisions to retain or fill those positions, then down into the fifth paragraph, second line: no new full-time or part-time positions or employees shall be hired, correct, change there.

Jeff Ahlers: I think that sort of accomplishes what I hear everybody collectively saying. Does that make everything clear then?

President Shetler: Right. Thank you. Councilman Lloyd and then Councilman Goebel.

Councilmember Lloyd: One thing I had a problem with, under paragraph four, the second sentence: Priority consideration will be given to requests to retain existing positions which would impact financial controls, revenue and public safety. I agree with that, but I don't think, I mean, what that says is some employees are more important than others. I think every county officeholder would say their employees are the most important. So I just think that whole sentence should be struck and it's up to the Council to determine that rather – even though I would agree, obviously, financial controls are important. If you can bring in revenue, that would help the county's general fund, but I think you're making an issue there of certain employees when we're still going to evaluate every position. But I would recommend that sentence be struck.

Councilmember Sutton: Point well taken. But essentially, that's what we're going to do when they come before us anyway is make some value or discretionary judgement call based upon what we believe is a higher or best need. To try to, I guess, put those in very generic type of terms, not necessarily saying one employee is graded or valued more than another, but just kind of in light of some of the discussion that we had, and some of the maybe misinformation that may be kind of floating around out there, I thought we may need to maybe at least clarify some of that. I mean, I'm fine if we strike that, but I think that at least something needs to be said in that regard.

President Shetler: Well, kind of going back to my employee position argument or

point there, and I think what we really are saying is that, we are saying that one position does serve a little higher need than another position. Not that one employee is more important than another, but that one position may be more important than another. And I think that's certainly true that you do have to weigh that. I mean, I think there is a certain amount of differences that we have that some employees or some positions are certainly more vital to the operation than others may be as far as positions, not employees. I think all employees are pretty well, you know, can be equal, but I think positions are different. Councilman Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: I was just going to say, this chair is falling apart, by the way. I was just going to say that what I do like about that language in there is that it gives guidance to the Councilmembers as they're voting. You know, if there is little or no confusion about what our priority is, it sure helps from the Councilperson's viewpoint if we say public safety is something critical, but I also understand Councilman Lloyd's viewpoint, you know, I mean, that's something we're going to have to weigh case by case as well. So I'm indifferent whether it stays in or goes, I guess.

President Shetler: Okay. Councilman Goebel, did you have a –

Councilmember Goebel: This resolution is for 2009. Are we going to do this again early next year or is this indefinite?

President Shetler: You know, that's a good point because I really think that, given the fact that it's so late in the year, that I personally would like to see us go ahead and include this for 2010, myself. But –

Councilmember Kiefer: We could change it to 2009 - 2010.

President Shetler: That would be my recommendation.

Troy Tornatta: I'd just do it again in 2010. It's clearer.

Councilmember Goebel: It's another half hour.

President Shetler: Yeah, and it's two months away. So, I mean, I just don't think rather than deal with this thing again in another two months, that it's...

Councilmember Raben: You know, to that point, we've been on this since the first of July and we're talking about a simple resolution. You know, we're not – this isn't an equation for splitting the atom or something. I mean, it's a resolution that's non-binding, you know, I think we ought to make the simple modifications that we've discussed here today and plan on passing this thing at our very next meeting.

Councilmember Goebel: I agree with Mr. Einstein.

Troy Tornatta: There is some small issues that I think we need to –

President Shetler: Well, Councilman Lloyd, I think, had a point here.

Councilmember Lloyd: So, like the City Council passed a resolution on Riverboat funds so they can't be used for operations. That was passed in 1994, it's still in effect, so I think when you pass a resolution, it stays in effect until such time as you declare that you want to repeal it or vote it down or –

Councilmember Kiefer: Then take out the: in 2009 and just say, period, after

employees.

Councilmember Lloyd: Yeah, I mean, when you pass a resolution it's –

President Shetler: That resolves the issue. Alright.

Jeff Ahlers: You can do that or add 2010, whichever you want to do.

President Shetler: Let's take out the 2009, and then it's also in the last paragraph as it's passed on the 4<sup>th</sup> day of November – no, wait a minute. The part that said 2009, yeah. We need to just change that, too.

Councilmember Kiefer: Just take out the year.

President Shetler: Yes. Councilman Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: I know these are tough times and this is particularly tough for us to determine which employees are necessary and maybe which are not. I think we really need to take a much deeper look into county government and maybe not move piecemeal, but have a comprehensive plan across the board where department heads have influence. If we're looking at cutting budgets and things like that, we've got to involve them and tell them they have to cut, and hopefully we can save employees and jobs in the meantime. But I don't think we've addressed that very well. But we have to have their input.

President Shetler: Alright. Yes, Commissioner?

Troy Tornatta: To that point, we're not doing the officeholders and the department heads any justice by telling them or not telling them what employees will not be moved on to the next phase. And I think we have to go to that point to be able to tell them, when X employee leaves, you won't replace that person because they expect to replace that person as they always have. We might say no new hires, so if you have eight in your office, you will not get nine, but if you have eight in your office and you schedule your team around eight, I think it's an injustice to that office to tell them that, well, your leg is not as important as another and you're going to have to drop down to seven with no goals in mind, with no monetary figure that we're trying to achieve in mind. Now I understand it's also going to be, there is going to be a cost factor in trying to get that study done, but I think when we do this, if we're serious about it and want to look at the government and its growth, we need to be able to study what departments we think, if there's an antiquated piece to our government, we need to identify that, tell that officeholder and make them realize once this person leaves, they're never going to be replaced. And go about it that way. I think sometimes to piecemeal this only brings heartache on this body and then it comes to the Commissioner's office, and we have to approve these pink slips when they come through. And to be honest with you, I'm on a hiring freeze. You tell me to have a hiring freeze, I'm on a hiring freeze. We're not hiring anybody. I mean, that's how we feel about it. We're not hiring any new employees. That's what you said, that's what we're going by. So, I mean, don't tell me, as an administrator, that I'm on a hiring freeze and then ask me to start hiring people willy nilly, because that makes it tough then on me and then we have three decisions up there on that board and now we're going to get crossways. And I'd rather do it in a manner that encompasses all facts and figures before we just do it on a piecemeal set up. Now, I mean, the wording is great, I do understand it, it's much more clarified. I appreciate that. But at the end of the day, I think we're are doing a little bit of injustice to our officeholders and department heads when it comes to not telling them who is going

to be there and who's not, and their plans that they're making for an entire year could fall on that employee being there or not.

Councilmember Kiefer: Could we have these employees, say, somebody works somewhere and they retire and now they have to replace, can we have that go through Job Study? Right now, it's just only new jobs that are going through Job Study. What about these replacement or refills, could we have them go through Job Study?

Councilmember Sutton: Councilman Kiefer, I think that addresses some of what my discussion was even last month and the month before was, the subjective nature of going through as they make requests to come before us and deciding whether to keep them or not keep them based on numbers. We're just kind of all over the board. The logical next step is to figure out what the process should be to determine if a position can or cannot justify itself in the greater scheme of the county mix. And we really haven't gotten to that point and I don't know, maybe the job study might be a logical place for that to occur.

Councilmember Kiefer: I think it would be, but I'd like to get Councilman Lloyd's input on that since he chairs that.

President Shetler: Well, honestly, first of all, I disagree, we do have an objective here, we do have a goal. And I think the objective and the goal is, to bring back the taxpayers' money into their pockets. And I think the objective here is to try to save approximately 200 - \$250,000 in the first year of it and it will only escalate in the years to come on that. I think people have given a pretty loud sound that county government is growing perhaps larger than what it should have over the last several years and I think we need to look at that real hard. Now there are some critical positions that may be in safety or certain areas of accounting or wherever where you've got to have it, but I think the decisions that we've made thus far haven't been willy nilly by any means. I take strong exception to that. I think the decisions that we've made, at least in my mind, were based on, in one situation where the obvious workload in that office has gone down tremendously over the past five years. In another office, we were talking about a position that was a general clerical position that, after asking questions of the department head, that position ended up, you know, like answering the telephone during lunch hours, it filled in for filing and it just did basic entry level clerical type of work and there was another 50 people in the office that did a similar type of work. And if you can't absorb roughly two percent more within an office these days, and we're all asked to do it, you are privately, you are publically, I am, as well. All of us around here are and I think that the taxpayers are asking us to do that. So those are the decisions, that's the criteria that I used, and then there were a couple of instances where we approved it because there was a unique position that had unique characteristics with it and it took a certain amount of expertise in that area that they had to have for that position. And in those cases I felt like it was necessary.

Troy Tornatta: I agree, but –

President Shetler: So there's no other way of doing it, as I said, but sometimes we become judge and jury of it, and that's unfortunate, but –

Troy Tornatta: But we've subsidized those offices that you cut positions in already. We've subsidized their office, they're subbing out work. So, I mean, where is your cost cutting measures? And that's what I'm getting to. If we cut that person, then they're asking for some extra help, they're going to sub that help out. It's going to



be contract work that we're subbing out. Now is that accomplishing your monetary cutbacks? I don't think so. So I want to be smart about how we do this and I don't know that that's being addressed and that's why I wanted to address those problems. Keep in mind, critical positions have to be supported by other legs of government and that's what I want to identify. If the Auditor's office, which we know pays bills and does payroll and they do an enormous job for the county. But if they have to be supported by some other facet of that office or community of government, that's as big as the job as they do. So that's what I want to do is identify where these positions are.

President Shetler: Once again, though, that position that you're talking about that is subbing that out, the money that we're saving in the general fund is real money, the money that they're taking that out of is service fees that comes through that department. And the only way of taking those service fees out was to put them in a position where they had to subcontract that work out. So bottom line is, it is saving the taxpayers money. And that's a real fact and that's real dollars. Yes, Councilman Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Interesting dialogue. I still think that if we have a goal of \$250,000 cut, we should have a comprehensive plan, we should involve the department, elected heads and let them suggest to us how they're going to lower the expenses within their office. And we, as a Council, these are very trying times and I think this Council is trying, however, I don't know if we ever will have enough information on some of the employees, because every department head is going to come here and fight to retain positions for his office or her office. And we can go talk to them but really, being outside of that office or their everyday work force, I don't know if we can make that decision correctly all the time. I like the idea of presenting to the department heads, look, you've got to cut and, Mr. Fluty, I don't know what the projections are but I assume our revenues next year are going to be drastically lower?

Bill Fluty: Well, I wouldn't go drastically lower, but as we've talked before in the past, the revenues continue to fall. We have our COIT predictions which I would say would be lower next year. We also have the change in the property tax caps that go from 1, 2 and 3 next year. So what you do, your revenues, your future revenues in '10, '11 and '12 won't support a workforce of 800. And it's a difficult decision of how you trim your workforce and trim your expenses. But I think you start it through attrition. Somebody retires, you make the decision whether you should rehire or not rehire. Will you have to go further? Will you get to your number? This is a beginning. Will you have to go back to offices and say well, it's a little harder pill to swallow when you say, you need to decide which two have to leave. So right now you're doing it through attrition. If the numbers continue to get worse over the next two to three years, you may have to do it a little bit differently. But it's a beginning.

President Shetler: Alright, thank you.

Councilmember Sutton: Well, I don't know if we've got any additional suggestions on the resolution, I know we've kind of taken it to maybe what the next step is beyond the resolution. But, you know, in government we've seen this process occur before. I mean, in your early 80's when revenue sharing was eliminated, cities and counties all over the country were looking and searching for ways to try to deal with what ultimately became cutbacks across the board, so now we're at a different stage. Fortunately, the county has not – we haven't gone through and eliminated any positions, but if and when we get to that point, I think what we all are saying to some extent in different ways is, we need to figure out how that would occur, if it

does occur. How do you make that decision rather than having people coming up individually and as openings come about, maybe there needs to be some future planning that occurs to begin to take a look at that. But I don't know, on the resolution here, if there is any other markups or changes that we have on this or if we are ready to move forward with it, I'd be more than happy to offer the motion to get it on the floor for consideration and so forth.

Councilmember Kiefer: The only thing is, I'd like to go back to what I'd said earlier about having these positions go through Job Study. I'd like to get Councilman Lloyd's input on that as chairman of the Job Study.

Councilmember Lloyd: Job Study, Personnel Administration is a recommending body, it's ultimately up to the Council. I don't know – the Job Study, I don't know that it's a mechanism for county-wide evaluation of the offices. I don't think it is. It's more geared towards position descriptions, job descriptions, things of that nature, upgrades, downgrades, changes in salary, changes in duties. So I think that might be beyond the scope of Job Study. It would make the Job Study a lot more time consuming and intensive and I'm not sure that that would be the best thing.

Councilmember Kiefer: That's why I wanted your input. Thanks.

President Shetler: Okay, we have a –

Councilmember Bassemier: Mr. President, are we going to redraft these changes here? We're not going to vote on anything today are we?

President Shetler: We're going to have another discussion that could be lengthy, too, so that could probably be done in between here.

Jeff Ahlers: Yeah, I can have her make these. I've got a markup, the only thing I do need to know or I guess you guys can decide that when you vote is, I've got all the changes in here. We've decided to take out the reference to the years, it's just not going to reference that at all, I guess. So the only thing that I heard was Councilman Lloyd on that one sentence in the fourth Whereas clause, whether that last sentence stays in or out. Other than that, I think I've got all the changes here.

Councilmember Lloyd: Could we just do a vote on that?

President Shetler: Well, we also have a question whether or not this was actually amending what we had done, so if it would be amending the resolution with the number or if this should be a new number. And if it is, then we need to just get the number that it should be, so if this is going to be a new resolution in place of the old.

Jeff Ahlers: My understanding is like any time there is an ordinance or amendment, it always gets a new resolution number. Now what you can do if you want to keep a reference to the old, I guess you could put in parenthesis an A or a B or something after it to signify it's different. But this thing may continue to have a metamorphosis over the upcoming year it sounds like, because you guys continue to refine it. So I think, so that as a matter of clarify we know when something is passed and that it is the new one, I think it needs to have a new number of some sort whether it relates to the old number or not. But I don't know if that's something we have to resolve now. The Auditor's office can put a number on it after the fact, I suppose.

President Shetler: Okay.

Councilmember Sutton: Well, I mean, other than that, I don't know if there is any other items within this where we have any differences of opinion. I think we've made some alternations and some changes, but it appears to be across the board support for what we have presented along with the changes.

President Shetler: Councilman Sutton, you've made a motion and that changed the dates and a couple of those other changes in those paragraphs that you've outlined before. Do I have a second to that motion?

Councilmember Goebel: Second.

President Shetler: It's been moved and seconded. Do I have any other questions?

Councilmember Lloyd: I mean, I had made a recommendation that paragraph four, remove the second sentence.

President Shetler: Yes, you did. Do we want...well, --

Councilmember Lloyd: I guess if you vote on his motion, then you would want to keep that sentence in or keep the change.

President Shetler: Is that the way you would want to keep it, Royce?

Councilmember Raben: How were you wanting it written? Are you wanting it, where it begins, Priority consideration?

Councilmember Lloyd: I recommended deleting that whole sentence.

Councilmember Sutton: So read maybe your version of what --

Councilmember Lloyd: Well, it would be, paragraph four, Whereas the County Council believes that when vacancies in existing county positions occur, decisions to retain or fill those positions will be evaluated by the County Council on a case-by-case basis upon receiving a written department head request. And that would be the end of that paragraph. You know, I was stating it's difficult to determine who is more important: public health nurse, sheriff deputy, you know, if you have a storm, the county garage worker would be very important. So this mentions certain positions but I'm not sure that that's helpful to the overall -- what we're trying to accomplish.

Councilmember Goebel: Have we not done that already, though? We've given those basic positions priority?

Councilmember Sutton: In a sense, too, it's for us, but it's also to the department heads, as you make your requests, keep these things in mind. These are the things that the Council are going to factor in as they weigh whether or not they're going to approve. Does it mean that if you are a -- if you're none of those three, that your position will not be approved? It doesn't say that, but what it does say is those will be the essential elements that will be given strong consideration as you make your request.

President Shetler: Do I have any other additional support for Councilman Lloyd's recommendation?

Councilmember Raben: Well, let's, I mean, if we want to get this thing done today, let's go ahead, I mean, I'm fine striking that. Then everybody gets a little bit of what

they want and we've got a document that should serve the need. I'm good with striking it.

President Shetler: But it's up to Council if you want to amend your motion or not. If not, we'll go ahead and hear that and roll call it and then go from there.

Councilmember Sutton: I'm trying to put together a document that will work for all of us. I mean, what's – I mean, I can –

Councilmember Kiefer: He's asking you if you'll amend your motion to strike that last sentence that Councilman Lloyd suggested.

Councilmember Lloyd: Or we could vote on that and then we could vote on striking the one thing and if that fails, then I would be in favor of the motion as you've presented it.

Councilmember Sutton: Let's, I mean, being that we're going to evaluate them on a case by case basis, we're essentially going to make, whether it's an individual priority or a group priority, we're going to make that in some type of way, some type of value judgement on the request anyway, I'll amend my motion to go ahead and strike that last sentence.

President Shetler: Joe, did you second?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yeah, so I'll amend it to strike that.

President Shetler: Alright, anybody have anything else? Anybody else object to...any questions about the motion? Alright, all in favor signify by saying aye.

**(All Councilmembers voted affirmatively)**

President Shetler: Anyone opposed?

**(No opposing votes were cast)**

President Shetler: Motion carries.

**(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)**

Councilmember Lloyd: Thank you. Thanks, Mr. Sutton.

<b>REVISED COMOT PAY SCHEDULE FOR POST 2009 NEW HIRES</b>
---

President Shetler: Now if you thought that issue was fun, let's go into the next one which is discussion on the COMOT schedule.

Councilmember Lloyd: You should have in your materials a proposed COMOT pay schedule for 2010 which is a reduction from the prior COMOT schedule. A couple of points, and this, first of all, I'd like to make a point, the Job Study personnel approved this 6-1, so it was approved. There would be no impact on existing employees, so their pay rates and steps would stay the same. What we're proposing is to lower the pay rates and steps effective January 1, 2010 for all new hires. And what we had our Job Study consultant, Mr. Deisher, do, he went to the Indiana Chamber and the Indiana Department of Workforce Development, polled

occupations and starting wages. There is a report here and I've got a couple of them so I'll pass those around if anybody wants to look at that. But what he determined was that on some of the COMOT positions, our starting pay has gotten above the market quite a bit, several thousand dollars. When you look at county government, there is very few COMOT II's. COMOT III is probably the lowest starting position in most offices. There are some COMOT II's in the Health department and that's something the Health department needs to look at and maybe go to Job Study with if those positions have changed and additional duties, then they need to look at making a request to upgrade those. But anyway, the study that Mr. Deisher did showed that some of the COMOT III and COMOT IV positions, for example, a Step 1 in the Health department, \$25,235 on an annual basis, in the marketplace, that type of position, you're looking more at \$18,782 up to \$21,362. So the county is 3 to \$4,000 high on just an entry level position. The revised schedule would put an entry level for that COMOT III at \$20,188, for a COMOT IV, you're looking at \$21,120, and then with our steps, you'll recall, the Step 1 comes into effect after six months. So when the employee completes their probation and is doing a satisfactory job for the officeholder, they go to their Step I, which is a raise of approximately four and a half to five percent. And then the other steps come into effect, Step 2 after three years, Step 3 after five years, Step 4 ten years, Step 5, I think, twenty years, Step 6 twenty-five years, etcetera, etcetera. And I may have a slight change there. Step 2 two years, Step 3 five years, Step 4 ten years. Also a reminder, the City of Evansville, they don't have steps. So a step, even though in our county personnel handbook, a step is to be awarded based on merit and ability, we've, in the county, we've gotten more to a position that a step is if you've stayed in a position for that length of time, you've survived, if you've not caused any trouble, then you get your step. It's pretty much automatic. So while the City of Evansville doesn't have steps, the county does and we've had that for a number of years. The step differential in the new schedule is exactly the same as the old, so from one to two to three, it's approximately 4.7%. So those raises come into effect regardless of the county's normal raises, which have been two and a half, three percent in the prior years, although unfortunately, this year we had no raise. So anyway, the Personnel Administration Committee approved the new schedule and what we're looking at in the marketplace, the county wages have gotten a little bit out of whack over all the prior year increases. And what this would do, it would bring them back only on new employees going forward. But we anticipate over time saving a substantial amount of money for the county on these. A possibility in one year, if you have fifteen new employees, which is what happened in 2008, there were fifteen new hires in the COMOT positions, you're looking at approximately \$45,000. And, obviously, you're going to save on FICA, on PERF, as well as some of these other things. There's other benefits that might be needed to look at, those are some of things the Commissioners would have jurisdiction over. But this is Council jurisdiction so I would recommend approval for the new COMOT schedule.

President Shetler: I might point out that this is not simple mathematics type of savings, this is geometric and it grows year after year. The first year it's \$50,000, that's figuring on part of a year that some, that in a given year you'll save \$100,000 if everybody, all fifteen positions were vacated January the 1<sup>st</sup>. And that isn't going to happen, so trying to average that out, we came up with a figure of about 45 to \$50,000 that during the course of the year, you'll lose about fifteen employees. The second year you've lost that and they've started off at a lower scale so you'll save \$100,000 plus that \$50,000 there, plus, the new ones that, the fifteen that also go on that. So it becomes with that geometric progression, it won't take but four or five years there and you'll be saving a million dollars a year from where we are today. So we're not talking about really small potatoes, here, I mean, we really are talking about something that will, I think, particularly our employees that we have, it's one

way we're going to be able to afford to pass on increases to the existing employees and reward them for the work that they have been doing instead of being stuck in the position we were this year in not being able to afford any increases for them for their service. So I think it's a prudent thing to do in light of the caps that are going to be placed on us in the future. I think it's prudent in the way that we want to make sure that we take care of our existing employees in the future as well.

Councilmember Bassemier: I'll second that motion.

President Shetler: Okay, we had a motion by Russ Lloyd and then a second by Councilman Bassemier. Do I have any questions? Councilman Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Do we have a – I mean, we're kind of projecting out, you're projecting out some figures out on what the potential savings would be. But for our entry level and positions that maybe just above entry level here, do we have a sense or feel of how many of those positions turn over, say how many turned over last year?

President Shetler: Yes.

Councilmember Sutton: How many have turned over this year?

President Shetler: Basically about fifteen. We average about fifteen entry level replacements a year or turnovers that exist.

Councilmember Sutton: And when those positions are refilled, are we generally refilling basically the same positions or are we seeing it just kind of all over? I mean, I guess maybe what I'm trying to get a sense of, is the degree or the amount of turnover in positions? I know on the private side, we've got certain positions that tend to have a little bit more frequency in the turnover and others maybe not as much. So are we seeing the same type of positions that are turning over here?

President Shetler: I think probably much like you do in private, I would assume that lower paid positions might turn over a little bit more so than others, but quite honestly, I think if you would check with most HR agencies, you'll find that the county government's turnover rate is extremely low compared to the size of workforce that we have of 800, turning over fifteen to twenty employees a year, is extremely low so it's almost, I guess the point I'm making is that the difference between middle management and entry level clerical or entry level laborer, whatever that you might have, whatever classification that you might have, the difference is pretty minute as far as figuring out those percentages where it's hit hardest.

Councilmember Sutton: Okay, if that is the case, and I see where we're trying to go with this, but by lowering the entry level wage scale, do we not further exacerbate that issue? If the positions that are frequently turned over are lower paying positions and I would venture to say that the reason why they're turning over is because of the rate of pay, because we obviously have a pretty strong benefits package here compared to a lot of different other places in the community. Do you understand my point?

President Shetler: I understand your point but –

Councilmember Sutton: Do we not then further have more positions and more so opening up?

President Shetler: I heard, I understood your point and that, I guess what I was trying to answer on it, is that, to answer your question, is that I don't think there is a real significant difference and we aren't losing, we don't have a big turnover in any segment of the employment rankings or classifications when you really get down to it. When you're talking about fifteen to twenty out of a workforce of eight hundred, that is an extremely low turnover rate, even good times or bad times and I think one of the things that we talked about is not only are we 25,000 plus for that COMOT III position, but we are also and in the private sector is at 18, but we are also talking about a benefit package that includes fourteen holidays and two weeks vacation that first year and several other things that are not commonly offered in the private sector. So, and the health insurance is very attractive as well, particularly eight percent versus what they may have to pay in private.

Councilmember Sutton: I guess it just, that just concerns me, I guess, to a certain extent because the pay level is not necessarily that high on the entry level positions as it stands, and that seems to be the guy that we always seem to pick on, is the guy who is at the lower end of the wage scale. And I know we don't really have a lot of turnover really on the whole throughout county government, but I just, I guess my concern is that I'm not sure if, in the long run we're going to realize that savings if we have a much more constant turnover. Because you're talking about additional training that's going to be required if you have a lot more turnover. And I'm as much for trying to find savings as anyone, but I just think if we're going to evaluate the wage scale, maybe we need to look at some other levels as well, rather than just the entry level.

President Shetler: We did take an evaluation of other sectors and found that, compared to private, we were under what private was doing in a few of the other sectors, so that's why we started with the COMOTS and pretty well left it there. I don't know if Councilman Lloyd could elaborate further on that with more –

Councilmember Lloyd: We looked at the PAT and the other positions and they were not, I mean, they were comparable or lower than similar positions in the private sector. But these were the ones that stood out as higher.

President Shetler: Yes, Councilman Goebel, do you have a point?

Councilmember Goebel: I think a new hire, let's say 2010 will start out at 20 percent lower and throughout the entire longevity of that position are being at work for the county, they'll remain at 20 percent lower pay, is that correct?

Councilmember Lloyd: If they stayed in that exact same position for their whole career, which I'm not sure that that, I mean, I'm sure that happens some, but there's others that there's movement. But that's correct.

Councilmember Raben: Well, that will only stand true for a certain period of time, too, because eventually, you know, however many years that is from now, I don't know if there was any projections made on that, but this will be the salary ordinance with enough time.

President Shetler: Yes, exactly, you're correct.

Councilmember Raben: The thing you've got to look at, too, with these rate schedules, you know, this doesn't include the annual pay increases that Tom mentioned earlier. I mean, these are as it is with nothing and the years where we've had three and five percent, now that's not reflective of any of that.

Councilmember Kiefer: I like the part where it protects existing employees, too.

President Shetler: Right, and not only does it really protect them, but I think it is the one way that we can give something to them because we'll have, perhaps, and hopefully, the monies and revenues available to do that for both classifications, if we don't do this, if we don't take some positive step in that direction. Again, it's still above what the private sector is paying, and that doesn't include the benefit package which is much more lucrative than what the private sector has. I'll point out one, and this has nothing to do directly with this, but I'll point out some of the discrepancies we have in our current policies today like on longevity, and the Sheriff and I went through something not too long ago when we were dealing with the Screeners and talking about that. And the longevity pay, I think, for the Sheriff Deputies, correct me if I'm wrong, Sheriff, but for the same amount of, someone that's been around about thirty years roughly, was about \$5,500, in that neighborhood, for their longevity pay, whereas someone that's actually working here in the building or in the office, civilian employee, their step increases and longevity equated to about \$11,000 a year. So it was about twice of what it was and that's within our county government, we have those kind of discrepancies. Then you look over on the city, people in the same building, and they don't even have the steps, and they don't even have the longevity and stuff. So, you know, we've got a whole different ball game going on there. All of that has created an unruly type of situation here that has grown out, a little bit out of control and we need to try to reign it in the best we can and this is just a start. In the long run I'm hoping that it will save a considerable amount of money.

Councilmember Goebel: I think it certainly will and I think the concept is well taken, but I'm not sure we have a comprehensive plan yet when you talked about the benefits and vacation and things like that, I'd feel more comfortable if we had it all together and pulled the reigns across the board. I guess this would be a period of time, I don't know how many years it would take, but you might have an office with forty employees, half of them making the new scale, much lower, half making the old scale, much higher, or somewhat higher, and what will be the morale inside the office between the working groups? Or is that just a transition we have to go through?

President Shetler: Well, yeah, I mean, it's hard to say. But I think that you're experiencing that today. I mean, you have an employee who's been around for twenty-five years that may be getting \$40,000 a year and you have someone next to them that's been there for five years and is getting paid \$31,000 a year or whatever. And so, and doing the same work essentially. So you have that today, you have some discrepancies in pay levels as it exists, so this will just be a way of making sure that we're able to enhance the people that we have and continue on.

Councilmember Goebel: I have no doubt the way things are right now that there will be people lining up at the new schedule because these are trying times and a job here with the benefit package would be very desirable. I don't know if a single mother with children, if this even meets poverty level, though.

President Shetler: Well, it does, it exceeds the poverty level. In fact, I think, roughly speaking, a single person is what, 10.5'ish?

Councilmember Lloyd: I pulled that off of the HHS website because I anticipated this question, \$10,830 for 2009, each person 3,740 and that's annual, so two people, poverty level is \$14,570. Three persons \$18,310 annually, so, I mean, those are some of the wages for poverty level. And then minimum wage, \$7.25, which was increased in July would be an annual pay \$15,080. So, I mean, these are way



above minimum. And you don't want county government to be a minimum wage payer.

Councilmember Sutton: And this level would be how much, that's being proposed here?

Councilmember Lloyd: Well, on a COMOT III –

President Shetler: Eighteen-eight, rounding numbers off a little bit. It's eighteen-seven, --

Councilmember Lloyd: 19,281, and after six months 20,188.

Councilmember Bassemier: That person would also be getting health insurance, too, and benefits.

President Shetler: Correct.

Councilmember Bassemier: I really feel like I kind of agree with Mike a little bit as far as when a person hires in, he knows what he's going to make or she knows what they're going to make at the time, so if it's not enough for them, you know, they don't have to take the position. So the way I feel about it, they'll know up front, you're not hurting anybody because, like I said, they know up front.

President Shetler: Joe?

Councilmember Kiefer: These COMOT pay schedules, what's the percentage of our workforce population that is on these pay schedules? Is this fifty percent or twenty percent or...?

Sandie Deig: Probably fifty. I'm not quite sure, but most of them are COMOT (Inaudible, microphone not turned on).

Councilmember Lloyd: Fifty percent will be about 350 –

Sandie Deig: Most of your employees under COMOT, are COMOT IV's.

Councilmember Kiefer: Yeah, but what I'm saying is, there are some employees not on a COMOT pay schedule, you know, and this wouldn't affect –

President Shetler: Classifications, COMOT versus PAT, Laborer and stuff like that, how many, what's the percentage of COMOTS of the total payroll?

Bill Fluty: I can get that for you, but I can't tell you that today.

Councilmember Kiefer: I'm just curious how this affects the whole workforce population because you have labor agreements that this doesn't affect, correct?

President Shetler: Correct.

Councilmember Kiefer: I mean, and there's other salary levels that this doesn't affect, but it sounds like this is about fifty percent of the workforce population and with the hiring freeze, I don't know, maybe we might not ever get to this.

President Shetler: And Councilman Goebel, your point is well taken and it is

something that actually the Commissioners have to do those parts because those have to be contractual agreements that we'd need to work with them on as far as vacation pay and holiday pays and all that kind of stuff. But I would envision that that would be part of this whole package that I'm envisioning that we need to do to pare down county government. So I will approach Commissioner Tornatta on that. Alright, anybody else? Okay, we have a motion on the floor. Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: You know, I commend the efforts of the group who worked on this, I mean, it takes a lot of time to look at all these different tables and try to come up with a formula, but my point still is, in light of what we're trying to do, the lowest man on the scale is the one being asked to sacrifice and if there are sacrifices to be made, I think the right thing is to look up and down all levels and come up with an appropriate recommendation for all levels, and not just the entry level, lowest guy, and ask him to take the cut. Even though they are new people coming in, they're sitting next to someone who is getting paid at a different scale and I think if there is going to be some sacrifice, look up and down the board, so I can't support this. No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: I think the efforts, obviously, are very good and there's been a lot of time put in, but I'd still like to see a more comprehensive plan before I support, so my vote is no.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: I think it's going to be interesting. Time will tell if this is too low, then obviously, we'll have trouble or struggle hiring people, so I think the market should take care of this thing. If we get a flood of people hiring in, and they're satisfied with these pay rates, well, then, I guess it's a great move. If we struggle and can't hire people, then we'll have to come back and re-evaluate and say hey look, this is too low. We can't hire people and we're struggling or at least the quality of people that we're used to. So with that, because we're not affecting any current positions, I'll vote yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Aye. There being five ayes and two nays, the motion carries.

**(Motion carried 5-2/Councilmembers Sutton & Goebel opposed)**

<b>PROPOSED USAGE OF VACANT SPACE IN CIVIC CENTER</b>
---

President Shetler: We've asked Mr. Rector to be here today to give us a presentation, an update on the building.

Dave Rector: Good morning, Dave Rector, Building Authority. A few weeks ago, we had a new request for use of the space in the old jail. Judge Heldt and Judge Niemeier met with Commissioner Tornatta and I, requesting space in the old jail to be used, and the drawing I gave you illustrates this but I'll kind of walk us through it and then we can talk about it. But Judge Niemeier is needing additional space for his juvenile staff and to accomplish that, was requesting that we move Circuit Court adult probation up into the old jail space. Judge Heldt is wanting AAPS and DAPS to come in from the leased space on John Street they're in along with his Circuit Court Adult Probation. And then he is also requesting Superior Court Adult Misdemeanor Probation to move over to create more space in the courts building for the County Clerk to expand into that space, and his micro Circuit Court to expand into that space. And then the second phase of this is the Election Office and Voter Registration moving up onto the third floor, creating more space for the Prosecutor to expand on the first floor of this building and getting more space then for the Election Office with their equipment and the voting machines. In doing this, this still leaves about 7,000 square feet of vacant space available for other –

**(Tape Changed)**

– rents. If you recall, I think the last time we discussed it, Commissioner Tornatta had asked us to explore opportunities to lease to third party opportunities out there that perhaps would bring some income in. Because we have a tax exempt loan right now with a bank, we can't do that by the lease agreement, so we're back to looking at uses for governmental purposes in there. I asked Commissioner Tornatta to stay around to indicate if the Commissioners indeed want to move forward with this. But this is the current proposal before us. Again, one of many as we've all discussed over the last several years, but that's where we are today.

Councilmember Raben: Could I, Dave, go back to juvenile first. You said that they're needing room for expansion. The area that they're in today is approximately 12,000, is that what that was?

Dave Rector: Yes.

Councilmember Raben: That they didn't have three years ago, two years ago, I mean, that was part of the – that 12,000 square foot was in this other building.

Dave Rector: In the courts building.

Councilmember Raben: I can't believe today that Circuit Court nor Juvenile Court or Superior Court, with moving, freeing up Juvenile and giving them 12,000 new feet a few years back, I can't believe that any of them would need any space.

Dave Rector: I quite honestly did not question the Judges on their request on the need of the space. I accepted that they have expanded and are requesting the space.

Councilmember Raben: I mean, I've got to say early on here that I wouldn't be supportive of any additional space for courts, not in lieu of the expense and the additional space they got a few years ago. And I know I've expressed my concerns

about making this monster any bigger than it is now. You know, I'm not, I'll never be supportive of opening up those walls to making county government bigger. I mean, if that space over there remains as a shell between now and – well, as long as I'm on here, is fine, because I think government is plenty large like it is. You get more space, you'll be adding people, you're adding expenses. You know, more computers, more everything, more desks, more – you know, I just, I want to set it straight how – what my views are and opinions are as we move forward on that other space. I'm just not going to be supportive of anything in that regard. I mean, if we need to bounce around an office or something, you know, I'll consider that on a case by case basis, but I don't want to hear discussion on expanding court space or moving a bunch of county offices into that space.

Dave Rector: And again, I guess to make my position clear, I'm here as a facilitator, not necessarily an advocate.

Councilmember Raben: Oh, I understand. I'm just telling you as a Councilmember.

Councilmember Sutton: Right, well, how much space is in the old, total square footage, how much –

Dave Rector: About 31,000 square feet and that includes about 2,300 square feet that the Sheriff is still continuing to use for holding prisoners going to courts. I think we discussed before, Senator Luger does have an earmark request in for a new sally port holding cell facility that would then free up that space the Sheriff is using so we would have all the space available. Right now we don't know the status of the earmark request.

Councilmember Sutton: As you put together this proposal, and I don't know which version this is, if this is the third, fourth, ninth, but it's several versions of this. The city has expressed no interest in any space, is that correct?

Dave Rector: That is correct.

Councilmember Sutton: Okay. And how much is the – how much are we paying each month on the space that we aren't using? When I say we, I mean the county. How much are we paying on that space?

Dave Rector: Annually on that space, it's about a half million.

Councilmember Sutton: We're paying a half million a year. So we're...

Councilmember Kiefer: What's that run per square foot?

Dave Rector: We lowered our budget to you for 2010, so it's reduced. I think we're down somewhere now around 17, but once again, that's occupied lease cost, not total square footage we use. I don't know why the lease was established that way. It kind of skews that number. If we looked at total square footage of the Civic Center Complex, we get our lease down to somewhere around the \$10 range.

Councilmember Kiefer: 17 gross range.

Dave Rector: Yeah.

Councilmember Kiefer: Includes utilities and everything.

Dave Rector: Yes, utilities, maintenance, housekeeping, everything.

Councilmember Sutton: And then, I guess, as well, as we look at the space that is currently being used and occupied, we have made some adjustments and we've also had some requests that have come forward to us the last year or two from different offices. I guess what kind of even springs up to light to me is all that consolidation of all the Assessor functions and it appears that there has been somewhat of a solution that has come about to try to address their issues with being able to function as one office with some of the walls being moved there.

Dave Rector: Earlier in the year Assessor Weaver did request a fairly major renovation in that space to try to accommodate that growth. He wasn't able to do that. Recently, to try to assist in some functionality of that area, we did open up an opening, a door between two of his departments that I think has helped him some. I think he's left now, but that did help to improve the functionality of those offices.

Councilmember Sutton: And I know we've even, we just take even the offices that are outside of this building that we pay rent on each month, how many offices are in this proposed version plan that are outside of this building that we are talking –

Dave Rector: The only one we see in the plan before us today is AAPS and DAPS for Judge Heldt coming back in. We have a number of other offices that are outside of the building that in other scenarios we have looked at moving into the space, too. Those aren't on the current plan, but they certainly could be looked at in this still vacant 7,000 square feet if you wanted.

Councilmember Sutton: And therein lies a potential cost savings back to the county by bringing those in, and I know we've got several that are out there and for some reason, or in some cases it makes sense for them to be outside. And I guess what comes to mind is the Co-Op Extension –

Dave Rector: Weights and Measures.

Councilmember Sutton: Weights and Measures because of the equipment and all. Of course, the County Highway. But –

Councilmember Bassemier: A lot of them can't come back in like Central Dispatch and the Sheriff's, you know...

Councilmember Sutton: The other question, I guess, I know we, the County Council, even in our space here, we've been working in less than optimal conditions for an extended period of time and there really isn't another space here presently available that would seem to be a logical use and I know I've been to a number of different public meetings as have many people here, this space isn't necessarily the most ideal and really accommodates really what we try to do in a lot of the public meetings here. That's not necessarily put into this particular plan here, but would seem to be something that would be a logical space, but again, I guess I go back to we're paying a half million dollars a year for space that is, we're getting zero use out of.

Dave Rector: And a comment to that, another plan in the past has been looking at creating another Council chamber. You know, I've tried to do what we can to bring this up to more technologically advanced opportunities with the T.V.'s, and the computer and all that, but still, it's a far cry from modern meeting rooms. If consolidation ever happens, this chamber wouldn't accommodate the new consolidated combined City/County Council, whatever it may be. As part of that

plan, it was looked at expanding the Council offices that you said are inadequate and also Commissioner offices. So we've looked at a lot of these things, Councilman Sutton, it's just we've never firmly decided where we're moving with any of them.

Councilmember Raben: Let's look at the square footage price real quick, since you hit on that, both of you. The 17.50 is what we're paying in the entire building.

Dave Rector: I think that's high right now for 2010.

Councilmember Raben: And that includes the vacant space next door?

Dave Rector: Yes.

Councilmember Raben: I mean, why it's 17.50, which is, you know, would be high anyway, is because there is no maintenance over there, there is little or no heat, air, there –

Dave Rector: No, we've gutted it.

Councilmember Raben: – you're not painting, you're not cleaning, I mean, when you move into that space, your overall rent isn't going to remain 17.50 –

Dave Rector: Yes, it stays the same. It's occupied space is the way the lease was written. And by the lease, the county still retains ownership of that space.

Councilmember Raben: So you would not need additional personnel, you can do –

Dave Rector: I don't anticipate adding additional personnel for that space.

Councilmember Raben: How could we grow a third in size and not need additional personnel unless we have, unless we're way overstaffed now?

Dave Rector: The same way I've reduced since the time I've been here. I have five housekeepers where we used to have five more. I've reduced that staff. I try to look at efficiencies in –

Councilmember Raben: I mean, I understand. I appreciate that. I guess the point is, I just, long term, I don't see that we can maintain that additional space with the same current staff we have now unless we contract more out or something like that. But there is expense with that space today that you don't have that you will have when you move into that space.

Dave Rector: You'll have increased utility costs, but I really don't anticipate increasing manpower.

Councilmember Raben: You're changing light bulbs, you're polishing floors, you're shampooing carpets, you're paying – I mean, the list goes on. I mean, you'll have internet fees, you'll have, you name it, I mean, the list goes on. When you move departments in there, it's a whole new bundle of fees that will come with it.

Councilmember Sutton: To a certain extent, we're already having those costs anyway with those departments whether they are in cramped space or whether they are in a little bit more spacious situation, you've got computers, desks, carpet, what have you, in all the spaces to make an office, but yes, to say that there will be no additional expense, I think that would be unrealistic. Yes, I think there would be, but

at the same time, too, when you look at, you know, we have made some, the courts, I think there is some merit to your earlier point on that. It doesn't seem to be a new need that would be created there. But I think there are some other areas that would merit some consideration. Does that mean use the entire space? I don't think there is a need for the entire space, but some of that space could have a practical use for the county rather than just sitting there vacant. We've even talked about the need and the emphasis upon trying to reduce our health costs on our health plans. Why couldn't we have something here that allows the employees right on site to have some type of health facility here where they can, rather than paying the Y thing that we pay every year, we could do it right here in that space there. So those are some of the things, not necessarily my ideas, but I've heard from others. But clearly, I think it merits at least some consideration rather than languishing.

President Shetler: I have a question and then I'm going to go to Councilman Kiefer and then Councilman Bassemier and then Councilman Lloyd. The question that I have, is there some kind of a standard or rule out there set up by the Architects of America or whoever, some organization that says that in a given workplace you need so many square feet? There are so many employees and all that kind of stuff?

Dave Rector: There are architectural standards that set forth, same as you just talked earlier by position, by workforce, recommended square footage.

President Shetler: Is it possible to apply those to what we have in the court building today, the number of employees and their classifications and the whole business, apply that to see if there is a need for the space? I mean, that might tell us a little bit right there that, you know, based on that kind of a study, we do need another thousand square feet or ten thousand square feet or whatever it might be.

Dave Rector: I can do that with a better understanding –

President Shetler: So we've got some kind of a benchmark here, I guess, if you will.

Dave Rector: With a better understanding from the Judges, I could do that, yes.

President Shetler: Alright, Councilman Kiefer, Councilman Bassemier and then Councilman Lloyd.

Councilmember Kiefer: Are there cost estimates on this?

Dave Rector: Build out estimates for this entire space, I've always still bantered about the 3 to \$4,000,000 fee. Without knowing finishes, individual offices, conference rooms, what we're doing, but I think that would cover the build out fee.

Councilmember Kiefer: Well, a couple of points. I'd like to commend you guys because if your rent is 17 or 17.50 per square foot, that sounds high, but realistically it's not when you throw in utilities, housekeeping, maintenance and all that. I know on the open market, for those same services at Integra or Old National Bank they're in the 20, mid-20 dollar range. So these are good competitive prices unless they're vacant. So I don't know, what's the opportunity that we could renegotiate that lease, I mean, to, I mean, obviously you guys probably don't want to do that because you've got a lease agreement, but is there a possibility that the lease could be renegotiated?

Dave Rector: One of the leases was renewed for another twenty years under the same conditions as the original forty year lease. But it's kind of a misnomer on this

whole thing because our costs to you are nothing more than what it costs to operate. So it doesn't matter whether we have 3,000 square feet or 300,000 square feet –

Councilmember Kiefer: So the city probably would not like that because –

President Shetler: That's the only thing that could happen, we could take from Peter.

Councilmember Kiefer: Yeah, to pay Paul.

Dave Rector: Our number to you is the same. It's our budget number regardless of the square footage.

Councilmember Kiefer: Well, then, I guess the other thing is, you know, we could look at all of our other leases which we talked about in the past: the Health department, you know, I don't know what we're paying over there, but does it make sense to move the Health department? They use a lot of square footage, they may absorb all this vacancy and then you can give them a separate entrance through where the police department is now or the old –

President Shetler: I'm not sure, but I think that was a lease and I think they probably have a –

Councilmember Kiefer: Five years or –

President Shetler: Yeah, at least, and it could have been fifteen. But I don't know if they can go beyond that.

Councilmember Kiefer: Yeah.

President Shetler: Do you know, Troy? On the Health department.

Troy Tornatta: And we, everyone got this, the assessment of who's outside. We actually sent that last year and so we just sent it again so you'd have it, but the one thing about the Health department, it was in this building. I don't know if you knew that. At one time, the Health department was here and they moved out. Two reasons: one is the ability to get people in there more efficiently and especially since we're going through the situation we are here with the screening and everything, that probably puts a damper on that. The second thing is to be able to get people quarantined to that place and I think it allows them to do more of that in that space than it does here with general business being done along with health services. So just something to think about when you're pulling in certain offices.

Councilmember Kiefer: Well, it sounds like we've got our hands tied. We don't have county departments to move in there and we can't rent to private sector –

Troy Tornatta: Well, we can. And if we decide that we want to pay off the loan, put our financial hats on, we can pay off that loan and I don't know what it is, Bill, any idea?

Dave Rector: It was a half million dollar loan.

Troy Tornatta: Okay, pay off a half a million dollar loan, to my knowledge, at that point, then we can entertain private business. The reason why we haven't entertained private business so far is because we'd have to pay back a bond cost. Is that correct? Or –



Dave Rector: It's a tax exempt loan.

Troy Tornatta: Tax exempt loan, so we'd have to pay off whatever that tax is. So we'd have to look at doing one or the other and that would come before this body. So that's a little food for thought there. If we did that, then we could potentially put a privateer in here. If we wanted to put a private health club for people in here, it was more appetizing when we could do it outside of a – when anybody could just roam in here and use the facilities at any time. Now we will be put on a little bit different security detail, so that's going to be just for people in this office. But there is attorneys that might want to relocate here and maybe accounting firms or whatever, that would like the space and like the security of that space.

President Shetler: Councilman Bassemier next and then Councilman Lloyd.

Councilmember Bassemier: Mr. Rector, now we are talking about Circuit Court AAPS and DAPS that wants to move into the space here, is that –

Dave Rector: Yes.

Councilmember Bassemier: Okay.

Dave Rector: That's the one on John Street.

Councilmember Bassemier: Okay, and we're paying rent over there right now or lease for them over there right now. Why would we not want them to come back here and we won't have to pay that lease? We're already paying, so Jim, you were pretty adamant about you don't want them to come back here. I don't understand if we're paying rent over here, and we don't have to pay it over here because we're already paying it, why wouldn't we want them to move back?

Councilmember Raben: Well, let me clarify one thing. I'm talking about the renovation of 30,000 feet. I don't think government needs to expand a third its size or a third time again as big as it is now. I mean, if we need 1,000 feet or we need 1,500 feet, sure, we have to look at it. But a 3 to \$4,000,000 build out simply because the space is available and all the other costs that go along with it, no, I'm not supportive of any part of that.

Councilmember Bassemier: Well, what space do they have over there now, Mr. Rector? Where they're at now.

Dave Rector: We've got 2,400 square feet planned in the proposed expansion. They have slightly less than that now.

Councilmember Bassemier: Slightly less, so it's not much more?

Dave Rector: No.

Councilmember Bassemier: About the same.

Dave Rector: Yeah.

President Shetler: Okay, Councilman Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: And I'm sympathetic to Councilman Raben, the courts, the blob that ate county government, I mean, that's a problem when we see how they've

expanded radically. I'd like to commend Dave Rector on this. It's one of the most helpful documents I've ever seen in government. I mean, this is good because you have all the layout and all the square footage. And I guess this is proposed, though, because you've already got AAPS and DAPS in here.

Dave Rector: It is proposed.

Councilmember Lloyd: So you're moving them here but I guess that's still being debated.

Dave Rector: It is only proposed.

Councilmember Lloyd: But anyway, I think it is very helpful for our plans on the building. Thank you.

President Shetler: Okay, any other questions or comments?

Councilmember Raben: Just one quick question, Dave. I know we've asked you this numerous times and I don't remember the answer. All the old administrative offices for the Sheriff's office, is that all occupied today?

Dave Rector: By EPD, yes, the city took that over.

Councilmember Raben: Alright. Thanks.

Councilmember Sutton: This has been kind of sitting around for a while and –

Dave Rector: Actually, we started on proposed use of the old jail space when we started design of the new jail.

Councilmember Sutton: I think what I'd like to propose so we could at least try to begin to move forward and say yes, no, maybe, part, none, whatever, I think we need a committee comprised of, obviously, yourself, Commissioners, Council, and I guess, I don't know, since you say the city is not really interested in any of the space, I'm not sure if they would –

Dave Rector: That or confirmation. My understanding, indeed, still, the city has no interest in this space.

Councilmember Sutton: I mean, at least we could extend an invitation to serve on a committee of such to come up with a recommendation. I think the suggestions with Councilman Kiefer and Councilman Shetler about the amount of space that could or should be used based upon the number of people here is obviously something that should be considered, but if we could have a committee that can begin to review exactly what we have out there as far as what we're paying to outside vendors for renting space, that could potentially be back in here, what logical offices or spaces would be candidates for expansion. If they could put together some type of proposal, some type of recommendations that could then come back to the affected bodies, I think we'd begin to move this forward because I think what you've been dealing with is over the course of time, is there's been changes in Council composition, Commissioners and so forth, and the plan has continued to change and change, and we've never come to any conclusion. I think we really do need to make some conclusive statement by this body, the Commissioners and so forth, on what we're going to do. And the only way we're going to do that is if we sit down and talk about this with some committee that we support that could then bring

back a recommendation for us to act upon.

Dave Rector: I think that would be an excellent idea on the consideration that the committee is empowered with making the decision. Otherwise, I think it's subject to second guessing and much like the security proposal before all of us right now, it's just another suggestion, and it's going to go back and another officeholder is going to say, but I want that space, but I want that space. And I think with this committee as you've said, composed of the executive, legislative bodies, of those representatives to make those decisions, I think that's a smart recommendation.

President Shetler: Councilman Sutton, why don't I recommend, and Joe, I don't know if you've got the time to do that? With your real estate background, it might be helpful and stuff. But to be a representative maybe for the County Council and then get with Troy and stuff, and then as the executive branch, he could put something together, as the official committee and just telling you the two names, Troy, that we'd like to see. If anybody else would want to serve, I'm sure they'd be welcome to help out on that as well. I do have one question –

Dave Rector: I'd be glad to facilitate that and pull it together and start putting these numbers together. And I think one thing that we really haven't done is captured all these outside leasing costs and the utilities and lease and everything associated with those and what impact that would be in this space. And I think that's important that we look at that.

President Shetler: Right. Who pays for this building? This room, this room right here. How is this assessed?

Dave Rector: Well, ultimately, it all comes back to taxpayers –

President Shetler: No, I mean, between city and county, who is paying for this room?

Dave Rector: It's split.

President Shetler: 50/50?

Dave Rector: No, 70/30. We do not include the square footage of this room, of 307, 318, the hallways, the bathrooms, we don't include that square footage –

President Shetler: So this is a common area –

Dave Rector: Common area –

President Shetler: – and then it gets divided according to the percentages.

Dave Rector: Yes.

President Shetler: And the percentages of 30/70 is developed because of the occupancy of the building...

Dave Rector: By city and county.

President Shetler: By city and county, okay.

Councilmember Bassemier: Mr. President, I'd like to serve on that committee since I'm the superintendent – I'm the liaison for his department. If it's okay, I'd like to

serve on that committee.

Dave Rector: So we'll have Joe, Royce, Ed and Troy and myself, currently?

President Shetler: Right.

Dave Rector: Any other suggestions for the –

Councilmember Sutton: Jim, are you sure you don't want to serve on this?

President Shetler: I guess the –

Councilmember Raben: You guys can keep me apprised on what's happening.

President Shetler: The follow-up question I would ask you, then, is that the vacated space isn't considered common?

Dave Rector: No, it was county occupied and, once again, by the lease, --

President Shetler: Trying to get back from Peter a little bit here.

Dave Rector: Yeah, and when it's vacated, it still remains to that entity until it's occupied differently, much like when EPD moved out of the third floor personnel up here on this floor, it was vacant for a year, the city still carried that.

President Shetler: Alright. Thank you. Any other questions or comments?

Councilmember Lloyd: Motion to adjourn.

Dave Rector: Thank you, gentlemen.

President Shetler: There doesn't seem to be any objections.

**(There being no further business to come before the Council, the meeting was adjourned at 10:50 a.m.)**

VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL

\_\_\_\_\_  
President Tom Shetler, Jr.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Vice President Joe Kiefer

\_\_\_\_\_  
Councilmember Jim Raben

\_\_\_\_\_  
Councilmember Mike Goebel

\_\_\_\_\_  
Councilmember Russell Lloyd, Jr.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Councilmember Ed Bassemier

\_\_\_\_\_  
Councilmember Royce Sutton

Recorded and transcribed by Teri Lukeman.

**VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL  
MINUTES  
DECEMBER 2, 2009**

The Vanderburgh County Council met in session this 2<sup>nd</sup> day of December 2009 in room 301 of the Civic Center Complex. The meeting was called to order at 8:32 a.m. by County Council President Tom Shetler, Jr.

President Shetler: Good morning. It's December 2<sup>nd</sup>, it's 8:30 by my watch, I guess, 8:32 by the one back there, and welcome to the County Council meeting. I'd like, first of all, to call the attendance please.

COUNCILMEMBER	PRESENT	ABSENT
Councilmember Sutton	X	
Councilmember Bassemier	X	
Councilmember Lloyd	X	
Councilmember Goebel	X	
Councilmember Raben	X	
Councilmember Kiefer	X	
President Shetler	X	

President Shetler: There being seven present, no absent, we have a quorum. I'd like at this time to ask our County Auditor, Bill Fluty, to lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance.

**(Pledge of Allegiance was given)**

<b>APPROVAL OF MINUTES NOVEMBER 4, 2009</b>
---

President Shetler: Thank you. Next we have approval of the minutes from the November 4<sup>th</sup> meeting.

Councilmember Lloyd: Motion to approve.

President Shetler: I have a motion to approve. Do I have a second?

Councilmember Bassemier: Second.

President Shetler: Motion and a second. Any questions? All in favor signify by saying aye.

**(All Councilmembers voted affirmatively)**

President Shetler: Any opposed?

**(No opposing votes were cast)**

President Shetler: So ordered.

**(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)**

<b>APPROPRIATION ORDINANCE</b>
--------------------------------

President Shetler: Next is the appropriation ordinance, Councilman Raben.

**TREASURER**

Councilmember Raben: Okay, good morning. The first and only one for the day is the Treasurer, 1030-4220 Office Machines in the amount of \$12,000, I'll move approval.

Councilmember Sutton: Second.

President Shetler: We have a motion and a second. Do I have any questions?

Rick Davis: Sorry to interrupt. Rick Davis, Vanderburgh County Treasurer. I've got my Chief Deputy Zachary Heronemus here today. He's handing out some cost estimates. As you know, last week I went over in great detail a five year plan for us to do printing in-house and there was one catch. Unfortunately, I would like to ask the Council to disregard my request to use the funds to purchase our office machinery right now. As I had told you last week, Xerox recently won a bid for the city's copier needs and the county had the ability to take advantage of those cost savings. So I gave Xerox a crack at trying to give us an ability to do this project at an even better deal for taxpayers. However, the most aggressive model Xerox offered our local governing units involved an \$11,000 multi-functional copier that does not utilize MICR ink, and MICR ink is a necessity for the printing of our property tax bills. Xerox did quote us a wonderful price on two MICR printers at an attractive price of \$6,800 total, but the toner yield for those printers is only 19,000 copies for every \$465 toner cartridge. That would require 11 print cartridges to print 200,000 MICR copies at a cost of 5,155. The non-MICR multi-functional copier would cost .006 per click, and at 600,000 copies, that would come out to \$3,600. And when you add up the capital cost in year one and maintenance cost and toner in years two through five, we're talking an average of \$38,000 to print our tax bills. That's \$41,000 cheaper over a five year period than the out of state vendor we used this year, but it's negligible when you consider that I got a quote from a local vendor who will do the job for almost exactly the same cost, 39,000. At this point, I can't justify purchasing this costly equipment when it could be done professionally, locally at nearly the exact same cost without risk to the county. The previous offer for printers I had on my presentation a week ago from Van Ausdall & Farrar still stands, but unlike our current printers and the printers from Xerox, the Van Ausdall printers get phenomenal yield per cartridge, 144,000 for regular toner and 72,000 for MICR. However, not mentioned to me in the original discussions were two maintenance kits that are required after every 160,000 clicks. And the maintenance kits and additional printer cartridges required to do this job kick up our five year average to \$35,778, which is cheaper than the quote from the local vendor, Data Mail, but again, I don't know if I can justify the liability of the county for a \$700 a year savings. My initial goal in coming to you today was to bring you the best deal I could find on printers in order to encumber money from our current budget, which we're under nearly \$19,000 for the year, and to use that money to cover capital costs on this project. But I don't feel I can do that in good conscience today. So despite the many, many hours I've dedicated to this project, I'm going to put it on hold for one more week in an effort to get a better deal on printers with better toner yield. And if I'm successful, I would like to come before you again in January and if it's okay with the Council, I would give another presentation and ask for that request at that time. But right now, for a five year period, I just can't justify it at this point. There

is a silver lining because, as you know, we've already found a local vendor who can do that job for 15% cheaper than it was done this year. And we're including one additional form and we are also eliminating one person in our staff, which is going to result in a nearly \$40,000 a year savings. So I just would like for you to table this request. Let me do a little more homework, give me one more week. If I can find printers that can do the job with the cost savings I outlined last week, I'll come before you in January and ask for an additional request. If I can't then we will just put this out for an RFP to get the job done by a local vendor for next year.

President Shetler: Okay, well, I appreciate your candor on it and your prudence. I agree with you, it doesn't seem like it would be worth our while to invest into that today, but Councilman Goebel and then Councilman Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Just a brief comment and then I'll amend my earlier motion. I still commend you for the effort and the fact that you've made the effort. And the worst case scenario is that we're still saving 15% a year. So, job well done, and thank you very much.

Rick Davis: Hopefully, I'll get to come before you in January and say we can still save additional funds.

Councilmember Raben: With that, Mr. President, I'll move to amend my motion for 1030-4220 be set in at zero.

Councilmember Sutton: And I was the seconder and I agree to that amendment.

President Shetler: Alright. Any other questions?

Councilmember Raben: Just a comment. The next motion, we'll want to set in the transfer, as well, at zero.

Rick Davis: Exactly.

Councilmember Raben: You still need the PERF or the tax sale money? There is another item.

Rick Davis: Oh, that's fine. Yeah, you can leave that as is. What I was here for is the appropriation for the Office Machinery and I'd just like for you to just table it and let me come back in January if I can show the savings, and if the next week I can't find the savings, then we'll just put it out for bid for a local vendor to do the job.

President Shetler: Alright, thanks. Thank you, Rick.

Rick Davis: Thank you.

President Shetler: Okay, next item, then, are transfers.

Councilmember Raben: We need to vote on the motion.

President Shetler: So you amended the motion then to bring it in at zero rather than – all in favor signify by saying – we had a second on that?

Councilmember Sutton: Correct.



President Shetler: Signify by saying aye.

**(All Councilmembers voted affirmatively)**

President Shetler: Any opposed?

**(No opposing votes were cast)**

President Shetler: So ordered.

TREASURER		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1030-4220	Office Machines	12,000.00	0.00
Total		12,000.00	0.00

**(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)**

<b>TRANSFER REQUESTS</b>
--------------------------

**TREASURER**

Councilmember Raben: Okay, now for transfers. First under 1030-3410 Printing in the amount of 18,483, I move we set that in at zero and 1030-1910 PERF in the amount of \$11 transferred into 1030-1270-1030, make that in the form of a motion.

Councilmember Sutton: Second.

President Shetler: Motion and a second, all in favor, signify by saying aye.

**(All Councilmembers voted affirmatively)**

President Shetler: Those opposed?

**(No opposing votes were cast)**

President Shetler: So ordered.

TREASURER		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1030-3410	Printing	18,483.00	0.00
1030-1910	PERF	11.00	11.00
To: 1030-4220	Office Machines	18,483.00	0.00
1030-1270-1030	Tax/Sheriff Sale Coord.	11.00	11.00

**(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)**

**SHERIFF  
JAIL  
COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS  
SHERIFF (LATE)**

Councilmember Raben: I’m going to lump the Sheriff and Jail together along with

Community Corrections. Sheriff, we have transfers in the amount of \$33,000 from a vacant Deputy line item into Overtime; under Jail, Confinement Officer in the amount of \$10,000 transferred into Overtime; Community Corrections, Confinement Officer in the amount of \$1,000 transferred into Shift Differential and then we have a late transfer, which is from a Sergeant line in the amount of \$10,071 transferred into a Lieutenant line in the amount of \$5,315 and Sergeant line in the amount of \$4,756, I'll move approval.

President Shetler: Do I have a second?

Councilmember Bassemier: Second.

President Shetler: It's been moved and seconded. Do I have any questions or comments? All in favor, signify by saying aye.

(All Councilmembers voted affirmatively)

President Shetler: Any opposed?

(No opposing votes were cast)

President Shetler: So ordered.

SHERIFF		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1050-1130-0082	Deputy Sheriff	33,000.00	33,000.00
To: 1050-1300	Overtime	33,000.00	33,000.00

JAIL		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1051-1130-0359	Confinement Officer	10,000.00	10,000.00
To: 1051-1850	Union Overtime	10,000.00	10,000.00

COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS		REQUESTED	APPROVED
FROM: 1361-1360-1361	Confinement Officer	1,000.00	1,000.00
TO: 1361-1530	Shift Differential	1,000.00	1,000.00

SHERIFF		REQUESTED	APPROVED
FROM: 1050-1130-0029	Sergeant	10,071.00	10,071.00
TO: 1050-1130-0015	Lieutenant	5,315.00	5,315.00
1050-1130-0024	Sergeant	4,756.00	4,756.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

**CORONER  
COMMISSIONERS  
CIRCUIT COURT  
SUPERIOR COURT  
CUMULATIVE BRIDGE  
LOCAL ROADS & STREETS  
COMMISSIONERS (LATE)**

Councilmember Raben: Okay, does anyone have any questions? I can take the balance of these in one motion if you'd like. Does anyone have any questions on any of the other transfers? None? Okay, Mr. President, I will move that the remainder or the balance of the transfers be approved as listed.

Councilmember Bassemier: Second.

President Shetler: It's been moved and seconded. Do I have any questions? Comments? All in favor, signify by saying aye.

**(All Councilmembers voted affirmatively)**

President Shetler: Any opposed?

**(No opposing votes were cast)**

President Shetler: So ordered.

<b>CORONER</b>		<b>REQUESTED</b>	<b>APPROVED</b>
FROM: 1070-2600	Office Supplies	800.00	800.00
1070-3130	Travel/Mileage	635.00	635.00
1070-3190	Solid Waste Disposal	600.00	600.00
1070-2230	Garage & Motor	700.00	700.00
1070-2600	Office Supplies	400.00	400.00
1070-2700	Other Supplies	400.00	400.00
1070-2710	Color Film	800.00	800.00
1070-2740	Chemicals	500.00	500.00
TO: 1070-4210	Office Furniture	800.00	800.00
1070-3310	Training	1,235.00	1,235.00
1070-3530	Contractual Services	2,800.00	2,800.00

<b>COMMISSIONERS</b>		<b>REQUESTED</b>	<b>APPROVED</b>
FROM: 1300-3000	Bond & Insurance	10,000.00	10,000.00
TO: 1300-3610	Legal Services	10,000.00	10,000.00

**CIRCUIT COURT** **REQUESTED** **APPROVED**

FROM: 1360-3944	Special Reporter	1,000.00	1,000.00
TO: 1360-2270	Juror Meals/Lodging	1,000.00	1,000.00

**SUPERIOR COURT** **REQUESTED** **APPROVED**

FROM: 1370-4210	Office Furniture	4,000.00	4,000.00
TO: 1370-3250	Law Books	3,000.00	3,000.00
1370-3730	Continuing Education	1,000.00	1,000.00

**CUMULATIVE BRIDGE** **REQUESTED** **APPROVED**

FROM: 2030-4417	Baseline Rd. Bridge	450,000.00	450,000.00
2030-4424	Baehl Rd. Culvert	60,000.00	60,000.00
2030-4716	Mohr Rd. Bridge	40,000.00	40,000.00
2030-4719	Sensmeier Rd. Bridge	25,000.00	25,000.00
TO: 2030-4373	First Avenue Bridge	575,000.00	575,000.00

**LOCAL ROADS & STREETS** **REQUESTED** **APPROVED**

FROM: 2160-4329	County Line Road	2,000.00	2,000.00
TO: 2160-3610	Legal Services	2,000.00	2,000.00

**COMMISSIONERS** **REQUESTED** **APPROVED**

FROM: 1300-3000	Bond & Insurance	403.00	403.00
1300-3612	Legal Contractual	5,011.00	5,011.00
TO: 1300-1120-1300	County Attorney	3,193.00	3,193.00
1300-1900	FICA	245.00	245.00
1300-1910	PERF	248.00	248.00
1300-1920	Insurance	1,728.00	1,728.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

**CONTINUATION OF HIRING FREEZE FOR 2010**

President Shetler: Alright, the next item then is, basically, new business. We started talking about the hiring freeze and I think, Councilman Sutton, you had brought that up before about revising that slightly. Did we have anything else to add to that?

Councilmember Sutton: I am not aware that we had any additional things to add to it. We, at our last regular meeting, we tweaked it, made some adjustments to it, and I think there was pretty much common consent on the proposal. I guess it's not a proposal, but I guess it's, on the resolution. And so if there are any other items, I'm not aware of it. But, I mean, this would be a good time to discuss those if there are some adjustments to that resolution.

President Shetler: Do I have any comments or questions about the hiring freeze as we proposed?

Councilmember Lloyd: Do we have final language? I guess we don't have it in front of us.

President Shetler: We approved that the last time. I think we left it that we'd bring it up again in case there were any other questions that came up.

Councilmember Sutton: Well, the discussion was for 2010, what action we would take so, in fact, that's how it's listed on our agenda. We've already enacted it for 2009 at our last meeting which is kind of the tail end. So the question is, do we want to take that same language, the same resolution and then carry that over for 2010, and take action on that?

President Shetler: It would be my feeling, my own personal feeling on it, is it is something that is working, it is taking a little bit more time for Council, but it's something that, I think it's part of our responsibility and our job to take up and I would like for us to continue the program through the year 2010 as well. Do I have any other questions or comments?

Councilmember Lloyd: My understanding, it would just keep in effect unless the Council chose to rescind it. But, I mean, if we wanted to reiterate it in January of '10, we could do it that way.

President Shetler: Right. That's correct. Okay, we'll move on. Any other comments, then?

<b>PROPOSED REDUCTION OF 2010 REASSESSMENT LEVY</b>
---

President Shetler: We'll move on to the next which is a resolution to appeal for property tax shortfall. What I wanted to bring up here, and I just, basically, I think Mr. Weaver is – back in September, I think it was September 2<sup>nd</sup>, Jonathan, if you want to come forward. I had mentioned at one of our budget hearing meetings about the possibility of reducing the tax levy on the monies that come in every year for the assessment. And because the reassessments are done now on a continually rolling basis rather than done once every five or ten years, there wasn't the need to have the levy quite so high, that we could save the taxpayers, perhaps if we rolled that back a little bit. And I think we've accumulated 1.2 – 1.3 million dollars in there so far that we have in the balance.

Jonathan Weaver: So we're talking about the Reassessment fund?

President Shetler: Yes. And just wondering if, perhaps, what I think, checking into that, what we need is the Auditor and the Assessor to sign off on that to send that to the Department of Finance on that, and I just wanted to know if you could, if you're in agreement to that and would work along with us on that?

Jonathan Weaver: Uh, you know, I wasn't – good morning, Jonathan Weaver, Vanderburgh County Assessor – I wasn't aware of the initial conversation, so I wasn't aware what all that was about. I'm open for discussion about it. I did receive a letter from the Auditor's office, but my questions were not answered about that letter. So...it's something we could talk about.

President Shetler: Right, it's my understanding, if we don't act on it very quickly, the taxpayers will lose that opportunity to save about a quarter of a million dollars. And I guess if I recall, and I'm going to be in kind of round numbers here. We have a balance in that fund right now, somewhere between 1.2 and 1.3 million dollars. I think the budgeted expenses for that are roughly close to half a million dollars, 450 – half a million, I'm not exactly sure what the nickels and dimes are there, the change is, and what I would be proposing is that we keep the tax levy at something that would bring in maybe about half the amount of money there so that the other half could draw off of that balance until we get the balance down after two or three years, down to about 6 or \$700,000. And that's capitalizing on the fact that we have the rolling assessments now and that we have a restructured Assessor's office that probably lends itself a little bit more to doing it on an ongoing basis. We don't have this big rush every five or ten years when you have to do it. And again, it's the way to save the taxpayers \$250,000 approximately a year. And I think that, basically, explains it. I don't know, there might be some more detail into it than that, and I don't know what your questions were, specifically.

Jonathan Weaver: Uh, not, wasn't...not at this second I don't have any questions. I did have questions I did pose to the Auditor's office on what it would do for the taxpayers, and how much it could save the taxpayers, and they were unable to answer that question for me. You know, like I said, I'm willing to talk about this. This is the first I'm hearing about it, like it's being brought up upon me in a public forum, so we can sit down and talk about it. I'm open to that idea.

Bill Fluty: Tom, I'd like to clarify a couple statements Jonathan has made. It was in the budget hearings that you asked how we could go about reducing that levy because we have 1.4 million dollars in reserve and we're taxing over 400,000 and using about 300,000. So, unnecessarily overtaxing is, I guess, where you were headed with that. I wrote the letter to Jonathan on September 25<sup>th</sup>, just stating the facts, because of the rolling reassessment, the balance of 1.4 million, reducing that levy in half to bring in \$214,000 opposed to the 428,000, and his response was, can you guarantee, he asked me if you can guarantee that would help the taxpayers or I can read it, if you'd like me to: Can you guarantee a substantial reduction in the tax rate if this were to happen and can you guarantee that this will substantially help the taxpayers? My answer back was, because of the reasons cited in the letter, I believe this is the right action to take. No other correspondence came from Jonathan. We made cuts, very small cuts in supply line items, contractual line items, and it is the cumulative total of all those cuts that make a difference. This is a chance to make a cut over 200,000 –

Jonathan Weaver: And that's what you didn't answer –

Bill Fluty: Excuse me, let me finish Jonathan. This is a time to cut over 200,000 out of one particular line item that has a direct effect on all taxpayers. So, for those reasons, I believe I did answer those questions clearly enough, which he should understand those –

Jonathan Weaver: – you said for the reasons indicated. You didn't answer my questions specifically, which is why the –

Bill Fluty: I think it was obvious that a \$200,000 cut would be a benefit to the taxpayers. So that's how I answered those. But I just wanted to say, I did respond.

President Shetler: That point was something I brought up myself during the budget hearings because I recognized that it was a way that we could save and I felt like we were going through and trying to save a thousand here, \$200 there, and five, that this was some big meat here, if you will, that we'll be able to save, you know, taxpayers some 200 to a quarter of a million dollars, and it is going to take – the more I got involved into it and found out what it would take to reduce that levy, it would take the cooperation between you and our Auditor. You may have, I know you were present that day, but you may have left when I asked that question and brought the subject up, I'm not sure –

Jonathan Weaver: Yeah, I don't recall –

President Shetler: – because our minutes don't reflect if you were present at the moment. But anyway, it is a concern that I have, and again, we have until, I think, December 31<sup>st</sup> to get that information up to Indianapolis so that they can roll that back, so I guess where I'm posing the question today is, if you're willing to sign on board with that to help, you know, reduce that tax levy back a little bit then, again, it's something that I feel like would be –

Jonathan Weaver: And that's my concern over this whole thing. If I'm 50% of the piece, why didn't we sit down and talk about this instead of just sending a letter to me or why couldn't we sit down as the County Council body with the Auditor and myself and talk about the benefits instead of just hearing them right at this second?

Bill Fluty: At the September 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting, they asked me questions on that, asked me how that would be done. I told them it would be done by a letter, that it would have to be sent to the DLGF, signed by the Auditor and the Assessor. I believed you had information on that fact. I sent the letter as they requested just starting that process out. So I did what I was directed to do by the Council. You elect to sign or not to sign. You still have that option.

President Shetler: He brought a copy of that letter and no action has really been taken. This is our last official meeting between now and the end of the year and after that, the taxpayers lose out on that opportunity to save that quarter of a million dollars. I felt that it was important to get it going and it's our last chance to get it done since I hadn't heard anything from the request that we had made back in September. So –

Jonathan Weaver: And I guess if this is such a huge, you know, decision, why am I, why didn't we talk about this last month during the meeting...in, when you voted in November or October?

President Shetler: Well, again, it was brought up on two different occasions in September, once in a public meeting and a second time, you know, by letter to you that I had been copied on, and I just felt that you were probably in the process of working on it, and that's what I'm asking you. And I guess you're telling me today that you're not, that you have not been working on it, and I guess my next question is, is there any intention to get the ball rolling on it or to do anything, or what is your pleasure today?

Jonathan Weaver: I kind of felt my response from the Auditor was that he didn't answer my questions, but now you seem to be answering my questions...I can work

with you.

Bill Fluty: Just back to that, Jonathan, I did answer your questions, told you the reasons why I felt it was the right thing to do.

Jonathan Weaver: You didn't answer those specific questions that I emailed to you. You said it was in the previous correspondence.

President Shetler: Okay well, bottom line here, for the taxpayers' sake, I mean, you are willing to sign on board and get this going so that we can reduce that tax levy?

Councilmember Sutton: Can I ask a question here? We're talking about the Reassessment fund, now what is the present levy?

President Shetler: The present levy is about \$428,400 a year. That's what we had projected for 2010.

Councilmember Sutton: I guess maybe I'm talking about the rate. Do you know what that is?

President Shetler: I don't know what the rate would be. I just know what it translates into dollars.

Councilmember Sutton: And the uses for that fund are...?

Jonathan Weaver: We use it for everything else besides salaries, comes out of that. So we're talking about contractual services, technology, travel, office supplies...and that sort.

President Shetler: The budget for it, this might help, Councilman, the budget for that is \$317,300 for next year. In other words, we are putting \$111,100 more into it next year, and we have a balance of almost \$1.5 million.

Councilmember Sutton: Right. And this year, we've had appropriations of 536,536,000 and some change, at least according to the report that we've got here. And the budget, you said for next year, you say is –

President Shetler: \$317,300.

Councilmember Sutton: So we've got a healthy balance there. Did the Pictometry come out of this fund, costs related to that?

Jonathan Weaver: Yes. It was an additional appropriation that was made this year. It's included in the 2010 budget.

Councilmember Sutton: Okay, and how much is that in 2010?

Jonathan Weaver: It's going to be roughly 40,000.

Councilmember Sutton: Okay.

Jonathan Weaver: Now, I don't know if half that is split with the other department heads in the county, but that's the balance of the remaining, of the contract.

Bill Fluty: And that's already budgeted, within the budget for next year.



Councilmember Sutton: Right. The...so, trying to reduce that balance down based upon what you're proposing here over what period of years, how much are you talking about in total? You're saying a quarter of a million –

President Shetler: I think, basically, we were talking about –

Councilmember Sutton: Are you talking about 2010 or are you talking about a certain amount moving forward, what are you...

President Shetler: I think, basically, we were talking about cutting that levy in half, so pretty close to half, so that it would be somewhere in the neighborhood of \$215,000 a year that we would be saving the taxpayers.

Bill Fluty: Essentially, you would be using your cash balance to some degree to make up the – I think you're bringing in 215 plus –

Councilmember Sutton: I mean, we can't use it for anything else, but –

Bill Fluty: You can't use it for anything else and holding, whether you believed that holding that much cash balance is prudent or not, or let it go down, and then you can review this on a yearly basis as needs – you remember that reassessments were every four years or I think sometimes went longer, and there was a higher dollar amount that went out to do a total reassessment of the whole county. Now we do rolling reassessments, which I believe they're 20 percent, I think, is what they do, and the cost has gone down.

President Shetler: Basically, we're maintaining a balance of five times what our annual expenses are and, I mean, you know, when you get down to it and you look at what we did before on some of the other funds, I mean, this is a good amount of money that we can return to the taxpayers now.

Councilmember Sutton: Right. I understand your point and I guess what, maybe what I'm just trying to get a sense of, wouldn't this be an appropriate time as well, I mean, if we look at just the historic patterns of how that fund has been used, and what those cash balances are, we're reducing that by \$215,00 for 2010, we're still going to have a pretty healthy balance, I guess, in 2010, is there something maybe we want to look at over an extended span of time, say three years, in terms of how we want to look at how that fund is being used or are you believing that by reducing that by half on the levy on that, and looking at historic patterns, then they will begin to balance out at that time by reducing it in half, and then at some point in time, then revisiting that balance after a period of time? Is that what you're proposing?

Bill Fluty: Obviously, I mean, that's your pleasure to look at this at any time if there are new things coming up which you may have to purchase. But you have a million, almost a million and a half dollars now, and left with the current rate you have in place, if you don't change it, you'll have more than a million and a half dollars in there next year. Is that prudent, is that fair to the taxpayers, is the question. We've reduced the general fund, this is another place we can reduce and lower the tax rate and the burden on the taxpayer. It's just your pleasure if you'd like to do it, if you believe that that 1.5 is just a little, is too much to hold as a cash balance.

President Shetler: And the issue is that these are fairly restricted funds, that can only be used for a limited amount of items and so it's not really prudent to be able to hold a large cash balance in a very restricted fund, would be to do that more in the general fund where you have a more wide open area to utilize those funds for, but

in this given area, it's fairly restricted. So it doesn't –

Councilmember Sutton: So is the request today, I mean, I don't –

President Shetler: The request today, actually the request back in September that I'd made, is basically to look at rolling that levy back so that we cut that somewhat in half, start working off of the savings that we've accumulated over the past several years and –

Councilmember Sutton: I mean, are you looking for the Auditor, the Assessor to put together a request –

President Shetler: Yes, it takes a joint.

Councilmember Sutton: To come to an agreement on that? On the Council's side, I mean, what are we, what are you requesting from the Council on our end?

President Shetler: Well, basically, I wanted, in essence, just to kind of bring it up so that, you know, to see if Mr. Weaver was in agreement on it. If he was in agreement on it, then we have no question. If he's not, perhaps we needed to do a resolution to ask as a joint body to get that done. So that's the issue today.

Councilmember Sutton: Well, I mean, I guess we've got the Personnel & Finance meeting at the end of the year. Other than that, we don't really have another action or another meeting where we would be able to act on a resolution if it was coming from the Council. So I'm still trying to get an idea what you're looking for here.

President Shetler: I think Ed had a question.

Councilmember Bassemier: Yeah, I understand that, of course, both the Auditor and the Assessor has to be in agreement on this and, obviously, you think you've been blind sided here today. I just wonder if we had enough time, if maybe you and the Auditor, you'd rather have an audience than to send information back and forth by a letter, maybe some time in the next week you and Bill, and maybe the Finance Chairman, a couple more, and maybe sit down and talk about this and maybe come to terms because what I'm reading today, there's no way you're going to okay this because you feel like you've been blind sided.

Jonathan Weaver: Well, I do feel like I was being blind sided, you know, if there was such a time crunch on this, again, you had October and November to talk to me about this. You know, I'm all about saving taxpayer dollars. We've cut \$200,000 from our 2010 budget, we've been under budget hundreds of thousands of dollars over the last two years, so...

President Shetler: Councilman Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Mr. Assessor, I do appreciate your concerns about, you know, you'd like to have good communication, but to me this seems like a no brainer. As a matter a fact, I think cutting 50 percent is not enough. I mean, we've got 1.5 million. Why not just cut out the entire 300 and some odd thousand out of the budget? We'd still have 1.2 million left over. I mean, this is the year that taxpayers are suffering in a bad economy, there's no reason not to give them the full benefit immediately and, you know, in future years we may not be in an economic crisis, so I say, give them the full benefit, cut out the entire 300 and some thousand, and hopefully you'll agree with that and you guys can get together and get this done.

That's my opinion.

President Shetler: Councilman Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Well, a quick comment on that. We still have to appropriate what he needs as a budget for next year. If you were saying --

Councilmember Kiefer: Cut from the assessment for next year, the amount --

Councilmember Raben: You mean eliminate the whole rate?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yeah.

Bill Fluty: In essence, what you would be doing if you would zero that rate down to zero, you would be, all the, everything that you'd budgeted for the reassessment next year would come out off the cash balance. So there would be no taxes due for reassessment next year, if that's your --

Councilmember Kiefer: And we've got plenty of money in our cash balance, so I don't see why --

Councilmember Sutton: Well, but we know we will, obviously, need that fund in future years. The balance is heavy, but if you eliminate that altogether, --

Councilmember Kiefer: You're still three times the amount of what we're budgeting.

Councilmember Sutton: Right, but what it would take to bring that fund, you're talking about a --

Councilmember Kiefer: But in future years, my point is, --

(Inaudible, both speaking at once)

Councilmember Sutton: -- essentially, what you'd have to do.

Councilmember Kiefer: And my point is, in future years, our economy is going to be in better shape. This is the year that taxpayers need that, more than any. And so if we've got the luxury of having 1.5 million, why not do it? We'll still have plenty of money left in it, approximately 1.5 million, we should be in great shape. It seems like a no brainer to me.

Councilmember Raben: Just a procedural question. I mean, the action that, what is required by us to reduce the rate? By this board?

Bill Fluty: Nothing.

Councilmember Raben: What is required by this board to increase the rate?

Bill Fluty: I would still say nothing.

Councilmember Raben: So I'm trying to answer a question that was raised I think by you at some point earlier in the discussion that I don't think this Council has to take any action. I guess it just comes back to the question, you know, what's decided amongst, so really, the Assessor and the Auditor fix this rate either way, right?

Bill Fluty: Back in, I just want to reference September 2<sup>nd</sup> when I was asked to do this and I sent the letter, as I was asked to do, basically, this letter was to go to Tim Rushenberg, and that's how it was proposed. And I signed it and scanned it and sent it to Jonathan to be signed if he was in agreement. To lower or raise this levy, takes a letter signed by the Auditor and the Assessor to be sent to the DLGF for their determination. So that's where we are today.

President Shetler: Councilman Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Since this Council really has no power in this, can the Assessor and Auditor agree to meet between now and maybe next week, give a report back and then maybe work this out? I don't know what we're doing here right now discussing it, actually.

President Shetler: Well, I think it's important to at least know that we're going to get some kind of agreement that they will work it out and it was brought to my attention that the request that we had made on September 2<sup>nd</sup> had been followed up on, but it had dropped. The ball had been dropped along the way and I just wanted to make sure that that ball got picked back up again and started down the court so that –

Councilmember Goebel: I understand, and I think everyone is in agreement that something can be done to help the taxpayers. But these two gentlemen can sit down and come back to us now, I think, if they both publically say they're going to meet.

Jonathan Weaver: And to clarify, I wasn't at that September 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting when that topic came up, and I didn't receive the letter until September 25<sup>th</sup>.

Bill Fluty: You instigated this by asking ways to reduce and I've given you this option, so it's just reporting back to where we are on this.

President Shetler: And I apologize. My intent was not any blind siding or anything, it was that, well, time is becoming of the essence. It was two months ago since the letter was sent. Its been almost three months ago since I actually brought the subject up, and I know that if we don't do this by December 31, the taxpayers lose the opportunity. So this was the best opportunity to get this thing rolling again, get the discussion on the table so that we could move forward on it and what I needed then is a commitment that both of you guys are going to be willing to get this somehow accomplished. I didn't go for the whole enchilada of zeroing it down because I felt like that may have been a little bit more, although Joe is exactly right, this is probably the best time to do that. The taxpayers are in a hurt, we all are. But I felt like it would be most prudent and a compromise position to look at splitting it somewhere in the middle there. So that's what I was looking towards. And I get, we're getting from you today that you are in agreement of the concept of cutting down the tax or the levy so that the taxpayers will save on it and you will meet with our Auditor and get this all worked out then?

Jonathan Weaver: And I appreciate you bringing it up to my attention again and I've learned more in the last twenty minutes standing up here than through my conversation with you. So now I understand a lot better and I'm willing to, we'll probably sit down Friday, right?

Bill Fluty: At any time.

Councilmember Raben: You know, as far as this body is concerned, you know, we

have different levies and we've adjusted those back and forth. We've done that a time or two with the Bridge rate, with the Cum Bridge rate. We've reduced it and then had to increase it a few years later, so it's not unprecedented to adjust rates depending on what the times are and the needs are.

Councilmember Lloyd: Just real quickly, this has been a topic of conversation with the Council and the Auditor and Assessor going back several years, because I know even when Cheryl Musgrave was Assessor there was talk well, we need to keep this level of cash high because of the GIS, because of computerization. So there was some thought that well, we'd better hold that off for those reasons. But here we are, we've got the Pictometry system moving forward. It just seems like this is an opportunity to reduce property taxes for taxpayers whether it's two cents on a bill or one and a half cents, if you can knock it down, that will be a benefit to the taxpayers to the tune of \$250,000. I mean, I'm in favor of it. I hope the rest of the Councilmembers are in favor of it, and I would like to see Mr. Weaver and Mr. Fluty sign the letter, get it up to the DLGF.

Councilmember Sutton: Well, could we have both of them do this: first of all maybe what this Council could do is make a recommendation on when this business needs to be taken care of, when it needs to be concluded. Can you guys meet before December the 15<sup>th</sup>?

Jonathan Weaver: Oh yeah.

Councilmember Sutton: And at that meeting, Auditor Fluty brings a – well, he has already prepared a draft that he sent to you before that meeting, you prepare a draft of what your version is, that you've sent to him, prior to that meeting, when you sit down, you have something to talk about and our Finance Chair could sit in on that meeting, as well. Maybe our President of the Council could sit in, but come to that meeting with drafts that both of you have already reviewed and have this taken care of, say, by the 15<sup>th</sup> of this month. Is that possible?

Bill Fluty: The draft I've sent will remain the same unless you have some other, unless the Council has some other direction. Right now, the letter was to cut that levy in half and that's how I responded.

Councilmember Sutton: Okay well, you're in good shape. Okay.

Councilmember Bassemier: Jonathan, was that a good time for you?

Jonathan Weaver: Fine, we have a DLGF conference call. I assume you're sitting in on it?

Bill Fluty: Yes.

Councilmember Goebel: Question again, can you two sit down together and hammer something out? I think you both have to sign the same piece of paper.

Bill Fluty: Yes. I've already signed it.

Councilmember Goebel: But will you meet with Jonathan again?

Bill Fluty: Sure.

Councilmember Goebel: Thank you.

President Shetler: Okay. Thank you, Jonathan, appreciate it.

<b>PROSECUTOR EMPLOYMENT REQUEST</b>
--------------------------------------

President Shetler: Okay, next is a request from the Prosecutor's office to fill a vacancy.

Stan Levco: Good morning. For the record, I'm Stan Levco, the Prosecutor, and I'm here to fill a vacancy or I'm here to ask you to fill a vacancy. Do you want me to say anything more in the way of an opening statement?

President Shetler: Alright, anybody have any questions?

Councilmember Kiefer: Sure. Mr. Prosecutor, is this a necessary position, you feel like it's one of these positions, I'm assuming it is, it's a full-time deputy prosecutor?

Stan Levco: Yeah, I believe it's necessary.

Councilmember Kiefer: And what are some of the duties this person performs?

Stan Levco: Well, it's a more complicated answer than you might expect. The vacancy is for a child molesting prosecutor. But I'm going to fill that in-house, so one of my deputies now is going to become the child molesting prosecutor, so this new position will essentially take over that, which will be misdemeanor court and handling court matters, trying cases, things like that, but mostly misdemeanor court.

Councilmember Kiefer: Thank you.

President Shetler: Okay, any other questions?

Councilmember Lloyd: Roughly, how many child molesting cases are they prosecuting? How is your statistical brain?

Stan Levco: I'd guess roughly 100 a year, but under 200 for sure.

Councilmember Lloyd: Okay, but, I mean, when we talked, I mean, it just seems like we do need to replace this position and we're going to add some full-time, changing from part-time in the Public Defender's office, so why would we want the Prosecutor to be short-handed in that regard?

Councilmember Raben: A sign of the times is the recent news on the jail, or the population growth, so I'm sure this would have a huge effect on that. But since I mention that, is there, I hope we get some renewed interest among your office and the court system along with the Sheriff to maybe get more interested – maybe that's not the right word, but do something to speed the process up to move people through our system quicker and send them off to DOC and what have you. And I know this is an important step to do that, but again, I hope we're meeting maybe more regularly than we were six months ago with all those players to ensure that we're doing everything we can to move people through the system.

Stan Levco: Yeah, the Sheriff and I have been emailing the last couple of days and Judge Heldt, and I know we're going to have a meeting relatively soon, certainly before the first of the year. I'm concerned about it and I know everyone else is, too.

Councilmember Raben: It seems like when it's discussed, things seem to happen

a little quicker, then maybe we kind of forget about it but I'm not saying that any part of it is your fault, any part of it is the court's fault, actually, none of it is the Sheriff's fault, but – well, you know, again, he's charged with housing them, not letting them through the system. But, you know, again if we could –

Stan Levco: I think it's the criminal's fault, that's my –

Councilmember Raben: Well, it is.

President Shetler: Stan, in that area of work there, that segment, how many attorneys do you have that are actually performing in that misdemeanor area there?

Stan Levco: There's one main misdemeanor head, and that's the person right now that's going to go into the child molesting. Then there's about four or maybe five other attorneys that will do one misdemeanor session per week or maybe two.

President Shetler: So if we didn't fill this, basically what you're talking about is being short one person, so that you'd be kind of gathering up, everybody would have to do another 20 - 25 percent of the workload in order to make up for that shortfall?

Stan Levco: It's not that simple, but –

President Shetler: I'm trying to simplify it for my brain to fit it in here.

Stan Levco: It isn't that simple.

President Shetler: I'm trying to quantify it somehow here. But basically we're talking about a department of five people in an area and they do different things.

Stan Levco: No, but because one of the persons who would do the one misdemeanor court a week would be head of the gun program, so that person is not a misdemeanor deputy, they just do one session a week. Another person is the person in charge of domestic violence does a domestic violence session, so they do one of those a week. So they're really not a misdemeanor deputy.

President Shetler: Okay, let me ask it a different way.

Stan Levco: I mean, theoretically, I could go to misdemeanor court, and that's very theoretical. I could do misdemeanor court once a week.

President Shetler: What's the average caseload of your prosecutors?

Stan Levco: I can answer that but it's going to be misleading. We filed roughly 2,000 felonies a year, actually more like 2,300. And there's roughly 10,000 misdemeanors a year. Now if you had one misdemeanor deputy and said their caseload is 10,000 a year, that's meaningless because all they're doing there is sitting there and most of them are just being processed. So when you talk about caseload, it's more for felonies than misdemeanors, so there's 2,000 felonies, there's roughly 20 full-time deputies, so you could say it's a hundred a person, but –

President Shetler: In comparing that to private, I mean, I have no idea, I mean, what somebody in defense law might do in a – I mean, would that be about what most of them do in private or would that be...

Stan Levco: Do you mean private/civil?

President Shetler: Yeah, criminal defense work that...

Stan Levco: A criminal private attorney is paid on a per case basis. He might, he does other things besides criminal work, too. I don't think many –

President Shetler: Well, do you know what the average caseload might be for a private attorney just doing a variety of general practice type work?

Stan Levco: You mean somebody like Jeff?

President Shetler: Well, I don't know if he's – I don't know if he's doing any criminal at all.

Stan Levco: Well, do you mean a private civil attorney who does some criminal work?

President Shetler: Yeah, I'm just trying to quantify this somewhat to determine whether or not your people are working about the same or more or less than what private is and if there is any room, you know, in the future or in this position and I'm trying to determine whether or not this position is fully needed. Now it sounds to me like in every situation that you've discussed so far it is, because I'm getting a feeling here that we're talking about people who are – while you've got different departments and different segments here and I don't know how all of your; and exactly how many employees that you're talking about because you've got part-time, full-time and everything else, but it sounds to me as if you're talking about a very specific job that needs to be covered here and I'm just trying to, in my mind, quantify that somewhat and compare that to some kind of outside mark there that your guys are already handling 20 percent more cases than what a guy would if he were generally in private or whatever, and for the amount of money that they're making, that's pushing them pretty hard.

Councilmember Sutton: Tom, probably a more comparable measure might be against another county as opposed to maybe private practice.

President Shetler: Well, I'll go with that. Give me a benchmark of some sort.

Councilmember Sutton: Well, private practice you pick and chose what you want to – they have to take every case that comes through their office, not by their choosing. Private practice, you can select what you may – so maybe another county might be an appropriate way to –

President Shetler: Or even, how about the Public Defender's office?

Stan Levco: See, and that's the closest thing, but if you tried to do that, I'd say that's not right either because when a public defender has a case, all he has to do is defend that case. We do a lot more things other than prosecute cases. We decide not to prosecute cases. It takes time to evaluate cases and a case that comes in, our investigators look at and decide not to prosecute. The public defender never sees that case. Then you've got a lot of private attorneys – well, that's kind of a different thing, but a lot of private attorneys take cases that public defenders don't take but we are prosecuting all those cases, too. But relatively, and I can't give you numbers, but relatively, I think the public defender's case load is not much different than ours and I've always thought that's not, shouldn't be the case because we do more than the public defender. We have more duties than the public defender. But if you want to...



President Shetler: Alright, thank you, Stan, I think. Alright, anybody else have any questions?

Councilmember Bassemier: Make a motion to approve.

Councilmember Kiefer: Second.

President Shetler: Okay, we've got a motion from Councilman Bassemier and a second by Councilman Kiefer. Okay, any other questions? Alright, all in favor signify by saying aye.

**(All Councilmembers voted affirmatively)**

President Shetler: Anyone opposed?

**(No opposing votes were cast)**

President Shetler: So ordered. Thank you, Stan.

**(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)**

<b>COUNTY ASSESSOR EMPLOYMENT REQUEST</b>
---

President Shetler: The next one is Jonathan, our County Assessor, with a request.

Jonathan Weaver: Good morning, I'm Jonathan Weaver, your Vanderburgh County Assessor. We're asking to replace an employee for an existing line item position that was left vacant by someone that left for the private sector on October 31<sup>st</sup>. We are able to get through the rest of this year not filling that position. That will save about \$5,300 but we'd like your permission to hire someone starting January 1<sup>st</sup>. This is the third staffer we've had this year leave for the private sector. We gave back a position to you guys in January, we gave back another position to the county back in August. Prior to the assessor consolidation, we had 52 employees and now we have 40. You may recall that our part-time budget this year was zero. We used two unpaid college interns this summer, working on a part-time basis and then tomorrow we start interviewing candidates from the community work experience program, or otherwise known as the Welfare to Work program to see if we can tap into that resource and to get more bodies into the office. We initiate and help bill over \$160 million in property taxes and as a revenue generating office, we picked up an additional \$6 million so far in assessed value over the last three months since we started using Pictometry. And if you conservatively use the 1.5 percent cap, that's an extra \$80,000 in revenue that we're bringing back into the general fund. As you may recall, the first year of Pictometry cost nearly \$80,000, and so in the first three months of us using it, it's basically paid for the first year already. We've been hundreds of thousands of dollars under budget for the last two years as I stated in the Assessor plan I gave you on February 25<sup>th</sup>. We cut over \$200,000 from the 2010 budget and with the talk of the pay scale changing, I assume this new employee will save more taxpayer money by being paid less, entry level. So that's our request, I appreciate your time, I'll take any questions or comments you may have.

President Shetler: Do I have any questions? Yes, Councilman Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: I was looking at the salary ordinance, the different individuals with personal property, what are the duties of this person? I guess you've got, like

a First Deputy Business Personal Property is one position, and you've got Deputy Assessor Business Personal Property is another position, you've got Personal Property Coordinator is another position, Deputy Assessor Personal Property Data Analysis is another position, Personal Property Inheritance, which I know is a separate situation, and then you've got two of them that deal with mobile homes.

Jonathan Weaver: This person, we actually swapped out earlier this year with another person, so this person went to real estate, the other person went to personal property. So they have a personal property title, line item description, but they're working in the real estate department.

Councilmember Lloyd: Out of the property parcels, I don't know if you know a percentage or an approximate number of how many are personal property?

Jonathan Weaver: How many personal property parcels do we have? About 9,500.

Councilmember Lloyd: Okay, and the overall parcels was –

Jonathan Weaver: There's 81,315 real estate parcels.

Councilmember Lloyd: So 81,000, roughly 9,500 personal property. Are those more labor intensive than other for assessments?

Jonathan Weaver: The real estate is probably more labor intensive. They're both huge assets to bringing in revenue for the county. There's certain times of the year where each department is bombarded.

Councilmember Lloyd: I know, I mean, from my private sector experience, I know we work with some of our business clients that fill out personal property returns, so you've got all the machinery, other assets like that that aren't real.

Jonathan Weaver: This was a loss, though, to our real estate department because, like I said, they were swapped. So personal property, I feel is staffed well at this point in time. I'd just like your permission to hire for the real estate department.

Councilmember Lloyd: So the request is for a personal property deputy assessor, is that the request?

Jonathan Weaver: That happens to be the line item description, that person would be working in real estate.

Councilmember Lloyd: These were some of the positions that were eliminated and then brought back, does that make sense, in the beginning of the year? Do you remember that?

Jonathan Weaver: Vaguely.

Councilmember Lloyd: Well, they were, I guess, they were eliminated in December and brought back in January. There were three positions.

Jonathan Weaver: Oh, those. Yes, I remember that.

Councilmember Lloyd: Deputy Assessor Deeds, Deputy Assessor Personal Property, and Real Estate Deputy. So is this, this would be a COMOT IV, then?

Jonathan Weaver: I'm not 100 percent positive.

Councilmember Raben: A new position would be less than that, wouldn't it?

Jonathan Weaver: It would be, I guess my understanding is that the new person would make less than this person that left. Is that...

Councilmember Lloyd: Well, it would be a COMOT IV under the new schedule. But, so you don't see any situation where this could be, this position could be eliminated and the duties transferred?

Jonathan Weaver: Not at this point in time. We eliminated a position in January and then we eliminated another one in August, and we're down – if you consider at all when we were nine different Assessor offices, there were 52 employees, and now we're down to 40, as one big office.

Councilmember Raben: Has this person, is officially gone now?

Jonathan Weaver: Yeah, they left October 31<sup>st</sup>.

Councilmember Raben: And we paid out their line for all their time and everything?

Jonathan Weaver: I believe so.

Councilmember Lloyd: The other possibility would be leave it vacant until things get busy in March or April.

Jonathan Weaver: Well, things are busy continually. We're trending now for '10 pay '11, so we're working on that. You know, we have mandates to get to the state and I think we're finally on the timetable where I want to be on, is when we submit to the state in May, get approved in June, so...

President Shetler: I know it came up, I think, during Pictometry back in the spring when we talked about teams and I think that at that time it was brought up about sending two people out on teams. Are we still doing that or did we cut that back to one, I think it used to be one for years.

Jonathan Weaver: We're still two people.

President Shetler: Do we utilize full-time people on that or is that part-time?

Jonathan Weaver: I have no part-time people right now.

President Shetler: I think, in this budget, didn't we reinstate it for 2010?

Jonathan Weaver: For 2010, I do have a part-time budget, yes.

President Shetler: Yeah. Will you be using, continue to utilize two people then on those teams?

Jonathan Weaver: It's good – yes. It's good for – you need someone when you're measuring the structures. It's good to have a second set of eyeballs. It's good for safety purposes. It's good if you get into a he said/she said sort of situation with a taxpayer, if there's another witness there. So we feel this is the appropriate thing to do.

President Shetler: Are we getting twice the amount of work finished? Are they able to do things quicker, and go through the properties, and measuring and all that stuff a little quicker?

Jonathan Weaver: (Inaudible)

President Shetler: If we didn't have two people on a team going out to do that physical surveying and stuff, and we went back to the system that we had traditionally for years and years with the one man teams and stuff, would it be necessary to have this position filled?

Jonathan Weaver: I don't know if I can guarantee that other offices prior to the consolidations sent just one person, so I don't know if that's a –

President Shetler: Yeah, I don't know that they always sent one person, but I think, generally speaking, I think there was.

Jonathan Weaver: In the past we've had someone's car stolen. We've had guns pointed at people, we've had, even when I was out with them back in January, I went on the field visits, a pit bull hopped a fence. You know, there's hazards out there.

President Shetler: Yeah well, I think at the time Councilman Raben brought up the point that, you know, I know the meter readers, water, you've got postmen, all those kinds of services that go door to door and things as well, that they kind of encounter some of those same kind of threats that you're talking about and they basically still maintain a singular –

Jonathan Weaver: And as I said in the past, what we've been able to do in four hours in the field, we've done in 15 minutes using Pictometry. So we are utilizing our technology, that's brought in again –

President Shetler: So we're cutting down the number of visits then?

Jonathan Weaver: We are trying to do that, yes.

President Shetler: Alright, thank you. Alright, any other questions?

Councilmember Sutton: I move for approval.

President Shetler: It's been moved.

Councilmember Bassemier: Second.

President Shetler: And seconded. Yes, Councilman Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: I do have a question about the title: it's Real Estate Deputy Assessor? I think it was brought up whether, is it different than the request here –

Jonathan Weaver: It was ever evolving with the transition and this person originally did start out in personal property. We felt, as we looked, did our reviews, periodic reviews, we found that this person would be better in real estate and the other person that we switched them, so their titles didn't change, but their job duties, what they were doing at the time. So it would be for real estate.

President Shetler: Okay, any other questions on the motion? Yes, Councilman

Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Sounds like that should go to Job Study then if the duties have been changed. I mean, maybe the position needs to be re-rated. Or are you just saying it's an open position and you're wanting to hire for a different position than what you mentioned in your letter? In your letter, you stated the position is a Personal Property/Deputy Assessor, and now you're saying that's not true.

Jonathan Weaver: The intent is to replace someone in the real estate department.

Councilmember Lloyd: Okay.

Councilmember Raben: (Inaudible – microphone not turned on)

Jonathan Weaver: This new person would be working in the real estate department, so –

President Shetler: You're going to shift somebody within the department to another position and then fill that vacancy? Is that what's going on?

Jonathan Weaver: That I haven't thought about but the intent of requesting for the new employee was to help out the real estate department, they'd be doing real property duties.

President Shetler: Let me –

Councilmember Sutton: We've already got the position there and you're taking someone and you're moving them to that and then you're filling that personal property, I mean, that's your call to make in terms of how you want to move the people around, but if the position you're requesting has different responsibilities, different duties, I mean, you will need to bring that back to Job Study. But if the position already described exists, that's probably a non-issue, I guess, on our end.

Councilmember Bassemier: Jonathan, is it a new position? I mean, were we changing a line item here?

Jonathan Weaver: Oh no, this is a position that was funded through 2009 and it's funded next year for 2010.

President Shetler: Is this a position, though, that was vacated back in the spring or in early winter or late winter, whatever?

Jonathan Weaver: This person left on October 31<sup>st</sup>.

President Shetler: And that position is what you're trying to fill here, the same title, same job description?

Jonathan Weaver: Yes.

Councilmember Bassemier: Okay.

President Shetler: And that position that was vacated, did you say...

Jonathan Weaver: This person left October 31<sup>st</sup> –

President Shetler: And then that position was what specifically, again?

Jonathan Weaver: Apparently, this was his title, Personal Property, whatever.

Councilmember Lloyd: Personal Property/Deputy Assessor position 1000-1090-1730, but now what you're indicating is this person actually, they didn't work on personal property, they worked in real property?

Jonathan Weaver: Correct.

Councilmember Lloyd: Okay, so it actually is a different job description than what they were, but it just had not been brought to Council or we didn't have any idea about that.

Councilmember Raben: More of a job title, which we can make an amendment to the job title. The duties are – the job description is the only thing different.

Councilmember Lloyd: There is going to be a Job Study meeting December 16. I mean, we could look at this then, if that's appropriate. I don't know.

Councilmember Sutton: I mean, if you're, it's been operating under this job description, I mean, if Council went ahead and approved it and you bring it before the Job Study to make sure everything is in line with what we know that position to be as far as duties, there's no reason why we couldn't take action on this position here.

President Shetler: That's what I was going to suggest is perhaps we could go ahead and take it subject to Job Study's approval since we have a motion.

Councilmember Lloyd: Request a roll call vote.

President Shetler: Okay, any other questions or comments? Do you want to amend the motion to reflect subject to Job Study's approval then? On that?

Councilmember Sutton: Well, ultimately, this body makes the decision anyway.

President Shetler: But if we make this approval, we're approving...

Councilmember Sutton: Rather than make it subject to, I would say in my motion, I would say something to the fact that the position description needs to go before Job Study as a part of this approval.

**(Tape Changed)**

President Shetler: – so you are tweaking it, so does the seconder –

Councilmember Bassemier: I'll amend my second.

Councilmember Sutton: As a part of approving this, that this position description would be updated at the Job Study meeting.

Councilmember Bassemier: And I'll second.

President Shetler: Okay, it's been moved and seconded. Any questions? Comments? Roll call please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: I think based on the fact that you've already eliminated two and you have your part-time cut out, I think it should go on to Job Study with that clarification. Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: I'd prefer to vote after Job Study and then consider it. This person's already been gone for over a month so I don't know why we couldn't just vote on this after Job Study. So with that, I vote no.

Teri Lukeman: President Shetler?

President Shetler: Yes. So, there being five ayes and two nays, the motion carries. Jonathan, then you got the date on that, December 16<sup>th</sup>? Job Study?

Jonathan Weaver: Okay. Thanks.

President Shetler: Alright, thank you.

**(Motion carried 5-2/Councilmembers Lloyd & Kiefer opposed)**

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>HEALTH DEPARTMENT OVERTIME PAY FOR SATURDAY H1N1 CLINIC</b></p>
---

President Shetler: Alright, next, Gary with the Health department.

Gary Heck: Gary Heck, Vanderburgh County Health department requesting permission to use federal funds to pay overtime for Health department employees that are working at an H1N1 clinic on Saturdays.

Councilmember Raben: Gary, a quick question: I think in your letter, you state that the grant will allow you to pay existing health department staff overtime compensation and/or hiring temporary vaccination staff.

Gary Heck: Yes sir. We'll be doing both.

Councilmember Raben: I know, but when you're paying overtime, you're paying them time and a half and –

Gary Heck: It's cheaper than hiring the vaccinators that are paid at a higher hourly rate than county employees are paid. An average RN, when you hire them through a temporary service and you work them on weekends or holidays, it's about \$44 an hour.

Councilmember Raben: We have to use a temporary service to –

Gary Heck: That's where the contracts are. I mean, we have to go through the County Commissioners and the County Attorney to get contracts. And you have to use somebody who is legally allowed to vaccinate in the state of Indiana, and that's either an RN or an LPN or some other, and the only ability we have to hire them is through temporary services who furnish staff to do that kind of work.

Councilmember Raben: Is that just an ordinance established by Vanderburgh County or –

Gary Heck: It's a state law. I mean, state law –

Councilmember Raben: And we have to utilize these temporary services?

Gary Heck: No, we have to use a vaccinator. I guess –

Councilmember Raben: I understand that, that the person has to be registered or licensed to vaccinate, but is there anything – is the county, is it just a county ordinance that says we have to use a temporary service or is it –

Gary Heck: No, I guess we could go out and try to hire individual nurses on our own, but if the other services are paying them \$44 an hour and we establish a rate of whatever, something substantially lower than \$44 an hour, the chances of us being successful hiring somebody isn't very good.

Councilmember Raben: I'd like to take that chance, though, I mean, if we're talking \$44 an hour for part-time. I think it's worth taking that chance for, you know, to run an ad or something for –

Gary Heck: I guess I wish you'd have asked me this last week because we've got a clinic scheduled for this Saturday and then one the following Saturday. We did the math on it and it's actually cheaper using our own staff and paying them time and a half than it is hiring under another system.

Councilmember Raben: Under the...

Gary Heck: We did request for proposals –

Councilmember Raben: ---- under you going through an employment firm. You know, I think you probably need to do what you've got to do for something that you already have in place for this weekend, but, you know, at \$44 an hour, I think it would be worth my time to run an ad in the paper and see what we come up with.

Gary Heck: We solicited requests and we sent, turned those over to the County Attorney. I'd be happy to go back and try to do something else where the county, in essence, was looking to hire part-time nurses. I don't know that I've got a part-



time nurse job description. I mean, I'd have to go to Job Study, probably?

Councilmember Raben: I think it probably exists. I know we – well, I say I know, you know, we have nursing staff at the Jail. I don't know if all those are full-time or not, but we probably have part-time nurses there as well, and I would have to believe that we're probably not going through a service with those. But I could check on that.

Gary Heck: Well, the normal work, well, I understand. I will try to get that researched and come back with an answer for you.

President Shetler: Gary, the money, does that come from the federal government?

Gary Heck: All of this is federal money. It's not – there's not a penny that will be spent out of local money for this particular clinic effort.

President Shetler: Not that I'm trying to burn through the federal treasury or anything like that, but –

Gary Heck: We aren't either, but it's all set up on a pro-rated basis, so we have ample federal funds to help pay for this and this will actually stretch those federal dollars by using county employees at time and a half.

President Shetler: Yes, alright, thank you. Yes, Councilman Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Gary, is this basically what surrounding counties are – how they're operating their clinics?

Gary Heck: There's other counties that are doing weekend clinics. We're trying to reach school age kids and this is the best way in our county to do it because we don't have access to go to each individual school to try to do it and so this is the best way when the parents can be present to sign the consent form and be there with their child, while they're being vaccinated. And so there are several other counties in Indiana that are doing this as well. I can't speak for Kentucky or Illinois, but I know there's other counties in Indiana that are doing it.

President Shetler: Okay, a motion would be in order.

Councilmember Lloyd: Motion to approve.

President Shetler: We've got a motion to approve. Do I have a second?

Councilmember Bassemier: Second.

President Shetler: We have a second. Do we have any other questions or comments? All in favor, signify by saying aye.

**(All Councilmembers voted affirmatively)**

President Shetler: Any opposed?

**(No opposing votes were cast)**

President Shetler: So ordered. Thanks, Gary.

Gary Heck: Thank you.

**(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)**

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>SHERIFF EMPLOYMENT REQUEST (SEE PAGE 38 FOR CONTINUED DISCUSSION)</b></p>
---

President Shetler: Is anybody here from the Sheriff's department? Next is amendments to the Salary Ordinance.

Councilmember Sutton: Are you going to act on the Sheriff's department?

President Shetler: Well, since he wasn't here right now, I didn't know if we wanted to hold that off until –

Councilmember Raben: Well, I think there's a – because of the time it takes to run background checks –

Councilmember Sutton: And training and pulling all those guys in at the same time, he discussed that last month, and the reasoning why he waited on some of them to bring them to us, so they have a training regimen, a schedule that they do follow and the way that they go through the hiring process. So probably if we delay this it's going to really throw off that whole training schedule and I thought we were pretty much in agreement that we were supportive of bringing those all on at the same time.

Councilmember Bassemier: He said he's not going to fill it 'til the first quarter anyway of 2010.

President Shetler: Right. We can take it up, I didn't know if anybody had any questions of the Sheriff.

Councilmember Raben: – which is part of the problem, you know, to even begin the process he has to (inaudible – microphone turned off), so it's fairly critical, I mean, that we say yes or no today because it's, you know, probably late February or early March before the background checks are completed and before you –

Councilmember Kiefer: I make a motion that we approve.

Councilmember Bassemier: Second.

President Shetler: It's been moved and seconded. Do I have any questions about the motion?

Councilmember Lloyd: Well, I just would like to have the Sheriff come in and explain what the seven deputies will be assigned to? But maybe we can get him at our next meeting.

President Shetler: Right, okay. Alright, we have a motion and a second. Are there any other questions? Comments? All in favor signify by saying aye.

**(All Councilmembers voted affirmatively)**

President Shetler: Any opposed?

**(No opposing votes were cast)**

President Shetler: Motion carries. And we'll send a, usually Eric is here, but send a note to the Sheriff, then, to make sure he's here at the next meeting so we can talk to him about that.

**(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)**

<b>AMENDMENTS TO SALARY ORDINANCE</b>
---------------------------------------

President Shetler: Next is amendments to the Salary Ordinance.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Mr. President, everyone was given a copy of the December 2<sup>nd</sup> amendments to the salary ordinance. I'm going to move that we amend salary line 1050-1300 Overtime as previously adopted. Under Jail 1051-1850 Union Overtime as previously approved, Community Corrections 1361-1530 Shift Differential as previously approved. Under Sheriff, amend salary lines as transfers were previously approved 1050-0015 Lieutenant at an 2009 annual salary of \$57,799, 1050-0024 at \$51,719, transfer was due to promotions and insufficient funds for the above salary lines. County Commissioners, amend salary line 1300-1120 County Attorney as previously approved. The amount of transfer approved is \$3,193 based on an annual salary of \$36,229. The annual base is \$56,956, that's less the \$20,727 for health insurance and benefits. Under Health Department, salary line 2133-1980 Other Pay to pay the Health department staff to work hours, I'm going to insert part-time and overtime on vaccination clinics for the H1N1 vaccines. Overtime employees, should we continue that, will be paid at 1 ½ times their hourly rate. And then last, move that we approve the hiring of seven deputies to fill current vacancies. I make that in the form of a motion.

Councilmember Sutton: Second.

President Shetler: It's been moved and seconded. Do you have any questions? All in favor, signify by saying aye.

**(All Councilmembers voted affirmatively)**

President Shetler: Any opposed?

**(No opposing votes were cast)**

President Shetler: So ordered.

**(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)**

<b>CLOSING OF CLERK'S LIBRARY</b>
-----------------------------------

President Shetler: Next is, I think we have several different people here and I don't have any specific requests for speaking, but I think there's a couple people here that do want to speak. Krista, I think you're representing, perhaps, the Evansville Bar Association, if you wish to come forward, then.

Krista Lockyear: Thank you, Mr. President, members of Council. Krista Lockyear. For the record, I am here both personally and as president-elect of the Evansville Bar Association, with regard to the concern over the recently announced closing of the Clerk's library. Yesterday we received notice that the Clerk's library will be

permanently closed on December 23<sup>rd</sup>, and I had sent an email yesterday afternoon pretty late to President Shetler. I acknowledge here as a member of the Bar Association, and as a personal real estate attorney, and as president and part-owner of a title company, we don't have a whole lot of background information. And I tried to get a hold of the Clerk, Susie Kirk. I understand she is out of town until tomorrow, so I haven't had a conversation with her regarding the restructuring in her office. My understanding is that she had requested to fill a vacancy that was not approved and then did some shifting within the office, and that resulted in this closure. Until we can talk to Susie, I don't really have a direct proposal for Council or request, but I would like you to be aware that if funding is the issue, we're hoping that with the Clerk's office and Council cooperation, we can get this library closing delayed or off the table completely. What this means to title companies, to attorneys, and to the public in general, is potentially a complete lack of access to public records that are older than five years old on closed cases. The public can get access to cases that are open without paying and the resort to closed cases, to get any access to information, is through the new Doxpop system. Doxpop is fantastic, it's going to be a wonderful program for attorneys, we're all supporting that program and happy to see that go online. But it is subscription based and pay based, so for title companies that do daily searches of buyers and sellers on real estate, there's going to be an immediate fee and time delay on being able to access the records that we need. Should Doxpop show up a problem with a buyer or seller of real estate and additional records are necessary, we have to make a foyer request from the Clerk's office, who then has seven days to respond. That's going to be a pretty significant delay for lenders and customers that are interesting in transacting a real estate, refinance, purchase or sale. And the cost involved in that as well, something that consumers right now are fighting refinance costs, trying to get through the banks, through the appraisal process, and this is a potential additional burden to them when we can't get public court records without paying additional fees for that. Again, my purpose is to bring this to your attention, to advise that we may be in front of you again asking for additional support for the Clerk's office, and my hope is that within the next week or two, perhaps before your finance committee meeting, if that's appropriate. we could meet with Susie Kirk, perhaps a committee member from Council, and see if we can come up with potential solutions to this problem because it really could have a devastating effect on bar members as well as the public.

President Shetler: Okay, thank you, Krista. Let me just, I guess quickly, because we dealt with this a couple of months back, I think it was back in October. Basically, this Council acted on one position that it was our understanding under questioning, that this was a general entry level type of position that was doing basic filing, answering telephones during lunch periods, and just filling in from one position to another as needed. Shortly after the decision was made, which I think was the first week of October, whatever, shortly thereafter, we received an email outlining the procedures that she was going to do in order to pick up the slack. Primarily, the burden was being placed at that time on the judge's staffs in order to compensate for the workload being shifted. Now I'm one member of seven, but my thinking at the time was, that we're dealing with an office that has 54 employees and that a person that is not with any specific task, but very generalized office type of work, that in today's economic environment, all of us in private as well as in some cases in public, there are layoffs being done in Gary, Indiana and, you know, up north all across northern Indiana, there are communities that are laying firemen, policemen and everything else off. Fortunately, we've been prudent enough and I think wise in our hoarding monies back and saving and being able to do the right things, that we've avoided those. But we can see what the writing is on the wall for the next

couple of years and we are trying our best to avoid any kind of real serious situation like that. So we came up with the hiring freeze. It really was meant in areas, if there is a specific task that takes a specific talent to do, that I don't think any of us have had that in mind to eliminate those positions. This was never explained, it never did come, and this is kind of two – better than two months after the fact of this proposal, so I'm not sure really how it relates to it, but I think it had been corrected or rectified back in October through the judges because as far as I know, the judges had agreed that they would allow some of their staff to do some of their own filings and do some of this stuff that she was saying would be necessary to pick up the slack. So I'm thinking out of 54 employees, if they can't squeeze together there a little bit and we're talking about less than two percent of the workload being shared, again, I'm trying to quantify jobs. And I know that's not always easy to do as Stan pointed out earlier to me, but the best we can possibly do and I felt like that was a reasonable request that was going on. None of us are in favor of this action and I shouldn't speak for the other six, I apologize. But I think this was not the intent of this Council. Councilman Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: Question for Ms. Lockyear. How many terminals are in that office?

Krista Lockyear: Six.

Councilmember Lloyd: Okay, there are six and they're logged on to like, CourtView, correct?

Krista Lockyear: Uh-huh.

Councilmember Lloyd: And so this is free access for attorneys and those that deal with the courts?

Krista Lockyear: And the public as well, uh-huh.

Councilmember Lloyd: Okay, is there a Clerk's employee in there at all times?

Krista Lockyear: (Inaudible)

Councilmember Lloyd: Okay, so what's the hours of the office?

Krista Lockyear: I think probably somebody from the title company that's in that office daily should –

**(Unidentified inaudible comments made from the audience)**

Krista Lockyear: 7:30 to 4 is what I'm hearing.

Councilmember Lloyd: So the Clerk's employees, are they necessary to make sure somebody doesn't haul the computers out? Why is that necessary?

Krista Lockyear: They indicate filing...truthfully, and I want to reiterate, we're not here pointing fingers at Council or at the Clerk's office, but we were all advised yesterday, I got in the mail the Doxpop is now online and available and that's fantastic, and then I get the letter that permanently closed in less than a month, the Clerk's library. And, you know, a lot of my emails and phone conversations yesterday were me just thinking out loud and I'm still doing that and without having

the ability to sit down with Ms. Kirk to talk about what could be done, what other options are there, really the only thing that we could do at this point is bring to your attention that hey, wow, the library is now going to be closed permanently. This is a concern and we may be asking Council to help us address that concern.

Councilmember Lloyd: I think it might be helpful if you could provide a letter, maybe the use of the facility. Are there lines to get on those computers? Are they pretty heavily used or no?

Councilmember Sutton: Oh yeah.

Councilmember Lloyd: Okay.

Councilmember Kiefer: I have a question.

President Shetler: Councilman Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Hi, Krista. I guess not being real familiar with this, these computers, is it tied in to their network and you're basically viewing documents on their network or is it tied into some kind of – I mean, I guess explain to me how it works. The Clerk enters documents and then you guys have access to those documents being entered because these computers are tied to their network?

Krista Lockyear: Yes, and it's court records, it's dockets, current pending cases, calendars of pending cases and all that, like I said, without subscription will be available on Doxpop, maybe even concerning is a judgement that's five years old against a business or an individual in town. That is not available at all, you could get that now through the Clerk's library, but you're not going to be able to get that through Doxpop without a fee or making a foyer request.

Councilmember Kiefer: So the Clerk's library is more, really, important to you for historic documents five years or older?

Krista Lockyear: That's not necessarily true, however, with the Doxpop system, there is a replacement for open documents on a non-subscription basis. Now losing the computer terminals is probably a different issue. There's one in the law library, that certainly couldn't handle the demand that the public is going to need to have access to open cases, and I'm not sure if there are plans for replacement of the computers that are in there now.

Councilmember Kiefer: I guess I'm confused. Is her personnel that she's eliminating, is it because she's no longer entering that data or it's just somebody that watches over the computers? I guess I'm confused on what, how it works.

Krista Lockyear: And I'm not sure, again, I have not been able to speak with her and don't know the rationale and it may quite be that's she's got a wonderful solution for us, but the notice that we received was public records available through Doxpop, that the general public has limited access to current, without subscription to current cases through Doxpop and that the law library is down the hall. And again, this Council funds the law library, I know, and it's a great public service, but there's one computer in there that's available for them to use.

Councilmember Raben: Well, maybe that's what we need is to add, move one or two of these computers into the law library. But I have a quick question. The fee

that's associated with Doxpop, what is that fee (inaudible – microphone turned off).

Krista Lockyear: The subscriptions haven't been opened yet. We've just been advised that it's available.

Councilmember Raben: So we might be worried about something that's not a big thing anyway, like, I mean, a lot of fees, you know, any fees associated with something like that are probably usually passed on to your clients anyway, aren't they?

Krista Lockyear: Sometimes, yes, and again, refinance customers and banks are probably not going to appreciate that pass along either. And additionally, the public cannot get these records without access and fees, so, you know, there are a lot of unanswered questions, I do not deny that. And again, before finance committee, as I indicated, my hope would be to be able to get with Ms. Kirk to find out possibilities to have other resolutions available. And again, this is just that we know you aren't meeting again before this closes as a full body, just an advice that it's a big concern to us.

Councilmember Raben: Is it possible, I mean, you said that you are making an attempt to set up a meeting with her representing the Bar Association. Is the Bar Association's thought or intent to reimburse the county for this person or...is that what you're considering?

Krista Lockyear: We have not considered anything at this point. We're just trying to get answers to the issues.

President Shetler: I might suggest, Councilman Lloyd is the liaison with the courts and he's looking for something to do during the holiday season, I could tell from the look on his face, and perhaps Russ could get with you, Krista, and our County Clerk and come to a meeting of minds here and resolve this one way or another, whether it's moving some terminals, whether it's the centurion that's watching over the six things in there, is part-time or whatever we do, but we can figure out a way that this can work.

Councilmember Sutton: Well, but, Councilman Lloyd, from my limited information I know about this, what I do know is that as people are going into the Clerk's area and accessing these terminals, that's the resource that they use to find out updates on cases, find out what the schedule is as things may change. That's the source that they are utilizing. That will no longer be available to the public and if someone wants to find out if there's been an update on their case, according to what we have been hearing here, they may have to wait a week or more before they can find out that information, so it does severely restrict access to what is public information right now. And what we eliminated here was not that position at all.

President Shetler: Exactly.

Councilmember Sutton: And if this is a way to get back at the Council using the office as a weapon, surely that's not what we would support or in any way should be appreciated by the public. What we felt like was a very prudent decision on our part to try to streamline, in line with what we've done with every other office that's come up here and asked for a request, just had the Assessor up here, you had 52 employees down to 40. We eliminated one person in the Clerk's office and this is the response that we get back is restricting the access that the public and private

business has to public information. I clearly would like to see some explanation of why that is the prudent action to take when that wasn't the position that we eliminated.

President Shetler: You articulated my opening remarks much better than I did and I appreciate that, Councilman.

Don Fuchs: Mr. Shetler, if I may speak just for a moment here. My name is Don Fuchs, I'm an attorney here in Evansville, been practicing in this community for 30 years. My practice is real estate, I'm also a co-owner of a real estate company here. We have a number of individuals here in the audience today representing the title business here in our community. The thing I just wanted to go on the record for, again, as Krista said, no blame on this Council. My point is to bring to this Council's attention, the significance of this issue of limiting access. In a title search we have to do, I'm giving you some general principles of law, a ten year search against the buyer and seller. And by statutory, Indiana statutory law, the County Clerk is required to have an index of those judgements. So for us to do a search for financial institutions or cash closing or whatever may be, we have to do a ten year search against anybody in the chain of title as to outstanding judgements. That information has to be available to us, so if that information by the County Clerk is not available to us, we can't do our jobs. And this will have a significant impact on how transactions are done in this community. It would be like Ms. Tuley here, who is our County Recorder, saying we're not going to have access available to abstractors and to the public of certain records. If she would say that, we'd come to a standstill also. So again, I just want, no blame here to this Council, but again, bringing the significance of this issue. This is of quite importance to us that we have full access to the Clerk's records on judgements, otherwise, we can't do our job.

Councilmember Kiefer: Don, have you expressed that to the Clerk?

Don Fuchs: No, Mr. Kiefer, I have not. I, like Krista, I got an email this morning saying, about this, and so that's what I came over here. We want to do that, we just felt this would be at least an initial –

Councilmember Kiefer: Sure, thank you for bringing it to our attention, I appreciate that.

Don Fuchs: And we will do that.

Councilmember Kiefer: Thank you.

President Shetler: Yes, Mr. Ahlers.

Jeff Ahlers: One thing that I guess in talking about these documents, I guess I'm not sure what the Clerk's office is saving because my understanding is, in fact, I think if you make a freedom of information act request in person, I think they have to furnish the records within 24 hours. So it seems to me that somebody in that office is going to be busy running around furnishing documents. And so I guess I'm kind of wondering, I guess I'm not sure what's being saved here in terms of employee time. It seems like instead of helping with computers, the person is now going to be running around pulling records, so I don't know, that may be something that Mr. Lloyd, when you look into it, that you need to figure out how that's working.



Councilmember Raben: Is that how it was stated earlier or was it, if there is a discrepancy with the data that you get from Doxpop?

Krista Lockyear: If we need additional records that we cannot get from Doxpop, we have to make a foyer request from the Clerk's office and then if it's not in person, they've got seven days to respond.

Councilmember Raben: So it's only what may not be on there.

Councilmember Sutton: Yet, Doxpop is only going to cover like the most recent five years, so beyond that –

Don Fuchs: Open files.

Councilmember Sutton: Yeah, and then not to mention that now you'll actually have to pay for that which is kind of a hidden little tax that's not been imposed upon taxpayers here with the Doxpop. But just a totally different angle of what has occurred in the past as far as records, accessing those, being able to get the information that you need in a timely fashion.

Councilmember Goebel: Doxpop will be operating on subscriber fees, is that correct?

Krista Lockyear: Yes.

Councilmember Goebel: Thank you.

Councilmember Sutton: Well, if you don't subscribe, you don't get the information, though.

Councilmember Raben: I might be the only one that, this may not come out right, but I think you need a little of both. I mean, I don't think the Doxpop is such a bad thing. I think some user fee based services, you know, that can offer a little relief on the county is not so bad. I mean, you know, I know in my business, we pay tons and a stack of, just tons and tons of subscriptions fees for automotive repair stuff, you know, where you can, diagnostic stuff, you know, things of that nature that aren't available to me through the county. And I, so I think we need to try to do both. You know, I think the county needs to meet the needs when they can of the business sector, and do everything possible for public sector, you know, for an individual that needs something. And I see Don back at the podium.

Don Fuchs: Mr. Raben, let me just address that, by Indiana statutory law, Mr. Ahlers can comment on this, the County Clerk is required to have a judgement index available to the public. So I understand saving the money on private services, but this is a statutory duty that the County Clerk is obligated to fulfill.

Councilmember Raben: And I understand that, and –

Don Fuchs: And so if another private company wants to supplement that, better service, more available, whatever it may be, that's fine. But you cannot shed the County Clerk's responsibility to have that information available, not just to people like us in business, just the general public.

Councilmember Raben: But my point is, maybe we're not always going to have six

computers available, maybe it's two, maybe it's three, but – I'm sorry?

Unidentified: She's done away with all of them.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, again, you know, you're going to meet, I think Councilman Lloyd is going to meet with them and try to resolve something. We do have the law library that has a computer and it might be an option to move a couple of these into that area, so –

Don Fuchs: Mr. Raben, I sit on the law library foundation and we've got very limited space and we're trying to do a lot there, so –

Councilmember Raben: That's probably not the –

Don Fuchs: I think that will be a challenge, let me just say that.

Councilmember Lloyd: I have another question. There is a position in the Clerk's office, Administrative Librarian, I assume that's the person that assists here. How long have we had those computers over there doing this? A long time? Ten years? Fifteen years? At least ten years?

Don Fuchs: And, Mr. Lloyd, people here that do this on a daily basis –

President Shetler: Let me – okay, go ahead.

Councilmember Lloyd: Just wondered how long we've had these open and available like that.

Unidentified: '84.

Councilmember Lloyd: '84? Well, and the other question I would have, if she was concerned about the well-being of the computers, you could just stick a camera in there and put a camera in the Clerks' office and then not have a person. Just have someone to open and close it at night. So, I don't know. I'm willing to work with her, I'm the liaison for her and we'll see what we can come up with. But I think your concerns, if we can get something in writing, that would be helpful.

Darla Lindauer: My name is Darla Lindauer and I'm manager of the underwriting and search department at Evansville Titles. And, I guess, maybe Councilman Raben, I wanted to address one quick thing. We're not here to criticize or argue and I think Krista said that and communicated that, and we would like to have some dialogue with Susie Kirk, the Clerk. One thing about Doxpop, I think it's, I'm not in disagreement, it seems like it's a great thing. The thing about Doxpop, and maybe you're not the forum to talk to about it and Susie would be, is that it is limited, very limited in nature, probably the biggest user or the benefactor of that would be somebody coming in off the street and wanted to check the docket to see if they paid their parking deal or something like that, their ticket. Doxpop will only show docket sheets. It does not certify or does not allow us to access two very important things as title company searchers and that is gross income tax warrants and foreign or transcript docket records. It does not include that so that would be an additional step that we would have to do. And my understanding is, if we are limited to this access, even though we can go to Doxpop, we would have to then submit in writing two more important areas that we have to certify to in our searches, and that would be gross income tax warrants and foreign judgement dockets. So once again, that

limits our ability to get out something in a timely and cost effective manner. In addition to that, if we do have to wait seven days for something or wait three days, it doesn't really matter, that's not the point. The point is, if we do have to wait, we cannot have our employees go and access that themselves and take a look at it, rule it out, or whatever. A lot of times what that leads into, if we look at something, we see, okay, we've waited three days, we've looked at something that we've ordered, we've got it back in three days instead of the seven. That leads us to something else that we have to look at and we have to access. Then we have to put in another written request. Okay, all of the sudden we're down, instead of three days, we're down to six days, we're down to nine days or up to nine days, or whatever. So Doxpop, and we can talk, once again, have this dialogue with her, could be a help, but I don't want everybody to think it's a –

Councilmember Raben: And those are all great points and, you know, Doxpop is new to us. I think I got my first information on it Monday, something came through from the courts or something by email, that was the first I had heard of it. But those are all very good points and I think from the Council standpoint, you know, enough has been said today that everyone has got very similar interests that you have and Councilman Lloyd is going to work as their liaison to the courts to work through this.

Darla Lindauer: Well, thank you for your time.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, thank you.

President Shetler: I want to point out real quickly that according to the statute, that our responsibility here as a body is to fix the compensation of the employees and to fix the number of employees in a given office and to describe and classify the positions and the services. We did not de-fund that position. We did not de-fund that position. So I just want that real clear, kind of piggybacking on what Royce and I have said a few times before. So I'm not so sure that it can be done to eliminate that just arbitrarily without going to Job Study or without going back to this Council body and actually having that position eliminated and then rolled over. And I can assure you, it sounds as if you probably have maybe six or seven votes anyway, in that direction, quite a few anyway. So yes, Councilman Lloyd?

Councilmember Lloyd: The only thing I would add, the Sheriff is here, I had a question of him about the seven new positions.

President Shetler: Yeah, I'll get on that here. So I hope that resolves the issues and, Krista, you and Russ and the Clerk will get together and get that done. And if Don wants to join, and if there's any other Councilmembers that would like to, they're welcome as well.

<b>SHERIFF EMPLOYMENT REQUEST (CONTINUED FROM PAGE 29)</b>
--

President Shetler: Okay, Sheriff, if you wouldn't mind coming up real quickly. We did approve the seven replacements but there is a few questions that we had and we'd like –

Eric Williams: Sheriff Eric Williams. I apologize, we had a personnel issue at the office that I had to take care of.

Councilmember Kiefer: You already got a 7-0 vote, by the way.

Eric Williams: And they weren't inmates today.

President Shetler: You got a 7-0 vote and you weren't here, I mean, that's –

Eric Williams: I should not show up more often.

President Shetler: That's right. Brevity.

Councilmember Lloyd: I just wondered if the seven positions were all new entry level and they would be going into patrol or if you had other places where they would go.

Eric Williams: No, all seven positions will be brand new deputy sheriffs at the base level. Actually, they'll be probationary deputies, so they'll even be less than the base model, they'll be \$1,000 less the first year.

Councilmember Lloyd: They'll eventually patrol or other possible duties once they take the complete probation?

Eric Williams: We're constantly moving people around through the office to try to accomplish all of our services required. You know, right now I'm a few short in court security, I'm about four or five short in patrol. So they'll spread out throughout the office.

Councilmember Lloyd: Do you currently have a hiring list?

Eric Williams: Yes, there's a pool in place.

Councilmember Lloyd: Okay, so you'll – this has been approved so you would go through the process of selecting the best –

Eric Williams: Yeah, they'll come off the merit list that's approved by the merit board under the statute.

Councilmember Lloyd: How many names on there, roughly?

Eric Williams: We usually start the pool with about 50, that's good for about two years, and when you look at our average hiring, this is a little higher than normal. We hire about seven a year, so that pool is good for two years, so usually we hire between ten and twenty out of that pool.

Councilmember Lloyd: Alright, appreciate it.

President Shetler: Any other questions? Okay, thank you.

Eric Williams: Thanks again, I apologize.

President Shetler: That's alright.

<p><b>PETITION TO APPEAL FOR AN INCREASE TO THE MAXIMUM LEVY FOR A PROPERTY TAX SHORTFALL</b></p>
---

President Shetler: I had one other issue that we need to deal with. It is petition to increase the maximum levy and I'll let Bill Fluty, our Auditor, explain that. I

think you all have a copy of this in your packet. If we approve this, don't run out, well, whether we approve it or don't, I guess we probably need signatures here. So I need signatures on a form before you guys run out.

Bill Fluty: Yes, every year at this time in December, we ask for this to be approved by the Council. We'll do this, it's an estimate at 2.8 million. I think it will be less than that, I am sure of that, but you can't increase it, and it will be reduced. I think last year it was 500,000. This is just a request, we'll send it to the DLGF. It may or may not be approved by them.

President Shetler: Alright, any questions? I need a motion for approval.

Councilmember Kiefer: I move that we approve.

President Shetler: Okay, and a second?

Councilmember Lloyd: Second.

President Shetler: It's been moved and seconded, all in favor signify by saying aye.

**(All Councilmembers voted affirmatively/Councilmember Bassemier left prior to vote)**

President Shetler: Those opposed?

**(No opposing votes were cast)**

President Shetler: So ordered. It's six in favor and one – one missing. So 6-0.

**(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)**

President Shetler: Need a motion for adjournment.

Councilmember Sutton: So moved.

President Shetler: Don't forget to sign. The motion has been approved and we stand adjourned.

**(There being no further business to come before the Council, the meeting was adjourned at 10:21 a.m.)**

VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL

\_\_\_\_\_  
President Tom Shetler, Jr.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Vice President Joe Kiefer

\_\_\_\_\_  
Councilmember Jim Raben

\_\_\_\_\_  
Councilmember Mike Goebel

\_\_\_\_\_  
Councilmember Russell Lloyd, Jr.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Councilmember Ed Bassemier

\_\_\_\_\_  
Councilmember Royce Sutton

Recorded and transcribed by Teri Lukeman.