

**VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL
MINUTES
JANUARY 6, 2010**

The Vanderburgh County Council met in session this 6th day of January in room 301 of the Civic Center Complex. The meeting was called to order at 8:35 a.m. by Vanderburgh County Auditor, Bill Fluty.

Bill Fluty: Welcome to the County Council 2010 meeting. Madame 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 Goebel arrived after roll call taken.

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

(Pledge of Allegiance was given)

ELECTION OF PRESIDENT

Bill Fluty: The first order of business today is to elect a president for 2010. May I have a motion please?

Councilmember Shetler: I'd like to place a nomination, Councilman Russ Lloyd for President of County Council.

Councilmember Kiefer: I'll second that.

Bill Fluty: 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 Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: Yes.

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

Bill Fluty: Congratulations, and I'll turn the meeting over to you.

President Lloyd: Thank you, and thank you, Councilmembers.

ELECTION OF VICE PRESIDENT

President Lloyd: First order of business, we'll have the election of a Vice President. Can I take a nomination?

Councilmember Kiefer: I'd like to nominate Councilman James Raben.

President Lloyd: Okay, is there a second?

Councilmember Shetler: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion and a second. Any further nominations? Okay, 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 Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. Six ayes and no nays, Jim Raben, Vice President. Congratulations.

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

APPOINTMENT OF COUNTY COUNCIL ATTORNEY

President Lloyd: Next we'll have the appointment of the County Council Attorney. Can we have a motion for that or I'd like to nominate Jeff Ahlers, Kahn, Dees, Donovan and Kahn.

Councilmember Bassemier: Second.

President Lloyd: Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. There being seven ayes and no nays, Mr. Ahlers will continue this year as County Council Attorney.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

APPOINTMENT OF PERSONNEL CHAIRMAN AND FINANCE CHAIRMAN

President Lloyd: The appointment of Committee Chairs, I'd like to appoint as the Personnel Chair Councilman Joe Kiefer and as the Finance Chair, Councilman Tom Shetler. Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: Can I think about this one? 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. Councilman Kiefer and Councilman Shetler, I know you'll do a good job on that. Thank you.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

BOARD APPOINTMENTS TO REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

President Lloyd: Now we're going to deviate from the agenda due to the fact that the Vanderburgh County Redevelopment Commission meets at 8:30 as well. So I'd like to submit Bob Musgrave and Dave Abbott as the County Council appointments to the Vanderburgh County Redevelopment Commission. Roll call vote please. Oh, I'm sorry, we need a motion.

Councilmember Shetler: So moved.

Councilmember Kiefer: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Shetler, second Mr. Kiefer. Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes, I'm fine with it, but I mean, you probably could just take the whole list in its entirety, if you wanted to.

President Lloyd: Well, we'll just go ahead with these two to make sure, for time reasons.

Councilmember Sutton: That's fine.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. Seven ayes and no nays, so those two are appointed to those boards.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

APPROVAL OF DECEMBER 2, 2009 MINUTES

President Lloyd: I'll accept a motion for approval of the minutes from December 2, 2009.

Councilmember Sutton: So moved.

Councilmember Raben: I'll second.

President Lloyd: Second Mr. Raben. All in favor, signify by saying aye.

(All Councilmembers voted affirmatively)

President Lloyd: Any opposed?

(No opposing votes were cast)

President Lloyd: Okay, that motion carries seven to zero.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

President Lloyd: Okay, before we get into the regular business, I've got a couple of items here. For his service as president, we'd like to present Tom Shetler, Jr. with a plaque commemorating President 2009 Vanderburgh County Council.

Councilmember Shetler: Thank you.

President Lloyd: All that and you get a plaque, too. Wow. And then for his unprecedented fifteen years as Vanderburgh County Council Finance Chair, 1997 to 2002, 2004 to 2009, Jim Raben.

Councilmember Sutton: We can go ahead and let you do that one more time, Jim. I know you're just roaring to get back at it, but we've already taken a motion.

Councilmember Raben: I'm going to watch real careful. If I notice anything unusual

or not being taken care of right, I'll step back in.

Councilmember Shetler: I'm going to add please to that, Royce.

President Lloyd: Okay, we've got our plaques presented.

ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATION REQUESTS
--

President Lloyd: Appropriation Ordinance, we'll start with the Vanderburgh County Prosecutor. I'll turn that over to the Finance Chair, Mr. Shetler.

PROSECUTOR

Councilmember Shetler: Alright, we have a request from the Prosecutor today for \$4,739 on an increase on a Deputy, that's line item 1080-1190-1080, and then the related perks with that, the FICA and PERF, for a total of \$5,470.

Councilmember Raben: I'll second.

President Lloyd: Okay, is that a motion to approve?

Councilmember Shetler: Yes.

President Lloyd: And then the second, Mr. Raben. Any further discussion? Okay, roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. Motion 7-0 carries.

PROSECUTOR		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1080-1190-1080	Deputy	4,739.00	4,739.00
1080-1900	FICA	363.00	363.00
1080-1910	PERF	368.00	368.00
Total		5,470.00	5,470.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

COUNTY COUNCIL

President Lloyd: Second item, County Council, request for Insurance. Is there a motion for that?

Councilmember Shetler: I'd entertain a motion on County Council to increase its line item 1480-1920 Insurance \$20,727.

President Lloyd: Is there a second?

Councilmember Raben: I'll second.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Shetler, second Mr. Raben. Any discussion?

Councilmember Raben: Just a note that the Commissions are repealing the same amount out of I think Legal Services account, or something.

President Lloyd: Okay, roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. Seven ayes, no nays, the motion carries.

COUNTY COUNCIL		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1480-1920	Insurance	20,727.00	20,727.00
Total		20,727.00	20,727.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

HEALTH DEPARTMENT

President Lloyd: Health Department, Mr. Shetler.

Councilmember Shetler: I'd recommend a motion for approval on Health Department request, line 2130-1320-2130 Office Manager/Finance Manager \$5,928, Disease Intervention Specialist line item 2130-1450-2130 \$13,454, and then the related FICA and PERF to that, bringing a total of \$22,369 additional for those two positions.

President Lloyd: Okay, that's a motion, is there a second?

Councilmember Bassemier: Second.

President Lloyd: Second Mr. Bassemier. Mr. Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Maybe I need a reminder here on the – will all this come from county general or will this be split?

Councilmember Shetler: Its coming out of the Health Department funds.

Councilmember Goebel: Totally?

Councilmember Shetler: Yes.

Councilmember Goebel: Okay, thank you.

President Lloyd: Any other questions? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

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

HEALTH DEPARTMENT		REQUESTED	APPROVED
2130-1320-2130	Office Manager/ Finance Mgr.	5,928.00	5,928.00
2130-1450-2130	Disease Intervention Specialist	13,454.00	13,454.00
2130-1900	FICA	1,484.00	1,484.00
2130-1910	PERF	1,503.00	1,503.00
Total		22,369.00	22,369.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

President Lloyd: We'll move on to Transfers, Mr. Shetler.

TRANSFER REQUESTS

**COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
SUPERIOR COURT (LATE TRANSFER)**

Councilmember Shetler: We have a transfer from the County Commissioners in the amount of \$20,727. And did you want me to go –

President Lloyd: That's a repeal.

Councilmember Shetler: That's a repeal, I'm sorry. And then – since that came first and then it's different on the agenda, I'm sorry. The Transfer request, our County Commissioners, from Legal Contractual line item 1300-3612 \$41,809 going to County Attorney \$36,229 and that's to line item 1300-1120-1300, and to the FICA and the PERF line items which is 1900 and 1910, and that would equal the \$41,809. That's to do with changing around the contractual agreement we had with the County Attorney bringing I think to an employee level, we talked about it late last year. The other is a late transfer that's coming from Superior Court and I know Judge Dietsch is here probably for that matter. It's coming from line 1370-3050 Patient/Inmate Care \$20,000 going to line item 1370-3949 Home Study Adoption in the same amount, \$20,000. That is a motion.

President Lloyd: Okay, is there a second?

Councilmember Raben: I'll second.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Shetler, second Mr. Raben. Any discussion? Would you want to add to that, Judge Dietsch or –

Terry Dietsch: No, unless you would like an explanation.

President Lloyd: Does anybody need an explanation? Alright, roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. Seven ayes and no nays, the transfers carry.

COUNTY COMMISSIONERS		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1300-3612	Legal Contractual	41,809.00	41,809.00
To: 1300-1120-1300	County Attorney	36,229.00	36,229.00
1300-1900	FICA	2,772.00	2,772.00
1300-1910	PERF	2,808.00	2,808.00

SUPERIOR COURT		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1370-3050	Patient/Inmate Care	20,000.00	20,000.00
To: 1370-3949	Home Study/Adoption	20,000.00	20,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

REPEAL REQUEST

COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

President Lloyd: Now we'll go back to the General Fund repeal request. Mr. Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: We have one, County Commissioners, line item 1300-3612

Legal Contractual in the amount of \$18,323, and line item 1300-3000 Bond & Insurance \$2,404, total of \$20,727 that's to be repealed. That's a motion.

President Lloyd: Motion to repeal, is there a second?

Councilmember Bassemier: I'll second.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Shetler, second Mr. Bassemier. Any questions or discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. There being seven ayes and no nays, the repeal passes.

COUNTY COMMISSIONERS		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1300-3612	Legal Contractual	18,323.00	18,323.00
1300-3000	Bond & Insurance	2,404.00	2,404.00
Total		20,727.00	20,727.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

COUNTY COUNCIL GOALS FOR 2010

President Lloyd: Does anybody have any old business? Okay, we'll move on to new business. Before we start with the agenda items, I'd just like to briefly talk about our goals for County Council, some of the things that I – and I'd talked to some of you members about as well. Once again, I think the number one goal for the Council, keep the tax rate level, we want to protect taxpayers wherever we can. Number two, we want to listen to the public's concerns. We've seen a lot of publicity that sometimes government doesn't listen to the people, so we want to certainly be

open and honest and have stability in our meetings. Number three, we want to continue to make county government more efficient. If there's ways to combine, consolidate, we want to look for that as well as continue the hiring freeze. Number four, we want to work with our County Commissioners and the City of Evansville to promote economic growth, bringing jobs to our community. And then finally, number five, we want to continue our conservative budget management. And personally, I would like to see if we can find a way within our budget to allow for maybe a larger computer purchase than we had to encourage efficiencies and then also if there is some way this year to figure out a way in the budget for employee raises, I'd like to see that as well. I know they did without last year, they're doing more with less, and if there is a way we can reward them next year, I'd like to see that.

APPROVAL OF 2010 AMENDED SALARY ORDINANCE
--

President Lloyd: Now we'll move on to item 13, New Business, A, Approval of 2010 Amended Salary Ordinance. I'll turn that over to our Finance Chair Mr. Shetler.

Councilmember Shetler: Okay, I think everybody has a copy on their desk, I'm trying to find mine. Does anybody have any questions? Hopefully, nobody is going to ask me any detailed questions about it. I'd make a motion for approval.

President Lloyd: Is there a second?

Councilmember Raben: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion by Mr. Shetler, second by Mr. Kiefer or Mr. Raben, one of those two. Any further discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. There being seven ayes and no nays, the approval of the

amended salary ordinance passes.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

APPOINTMENT OF LIAISONS

President Lloyd: Item B, appointment of liaisons. You have a list in front of you, I'll just read those out real quickly. Tom Shetler, Jr.: County Highway, Cumulative Bridge, Local Roads & Streets, Superintendent of County Buildings, County Surveyor, and Airport. Councilman Raben: Burdette Park, Sheriff, Community Corrections, Commissioners, Superior Court, Circuit Court. Myself, Councilman Lloyd: County Clerk, Health Department, Convention & Visitors Bureau, Voters Registration. Joe Kiefer: Auditor, Central Dispatch, MPO, County Assessor, The Centre. Royce Sutton: Prosecutor and IV-D, Human Relations, Welfare Department, City-County Purchasing, Hillcrest Home, Co-Op Extension. Mike Goebel: Public Defender, Treasurer, Veterans, Legal Aid, Recorder. And then Ed Bassemier: Drug & Alcohol Deferral, Building Commission, Weights & Measures, Coroner, Levee Authority, Area Plan Commission. Any discussion on that?

PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE

President Lloyd: Item C, appointments to Personnel Administration Committee. The second page which shows your Personnel Administration Committee, also known as Job Study: Joe Kiefer is the County Council Personnel Chair; Russ Lloyd, Jr., County Council President; Tom Shetler, Jr., County Council Finance Chair; Mike Goebel, County Council Minority Party Representative; Judge Wayne Trockman, Judge Representative; Lloyd Winnecke, County Commissioners Representative; Bill Fluty, Republican Elected Officeholder; Rick Davis, Democrat Elected Officeholder; Doug Brown, Executive Classification Representative; Robert Goedde, POLE Classification Representative; Wallace Corbitt, PAT Classification Representative; Danna Clark, COMOT Classification Representative. So those are the new appointments to the Personnel Administration Committee and I look forward to Councilman Kiefer's leadership on that.

APPOINTMENT TO THE ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE COMMISSION

President Lloyd: Item D, Appointment to the ABC Alcoholic Beverage Commission Board. I'd like to appoint Bettye Lou Jerrel to that. Is there a motion?

Councilmember Shetler: So moved.

President Lloyd: Is there a second?

Councilmember Raben: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Shetler, second Mr. Raben. Per state law, this has to be a roll call vote. Any further discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. There being seven ayes and no nays, Mrs. Bettye Lou Jerrel is appointed to the ABC Board.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

COUNTY COUNCIL BOARD APPOINTMENTS
--

President Lloyd: The other County Council appointments, Item E, you've got a sheet there. We'll just read those off quickly: Area Plan Commission appointment Ed Bassemier; Burdette Park Advisory Gene Koch; Business Review Committee Joe Kiefer; Convention & Visitors Bureau Kristen Tucker and David Dunn; Dental Clinic Advisory Committee Royce Sutton and Lloyd Winnecke; Economic Development Coalition of Southwest Indiana Russ Lloyd; Evansville MPO Policy Committee Joe Kiefer; Evansville Museum of Arts & Science Trustees Josh Claybourn; Growth Alliance for Greater Evansville Board Russ Lloyd; Human Relations Commission Board Russ Lloyd; Initiative Based Assistance Program Royce Sutton; ITAC Data Processing Board Tom Shetler; Jail Overcrowding Assessment Committee Jim Raben and Royce Sutton; Library Board of Trustees William Miller; M/WBE Utilization Board Stephanie Rolland and Eric Cake is a late entry, so put his name there; Pigeon Creek Greenway Passage Committee Jayne Manis; Property Tax Assessment Board of Appeals Carrie Hatt-Figueroa and Kraig Nance; Solid Waste District Board Russ Lloyd; Vanderburgh County Redevelopment Commission, we already did those; West Side Improvement Association Ryan Beck; Willard Library Board of Trustees Bob Davies. Any further discussion on those?

APPROVAL OF 2010 MEETING DATES

President Lloyd: We'll move on to item F, approval of 2010 meeting dates. You have a list in front of you. Anybody see any changes, corrections on meeting dates?

COUNTY CLERK REQUEST TO FILL VACANCY

President Lloyd: We'll move onto item G, County Clerk new employee request. Is

the County Clerk here, please?

Susan Kirk: Good morning. Let's see if we can do this a little better this time. First of all, I realize that the Council needs to cut costs. I realize that and I'm all for that. I'm a taxpayer, too. Unfortunately, the Clerk's office, in the year 2009, we filed over 64,000 cases. Unfortunately, it just keeps going up every year. And like I said, I realize that you felt like because we had 54 employees that we could certainly do without a couple and absorb the work. The problem is, is that the workload is increasing. I know, Councilman Shetler, you had asked about automation, whatever. We have been on this system for almost, well, it has been ten years. So the system is the same, the computer system, the software is the same. We don't have anything that we can kind of press and everything kind of falls in place. It's a tremendous amount of work. Under the circumstances, this particular position that is vacant now, it was the cashier, but being that we waited until January the 6th to come before Council, I did fill that position, I moved someone within the office to fill the cashier's position. So the position that is open now, their job description is, they maintain off-site storage requests for files, order books, etcetera, they apply bar codes to all requests before FAXing, research bar code data base to determine the correct code for the request, FAX requests semi-weekly, sort and distribute files, order books that have been delivered from off-site storage, assemble filing to be sent to the off-site storage, assist fellow clerks with library phones, marriage licenses, mail and filing, bar code all order books to be sent off-site for storage and scanning and storage purposes. Assist with moving the files to the basement and prepare some basement files to be sent to off-site storage. They also file, we gave them added duties, they all file about two hours a day for Circuit, Superior plus that job was also cross-trained to do tickets from misdemeanor traffic, so we've sort of added to the original job description. We really can't do without any more employees. Like I said, I wish we could. I wish our business was not thriving, it doesn't, you know, it's not good to see so many things happening in court because these are not good things, these are not people getting married, these are people having a lot of problems. So I'm asking the Council to please, do not cut any more. Now, I will say this, if in the years to come, we see where our numbers are decreasing, I will be the first one to tell you and we will give up an employee. But at this time, you know, we closed the library down, the public – well, I said closed, we didn't close it down, we closed it off for the librarian to assist the public and this has been quite a strain on the public. They don't know exactly what they are doing when they look up their files to see what their case numbers are, something that's simple, and they don't have that anymore, someone there to assist them. So we basically have to tell them we'll have to find someone that knows how to do that because we just, we don't have time now to really assist the public. So I'm asking Council to please let me have this employee that I'm requesting today. If the numbers go down, I will come back and let you know and be more than willing to give up another employee through attrition or if they quit.

President Lloyd: Let me ask a couple of quick questions. What's the COMOT level for that position?

Susan Kirk: It is a COMOT IV, it's line item 1400.

President Lloyd: Okay. Any questions by Council? Okay, Mr. Shetler.

Councilmember Shetler: We started off at basically around a three, is that correct? COMOT III?

President Lloyd: There is a designation of III. There's very few –

Councilmember Shetler: We don't have any – okay, or there are a couple, I think. So this is basically about the lowest level or entry level that we can go into.

Susan Kirk: Yes, in our office, it is. It's the lowest level you can go into. But I want you to remember, we do average daily, we average around 3,600 docket entries daily touching over 2,300 cases daily. Now I know when you say filing and keeping track of bar coded files that go back and forth to our off-site storage and things like that may not seem, to make it simple, like brain surgery. Of which, maybe it is, but the thing of it is, the files have to be filed. We've got to keep track of this stuff. We can't just let it pile up. So even a COMOT IV, that job still has to be done any way you look at it. We just – a job has to be done and we don't have anyone else in there now that can spare the time to do all of this off-site storage. You have to remember, we have files requested every day. We can't keep everything up there.

Councilmember Shetler: Could you estimate about how much time they really are working towards that storage facility? You know, getting things prepared and then delivered out there and or picking, retrieving information and then coming back?

Susan Kirk: Yeah, her job, or that job, I shouldn't say her. It's not politically correct. That job, I would say it takes up probably, oh, I would say five hours out of the day just to do this, just to keep track of these files that are going back and forth, bar coding, all this kind of stuff, getting that ready. She would spend two hours, the position would be two hours filing for Circuit/Superior. The other hours, whatever she has left, whether it's two, three, she does tickets, she has to process tickets for misdemeanor and traffic because they went up, well, let's see, the infractions went up 26.39% and a lot of that is traffic tickets, stuff like that, you know, seat belts, speeding, no license plate, so that's, she's cross-trained. Like I said, that position, I need to quit saying she, that position has been cross-trained in other areas because we've just, you know, we've got to get the job done. We have time limits, we can't let it sit.

Councilmember Shetler: Are you utilizing any part-time employees, currently?

Susan Kirk: No, I asked for part-time help in my budget but didn't get it. And that's why I had 54 employees.

Councilmember Shetler: Alright. Thank you.

President Lloyd: Mr. Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: I'd just like to say, knowing Ms. Kirk in the past, she would never come up here and ask for a new employee unless she really needed it. And I support it 100% and I hope, like she said, in the future, if she doesn't need it or whatever, she'll be back up here, but she has always been, she's always looked on behalf of the taxpayers and saving the dollars. So I hope we can give her this new employee.

Susan Kirk: Well, thank you very much, Councilman Bassemier. I appreciate that.

President Lloyd: Okay, it's an existing employee, it would be just filling that replacement. One other question I have, even though it's basically entry level, apparently, that person handles funds, so, I mean, there's some exposure there,

correct?

Susan Kirk: They do. This position, she also fills in at the cashier's office so she's, they do numerous different things. Since I've taken office and during the five years that I've been in here as the Clerk our cases have increased every year. So due to that fact I have had to cross-train numerous employees because you have to remember, we hardly ever have a full staff working because of vacations and different things like that, sickness, so I have a lot of cross-trained, we just have to just to get the job done. When we see, like the infractions had such an increase, then we try to find somebody that can spare a little time and do that so we can kind of – not kind of – we've already done that. You know, we had more work so we have tried to absorb it by cross-training, so anyway, I would appreciate your...

President Lloyd: Okay, I mean, so they handle funds, so there's some exposure there even though it's an entry level position. Mr. Shetler and then Mr. Sutton. Mr. Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: I don't mean to assume anything here, but it sounded like that you might be amenable to looking at the possibility of part-time employees to help offset some of the burden that you have in the office, currently.

Susan Kirk: Yeah, if we could have a couple of part-time employees on top of what we have now, at least the staff could work at a normal pace rather than such a quick pace. That's what concerns me, you know, sometimes the faster we go, we're apt to make a mistake, more apt to make a mistake and that does concern me. We're such a litigious society that no one can make a mistake anymore, and I would prefer not to do that. But I need this full-time employee. If you can grant me that, let's see how it goes. Now I'll have to say, too, I'll come back if the numbers decrease. But if the numbers continue to increase, then part-time help would help a lot just to do that task of filing and keeping things in order. We just, like I said, we can't have big stacks of stuff because, you know, when a judge wants something, you can't say, well, okay, it's over there in that ten foot stack over there. It doesn't work that way. It takes a lot longer to find it. It's better to go ahead and get it filed and taken care of.

President Lloyd: We know judges can be demanding.

Councilmember Shetler: I guess at the moment, I guess that I'm feeling that it may be far more prudent for us to look at doing it kind of the other way and that might be to look at the part-time and then see how that works and if that's able to satisfy and resolve the situation, that perhaps that might be our way to go. If it doesn't then perhaps coming back at a later point in time to go for the full-time might be, once we get locked into that full-time, then I think we're locked in. That's my own personal preference at the moment. But...

Susan Kirk: Well, if I could have two part-time people, that would make the difference, but having one part-time person, that's not going to help because every position over there, everybody is extremely busy. And thank you, Councilman Bassemier, I am very conservative. And I would not be here if we didn't, if we really didn't need it. I mean, the numbers, we have the numbers to prove. I want to compliment, all the judges except two stepped forward and helped us. They did a little bit more than what they were doing before to help us absorb some of the work from the position that we lost. But they are done, they can't do any more either. We're just, in other words, the glass is pretty full, we're running over here.

President Lloyd: Yeah, we don't want to name names, there. Mr. Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: A couple of questions. How long has this position been open that you're requesting here?

Susan Kirk: It has been open, well, this position has been open for, what is today? The sixth? Six days.

Councilmember Sutton: And what are the qualifications for this position as it's described right now and then the coding or the rank for this position? What are the minimum qualifications for someone for this position?

Susan Kirk: Well, we don't really need, like a degree in business or whatever to do this. The work that the Clerk's office does, as in most of the other officeholders, it's on the job training. I think your best qualification for anyone that I hire is always someone that seems to be multi-task, they can do multiple things, especially at once because you're kind of running here, there and so forth. So, in my office, that's what I look for is someone that is multi-task as far as having a specific training in something, --

Councilmember Sutton: I guess I'm looking for, I mean, if you're going to, I mean, if you had this position to advertise for and you put together some criteria that a person would look at, what would it say? I mean,...

Susan Kirk: Well, what we do is, I have probably 300 people who have given me applications, submitted applications for jobs. I go through those applications. I look to see, is there anything maybe that kind of stands out that would show me that this person maybe is more multi-task. We do interviews, they need to be able to get along, obviously, with a bunch of other women in the office. I want them to have courtesy and respect but it's, you know, I don't advertise for, gee, do you know how to do bar coding or that's not --

Councilmember Sutton: Well, I mean, I guess I'm looking to see if someone is applying for the position, I mean, you need someone with some strong math skills or writing skills, you mentioned multi-tasking, so that can be pretty broad, I guess, in terms of what that might mean and what you are looking for, because I'm looking -- how many people in your office, this is a COMOT IV, correct?

Susan Kirk: Yes.

Councilmember Sutton: How many COMOT IV's do you have in your office?

Susan Kirk: I don't know, I didn't count them. I would say, you take Donna and me away, and then there's what, five supervisors, I don't know, 40? 35? Well, I mean, then there's the cashier, I don't know, 30? I'll say 30, I guess. Sandie is counting like crazy over here.

Councilmember Sutton: I guess it just seems to occur to me, with your office being one of the larger offices in the county, which increases the probability that you're going to have openings in your office probably rather periodically and we still do have the hiring freeze, county hiring freeze that is going on for the county. It would seem at least for an office of your size, to go in and really assess those duties and functions, because it would seem to me that you're going to always have an issue with being able to keep functions going at a productive and at the pace that you're

wanting to go if you're getting employee losses along the way. Now we mentioned about the cross training a little bit earlier. I'm not even sure, there might not be a need and perhaps maybe you've already done this to really assess those functions and duties for all of the positions that you have in your office in the event that you do have someone that leaves and have a backup plan for carrying on those duties and functions when that person may leave. You've only had this position open for six days but let's say if this position was, by chance, outside of the hiring freeze and was approved, you're still talking about a process of considering all your applicants and going through all the paperwork you have to go through here, so you're probably talking maybe another 21, 28 days or so before that position is in place, so you've gone a significant amount of time and those functions still have to go on. Have you given any consideration to that?

Susan Kirk: Yes, Councilman Sutton, as I stated earlier, since I've taken office and our case load has increased every year. The reason that we do so much cross-training is because we have someone out sick, surgery, Family Medical Leave, so there's always at least three people who can perform that particular duty when someone is out of the office. Because like I said earlier, with 54 people, it's unusual that all 54 are there every day. So someone is always picking up the duties of someone else, due to one thing or another. It could be that they're off work, not there. It could be that, say, small claims, sometimes they get bombarded with cases. Their desk will be stacked with, you know, cases. And because they're so busy, one of those people that was cross-trained to maybe help in Circuit/Superior, they can't go over there and do that because they've got to do this. So then we have someone else to try to pick up that, yes, we have done that. Everything, we have analyzed the positions, gone over them through this last five years, made numerous changes in order to compensate for the increase in case filings and work load and people who can pick up and try to do. And, even with that, we do get behind. We do get behind. There will be, you know, like ten days when a case is filed and in order for us to get certified mail, get it all out, and sometimes we don't make that because of circumstances where it didn't make any difference how many we had cross-trained, everybody was so busy with what they had to get done, that we were a little late on that. So, and especially now that we've lost one employee. Of course, the public has suffered more than anything for this because, like I said, they come in and they get on the computer, even with the instructions, they're having difficulty in looking up their cases. Plus, you know, we have the abstractors and they're over there and they kind of stay there a lot. And then you've got people waiting to get to the computers because the abstractors are there and so, anyway—

President Lloyd: Hey Royce, Sandie counted 37 COMOT IV's out of a total of 54 employees.

Susan Kirk: Thank you, Sandie.

Councilmember Sutton: I mean, I don't want to rehash old ground, but you've mentioned the law library, I guess, a couple different times. The Council did not cut the law library position. I mean, you made the choice as the manager and administrator of that office —

Susan Kirk: You cut a position —

Councilmember Sutton: — to remove that position to rearrange your staff and your workforce to meet other needs. But the Council did not cut that position. I just want to make sure we're very clear and on the record and we did discuss this the last

couple – I just want to make sure that impression is not left out of it that this Council, anyone on this Council, made that decision. That was your decision.

Susan Kirk: Well, I'd just, by Council cutting the position, we obviously have priorities in the office that have to be taken care of. It's just like everything else, there's the priority. You've got to do this first, you've got to do this second. And because of the loss of an employee, something had to go. And that's what had to go because the other things, we have to get done. We don't have to go out there and assist someone on a computer looking up their case. We don't have to do that but we have to get other things done within certain time limits that are prescribed by law. So those things take priority. So you have to, again, assess what you're doing and get your priority list. And that was the only place that we had that we could cut back and take part of that job of being there all the time for the public and take that away now. She has to do small claims duties, too.

President Lloyd: Okay, and anything else, Mr. Sutton? Mr. Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Just a general comment. And, Susie, this doesn't have anything to do with your office. Your office would be a great place to start because it's probably our biggest, but I've had some dialogue back and forth with Commissioner Tornatta on starting somewhere within the county and doing a study, bringing in somebody that's outside of government. And, as an example, go to Susie's office, study the flow, study the tasks, you know, look and see where efficiencies are, where they're not. You know, in today's environment, and all the money we've spent and software, computerization, and what have you, and I'm shooting in the dark here, but I'll bet you, we probably have the same amount of employees in here in that office today that we did in 1970. So there's got to be some things or somebody, a firm, that can come in and look and, you know, from a different set of glasses. Not the ones that we look through every day, but from a whole different set of glasses that can study all the flow and, you know, do we file today things because that's just the way we've always done it? Do we handle every task just because that's the way it's been done for the last 20 years? I don't know. And I'm not telling you there's any changes at all that could be made, but I would like somebody other than somebody that works in the interior walls of this building to come in and start somewhere and analyze our whole process. Our whole system. And start – I do believe it would be a great start in a larger office and don't, I'm not looking to sign a big contract to study the entire county or city/county both, but start somewhere. Just see what our gains could possibly be from doing that and, you know, if we like what happens, take it into other departments and other offices. I don't know what anybody else's thoughts are but –

Susan Kirk: Well, our office, Councilman Raben, runs by federal and state law and our judges. So if the judges have a particular way that they like something done, that's what we do. So I'll just give you a little forewarning, that if you want to change something, you probably ought to get their okay, because, and I'm not saying that what they do causes –

Councilmember Raben: And my point is, you bring somebody in that has no association with any part of government. And there could be a little finger pointing. That may be good. But if the judges are the ones that are the reason why we have to hire more employees, you know, somebody needs to call them out on that. If we're doing things, again, just because that's the way they've always done it, doesn't make it right. I mean, everybody is adjusting, you know, in the private sector, you know, Royce's bank that he works in has made a lot of adjustments, I'm

sure, in the last ten-twenty years. And we all do. And again, I'm not picking on you or your office. I would like to start somewhere and, you know, government isn't always right. And in most cases, you know, I'm going to go out on a limb and say most of the time, we're wrong.

Councilmember Sutton: I think, Jim, what you're talking about is kind of like an efficiency study that would look for areas that might be duplicative or ways to streamline processes and it could be technology that could be upgraded in some areas. It could be responsibilities are shifted or moved in different areas. There may be some things that we're doing that maybe we don't, as you said, no longer really need to do, but I don't think we've ever really had any area in county government, as far as I can recall, that really looks at the efficiency of the tasks and responsibilities that we have and how to carry those out in the best manner possible. I think President Lloyd put it very appropriately at the beginning as he talked about ways in which we can make government work better for the public and making it more efficient, why can't we – and I think it would be a valuable tool for us by investing in something along that line. I'm not sure what kind of companies are out there that do that kind of thing, but I'm sure there are others out there that –

Councilmember Raben: I'm sure there are tons of them, you know –

President Lloyd: We talked to, when Tom Shetler was president last year and I was Personnel Chair, we talked to BKD accounting firm and they're the ones that do the job study, and they also indicated that they have contacts with some national firms that do this kind of thing, that specialize just in government. So if you like, we could request from them just maybe a sheet of some of these firms and possible pricing.

Councilmember Kiefer: Mr. President, before –

President Lloyd: Councilman Kiefer and then Mr. Goebel.

Councilmember Kiefer: Oh, go ahead, Mr. Goebel.

Councilmember Goebel: If you're going on the same line, go ahead. I'll come back with my –

Councilmember Kiefer: Well, I was just going to say, a lot of what we're talking about, in the private sector, over the years they've had different names like TQM, Total Quality Management, or local governments in Baltimore and in New York, they call it Comp Stat or City Stat, so there's more than one way to skin a cat. I mean, I think hiring somebody, you know, I'm not saying that's a bad idea at all, but there's also programs out there where you have the employees who do the work day in and day out, and they get together and they strategize to come up with ideas on how to make their departments run better, and they do that interdepartmentally. And they set goals and set benchmarks and then they hold themselves accountable. You know, perhaps before we hire somebody, we ought to get together and talk about this outside in a committee format and say, hey, what's the best way to approach this. What should be our next steps, because I do think that we're on to something here. There's probably ways to streamline and make government work a little bit better. Just how do we go about getting started and doing that?

President Lloyd: Okay, Mike?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes, I think the idea has a lot of merit to have an outside source come in because, like Susie today has a request, and she's been here before with her request. She's going to fight to fill her positions in her department. And it's going to be awfully difficult for us to determine which positions are vital and across the board because every person is going to ask and she wouldn't come here if she didn't feel it was very necessary. We've had other people, and we're going to go through this time after time after time. I think it's going to become even more burdensome for us as a Council. And really, sometimes I don't know if we're going to make the right calls because we might have a gut impression, we might hear something from a different department head or who knows what the criteria might be for us, but I really hope that we can get some guidance from another group that maybe could make us more efficient and save taxpayer money in the long term and make this job a little bit less burdensome, too.

President Lloyd: I'll commit to the Council that I'll get information from BKD on outside firms that do this and at least we'll have information to take a look at. Councilman Kiefer is the Personnel Chair, so maybe he wants to pick up this ball a little bit.

Susan Kirk: Well, just as a suggestion to Council, I realize that several officeholders are coming up here wanting to fill their positions. And it seems like to me that if Council would have a criteria like I have numbers to prove that our caseloads are going up. Not by a little bit, by quite a bit. And to me, if anything would count in determining whether a position is to be filled, it would be the facts. Not just me saying, yeah, they're really busy. But that the numbers are up. It's a fact. This is not just some little whim thing that we're coming up with here. That should be your number one criteria. Now, after that, yes, there may be some discussion. But when you can prove that you've got an all-time high, over 64,000 cases compared to 40 some odd thousand cases, just a few years ago. I don't know that, you know, and I don't have any problem with someone coming into the office to assess it. We have gotten together as groups in our departments, mixed in our departments, mixed within the whole office, to see what can we do to absorb this workload. We've done that. And we've actually – and we've done it, literally, we've done it.

President Lloyd: For our sake here, what position is this again, or the number?

Susan Kirk: It's line item 1400, it's the Administration Assistant Chief Deputy.

President Lloyd: Okay, in this salary book I'm looking at, that's Bookkeeping Clerk. Is that the same one?

Susan Kirk: No.

President Lloyd: What's the title?

Susan Kirk: It is the Administration Assistant Chief Deputy. It's line item 1400.

President Lloyd: Okay, we've got different numbers. There's some, let's see, Administrative Chief Deputy. 1450, maybe? Or you said it was a COMOT IV.

Susan Kirk: It's a COMOT IV. The bookkeeping, the cashier's position, we switched a few people around here. So the line that is open is 1400, and it says, according to the job description, it's the Administration Assistant Chief Deputy.

President Lloyd: Okay, we'll sit here and try to figure that out. Any other questions?

Councilmember Goebel: I think this just demonstrates, again, our problem. Susie need a replacement, we don't exactly know what job that person would fill, totally. I mean, we're coming right now, kind of in the dark. We don't have the description or anything else in front of us or the numbers or anything else. We're listening to you and I believe you, but it would be nice to have that for us to study.

Susan Kirk: Would you like to have this and pass it around and read it?

Councilmember Goebel: Or a copy beforehand. That would be nice.

Susan Kirk: Okay.

Councilmember Goebel: Thank you.

President Lloyd: It's Bookkeeping Clerk. It is 1400. My mistake. That's a COMOT IV. Do we want to entertain a motion to approve this replacement?

Councilmember Kiefer: Before we do that, Councilman Shetler had mentioned, and I thought Susie had said, you know, if she had two, that might work. I mean, Tom, were you suggesting start out with two part-time employees and see if that works in lieu of this position?

Councilmember Shetler: I didn't specify a number, but I think I would look at entertaining the idea of maybe looking at putting 12, \$13,000 into the account for part-time help, see how that works and then a couple months later, if it's absolutely necessary to go a full-time or another part-time, then we could certainly take up that question at another time. But that's how I would view it, my own personal opinion today.

President Lloyd: Okay, and then the other thing is, we did eliminate one position in this office in December, so –

Councilmember Sutton: The part-time dollars, you say you don't have any, we didn't allocate any for 2010?

Susan Kirk: I put it in my budget for part-time help and it was not approved by Council. And, like I said, that is when we had –

Councilmember Shetler: What we could do is transfer from this line that we would be vacating, put it into the, transfer at a, you know, next month.

Councilmember Sutton: And then it also gives us some time to really mull over this matter that we talked about with the efficiency issues and maybe form an actual group or a committee that can actually move this forward. But if we fill this position, we've locked ourselves in to not really supporting what we're talking about here.

Susie Kirk: And you have to remember, also, part-time help, one thing about that, ideally, if you find a couple of people that, it's kind of like full-time, part-time, because if it's people that's going to be coming and going, we don't have time to train people. We don't have time to do that. That's going to take up more time, so we don't have time for that. That's the only problem with part-time help is that, you know, if you have a full-time employee, they're there, you get them trained, you start

moving on. Part-time, they're kind of here, there, yonder and we really don't have time to train them, especially in some of these duties. You know, you have to remember, when we hire someone, they get access to our court records. And they need to be full-time. When you, like I said, start hiring part-time and you're having a turn-over, ah, you know, sometimes that can be more. Like I said, I wish the Council would at least, this time, let me stay at this number and, again, thank you, Mr. Bassemier, because I will be back. I do want to save money. I don't like paying taxes any more than anybody else does. So I'm just asking you to do it this time. Like I said, if my numbers go down I'll be back, but –

President Lloyd: Okay, one other point, last year, the Council approved a lower hiring rate for new employees, so this person would come in at a lower rate.

Councilmember Sutton: That's what I was going to – along with the benefits, I mean, this position, of course, is based upon the – on mine it says vacant, actually there, for 1400, but it's 27,648, Sandie, if you – I know you –

President Lloyd: That was 2009, it's not going to be the same.

Councilmember Shetler: The entry would be about 21.

Councilmember Sutton: If you talk about the benefits on top of the salary, roughly, what are we probably talking about annualized on a position like this? Just kind of an average.

Sandie Deig: (Inaudible, microphone not turned on)

Councilmember Sutton: So let's say we knock that down some just to, so you're talking about at least 45,000 total compensation for the position.

Susan Kirk: I don't know. And my advice is, is I wouldn't get into benefits with me standing up here.

President Lloyd: We need to move this along.

Susan Kirk: That's right.

Councilmember Sutton: Well, I –

Susan Kirk: Do you really want to go to the benefit area?

Councilmember Sutton: Can you allow me to go ahead and ask –

President Lloyd: Go ahead.

Councilmember Sutton: Thank you. Just to your point, what do you have in mind, Councilman Shetler, as far as the amount on that, part-time dollars?

Councilmember Shetler: Well, first of all, I mean, I hate to nickle and dime a \$54,000,000 budget, but you have to start somewhere. And that's, I guess, where I'm coming from. And I guess I'd have in my mind in the neighborhood of 12 to \$15,000 in a part-time budget that would allow us to, that gives you a lot of flexibility. I think our Clerk gives us a very compelling argument for why it's important to have full-time employees and I certainly think that it is. But, by the

same token, you have flexibility with part-time. One week they work 15 hours when you need them and you don't have very many people taking vacations and sick leaves and bad weather and all the other things that come up. The next week, you've got a full staff in and you can slow them down a little bit and not bring them in as often. So there's some flexibility that you have that it's very advantageous to managing an office. So I think 12 to \$15,000 would be appropriate and would work, and save the county in the neighborhood of about 30 - \$35,000. Again, it's nickle and diming a \$54,000,000 budget, but you've got to start somewhere. I feel it's a better move than doing nothing at all and –

Councilmember Sutton: I mean, I like the idea.

President Lloyd: Okay, we need to wrap this up, so would someone entertain a motion to either replace the position or some other type of motion?

Councilmember Bassemier: I'd like to make a motion we approve a full-time employee, what she's asking for. She knows what she needs. You're going to get two part-time people 15,000, what is that, \$7.25 an hour a person, or \$8.00 an hour person. And that person would probably quit after six or eight months or a good possibility because it's part-time, no benefits. I think if we give her a full-time employee, that person would be more conscientious to do a better job, and I think we need to give it to her.

President Lloyd: Okay –

Councilmember Bassemier: I make a motion to approve a full-time or that full-time however you call it.

Susan Kirk: Thank you.

President Lloyd: Is there a second? Okay, no second. That motion dies for lack of a second. Additionally, well, as I said, this would be a person coming in at the lower tier for that COMOT IV. Okay, we need another motion.

Councilmember Shetler: I would suggest, really, we just put a flat amount in there and then she has the ability to decide if, one week she may want two in there, maybe she needs one, maybe she won't need any for a couple of weeks. I don't know how that would be. I know in our own facility, we use some. That works out great for them. There's people who are actually looking for it because they want to work when their kids are off to school and work from 8:00 to 12:00, or some who want to work from 10:00 to 2:00, and that kind of situation, that works very, very well. So I think that's part of management's decision and not for us to try to dictate how many and what the hours might be or how they might do it.

President Lloyd: What about transferring the amount of that salary to part-time?

Councilmember Sutton: Which would be about –

President Lloyd: 21,000 or something like that.

Councilmember Sutton: Yeah, or whatever it – I mean, that sounds like it would provide a lot more flexibility. You know, there might be times where she might need only one. Maybe she needs three.

Councilmember Shetler: I have no problem with that. That would have to come back, I assume, next month for a –

President Lloyd: We'd have to get a transfer, file a request.

Councilmember Shetler: Yeah, I'd have no problem with that.

Councilmember Goebel: Susie, can you live with a part-time right now?

Susan Kirk: I will have to say I'm disappointed because I know there are other areas that we can also save money. I'm not going to mention it right now, but I think all the Councilmen know what I'm referring to. I'm disappointed that the Council is not going by the facts, that I have numbers, that you have granted other officeholders their employees with really no facts, particularly, just by their presentation. I feel like my presentation was very good today. And I'm very, like I said, very disappointed because I know there are some other places that we can cut. So, but that's your decision and I will abide by whatever your decision is. We'll see what the repercussions turn out to be.

President Lloyd: Okay, to make it official, let's get a motion and a second on this so we can move forward.

Councilmember Shetler: I move that we bring up the question again next month in reference to a transfer of funds into a part-time line item from this particular full-time position. The amount to be determined –

President Lloyd: Whatever a new full-timer would be for a COMOT IV?

Councilmember Shetler: Uh, I would say not to exceed maybe \$20,000, which is close. I think a new entry level COMOT was at \$21,000 roughly. So...

President Lloyd: Okay, is there a second?

Councilmember Kiefer: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Shetler, second Mr. Sutton. Roll call vote please.

Councilmember Sutton: The second was Kiefer.

President Lloyd: Oh, I'm sorry. Mr. Kiefer.

Councilmember Sutton: I'm not a ventriloquist.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: I'm not really in favor of part-time help, but I think she needs a full-time person. If it's part-time, I wish she could at least get a 39 hour person, but for her to get maybe a good chance of getting some extra help here, I'll vote yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: I'm going to vote no. Six to one, the motion passes.

(Motion carried 6-1/President Lloyd opposed)

President Lloyd: Before we do item H, a couple of housekeeping things that I neglected. Our Council Attorney is Jeff Ahlers from Kahn Dees, however, Mr. Ahlers had a deposition, he couldn't make it here today. So in his place we have Ryan Schulz from Kahn, Dees. Appreciate you coming here, Ryan. I know he's interested in government, so what better place to stick him than in the middle of this Council?

BOARD APPOINTMENT TO CENTRAL DISPATCH
--

President Lloyd: The other thing is, on our County Council appointments, I missed Central Dispatch. And we do have an appointment to Central Dispatch, that would be Mike Humphrey. Mike Humphrey, the former fire chief agreed to take the Council's appointment on Central Dispatch.

HEALTH DEPARTMENT REQUEST TO FILL VACANCY
--

President Lloyd: Okay, let's go to Item H, Board of Health, permission to fill vacancy.

Councilmember Shetler: Councilman, could I ask you if we could skip over and go to the salary ordinance amendments prior to that? I have an appointment that I need to get to and I apologize for that. But if we could go to that and then –

President Lloyd: Alright, we're going to deviate from the agenda. Let's go to item number 14, Amendments to the Salary Ordinance.

Councilmember Shetler: Oh, I'm sorry, we won't be able to do that because the Board of Health is on there.

President Lloyd: Maybe we can get through the board of Health and then –

Councilmember Shetler: And Councilman Raben can – yes, thank you.

President Lloyd: Otherwise, Councilman Raben could pinch hit on that. Alright, let's go back to 13 H, Board of Health, permission to fill vacancy.

Gary Heck: Gary Heck, Vanderburgh County Board of Health. Thank you for considering this request. Dr. Del Rio had requested this at the board meeting in December. Before I start, I would like to just remind the Council that the Health department does have some COMOT II's and some COMOT III positions. It's my understanding there's been a moratorium on requests to upgrade positions since April of 2009 while there was an ongoing review of all of the county positions. The Health department is still waiting to have their positions evaluated by the contracted service, so we don't have that position in yet. This request is to fill a public health nurse position, 2130-1240, that was vacated in April of last year. And we would have already had this position filled with the exception that we needed to use a vacant position's funding to do an accrued payment buy-out of a long-time employee's accumulated benefits. The hiring freeze went into effect July 29th of 2009 or we would have already had a request to fill this position prior to that. This is our first opportunity to actually request that this position be filled because the funding just would have become available at the first part of December, 2010. I would just like to give you some additional numbers about the workload at the Health department with concerns to immunizations, which Public Health Nurses do fill in to help out in this. And then our Director of Nursing is here to also answer questions about the workload for this particular position. In 2008, the Vanderburgh County Health department provided 12,898 –

(Tape Changed)

– vaccinations over the course of the entire year. In 2009, the Health department and any of the, some of the volunteer vaccinating sites, a few doctors, what have you, provided 38,384, this is a 297% increase in vaccinations. Now granted, it's due primarily to the H1N1 vaccination that those increases are there, but that's still part of the public health department's responsibility and it's still part of the workload and having an additional nurse would certainly have been beneficial and helpful.

Councilmember Raben: On that note, that's not an annual vaccine, right? I mean, that's a one-time –

Gary Heck: Well, it's a one-time for this one, but, and it probably would be included in seasonal flu vaccines, so while this is, we're still going to be receiving vaccine through May of this year so it's not like it's –

President Lloyd: It's going to go through half this year.

Councilmember Raben: To be fair, that number is not going to carry into 2010.

Gary Heck: The number will carry into 2010. Now whether it will be in 2011 or 2012 remains to be seen about with the phases, but it will carry into 2010.

Councilmember Raben: Vaccines to give out. But that's not an ongoing, that's not a building number, though.

Gary Heck: It is an unusual occurrence in the sense that in the last 20 years, we probably haven't had this same type of thing. So I guess your point is correct in that

regard.

President Lloyd: Let me ask a quick question. What's the position name and number in the budget book?

Gary Heck: It's Public Health Nurse, 2130-1240.

President Lloyd: Okay. And that's a PAT MED II.

Gary Heck: That's correct.

President Lloyd: So it's a skilled position. It obviously has to be an RN.

Gary Heck: That's correct. A bachelor degree RN.

President Lloyd: Okay, so it's a person that administrates services from the Health department.

Gary Heck: That's correct, and goes out to the public and if you have questions, the nursing director would be more than happy, Diana Simpson, could answer in probably greater detail than I.

President Lloyd: How long has this been vacant?

Gary Heck: Since April of 2009.

President Lloyd: Okay, and part of that was money used for the buy-out of Mr. Elder?

Gary Heck: That's correct. The vast majority of that buy-out came from this position.

President Lloyd: Okay. Questions by Council? Or did anybody want to have the nurse offer her thoughts on this?

Unidentified: What was the question?

President Lloyd: Oh, is there questions by Council or did Council want to have the nurse elaborate on this position?

Gary Heck: Our nursing director.

Councilmember Raben: Yeah, or I would, I mean, I might ask a question if you, you know, I guess if we managed for all of '09 without this person, under the circumstances that we discussed earlier, I would find it hard to believe that we can't go forward without the same person. I mean, if '09, you know, the numbers were through the roof, up 200%, and we did it without this person. And that kind of was my point earlier, was, you know, we'll probably never see those numbers as high again.

Gary Heck: Well, in all fairness, we also had federal funding that allowed us to hire, otherwise, we would have, the board would have asked us, and they did ask us, to come back and ask for this position to be reconsidered and to do an appropriation. But we, administratively, we chose not to do that since we have this other funding

that we could hire some temporary help. But that, federal funds wouldn't be available after this episode. We really do need this position.

Councilmember Raben: How much in federal funding did we use on temporary help? For this?

Gary Heck: Well, we had 374,000, and to date, we probably have used, oh, close to \$50,000 in, because we continue to run clinics. We're having a clinic this Thursday, for example, this Saturday, and then one out at Nativity Church on Sunday. And, what you don't hear about are the closed pod clinics where we've been going to childcare centers and to other facilities and anybody under the age of ten, you have to do a second, a booster. Diana Simpson can answer that question.

Councilmember Raben: But back to the federal funds, you received 300,000?

Gary Heck: We have the ability to claim up to \$374,000 to do that, to do all sorts of related costs.

Councilmember Raben: And you've claimed 50?

Gary Heck: Well, we've submitted claims. We haven't received it all yet because there was some advancing. But that's a one-time, if we hadn't of had that opportunity, I can assure you we would have been back and I had a lot of pressure from within requesting this position be filled several times last year.

Councilmember Raben: As far as those federal funds, though, those funds are still available for 2010?

Gary Heck: They're available through June 30 of 2010.

Councilmember Sutton: And how many, I'm sorry, Jim –

Gary Heck: They can't do anything but H1N1 vaccination.

Councilmember Sutton: And how many people did you take on through these federal funds that you received?

Gary Heck: It varies from clinic to clinic, but we had the opportunity under three contracts that the Commissioners have signed where we could use as many as we needed at any one clinic. We could have 20 people, 20 vaccinators at a clinic or screeners.

Diana Simpson: Let me kind of explain. My name is Diana Simpson, I'm the Nursing Division Director. Let me explain this position. It's one of those that probably people don't know about unless we're in the paper or there is an incident. This nurse, the money that Mr. Heck was talking about is only for H1N1. That is it. This position is a nurse who actually goes out into the community. We accept referrals, we get referrals from doctors, hospitals, CPS court appointed visits, we go into their – last year the four nurses made over 3,000 about 3,200 visits. They each had a case load of about 67 people. A lot of those required weekly visits, maybe two or three times a month. A case yesterday, a doctor called, a little eight month old, failure to thrive. One of our nurses went out that day, looked at that child, got him in, he was behind on his immunizations. These nurses go in there

and what we always say, public health are the eyes and the ears for the community because our doctors can not go into those homes. When we lost the position, we didn't lose the position but we just were not able to hire when our nurse retired in April. We saw an effect, the higher case loads for our nurses. We also do U of E and USI students, they come to the health department, they go out with our nurses. USI had such an increase in the number of students that our nurses could not handle that caseload to teach these girls and take them out. We're very strict on how many, you know, we could actually take without affecting our other job. The H1N1 is just kind of, you know, that's a burden right now but we have money, we're hiring. But I would love to see this position go. We have four nurses right now. One of those nurses is on an MCH, Maternal Child Health Title V grant that is possibly going to be cut in this fiscal year, which would be October 1. So if we lose that position and this position, we'd be down three nurses.

President Lloyd: Okay, and I know, I attended the board of Health meeting where they strongly endorsed this position. It's a, you know, a position that administers to the public. It's a registered nurse. I think with the Health department, if you wanted to look at the possibility of eliminating or changing positions, you may want to look at the administrators. I'm not sure you want to look at an RN. But anyway, Mr. Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Thank you. Is this a position that you could possibly hire as a contractor instead of as an employee? That way, when the H1N1 and other things decrease, you could then re-evaluate the need for a full-time nursing position?

Gary Heck: I don't believe so. Once again, we're still waiting for the evaluation of all of our positions by the contractor. We haven't been visited yet like all of the other departments. We have COMOT II's and COMOT III's that we believe should be at a much higher – because our positions, our job descriptions have been in place since 1993 and have never changed unless they've come before Job Study. So the vast majority of our clerks, bookkeepers, secretaries are all in COMOT II and COMOT III positions, unlike some of these other departments that only have COMOT IV's and up. But the registered nurses, it's not something that we can do with contractors, and the public health nursing positions are, they're a vital part of the health department and if there was another way we could do it, we would certainly want to try and do it that way. But we don't believe we can do it with contractors because –

Councilmember Kiefer: There's not a pool of nurses out there in the community that would, like we talked about earlier, part-time positions where –

Gary Heck: If they're going to do it, they're going to do it at places that pay a much higher hourly rate than the county would be willing to pay.

President Lloyd: There's a shortage of nurses, isn't there, basically?

Gary Heck: Well, there's beginning to be. You're going to start feeling the pinch everywhere.

Councilmember Kiefer: Thank you.

President Lloyd: Other questions? Okay, do we want to entertain a motion to approve the replacement of the nurse, which actually had been a full-time position

there, has been left vacant. Part of that was money to go to Mr. Elder's retirement.

Councilmember Raben: How many, let me circle the wagons. Total, how many nurses do you have, health nurses?

Diana Simpson: Four right now.

Councilmember Raben: Four. And all four of them are doing the same job?

Diana Simpson: Basically, yes. Some have other duties. We go into the schools every once in a while, especially the New Directions Program, and do classes for pregnant teenagers there. So each nurse has their own specialty or other areas, but they all make home visits. We look at the referrals as they come in. Our nurse, we have one nurse, her specialty is in lead, we have these kids with high leads, that people never know about that are being affected, that we follow up on, case manage. Pregnant women, they come, we have a nurse every day at the health department that does free pregnancy testing on a walk-in basis. We try to hook that woman up, 90% of them don't have insurance when they come in, so we, there's a lot that goes on behind the scenes that people probably don't know. And it's hard to get numbers on a lot of that.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, I still – I'm thinking back, if can use federal funds to offset the workload between now and June, why are we discussing this –

Gary Heck: That's just for the H1N1, that's not for the every day –

Councilmember Raben: These four nurses don't spend a minute of time administering H1N1?

Gary Heck: Oh no, they do spend some time, but in the course of a week, it may amount to, probably at the best, six hours, four hours.

Councilmember Raben: Per?

Gary Heck: Per nurse if they're available.

Councilmember Raben: So, --

Gary Heck: Other than that, and there's already, we're already down one of these nurses and they're trying to pick up this remaining caseload for the demand for these services. If there was a way we could, if we could legally use the H1N1 money, perhaps I wouldn't be here today to ask you for this because we would have another funding source to do something with. We can't use it for that.

Councilmember Raben: Well, if that funding source is available and you can take away six hours a week from each of the (inaudible) bringing in more federal assisted health –

Gary Heck: Just to do the H1N1 vaccinations. It's just to do the H1N1 vaccinations. It's not for the day to day workload, that's called supplanting.

Councilmember Raben: I know, but that eliminates 24 hours a week of responsibility that these four are sharing in.

Gary Heck: We can't actually eliminate it that way because our nurses have to go out to do the work, too. We're just hiring to augment what we can't do with the staff that we have on our own.

President Lloyd: Let me ask Dr. Nicholson. He wanted to make a comment.

Dr. Ray Nicholson: Well, in our profession, it's the doctors and the nurses that see the patients on a direct, one to one position. And they're professionals and they're the only people that can do that. It appears that this caseload has been cared for by other people, which is actually illegal. In order for good public relations, we have been sending a clerk to the clientele that this nurse had been seeing in order to just keep it going. But we can't do that forever. You're not allowed to do that. You have to have an RN degree to do that. So we're going to have to do something with that caseload. Now when I was in private practice, just to illustrate some of the things that they do, what do you do with a 14 or 15 year old that's had a new baby and has a husband who has barely begun to shave? Do you send them home hoping that they can take care of that baby? No, I would refer them to this nurse who would go into the home and check on this child to make sure that things are alright. And we have diabetics that would not take their medication, so I would make referrals to them, they go out on a one to one basis and handle those. So they become case managers. And this cannot be a part-time position. It is a position where a professional has to have a relationship with the patient on an ongoing basis. You can't send a part-time employee every so often and get the same kind of result. It is a professional position and that's the backbone of any health department and any doctor's office. You can have all the clerks you want to and all the administration you want to, but it's that one on one position with the nurse seeing the patient that really adds up and it is important.

President Lloyd: Okay, is there other – Mr. Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yeah, thinking back to the dental clinic and how we provide 20% services outside the county which gives me a lot of heartburn that we're paying for things outside the county, do these nurses provide services outside Vanderburgh County?

Diana Simpson: No. Only Vanderburgh County residents.

Gary Heck: And for the record, anybody from outside the county pays a higher fee. So it's not Vanderburgh County providing services that aren't shared by a higher service fee for those individuals who don't reside in Vanderburgh County.

Councilmember Kiefer: Yeah, I understand that. It just displaces –

Gary Heck: I couldn't tell that exactly from your comments, though, Sir.

Councilmember Kiefer: Yeah, I just want to make sure we're not paying for somebody to do services outside of Vanderburgh County.

President Lloyd: Okay, Mr. Goebel, did you have something?

Councilmember Goebel: I'm a bit confused. You have four full-time.

Diana Simpson: Yes.

Councilmember Goebel: And this replacement would make it four, and you have one other –

Diana Simpson: Would make it five.

Councilmember Goebel: Will make it five. You have another nurse who is –

Gary Heck: Funded by a grant program, so they're not under the county's budget. They're under a grant.

President Lloyd: Okay, do we want to entertain a motion to either approve it or – approve the request and then either vote it up or down?

Councilmember Kiefer: I move that we approve the request.

President Lloyd: Okay, is there a second?

Councilmember Bassemier: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Kiefer, second Mr. Bassemier. Okay, this would be to approve the filling of the vacancy of the public health nurse. Start with a roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Anything that will help the health of our community, I'm going to vote yes on this.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: I'd like to abstain.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Based upon the strength of Dr. Nicholson's request, I'm going to vote yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. So that's five yes, one abstain. The motion passes. Thank you.

(Motion carried 5-0/Councilmember Raben abstained and Councilmember Shetler left the meeting prior to this vote)

Gary Heck: Thank you and I hope you all got the information you requested. I emailed to you the dental clinic information, and some other financials concerning the prescription drug card. Thank you. And thank you again, Sir.

TRAVEL REQUEST PROCEDURE

President Lloyd: Okay, we'll move to item I, and now, you thought that was fun, we're going to travel requests. You should have in front of you a memorandum that was sent out to all the county officeholders and elected officials. And this is something new this year that we can thank our former president, Councilman Shetler, on this. As a way to control county costs, we're looking at the Council approving travel requests. The memo is self-explanatory, the Commissioners passed an ordinance to this effect that now travel requests go to the County Council. Some of the county budgets have a small amount for travel in their budgets, but the majority, there's, I believe, \$20,000 in the County Council budget for travel. So now we're going to start entertaining travel requests. The first one on the list would be the County Engineer. You should have a copy of the paperwork –

Councilmember Sutton: Excuse me, Councilman Lloyd? I just want to reference back to the memo you just were talking about before you get into the actual requests themselves.

President Lloyd: Okay.

Councilmember Sutton: A couple of questions. You said that the Commission has taken action to approve that the Council would take on this responsibility?

President Lloyd: Yes.

Councilmember Sutton: So are we looking at moving all of the travel budgets into the County Council budget? That would seem like would be the – because there are several travel budgets out there with various, not just the Commission, but several offices. Is that what is proposed here?

President Lloyd: Yes, and I believe, and I could get you a list. There's a few offices that have small amounts of travel money, but where they have, I guess, routine, annual travel that they do. But the majority of it is in the County Council budget. And that was agreed to by the Commissioners.

Councilmember Sutton: I guess I'm a little puzzled, I guess, to a certain extent. Our function as Council, we put the travel budget in place, so by virtue, we are approving travel in a generic way and the Commission, who has the administrative function, would then actually review the travel requests. And, of course, as our responsibility from a fiduciary standpoint, we would monitor it to see if it's being used properly and the way it's supposed to be. But we don't have to go back and take a second action, I guess, on any travel requests. So I guess I am a little puzzled about their action on this because that would seem to be more of a County Commission function to actually approve the actual travel requests that come before them as opposed to a Council duty. Because it's not really dollars being –

Councilmember Raben: I think their thought, Royce, was that it was more of a Council function because it was a matter of dollars and cents, that they were approving travel requests and having them come back to us to get money to fund

the line. I think it's really, it saves them a step.

President Lloyd: Well, we like to try new things in government. Don't we?

Councilmember Sutton: Well, I don't necessarily say that the old is good and that the new is bad, I guess I'm just trying to get an understanding on just the logistics of who is making what decision and how this really coordinates. It seems like we've already taken the action we need to take by approving the travel budgets, I guess, that's –

President Lloyd: So, and I guess in this year's budget hearings, what we did is in a number of departments, I think we put zero in for travel. So we're saying that we don't know that they need to travel, so I guess that's why this new mechanism, they're going to come before Council to request those funds from a common fund for travel. I know you've been on the Council a long time; we've never done it.

Councilmember Sutton: How much are we going to have in this fund, by chance?

President Lloyd: \$20,000.

Councilmember Sutton: Okay. That's going to go quickly.

President Lloyd: I know. Well, and in past years, if you had a department or an officeholder that exceeded their travel budget, then it would come to us as an additional appropriation. So now we're just starting from square one.

Councilmember Sutton: Well, I guess we'll see what happens.

President Lloyd: We'll see how it goes.

COUNTY ENGINEER TRAVEL REQUEST

President Lloyd: Okay, the first on the list, County Engineer, which is item L, travel request. Is the County Engineer here? Okay, he was here earlier. I guess he had to leave. I did talk to him briefly about it, and this is a trip to the Storm Water Drainage Conference, they go every year. And the dollar amount, \$650. Any questions on that? Is there a motion to approve?

Councilmember Raben: So moved.

President Lloyd: Is there a second?

Councilmember Bassemier: Second.

President Lloyd: Let's just do, all in favor, say aye.

(All Councilmembers voted affirmatively)

President Lloyd: Any opposed?

(No opposing votes were cast)

President Lloyd: Okay, 5-0, motion passes.

(Motion carried 5-0/Councilmembers Shetler and Kiefer were not present for the vote)

HEALTH DEPARTMENT TRAVEL REQUEST

President Lloyd: The second item would be item M, Health Department travel request. They're still here.

Gary Heck: For the record, if you all don't approve these, then the Auditor's office can't reimburse on any claims, and that was the process when the Commissioners used to do these. Since you all only actually meet to approve things once a month, it means that you want a 30 day advance notice of the travel, and some departments won't have that 30 day advance notice time. So if you have to set up a travel line item in a department's budget, unless there's a way that you can work out a mechanism that either department heads or somebody can say it's okay for that travel till they run out of money or whatever, it would certainly speed up not having to have requests come to you so far in advance, and you may not even have that in advance.

President Lloyd: If we have notice we can take official action at Personnel & Finance. So we can do that. I mean, that's another thing. The other thing would be, I guess you could communicate with the Council office and they would forward that to the members.

Gary Heck: Okay, I just know that the Auditor's office can't pay a claim for travel unless there is an approved travel request form, or at least that's the way it was under the old system with the Commissioners.

Councilmember Raben: So Gary, you're referencing like state called meetings where you might get a week notice or something.

Gary Heck: In some regards, they could call a meeting that quick. A lot of times you know nine months in advance if it's an annual type meeting. But if it's, like under this H1N1, it's not unusual for Dr. Nick to get a notice that they're having a meeting next week that they need him to attend, and we wouldn't have that 30 days advance notice on something like that. And so we would be at the risk, if somebody attended the meeting hoping it was approved and then it wasn't, then you'd have people potentially making trips or trying to make a decision that it's okay to go or not go.

President Lloyd: Okay, the request in front of us is \$425, auto reimbursement for state called meeting. Is that correct?

Gary Heck: Uh-huh.

President Lloyd: Okay, is there any discussion? Questions?

Councilmember Raben: There's actually two requests.

Gary Heck: I think there is, too. There should be a second.

President Lloyd: Oh, okay, there's also \$150 for state called meeting and that's mileage as well. Are those in Indianapolis?

Gary Heck: I believe they are, Sir, yes. And we didn't have an actual form to submit them on, so we kind of made a temporary one similar to what the Commissioners used that had a, hopefully, a spot for the County Council to sign off on.

President Lloyd: Okay, one of them is for Dr. Nicholson to ISDH, Indiana State Department of Health.

Gary Heck: And that's in Indianapolis.

President Lloyd: And the other one is for Gary Heck, Indiana State Department of Health for one day. Dr. Nicholson for two days.

Gary Heck: Right.

President Lloyd: Any other questions? Is there a motion to approve?

Councilmember Bassemier: Motion to approve.

President Lloyd: Is there a second?

Councilmember Sutton: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, we've got a motion, Mr. Bassemier, second Mr. Sutton. All in favor, signify by saying aye.

(All Councilmembers voted affirmatively)

President Lloyd: Is there any opposed?

(No opposing votes were cast)

President Lloyd: Five - zero, the motion passes. Thank you.

(Motion carried 5-0/Councilmembers Shetler and Kiefer were not present for the vote)

Gary Heck: Thank you.

SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT TRAVEL REQUEST
--

President Lloyd: Okay, item number M, or no, we just did that one. I'm sorry. Item number N, Soil and Water Conservation District travel request. There should be four of those. Is anybody here from Vanderburgh County Soil and Water? Hmm. Okay, start with questions on this. Mr. Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Are these four, are they driving four vehicles to this conference?

President Lloyd: That's a good question. Based on what, yeah, I guess the information Mrs. Deig supplied, the county had approved one person to do this last year, and there is two county employees at Vanderburgh County Soil & Water, but now we've got requests for three additional employees or volunteers that the county would provide their travel when they're not county employees.

Councilmember Raben: You know, my recommendation is this: it doesn't take four to attend the meeting. You know, one or two, and those folks come back and they take good notes while they're there. They bring back any of the materials that are given out and share it with the other office members, board members and what have you. I'm with Mr. Goebel on this one. One person is probably enough. I might lean towards two, but definitely not four.

President Lloyd: Mr. Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: I think in the future, anybody wants some kind of appropriation or some kind of request to come before us, unless they call Sandie and give us a good excuse why they can't be here, I think we ought to table it until they can be here. Because there are some questions we need to ask and it's only fair that we ask the questions.

President Lloyd: Okay. So –

Councilmember Sutton: Well, this says January 10.

President Lloyd: January 10th, Indianapolis for a – it doesn't say what the meeting is.

Councilmember Bassemier: I'm referring, in the future.

President Lloyd: Right. Okay.

Councilmember Sutton: It's their annual conference.

President Lloyd: You know, if we approved one person last year, the person out of these four, the one that's a county employee would be Bonnie Bittner. I mean, I would be comfortable approving the one and let them come back and get reimbursed for the other ones. But I'm not sure why the county would reimburse non-county employees. This department is funded, they also have state funds and federal funds for soil and water, not just county funds.

Councilmember Sutton: Where does this show that they are – a couple of those are non-county employees? Maybe I'm missing that? On the forms here? I see, under the employees, where, on the requests they have the people listed that are intending to travel under the employee line, so how do we –

Sandie Deig: (Inaudible – microphone not turned on) they're not county employees.

Councilmember Sutton: Who are they?

Sandie Deig: I have no idea.

President Lloyd: Well, they work for Soil & Water. They may be funded by the state or federal monies.

Councilmember Sutton: Yeah, I see their names, but it doesn't really give any indication on what their position is.

Councilmember Raben: If this were, you know, 50 – 100 bucks and it, you know, that would be one thing, but this is \$2,700 worth of travel, so was there a motion

made to approve –

President Lloyd: We don't have a motion yet.

Councilmember Raben: Okay.

President Lloyd: I would suggest, do it for one person and that's it. The county employee, or we could do it for none.

Councilmember Raben: So moved.

President Lloyd: Okay, so Councilman Raben, \$689 for one employee. Is there a second?

Councilmember Sutton: Second.

President Lloyd: Bonnie Bittner?

Councilmember Sutton: Or let them decide who they want to send. I mean, all we've done is approved the money.

President Lloyd: Right. Who had the second?

Councilmember Bassemier: Royce.

President Lloyd: Okay, Royce. Okay, \$689. Councilman Raben and Councilman Sutton seconded. Any further discussion? All in favor signify by saying aye.

(All Councilmembers voted affirmatively)

President Lloyd: All opposed?

(No opposing votes were cast)

President Lloyd: Five - zero, motion passes.

(Motion carried 5-0/Councilmembers Shetler and Kiefer were not present for the vote)

AMENDMENTS TO SALARY ORDINANCE

President Lloyd: Now we go to item 14, amendments to salary ordinance. The finance chair had to leave for a business appointment, so I'm going to turn this over to Councilman Raben, our previous Finance Chairman.

Councilmember Raben: Back in the saddle again. I move salary line 1080-1190 Deputy as previously approved. The current employee is an Executive II/Step 2 with an annual salary of \$57,663. Health department, amend salary line 2130-1320 Office Manager/Finance Officer as previously adopted. The current employee is a PAT V/Step 4, with an annual salary of \$44,921. I also move we amend salary line 2130-1450 Disease Intervention Specialist as previously approved. The current employee is a PAT MED I/Step 4 with an annual salary of \$37,653. Position title change approved and recommended by the Personnel Administration Committee on December 16, 2009. I move that we amend salary line 2130-1240 to allow the

hiring and fill the vacancy of the Public Health Nurse. Under County Commissioners, salary line 1300-1120 County Attorney as previously approved. The 2010 salary is \$36,229. The line number and salary was approved on December 1, '09. I make that in the form of a motion.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Raben. Is there a second?

Councilmember Bassemier: Second.

President Lloyd: Second, Mr. Bassemier. Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. The amendments to the salary ordinance passes six to zero.

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

President Lloyd: Before we adjourn, I'd just like to offer, is there any citizen that wants to make a comment? We want to have open meetings accessible to the public.

Rick Davis: Rick Davis, the County Treasurer. I just had a quick question on the salary ordinance. We recently had a position go to Job Study and it's not on here today –

Sandie Deig: It's in the salary ordinance.

President Lloyd: It was prepared in the new salary book prior to – we'd have to do an amendment.

Rick Davis: Okay, I appreciate that. Thank you for your help.

President Lloyd: You're welcome. Any other citizen comments? Alright, I'll entertain a motion for adjournment.

Councilmember Kiefer: I'll move for adjournment.

Councilmember Bassemier: Second.

President Lloyd: Second Mr. Bassemier, motion Mr. Kiefer. We are adjourned.
Thank you.

(There being no further business to come before the Council, the meeting was adjourned at 10:15 a.m.)

VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL

President Russ Lloyd, Jr.

Vice President Jim Raben

Councilmember Joe Kiefer

Councilmember Mike Goebel

Councilmember Tom Shetler, Jr.

Councilmember Ed Bassemier

Councilmember Royce Sutton

Recorded and transcribed by Teri Lukeman.

**VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL
MINUTES
FEBRUARY 3, 2010**

The Vanderburgh County Council met in session this 3rd day of February, 2010 in room 301 of the Civic Center Complex. The meeting was called to order at 8:32 a.m. by County Council President Russell Lloyd, Jr.

President Lloyd: I'd like to open the meeting for the Vanderburgh County Council February 3rd, 2010. Attendance roll call please.

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

President Lloyd: For the Pledge of Allegiance, I'd like to ask Councilman Shetler to lead us.

(Pledge of Allegiance was given)

APPROVAL OF MINUTES JANUARY 6, 2010
--

President Lloyd: Okay, we have minutes from January 6, 2010. Has everyone had a chance to review those? I'll accept a motion to approve.

Councilmember Shetler: So moved.

President Lloyd: Is there a second?

Councilmember Bassemier: Second.

President Lloyd: All in favor, signify by saying aye.

(All Councilmembers voted affirmatively)

President Lloyd: Any opposed?

(No opposing votes were cast)

President Lloyd: Thank you.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

<p>CIRCUIT COURT SUPPLEMENTAL ADULT PROBATION REQUEST TO FILL VACANCY</p>
--

President Lloyd: Okay, we're going to have a deviation from the agenda. We're going to defer to Judge Heldt here, so let's go to Item 9, New Business, Item D, Circuit Court Supplemental Adult Probation, request to fill a vacancy, and we've got Judge Heldt here.

Carl Heldt: Carl Heldt, Circuit Court Judge. Mr. President, members of the Council, first of all, thank you for the courtesy of letting me go first; the reason is we're accommodating a jury. I'm in the middle of a jury trial and I can get back there earlier and get them started, and they appreciate it as well. This is a request to fill the secretarial position. We lost our secretary at the drug and alcohol probation services program, it's the office on 501 John Street. I have with me today Karen Angermeier, who is our administrative assistant; Cherie Wood, who is chief probation officer; Mignon Ware, who is the head of the drug and alcohol probation service over on John Street. This is, I want to say two things from the outset: first of all, this is a position that is funded, salary and fringe benefits, entirely by the adult probation user fee fund, the user fees, so it will have no impact on the taxpayers, or county budget. This is also one of those positions that's indispensable and can't be done by other people in the office. And I'm going to ask Mignon Ware, who is the head of the program over there, to come explain more of the details and answer whatever questions you have then. Mignon?

Mignon Ware: Good morning, everyone. As Judge explained, this position is very vital to our office. Currently, we have several people pitching in just trying to assist which is actually taking away from their daily responsibilities. We have a large volume of clients coming through on a daily basis, phone calls, doing urinalysis, just maintenance of daily operations, paperwork that is needing to be prepared, agencies that we coordinate with. This position definitely assists with that. Instead of me probably trying to explain, I don't know if there is specific questions that might need to be asked of that actual position.

President Lloyd: What was your name again?

Mignon Ware: Mignon Ware, I'm the supervisor with drug and alcohol probation.

President Lloyd: Okay, any questions by Council? Mr. Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: The person that's leaving that position, is there a buyout on that person? Have they been there for an extended period of time?

Karen Angermeier: Yes, there was a buy-out of 81 hours, and that is completed as of today.

Councilmember Shetler: Okay, and so there is, you've not hired or not looking to hire anybody in the middle of that, it's going to be completed and starting over from that point?

Karen Angermeier: Correct.

Councilmember Shetler: Okay, thank you.

Carl Heldt: I might say, we did send a letter, there was a lot of details in there that

we're not going to take up your time with. I hope you all have a copy of that, it says exactly what that person does.

President Lloyd: Right, 74 people a day coming through there. Other questions? Mr. Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: I just want to reiterate, you said that that is paid from what source?

Carl Heldt: Probation User Fee funds. It's money that is generated from the people that, the probationers that actually use the program and also it's also subsidized by the Community Transition Program where we take, it's sort of like a re-entry program and Department of Corrections pays us an amount of money to take people back. And that fund is used to operate this program, including this position and so nothing comes from the county fund.

Councilmember Kiefer: Thank you.

President Lloyd: Mr. Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: I'll make a motion to approve.

Councilmember Kiefer: I'll second it.

President Lloyd: Motion Mr. Bassemier, second Mr. Kiefer. Any other discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: It sounds like this position, it really doesn't have any effect on the

general fund and it's a busy position, so I'll vote yes. Thank you, Judge.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

Carl Heldt: Thank you. And thank you for accommodating us, again.

President Lloyd: You're welcome.

APPROPRIATION ORDINANCE

President Lloyd: We'll go back to the regular agenda, so that would be Appropriation Ordinance, number five, and I'll turn that over to Mr. Shetler, the Finance Chair.

CORONER

Councilmember Shetler: Yes, this request is from Coroner Groves, with regards to part-time help that she has in there, to increase that. And I do have a couple of questions and I apologize, I wasn't here last week to ask those questions. If I recall, we had this discussion I think at budget time –

Annie Groves: Yes, we did. Last year.

Councilmember Shetler: Seemed like it may have even been the year before that. But anyway, at that time, it's my understanding that these part-time folks were kind of put on a retainer where they got paid a minimum, so much a week like 12 hours or 20 hours, and –

Annie Groves: They get paid per hour.

Councilmember Shetler: They get paid per hour, there's no retainer, they don't get paid regardless if they fulfill that time or not?

Annie Groves: Oh, so they're paid per hour to take call, so they take call for 12 hours at a time, and they're paid for 12 hours of call.

Councilmember Kiefer: Can you clarify that? I'm a little confused. If they only work one hour, do they get paid for 12?

Annie Groves: Absolutely. They get paid to be on call.

Councilmember Kiefer: Oh, they're paid to be on call, so they're on call for a minimum of 12 hours?

Annie Groves: Correct.

Councilmember Goebel: And that's one person at a time, correct?

Annie Groves: Correct. Well, we hope. Sometimes we have to throw a couple more on.

Councilmember Kiefer: And that's whether you get called or not, correct? So if you don't get called and you're on call, you still get paid for 12 hours?

Annie Groves: That is technically correct. However, they never make it through a night without being called.

Councilmember Kiefer: I just wanted a – thank you.

Councilmember Shetler: So there's not any four-hour minimum? If they do get a call, is there like a four-hour minimum –

Annie Groves: No.

Councilmember Shetler: Now, if they would exceed that 12 hours, they would be paid –

Annie Groves: Yes.

Councilmember Shetler: – accordingly. And right now, they're at a rate of eight dollars an hour?

Annie Groves: Correct.

Councilmember Shetler: Because we did, if memory serves me, and it's getting old and more fragile than it used to be, but if memory serves me correctly, it seems that we approved around \$8.75 an hour back, again, about a year and a half ago, I think, prior to your occupying the office. I thought, under Mr. Erk, that we had approved \$8.75, but that isn't being –

Annie Groves: Well, what happened is, is that I was sworn in January 1st of 2009, January 28th of 2010 is the first I ever heard of that. No one had ever told me, my pay schedule never showed anything differently, so I just found out on January 28th about that, so, you know. And the counties around us pay more, so even with the 75 cents, what they have to do and what they have to go through, that's really not a fair wage for what they do.

Councilmember Shetler: Alright.

Annie Groves: And they have not received a pay raise.

Councilmember Shetler: Alright. Thank you.

President Lloyd: Other questions by Councilmembers? Do you know roughly what the other counties are paying?

Annie Groves: Yes, I do. Warrick County pays \$9.25 an hour, and then Posey County pays per case, and they pay 125 a case. And we have over 400 cases a year, so that wouldn't be fair to ask for that.

President Lloyd: Okay, any other questions, Councilmembers? Is there a motion to approve a dollar amount? Mr. Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yeah, I just wanted to get a little clarification. So right now, you can pay 8.75 per hour, is that what you were saying?

Councilmember Shetler: That's what we had authorized, I think, back in –

Councilmember Kiefer: Because I was looking back at these old minutes here, and I thought it said a higher amount, so really, what she's asking for is from 8.75 to 10?

Annie Groves: I'm actually asking for \$8 to 10, because no one ever told me about the 75 cent raise.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay.

Councilmember Bassemier: So we've saved 75 cents an hour for the last year?

Annie Groves: Correct. That is correct, and that's over \$5,000.

Councilmember Bassemier: I'll make a motion to approve if you're looking for a motion.

Councilmember Kiefer: More discussion.

President Lloyd: Okay, we need a dollar amount. It's a range from \$8 to 10.

Councilmember Bassemier: Yeah, I make a motion to approve it for \$10.

President Lloyd: Okay.

Councilmember Kiefer: Discussion.

President Lloyd: Discussion. Well, we'll ask for a second. Is there going to be a second to that motion? Any second for \$10 an hour? Okay, seeing there are no seconders, that motion dies for lack of a second. Discussion, Mr. Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: I'm in favor of doing something. I, personally, probably would have preferred to do this at budget time, you know, when, because this is coming up, although it's the beginning of the year, you know, it would have been nicer to have this discussion back when we were doing the budget hearings.

Annie Groves: I did ask for that during the budget hearing.

Councilmember Kiefer: And we didn't do it, so –

Annie Groves: I asked, I had put the money into the budget for the increase and it was never approved.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay. Well, thank you for doing that then. You know, is there a reason that the county may, the position may have changed from budget hearing to today, then?

President Lloyd: Ed?

Councilmember Bassemier: I'm just saying, you all have got to realize, being in emergency service what these workers go through. I mean, it's, they deserve the \$10 an hour. What they do, with being in emergency service for going on 40 years, they deserve \$10 an hour, what they have to go through. I mean, I know I didn't get a second on it, but they deserve, they deserve more pay, I'm telling you.

Councilmember Raben: It probably wouldn't be out of line to at least get them

parallel with Warrick, at the \$9.25.

Annie Groves: I can't fill my schedule now. I have several people that work for Warrick also, and when you work for Vanderburgh County, you're going to be out working. When you work for Warrick County, what we do in one week, they do in a year. So I don't blame my staff for wanting to work somewhere else to make more money to do nothing.

Councilmember Raben: And then getting them at the \$9.25 an hour with Warrick, that should alleviate your problems.

Annie Groves: I sure hope so.

Councilmember Raben: Yeah, okay.

Councilmember Kiefer: I'm comfortable with the \$9.25 to balance it out with Warrick County.

President Lloyd: Mr. Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: Yeah, I'd like to make a motion that we approve \$9.25 an hour to establish a rate.

Councilmember Kiefer: I'll second that.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Shetler, second Mr. Kiefer. We have to establish an hourly rate, we also have to act on the general fund appropriation of the \$5,000, so I needed a motion for that as well.

Councilmember Shetler: I'll move that, do it all in one motion, that we approve of the \$5,000 at a rate of 9.25 per hour.

Councilmember Kiefer: And I'll second that amendment.

President Lloyd: Okay, so motion Mr. Shetler, under Coroner, Assistant Coroners, \$5,000, and second Mr. Kiefer. Any other discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. Motion approved 6-1. Thank you.

Annie Groves: Thank you and my staff thanks you.

CORONER		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1070-1210-1070	Assistant Coroners	5,000.00	5,000.00
Total		5,000.00	5,000.00

(Motion approved 6-1/Councilmember Bassemier opposed)

TRANSFER REQUESTS

President Lloyd: Next item on the agenda, go to transfers, continue with transfers, Mr. Shetler.

CLERK
TREASURER
TREASURER (LATE)
WEIGHTS & MEASURES (LATE)
LEGAL AID (LATE)
LEGAL AID/UNITED WAY (LATE)

Councilmember Shetler: We have transfers from the Clerk, the Treasurer's office and a late request from the Treasurer's office, I think you all have it there in your packets. So, any questions? I'd move that the transfers be approved as submitted.

Councilmember Raben: I'll second that motion.

President Lloyd: Okay, also we have the late transfers on the second page. Does everybody see those? Okay, there is a motion to approve all the transfers as submitted, Mr. Shetler, and a second, was it Mr. Raben? Any discussion or questions from Council? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. The transfers are approved 7-0.

CLERK		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1010-1400-1010	Bookkeeping Clerk	20,000.00	20,000.00
To: 1010-1990	Extra Help	20,000.00	20,000.00

TREASURER		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1030-1200-1030	Delinquent Tax Collector	27,648.00	27,648.00
To: 1030-4220	Office Machines	20,000.00	20,000.00
1030-3410	Printing	7,648.00	7,648.00

TREASURER		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1030-3410	Printing	1,000.00	1,000.00
To: 1030-3550	Repair to Bldg. & Grounds	1,000.00	1,000.00

WEIGHTS & MEASURES		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1302-1120-1302	Deputy Inspector	7,241.00	7,241.00
To: 1302-1971	Accrued Payments	7,241.00	7,241.00

LEGAL AID		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1460-1150-1460	Senior Legal Secretary	13,814.00	13,814.00
1460-1190-1460	Jr. Legal Secretary #2	2,075.00	2,075.00
To: 1460-1971	Accrued Payments	13,814.00	13,814.00
1460-1990	Extra Help	2,075.00	2,075.00

LEGAL AID/UNITED WAY		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 4290-1150-4290	Senior Legal Secretary	975.00	975.00
4290-1190-4290	Jr. Legal Secretary #2	1,175.00	1,175.00
To: 4290-1971	Accrued Payments	975.00	975.00
4290-1990	Extra Help	1,175.00	1,175.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

ASSESSOR REQUEST TO FILL VACANCY

President Lloyd: Next, no repeals, Old Business, appointments were made last week. Number 9, New Business, Item A, Assessor request to fill vacancy. Any questions from Councilmembers? Mr. Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: Yes, Mr. Weaver? Good morning.

Jonathan Weaver: Good morning.

Councilmember Shetler: We set up – I know the year before we eliminated pretty much the part-time account, and then last year, we re-established it. How much did we set that in for?

Jonathan Weaver: Part-time for 2010?

Councilmember Shetler: Yes.

Jonathan Weaver: It's \$40,000.

Councilmember Shetler: 40,000. And has there been anybody hired part-time yet?

Jonathan Weaver: No, we're waiting closer to the reassessment.

Councilmember Shetler: Which will start...?

Jonathan Weaver: July 1st. What we're doing right now is, we have an intern from USI who is unpaid and we have three Community Work Experience Program candidates, the Welfare to Work people, working with those right now on a part-time basis.

Councilmember Shetler: But they're not being paid out of this yet?

Jonathan Weaver: They're not being paid, none of those four are being paid, so we're saving a lot of money by having those four unpaid part-timers.

Councilmember Shetler: Can you tell me how you get that done? I would appreciate knowing that story at a different time.

Jonathan Weaver: Okay, yeah, let's get together.

Councilmember Shetler: Okay, I think that's all the questions I have right now.

Thank you.

President Lloyd: Questions from Council? Anything else, Mr. Weaver? I mean, we've received your correspondence on this. It's a COMOT IV Real Estate Deputy.

Jonathan Weaver: Yes, I would appreciate your support on this.

President Lloyd: Is there a specific area, specialization for this position? Area that they handle?

Councilmember Kiefer: Mr. President?

President Lloyd: I was asking Mr. Weaver if this was a position that handled a certain area.

Jonathan Weaver: There's going to be a lot of data inputting. When we take new curbside photos, they will be sticking that into our ProVal assessing software. We have a lot of permits we need to process, just a lot of information to get into the system before March 1st.

President Lloyd: Mr. Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Oh, thank you, Mr. President. Jonathan, how long has this position been vacant?

Jonathan Weaver: It was vacated on January 4th, 2010.

Councilmember Kiefer: And you're asking to fill this immediately, then?

Jonathan Weaver: Within the next couple of weeks.

Councilmember Kiefer: Yeah, and I guess the same question that Mr. Shetler had asked earlier, is there some payout owed on this or how long will we be paying out on this?

Jonathan Weaver: I believe the payout has already happened. This particular person was here a year, so the payout wasn't substantial, is what I recall.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay, thank you.

President Lloyd: Other questions? Mr. Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: How many full-time people do you have in your office currently?

Jonathan Weaver: Near forty. Thirty-nine.

Councilmember Shetler: 39? Okay, and this position is a general clerk type position, you said?

Jonathan Weaver: It will be a – do you want to add to that, Glen?

Glen Koob: Glen Koob, Real Estate Deputy, County Assessor's office. This position will work with Pictometry, the ChangeFindr. We have four categories we

have to go through: zero to 25% change, 50% change, 75% change, and all demolished property. They will also do data entry for anything that is picked up for the March 2010 deadline. They will also put in photos. What we do down there, we do have cross training in our own office as they will do apartments, call for apartments, the income on those. So whatever needs to be done down there, that's what they will do at any given time. But those are four of the things that they're going to be doing to be trained on. We already have, presently, one other person doing that. And four of the people that are working for free, they don't come in all day. They come in from like 7:30 until 11, one of them does. Whenever they are available to work, we get them, and they're not going to be there forever. One girl is a college student and so she'll be gone, you know, soon. But it's nice that they come in. But that's what the new person will be doing that I can think of right now.

Councilmember Shetler: Your part-time help, how do you envision, – I guess in my mind I'm thinking of part-time can be, you know, a lot of different things. You can define that like a seasonal part-time, somebody just works in the summer months, or somebody works in the school year. Somebody that works six hours a day instead of eight hours a day, somebody that works less than 25 hours a week, whatever. I mean, there's different categories of part-time. How do you envision that part-time person?

Glen Koob: We start reassessment, as far as we know, July 1st of 2010. We still have ongoing pickups, new houses, that will go in different areas of the city. And it's a rolling reassessment, so the people that we have now will do ongoing work. The new people that we would have part-time, that we would pay part-time salaries to, would be the ones that are going out in the field in the new areas and data collecting for the reassessment that starts in 2010. There are two different, we have a general assessment and a reassessment, as you know, because of the budgets.

Councilmember Shetler: And how many people will that 40,000 be able to have employed working part-time?

Glen Koob: The \$40,000?

Councilmember Shetler: The \$40,000 part-time monies that, how many part-timers will that give you?

Glen Koob: Well, I know this is a silly answer, but as many as we need to get the job done on time because Commissioner Rushenberg, he's very adamant on us getting on-time assessments, I'm sure you've heard, and on getting May the 31st, getting all of our trending finished for this year because he wants the tax rates and everything for the whole state to be on time. He's very adamant about that. So we have to hit our deadlines pretty well. So, if the people that are having to hit the deadlines that are there working presently, like trending, we have to have finished by May 1st, okay, and we have, I think last night the Commissioners were just working on that vendor. But anyway, they start reassessment July of 2010. So when we get, we'll still be correcting things for 2010 assessment up until, all year, up until it rolls over, the Auditor rolls it over.

Councilmember Shetler: And those part-time people are going to be basically in the field, doing the measurements and doing – Pictometry has relieved a little bit of the duties we've had in the past or ...

Glen Koob: Well, not really, because right now, what Pictometry is doing, is we've had that ChangeFindr, I think we paid extra money for it. What we're doing now is we're going out and looking in the field as to what has been missed out in the field. Like, somebody will build a house or build an addition on to a house, actually, or a garage or something, they never take a permit out for it, you know. So that's what ChangeFindr is actually doing and we're going out. I picked up a 60 x 32 barn yesterday in ChangeFindr, it's 75% complete or a 75% change is what it actually is, to the parcel, to the building, and I picked up a 32 x 60, and that's expensive.

Councilmember Shetler: If I remember, that Pictometry was supposed to be able to get down to within a few inches of the dimensions of the – do we actually need to go out and visually look at each one of those things and measure it off and the whole business then, to have –

Glen Koob: You know, the only reason, like the barn, we don't know if it has a concrete floor by Pictometry because it just shows the outer shell of the building. We need to see what the amenities are to the building and that doesn't need to be done every year. Once it's done, it's done, just like everything else. But they're building new houses each year, they're, you know, building new commercial buildings, they're adding room additions and those are really what's expensive and what we need to pick up. They add to the assessment base.

Councilmember Shetler: Now, when they go out and do the field work, are we sending one person out or two people, because that's my question, too.

Glen Koob: Well, for safety reasons, I think it's good, especially if the women go out, I think it's good to send two people. The other thing is, somebody has to hold the dumb end of the ruler, is what we call it. You know, the end that you hold to the side of the building, and the other one reads the other end.

Councilmember Shetler: Sounds like my job.

Glen Koob: Yeah, so that's the reason, and for safety reasons, too, because they are going all over the city. So that's the reason why we send two and the other thing, too, is that whenever the person is reading the measurement, she's calling it out to the other person that may have the clipboard writing down or doing the drawings. And then they have to do photos, they have to look at the land, they have to look for any pavement, you know, in commercial. They have to do a lot more in commercial than they do residential. But there's, I'd say, yes, on the two people.

Councilmember Kiefer: Just a comment real quick.

President Lloyd: Mr. Goebel was next.

Councilmember Kiefer: Oh, I'm sorry. I didn't see all the hands going up.

Councilmember Goebel: I was going to backtrack. Jonathan, about a month ago we approved a replacement. Has that position been filled?

Jonathan Weaver: Yes.

Councilmember Goebel: Okay, thank you.

President Lloyd: Mr. Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Glen, I was just going to ask, you said they use rulers, --

Glen Koob: Well, a tape measure. Fiberglass, hopefully, in case they go across an electrical line, they don't get electrocuted.

Councilmember Kiefer: Have you guys thought about getting those digital measuring tapes and reading those? I mean, they --

Glen Koob: We've seen those but no, we've not --

Councilmember Kiefer: You wouldn't have to have somebody holding the dumb end of it.

Glen Koob: Well, I tell you the reason why. We get tape measures because they're a lot less expensive than those things. You drop them in the mud, I'm not sure if they would work. We would have to do more investigation on those electronic ones.

Councilmember Kiefer: Yeah, the only reason I'm thinking is because it doesn't take two people to utilize that.

Glen Koob: Exactly.

Councilmember Kiefer: You know, you could use that and you might save some money by not having to have two people.

Glen Koob: I guess we could give them stun guns, too, in case they got attacked by dogs or something like that. But, I mean, you know, that's the reason two people go out for the safety of it, too.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay, I was just trying to think if the digital ones might save some money.

Glen Koob: The laser ones are good for angles. You know, the newer houses, how they have the house may be rectangular, two or three stories, but you know how they have the angle, the garage may be angled? That's good for the vector in that when you measure that. But, for now, unless we can come up with a different thing for their safety, that's what I worry about more than the -- the other thing is, we could check into that laser and see how much those are. But I think they're quite a bit more than a tape.

Councilmember Kiefer: Yeah, I'm sure they are.

Councilmember Bassemier: Joe, would that be another job for Loretta to check that, make sure that's working right?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yeah, we want to add to her work. But, you know, Loretta can get it done.

Jonathan Weaver: I just want to add, too, Pictometry, Mr. Shetler, that we've picked up over \$6,000,000 in assessed value that has been missed, with the addition of Pictometry. And essentially, you know, the first year has already paid for itself with the extra revenue it's bringing in.

President Lloyd: Mr. Raben, was that your barn that they got?

Councilmember Raben: No, no, no.

Glen Koob: Not yet.

Councilmember Raben: I guess what I'm kind of picking up from everybody is the Council may want to lean more towards using some part-time help and seeing how that goes. Let me ask you this, would that not also give us an opportunity, you said there were two or three people that were coming from the Initiative Based program, if there were an individual or two that are really working out, that might be an opportunity for them to earn their wings within your office and eventually go to a full-time position?

Jonathan Weaver: So far we've been really impressed with two of the four part-timers. We really would love to have that full-time person replaced, though, at this point. Last night at the Commissioner meeting we threw out the bids for commercial/industrial trending, they ranged anywhere from, I think, 78,000 to 98,000. We're going to do that in-house and save money there. We are going to, we did get permission to seek bids to get assistance with the appeals, commercial/industrial appeals, which I'm guessing might cost 30 to 40,000. But, so last night, I feel like we saved an additional 40 to 50,000 by rejecting those commercial/industrial bids.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, I'm just trying to balance this out because I'm kind of doing a forecast of how the vote turnout might be. But I think we might have to reconsider if you can possibly do the part-time and see how that goes and training, understanding training probably takes 30 days. If it doesn't work out, you would want to be in here in time to have someone trained and ready for the reassessment period.

Glen Koob: Glen Koob, again. I just need to say this, Jim, the part-time person, if we have four people now that, and one person that only goes out in the field for commercial and he is somewhat behind because he's the only one that goes out, and there is one person that data enters. The other person is calling for income and expense information for – we've got over 10,000, approximately 10,000 commercial/industrial that have to be done. Where it would take maybe two hours to do a house, to measure a house, it takes almost a day to do a commercial building if they put an addition on it or whatever, and that's what this person, the replacement, would do because that's where we need the help the most is over in the commercial department right now.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, I guess that could be part of the confusion here within the Council then because the summary, it has this individual doing more clerical. And really, I was kind of confused, when we were getting off on measuring and stuff, how we go from data entry and clerical to doing field work.

Glen Koob: Well, that's just a question that Tom had. But this person, this new person would be clerical also because whenever they bring in the information right now, we have one lady that's going out, two people that go out. When she gets back in, she has to do all the data entry, so therefore, she gets behind, too. To do data entry for commercial, it's going to take probably at a minimum three weeks to even teach them how to do this. And then they have to get their level I and II before they can do commercial. So it's really not a job that you can just give to anybody to do. They do have to have those classes to do that, the level I and level II to do that because of the fact that, is it this year, 2010, they have to be a level II before

they can assess? So that's the reason why we were going to put them in clerical and commercial because that's where we needed it worse, because we have four people there and they're all covered up. Thank you.

Jonathan Weaver: I'd also like to add that, you know, we've gone from 52 to 40 employees also just with the consolidation, so I feel we really need this person. We also gave back two positions last year to the county.

President Lloyd: Which kind of segues into a question I have: Commissioner Tornatta had brought a proposal from Waggoner, Irwin & Scheele about an operations review for the county, I don't know if you saw that. I think the Council, rather than spend \$65,000 doing the whole county, Council would look at the possibility of maybe doing one or two departments as a kind of a pilot. Would you be interested in having them do an operations review on your department where you've had all these townships combined into one County Assessor?

Jonathan Weaver: I could work with that.

President Lloyd: Alright. I mean, I think that, as opposed to some of the others where they've had reviews in the past and it may be more difficult to organize the workload, but maybe with yours, they might be able to come up with something there. Okay, any other questions from Council? Is there a motion to approve filling the vacancy?

Councilmember Bassemier: I make a motion to approve.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion from Mr. Bassemier. Is there a second?

Councilmember Kiefer: I'll second it.

President Lloyd: Okay, second Mr. Kiefer. Any discussion? Mr. Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Once again, this is kind of a gray area for us as far as the job descriptions, actually, because it seems like one is mostly clerical and office and now it's become commercial, actually going out into the field. So it's kind of difficult for us to understand if the people you have right now that are working, I guess, basically, as volunteers? Is that correct?

Jonathan Weaver: The four, are you talking about the four?

Councilmember Goebel: Four part-timers. Or is there consideration about hiring them or is this just short-term and they're going to leave right away?

Jonathan Weaver: The three Community, from CWEP, they're there on a short-term, I think six to eight weeks. And they have the opportunity to apply. I think they seek other experience, though, after their tenure is done with me.

President Lloyd: Other questions? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: I'd like to see us utilize the part-time help now for trying to take up some of that space. I'm having a little bit of difficulty expanding or keeping our budget at a point that we need to shrink the size of county government the best we can. This is a pretty good size office, 40 employees, I feel like this is an opportunity for us to really look hard at this, and if we have to do something more than part-time later on in the year, we have to do something there. But I'm going to have to vote no, to keeping this at the same level. So I vote no.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: I'm between a rock and a hard spot as well. I don't know how essential this position is and if it doesn't go through today, would you be likely to come back? I hate to ask this question during the vote, actually, but, or if we go with the study –

Jonathan Weaver: Yeah, I'd be willing to come back. It's already budgeted for 2010, so I'm not asking for an additional appropriation.

Councilmember Goebel: I understand that, but it's not very difficult to see what kind of crises I think is ahead with our revenues being cut. I mean, schools are closing buildings and we're wondering how we're going to make bills. And I think that tidal wave is going to hit us very quickly, so we have to be as prudent as possible at this point. I just don't feel real comfortable with the job description as to actually what this person is going to be required to do right now, because it seems to be a little bit up in the air, so I think I would go with part-time for right now. But very willing to reconsider once I have a better grasp as to what your, what the job really entails.

President Lloyd: And the vote is?

Councilmember Goebel: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Okay, you echoed a lot of what I was going to say. It would be my desire to first make an attempt to go part-time, but at the same token, I also understand that this office is what generates our income to operate county government. So understanding that, as we get closer to real crunch time with reassessment, if it doesn't work, I'll sit here with a very open mind and look at turning this position into full-time.

President Lloyd: And the vote is?

Councilmember Raben: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: I won't make a long speech. I think the field component of this is what's compelling to me, so I'm going to vote yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Lloyd?

President Lloyd: At this point I'm going to vote no, and look at the part-time budget as well as some of the other Councilmembers had mentioned, so the motion fails 3-4. Thank you.

(Motion fails 3-4/Councilmembers Shetler, Goebel, Raben & Lloyd opposed)

WEIGHTS & MEASURES REQUEST TO FILL VACANCY

President Lloyd: Next, Weights & Measures, request to fill vacancy, Item B.

Loretta Townsend: Loretta Townsend, Weights & Measures department. And don't go with the digital ones, either. Stick with the metal tape.

President Lloyd: Okay, we had a pretty good discussion in the Personnel & Finance meeting about this position. Any questions from Council? Mr. Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: Is there a buy-out on the person leaving?

Loretta Townsend: Yes, there is.

Councilmember Shetler: And that buy-out takes it up to about what time will the position actually be vacant?

Loretta Townsend: I think, if I'm right, Sandie, that on part of your agenda, today, isn't it, that we're asking for an appropriation or a transfer in order to be able to fill it as quickly as we can. I don't have a whole roomful of people. I mean, there's myself and two guys, and the secretary. I can't turn around to one of them and say, you're going to have to pick up the slack. They're already there, you know. So, I mean, and there's no slow time at all. We go from one thing on to another thing. As far as complaints, I've got them laying on the desk right now that –

Councilmember Shetler: The buy-out is what, around \$7,000 or something like that?

Loretta Townsend: Yeah.

President Lloyd: 7,241 is the transfer that we approved.

Councilmember Raben: You know, this, if you've ever, I've had the luxury of seeing them when they're checking tanks, and what have you, and gas stations, and there's a lot of lifting. When they're onsite, it is a two or three man job and at the same token, the residents of Vanderburgh County expect someone to answer the phone when they're out .

Loretta Townsend: Oh yeah.

Councilmember Raben: So, you can kind of look at this department, I very often look at it as kind of like the big brother department, that's somebody that's not a revenue generating department, but's it's somebody that's –

Loretta Townsend: No, we'd go to jail if we did. We can't take revenue.

Councilmember Raben: – that's ensuring that you're getting what you paid for and this is one that I think is very necessary, and I'm supportive of replacing.

Loretta Townsend: There's only five people total in the whole department, period, including the secretary. And sometimes we go by ourselves, it depends on the situation. We don't want to look like we're ganging up on somebody if we don't necessarily have to. But most of the time, it takes every one of us.

Councilmember Bassemier: Jim, is that a motion to approve?

Councilmember Raben: I can make the motion, yeah, but I –

Councilmember Shetler: I'll be glad to make that motion and I will because when we first established the hiring freeze, one of the things that we talked about, I think Councilman Sutton may have even brought that point and that question up, about if we're dealing with a small office, and it would have an effect on 20 or 25 percent of the operation, that's something that has to have due consideration as opposed to something that might be one of 30 or 40 or 50 employees, where it wouldn't have quite the effect. So I'll make a motion because I feel like it's –

Loretta Townsend: Well, if you can turn to another person and say, you know, can you pick up his slack, that other person ain't there. I mean, they've already got all they can handle, you know.

Councilmember Bassemier: I'll second that, Tom.

President Lloyd: Okay, maybe Mr. Fluty can make some clarification here.

Bill Fluty: Just, the action taken today was a transfer out of that particular line item, salary line item into Accrued Payments. So it's really, it's not an appropriation to immediately hire. I just want to make that clear to everyone, that what you've done is reduced the amount of that salary to do the buy-out and then that person would be hired in when the money hits for the remainder of the year, so it's at a later date. So is everybody clear on that?

Loretta Townsend: I'm not. I mean, I'm not clear on it. Bottom line is, we had to pay out what, \$7,000? We will be paying out, it's already in to be paid out like, what, next week or whenever? Okay. We had to pay that out to him, he was there for 20 years, okay. We need somebody as quickly as we can. I can't just put them in the front seat of the truck and say go for it. You know, we're going to have to train them. We've got to train them ourselves, because we have no money in our budget to send them off somewhere to train. We got a whole hundred bucks, I think, in travel.

Bill Fluty: But the action taken today wasn't an appropriation to leave this money in. This money has been moved to be his buy-out, so there's not enough money in that line item to pay a full-time person until the end of the year.

President Lloyd: Mrs. Deig?

Councilmember Raben: Right, there's funds that could pay the person, but some time later in the year, the fund will run out.

Bill Fluty: That's correct.

Loretta Townsend: They're going to make less, too. Whoever comes in will make less.

Sandie Deig: I believe you filed an appropriation, didn't you, for additional funds?

Loretta Townsend: Yes, I did.

Bill Fluty: For next month?

Sandie Deig: Yes.

President Lloyd: Okay, that clarifies that. Any other questions from Council? Was there, did you make a motion, Mr. Raben?

Councilmember Bassemier: Tom did.

President Lloyd: Oh, you made a motion to approve filling the vacancy and Ed seconded? Any further discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: I think Councilman Shetler stated my position very well in relation to the size of the office and the impact that you guys have, and I do vote yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: And I appreciate the conversations we've had, and I would like to vote yes as well to fill the vacancy. Thank you.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

Loretta Townsend: I've got one question, what's my next step? When can I get him?

President Lloyd: The, I mean, there's money in that line item now, so I believe she can hire somebody at any time. Isn't that correct?

Bill Fluty: I guess if you do go forward next month and appropriate that money. Now if you don't, then, so that's where you stand –

Loretta Townsend: Well, there's money in there now to cover his salary, you know, for quite a few months.

President Lloyd: Right, there's plenty of money in there and then we'll take up the additional appropriation next month. But there's money in there to hire the employee as soon as you can make that available.

Councilmember Shetler: From a, I may be overstepping my bounds here, I guess, my position, but I guess from a legal standpoint, though, wouldn't you have an issue, that if, in fact, it did not get passed, you could end up running out of money for that employee come December?

Jeff Ahlers: Right. Once the money runs out of that line item, if it's not replenished, that would be the end of that position. It would be contingent upon, in terms of whether that employee makes it to the end of the year, whether you put additional funds in that line item.

Councilmember Shetler: So I'm kind of echoing what our Auditor is saying and with a word of caution here that, you know, we may want to not rapidly look at replacing. You know, every day or two or week that we have to be able to stretch that out a little bit gets you closer to the point that you won't need as much of an appropriation and/or you can make, with a lesser pay that that new person is coming in, you know, it may work itself out.

Loretta Townsend: What I'm saying, we do need him as soon as we can because we've just now started going through everything. The first of every year, we've got to start all over again. And train them, too. I just can't send them out there. I mean, there's going to be quite a bit of training that we're going to have to do for him.

Bill Fluty: When these buyouts are figured, there is a future date that is calculated to say you can hire in as of this date.

Councilmember Shetler: And that date is...

Bill Fluty: Well, I don't have it with me, but I mean, it has been done. Sandie, do you know what that date is?

Sandie Deig: (Microphone not turned on)

Bill Fluty: When they can hire.

Sandie Deig: (Microphone not turned on)

Bill Fluty: But it's later.

Sandie Deig: (Microphone not turned on)

Bill Fluty: Yes, but if there were no funds then from March 3, do you know the first date that she could hire? I just don't have it, but I know it's been done.

Sandie Deig: I want to say seven weeks.

Bill Fluty: I think that's close.

Loretta Townsend: So we can't hire for seven weeks?

Councilmember Shetler: Well, you could if the appropriation would go through March the 3rd, then you could hire prior to that, but I guess the caution is, you would not be able to really hire, again. Maybe I'm overstepping my bounds. I apologize, but that's the way I'm understanding.

Bill Fluty: Let me just back up a minute. March 3rd, but then you send the appropriation to the state and you wait for their approval which takes a couple of weeks. We do have a budget order, so that's not a problem now, but the state will tell you that money is okay somewhere in the second or third week of March. But even doing it at that time, I mean, you can take other risks, but I'm just telling you what you did today.

Loretta Townsend: They are Teamsters so it's going to have to be advertised five days there and then other than that, I mean, we've not gone out and looked, you know.

Jeff Ahlers: Obviously, if you want – the safest route, it's obviously best to wait until, you know, you make the appropriation on March 3rd. If, however, Council approves you moving forward to do that prior to that appropriation, I would suggest that, well, I would ask that, I think you ought to tell any employee that's hired, and it probably ought to be put in writing that they understand unless that appropriation is in effect, it could be that their position runs out of funds before the end of the year. And if that occurred, their position would terminate, so that there's no confusion and no one, you know, has any argument to be made that somehow they were mislead, that they left another job to come to this job. They need to understand, until the official action is taken by Council, the funds run out in that line item, their job terminates. Is that fair? Does everybody understand that?

Councilmember Raben: You know, if we look at March 3rd, by the time you advertise it and do what you have to do, February is a short month, I mean, it probably isn't the end of the world waiting until March 3rd to officially hire anyone.

Councilmember Bassemier: The vote was taken today, Loretta, that's not going to happen.

Loretta Townsend: I trust you.

Councilmember Bassemier: I don't hear anybody saying it won't happen, so...

President Lloyd: Does that clarify that to some extent?

Loretta Townsend: Yeah. Alright, thank you very much.

President Lloyd: Next, we have Superior Court, request to fill vacancy, 9C.

SUPERIOR COURT REQUEST TO FILL VACANCY

Brett Niemeier: Good morning, Brett Niemeier, Juvenile Court.

President Lloyd: Okay, we have some correspondence about the position of Bailiff Transportation Officer.

Brett Niemeier: Yes, I think it's set in at approximately \$6,700. This position hasn't been used on a regular basis over the last few years. What I'm asking for is to go ahead and fill it now. Unfortunately, because of the tough economic times, it really affects the court tremendously. And it came to my attention, especially in the paternity area where we collect child support for parents, that if a parent came and applied for child support, the earliest they were going to get a court hearing to get a court order was four months out. To me, that's not efficient government and we had to do something. So I've reconstructed with the help of the other superior court judges, some new court sessions, but because of that, I truly need this part-time bailiff to be able to call cases in and out, because all of our proceedings are confidential in nature. We just can't bring them all into the court at one time. And this position would allow us to probably cut that downtime in half. We probably can get people in and out of court now within two months instead of four months, so they could get their court orders for back child support.

President Lloyd: Okay, and you indicated it's a part-time position. Any questions from Councilmembers?

Councilmember Raben: This line item, is this, I'm trying to recognize that. Is that a general fund line item?

Brett Niemeier: Yes.

Councilmember Raben: Do you have any other funds available to reimburse for that position?

Brett Niemeier: I guess I'm not positive what your question is, Jim.

Councilmember Raben: Well, do you have any other line items or any other non-general fund accounts that we could use to offset this position?

Brett Niemeier: No. I don't anticipate using all that was granted to us in the Patient Inmate Care line item, but that, again, is a general fund line item. But I expect to have substantial savings there by the end of the year, but I don't have any other means to come up with \$6,700.

President Lloyd: Is that, are you finished, Jim?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

President Lloyd: Now, if I look in the salary ordinance, we've got Bailiff, but it shows full-time.

Sandie Deig: (Microphone not turned on)

President Lloyd: COMOT V.

Sandie Deig: (Microphone not turned on)

President Lloyd: Oh okay, I'm sorry. Okay, but this one, what are you anticipating the hours per week? Like 20 hours?

Brett Niemeier: Probably 15. Yeah, they're going to end up covering three sessions. Not only will they cover one new paternity session, they'll also cover two new Children In Need of Service sessions that the courts had to add. We increased 20% last year on both of those variety of cases, those type of cases.

President Lloyd: So this would be kind of the lower level type work, where right now, you're having to pull staff out to do this kind of stuff?

Brett Niemeier: Right now, I have somebody volunteering, they're not being paid.

President Lloyd: Okay, very generous on their part.

Brett Niemeier: Very.

Councilmember Raben: But this position does exist today? It's just vacant.

Brett Niemeier: Yes, it's just vacant. Yes.

Councilmember Raben: Okay.

President Lloyd: Other questions from Council? Mr. Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: You mentioned that you thought the waiting time would be cut in half?

Brett Niemeier: That's what I anticipate.

Councilmember Goebel: With the new proposal?

Brett Niemeier: Yeah. We're going to be able to run an extra 20 to 25 cases per week through that one session and as importantly, probably even more importantly, quite frankly, is the two sessions that we're adding to the Children In Need of Service cases, so that we, again, have faster results and get our parents in that have abused and neglected kids. Hopefully get those cases moving quicker than they are now.

Councilmember Goebel: Thank you.

Councilmember Raben: Put that in perspective, how many cases do you normally, because that seems like a pretty substantial amount of additional cases?

Brett Niemeier: Well, last year, we had approximately just below a thousand cases filed on the children born out of wedlock. And in the CHINS area, we're talking 500 new cases. We currently have 800 children that are not currently living in their homes because of abuse and neglect and we have to have court hearings. We have to make those determinations, determine what's best for those kids, whether or not they're going to continue to be outside of their home or to get them back home.

President Lloyd: Other questions from Council? Does somebody want to make a motion?

Councilmember Shetler: I'll make a motion.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion to approve a part-time vacancy, filling it. Is there a second?

Councilmember Raben: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Shetler, second Mr. Raben. Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: I'm going to vote yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: I vote yes. Thank you, Judge.

Brett Niemeier: Thank you all.

President Lloyd: Seven-zero.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

LEGAL AID REQUEST TO FILL VACANCY
--

President Lloyd: Okay, we already had Circuit Court, Item 9D. We'll move to Item 9E, Legal Aid request to fill vacancy.

Sue Hartig: Good morning, I'm Sue Hartig, the Director of Legal Aid. Mr. Gibson is passing out to you a letter of support we have from the Evansville Bar Association and several of our board members are here. Would the board members please stand? And Carol Braden-Clarke, the Executive Director of United Way is here. I explained this in pretty explicit detail last week. Last year, we lost one of our three full-time secretaries and had tried to replace her with a part-time person. We've gone through two part-time persons and that position is vacant right now, but we will

fill that with a part-time person we have approval for. Now our most senior secretary of 29 years has submitted her retirement at the end of the month. And we're one of those small offices with three attorneys and three secretaries and our attorneys are as efficient as we are because we have the secretaries to rely on. They do intake and spend a lot of time dealing with the general public and serve on committees and file paperwork in the courthouse as well as doing our legal work for us. Last year, we handled 877 cases and leveraged every dollar of our budget over four times. We had a 430,000 something dollar budget and did 1.9 million dollars of legal work. With the economy, our requests are even higher. You just heard Judge Neimeier say that he's adding additional sessions of court that we'll have to appear at and we need this full-time person. There is a fairly substantial buy-out since she has been with us for 29 years. We did the transfer for that this morning and I have not worked out all of the details, but I think between the extra funds because of the position where we're only filling part-time was budgeted for the whole year, and each of the new positions, if you approve it today and if the junior secretary is promoted to senior secretary, I think there will be enough savings in those three accounts, that we can do a transfer for the large majority of the money we would need, so that we could hire someone fairly quickly. Otherwise, it's going to be July and I think our next appointment right now is near the end of March, about ready to go into April because we've just had to cut back on appointments because we didn't have the staff. Are there any questions?

President Lloyd: Questions from Council?

Councilmember Bassemier: You're showing a savings of \$11,419 if this is approved?

Sue Hartig: Yes. Because the senior secretary will make less than the current person does, the new hire will make less than the current person does, and our third position remains part-time instead of full-time.

Councilmember Sutton: The total number of people you have in your office is?

Sue Hartig: When fully staffed, six. Three attorneys and three secretaries. Under this new plan, it will be 5.5, three attorneys and two and a half secretaries.

President Lloyd: And when Mrs. Paulin leaves, as of right now, you'd have one and a half secretaries, right?

Sue Hartig: Yes.

President Lloyd: Okay.

Sue Hartig: And the half isn't filled at this moment.

President Lloyd: Okay, Mr. Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: I'm in favor of this. I mean, they're saving money, they've developed a plan that's reducing the cost by over \$11,000. I think it's a good way to manipulate the staff so that way you can reduce the total costs, especially by hiring in lower salaried people. So I'm in favor of it.

President Lloyd: Other questions? Mr. Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: I was just wondering, do you have a plan as far as the part-time replacement? Do you have someone in mind at this point?

Sue Hartig: Um, we've got several people in mind, so we'll probably do some interviews.

Councilmember Goebel: At the end of this month, though, actually, you'll be down to one secretary, is that correct?

Sue Hartig: Yes.

Councilmember Goebel: And you definitely intend to promote your junior to the senior level?

Sue Hartig: Yes.

Councilmember Goebel: And that, I don't know if that's an issue with us or not. I think the payout might be if these numbers are correct that you provided today compared to what might be in the line items. I don't know.

Sue Hartig: There's still a savings in that line item even with the promotion because the person we're promoting still has much less seniority than the person retiring did.

President Lloyd: Did we have the payout figure on here, Sandie?

Sandie Deig: It's a little over \$14,000, is the buyout.

President Lloyd: 14,000, okay. Other questions from Council? Yes, Mr. Shetler.

Councilmember Shetler: Well, I have one question and that is, so you're thinking that you might be able to massage this timing-wise to get it pretty well revenue neutral here, so that it isn't going to have an effect?

Sue Hartig: If we have to do an additional appropriation, I don't think it will be anywhere close to that 14,000 that we transferred because we're going to have money left in the full-time position that you've made part-time, we'll have money left because the new hire will make substantially less than the current junior secretary, and the person that we promote will make less than the person that's retiring.

Councilmember Shetler: And I'm not trying to reflect anything on this particular individual. A lot of circumstances arise that, we, as individuals, cannot predict. From a management perspective, it appears to me, particularly when you have an employee that's been there for a considerable amount of time and you have a small office, that a two week notice, and they may have given you more than that, you know, a month's notice, sometimes may not be sufficient, though, to help us out in our way of trying to keep it revenue neutral as much as we possibly can. And I'm just wondering, maybe we ought to look at that handbook, the employee handbook there and see exactly what it does say, how much notice an employee should give us when they're getting ready to leave. I'm thinking, the more seniority they have, particularly if you're looking at a retirement deal, that it might be helpful to have a little bit more notice on that because that's what puts us in a real predicament, particularly if you can't fill this until July, you know, keeping it revenue neutral, and some of that is constrained by laws. I mean, we're not able to have two people occupying the same line item for any period of time, so that creates a real problem

for us and that's why I've kind of established that questioning throughout, you know, starting with Judge Heldt's office and everybody has been aware of that and trying to keep it so that there aren't two people occupying the same line. Our job is to make sure that we keep things at or below where they were last year, particularly with the budget that we had this year. So it's creating a real management nightmare for you to do it.

Sue Hartig: I think she gave three weeks' notice, if not four, but I found out the Friday afternoon, and then the information was due to you the next Monday, the following workday.

President Lloyd: Mr. Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: I was curious, to make sure we stay revenue or expense neutral, would it be possible to hire in another junior secretary and keep your current recommendation for a senior secretary at that level until the books balance, with her knowing that she will then get the promotion? Is that a consideration?

Sue Hartig: That would hardly be fair for her to take on all those additional duties in addition to training the new person.

Councilmember Goebel: I don't know, you obviously need the position and I'm just thinking as far as increasing the budget...

Councilmember Shetler: What's the difference in those two positions, junior/senior because I think Councilman Goebel may have struck on a good compromise here, as far as what I'm hearing.

Sue Hartig: Well, the senior person does all the bookkeeping, all the accounting, all the bill paying, the time keeping, many things that the junior secretaries don't do.

Councilmember Shetler: What's the difference in the pay levels? How will that affect...

Sue Hartig: If the person is promoted, the salary will go from 30,338 to 34,716.

Councilmember Shetler: So about \$1,400, is that right?

Sue Hartig: And then the new person will come in at 21,120 instead of the 34,716, so there is –

Councilmember Goebel: I withdraw my recommendation.

Sue Hartig: I think it will be – if not revenue neutral, it will be very close to it.

President Lloyd: Okay, other questions?

Councilmember Goebel: We're just talking \$1,400 difference, is that correct? And you need to fill then a junior vacancy? Is that, my understanding, is that right?

Sue Hartig: No, it's 4,000, 30,338 versus 34,716, so it's about 4,000.

Councilmember Shetler: Yeah, about 4,400.

Councilmember Kiefer: I move that we approve.

President Lloyd: Okay, is there a second?

Councilmember Bassemier: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Kiefer, second Mr. Bassemier. Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: (Inaudible) committee for being creative and trying to find some alternate ways to address what is an issue in your office but, more so, looking from a more global perspective of what the county is facing and the challenges that we have in trying to not just freeze, but we're trying to find ways to reduce. And I appreciate your efforts in doing that. So I vote yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: While it's only \$4,000 I think I like Councilman Goebel's suggestion on trying to compromise on this a little bit. I, like him, I think misunderstood at first, I thought it was 33,000 and a \$1,400 difference, which wasn't enough to worry about, but 4,000 –

(TAPE CHANGED)

Councilmember Shetler: – a little bit more revenue neutral or expense neutral or whatever. I would be in favor of this if we could somehow stipulate that this is going to be revenue neutral and not affect the budget, whatsoever. Since it's not presented that way, I'd have to 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: I can appreciate what Mr. Shetler has indicated here. They have a dire situation, though, so I'm going to vote yes. The motion passes six to one. Thank you.

Sue Hartig: Thank you.

(Motion carried 6-1/Councilman Shetler opposed)

President Lloyd: Mrs. Deig.

Sandie Deig: But you do realize that that position cannot be filled until Mrs. Paulin is out of that position? You have to have your buyout and everything out of there. You can't put two people in the same line item.

Sue Hartig: Right, but we transferred the buy-out –

Sandie Deig: You still have to wait until she gets her last pay.

Sue Hartig: So we still have to wait until July?

Sandie Deig: No, her last pay.

Sue Hartig: Okay, so that will be one lump sum that comes out some time after she leaves.

Sandie Deig: Yes.

Sue Hartig: Okay, I understand that. Thank you.

AUDITOR TRAVEL REQUEST

President Lloyd: Okay, we'll move on to 9F, Item F is travel requests. Item number 1, Auditor, Spring and Fall County Auditor Conference. Any questions, Council? These are state called meetings. Yes, Mr. Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Well, it's not a big issue, I guess, but I spoke to Mr. Fluty about it. It seems like the Auditors Association would put that second meeting later in the year after the general election when perhaps a new person would be able to benefit. I have a little question on the second one, but all in all, I think it's okay.

President Lloyd: Maybe they purposely do it in late October so all the candidates will show up and they would get more revenue at the conference. Mr. Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: On that request, is all of that lumped in to one request? Is there a way to divide that off into the expenses for spring and the expenses, what they would end up being for the fall?

Bill Fluty: It was turned in as two separate requests.

Councilmember Sutton: Can we act on those separately as opposed to one?

President Lloyd: Sure. There is a February 3rd estimated cost \$810, or no, that's October, and then May, the estimated cost is \$960.

Councilmember Sutton: And kind of along the lines of what Councilman Goebel was saying, just in relation to kind of where we are now financially and where we may be come summer or fall, I'd rather kind of wait before we make a decision on expenses that far down the road. I feel comfortable acting, obviously, on the one in the spring, but the other one is a little far off.

President Lloyd: Let me ask a question for Mr. Fluty. Could you send the Chief Deputy to one of these conferences instead of the Auditor?

Bill Fluty: I surely could. The habit is just myself going and bringing back material, and that's what I've done for the last eight years or past seven years. These are state called meetings that I'm required to go to, so I don't have a choice, that's why I just went ahead and sent them both in as early as possible to have them approved. So that was the reasoning behind that.

President Lloyd: Okay, any other questions, Council? The request was for these to be taken separately. I'll entertain a motion either that way or if a Councilmember feels they should just be taken together.

Councilmember Kiefer: So state required, it's mandatory you have to be in attendance?

Bill Fluty: Yes, unless I would have some excuse, some reason, I guess, that they would accept. But yes, I am required to go.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay, thank you.

Bill Fluty: But if you wanted to wait on the other one, I just wanted to get them both out there, but it makes no difference to me.

Councilmember Sutton: Well, I'd like to make a motion that we approve the spring conference and, well, I'll just leave it at that.

President Lloyd: Okay, so \$810 spring conference for the Auditor, is there a second?

Councilmember Goebel: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Sutton, second Mr. Goebel. All in favor, signify by saying aye.

(All Councilmembers voted affirmatively)

President Lloyd: Any opposed?

(No opposing votes were cast)

President Lloyd: Okay, seven to zero. The motion passes.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

President Lloyd: Is there anybody that wants to make the motion on the October conference?

Councilmember Shetler: So moved.

Councilmember Sutton: Well...

President Lloyd: Well, we can still vote on it, Royce. I mean, it could be voted down.

Councilmember Sutton: Well, I mean, there's a motion on the floor, so –

Councilmember Raben: You know, the motion that was made, I think it came from you, you cited an amount for the spring conference of \$810. That's the fall, so –

President Lloyd: My apologies. So I announced it wrong, but the motion was voted on for the spring, so that amount was \$960, that was my error. But that was still approved.

Councilmember Kiefer: Should we redo –

Councilmember Raben: No, that's fine as long as –

President Lloyd: Well, we have a motion from Mr. Shetler for the Fall Conference, we can take this all then. Is there a second for that?

Councilmember Sutton: I was going to ask for you to resubmit it, the Fall Conference is later on.

Bill Fluty: I'd be happy to resubmit it. I just wanted you to know that it was something I'm required to do and get it out there, but I'd be happy to bring it back at a later date.

President Lloyd: Okay.

Councilmember Shetler: Withdraw my motion.

TREASURER TRAVEL REQUEST

President Lloyd: Let's move on to Item 2, the Treasurer. Any questions on the request from the Treasurer? It looks like Treasurer's Association county meeting.

Councilmember Bassemier: Make a motion to approve.

President Lloyd: Is there a second?

Councilmember Goebel: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Bassemier. Second, was it Mr. Goebel? Okay. All in favor signify by saying aye.

(All Councilmembers voted affirmatively)

President Lloyd: All opposed?

(No opposing votes were cast)

President Lloyd: Okay, seven to zero. Motion passes.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

WEIGHTS & MEASURES TRAVEL REQUEST
--

President Lloyd: Weights & Measures, Item number 3, Indianapolis trip, certification of equipment, \$100. Is there a motion to approve?

Councilmember Sutton: So moved.

President Lloyd: Is there a second?

Councilmember Bassemier: Second.

President Lloyd: Motion Mr. Sutton, second Mr. Bassemier.

Councilmember Shetler: Is this going to exhaust their whole fund?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yeah, that's what I was going to say, there goes their hundred.

Loretta Townsend: That's two trips, actually. Take them on a Monday and then come back home, and then we've got to go up on a Friday and pick them up and come back, so it's a hundred bucks for two round trips.

Councilmember Kiefer: I'm amazed you can get up there and back with the gas.

(Inaudible, several speaking at once)

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay.

President Lloyd: Okay, all those in favor, signify by saying aye.

(All Councilmembers voted affirmatively)

President Lloyd: Any opposed?

(No opposing votes were cast)

President Lloyd: The motion passes seven to zero.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

Councilmember Shetler: Somebody want to check her mileage on her odometer there just to make sure that she's getting the right fuel mileage?

HEALTH DEPARTMENT TRAVEL REQUESTS
--

President Lloyd: Okay, Vanderburgh County Health Department, I've nine requests, is there any questions from Councilmembers?

Councilmember Raben: What are the nine?

Councilmember Kiefer: Are they all state called meetings, because some of them are not checked?

President Lloyd: STD/HIV meeting –

Gary Heck: Gary Heck, Vanderburgh County Health Department. None of these trips come out of the general fund. They either come out of the Health fund or grant funds. The vast majority of them are from grant funds that are part of the grant requirements. I'd be happy to answer any questions.

Councilmember Raben: Nine of them is a lot. What are they?

Gary Heck: There's probably going to be that many every month. I sort of alluded to that last month when you took on this task. This is not an unusual number for the Health department. We have almost 70 employees. There's different training requirements, attending the meetings, learning additional or attendance at various locations all around the state. It's just part of doing business today. I don't think it's necessarily unusual, but I can, I mean, if you have a specific question, I'll be more than happy to try to address it, but I would expect that you'll get about this same number every month from us.

President Lloyd: Mr. Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Has this been standard procedure through the Commissioners?

Gary Heck: It has been. Once again, it doesn't affect the general fund, it comes out of the money that's been budgeted in the travel line item in the Health Department's fund, which has been reduced. It used to be 17,000, we're down to \$12,000 now.

President Lloyd: Well, and this includes trips to Deaconess Hospital Gateway in Warrick County, so –

Gary Heck: To serve our Vanderburgh County residents there.

Councilmember Kiefer: Question. That Deaconess one, just out of curiosity, I guess if you don't check anything, then it means no? Like, it says, is this a state called meeting, there's no checkmark on either yes or no, so does that mean no?

Gary Heck: I don't think it's a state called meeting in the sense that we have Vanderburgh County residents that give birth at Deaconess Hospital or they're entered into the hospital there and our Health Department staff has to travel there to serve their needs.

Councilmember Kiefer: So if it's not checked, it means no, basically?

Gary Heck: Yeah, it wouldn't be a state called meeting. It doesn't mean it's not a required –

Councilmember Kiefer: I was just curious because it has a place to checkmark no, and there was nothing checked. No big deal.

Gary Heck: Oh, I'm sorry.

Councilmember Kiefer: Yeah, and the source of funding, it says \$213, but that annual cost is \$300.

Gary Heck: Which particular one are you –

Councilmember Kiefer: I'm looking at the one that says Deaconess Gateway Hospital, Women's Hospital.

President Lloyd: That's the Health Department number, 213.0.

Councilmember Kiefer: Oh okay. I thought that was a dollar amount there or something.

Gary Heck: No, that's the fund number, the 2130.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay.

Gary Heck: I was just trying to make sure he had the source of the funding from the fund.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay, that makes sense to me now. Thank you.

President Lloyd: Other discussion, questions? We'll just take them as a lump unless somebody else wants to take anything out here. Is there a motion to approve the Health Department?

Councilmember Shetler: So moved.

President Lloyd: Is there a second?

Councilmember Kiefer: Second.

President Lloyd: Mr. Bassemier, did you have a question?

Councilmember Bassemier: No.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Shetler, second Mr. Kiefer. All in favor signify by saying aye.

(All Councilmembers voted affirmatively)

President Lloyd: Any opposed?

(No opposing votes were cast)

President Lloyd: Seven to zero, motion passes. Thank you.

Gary Heck: Thank you so much.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

Councilmember Shetler: I have a question before we go on. With regards to, and I could ask this to Mr. Davis, or to Mr. Fluty, or both, or one, or the other. But the question is that, in your associations, like with the Auditor and the Treasurer's statewide associations, do you have the opportunity to get that convention or those meetings in Evansville, perhaps, from time to time?

Bill Fluty: Yes, that has happened. The Auditor's Association hasn't been to Evansville for a while. Their habit is to hold one in Indianapolis, centrally located, and then one somewhere else throughout the state. But they actually, the president, vice president, treasurer and secretary decide on those every year. So they do come here and look at our facilities, but they haven't been here lately.

Councilmember Shetler: So your presence, being involved in a group like that could also help generate additional type of funds when they come down here for meetings, and the more you're involved in things like that, the better for our community as far as convention and tourism type activities and stuff.

Bill Fluty: Correct.

Rick Davis: Rick Davis, Vanderburgh County Treasurer. Just so you know, last year, the Treasurer's Association actually had their conference here in Evansville and we had all 92 county treasurers and many chief deputies or first deputies who came down here and booked rooms and the hotels and went to eat in our restaurants here in the Evansville area. They even went to the Log Inn for dinner one night. So you are absolutely correct. It is a nice convention and visitors bureau type function, and last year the Treasurer's Association did come to Evansville. And a few years ago, the Association of Indiana Counties had their entire convention here in Evansville as well, and that wasn't just treasurers and auditors, that was councilmembers and commissioners and all types of county functions, so it can be a major boost to convention and tourism type dollars in Vanderburgh County. You're absolutely correct.

Councilmember Shetler: I just wanted to point that out, that there is a certain byproduct, I guess, that comes out of those expenses of the traveling and stuff, that is important for us to keep in mind, because that can be considerable. Now when they go into Gibson County to eat, that doesn't help us a whole lot, so maybe the next time we'll have them eat chicken here in Evansville.

Rick Davis: Well, actually, the president of the Treasurer's Association was from Gibson County last year, and he's the one who got it here, so you have to throw them a bone occasionally, even if it's a chicken bone. Also, it's very good for educational purposes. We are informed about new changes in state law that affect our office. We get our input to our president regarding issues that are affecting our office, changes in operations and climate and they can take that information to the state house that this time of year, when they're passing laws that affect our office concerning property taxes, and in my case exemptions, and in the Auditor's case. So it's a very good conference to go to and it's very educational for people, especially me, that was my first year as Treasurer last year, and it's very good to be able to speak to other Treasurers, especially smaller ones who have different issues than you do, or bigger ones where you can talk about issues that are affecting your office and how they solve their problems, and you can bring that back to Evansville and try to apply those remedies in your office as well. So, it's very educational.

Councilmember Shetler: Alright, thank you.

President Lloyd: Along those lines, I know officeholders that are active, those associations, a lot of times you need to be on their board or on their policy committee to try to drag those conventions down here. And I know when I was mayor, we were always trying to drag the mayors and the cities and towns to

Evansville, when we could. I mean, I think that's important and the Convention & Visitors Bureau is very helpful in that regard as well.

COUNTY ASSESSOR TRAVEL REQUEST

President Lloyd: We've got another travel request, Item 9F5, County Assessor. Any questions from Councilmembers? And this is actually, well, there's a couple of them here, you've got the Assessor's Winter Conference, they've all been done in January, you also had...we sent a board member, Mr. Nance, from the PTABOA to the conference and I guess that's, past practice we had not sent board members in the past, so that's something I think we may want to talk about. But anyway, these have already been done, they actually went to the Commissioners at our last meeting. But it was brought over to us since we took over this function January 1st. Any questions from Councilmembers? Is there a –

Councilmember Goebel: It's already happened. Is that correct?

President Lloyd: Right. If there's no questions, then I'll entertain a motion to approve.

Councilmember Bassemier: So moved.

President Lloyd: Okay, is there a second?

Councilmember Raben: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Bassemier, second Mr. Raben. Any further discussion? All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

(All Councilmembers voted aye except President Lloyd)

President Lloyd: Opposed? Aye. Six to one, it passes.

(Motion carried 6-1/President Lloyd opposed)

COUNTY HIGHWAY TRAVEL REQUEST

President Lloyd: Let's go to item number 6, County Highway.

Councilmember Raben: (Inaudible)

President Lloyd: No, we've got one more. County Highway, training, Purdue Road School. Any questions? Entertain a motion to approve.

Councilmember Raben: So moved.

President Lloyd: Is there a second?

Councilmember Goebel: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Raben, second, was that Mr. Kiefer or Mr. Goebel? I'm sorry. All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

(All Councilmembers voted affirmatively)

President Lloyd: Those opposed?

(No opposing votes were cast)

President Lloyd: Seven to zero. Motion passes.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

<p style="text-align: center;">PROPOSAL BY WAGGONER, IRWIN, SCHEELE & ASSOCIATES FOR OPERATIONS REVIEW</p>

President Lloyd: Item G, Proposal by Waggoner, Irwin, Scheele & Associates for operations review. We discussed this last week and Commissioner Tornatta brought this to the Commissioner's meeting on January 19th. There is a contract proposal from Waggoner, Irwin, Scheele. They actually have some history with the county. They were the original job study creators and worked on the job descriptions and organization back in the mid-1980's, so they would do an operational study of the county for between 60 and \$65,000. Commissioner Winnecke questioned whether this would be an effective use of funds being that there is a possibility of the government reorganization committee coming up with possible recommendations to change city and county government. Regardless, we've got the proposal from Waggoner, Irwin & Scheele and I also requested Tim Deisher from BKD to give us a similar proposal, which is item H. Before we go to item H, does anybody have any questions on the Waggoner, Irwin & Scheele proposal? And I don't, we're not going to act on this today, but since it was brought up at the Commissioner's meeting, the Commissioner's asked that we take a look at it. Any questions on it?

Councilmember Sutton: The scope of work, there's no one here from the Commission and for those who didn't get to hear Commissioner Tornatta's presentation last week, what would that include with this review?

President Lloyd: Okay, this engagement, operations review, collect data from each department including budget, staffing, services provided, current and planned projects, review organizational structure and future needs of county offices and department staffing, technology, equipment, assessment in-house versus outsource functions, and then review past practices. So they would go into these departments and gather the data and then prepare a report for county government.

Councilmember Sutton: I think what also would be helpful for us, and that's a good explanation, we are one of 92 counties in Indiana and every single county has a basic similar operation in terms of every office that we (inaudible) if you exclude Marion County off the radar screen. I would like to see or hope that they can find as a part of this review, whether we go with Waggoner Irwin, BKD, whomever we decide to go with, if we could get a sense of what some other counties are doing that are of comparable size and population like your Elkhart County, St. Joe County, Allen County, that would be helpful information for us as we begin to look at efficiencies or ways to streamline or improve or combine service, whatever the case might be, there is some value that can be gained by looking at the others. We may find that we're leading the way in several of the things that we do or we may find that there's some things that we can truly add some value by virtue of what's already been studied and done in other counties. So whatever that engagement

agreement ends up being, and whoever is selected, I hope they take advantage of what I think is a great opportunity for us to learn about what we do as well as the experiences of others.

President Lloyd: So what you're saying is, add to this a request that whoever is going to do this study, you would like to see some prior experience that they had with governments, and, for example, St. Joe County, South Bend, or a similar sized county to Vanderburgh?

Councilmember Sutton: Yeah, and I just think there is a great value. I think the opportunity is missed. If they go into the Auditor's office, Bill Fluty's office and say okay, you've got 12 people in your office, these are duties that we think should be aligned this particular way. Give me another basis by which you make that conclusion as opposed to only just looking at what you see in his office. Give me something to compare things against.

Councilmember Kiefer: Mr. President? I think – and maybe they'll do this, but I think they need to really get into the nuts and bolts of how a department operates. For example, and this is just a very brief analysis, you know, when I had been meeting with the Assessor's office, I noticed they had gathered data from the Building Commissioner, where the Building Commissioner entered data and then it was submitted to the Assessor and then they re-entered the data. And, you know, just from a cursory view, I thought, well, why are we entering data twice? You know, that could save money if there was a way to transfer what the Building Commissioner already had spent time entering and kind of labor intensive time. So I hope that this group looks at some nuts and bolts of how these departments operate because I know there's probably some ways they could operate slightly differently and save time, which is money. So that's why I would say like, with what Commissioner Winnecke had said, he suggested holding off, I don't know that what that merger committee is doing is going to be anything like this where this is going to be more of a nuts and bolts, get into how they do their daily tasks day in and day out to see if there's some efficiencies that could be found in how they operate.

President Lloyd: And that's why I asked the Assessor, Mr. Weaver, when he was elected or he was running for office, his department had like 12 employees or something like that, the townships were eliminated, so he ended up with 50, and we've pared it down. But I think this would be obviously ripe for a group that knows best practices as you described coming in and looking at that, and, as you mentioned, where there may be some duplication, things like that.

Councilmember Kiefer: And I think the Assessor's office would be an ideal place as well as, perhaps, maybe the Clerk's office because they have a large number of employees.

Councilmember Shetler: You know, following along with what Councilman Kiefer is saying here and also what Commissioner Winnecke had suggested, and that I think we need to look at, you know, through inter-office, intra-office, we also need to look at it from a micro and a macro standpoint. And what I'm afraid could happen, and I think this is what Commissioner Winnecke was concerned about, is that we have somebody come in and spend \$65,000 or thereabouts on looking at the different offices and then we pass a referendum, a new form of government which may totally alter the way we're doing things today anyway, and that may be \$65,000, in essence, down the drain somewhat. So I, for one, while I think it's important for us to move forward and I've been trying to lead the charge on thinking out of the box,

and I don't think we should stop there at least among ourselves, I just don't know that we want to go outside, spend \$65,000 at this present day, and find ourselves in November confronting an issue that government is going to be radically changed come January 1, and we've spent the \$65,000.

Councilmember Kiefer: I'm not suggesting that we spend 65,000, but I think whether you have, say, a merged government or the same way we're operating now, you're always going to have an assessor doing assessments. I mean, that's a practical part of how government operates. We have to assess properties to know the values of them unless we eliminate property taxes altogether, which, I don't see that happening. You know, so what I'm suggesting is perhaps we narrow the scope down to one department to test the waters to see, and we can obviously determine that the Assessor's office is a big department and maybe just do one department like what President Lloyd said. Instead of spending 60, 65,000, maybe it's only 15 to do one department. And we could obviously see if he finds a lot of efficiencies there, then, oh, this is a good deal. You know, we have maybe an opportunity to explore other departments from that point.

President Lloyd: Well, and if you go to, I guess, we're using the Assessor as an example, if you come up with a recommendation to eliminate four positions, that could be 120,000 or more, you're talking about some big money, that would be well worth the study.

PROPOSAL BY BKD FOR OPERATIONS REVIEW
--

President Lloyd: Why don't we go ahead and go to item H, proposal by BKD? We have Mr. Deisher here, let's have him briefly bring that proposal forward and if there's any questions that we Councilmembers have.

Tim Deisher: Tim Deisher, BKD. We have a group that does operations studies, Herb Hanselmann out of our Indianapolis office has done these – he grew up in the manufacturing, engineering area. He has in recent years done studies of the Marion County Airport or Indianapolis Airport Authority, the Marion County capital improvement, Ivy Tech, he's done studies at Indiana State University. What we have talked with President Lloyd about is, him coming down and just doing an exploratory, if the Council wants to just try one office, come down and talk to you all, seek your input, if it would be the Assessor's office, and meet with him just to get an idea of where we go and he would present his plan and cost associated with it.

Councilmember Goebel: This would be handled by someone totally out of this area, though? I mean, not living in Vanderburgh County with no connections, is that correct?

Tim Deisher: Yes.

Councilmember Goebel: Other than your, --

Tim Deisher: It's with our firm, BKD, but Herb is out of the Indianapolis office.

Councilmember Goebel: Thank you.

President Lloyd: Other questions? I guess the methodology, either he or he would have a staff member come in, I guess they would do preliminary work, look at all the

job descriptions, look at maybe the functions of that area, and go in and interview?

Tim Deisher: Yes, absolutely.

President Lloyd: Okay.

Tim Deisher: Look at the processes. I mean, the example of duplicate entering of data is just a good example. Look at what the functions are, what the processes are, where the information comes from, how it's processed.

President Lloyd: Okay. Other questions?

Councilmember Kiefer: I'd just say I'd be in favor of getting an estimate to do one department and if Council said the Assessor, he seemed agreeable, you asked him point blank and he said yes. You know, I'd be agreeable to at least get some pricing on doing the one department.

President Lloyd: Okay, well, we've got a kind of preliminary operations review that you have provided us. If you would like to provide an estimate of one department, the Vanderburgh County Assessor, we'd certainly want to entertain that. We have a gentleman in the audience, Mr. Heck, you want them to do the Health department as well?

Gary Heck: I sure would. We're still – Gary Heck, Vanderburgh County Health department. There's been, since April of 2008, there's been a job study moratorium on looking at job positions as they work their way through the departments. The Assessor's office was one of the first one's done along with the Treasurer and the Auditor's Office. The Health department is still waiting. We would love to volunteer for either project. Not that there's anything wrong with the Assessor, because you're absolutely right, there has been some major changes in there, but we're still operating under those original job studies from the mid-80's and 1993, in particular when the city/county health department became part of the county under that big umbrella there. We're the seventh largest county, Vanderburgh, as I'm sure you all are aware, third largest urban area, and we would love to be able to have the benefit of this kind of study for the Health department. Thank you.

President Lloyd: Okay, other questions, Council?

Councilmember Bassemier: Would that be at our expense if he does the Health department or is there money in their budget to cover this expense for that study?

Gary Heck: Well, I believe, as I've stated before, this Council has done these studies all along, we've just been waiting our turn. And the answer is no, there's no money in our budget to cover a study like this, but I don't think there was money in anybody else's budget to do the other job studies and those job reviews. We've just been patiently waiting and it's, it just hasn't trickled down to us yet.

President Lloyd: It might have to be an additional appropriation unless we could carve it out of the Commissioner's budget. Alright, thank you. Thank you, Tim. I appreciate it.

Tim Deisher: Do you want Herb to come down and present to Council as he's meeting with Jonathan to work out what the scope is and –

President Lloyd: What do you think, Councilmembers?

Councilmember Bassemier: Is there an expense to this for him to come down here and give us a presentation?

Tim Deisher: I don't think there would be a cost for him to come down and scope the project to be able to come back to you with a price for the job.

Councilmember Kiefer: It would be nice to have him speak to us after he talks to Jonathan and did that preliminary discussion just to get his, he might give us a quick, say no, there's probably not much I could do there or he might say yeah, I think a study would be effective.

President Lloyd: Well, it probably would be beneficial for him to come to the Personnel & Finance and just maybe give us a general overview, so I would say yeah, we want to pursue that.

Councilmember Bassemier: If I remember, last week, I think we had a problem in Susie Kirk's office. I mean, that would be a study also because she has to face the judges and all that, you know. I mean, they can recommend whatever they want to, but you know, there's two entities there that I think Susie was kind of concerned about of doing a study on her department. I mean, you know, that's –

Councilmember Kiefer: Well, I mean, if we're just going to do one and the Assessor has agreed to it, you know, I think we start with one.

Councilmember Bassemier: (Inaudible) for now, it doesn't hurt to hear him out.

President Lloyd: Okay, thank you. Appreciate it. Okay, so I guess the answer is yes, we'd like to have him come before Council, and we can, you can contact me and we'll work out a time.

Tim Deisher: Okay, great, thank you.

AMENDMENTS TO SALARY ORDINANCE

President Lloyd: Number 10, Amendments to salary ordinance, go to Mr. Shetler on this.

Councilmember Shetler: I think everybody has been handed an amendment to the Salary Ordinance, so I would move that we enter this into the record as presented.

Councilmember Kiefer: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion to approve the salary ordinance Mr. Shetler, second Mr. Kiefer. Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. Motion passes 5-0.

(Motion unanimously approved 5-0/Councilmembers Sutton and Raben were not present for this vote)

President Lloyd: Okay, before we get to public comment, we were given some contracts that the Sheriff's department, I guess, had been, they were given to the Commissioners for the management of Community Corrections and the county jail. We have not had a chance to review those, so we're going to review those and we'll take them up at the next Council meeting. The other item of business, filing date for the March 3rd County Council meeting, we would like those requests in by February 11th, a little bit earlier because of the holiday.

PUBLIC COMMENT

(Portions of Treasurer Rick Davis's comments were inaudible because the microphone power was turned off)

President Lloyd: Now Item 11, public comment, is there anyone from the public that needs to address the County Council? Yes, Mr. Davis? We also have a new GAGE member back there, I see her.

Rick Davis: Hello, Rick Davis, Vanderburgh County Treasurer. I'll try to be brief. This is nothing I'm going to ask you to vote on, just for information purposes only. Earlier in the month I went to the County Commissioners meeting and gave them a rundown on the amount of interest the county earned on investments, (inaudible) and this gives the fiscal body an accounting. I thought it would be wise to come before you and give you a similar report. In 2009, the county earned \$868,000 plus in certificates of deposit (inaudible) and we also earned nearly \$150,000 in the TrustIndiana fund. So combined, Vanderburgh County earned just a shade over one million dollars' interest on our investments last year. That is significantly down from the previous year, (inaudible) we earned in 2008, but the average interest rate on our investments was 2.7, and that was in 2008. In 2009, the average interest rate was just 1, so, as you can see, we all know the reason why, the financial system was near a meltdown last year (inaudible). Since the beginning of the banking crisis there have been, I will tell (inaudible) I'm sorry, I apologize. I looked on the Internet before I came here today. There were 183 banks that have failed since the beginning of the banking crisis: 140 in 2009, and there have already been 15 banks that have failed this year in just five weeks. To give you an example of the challenges we faced last year, we had an eight day investment of three million dollars, and the public may wonder why we would make an eight day investment of three million dollars. We invest all types of revenue that come in through the various forms, one of them being County Option Income Tax from the state. We get it the first, it has to go out by the tenth, we try to get it and it's usually around

three million and you want to invest it and earn interest off of that money. And the end of 2007, that eight day investment of three million dollars was a 4.3% interest rate, earning almost \$3,000. In 2009, that same eight day, three million dollar investment only earned \$233. And that was a .35 interest rate and that is a 91.87% decrease. So that will help explain to you why we went from nearly four million dollars in interest one year to just one million the following year. You know, the interest rates drive everything. I'm happy to report, however, that the last three investments that we made at the end of 2009 are going to bring in nearly \$121,000 in interest. And in 2010, there are 16 investments that are due to mature and those total 262,000. That is more than what I estimated for the entire year, so the good news, despite the fact that we had a down year as far as investments go, the good news is, when you guys received an investment income estimate from me for the year of 2010, I put 200,000 because last summer it was very difficult to gauge, especially with interest rates continually sliding down, what we could bring in. That one million that I talked about, half a million was off of one investment, that was a long term investment. So 200,000, I didn't want to under estimate, but I also didn't want to over estimate, because I know you're basing your entire budget on revenues, and the revenue forecast. So in 2010, we put 200,000, we've already surpassed that, if all these CD's mature. When I come before you again for budget hearings, I will be able to tell you for 2011, I'll be able to gauge a little bit better and it will be better than the 250,000 that I originally gave you before because with this TrustIndiana, we've diversified our funds and that has enabled us to, the best way in public funds investment and to earn a higher interest rate and earn more interest, is to take these investments farther out. And we've been able to do that. So if you have any questions, I'll be glad to answer them. I just wanted, you are the fiscal body of the county, I wanted to make you aware of the interest that was earned last year and we're sitting pretty well compared to what was expected last year during the summer.

President Lloyd: So what you're seeing is, there's at least the average rates are maybe up slightly and you're extending maturities to get a better rate for the county?

Rick Davis: That is exactly right. And for the folks at home, the higher interest rate, I have to go by. The state says that we have to invest in very safe funds and when we get these CD rates from the local banks, I have to go with the highest rate. The catch there is that that means it's a riskier investment. So while I'm out there trying, fishing for a higher interest rate, you have to also be careful because some of the investments, if it's 1.0 with one bank and .3 with another, that means the 1.0 has a greater risk than the .3, a much higher risk statistically.

President Lloyd: Well, and we saw, I guess last year, some of the colleges and universities were caught with some of these funds that ran into trouble.

Rick Davis: Yes.

President Lloyd: The college fund. But in our case you steer clear of things like that and mainly I guess you can look at the list, but banks and state of Indiana type instruments that are very safe.

Rick Davis: Yes, and if I'm not mistaken, I think only one bank in Indiana has failed, it was Irwin Union Bank and Trust in Columbus and I believe another bank swooped in and basically took over the deposits and we didn't have situations where banks have failed and people have been relying strictly on the FDIC insurance to pay them

back for their investments. So Indiana, as we all know, is a very conservative state especially with public funds.

President Lloyd: Great. Any other questions, Councilmen?

Councilmember Shetler: Not to steal any thunder from Dr. Arensman, I'll give him credit, so in order words, basically, it's a whole lot better, while it may be a low interest rate to buy into US Treasury and US backed bonds, a whole lot better to do that than it is to Pakistanis who may have a five or six percent interest rate. A lot more desirable, I guess, is what I'm saying.

President Lloyd: Alright, thank you.

Rick Davis: Thank you for your time, gentlemen.

President Lloyd: Thank you.

<p>PAM MARTIN GROWTH ALLIANCE FOR GREATER EVANSVILLE</p>
--

President Lloyd: Pam Martin, did you want to address the Council, or no? Can we get her up here? Opportunity for public comment.

Pam Martin: Thank you. I didn't really intend to address you this morning, take up your time. I'm Pam Martin with the Growth Alliance for Greater Evansville and I am the new director of government relations and downtown development. I will be facilitating the county phase-in process, but I also want you to know that I offer my resources and my assistance how ever you need it. So do not hesitate to contact me for research purposes, assistance of any type. GAGE has a full compliment of resources and experts at your disposal. So just know that we intend to be a good partner with you.

President Lloyd: Right, and we'll continue to get the service on the tax abatements, analysis that you guys have given in the past?

Pam Martin: Correct.

President Lloyd: Great. Any questions for Pam?

Jeff Ahlers: Who will be responsible for doing tax abatements?

Pam Martin: I am. The tax phase-in process?

Jeff Ahlers: Yes.

Pam Martin: That will be me.

Jeff Ahlers: Okay, good. Well, I just wanted to know who, because when we do that it would be helpful, I can get you my email address or whatever and you can send me drafts of things.

Pam Martin: Yes. I will be compiling the compliance report for you and presenting it to you this year and I also will be facilitating processing every application that you have come in.

Jeff Ahlers: Great. Thanks.

Pam Martin: Thank you.

President Lloyd: Thank you. Any other questions? Any other questions from the public? Okay thanks, Pam. We are adjourned. Thank you.

(There being no further business to come before the Council, the meeting was adjourned at 10:21 a.m.)

VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL

President Russ Lloyd, Jr.

Vice President Jim Raben

Councilmember Joe Kiefer

Councilmember Mike Goebel

Councilmember Tom Shetler, Jr.

Councilmember Ed Bassemier

Councilmember Royce Sutton

Recorded and transcribed by Teri Lukeman.

**VANDEBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL
MINUTES
MARCH 3, 2010**

The Vanderburgh County Council met in session this 3rd day of March, 2010 in room 301 of the Civic Center Complex. The meeting was called to order at 8:32 a.m. by County Council President Russell Lloyd, Jr.

President Lloyd: I'd like to go ahead and get started with the meeting of the Vanderburgh County Council March 3rd, 2010. Could we have the attendance roll call please?

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

*Arrived after roll call.

President Lloyd: I'd like to ask Councilman Bassemier to lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Councilmember Bassemier: Everyone please stand.

(Pledge of Allegiance was given)

President Lloyd: Thank you, Ed.

Councilmember Bassemier: You're welcome, sir.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FEBRUARY 3, 2010

President Lloyd: Okay, item number 4, approval of minutes for February 3rd, 2010. I'll take a motion for approval or is there any changes?

Councilmember Raben: I'll move approval.

President Lloyd: Motion Mr. Raben. Is there a second?

Councilmember Bassemier: Second.

President Lloyd: Second Mr. Bassemier. Any discussion? All in favor signify by saying aye.

(All Councilmembers voted affirmatively)

President Lloyd: All opposed?

(No opposing votes were cast)

President Lloyd: Okay, that's 5-0.

(Motion unanimously approved 5-0)

APPROPRIATION ORDINANCE

President Lloyd: Okay, item number 5, appropriation ordinance. I'll turn that over to Mr. Shetler, the finance chair.

ELECTION OFFICE

Councilmember Shetler: First we have the Election Office and that's to the tune of \$228,850. There was a change in that as requested by the County Clerk last week. I don't think the County Clerk is here to answer any questions if anybody has any. But anyway, the proper amount is \$228,850, and I move for approval on that.

President Lloyd: 228,850?

Councilmember Shetler: Correct.

Councilmember Raben: The motion now, is that out of General or CCD?

Councilmember Shetler: This was coming out of the General Fund.

Councilmember Raben: And it's going to be reimbursed by CCD?

Councilmember Shetler: Yes.

Councilmember Raben: Okay.

Bill Fluty: If they put the paperwork in for next month's meeting.

President Lloyd: Okay, there was a motion from Mr. Shetler. Is there a second?

Councilmember Bassemier: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, second Mr. Bassemier. And we had extensive discussion on this last week, so that's probably why the County Clerk is not here. Jim, there is also a late transfer for this. Did you see that?

Bill Fluty: Let me correct myself. The transfer is in here for this meeting, not next month. Sorry.

President Lloyd: Okay, is there any other discussion? I guess Ms. Lukeman is questioning whether we're putting it in there twice, because we're doing an appropriation and then we're doing a late transfer. It's going into the Election Office account?

Councilmember Raben: Yeah, I think we need to zero out the first item and just take the transfer.

President Lloyd: Okay, hold on a second for further discussion.

Councilmember Shetler: Sorry, for the confusion. Because of the late transfer, we were trying to work these things out at the last minute here to avoid on the requirements of advertising and everything, so what was worked out late was to transfer the money from the Energy Savings Contract, which we will get to later, into the Contractual Services. If we go with this appropriation, we would end up with \$557,000 in that account rather than the \$228,000 which is being requested. So I withdraw, whoever seconded, ask that we withdraw that on the \$228,850, and make that level at zero, so that we can transfer the funds into that and we reappropriate later.

President Lloyd: Mr. Bassemier, are you willing to accept that change?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

President Lloyd: Okay, so the new motion is for 1210-3530 Contractual Services set in at zero. And that's a motion from Mr. Shetler, is there a second?

Councilmember Goebel: Second.

President Lloyd: Second Mr. Goebel. Any discussion? Roll call vote please?

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. Seven-zero, set in at zero.

ELECTION OFFICE		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1210-3530	Contractual Services	286,500.00	0.00
Total		286,500.00	0.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

President Lloyd: Mr. Shetler, the next one.

WEIGHTS & MEASURES

Councilmember Shetler: It's on Weights & Measures, and the request is for \$2,764: 2,334 is for the Deputy Inspector and the FICA and PERF that are associated with that, so a total of \$2,764, and this is because they have such a small office that they're operating with that they need to get somebody on board quickly to replace those funds, in order to do that. So Loretta is here if anybody has any questions. If not, put this in the form of a motion for approval.

President Lloyd: Is there a second?

Councilmember Raben: Second.

President Lloyd: Second Mr. Raben. Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. Seven-zero, the motion passes.

WEIGHTS & MEASURES		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1302-1120-1302	Deputy Inspector	2,334.00	2,334.00
1302-1900	FICA	179.00	179.00
1302-1910	PERF	251.00	251.00
Total		2,764.00	2,764.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

President Lloyd: We'll move on to item six, transfer requests, Mr. Shetler.

TRANSFER REQUESTS

CUMULATIVE BRIDGE

Councilmember Shetler: We have, we can do the one transfer and then we have some late ones and we can do those separate. The transfer request is for the Cum Bridge, for Materials to Union Overtime, and obviously because of the bad weather associated with it. If anybody has questions, I don't see anybody here from the garage, but I put that in the form of a motion for approval for the transfer request.

Councilmember Raben: I'll second.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Shetler, second Mr. Raben. Any discussion? Roll call vote.

Councilmember Raben: Just a general comment that, you know, the garage was hit with hopefully the last snowfall, but with all the bad weather that we've had, I think they did a great job this year keeping the roads safe and clear and hopefully it's over for them now.

President Lloyd: Okay, I would second that. Any other discussion? Okay, can I get a roll call vote please?

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. The motion passes seven-zero.

CUMULATIVE BRIDGE		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 2030-2000	Materials	3,000.00	3,000.00
To: 2030-1850	Union Overtime	3,000.00	3,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

LATE TRANSFER REQUESTS

**COOPERATIVE EXTENSION
WEIGHTS & MEASURES
RIVERBOAT
COUNTY HIGHWAY
CCD/COMMISSIONERS**

Councilmember Shetler: A couple of late transfers that have come in and basically we're talking about the Cooperative Extension, which is a part of the Popcorn grant that is done routinely every year. Weights & Measures from Rent to Utilities. Riverboat, that has been withdrawn, that was Economic Development that the Commissioners want to come back at a later time. County Highway from the Assistant Mechanic \$7,500 to Union Overtime, again because of weather related issues. And then as we talked about earlier, the \$228,850 coming out of the Energy Savings Contract going into Contractual Services for the Election Office out of the Commissioners budget from CCD. So those are the late transfers and unless anybody objects, I'd put those all in one motion for approval.

Councilmember Raben: I'll second.

President Lloyd: Okay, for clarification, on the Riverboat, that would be set in at zero or it's withdrawn? No action?

Councilmember Shetler: I think we can just withdraw that because it's not an appropriation.

Councilmember Raben: You need to set it in at zero.

Councilmember Shetler: Alright, set that in at zero then.

President Lloyd: Okay. All the others as requested, and the Riverboat, Government Reorganization, set in at zero. And that was a motion?

Councilmember Shetler: Yes.

President Lloyd: Is there a second?

Councilmember Raben: Second.

President Lloyd: Second Mr. Raben. Any discussion? Just a point of information: I got to talk to all three Commissioners yesterday about the government reorganization, so they wanted to withdraw that and they're still gathering some information on that and working to coordinate with the city as well. So I guess those that argue for government reorganization, I could have talked to one metro mayor instead of three Commissioners, but that's something down the road. So anyway,

any other discussion? Okay, we'll take a roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes, with a general comment. Under that reorganization request, I hope when it does come back before us, there is a complete itemized listing of what they plan to spend \$100,000 on prior to coming in for a vote.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. The motion passes seven-zero, and I agree with Councilman Raben that I think that was part of it. They were looking to come up with a general itemized budget on the spending of the taxpayer money, although I believe the state law says that the county and the city are supposed to provide support to them. So that's why I think the request was going to be made. But anyway, we'll see what happens at a later date.

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1230-1200-1230	4-H Assistant	2,660.00	2,660.00
To: 1230-1990	Extra Help	2,660.00	2,660.00

WEIGHTS & MEASURES		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1302-3600	Rent	1,000.00	1,000.00
To: 1302-3200	Utilities	1,000.00	1,000.00

RIVERBOAT **REQUESTED** **APPROVED**

From: 1490-3110	Economic Development	50,000.00	0.00
To: 1490-3542	Govt. Reorganization	50,000.00	0.00

COUNTY HIGHWAY **REQUESTED** **APPROVED**

From: 2010-1061	Assistant Mechanic	7,500.00	7,500.00
To: 2010-1850	Union Overtime	7,500.00	7,500.00

CCD/COMMISSIONERS **REQUESTED** **APPROVED**

From: 2031-1300-4129	Energy Savings Contract	228,850.00	228,850.00
To: 2031-1300-3530	Contractual Services	228,850.00	228,850.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)**LEGAL AID REQUEST TO FILL VACANCY**

President Lloyd: Okay, item seven, Repeals, none. Item eight, Old Business, none. Item nine, New Business, A, Legal Aid request to fill proposed vacancy. Any questions? And we had, once again, we had some discussion last week on this. And this was kind of the second half of the request to fill the secretarial position. No discussion? I think we had extended discussion on this. So I'll entertain a motion to approve the request.

Councilmember Shetler: So moved.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Shetler, is there a second?

Councilmember Raben: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, so this would be to allow Legal Aid to fill the secretarial position, and I believe that would be all the vacancies at Legal Aid at this time, is that correct? Okay. Roll call vote please.

Councilmember Shetler: Let me give clarification on that because there was some extensive confusion on that the last time, and is that matter clear as far as we are concerned that, where we transferred the Junior to the Senior, and that's resolved and this is then for the Junior? Let me just...secretary position, is that correct?

President Lloyd: We could ask Ms. Hartig to explain it real quickly.

Sue Hartig: The two steps are number one, to move the existing Junior Secretary to the Senior Secretary position. And that's from line item 1190 to line item 1150. And then the second half is to let us hire a full-time person in that now empty Junior Legal Secretary 1190 position, and that would be on your new reduced scale, at the initiation rate.

Councilmember Shetler: I guess my point was, did we resolve that part over the last two meetings as far as the Junior going to the Senior? And that our motion today is just to fill the Junior?

Sue Hartig: I haven't seen the minutes, so I – I think the motion was simply to approve, so when we looked at it in retrospect, we didn't really know which part it was approving.

Councilmember Shetler: Okay, let me, I guess, make my motion clear then that we will be allowing the Junior to go to the Senior, Junior Secretary to go to the Senior position, and that we will fill the vacancy of the Junior Secretary with a full-time employee.

President Lloyd: Okay, that makes it clearer. Is there any other questions on that? We've got a motion, is there a second?

Councilmember Bassemier: Second.

(Inaudible)

President Lloyd: Second Mr. Bassemier. Jim already seconded? Okay. Any other discussion? Okay, I'm sorry, Mr. Raben seconded. Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. The motion passes seven-zero.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

Sue Hartig: Thank you.

PROSECUTOR REQUEST TO FILL VACANCY

President Lloyd: Item B, Prosecutor request to fill vacancy, and we have the Prosecutor here. Good morning.

Stan Levco: Good morning. May I begin?

President Lloyd: Please.

Stan Levco: I'm here on a different tack than I thought I was going to be. Originally, I had an employee who resigned from the office at the beginning of the year and with his benefits, his salary ended a couple of weeks ago. And from the last meeting I had, Mr. Shetler, when we were here, and you talked about isn't there a possible way I could try to do without another attorney, I thought I would try, and I thought what I was going to do is come here this morning and say that I got this vacancy and what I want to do is, go a little while, maybe a couple of months, and make a good faith effort to see if we can do without that person. Then at the end of that time I was going to ask you today to approve that position if, after consulting with everybody on that staff and reviewing it, see whether we really needed it. Unfortunately, yesterday I had an unexpected resignation from a long-term employee, so the situation has changed pretty dramatically for me; I feel very strongly I need to fill this position immediately. And the other one, I guess what I'm here today asking is, for the other one, what I was going to ask for this first one. The other one would be vacation and sick time, I won't be able to, even assuming you approve it, I won't be able to fill it for, I think, at least three months. So by necessity, I'm going to have a trial period of three months without another attorney. I had a meeting yesterday with all the staff and discussed what I originally was talking about, seeing if we could do without another attorney, and I didn't take a vote, but I would say there was a very strong feeling among the staff that they didn't think this was a good idea on my part at all to try to do without this. But they agreed in the sense they're going to have to whether they like it or not, we're going to have to go for a few months without another attorney. What I am requesting is this, permission to fill that vacancy that was two weeks ago, immediately. And for the other one, I still would ask you for permission to fill it when the time comes. I will tell you, I will do this, I will discuss with everyone whether they really feel whether or not we can do without it. I didn't want them to vote yesterday. If they had of, I know how they would have voted yesterday. And also, you know, I want to not just simply say the reason not to do without it, that we feel like we're overworked, but specific, you know, give me specific examples like this really is causing us a problem. So that's my request.

President Lloyd: Okay, Mr. Sutton.

Councilmember Sutton: Mr. Levco, you and I have had discussions about your request and I know you've gotten around and you've talked to several of the Councilmembers. I think that during these times that we are facing as a Council and as a county, as we've tried to revisit where we are, what things we can and cannot do, I mean, it's really appreciated your candor and forthrightness in really taking a step back and evaluating whether you can or cannot do without a position. We don't have very many offices – we don't have any officeholders who have stood in the place where you're standing who've presented that same type of prospect to us as a Council. So we appreciate your efforts to at least take a look at your office and seeing where there might be ways where you can change, alter, find efficiencies in manpower. And obviously, you didn't anticipate another change coming down the pike. I'm supportive of your request today in filling that, and it will be a good opportunity over the next three months, whatever the time is that it takes to use the

employee's time to evaluate the workforce that you have, and give an opportunity to come back and consider your request at that time.

Stan Levco: Okay, but what I meant I was asking for, is that you approve it today, if that's possible.

Councilmember Sutton: You mean the second position?

Stan Levco: If that's possible, yeah, that's what I'm asking.

Councilmember Sutton: Well, today, we've just got the one position.

Stan Levco: Oh, you can't even consider it?

Councilmember Sutton: Right, actually there isn't anything on the agenda for today, you would have to come back for that position itself.

Stan Levco: Okay.

Councilmember Raben: I think we can because there's not a – it's not a matter of additional funds.

Stan Levco: And for what it's worth, and I don't know what it's worth, the difference in salary would be pretty dramatically less.

President Lloyd: Let's see, try to get order here. Are you finished, Mr. Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

President Lloyd: Next would be Mr. Kiefer, then Mr. Goebel.

Councilmember Kiefer: Mr. Prosecutor? Just to clarify, can you in layman terms explain the two positions you're asking to be filled? The attorney positions.

Stan Levco: Well, the attorney positions, they don't really have like, you know, the last time there was an opening for a child molesting prosecutor, they don't have a specific designation. I'd say, I can't think of the number right now, let's say a little less than half of the attorneys would have (inaudible) mixed duties, trying cases, doing misdemeanor court, doing research, things like that. They would just be deputy prosecutor positions.

Councilmember Kiefer: So they have a variety of tasks, they don't do specific, certain type of trials, but they do a variety?

Stan Levco: They appear in court, do court hearings, do misdemeanor court, and try cases.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay, thank you.

President Lloyd: I mean, just counting here, it looks like twelve full-time attorneys and six part-time, does that sound right?

Stan Levco: No, I think there's more than that.

President Lloyd: Oh, there's others in IV, Child Support?

Stan Levco: Not counting Child Support.

President Lloyd: Yeah, this is just Prosecutor.

Stan Levco: Right.

President Lloyd: Okay. I think Mr. Goebel was next.

Councilmember Goebel: Good morning, Mr. Levco. You're asking today for the one vacancy that you've requested prior to last week's meeting, is that correct?

Stan Levco: Well, I'm asking for two.

Councilmember Goebel: I don't, I'm not sure if we can even move on the second one. But you're maneuvering regardless, in a cost neutral situation for us, as far as not increasing your budget to hire people now?

Stan Levco: Well, and it's going to be a cost negative in that the incoming salary in three months, just roughly is at least 30 or more thousand less, at least 30 or \$40,000 less than what this salary would have been.

Councilmember Goebel: You have three months, though, to work on the second position, is that correct?

Stan Levco: Well, I have three months to go without it.

Councilmember Goebel: Right. I mean, as far as maybe giving us more information. I know you're caught short-handed and this happened basically over night, but we're kind of caught off guard, too.

President Lloyd: Jim, did you have something?

Councilmember Raben: Just so I understand, but your initial thought was when you only were down one was to make every attempt to do without?

Stan Levco: Right, my plan was to come in here today and say, in talking to my staff where I'd say we're going to go the next two months whether you like it or not, we're going to go without one employee. And at the end of the two months, I want to go back – actually, I was hoping to get approval in advance of this, you know, I go back to the Council or the Council has already told me I can at the end of the two months, see whether we really need it. Now I've got to tell you, from the response I've gotten, other than that they know they have to do it if we're going to do it, there seems to be a pretty strong feeling that they don't think this is a very good idea. But they, they're at least going to try it. That was my original thought, that I wanted to go roughly two months without it. Now, from my perspective, I can't go two months without filling either of these. The other one is able to be filled this minute, which was able to be filled a couple of weeks ago. And now there's going to be the situation in roughly three months or more where I'm going to have another vacancy.

Councilmember Sutton: He doesn't have a vacancy yet in the other position.

Stan Levco: Well, I don't have an official vacancy because the person is being paid. I have a person not there.

Councilmember Raben: So you actually have two – you're operating today two

people short?

Stan Levco: Right. Yesterday I was one person short. Now, today, I'm two people short.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, the one person you can't replace until you're finished paying out of that line item.

Stan Levco: Right, which will be at least three months.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, so we can really only approve one today.

Councilmember Sutton: That's what I was saying. Yeah.

Councilmember Kiefer: Question. Mr. Prosecutor, what's the, what have you found in your experience, I mean, how long does it take to fill one of these positions to find the quality person that you need? I mean, is this a – you got a stack of people waiting in line or does this take you two or three months to even get through the interview process?

Stan Levco: I have a large stack of people right out of law school waiting in line. I don't have a lot of people with a lot of experience, so I would prefer to find people with experience, but sometimes you can't. You know, I, because of the first position, I wasn't thinking I was going to be filling it very quickly until yesterday. You know, in a sense, an emergency. I want to fill those as quickly as I possibly can. I imagine it, assuming I get permission, I imagine I'll fill that within a month, and hopefully less. This other one, I'll have three months or more to potentially fill it so I don't think there's any reason that I couldn't fill it when it's available if I get the permission to fill it. So if you can't consider that other one today, I'm just thinking out loud here, I think what I would probably do, at some time at the end of two months or so, maybe a month before it's ready, I'll have that talk. And, you know, like I said, I'm not optimistic that the result will be, I think that I'll voluntarily do without the other person. Another factor is, the judges have told us they want us to add five misdemeanor sessions a month, which, you know, is just an extra burden on us. So I guess what I would do, assuming you can't fill the other position today, is bring this up again roughly a month or more before, you know, if I were to determine that I would want to ask for it, I'd bring it up a month or so before it's vacant.

Councilmember Raben: Just as a matter of clarification, just so long as you did not hire anybody before that other line item was finished paying out, we could approve both today. You just, I mean, we can give you the go ahead today knowing that, until you're finished paying out of that other line item, you can't bring somebody in.

Stan Levco: Right, I, and that would, if I may, that would be my request. I can understand maybe you don't want to do it, but that's at least my request. I can tell you, I will give it a good faith effort and talk to everybody, and I will also tell you that the likelihood is I would probably would come to the conclusion that I want to fill it. But I'd at least be open minded about not.

Councilmember Raben: And one last question, just so we're clear, on this line item, the initial one, the 1080-1030 line, nobody is being paid out of that line item now. So that one is free and clear.

Stan Levco: Correct.

Councilmember Raben: Okay.

President Lloyd: So in your meeting, you're asking your attorneys to do more work with less resources and they don't seem to like that too much. Welcome to America. Yeah, welcome to county government.

Stan Levco: Right, it's just a question of how much of a burden it's going to be. You know, and the reality is, you could cut everybody a certain percentage and we'd function, we just wouldn't function as well. And it's just a question of how much less quality functioning you're willing to accept.

President Lloyd: Right, and your caseload is not going down.

Stan Levco: No, it's not.

President Lloyd: Mr. Bassemier, I think, was next.

Councilmember Bassemier: Mr. President, I don't think we – I think this is a legal question here. I'm not against hiring this person, but there's no paperwork on it, on this second person and can we do that, Jeff?

Jeff Ahlers: Well, technically, since the money is already in place, if it's not an appropriation request, I don't think there's any requirement that there had to be any prior advertising or anything like that. So I think, you know, from a legal standpoint, you guys could certainly do whatever your pleasure is. The issue would just be treating all these officeholders and these requests, if you're going to have a procedure of protocol, whether you want to deviate from it. But legally, it's certainly your prerogative, because he's not asking for additional money as I understand it. Now I guess if the person he wanted to hire, you were wanting to bring in or there was a request to have a step increase or something like that and it was going to require some sort of an appropriation, that would be different. But if it's somebody coming into an existing position where there is sufficient funds, you know, there is no reason to have legal notice.

President Lloyd: For the vacancy, do we know what line item that is in the budget?

Regene Newman: (Inaudible – comments not made from the microphone)

President Lloyd: We've got the one that's open now, but we don't have the new one that you're –

Regene Newman: 108W, it's a grant position.

Stan Levco: No, it's not. Is it?

Regene Newman: Uh-huh.

Councilmember Sutton: While she's looking, but isn't the reality, what we're doing through this is we're making a decision whether we're going to – we already have a list of positions in the various offices and we're deciding whether we will keep those lines in the budget, essentially is what we're doing. So if we do nothing, the position is still there, the line is still there, so really on the second opening he's got, I don't see there's really a need for us necessarily to act. We're not affecting that adversely or positively no matter how you look at it. So when that position is really, when he actually can fill it with, once that person has exhausted their time, then we can

actually begin to act. So, I mean, I think really the only recourse we have today is really to act on what we have before us and that's the initial position, the first position, and the second position, we still have an opportunity to – because he can't fill the position anyway.

President Lloyd: The letter we have from Mr. Levco states he is requesting permission to fill a full-time deputy prosecutor for the vacant position, and that's kind of what's on the agenda here. Mr. Shetler is next.

Councilmember Shetler: I was just wondering, when you go to hiring this request, if you would do it with, keeping in mind that you're going to have the more experienced higher level position that's becoming vacant very shortly or already has. And if you do that, then in three months, that person perhaps could roll into that higher position and then we could entertain your earlier thought that I really liked, of trying the trial for a couple months of seeing if we could reduce the staff. And I do appreciate it. I think what's happening here is really, Mr. Levco is really coming before us to comply with our request, which is the hiring freeze, and then seeking our permission to hire someone even though it's all legal and possible, and there's the line item sitting there, he's asking for that permission based on our hiring freeze. And that's what it really boils down to. So that's, I think if we go about it in that process, that maybe if you're able to hire someone at this level today, fill that, and then maybe it's a more qualified person than would normally take that position in hopes that they'll be able to be the one rolling over to that higher position later on. It might work for you. I don't –

Stan Levco: But it's really, unfortunately for me, I guess, the fact that it's a higher position gives me no benefit because it becomes an entry level position and I can potentially go before some committee to get them their longevity raise up to five years or something, but this particular position is one of the longest longevity so that I won't be able to hire an experienced person for this position or experience anything close to what this person has. So I'm looking at hiring essentially two entry level positions. From my perspective, I don't see any difference other than anybody who comes in and applies, if they've had a lot of experience, I might be able to go through one of your committees and get them a small bump, you know, a five year bump, but this is like, way more than five years. So again, it's going to be way less in salary no matter what experience they have and very possibly be an entry level position, both of them.

President Lloyd: Mike, did he answer your question?

Councilmember Goebel: Mr. Shetler brought up the points I was going to ask.

President Lloyd: Any other questions?

Councilmember Kiefer: Comment here.

President Lloyd: Mr. Kiefer.

Councilmember Kiefer: It sounds like to me that either way we go, it's going to save the county money because it's going to be a person hired in at a much smaller salary.

Stan Levco: I think at least 30,000 difference.

Councilmember Kiefer: Yeah. From my viewpoint, I would see that you're probably

going to struggle along anyway, even if you had both new positions filled because they're not going to be as productive as your senior people, but with that said, you've got three months, I think some of the Councilmembers want to wait until maybe next month's meeting to vote on this other position, which, from your standpoint, that shouldn't hurt you in your interviewing time line because you've got a stack of people waiting. So with that, I'd like to move that we approve the one request that he has and call for a vote.

President Lloyd: Okay, there's a motion, and that would be to fill position 1030, which is the Deputy that left in January. Any other discussion? Is there a second?

Councilmember Shetler: I'll second that.

President Lloyd: Mr. Shetler seconded. Any other discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. So you have permission to fill one vacancy.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

Stan Levco: Okay, thank you. And I think what I'm going to do is, I'm going to set a time, roughly two months from now and go over this, and if it's my guess, we feel like we need the other position, I'll be back, at least try to be back at least a month before that salary runs out. And if not, I guess I'll let you know I'm not coming back.

Councilmember Sutton: One more question before you take off. What is your expected time table in filling this position that we've –

Stan Levco: As soon as I can. I don't have anybody in mind, so I'd say within a month.

President Lloyd: Great. Thank you.

**2010 COMPENSATION AGREEMENT IN LIEU OF STATUTORY FEES
BETWEEN SHERIFF ERIC WILLIAMS AND VANDERBURGH COUNTY**

2010 AGREEMENT TO OPERATE COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS

President Lloyd: Nine C, Sheriff Eric Williams, two contracts: Operating Community Corrections and Compensation In Lieu of Statutory Fees between Sheriff Williams and Vanderburgh County, and I think Mr. Ahlers has reviewed these contracts as well. The Sheriff is coming to the mic.

Jeff Ahlers: Yes, I've looked at those and at the last meeting I had asked the Sheriff, and he confirmed, I thought they looked familiar, they're the same as they've been in the past years, I think we just changed the dates on them. And the Commissioners and County Attorney have already looked at them. The Commissioners have already approved, so they're the same as we've had in the past, so unless there is any substantive changes that anyone wants, procedurally, they're in order.

Councilmember Bassemier: Make a motion to approve to get it on the floor.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Bassemier. Is there a second?

Councilmember Goebel: Second.

President Lloyd: Second Mr. Goebel. Any questions? We have Sheriff Williams here. Good morning.

Eric Williams: Good morning.

President Lloyd: Any questions about the contracts which are the same language as we've had in the past? What's the term on those? One year?

Eric Williams: Yes, sir.

President Lloyd: Okay. Mr. Bassemier, was your motion to approve both contracts or just one?

Councilmember Bassemier: Both of them.

President Lloyd: And the seconder agrees with that? Okay, Mr. Goebel agrees. Any other discussion, questions for the Sheriff? Okay, roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. The contracts are approved by the County Council. Appreciate it.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

Eric Williams: While I'm up here, just so you know, this statute on the sheriff's salary changes effective the first of next year, so that whole system will change and there will be a different way of handling it. So just so you're aware of that. And if I could have one minute of you all's time, I'd like to hand you something. Real quickly, what I handed you is a copy of a national publication that comes out. It's the second edition of a magazine that's published by the National Sheriff's Association, it goes to every sheriff in the country. But it's also, they produce two magazines, one called *The Sheriff* and one called *Deputy and Court Officer*. And I just thought you'd like to see that the second edition of *Deputy and Court Officer*, the cover features one of Vanderburgh County's deputy sheriffs and there's a five page article about our office. So I think it speaks volumes about the quality of people we do have. So I thought I'd share that with you.

Councilmember Sutton: Congratulations.

Councilmember Goebel: I recognize the cornfield.

President Lloyd: Okay, *Deputy and Court Officer*, I'll have to start reading that.

Eric Williams: Pretty exciting stuff.

President Lloyd: Alright, thank you, Sheriff.

BURDETTE PARK REQUEST TO HIRE PART-TIME EMPLOYEES
--

President Lloyd: We'll move to item D under item nine, request to fill part-time vacancies. We have Burdette Park here. Mr. Craig.

Steve Craig: Steve Craig, Manager of Burdette, and I am appearing here today to ask permission to start hiring my part-time and seasonal help for 2010. And this will be done according to the guidelines in the Burdette Park part-time salary exhibit G.

President Lloyd: Okay, is there any questions for Mr. Craig? What time do you normally start hiring them? I mean, is it in March?

Steve Craig: Yes, I've actually had some meetings with my management people already for the summer, it was not on the payroll, but we've already met and we will start bringing people in for maintenance at the pool and start planning for the summer.

President Lloyd: Do you know what the balance is in that line item for the part-time?

Steve Craig: As of today?

President Lloyd: Or just roughly.

Steve Craig: Approximately \$450,000, maybe a little bit more. The one thing that I did want to bring to your attention was that when we had our raise, the federal minimum wage raise, that we went from 5.85 two years ago to 7.25. And in that time, the amount of monies that I have received in my other employee's account has not raised, so it will be something I'm trying to deal with, but the substantial amount, last year we actually had 72,500 part-time hours, so take that times \$1.40 raise, there is going to be some kind of adjustment needed to be made later in the year, but I'm going to try to deal with it the best I can as of now.

President Lloyd: Okay, Mr. Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Steve, you're going to follow basically the same procedure you've had in the past as far as your hiring goes?

Steve Craig: Yes, the exhibit G tells me how much I can pay them per hour and how many people I can have in each position and it's all laid out. And it is, the whole thing, we've ran off of that, I guess, for 25 years.

Councilmember Goebel: And most of your hires are college, high school age for the summer time?

Steve Craig: I've got them in all different ages. I hire several retirees, they work for me three or four months out of the year, and then they head to Florida in the winter. But I do have some retirees, they make excellent employees, have good work ethics, always there on time.

Councilmember Goebel: That's a good thing.

Steve Craig: Yes, that is.

President Lloyd: Other questions? Yes, Mr. Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: Things like commissary or concessions, and different things, those are all paid out of a separate deal?

Steve Craig: Yes, sir, they come out of a reverting account, what they're all paid out of, the money that we make off of that account.

Councilmember Shetler: Okay, and those kind of run independently, that money doesn't go through the general fund and those expenses don't go through the general fund at all.

Steve Craig: No, sir, they don't.

Councilmember Shetler: Alright, thank you.

President Lloyd: Any other questions?

Councilmember Sutton: Mr. President, I move approval.

Councilmember Shetler: Second.

President Lloyd: Motion Mr. Sutton, second Mr. Shetler. Any other discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. Motion passes seven-zero to fill the part-timers.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

Steve Craig: Thank you very much.

CORONER REQUEST TO HIRE PART-TIME EMPLOYEE

President Lloyd: Item E, Coroner, request to fill part-time employee. Mrs. Groves is here. Questions, comments? Mr. Raben?

Councilmember Raben: No questions, just a comment that this is one I don't think we can do without. We need to go ahead and approve.

President Lloyd: What is the position?

Annie Groves: It's a part-time deputy coroner.

President Lloyd: Okay, and Mr. Raben made a motion, is there a second?

Councilmember Sutton: Second.

President Lloyd: Second Mr. Sutton. Any other discussion? Mr. Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: And this will be cost neutral as well? Is that correct?

Annie Groves: It's all out of the same line item. It doesn't matter if I have ten or twenty.

Councilmember Goebel: I knew that, I just wanted to make sure everyone else did. Thank you.

Councilmember Bassemier: Annie, you and I talked, you've already got that employee in place and we almost tried to swear him in last week, but a week delay, was he okay with that?

Annie Groves: Yeah, we've got him sworn in now.

Councilmember Bassemier: Okay, good deal.

President Lloyd: Other questions? And I understand from the Auditor, you are in the process of getting the wage increase?

Annie Groves: I've already received that.

President Lloyd: Okay, so that was what the Council approved back in –

Annie Groves: They approved that last month and the State Board approved it yesterday, so that's been approved.

President Lloyd: Alrighty. Motion and a second. Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. Motion approved for the hiring. Thank you.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

Annie Groves: Thank you.

HEALTH DEPARTMENT TRAVEL REQUEST

President Lloyd: We'll move to item F, travel requests. Number one is the Health Department.

Gary Heck: Gary Heck, Vanderburgh County Health Department. I'll be happy to try to answer any questions you may have. There is several travel requests. We get requests and we're trying to live with the 30 days advance notice. We've given the State Department of Health notice that we need to have as much advance notice, hopefully, 30 days so we can honor the County Council's request. We don't always get that amount of time. Some of the requests are fulfilling parts of a grant requirement, others are for training or to attend a workshop to maintain certification. One example would be, there is a pest applicators training request that's in front of you. Occasionally, there is a request to attend one of the professional associations, the Indiana Environmental Health Association has meetings on a quarterly basis, so there is just no telling how many requests we have. Some of these are quarterly meetings, and I think the staff submitted them for each quarter throughout the rest of the year. There was one date change on the one in May where they moved it up a day from the one that you had originally and we filed a correction with it.

President Lloyd: I think, mechanically, if we approve something and the date changes, I think it's still approved. That doesn't really matter.

Gary Heck: Okay.

President Lloyd: But I appreciate the...the majority of these are state called. There are some that are, I guess, discretionary, but it's state associations, basically.

Gary Heck: That's correct.

President Lloyd: So we've got thirteen from the Health Department, is there a motion to approve?

Councilmember Shetler: So moved.

President Lloyd: Is there a second?

Councilmember Sutton: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Shetler, second Mr. Sutton. Any other discussion, questions? Mr. Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Just a question. Is this it for the travel, then, for the year?

Gary Heck: That's it for this month. This doesn't come out of the general fund. This

comes out of the Health Department's either travel line item or – but we have no idea how many additional travel requests we could have, state called meetings because the state sends them out whenever they get them scheduled. It's not unusual for us to have this many each month.

President Lloyd: Okay. So this will cover us for March.

Councilmember Raben: That's a lot of travel for one month.

Gary Heck: Most of these dates are – well, there's a lot for March but there's some for May, August and November, I believe, in here as well, just like I said, they submitted, at least three of them were for quarterly meetings. But I don't want to mislead you, we have almost this many every month, requests.

Councilmember Sutton: Well, this is one of the offices where they've got federal, state, local requirements from a health standpoint, from a safety standpoint, so you guys have a number of different things that you have to stay up on unlike any of our other offices. And if you are behind on new regulations and new laws that come forward or new procedures that are put out and put you at a –

Gary Heck: It can certainly have a negative impact on the citizens of Vanderburgh County and their health, and we certainly wouldn't want that.

Councilmember Sutton: I'd like to see more of those meetings down here but there's a little trouble getting the northern part of the state to come down to the southern part of the state.

Councilmember Raben: There's none of these available by web?

Gary Heck: We have web conferences and we take advantage and use those whenever they are available. But we wouldn't be submitting a request to you for that. These are just the ones where there's actually physical travel required.

President Lloyd: Okay, I think Mr. Goebel was next.

Councilmember Goebel: Yes, I notice a couple or at least one in here at zero cost to us, which that's a no-brainer, but do you, basically, does your department attend every meeting that's called because you have so many requests, or do you turn some of those requests away?

Gary Heck: Oh no, there's no way we could go to every meeting that we've been invited to. These are just the ones that in the opinion of the management supervisor staff, it's required in order for them to remain current with either their certification or professional licenses, or whatever. No, there's several that you'll never see because I won't send them to you. These are just the ones that work their way to the top that there is some value for us to be able to attend them.

Councilmember Goebel: I understand that. Maybe you could give us a reflection each month when you come in with this number, how many you decided not to attend so we could get a little bit of a sense of balance. But, I don't know, that might be too much work, too.

Gary Heck: Well, it would be busy work, but I'd be happy to try to do it if you'd like.

Councilmember Goebel: Okay, I don't know if it's necessary. Thank you.

President Lloyd: Or maybe we could just get that for one month just to see what it is.

Gary Heck: Okay.

President Lloyd: I mean, it could just be on a sheet of paper, just a summary. Any other questions? Okay, we've got a motion and a second. All in favor signify by saying aye.

(All Councilmembers voted affirmatively)

President Lloyd: Is there any opposed?

(No opposing votes were cast)

President Lloyd: Seven-zero.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

Gary Heck: Thank you.

President Lloyd: Okay, so the Health department travel was approved.

DRUG & ALCOHOL DEFERRAL SERVICE TRAVEL REQUEST

President Lloyd: Item number 2F, DADS, Drug & Alcohol Deferral Service. Is anyone from DADS here? One of them is three day training, cost of the trip is \$78. The other one is two overnights and it would be \$450. Any questions or comments from Council?

Councilmember Sutton: I move approval.

Councilmember Bassemier: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion to approve Mr. Sutton, second Mr. Bassemier, unless we wanted to not approve since they didn't show up. Any comments? Mr. Raben?

Councilmember Raben: I don't know, because this is a recent shift on to our desk, I mean, it may be customary for the last several years that they didn't have to show. So...

President Lloyd: Okay, nobody communicated to them is what I'm hearing. Okay. Alright, we've got a motion and a second. Mr. Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Well, this one is not a state called meeting.

Councilmember Goebel: Have plans been made, I guess, to attend because it's March 10 and 11, it would be hard to reject it at this point, maybe.

Councilmember Kiefer: Perhaps we can send them a letter saying for the future (inaudible – microphone not turned on)

President Lloyd: Alright, we'll ask Mrs. Deig to send a letter to them requesting that. I'd be happy to sign that. Okay, any other discussion? All those in favor, signify by

saying aye.

(All Councilmembers voted affirmatively except President Lloyd)

President Lloyd: Those opposed? I'll say aye, I oppose since they didn't come. Six to one, it passes for approval of both.

(Motion carried 6-1/President Lloyd opposed)

COUNTY COMMISSIONERS TRAVEL REQUEST
--

President Lloyd: Okay, the next item would be County Commissioners road school. Any questions from Council? Actually, I did talk to all of our Commissioners yesterday and Commissioner Melcher did mention the road school and indicated that they received a lot of good information there and he thought it was a worthwhile endeavor. So you can point that as, that the commissioners have communicated, they requested we would approve this. Any questions from Council? Total budgeted cost \$2,000, and this is an annual thing at Purdue, but it's not state called, it's an optional thing but a lot of vendors there and services for highway projects. Any questions? Alright, is there a motion to approve?

Councilmember Shetler: So moved.

President Lloyd: Is there a second?

Councilmember Bassemier: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Shetler, second was Mr. Bassemier? Okay. All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

(All Councilmembers voted affirmatively)

President Lloyd: Those opposed? Aye. I approved it, I'm sorry. Seven-zero.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

AREA PLAN TRAVEL REQUEST

President Lloyd: Okay, next we'll go to F, number 4, Area Plan.

Brad Mills: Good morning, Brad Mills. I'd be happy to answer any questions.

President Lloyd: Request for American Planning Association National Conference, New Orleans, Louisiana. And this comes out of Area Plan Commission budget?

Brad Mills: That's correct.

President Lloyd: Questions? Mr. Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: I'm just smiling because you said New Orleans.

President Lloyd: I didn't know if you were volunteering to accompany Mr. Mills.

Brad Mills: And this will just be for the travel and the hotel. You all don't give me

budget to pay for the registration, so I have to pay for that separately.

Councilmember Kiefer: Have you been down there, I mean, to this event before?

Brad Mills: I go to the conference annually or if I don't, I send someone from my staff. So we get a lot of valuable information.

Councilmember Kiefer: Sampling, can you give any –

Brad Mills: We get all sorts of stuff from things like the road diet project that we did on Lincoln Avenue was something that we heard about and talked about at conference. I get both Area Plan Commission information and some stuff that's valuable for the Metropolitan Planning Organization as well. It's a vast array of information.

Councilmember Kiefer: I'd be interested in hearing back on some of the things you picked up that might be beneficial to the county upon return. That would be great.

Brad Mills: Okay.

Councilmember Sutton: Councilman Kiefer, if you look back in the material, there is information on some of the sessions. One of the sessions I think that would give great benefit to us, there is one that talks about planning for regional mobility and then there's one that deals with rural land use and transportation coordination that could use some thought regarding some of the issues that we're focusing around transportation here locally and some of the limitations that we have and how to address them, in particular public transportation still continues to be an issue and moving people from place to place. So that might be something worth –

Councilmember Kiefer: Councilman Sutton, I agree with you that these programs are great. I just think it would be nice if the various departments that go on these could just come back with hey, share some of the great ideas they picked up, you know, so we know that there's something being learned at these conferences.

Councilmember Bassemier: Make a motion to approve.

Councilmember Sutton: Second.

President Lloyd: Motion Mr. Bassemier, second Mr. Sutton. Any other discussion? It's in your regular budget which is the budget funded by city and county and this is something that you budget for every year wherever they have the national conference.

Brad Mills: That's correct.

President Lloyd: So I want to clarify that, it is tax dollars, it's part of your budget but it is something that's been approved in the past.

Brad Mills: Yes.

President Lloyd: Any other questions from Council? Okay, we have a motion and a second. All in favor signify by saying aye.

(All Councilmembers voted affirmatively)

President Lloyd: Opposed?

(No opposing votes were cast)

President Lloyd: It passes seven-zero. Thank you.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

COUNTY ASSESSOR TRAVEL REQUEST

President Lloyd: Okay, item number 9F5, County Assessor, IAAO course. Okay, I guess one point of information here, this is training, so we've kind of gone back and forth, but I guess you could argue that it's not state called, but it is training for the level.

Jonathan Weaver: It's state sponsored, I guess, and that's where we got into the little conversation here about that. Good morning, I'm Jonathan Weaver, your Vanderburgh County Assessor.

President Lloyd: Okay. And we have, I guess, one of the questions, and we had a phone conversation as well, that the requirements are increasing for those working on real property. That's kind of what your information is telling us as well. In the past, you could hire anybody off the street and they could be trained, but now what we're seeing is, I guess some period of time, that employee would have to have training at least to be a Level II.

Jonathan Weaver: A Level II right now and then eventually Level III, that's correct. Yes.

President Lloyd: You had indicated, I guess the people in your department that work on real property, there's like, approximately 15?

Jonathan Weaver: It's about 17. And then we have people that deal with the trending, so we're estimating about 25 eventually will have to earn this Level III.

President Lloyd: Okay, questions from Councilmembers? Mr. Shetler?

Councilmember Sutton: So right now, of those 17 or 25 potential, how many do you have right now that have the Level III?

Jonathan Weaver: Three of us, Ms. Koob behind me, Jackie Fox and myself.

Councilmember Shetler: And everyone, regardless of if they're supervisors or not, the way you're interpreting it right now, that you're going to have to have that –

Jonathan Weaver: Well, we're looking at the real estate division, the trending and then it probably would be good for all the department heads to have it also.

Councilmember Shetler: Okay, so like, I was kind of reviewing your plan the other day that you had submitted to us last year. I don't think that was included in there, but so if that were a part of it, you would say that your plan in the future would be to have 25 people certified with that Level III.

Jonathan Weaver: That would be the goal, yes.

Councilmember Shetler: Does the Chief Deputy, does she or –

Jonathan Weaver: She would qualify for that, too.

Councilmember Shetler: Does she have it, currently, the Level III?

Jonathan Weaver: She has a Level II.

Councilmember Shetler: Is this class offered at other times of the year or is this –

Jonathan Weaver: They're offered quarterly, the state pays for two people from each county for the course.

Councilmember Shetler: And you have the three, currently you have the Level III?

Jonathan Weaver: I have a Level III, yes.

Councilmember Shetler: Okay, so obviously you have the Level II, then?

Jonathan Weaver: I have a Level I, Level II and Level III.

Councilmember Shetler: And I know some of this is by statute, what's the difference between III and the II? I mean, can you quickly or briefly tell us what –

Jonathan Weaver: There's going to be a drastic difference. It's really going to weed out a lot of people. The Level I and Level II courses, Level I was residential, week-long course. Level II was commercial and industrial, it was a week-long course. Now to earn your Level III you need to take four week-long courses, and then another course that's about two days, and then there's an exam at the end of those courses, and you have to pass them.

Councilmember Shetler: Well, I guess my question was really more in terms of substance, I mean, is there higher levels of calculations or do you have to take on more responsibility? I mean, what kind of details are involved there?

Jonathan Weaver: The first course is fundamentals of real property, I believe, and then you have the income approach to value is the second course. Then you have USPAP, rules of appraisal, basically, and then you have a mass appraisal course, and then you have assessment administration.

Councilmember Shetler: Right now, there's nothing that calls for in the statute to pay additional for the Level III, that's –

Jonathan Weaver: I thought it was \$500 per person, but I'd have to check that for you.

Councilmember Shetler: Okay, above the \$1,000 that –

Jonathan Weaver: Yes, and they're actually looking at maybe giving the Assessors who earn a Level III a bigger raise at the state house right now.

President Lloyd: Mr. Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Mr. Assessor, did you say that the state pays for two employees every quarter to do this?

Jonathan Weaver: Yes.

Councilmember Kiefer: So every quarter we could send two employees and it wouldn't cost the county anything? They would get this paid for by the –

Jonathan Weaver: Well, the course is \$375, they're going to pay the cost of the course, but the hotel reimbursement and mileage will come out of our, we have to pay for that.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay.

President Lloyd: Mr. Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Good morning, Jonathan. With the number of people who are involved in this and the number of people in this area, I notice that the training sessions are mainly at Ivy Tech branches?

Jonathan Weaver: Throughout the state, yes.

Councilmember Goebel: But not in our Ivy Tech branch. Is there a chance that we can request from the state that they put on this seminar here? It would cost, I think, a lot less for them to send the instructors here than for us to have to make that type of travel especially using the mechanism of Ivy Tech.

Jonathan Weaver: That's something we can use The Centre also to host courses.

Councilmember Goebel: Would you mind looking into that?

Jonathan Weaver: No, I can do that. Last month, in January, I actually hosted a course here for my staff.

Councilmember Shetler: This past – '09?

Jonathan Weaver: 2010. Yeah, the last week in January.

Councilmember Shetler: You hosted one for your staff but it wasn't certified?

Jonathan Weaver: It was an appraisal of land course.

Councilmember Kiefer: Do they get credit for that?

Jonathan Weaver: They get continuing ed credit hours for their Level II's, yes.

President Lloyd: You know, we had also sent an email to the DLGF, I guess, asking about this and Barry Wood said that we would like to see all deputies have their Level II since this would give taxpayers confidence that person is competent in property assessment matters. At a bare minimum, I think that in addition to the elected Assessor, the Chief Deputy should have a Level II, and anyone else responsible for setting values, eg supervisory level would be a Level II, so that would be the supervisors in the property department. There's clerical people there, but they don't really set values, do they?

Jonathan Weaver: Well, what I'm reading here is after June 30th '09, an employee of the county assessor who performs real property assessing duties must have a level of certification that the county assessor is required to attain under I.C. 3-8-1-23.

President Lloyd: Okay, but if someone answers the phone for real property, they don't have to be a Level II or a Level III, they're not setting values.

Jonathan Weaver: Well, I think, anybody that's in the real estate department is dealing with real property and needs to be certified.

President Lloyd: But are they setting values?

Jonathan Weaver: Yes.

President Lloyd: They are?

Jonathan Weaver: A lot of people in the office are dealing with values on a daily basis.

Councilmember Raben: What about field workers, people that are just measuring, taking photos, stuff like that. We're not –

Jonathan Weaver: They have Level II's, also, at this point.

Councilmember Raben: Okay. But I'm just trying to figure out how we can get out of this bag that we're in on getting everybody certified to Level II or Level III. I think what Russ was asking is, you know, that you're not actually calculating values and stuff like that, if you're just gathering information, do those people need to go further than where they're at today?

Jonathan Weaver: The way I understand it is all employees, at some point, that are dealing, and they're all dealing with this in the real estate division, you know, need to have the correct certifications.

Councilmember Kiefer: Mr. Ahlers, could you check? I mean, because this language is confusing to me. I mean, I read what he provided us and it seems pretty clear that, you know, must have a level of certification that the County Assessor is required to obtain. And I'd like to get your, you know, maybe you can do some research on that and get an opinion because I know state law sometimes can be confusing, how it's written.

Jeff Ahlers: What is it that you're seeking an opinion –

Councilmember Kiefer: That first paragraph on this page that he's provided.

Jeff Ahlers: Oh, I don't have that, I don't think. I was looking at the actual statute itself that talked about if they're going to perform assessing duties, if that's what you're requesting. I don't know if I have the sheet –

Councilmember Kiefer: Well, it clearly states in this first paragraph and he's –

Jeff Ahlers: Okay, that's the same thing I've got, it's just in a different format. So you're asking, I mean, I guess the question is, it's just simply who is performing real property assessing duties and we have, I don't know if you have it in front of you, Mr. Kiefer, there is a letter from Barry Wood.

(Tape changed)

– my thought is, I'm more than happy to call him, but my thought is that is probably about as much clarification as you're going to get in terms of defining assessing duties to a certain extent. I mean, you're going to be free to do that yourself, I guess, until the state tells you otherwise. It's just a matter of, you know, are you going to go through each position, I suppose where someone would need to work with the assessor, I guess, and determine at what point some of the employees, if what they do is information gathering as opposed to actually assessing and setting real property values. And so, I mean, that legally is, I think, your distinction. The question is, who is going to work with the Assessor and go through those positions, I guess, and if there is a disagreement, make that determination. I mean, ultimately, that is your call and if the DLGF or someone says something different, then I guess we address it then. But, I mean, I guess that's what I read this to as saying, I'm more than happy to call the guy, but the statute says what it says. And it's, you're right, like a lot of statutes there's, you know, maybe not as much detail as you'd like, but I think Mr. Wood makes the attempt to distinguish that.

Councilmember Kiefer: Well, the way I read his email was that, really, the staff only has to be Level II, I mean, that's the way I interpreted his email, except the Assessor needs to be a Level III.

Jeff Ahlers: Oh, I see what you're saying. If that's your question, I agree with that. I thought that your question was on the Level II in terms of who has assessing duties.

Councilmember Kiefer: No, what I'm questioning is, the one paragraph says an employee of the County Assessor performs real property assessing duties must have the level of certification that the County Assessor is required. Well, it clearly says the County Assessor now has to, as of, in 2014, you know, he's going to have to be a Level III.

Jeff Ahlers: And I think I would interpret that, of course, a lot can happen between now and 2014, or whatever the legislature or DLGF does. But I guess I would say that then that means by 2014 you're looking at some of these people having to ratchet up to a Level III.

Councilmember Kiefer: And I guess then the question would be, how many can we ratchet it up, how quickly could that be ratcheted up? Maybe it all gets done in six months, I don't know.

Jeff Ahlers: I mean, one of the things I would suggest, and I don't know if he's done that or I'm not sure who the liaison is for the Assessor, but I guess if you could get some sort of a matrix to determine at least from the Assessor's point of view, I guess, what specific positions it is determined perform actual assessing duties as opposed to information gathering that would fall under the requirement to get some of these certifications. And ultimately, I suppose if the Council is going to have some job descriptions or reviews of various offices, that may be something that will occur between now and 2014 in terms of, perhaps, you can actually define in the job description which ones are going to perform assessing duties and which ones aren't, perhaps, might be the way to do it. But going forward, I understand that it doesn't help you today, but going forward –

Councilmember Kiefer: So the only downside to having Level III's, I mean, obviously, the upside is they're better educated, they understand what they're doing more because of their training. The downside is \$500 extra per year is what they get paid plus the cost of the travel expenses because the state actually pays for the

registration, two per quarter. Am I understanding that correctly?

Councilmember Shetler: Well, plus, once you sanctify that and put it into a line item and make that a requirement of the job, let's say, it makes it harder to replace, which drives up the cost of the employee, so then you end up putting them in higher classifications as far as county employees are concerned. So, I mean, we're talking about a cost that on the surface appears to be \$500, but in the long run, I mean, it could -- and I think education is a good thing. I think trying to educate your workforce and making them a whole lot more efficient and to be able to operate the office is a good thing for everyone to do. But there can get to be a point where it starts, first of all, making, because of competition, in the private sector, working its way towards the public sector and stealing employees and causing you then to elevate people a lot higher pace than what other offices might be. So, I mean, I think there's a lot of questions and issues that we might want to get into. I believe that going from these two employees today is probably a good thing and I think that we might need perhaps even a couple more. I don't know if we need 25. That scares me off a little bit here. But, you know, that's something we can evaluate later.

Councilmember Kiefer: It's definitely something we need to explore in further detail. I agree with that.

President Lloyd: Point of information: Mr. Kiefer is the liaison from the County Council.

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes, that's why I'm asking these questions.

Jeff Ahlers: Well, that's what I was going to say is, one of the things that you might consider doing as you're doing these job classification reviews, is I guess it would be similar to, now just if you said in the Prosecutor's office, does everybody in that office have to be an attorney or have a law license? No. Are there paralegals that gather information that do certain tasks to help the lawyers or perhaps even prepare some drafts of documents, but ultimately, if it is, you know, a lawyer that perhaps has to review and make the final approval or changes, maybe that's the person that has to have that level of licensure. And so, in part, to answer some of these questions, whenever you say, how many do we need, you know, perhaps that's how you have to fit that in the framework and say, how many do you have to have to ultimately look over.

Councilmember Kiefer: And that gets back to what we said a few weeks ago or a few months ago, why it might be important to review this office, do that study, you know, to look at the processes and how they operate, you know, which the Assessor agreed to allow us to do that. So all the more reason why that might important to do that review. And I, Councilman Lloyd, Mr. President, I can't remember where we were at on that. What was the next step on -- somebody was going to come down and make a presentation to Council, I believe.

President Lloyd: Right, that has not been scheduled. I guess it's on hold but we can certainly look at that.

Councilmember Kiefer: Thank you.

President Lloyd: Just a quick question, I know, I like to match these up in the salary ordinance. You've got Mr. Gowen, his title is Deputy Assistant Personal Property Data Analysis Tech, and then Mr. Samples, his title is Network Supervisor. Is that a computer position or is that related to real property?

Glen Koob: Excuse me. Mr. Samples helps me with trending. He's the one that runs the programs and develops databases to help do trending, so it's important for him. Jim has a couple of hats. Right now, he is working with the GIS. Also he's been, GIS training. You really can't put the Assessor's office in categories. We've got so much stuff to do, the data collectors, and you were talking about earlier, they also come in and data enter because we don't have enough people to do that. So yes, they are setting values, the ones that go out in the field and data collect. Just to answer that question for you. But anyway, Mr. Gowen, what I would like for him to do is when we go into Reassessment, he goes in and puts the assessed values into neighborhoods so you can look at a map and say, in GIS, so you can look at the map and say, okay, this is what the values are in this neighborhood. Why is this value lower over here or higher? That's what Mr. Gowen does and Mr. Samples helps develop the databases also. And if I might answer Mr. Goebel's question about, we do use Ivy Tech and the state has hired a company called Brilljent, and they come down here four times a year, each quarter, and teach us classes for free. The state hires them to come down and do that. But we also, besides getting our Level I, II or III, we also have to have 45 hours of continuing ed every year or they will take that away from us. And that's the reason why they offer those classes for free. Now, that is through the state. What the level, just so I can explain some of this to you, what we do to attain the Level III, it is put out by the IAAO, which is an organization that goes into income approach. You can go into that website if you're a member and you can look at any property in the United States that might compare to yours. For an example, if I can use this, Whirlpool. How many plants do you know in town that compares to Whirlpool to set a value on it? You know, so that's an example of what they do. They teach income approach, they teach all kinds of formulas, it's a very, for me, a traumatic experience. I started in 1987 getting this, took a hiatus for a few years and finally got my Level III. When they said that those are the requirements, they just set those requirements for a Level III, I think it was last year, wasn't it, Jonathan? Yes. So, and I had already had three of those classes and needed two more, so that's a week long class and then at the end, what did Jonathan say, it's a closed book test. And it probably could be a six week class, but they have to put it in there to get the people that are working, the assessors, you know enough time to get these courses. So they just offer them for a week. So they are traumatic to take those, for me it was. I'm sorry, Mr. President, did you need anything?

President Lloyd: Well, no, I just, when I looked at the title Network Supervisor, it sounded like the person was handling computers, and I'm not sure that would be related to real property. And what you're saying, is based on the trending, it is.

Glen Koob: Yes, he is. He's the one that runs the – we have to price everything. He has to give the narrative to the state. Then they will come, the state works through him. The computer, David Schwab and Jeff Volz, they come back and work through the computer person because of the fact that he does the narrative and that kind of stuff. If there is something wrong, if they could see sales chasing or if they see some neighborhood that they think is out of whack, it comes back to him and then we go through and look and see what the problem is.

President Lloyd: Based on this state law, it sound like you want to get the supervisors before you get the other people. I mean, is that the plan?

Glen Koob: That would be great. I mean, it would be great to have them all because in the state, there's only 68 Level III's in the state. You know, so what Mr. Shetler said is totally right. Last year, as a matter of fact, they took two of our computer tech people, one of these, Tyler, because they're wanting – of course, they didn't have

Level III's, but they're capable of getting them. But somebody else has to pay for it now. But, they took two of our people, our computer people, last year, a vendor, I guess, you'd say.

President Lloyd: Okay, only 68 Level III's in the state.

Glen Koob: That's what I heard in January, wasn't that –

President Lloyd: 92 counties, so some of these counties are out of compliance unless they – I guess if they have elected officials, they're grandfathered in maybe.

Glen Koob: No, only 68 people in the state have that Level III. So if a vendor or whatever happens to have one, I guess, well then, they could hire them, but we have our own and we're saving thousands and thousands of dollars as you know by not hiring vendors.

President Lloyd: Right. Other questions? Mr. Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Just for clarification, so of the entire staff, which you do have a very large office today, how many are you, how many do you aim to seek the Level III?

Jonathan Weaver: Twenty-five.

Councilmember Raben: Twenty-five, and everybody else doesn't need a level certification?

Jonathan Weaver: No, they're not going to need their Level III at this point in time.

Glen Koob: Personal property people, transfer departments, maybe some of those. People that work on Sales Disclosures, they don't necessarily set values. We need their information in the real estate department because we use all that information except for maybe personal property.

Councilmember Raben: Twenty-five in addition to –

Jonathan Weaver: Well, it will be 22 extras since we –

Councilmember Raben: Twenty-two, so there's three today that have the Level III.

Jonathan Weaver: Glen, myself, and Jackie Fox.

Councilmember Raben: So 22 extra.

Jonathan Weaver: So we already have four percent of the Level III's in the state, so we're pretty proud of that.

Councilmember Raben: Are any of those 25 part-time individuals? They're all full-time, okay. You know, and I think everybody is saying the same thing, we, you know, your office of all offices needs to have the best tools, the most educated workforce we can put out there, so we don't want to hold anything back in that manner, but I do think if we can take a little time getting there, we need to do that because there's also the unforeseen threat of turnover of staff. So, you know, you try to hurry up and get 25 individuals their Level III, and you lose six of them in the next year or two years, that's –

Glen Koob: I think it will take two, two and a half years, maybe two years for any one person get that because they don't only offer them at –

President Lloyd: Glen, could you speak in the microphone please?

Glen Koob: Sorry, – I thought I had a big mouth. I don't think it – they offer them all over the United States and Kansas, and we're just fortunate enough that the people in Indiana are starting to sponsor these classes. Indianapolis sponsored several, Lafayette or Tippecanoe County, Evansville, we had one, you know, last week, and Valparaiso, Greensburg, Indiana, that little town, you know, they're all starting to sponsor these because all the people in Indiana need their Level III – not all of them, you know what I mean, the ones that need it. And that's the reason why the state of Indiana is starting to do that. We even have an Indiana chapter of the IAAO that helps to sponsor those classes.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, and I do like Mike's idea of possibly coordinating something with the local branch of Ivy Tech to possibly bring that course here. I have one last question, I see on, like, as an example, these two are going to the same class at the same time, both requesting mileage. Can we not –

Jonathan Weaver: Oh, they're going to car pool. Are they requesting separate miles?

Councilmember Raben: Separate mileage on both of them.

Jonathan Weaver: They'll be car pooling.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, so that would be, the mileage reduces the total request by \$222.40 then.

Jonathan Weaver: Just to give you an idea, it took me, we started this in 2008, in May of 2008. It took me from May to December to earn my Level III. So that was being vigilant about getting out there and getting educated from the DLGF Commissioner, the rules that were set.

President Lloyd: Okay, Mr. Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: I'd like to make a motion for approval. I do have a couple of things, though, that do concern me. I am, and I don't mean to be sitting in the position that I know everything about your office or trying to be running it or anything, but I am alarmed to have 25 people, and while I'm very supportive of people being educated, I am a little bit concerned to have that large of a staff that would have a Level III. And I'm a little skeptical, a little leery about that and I'd like to caution us to proceed on that a little slower. I think Mike's idea of utilizing local services to keep the cost of travel down, it would help immensely on that. I'm concerned about the long run costs, though. And the second thing that I do have concern on is that it would seem to me that the chief deputy, that that would be a highest priority because of them being in a supervisory role where everybody, if you're not present, pretty well reports to that person and I would think that having that certification would be most essential for that particular position. But other than that, I think that we need to get on the road with this and get more people certified, so I'll make a motion to approve the two that we have in front of us today.

President Lloyd: Do you want to subtract the one mileage? The request was \$1,600, if you subtract \$222, that's \$1,378.

Councilmember Shetler: With that one exception, I will move approval.

President Lloyd: Okay, there is a motion to approve. Is there a second?

Councilmember Raben: I'll second with one last comment. In the future, for future travel requests like this, if you would, put those under Reassessment and not General Fund unappropriated. And Glen, tell your nephew thanks for putting us in all this.

Glen Koob: Now you know what he went through for years. Well, as long as he's been there. I mean, it's never been easy, I know.

President Lloyd: Okay, we have a motion and a second. Any other discussion? All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

(All Councilmembers voted affirmatively)

President Lloyd: All opposed?

(No opposing votes were cast)

President Lloyd: I said aye, I approve. Seven-zero.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

President Lloyd: Thank you, Mr. Weaver.

Jonathan Weaver: Awesome. Thank you.

COUNTY CLERK TRAVEL REQUEST

President Lloyd: Next we have a travel request, County Clerk, Southern District Clerk's Association. Is the County Clerk here? I had talked to her a couple weeks ago, she mentioned this briefly. It's something that they normally go to. Total of \$60. Any questions from Councilmembers?

Councilmember Bassemier: Motion to approve.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Bassemier. Is there a second?

Councilmember Sutton: It's more than 60. That's just the registration fee. It's 288.

President Lloyd: Oh, 288, I'm sorry. You're right, the second page. Okay, 288. Mr. Bassemier made a motion to approve, is there a second?

Councilmember Shetler: Second.

President Lloyd: Second Mr. Shetler. Any discussion? All those in favor signify by saying aye.

(All Councilmembers voted affirmatively)

President Lloyd: Opposed?

(No opposing votes were cast)

President Lloyd: None. It passes seven-zero. Thank you.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

COUNTY ENGINEER TRAVEL REQUEST

President Lloyd: County Engineer, state called meeting, item 7. Any questions?

Councilmember Raben: Move approval.

Councilmember Shetler: Second.

President Lloyd: Total \$300. Motion Mr. Raben, second was it Mr. Shetler or Mr. Bassemier?

Teri Lukeman: Mr. Shetler.

President Lloyd: Mr. Shetler, okay. Any other questions? All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

(All Councilmembers voted affirmatively)

President Lloyd: Opposed?

(No opposing votes were cast)

President Lloyd: None. Seven-zero, it passes.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

AMENDMENTS TO SALARY ORDINANCE

President Lloyd: Okay, we'll go to item number 10, Amendments to Salary Ordinance. I'll turn that over to Mr. Shetler.

Councilmember Shetler: I think everybody was handed a copy of the Salary Ordinance amendments, so I would like to put this in the form of a motion for approval for the amendments to the Salary Ordinance.

Unidentified: (Inaudible – microphone not turned on)

Councilmember Shetler: So this can be placed as part of the record.

President Lloyd: Okay, there is a motion to approve the amendments to the Salary Ordinance. You've got eight departments: Weights & Measures, Legal Aid, County Highway, Cum Bridge, Prosecutor, Burdette Park, Coroner, Cooperative Extension. Motion Mr. Shetler, is there a second?

Councilmember Goebel: Second.

President Lloyd: Second Mr. Raben. Any discussion? Oh, second Mr. Goebel. I'm sorry. Since it's a Salary Ordinance, we'll do a roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. Salary Ordinance is approved, seven-zero, passes.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

ROYCE SUTTON NOTICE OF RESIGNATION

President Lloyd: Item 11, Public Comment. Is there anyone from the public that wishes to address the County Council?

Councilmember Sutton: Mr. President? If there aren't any public comments, there is something I would like to share.

President Lloyd: Okay, anyone coming forward to comment? Questions for Council? Okay, we gave you your chance. Item number 12, first we'll go to Mr. Sutton.

Councilmember Sutton: If you will allow me the opportunity, I want to read something here. Recently, I accepted a new professional opportunity with my company, Fifth Third Bank, that will require me to relocate my family to the St. Louis area. This is a tremendous opportunity for my family and I did not want to pass on it. And with this great professional opportunity, however, comes the uneasy reality of leaving my family, friends and the place that I was reared and nurtured. Evansville is where Lori, my wife, and I have raised our children and it is here where I've been given the opportunity to serve in a wonderful place to worship, serve the community, lead new initiatives, and a chance to make a difference in the community, in so many ways. Since 1992, I have been blessed to serve this community as its Third District County Councilman. I was re-elected four times and in 2006 was successful in garnering 64% of the vote. During my tenure on the Council, I led the implementation of the Initiative Based Assistance Program, that has provided vital childcare assistance to over 4,000 working families since 1997. Working moms and dads with modest

incomes have greatly benefitted from this wise use of riverboat gaming revenue. My efforts with former Councilman and present County Commissioner Lloyd Winnecke to create an affordable dental clinic became a reality in 2006. The clinic has aided over 3,000 families who need dental care, but who lack insurance. In the community, I've been fortunate to lead or been an instrumental part of organizing key initiatives like the Joshua Academy, the United Negro College Fund initiative, the Urban League Study Group, Front Door Pride and Bank on Evansville. I would have never imagined that this community would have afforded me the chance to serve in public office for over 17 years, when I entered politics in 1991 as an unknown City Council candidate. And over the years I found a conscientious and cooperative spirit on this County Council that has enabled me as one of the Democrat minority members to strategically work with the Republican majority party members to keep property tax rates low, expand economic development opportunities and ensure that the county is fiscally sound. And in this, it makes me confident in the county's future. However, I do firmly believe that the county benefits from a periodic, natural turnover in its leadership. It is with this turnover that allows new, fresh ideas to advance and bold visions to be cast. So, it's with some degree of mixed feelings that I realize that I will be unable to complete my other platform that I developed for the coming campaign, yet I am excited about the prospects of continuing my community service in a different city. I have tried to lead with integrity, honor, respect, honesty and with a goal of making things a little bit better for those who would follow. So today, I am officially announcing that I will no longer be a candidate for the Third District County Council seat, and that effective May 31st, I will resign my position on this Council. I've truly enjoyed the experience and I pray blessings upon our great community. And, Mr. President, thank you for the opportunity to share the words, and Councilmembers, I thank you for the opportunity. And you guys are the first ones really to, that I've shared this information with.

President Lloyd: Well, it's somewhat sudden because you were filed as a candidate so, I mean, you were fully intending to run for re-election.

Councilmember Sutton: Fully was intending to.

President Lloyd: But obviously, the Lord works in funny ways and you have opportunities come before you. So, I think all the Councilmembers probably want to have some comments. We'll just go down the row, start with Mr. Goebel.

Councilmember Goebel: Well, Royce, I thank you personally, and I think this Council does for all your leadership and the work you've done. This is quite a shock. I think, without a doubt, Vanderburgh County's loss will definitely become St. Louis' gain and I wish you very, very much luck and if you just keep being Royce Sutton, you're going to have good fortune ahead. And thank you for everything.

President Lloyd: Mr. Raben.

Councilmember Raben: I tell you, it's kind of a shocker for me.

Councilmember Sutton: We both had black hair when we first started on this Council.

Councilmember Raben: Well, I was going to make a little further comment. I know when I was a young lad, pretty much a kid when I came on and Royce was a kid, and, you know, the only difference is, he still looks like a kid today, where I look like a fat old gray-haired man. But it's been a huge honor to serve with you. This is quite a kick really, it really is. And I've served with Royce the longest of anybody here and it's been a great journey, and, you know, the intellectual values that you've

carried to this room every month have been huge and outstanding and it will be missed, believe me. And I appreciate the fact that the announcement came here because it would have really been a shock to have heard it, getting a few shocks here lately on what's happening here. So, thank you, and man, the best of luck. I'm sure you're going to be a huge success in St. Louis like you were in Evansville, Indiana.

Councilmember Sutton: I'm going to give it a try.

President Lloyd: Great, thank you. Mr. Kiefer?

Councilmember Sutton: My former, he's one of two opponents that I actually had, I've run against.

Councilmember Kiefer: That's what I was getting ready to say, that I feel blessed to be able to have served this last year with you on the County Council, because I really started my career, you know, although we were opponents, we ran somewhat side by side. You know, we worked together during that campaign and I think the community was served well with your election and hopefully, the community was served with me then moving on to the City Council. But I feel very blessed to have served this last year with you and gotten to know you over the years, and developed a friendship with you. And hopefully, you'll come back now and then at Thanksgiving and we can pick up that game of basketball again. But anyway, best of luck to you. God bless you and thank you for your service.

Councilmember Sutton: For those who don't know, Councilman Kiefer and I ran, it was his first campaign as he indicated and I was running at that time, and I don't know whose kids were the worst at the campaign events, mine or his. We tore up a lot of public spaces here in trying to corral kids and make speeches at the same time.

Councilmember Kiefer: But it was a great opportunity to get to know you and I'm very thankful for that.

Councilmember Sutton: Yeah, thank you.

President Lloyd: Mr. Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Royce, it's been an honor serving with you. You and I served together on the Council for 13 years. I ran against you once and you kicked my rear end and you was a gentleman about it and congratulated me for my hard work and everything. You was a real gentleman when I ran against you and we ran a good campaign together, and it's just been a shock to hear this today. But we're all going to miss you. And we all have learned a lot from you and appreciate everything you've given to the taxpayers and the County Council.

Councilmember Sutton: Thank you, Ed. It's been great.

President Lloyd: Mr. Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: First, just let me say congratulations, and it has been truly, as everyone has indicated, an honor. You mentioned that you've tried to be a man of integrity. Well, I don't think there is any question or doubt about that. My experience has been, you're definitely a man of honor and integrity and I've appreciated, even the limited work that we did on the dental clinic a few years ago

and you have, I think, been a soul and conscience of this group, and I greatly respect your opinions on a great deal of matters. And I appreciate what you've offered to us. So thank you.

Councilmember Sutton: Thank you very much.

President Lloyd: And I would say also, my second stint on the Council, appreciate serving with you. I think you've taught me many things and I think your list of accomplishments are many and it just shows the difference one person can make in our community, a person that is dedicated to certain things. So we'll miss you after May and good luck in the new position. It's been a pleasure to serve with you.

Councilmember Sutton: Thank you. One quick little story on our former mayor and president of our County Council. He was the only mayor that I can ever remember, and I've see a few of them come through here, that when there was a public event, he would get there early and he would stay all the way to the end. I was, like, how does he do it? I mean, two hour programs, three hour programs, because he was just that kind of person who was interested in hearing, being there and supportive of different community events and I've always respected that. Thank you.

President Lloyd: Thank you. And some of those were services at your church. Those were long. Any other questions, comments, concerns from Council? That's certainly big news and we'll let that filter through.

Councilmember Raben: Just one last comment before closing, we've got our first balance sheet today or financial statement. Everybody needs to look at that. We don't need to go over it today, but, you know, we knew it was going to be a tight year and earnings on investments and stuff, I'm sure, are down significantly, so we're going to have to be really tight budgeted this year. We've got plenty of surplus funds, you know, for any emergencies, but it's not going to be as easy as what we've seen in the past. So everybody come in here with a game face on, ready to be frugal for the next ten months.

Councilmember Sutton: Or two months.

Councilmember Kiefer: I'd like to echo what Councilman Raben said, because I don't know if everybody had a chance to read the morning *Courier*, but obviously, the state of Indiana is in dire straits and we all know how what happens at the state ultimately reflects back, what happens here in the county and the city. And it's going to put some pressure on us.

President Lloyd: It all flows downhill and the state's problems will be reflected in our local budgets. Is there a motion to adjourn?

Councilmember Sutton: So moved.

President Lloyd: Is there a second?

Councilmember Kiefer: Second.

President Lloyd: We are adjourned. Thank you.

(There being no further business to come before the Council, the meeting was adjourned at 10:10 a.m.)

VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL

President Russ Lloyd, Jr.

Vice President Jim Raben

Councilmember Joe Kiefer

Councilmember Mike Goebel

Councilmember Tom Shetler, Jr.

Councilmember Ed Bassemier

Councilmember Royce Sutton

Recorded and transcribed by Teri Lukeman.

**VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL
MINUTES
APRIL 7, 2010**

The Vanderburgh County Council met in session this 7th day of April, 2010 in room 301 of the Civic Center Complex. The meeting was called to order at 8:30 a.m. by County Council President Russell Lloyd, Jr.

President Lloyd: Okay, I'd like to call to order the Vanderburgh County Council April 7th, 2010 meeting. Could we have attendance roll call, please?

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

President Lloyd: For the Pledge of Allegiance, I'd like to ask Councilman Raben to lead us.

(Pledge of Allegiance was given)

<p>APPROVAL OF MINUTES MARCH 3, 2010</p>

President Lloyd. Thank you. We'll move on to item number four, approval of minutes County Council meeting March 3rd, 2010. Does anyone see any corrections?

Councilmember Shetler: So moved.

President Lloyd: Okay, Councilman Shetler, motion to approve.

Councilmember Sutton: Second.

President Lloyd: Second Mr. Sutton. Any discussion? All in favor signify by saying aye.

(All Councilmembers voted affirmatively)

President Lloyd: All opposed?

(No opposing votes were cast)

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

COUNTY ASSESSOR REQUEST TO FILL VACANCY
--

President Lloyd: We're going to take a deviation in the agenda here since Councilman Shetler is going to have to catch a plane. I don't think he's going to be with us that long. So we're going to move to item number nine A, under new business, County Assessor, request to fill vacancy, replacement of the employee, Real Estate Deputy. Is there a motion to approve?

Councilmember Shetler: Well, I think, because of the way we've normally done procedures, I will make a motion to approve.

President Lloyd: Okay, is there a second?

Councilmember Bassemier: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Shetler, second Mr. Bassemier. Discussion? Mr. Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: Yeah, what I'd really like to do, perhaps, is offer this as a suggestion and that is to – the reassessment really doesn't begin until July. I know you need to bring people in to get them acclimated to the job and go through the learning curve, etcetera. I'd really like for us to see what we can do, though, to hold the line on hiring any new people. I think this gives us a great opportunity through the part-time seasonal account that we added into them for this year to give an opportunity. And maybe we need to have some more flexibility to allow a little bit higher rate of pay than what we've allowed in the past on part-time help, that we need to be more open-minded about that. I just think there's an opportunity out there where you have mothers at home that need some part-time work, that would like to do something, that are very well educated or experienced. You have some real estate people out there right now that, because of things being a little bit slower, that this is an opportunity for them. I think we ought to utilize that seasonal part-time help account a little bit greater and I'd like for the County Assessor to try that as an avenue, and then he can perhaps come back to us in September if that isn't working the way I think it can work for us. If it's not working then he comes back and just presents that to us. So that's what I'd really like to see us do.

Councilmember Kiefer: Mr. President?

President Lloyd: Mr. Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: I think you made some valid points, Councilman Shetler. One of the things I'd like to do, too, is, you know, going in line with what you're saying, is perhaps do something like that, use part-time, because I don't want to get into the, I don't want to set a precedent to where the Council votes no on something and then 30 days later somebody is coming back. And I'm not saying that's been a problem in the past, but no reason to start a new precedent and if there's a way that we can ease the pain a little bit by going part-time and following the suggestion that you just made, Councilman Shetler, then I think that would be agreeable. And then September, come back and then take a look at it again and if we've got to go full-time, then at that time take another vote.

Councilmember Shetler: I might also point out, and I think a few of you recognized this last month when we looked at the account balances, and we're dealing with a general fund balance at 1.3 million dollars, which is very low for the amount of money that we're trying to deal with if an emergency should arise. So that would be

another reason, and I'd like for, if it does come back, and hopefully a game plan could be put together that it would not be necessary to come back, but should it come back, I'd like to see it come back to go through the reassessment fund as opposed to coming through the general fund as well.

President Lloyd: Mr. Goebel.

Councilmember Goebel: I agree with points made by both Councilman Shetler and Councilman Kiefer, and I would think that if we do deny the position, we talked about it last week, about maybe putting a six month time frame before they could come back again. However, in this case, I do think the Assessor has worked pretty well with us and this is a position that is in the budget already, it's going to save us considerable amounts, and I think it's been open since January, and he does have \$40,000 in the part-time line item, but he's not used any of that, using the welfare to work and some interns, so I think he's acted in good faith. And the other idea, to my understanding, is this position will be pretty critical for the commercial aspect of the reassessment or trending, which they have also taken in-house instead of outsourcing that for 90 to \$100,000 savings to the county. So I think that would take a certain amount of expertise. It might not be available to part-timers. So I'm kind of inclined at this time to let him fill his position.

President Lloyd: Other comments? I guess one question that came up, and maybe this is a legal question, can the Assessor, are we allowed to have full-time in the property reassessment budget as opposed to the general fund? No, according to Mr. Raben.

Councilmember Raben: I don't think you can.

Glen Koob: Glen Koob, Real Estate Deputy, County Assessor's office. If I understand you right, can you have a full-time position in the reassessment fund? Yes, I think it was in – I'm not really sure. I think it was in 2002, we used real estate managers where they would come in and they would just run, department managers, office manager, where they would just run the reassessment fund and it came out of the – there was two people for each office that were full time.

President Lloyd: Okay, full-time county employees with county benefits, as far as you know?

Glen Koob: Yes sir, for eighteen months. Yes, they were, out of the reassessment. The part-time workers are the field people, the people that stay inside are the office managers and the reassessment managers for the people to send them out, make sure all the data is getting put into the computer. So yes, we have in the past. I think it was 2002.

President Lloyd: Okay, historically, I guess, we have not had full-timers in there as Council, but that doesn't mean it's illegal.

Councilmember Raben: Well, I think, and I think you're right, I stated that earlier that I think at some point years ago, that there were, but I think there was an opinion sent from the DLGF that, sometime in the last couple, two, maybe three years that stated otherwise, but I could be thinking about something totally different. But this is not the first time in the last five years this has been discussed, and I think it was decided that we cannot. But that definitely makes this a lot easier pill to swallow if we can shift this person onto reassessment .

Glen Koob: Well, there is, that's a whole new deal this year, probably be presented in the budget as the reassessment fund. That's a whole new, that's out of the reassessment fund. This is actually, like, you know, out of the general fund, and this person, the Council gave us that position. You're just, I guess, choosing not to fill it now, but I like Councilman Goebel's answer to that or remarks on that, they're very true. You know, we came in good faith, we've given back lots of money at the Assessor's office, and all we're asking is for a little help for the trending and that stuff. You know, just the, you wouldn't believe the amount of work or the amount of time it takes us to set up for that reassessment. It's going to start in July, so we're going to have to use that 40,000 for the rest of this year for that reassessment fund and we have to have a fourth of our parcels finished by December of 2010, of reassessment. We have to have a fourth of them finished and that's, we have 82,000 parcels, so that's about 20,000 parcels we have to reassess by December on \$40,000. So that's hiring the people to go out and look at them, that's the people to data enter, so that's what that 40,000 is going to be used for. It's not, we don't want to squander it is what I'm trying to say, that's why we're not using that to put a new person in there.

President Lloyd: Okay, we don't want to squander it. Mr. Sutton and then Mr. Shetler.

Councilmember Sutton: Yeah, I think that we've got a few offices here just by the very nature of what they do, we see them up before Council a little bit more often than some of the others and the requests that they have to make, we get a chance to interact with them a little bit more frequently. I think sometimes as we think about that, we've got the number of county offices that come here, we haven't had that many who've come with these employment issues regarding the hiring freeze and just so that we can make sure that we are kind of equitable across the board, I know our thoughts were, at some point in time, we wanted to do some type of review of all of the offices rather than just only the ones who, that we see come before Council. They have gone, you started out from 52 to 39 employees, we've had a couple other offices, they have taken some cuts as well. And July is really not that far away, I'd like to see us proceed forward with this position. You know, some of these services were contracted out before, so we're seeing some savings back to the county, so I don't know if we end up by not filling this, we end up maybe not really getting the savings, true savings that we, and the technical skills to get someone on board. I'd like to see us move forward with it.

Glen Koob: And we kind of are the initial revenue generator of the county, you know, going out and collecting the assessments and everything. In the process, the County Assessor starts the process, the Auditor puts the exemptions and different things on and then the Treasurer sends out the bills and collects it, so the Assessor is the revenue generator of the bunch.

Councilmember Sutton: I would say one more thing as well, it would still be of interest to us to see how the progress is going on the reassessment and since you're under this deadline of getting a quarter of those parcels done, we'd like to hear how that process is going. So if this position is, you know, don't know what the vote may end up being, but if this position were approved, you know, we'd like to see the impact.

Glen Koob: Alright, great. Thank you.

President Lloyd: I guess one other thing, the data that was presented, I don't know that we saw much of an increase in the number of parcels or other things. In the

private sector, you would look at reorganizing to do the best you can with the number of employees, so we did receive data on the employee's duties, but not necessarily that there's been a big increase in the workload. Mr. Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: I think what, in the reassessment fund, a way to get around this would be if you, in essence, kind of sunsetted the position. You would say that we would approve this position for a period of, let's just say 18 months or two years, whatever that term would be. That way, when the reassessment concludes, that position would conclude along with it. And, to me, it makes sense because then we wouldn't end up with a position that is perpetually sitting on the roles: when the job is finished, you know, the position is finished. And we could have a full-time position in there, with the benefits and then, in the meantime, if something is vacated in the general fund, that position could easily roll over there or that person could roll over into that. But it could be filled by a, I mean, that's one way of compromising this a little bit and looking at it as a way of actually putting in a sunset that this position would only last for two years, as an example. And that would give you the benefits and the whole thing that goes along with it.

Glen Koob: Now, you know that this position is coming out of the general fund, you would want the general fund money to fund the reassessment when we have a reassessment fund?

Councilmember Shetler: No, that's not what I'm saying. I'd like to see this go into the reassessment fund, put a sunset term on there so that the position would be good, let's just say from July 1st, 2010 to July 1st, 2012, as an example.

Glen Koob: Okay, but that's still not going to help us with the work that we have in the office after the reassessment is over. And that's what this position is for. A lady, she went to be an accountant, she was an accountant or an account student at USI working full-time here.

Councilmember Shetler: Hopefully, again, organizing the part-time help and the people in the office and as time progresses here we'll find some ways of achieving, just like we had this year with Pictometry, that we've been able to find some savings out there and stuff because, you know, the newest things on the market, and we're able to save having people march up and down the streets with measuring sticks, so you know, those kinds of things, I think, will be coming around to help us out even more so in the future.

President Lloyd: Our attorney has a point.

Jeff Ahlers: One of the things that I would just point out is, I'm going to need to pull the statute because as you know from when we past had issues on this, that the reassessment fund statute fairly specifically sets forth what it can and cannot be used for. So before, I would just suggest that before you go down the path of assuming you can or you can't use the reassessment fund money, that you vote on what's before you. Of course, I guess there would have to be a new appropriation request made anyway from the Reassessment fund, assuming we can. But I'll be happy to look at that today. But without having that specific statute in front of me, I can't tell you whether you can put that employee in there or not. But there are specific guidelines, as you guys know. But I'll look at that as soon as the meeting adjourns.

President Lloyd: Well, I suspect Mr. Raben, with his long experience, may have a point here that –

Councilmember Raben: Well, I'm sitting here second guessing myself. I know we've been back and forth, not only this fund, but the Recorder's fund. I know this is the case with the Recorder's fund and I could be confusing the two, but is it possible, you know, from the standpoint of how we advertise this meeting, as long as we don't increase what's advertised, I think we stay within the guidelines we have to stay in. Could we make a tentative vote to set this in a line within reassessment pending –

President Lloyd: I think Mr. Fluty might have a point.

Councilmember Sutton: I don't think, we didn't advertise it like that. It has to be advertised from that fund.

Councilmember Raben: Well, that's true.

Jeff Ahlers: What you've done is, you have advertised the general fund and you're correct, Mr. Raben, that as long as you don't exceed that, but here you'd be talking about a separate fund and I believe, unless there's been something advertised for that fund, you wouldn't be able to do that.

Councilmember Shetler: What about tabling the question until the following month then, until you have the chance to go through the legal questions there and make sure that we're on target.

Councilmember Kiefer: Can you use a part-time person, hire somebody part-time until we get this question resolved? That gives you a chance to determine whether the person you're hiring is a good employee as well. I mean, that's one way to use the part-time funds.

Councilmember Goebel: Can you get by until May, is the question, until we get this resolved, reassessment, and then I guess line 1740 would come back to the general fund if we can get it out of the reassessment fund. Could we do that?

Glen Koob: I'm pretty sure you can hire a person full-time out of the reassessment fund, but if you can move this money over to the reassessment fund, it's still going to make us one less employee in that office, after the reassessment fun is over. I mean, and it's not like, we do both jobs actually, we do the reassessment and we're going to do our normal ongoing data collecting, so we're still going to be one person short when reassessment is over.

Councilmember Raben: Glenn, but again, what was suggested by Tom, I think we'd have to weigh that after reassessment, is there still a need to continue that on. And to his point, the reassessment fund has more money in it than the general fund, about \$200,000 more than we're going to fund every department within the county with. So there is merit to doing what he's saying.

Glen Koob: And, you know, I think the Assessor, Jonathan, made the point last week, I guess, pretty clear, or your last meeting, is that, some of these counties are paying 1.3 to 2.3 million to do this. And we're doing it in-house, saving the county that much money. I mean, you know, I guess we could just give so much until that office, I mean, until we start being late with things.

Councilmember Raben: This seems to be a good compromise: if we can continue on with this employee, but just simply move it to a different line item within reassessment, I think it will be worth your wait in May because you're probably not going to get it today the way it's sounding, so –

Councilmember Goebel: You've got one fourth of reassessment due by –

Glen Koob: December of 2010.

Councilmember Goebel: And you're going to have reassessment again next year and the following year?

Glen Koob: Yeah, we have four deadlines. I don't know if I can remember, but we have it December 2010, I think it's April of 2011, I can't remember, I know we have to be finished by December 31st, 2011. That's 18 months that we have, from July 1, 2010 to December 2011, we have to do the reassessment. And the state, that's law, the state puts the guidelines on us. We have to have 20 percent done or a quarter of it is what it says in the law, finished by December 2010, and then, probably every four months after that they give us a deadline, maybe April 2011, July, September of 2011 is three quarters, and then December of 2011 it has to be finished.

President Lloyd: We're getting a little bit ahead of ourselves because this is going to be a vote on the general fund request. It's not a general fund request, it's actually, there's money there, but whether to allow the Assessor to hire this employee from the general fund. We can have the attorney do research on whether that can be done out of the property reassessment fund. I guess go to Mr. Bassemier.

Councilmember Bassemier: I'm not sure it's going to get voted down today. If it is, can they bring this back next month and start over again? It seems like, to me, they're coming before us and have to beg for this extra help. Like she said, this is a revenue generator for the county, they've saved us thousands and thousands of dollars over the years, and it seems like we've been addressing this for several months now. It seems like every time the Assessor's office comes before us, they have to beg for something. I don't agree on that, so I'm not going to back off my second, I'm just going to go on with it and see if it's voted down today.

President Lloyd: Okay, any other discussion? Okay, roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: No, but as a matter of clarification, too, this was not stated a moment ago, but next month, if we do file the appropriation request through reassessment, you also need to file a repeal from the general fund and then we'll act on both the same day.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: No, because I think what Councilman Shetler proposed seems like a good compromise and I'd be more inclined to support that, so no.

Teri Lukeman: President Lloyd?

President Lloyd: I'm going to vote no, so that request is denied to fill the employee, but I think the Councilmembers indicated we're going to look at the reassessment fund and also you have that money available in the part-time. Motion fails, 4-3.

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

APPROPRIATION ORDINANCE

President Lloyd: Okay, we'll move back to item number five, appropriation ordinance, item A, Cooperative Extension. Go back to Mr. Shetler as long as he'll be with us.

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE

Councilmember Shetler: Yes, this is Cooperative Extension, that is part of that grant, it's an ongoing appropriation request that comes up every year.

President Lloyd: Is anybody here from Co-op Extension? We missed you last week.

Randy Brown: My name is Randy Brown. This is for, like you mentioned, a grant that we get to pay for two part-time people that do our nutrition education program. This would pay for January through the end of the school year. They have been to about fourteen different schools, taught about 800 students during that time, and that's what that's for.

President Lloyd: Worthwhile education mission it sounds like. Any other questions for Mr. Brown? Is there a motion to approve?

Councilmember Shetler: So moved.

Councilmember Goebel: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Shetler, second Mr. Goebel. Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes, 7-0 motion passes.

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1230-1900	FICA	462.00	462.00
1230-1990	Extra Help	6,038.00	6,038.00
Total		6,500.00	6,500.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

CUMULATIVE BRIDGE

President Lloyd: Cumulative Bridge fund.

Councilmember Shetler: Again, we talked about this last week, it's the First Avenue bridge. They're going to build basically a bridge over the existing bridge type of deal, and they've got a resolution to the problem. If anybody has driven that road lately, you know that it's badly in need and it's something we've poured, literally, millions of dollars, I guess, into this sink hole for years. And it needs to be resolved. John?

John Stoll: We did receive bids on the project last night. The low bid was 1.396 million which was slightly underneath the engineer's estimate, so with the funds we have in the budget right now plus the appropriation, that would allow us to proceed with hiring a consultant and getting the project to construction.

President Lloyd: Any questions? I believe that's in your district, isn't it, Mr. Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: Yes, it is, and it needs to be done.

Councilmember Goebel: Do you know what company it's going to be awarded, or can you reveal that at this point?

John Stoll: The low bidder was Blankenberger Brothers. I have not gone through the paperwork yet, so I don't know if everything is in order, but they did give the low bid.

President Lloyd: Any other questions for Mr. Stoll?

Councilmember Shetler: So moved.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion to approve, is there a second?

Councilmember Bassemier: Second.

President Lloyd: Multiple seconds, roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes, motion approved. And this is for the additional inspection money, \$120,000, 7-0.

CUMULATIVE BRIDGE		REQUESTED	APPROVED
2030-4373	First Avenue Bridge	120,000.00	120,000.00
Total		120,000.00	120,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

CCD/COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

President Lloyd: CCD fund.

Councilmember Shetler: This was an issue that came up a month ago and we had, similar to what we've been talking about on the reassessment, taking money out of one fund versus the general fund. We found a way to replenish the general fund with the CCD monies. So if there's any questions on that, otherwise, I move approval.

Councilmember Raben: I'll second.

President Lloyd: Motion Mr. Shetler, second Mr. Raben. Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. That was for the transfer for the election fund that we’ve talked about for several months. Thank you.

COUNTY COMMISSIONERS		REQUESTED	APPROVED
2031-1300-4129	Energy Savings Contract	228,850.00	228,850.00
Total		228,850.00	228,850.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

TRANSFER REQUESTS

LEGAL AID
LEGAL AID/UNITED WAY
TREASURER (LATE)
SUPERIOR COURT (LATE)

President Lloyd: Okay. We’ll move on to transfers. Mr. Shetler had to leave us, he’s got to fly out of town, so we’ll turn this over to Mr. Raben.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Legal Aid, we have transfers in the amount of \$12,267, and again in Legal Aid in the amount of \$356; under County Treasurer, transfers in the amount of \$362; and Superior Court Bailiff/Transportation Officer in the amount of \$6,719. I’ll move approval that we accept all transfers as listed.

Councilmember Sutton: Second.

President Lloyd: Motion Mr. Raben, second Mr. Sutton. Questions or discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. The transfers pass 6-0.

LEGAL AID		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1460-1190-1460	Junior Legal Secretary #2	12,267.00	12,267.00
To: 1460-1150-1460	Senior Legal Secretary	5,017.00	5,017.00
1460-1990	Extra Help	7,250.00	7,250.00

LEGAL AID/UNITED WAY		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 4290-1190-4290	Junior Legal Secretary #2	356.00	356.00
To: 4290-1150-4290	Senior Legal Secretary	356.00	356.00

TREASURER		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1030-3550	Repair to Buildings & Grounds	362.00	362.00
To: 1030-4220	Office Machines	225.00	225.00
1030-3410	Printing	137.00	137.00

SUPERIOR COURT		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1370-1311-1370	Bailiff/ Transportation Officer	6,719.00	6,719.00
To: 1370-3790	Professional Services	6,719.00	6,719.00

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

DISCUSSION REGARDING REPLACING EMPLOYEES

President Lloyd: Okay, nothing under item seven, under item eight, we had a

discussion on that last week, and I guess we're still debating whether we want to put in a six month rule. So we'll continue that debate at a later time.

<p style="text-align: center;">PROSECUTOR REQUEST FOR SALARY ADJUSTMENT AND REQUESTS TO HIRE SUMMER INTERN AND PART-TIME HELP</p>
--

President Lloyd: Item number nine B, Cooperative Extension part-time assistant for 4-H. We did that?

Councilmember Sutton: Prosecutor.

President Lloyd: We approved the funds for it. Alright, so we did an affirmative vote on that. Item C, Prosecutor, request salary adjustment from the incentive fund, request to hire summer attorney intern and part-time help. And here's Mr. Brown.

Doug Brown: Good morning, Doug Brown, Prosecutor's office. The first part of the request, part-time receptionist, has been in our office for two years and done a great job, wanted to up her salary a little bit, very good employee. The other request is, one is for a law student intern. She'll be starting her third year as a pretty regular thing. We have them come in during the summer, they help out quite a bit and it's a great experience for them. The other is to rehire a part-time worker from the past because we have one of our Victims Assistance staff members that is going on maternity leave this summer, so we need someone to come in and help with that. All of this money is coming from our discretionary funds.

President Lloyd: Any questions for Mr. Brown?

Councilmember Sutton: What is the total amount on each of those requests?

Doug Brown: I don't have a total here, I don't believe. I know that as far as the child support part-time person, that's going to raise her salary from eight to ten dollars an hour. We hire, we usually pay all of our attorney interns ten dollars an hour and our other clerical staff intern would be \$8.50 an hour.

President Lloyd: A great value for the money.

Councilmember Sutton: I see it on the salary request here. Okay.

Councilmember Raben: Doug, I know we've made adjustments before in the part-time hourly wage for your office. Do we have anybody currently at \$12 an hour?

Doug Brown: I don't think so. I could check that out and let you know.

Councilmember Raben: Sandie, do you recall?

Sandie Deig: Yes, he does.

Councilmember Raben: He does have. So we're – this isn't something new. Okay.

Sandie Deig: Employees waiting on the bar exam results get \$12 an hour and the Recovery part-time employees get up to \$16 an hour.

President Lloyd: And they're bringing money back in. Okay, any other questions?

Councilmember Raben: No. Do we need a motion on this?

President Lloyd: We need a motion and a second.

Councilmember Raben: I'll move approval.

Councilmember Sutton: Second.

President Lloyd: Motion Mr. Raben, second Mr. Sutton. Other discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. Motion passes 6-0.

Doug Brown: Thank you.

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

<p>COOPERATIVE EXTENSION REQUEST TO HIRE PART-TIME 4-H ASSISTANT</p>

President Lloyd: We're going to back up here. I was mistaken. We do need to vote on the Cooperative Extension because this isn't adding a part-time employee, and you've got a letter on Purdue University letterhead to that extent. It's to hire one new part-time 4-H summer assistant. Any questions on that?

Councilmember Sutton: I thought we already did that.

President Lloyd: This is a different request. If not, is there a motion to approve?

Councilmember Sutton: So moved.

President Lloyd: Is there a second?

Councilmember Goebel: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Sutton, second Mr. Goebel. Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. Okay, that passes 6-0. Thank you.

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

TRAVEL REQUESTS

**AUDITOR
HEALTH DEPARTMENT
COUNTY CLERK
TREASURER**

President Lloyd: We'll move on to 9D travel requests. One is Auditor. Any questions on that? I guess I'll turn it over to Mr. Raben. Do you want to just take all these as a lump?

Councilmember Raben: Yeah, everyone has had an opportunity, I'm sure, to look at the travel requests. Are there any questions? You know, it looks like the Health department makes up the lion's share of them. No questions? Okay, Mr. President, I'll move that the travel requests be approved.

President Lloyd: Okay, we have a motion, is there a second?

Councilmember Sutton: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Raben, second Mr. Sutton. Any discussion?

Councilmember Raben: Just one comment. I hope we're not taking multiple

people, where we don't absolutely have to, we're not. I know with a lot of training, sometimes one person can, you know, we can qualify our department or our office with one person and when we get home do some other training. But some of these, you know, where there's two or three people, --

Gary Heck: Gary Heck, Health department. If there's two or three people, it's because it's job related specifically and they need that in order to either retain certification or to fulfill a grant requirement. Otherwise, we would honor the Council's request where we would send one and they can come back and share information. So whenever you see multiples, it's because it's a job related or a grant requirement.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion and a second. Any other discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. Motion passes on all four travel requests 6-0. Thank you.

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

PROPERTY TAX BILLING UPDATE

President Lloyd: Okay, new business item E, property tax billing update and we have our County Treasurer here.

Rick Davis: Good morning, Rick Davis, Vanderburgh County Treasurer. I wanted to come before you partly for a public service announcement and partly because you've invested some funds in our office for this property tax billing year and I wanted to give you an update. First of all, I wanted to let everyone know in the community who may be watching on television, property taxes will be due on May 10th for the first time in three years this year, which is very good news. It's due to the very hard work of the Assessor's office, Auditor's office, and my office that this happened, so I appreciate everything the other two offices have done as well as my

co-workers. We put the bills on-line for those watching at home who haven't seen it in the news, the property taxes are on-line now. If you want to go on-line, vanderburghtreasurer.org you may view your property taxes. They've been on-line since March 18th, which is 53 days notice, which is really good, very proud of that. The fall installment will be due November 10th. I'm expecting the property tax bills to arrive in the mail mid-week next week. If it's Wednesday, with a postmark of about Wednesday, that's about 27 days notice. I was shooting for a full month, but 27 days is not bad and, in fact, that's the first time since 2002 people have had this much notice getting their bills in the mail, so I'm very happy about that as well. As you know, you guys approved 56 - \$57,000 of taxpayer money and a new folder and sorter. It was installed in our office last Friday and it screams, it is extremely fast and I have some co-workers who did a fantastic job. They had to learn the hardware, they had to learn software, they had to print out roughly 100,000 bills and hopefully, we should be able to get those bills consolidated into about 60,000 envelopes saving on postage. Rather than 100,000 bills going out and 100,000 envelopes, we'll have them put into about 60,000. We did some rough figuring, that's not exact at this point, but we figure we're going to get about there. I invite each one of you after the meeting is over, please feel free to come down to the office and check it out. It's very impressive. Hopefully it's still running when you come down there, but I appreciate everything you did. I think its made a big difference and for the people at home, you're not going to get a fancy bill like last year when it was multi-colored. It's not going to be orange and purple. It's going to be black and white, but I think the number one thing everyone wonders is how much their bill is going to be and when is it due. And they definitely will have those items on their bill when they get them. When you get your bill you can pay it at Old National Bank, any of the local branches at Old National Bank. Obviously, you can come into our office and pay at the front counter. We have a new drop box out front, this is our second year. If you don't want to go through Civic Center security, feel free to drop your bill off in the drop box without having to put a stamp on it. You can also pay on-line two ways with a credit card. It's only a 2.75% interest rate. There's a convenience fee, it doesn't go to the county, it goes to the software developer. The convenience fee is basically for folks who may live in Alaska, Hawaii, South America, and we have folks who own property in Evansville who pay from those locations. If they notice it's May 10th and they haven't made their payment yet, they can go on-line, make the payment and 2.75% is a lot cheaper than a five percent penalty, so that's why that fee is there. There is also a brand new feature this year that has been very popular, you can pay by electronic check on-line and it's just three dollars. No matter whether you owe \$3,000 or \$250 on your property taxes, it's just a flat three dollar fee. It's been a very popular feature so far. That's about all I have. I'll be glad to answer any questions you might have.

President Lloyd: Mr. Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: For those that are established in the debit service, that's still taken directly from a person's personal account?

Rick Davis: Yes.

Councilmember Goebel: Without any kind of fee, right?

Rick Davis: That is correct. Councilman Goebel is referring to what we call debit option. It's withdrawn by ACH from your bank account, there is no fee for that, however, the time period to have it withdrawn from the spring period if you're not already on the program may have already passed but if you want to do it in the fall,

there will be some information with your bills explaining how to sign up. That's another very popular feature we have, about 2,000 people, I believe, who our office has permission to electronically withdraw their property tax payment from their bank account, and that's still in effect.

Councilmember Goebel: The other comment, again, this year, I think Vanderburgh County sets the bar almost as far as getting the work done ahead of time, the Assessor, the Auditor and the Treasurer, so thank you for that. It's not normally good news but the more time they get to pay anything, but more time we have to get ready or braced for it, I think, the better we serve the taxpayer. And particularly, I don't care about the colored format because it's not a very colorful day when you get your tax bill regardless. A question I have on the one percent cap, is that misleading? Will people be possibly paying more than one percent of their assessed value?

Rick Davis: Our office, basically, for those at home I'll explain. I know you already know, but for those watching at home, the Assessor goes out, they assess a property. People who own the property, if they are entitled to an exemption, maybe they have a mortgage exemption or a homestead exemption, they go to the Auditor's office and file that exemption and then the Auditor takes the assessment and subtracts the deductions, multiplies it by the tax rate and they actually do the calculations. My role in this process, I'm the Treasurer, and that sounds like I'm a financial genius and that's not the case. I'm a collector, so my duty is basically to collect what the Auditor says is due. So if you don't mind, I'd like to defer that to the County Auditor Bill Fluty, perhaps he can answer that better than I can.

Bill Fluty: I think, generally, we're getting more people familiar with the one, two and three percent caps. We get calls on that and we're able to answer those questions, but each tax bill stands on its own, so it's best to not make general statements. We can look at exactly, when they have you on the phone, discuss the parcel or the payment, and go from there. Normally, unless you have a high assessed valuation, people who have homestead deductions will not get to their cap. So it's other homes, rentals, and the commercial/industrial that will have a cap. But they're calling in, they seem fairly familiar, it's been in the news, there's been a lot of literature out there. But they can surely call us and we can discuss it.

Councilmember Goebel: Thank you.

Rick Davis: One more thing: the number one question the Auditor hears, I hear, and the Assessor hears is, did taxes go up this year? And I like to equate that like the unemployment rate: right now, the unemployment rate is around 10%. But if you're unemployed, the unemployment rate is 100%. So we like to stay away from saying yes or no, because every property is unique and if you say property taxes went down this year for 51% of the folks, 49% think you don't know what you're talking about. So we don't like to say they went up or they went down. The tax rates, the County Auditor can definitely tell you whether the tax rates are up or down, but every home is unique, every property is unique, and I hate to say yes or no in a situation like that because if you're unemployed, the unemployment rate is 100% no matter what the national figure is.

President Lloyd: I think the overall assessed value was up 1.2 percent or something like that, pretty minimal. But, like you said, between reassessments, you've got people that have done additions: theirs have gone up. Other ones have gone down, so, I mean, it's really, it's hard to tell. I had mentioned 1.2% for the assessed

value going up over the prior year, does that sound right? Mr. Fluty?

Bill Fluty: Lately, in the last couple of years it's been stagnant or dropped, but it did go up some this year, but very little.

President Lloyd: Right. And then the multi-colored bills, those came from South Carolina, right?

Rick Davis: That's correct. That's another thing I'd like to bring up. The bills, everything was purchased locally. My predecessor had signed the contract before I came in. The bills were printed in South Carolina before, everything was done locally, purchased locally and my staff did the vast majority of the printed work. So I will, when this is all said and done, I'll come before you and maybe during the – either next month or if you'd rather wait for the budget hearings whenever, you know, we had a \$65,000 printing budget this year that probably will only be 20,000 next year. And that's just giving us a little bit of elbow room. We may not even use that entire 20,000. It's up to you. I can come back next month and give you a rundown of our costs or I can come during the budget hearings and explain it to you then, it's up to you. I can talk to you guys afterwards and you can tell me.

President Lloyd: Okay. Well, and the multi-colored bills, they may be easier to see in a big stack of papers, but the important data is the black and white, what do you owe and when is it due. So I want to commend you on getting those out, though, even though to some taxpayers it might give them heartburn, but it is important for county government and the sooner that the money comes back in, obviously, we don't have to borrow and it saves, ultimately, it will save the taxpayer as the funds come in and we can fund county government.

Rick Davis: We were one of the few counties the last two years that made our billing and settlement by the end of May, and what that meant is all the governmental units: the schools, the library, the levee authority, city, county, etcetera, they did not have to borrow money in order to keep the lights on and pay their employees. I think we're one of the few counties who did not have that circumstance. And that situation, when you guys have to borrow money to keep the lights on, and keep the police on the streets, nobody wins in that scenario because you're paying interest on that money that's lost. And instead, we were able to get the revenues in and invest money, so it was a great thing, again, due to the Auditor, Assessor, my coworkers in the Treasurer's office that we were able to accomplish that.

President Lloyd: Great. Thank you. Any other questions?

WHIRLPOOL CLOSING FINANCIAL IMPACT

President Lloyd: We'll move on to 9F, Whirlpool financial impact and this would relate to the closing of the Whirlpool plant on Highway 41 North.

Rick Davis: Yes, if you don't mind, I'd like to hand my report out to each of you.

President Lloyd: Obviously, a large property taxpayer, the problem is, they're going to be moving a bunch of their manufacturing equipment out of the plant. They would pay personal property tax on that manufacturing equipment which is multi-millions of dollars. So it's going to have a future impact; it won't have an effect this year, but future impact.

Rick Davis: Yes. This kind of hurts to stand before you today. My godfather/uncle worked at Whirlpool for 41 years and retired two years ago. And I'm perceived to be a west-sider and I'm a proud Reitz graduate, but the first ten years of my life, I grew up on Baumgart Road and I can still remember as a child listening to my mom complain about the 3:30 Whirlpool traffic on Highway 41. And she used to comment about my Uncle David and how he had a great job at Whirlpool and I'd be lucky one day if I could work there because it was a good living. And to stand before you now after growing up and hearing that, it hurts. As you know, on August 28, 2009, residents in the Evansville area received sad news that Whirlpool Corporation, a mainstay in the tri-state economy for decades, announced plans to shut down its Evansville operations in mid-2010. Since that time, I have been busy crunching numbers to see how negative the impact of Whirlpool's closing will have on Vanderburgh County taxpayers. There are going to be a lot of facts and figures here but I will do a recap at the end, so you don't have to keep up with all the numbers at home. First and foremost, in 2009, Whirlpool paid \$410,000 in real estate property taxes on their building and land, which had an assessed value of 16 million dollars. Whirlpool also paid 1.2 million dollars in personal property taxes for the 53.1 million dollars of equipment residing inside the building. Obviously, Whirlpool paid three times as much on the equipment stored inside the building than they actually do on the building and land itself. If Whirlpool continues with its plan to shut down operations in the middle of this year, Vanderburgh County taxpayers most likely would not have to make up the difference in property tax or personal property tax revenues until 2012. Whirlpool has stated in a financial report that it plans to ship the personal property to Mexico once this plant is idled. To put the personal property tax revenue in perspective, Vanderburgh County had 973 million dollars in personal property in 2009, according to the Auditor's office. Whirlpool's personal property is 5.5% of all net personal property in Vanderburgh County. Vanderburgh County had a net assessed value of about seven billion dollars in 2009, a total that includes personal property, according to the Auditor's office. Whirlpool's total 69.1 million dollar assessed valuation of personal and real estate property was just less than 1% of Vanderburgh County's total .99. Center Township had a total net assessed valuation of about 1.7 billion dollars. Whirlpool is located in Center Township. Whirlpool's combined real estate and personal property comprised 4.1% of Center Township's total net assessed value. Center Township had net personal property valuation of 239.3 million. Whirlpool's personal property, 53.1 million, made up 22.2% of Center Township's net personal property. The reduction in the assessed values will increase the tax rate for residents living in Center Township. How much of an effect will not be known until 2012. However, personal and real estate property taxes will not be the only area where Whirlpool's closing will have a financial impact on tax revenues for Vanderburgh County governmental units. I've been in contact with several different agencies regarding the financial impact Vanderburgh County would face in declining county option income tax, also known as COIT revenues when all 1,100 Whirlpool employees are unemployed. The State Budget Agency armed me with information that would be helpful in estimating the financial impact of the COIT revenues. COIT has been established in Vanderburgh County at the maximum level of 1% of an employee's salary. If a person works and lives in Vanderburgh County, that means 1% of that employee's salary will be taxed in the form of COIT. Non-residents who live in another county but work in Vanderburgh County, are taxed at 1/4 of 1%. However, non-residents may not pay the Vanderburgh County percentage if their home county also has a COIT. So if you live in Warrick and you work in Vanderburgh, if Warrick County has COIT, your 1/4 of a percent would go to Warrick County, not to Vanderburgh County. In that situation, the non-resident employee would pay their home county's percentage and the money would go to their home county. The

State Budget Agency informed me that 75% of all Vanderburgh County employees live and work in Vanderburgh County. Whirlpool's payroll in Vanderburgh County was 85 million dollars a year, according to the State Budget Agency. Applying the law of averages, because I wasn't able to get exact figures from Whirlpool, 75% of Whirlpool's wages would total \$63,750,000. One percent of that total is \$637,500. If 25% of Whirlpool's employees live outside the county, that payroll total in Vanderburgh County is 21,250,000. That total multiplied by 1/4 of a percent, on average, equals a maximum contribution of \$53,125 from Whirlpool employees who live outside Vanderburgh County. Therefore, again, applying the law of averages, we can estimate the COIT impact of Whirlpool closing will cost the county an estimated \$637,500 to just under \$700,000. To put Whirlpool employees COIT impact in perspective, Vanderburgh County received a grand total of \$36,206,000 in COIT distribution from all employees in 2009. That is collected from income tax returns in fiscal year 2008. The contribution from Whirlpool's employees equals 1.9% of all revenues gleaned through COIT. In 2010 Vanderburgh County will receive almost 35.5 million dollars in COIT distribution and Whirlpool's percentage of that figure is just under 2%. The State Budget Agency tells me the full year impact of Whirlpool's employees being jobless and not paying toward COIT would begin in 2013. In 2012, the COIT revenue contributed by Whirlpool employees would be dropped in half if the plant shuts down mid-year of this year, which would be reflected on 2011 income tax statements and distributed in 2012. To recap, in a worst case scenario with all of Whirlpool's personal property being shipped to Mexico in mid-2010, and all Whirlpool employees remaining jobless, Vanderburgh County taxpayers will have to make up nearly two million dollars in combined COIT and personal property tax totals due to Whirlpool's closing. So long as Whirlpool owns the existing structures on the property, they will continue paying real estate taxes, although Vanderburgh County Assessor Jonathan Weaver tells me that amount may be reduced as time goes on. The full effects of the combined COIT and personal property tax declines will be in 2013 if Whirlpool's closing remains on schedule and none of the employees finds another job. Of course, there is a domino effect with Whirlpool's suppliers that will also play a role in our tax revenues, however, a spokesperson with Whirlpool was unable to provide figures for those suppliers. Due to Whirlpool's closing time frame and Indiana's real estate and income tax collection structure, economic development leaders in the tri-state have about three years to lure another manufacturer or industry to the site in order to keep Whirlpool's closing from having a negative impact on taxpayers in Vanderburgh County. And again, that was a worst case scenario, some of these Whirlpool employees will be finding jobs as time goes on. I was just giving you the worst case scenario.

President Lloyd: Okay, well, and I don't know if you've got in here the fact that there's been a commitment to keep the 300 research and development employees?

Rick Davis: That's correct. That's not in there. That's not included.

President Lloyd: Right, so –

Rick Davis: But again, I don't know how much those salaries are. I was basing it on the entire 1,100 going under.

President Lloyd: It's hard to carve that out. But the roughly 1,200 employees total, so 900 to 1,000 losing their jobs, which is a terrible thing and we're certainly sympathetic to that. But the plant is already shut down at this point, isn't it?

Rick Davis: I believe there's still some employees working at the plant.

President Lloyd: But, I mean, I know their intent is to ship all that equipment out and, obviously, they would not have to pay tax on that if it's moved out of the county.

Rick Davis: That is correct. But, again, you're assessed for one year and you pay the next, so because they were here through March, I believe that was a really important date for the Assessor's office, they will be paying next year for the equipment that was here this year.

President Lloyd: Right. And because they had, I know they wanted to ramp up some production prior to closing the plant, so, I mean, they were, I don't think the March date, they had any intent of closing before that. Any questions? This is a very thorough report. Appreciate that.

Councilmember Raben: No, just a general comment. Thank you. It's obvious you spent a lot of time with this. But, you know, one thing, this speaks volumes for what we do, you know, periodically throughout the year when we grant what we always call tax abatements, the politically correct name today is tax phase-ins. But those type of enticements, you see the real value of them, you know, once they go away. I mean, this corporation contributed nearly two million dollars in taxes to the local community each and every year. And so it's, again, you see the real value in offering tax abatement as new incentives for new businesses to come in with the hopes of lasting a great number of years like Whirlpool did and, you know, realize the benefit of those taxes paid in each and every year.

Rick Davis: It also speaks well for the diversity of our community, too. I think 20 or 30 years ago, Whirlpool going to Mexico would have had a much harder impact financially on this community than it does now. And you look up in the northern part of the state, you know, LaGrange County, where their main manufacturers are the RV producers and when the price of gas went to, you know, over three, three and a half, almost four dollars a gallon, they were decimated in those communities. I think they had a 17 to 19 percent unemployment rate at one time. The latest figures for Vanderburgh County are nowhere near that level, so it speaks well for how much diversity we have in this community and in the tri-state as well.

Councilmember Kiefer: Mr. President, does anybody know what happens to the abatements that Whirlpool received? It seems like you said that they're going to continue to pay property taxes, but the Assessor said those assessments probably will be reduced with the building being vacant. But it seems to me that previous abatements they've been given should be forfeited, you know, because they're not any longer operating under any agreement. I know when I was on the City Council just a couple years ago, we voted for an abatement that was going to be, for like, seven to ten years for Whirlpool. So it seems like somebody should be looking into whether or not those abatements need to be repealed.

President Lloyd: I mean, as far as under state law, and I don't know that we have any existing abatements for Whirlpool.

Councilmember Sutton: We don't have any.

President Lloyd: We don't have any?

Councilmember Sutton: Not on the county side.

President Lloyd: Well, they're in the city, so, I mean, that –

Councilmember Raben: You would like to believe, though, you said that was five to seven years ago –

Councilmember Kiefer: No, no, no, it was a couple of years ago and they were supposed, the abatement was for like seven to ten years, so they still probably have five years left on that abatement.

Councilmember Raben: Well, they would lose...I mean, the appropriate thing would be then that you're saying that they would lose the abatement immediately at plant closing and –

Councilmember Kiefer: Exactly.

Councilmember Raben: – as long as they own the property over the next five years, --

Councilmember Kiefer: I mean, they still pay property taxes according to the assessment.

President Lloyd: Well, I think that would, state law would govern that. I'm not sure they would lose it but that's something that I know the legislature, I think they even talked about it this year, about claw back provisions with abatements. But I'm not sure what has gone into effect on that. And then the economic development folks, Greg Wathen, Southwest Indiana and the Chamber people, they're going to be marketing that property and obviously, they're doing what they can to keep that research and development facility here, so we need some good efforts on that.

Councilmember Kiefer: Don't want to tick them off too bad.

President Lloyd: Yeah, we need some good efforts on that. I mean, those are a lot of engineers and maybe higher paying jobs that we'd like to keep in this community. Any other questions? Alright, thank you very much, Rick.

Rick Davis: Thank you for having me this morning. And again, feel free to come down to the office if you want to check out the property tax billing and operation. And I wasn't at the last meeting when Councilman Sutton announced that he was going to be resigning soon. I just wanted to wish him well in his future endeavors and it has been a pleasure working with him when I was Chief Deputy in the Recorder's office and now as County Treasurer. He's always been a great person to work with and he's been in my office before to see how things were going and I really do appreciate that, and I wish you well, Royce.

Councilmember Sutton: Well, I'll be here for a little while longer. But –

Rick Davis: Feel free to come on down.

Councilmember Sutton: So I'll still have an opportunity if you come forward to vote down your request.

Rick Davis: Okay, I appreciate that. Thank you.

President Lloyd: Are they running the sorter right now?

Rick Davis: Yes, they are.

President Lloyd: Okay, so they're sorting as we speak.

Rick Davis: Yeah, folding, inserting, actually, we have employees who came in at 8:00 last night and they stuffed about 16,000 envelopes between 8:00 at night and 2:00 this morning and they'll be back again this afternoon.

Councilmember Sutton: I did want to add something. Quite often we are questioned and I think Jim made an excellent point earlier, we're questioned when we get the tax phase-in requests, you know, what is the true benefit behind supporting phase-in requests and I think we can, just based upon what Rick has presented to us today, we can see that the impact can be really great on the community when we lose an industry and this is just really, probably just scratches the surface relative to the impact when you look at the purchasing dollars, just the number of different suppliers that you mentioned. It has a wide and reaching effect when you lose a major employer. Likewise, it has a wide and reaching effect when you bring one in. So we just need to be very diligent and work very hard to get additional new companies coming in, new opportunities here in the area and find ways to grow the local talent and find ways to really encourage the entrepreneurial spirit that will truly allow us to have some long-term growth so when we do have these type of situations that occur, we can find ways to continue to roll on.

President Lloyd: Thank you very much. Very thorough. Real quick, before we get to item ten, I had given each Councilmember a memo about the Evansville Convention & Visitors Bureau, and they wanted, I talked to David Dunn late yesterday afternoon, that's why we have this kind of short notice on this. But they are moving forward at the request of the mayor to present planning concepts for demolishing Roberts Stadium and replacing it with proposed baseball and softball fields, and they're going to present that to the arena project advisory committee tomorrow, Thursday at 5:30 at the Victory Theatre, fifth floor. And I think, I know, the Convention & Visitors Bureau, I think they shared some of these concepts with Councilmembers at one time and David Dunn wanted to emphasize, this is still in the public dialogue stage, there's no set plan, they've got some options they're looking at. But a situation where it's going to be a multi-million dollar project, the demolition of Roberts Stadium, a million dollar project just there. But the opportunity to turn concrete into green space, which is somewhat unusual and certainly a good thing expanding the green space in the Wesselman Park area, I would think that would be a good thing depending on how the plan sorts out. If you can't make that meeting or you still want to see the plans, we can contact David Dunn and he can work something out with you. Mike?

Councilmember Goebel: Mr. President, the plan with the – if Roberts Stadium is removed, is that basically the same proposal that we witnessed earlier if they remove Roberts, as far as building the structure for the softball/baseball?

President Lloyd: Pretty similar. We didn't get into much detail, but the existing Wesselman's Par 3 would stay and it would be, I guess, encroached, I guess that would be west of the Par 3 up to where Roberts Stadium is.

Councilmember Goebel: And Par 3 would remain as well.

President Lloyd: Par 3 would remain. So redevelopment of that acreage, but he wanted to emphasize it's still public dialogue so they certainly want the public to be involved in that. But anyway, they're looking at planning options. So I wanted to make everybody aware of that. Any other questions? Okay, we'll move onto item ten, amendments to salary ordinance and I'll ask Councilman Raben to take that.

AMENDMENTS TO SALARY ORDINANCE

Councilmember Raben: Okay, everybody has been given a copy of the amendments to the salary ordinance, almost two pages. In the interest of saving time, I'm going to move that the amendments be approved as listed and that the document be made part of the minutes.

Councilmember Goebel: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Raben, second Mr. Goebel. We don't have to read those out, right? Okay, any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. Motion on the salary ordinance passes six to zero.

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

PUBLIC COMMENT

President Lloyd: Item 11, public comment. Is there anyone in the public that wishes to address County Council? Okay, I don't see anybody scrambling up here. I'll take a motion for adjournment.

Councilmember Sutton: So moved.

President Lloyd: Is there a second?

Councilmember Raben: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Sutton, second Mr. Raben. We are adjourned. Thank you.

(There being no further business to come before the Council, the meeting was adjourned at 9:36 a.m.)

VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL

President Russell Lloyd, Jr.

Vice President James Raben

Councilmember Joe Kiefer

Councilmember Mike Goebel

Councilmember Tom Shetler, Jr.

Councilmember Ed Bassemier

Councilmember Royce Sutton

Recorded and transcribed by Teri Lukeman.

**VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL
MINUTES
MAY 5, 2010**

The Vanderburgh County Council met in session this 5th day of May, 2010 in room 301 of the Civic Center Complex. The meeting was called to order at 8:32 a.m. by County Council President Russell Lloyd, Jr.

President Lloyd: I'd like to call to order the May 5th Vanderburgh County Council meeting. Could we have the attendance roll call please?

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

President Lloyd: I'd like to ask everybody to stand for the Pledge of Allegiance, and ask Councilman Kiefer to lead us.

(Pledge of Allegiance was given)

<p>APPROVAL OF MINUTES APRIL 7, 2010</p>

President Lloyd: You have minutes from April 7th that were sent to you under separate cover. Is there a motion to approve?

Councilmember Shetler: So moved.

President Lloyd: Is there a second?

Councilmember Sutton: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Shetler, second Mr. Sutton. Any discussion? All those in favor please signify by saying aye.

(All Councilmembers voted affirmatively)

President Lloyd: Opposed, same sign.

(No opposing votes were cast)

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

<p>TRANSFER REQUESTS</p>

President Lloyd: Appropriation ordinance, we have none on item five. We'll move

to item number six, transfers, Weights & Measures, and I'll ask Mr. Shetler to take that.

**WEIGHTS AND MEASURES
PUBLIC DEFENDER
HEALTH DEPARTMENT**

Councilmember Shetler: Yes, we have people here from Weights & Measures and does anybody have any questions?

Councilmember Raben: Not on the transfer but, Loretta, take just a minute and kind of brief us on where we're at on –

Loretta Townsend: Moving? Hopefully, we can get in maybe next week. And the reason for the transfer is, see, we've been at the Executive for, well, a little over twenty years and our rent has never topped or even gotten to \$500 a month, which we've been lucky. Now there's a lot of them, maybe some of you all up there didn't want to pay money to a private firm. That included our utilities, water, electric, trash, whatever goes along with it and everything else. Now we don't pay rent, but our utilities is going, I'm positive, is probably going to eat us alive just like they do at home. So I'm asking to transfer what's left of the rent and not pay any more to the Executive Inn, so that may be, we might be on the street tomorrow, I don't know, and transfer into Utilities, so at least I won't have to come back, which I will have to, and ask for that much more money. You know, at least that 300 or close to \$3,000, rather, will go toward utilities. So, now as far as the move, we hope maybe next week. We've been driving them crazy running in and out of there, but they're going along as fast as they can because, you know, it took months for them to get their stuff out of there so we could even tell that there was no receptacles, we couldn't tell about the furnace, we couldn't tell about anything because there was no electric in the building. So there's where we stand. We're still sitting over here but I don't know how long.

President Lloyd: Was this transfer regarding the new facility?

Loretta Townsend: Yes. Hopefully, well, it's going to be for the utilities, paid toward the utilities.

President Lloyd: Other questions?

Councilmember Sutton: The building itself, Loretta, the new building that you're going into. What additional things are needing to be done to make it ready for you guys?

Loretta Townsend: Hopefully nothing since, I mean, now that we've got the electric going, I think the water was supposed to be turned on yesterday. I'm still trying to find out what they're going to do about the telephone. I know there might be a time, a day or two in there that we're going to be without service one place or the other. I'm trying to keep that from happening, but I can't get them to call me back from the – this afternoon I'm going to lay for them.

Councilmember Sutton: So are the Commissioners taking care of the actual move itself? How is that being –

Loretta Townsend: I've been told that, by one of the Commissioners, that they have somebody who will move us, and I hope he is right.

Councilmember Sutton: Well, we may have a Councilman who may be able to help you with that.

Loretta Townsend: I'll take it from anyone. Yes, I thought about that. The name wouldn't be prominent with a moving company, would it? I don't know, we'll do something. You know, we always manage somehow to land on our feet. I don't know how we do it, but we do.

Councilmember Sutton: Well, I hadn't heard just how the items were going to be transferred, so just wondering what the plan was.

Loretta Townsend: Yeah. Well, the plan is that he better come through. And if not, like you said, there are certain people that, very civic minded that, he's bowing his head right now and hiding.

Councilmember Shetler: It's all unsolicited, believe me.

Loretta Townsend: But that's where we stand right now.

President Lloyd: Other questions?

Councilmember Raben: No, but thanks for the info and, as always, I'm sure you're going to do it as inexpensively as it can possibly be done. You're pretty good at that.

Loretta Townsend: Well, I tell you what, and I imagine, I shouldn't say this but you know what, hey, me and Annaliesa are too old to get on a corner. I mean, there's just no way we can make up for the utilities. I mean, no, you guys are going to have to come across, that's it, you know.

President Lloyd: Okay.

Councilmember Shetler: I might suggest that we end up, or we can take these one by one or we can do it all in one group which is what we typically have done on transfers unless there is something controversial or a question that arises about one of the particular subjects. But it's your pleasure.

President Lloyd: Well, there is a late transfer, we may want to take that separate. It's related to the repeal request because I think we're going to need to deny the repeal or are we going to take the repeal and then change it to a transfer? But anyway, you want to just take a motion for all the transfer requests?

Councilmember Shetler: Yeah, the motion would be to approve all of the transfers and that would be the Weights & Measures, Public Defender, Health department, and then also the late request or do you want me to hold off on that one?

President Lloyd: We need to discuss that later.

Councilmember Shetler: We'll just do the first three and then we'll wait on the late.

Councilmember Sutton: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay. And we've got two others that we haven't had discussion on. Any discussion on the Public Defender or the Health department?

Loretta Townsend: Am I done?

President Lloyd: You're done. Thanks, Loretta.

Councilmember Shetler: Would Steve –

President Lloyd: We can probably just take the Public Defender with the late transfer.

Councilmember Shetler: Well, if we're going to answer the question now, we probably ought to at least have Steve and (inaudible) come up. Judge Heldt is also here.

Steve Owens: Judge Heldt is here as well and I know he has to get back to court so if we could have him also address the Council at this time.

Councilmember Shetler: Yes, that's fine with me, but...

President Lloyd: Okay, the 8,317, what's that related to?

Steve Owens: The 8,317 is transferring from a part-time line item, salary line item to fully fund the full-time salary line item. As you may recall, we incorporated two part-time positions into one full-time. We have filled the full-time position, in order to fully fund it, we need to transfer that amount to the full-time line item.

President Lloyd: Okay, and that was a position that we had already approved?

Sandie Deig: Yes.

President Lloyd: Questions? Mr. Goebel? Oh, I thought you held your hand up. Okay, well, let's do Health department and then we can move on to the other section. Any questions on the Health department from Gas & Oil to Contractual? There is Mr. Heck.

Councilmember Shetler: Gary, do you have anything to add to it on the contractual?

Gary Heck: No, just that we have some requests to actually do some cleanups and we would appreciate the ability to do those cleanups, but we need to transfer the money to do it.

Councilmember Shetler: Is that going to affect your Gas & Oil? I'm starting to see some prices rise out there.

Gary Heck: Not at this time. We went from full-size pickup trucks to Ranger-size pickup trucks with a six cylinder in the gas because they're used primarily within the county and our gas mileage has improved tremendously. So I think we'll be okay.

President Lloyd: Okay, other questions? Okay, Mr. Shetler made a motion for these three. Is there a second? Or, Royce, you seconded, okay. Any other discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. The transfers pass seven to zero.

WEIGHTS & MEASURES		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1302-3600	Rent	2,933.00	2,933.00
To: 1302-3200	Utilities	2,933.00	2,933.00

PUBLIC DEFENDER		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1303-1710-1303	Public Defender	8,317.00	8,317.00
To: 1303-1630-1303	Public Defender	8,317.00	8,317.00

HEALTH DEPARTMENT		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 2130-2210	Gas & Oil	5,000.00	5,000.00
To: 2130-3530	Contractual Services	5,000.00	5,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

PUBLIC DEFENDER (LATE)

President Lloyd: Now we'll go to the late transfers, Public Defender.

Councilmember Shetler: Alright, Steve?

Steve Owens: This sort of relates to the withdrawn repeal request. This is coming from the same line item as the part-time salary that we had for the Public Defender. As you'll note, probably all of you know, we now have a pending capital case. Rather than repeal this money and then come back and ask for an additional

appropriation this month, it was suggested that we just move to withdraw the repeal and transfer this money to the capital line item, and that's what we've done. That will get us started probably for at least the month, the end of April and part of May.

President Lloyd: Any questions on that? Mr. Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Can you give us an idea, like what the total long-term costs are going to be to the county, just out of curiosity, on defending this death penalty?

Steve Owens: We're really early in the process. Best guess would be somewhere between 4 and 600,000.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay.

President Lloyd: Mr. Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Sir, will this be probably tried in another county, and if it is, will it cost us more to go to another county?

Steve Owens: Councilman, again, we're real early in the process. It could be tried in another county, it could be that we go to another county and get a jury and bring them back here. I don't know yet.

Councilmember Bassemier: Will it cost more probably to go to another county?

Steve Owens: Obviously, if we have to venue it to another county and we take everybody to another county, yes, it's going to cost us a little bit more than it would be if it was tried here.

Councilmember Bassemier: Thank you, sir.

President Lloyd: Does that 400 to 600,000 include reimbursement from the state?

Steve Owens: No, we get reimbursed at 50% of whatever the expenditures that the county has. I think that the last case we had including the appeal cost is somewhere north of 600,000, and the county has received 50% of that.

President Lloyd: Okay, but from your end, you guys are going to start working on this, this month, right?

Steve Owens: We've already started working on it.

President Lloyd: Okay. Alright. Mr. Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes, I was going to ask about reimbursement as well, but you covered that. For us to prepare a little bit as far as the expenses coming up, has a trial date yet been set?

Steve Owens: There is a trial date currently set – it's April the 11th of next year. We have a number of pre-trial conferences and readiness conferences scheduled at different intervals throughout this year and early into next year.

Councilmember Goebel: Will you need the bulk of the funding prior to any of that time period or is it just going to –

Steve Owens: Oh yes.

Councilmember Goebel: Okay, thank you.

President Lloyd: I think Mr. Kiefer was next.

Councilmember Kiefer: Again, another curiosity question. Will – does the defendant have any assets? Will any of those assets be taken to help pay or offset these costs? I mean, does he have any assets at all? Obviously, he's using a public defender so, but, I meant, it would be nice to know that all of his resources have been used up to help pay for a part of the defense.

Steve Owens: He's been found to be indigent by the court, which basically means he doesn't have enough assets to fund a capital case.

Councilmember Kiefer: Yeah, I didn't know if there was anything to offset any of those costs, so...

Steve Owens: Not that I'm aware of at this time.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay, thanks.

President Lloyd: Mr. Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: Yeah, we talked a little bit about this and need to engage Judge Heldt a little bit in this conversation as well. But I don't feel like it's my role to sit back and micro manage the cost and the daily expenses, what we may incur if it goes out of town. What I'd rather see us do is maybe to get together and establish some sort of budget that makes good sense that we can, you know, live on and I'm talking basically about the cost of attorney fees and etcetera and per diem and we've gotten involved in that before here on Council, and I don't know that we need to get into the nitty gritty of how much they spent for a specific lunch or how they did for a particular dinner. I would rather, something, we look at it in a broader scope and maybe we just establish a policy on that. So, I don't know if you're thinking on, if you've had a chance to look at that at all, but anyway, I'd feel more comfortable myself, rather than sitting down and trying to look over somebody's shoulder and say hey, you shouldn't have spent \$2.50 on this or that, or what.

Carl Heldt: Although I sign the orders to pay the expenses, I really see it more as a function of the public defender and the Council to – because I don't know, I don't look over their shoulders either as they're doing things and I really think it's a function of the Council and the Public Defender to talk about those things. I think it's a reasonable request and I'm sure Mr. Owens will work with you on that, I would think.

Steve Owens: As we talked, I believe it was Monday, we don't have any problem with that. Mr. Dodd and I don't have an issue with that. I think Judge Heldt and I have a difference of opinion as to the responsibility of overseeing the cost of litigation. Criminal rule twenty-four provides that the court bills are to be submitted to the court. It has no function for the Public Defender's office. Now, while we have an office, death penalty litigation is sort of outside the realm of our normal, day-to-day activities. We would anticipate that what we would do is, we will submit monthly billing statements to Judge Heldt. He would then approve those or disapprove them in whatever respect he felt appropriate and then we would take and process those bill claims through the death penalty line item in the Public Defenders office. The

rule provides for a minimum amount of hourly compensation to the attorneys: it's \$106 per hour. So we're stuck with that in terms of compensation. As far as all the other and sundry things of experts and investigators and all of the things that kind of go along with it, we've put together that team. They sort of bill what they bill and it's difficult in this diminishing field, since there's fewer death claims filed, to find the number of people that we need to work on the case. So we're sort of at the mercy, there's fewer people doing this kind of work. But we certainly have no problems, if this case were to go out of town, in establishing some guidelines so that we're avoiding those sorts of questions that came up in the Wilkes case.

Councilmember Shetler: Perhaps we can work on that then and get that together so that we're all on the same page on that.

Carl Heldt: In hearing what Mr. Owens says: that's apparently, he feels more comfortable with the court being more involved and I'll be happy to do that, and be active with the Council if they wish and Mr. Owens, in crafting a budget and more closely parsing the expenses as they come in.

Councilmember Shetler: Well, perhaps all three of us could get on page on that so that –

Steve Owens: I don't think that will be a problem, Tom.

Councilmember Shetler: You bring up another question: if there is a full-time person in your office that's going to be a part of that team or any other team that would come up in the future, and being full-time and salaried by the Public Defender's office, does that charge, not necessarily the 106, but whatever rate it is, does that come back, then, from the state, that 50 percent come back to the state into that department then to cover that?

Steve Owens: Yes. All of the time that's spent on the capital case will be reimbursed to the county at fifty percent.

Councilmember Shetler: So if a staff attorney from Public Defender is on it, it actually helps reduce the cost to the taxpayers in that respect?

Steve Owens: Yes, essentially, because the time that the staff is going to be spending on the capital case, and the staff attorney being me, is going to be billed against the capital case at \$106 per hour, and that's going to be, obviously, covered by part of that.

Councilmember Shetler: Okay. Alright. Thank you.

Carl Heldt: Let me ask Steve this question, though. Will your time on this case require hiring additional attorneys to take your caseload for other cases? I don't know, and that, because I don't want to mislead the Council.

Steve Owens: As it stands right now, what we're doing is, we're maintaining all of the functions that we have had all along. We have to keep a minimum or a maximum caseload under the guidelines. We've reduced our caseload to that. There may be a small reduction in the number of cases that I would be assigned over a particular period of time. We don't know what that affect is going to be at this point because we don't know whether that's going to be any cases or several cases. The limit is 20 open other public defender cases at a time. That's about what I normally carry in any event. So I'm going to be still doing the administrative duties and doing the

caseload that I've been doing and if it becomes necessary to retain additional counsel, I'll advise the Council of that to make the appropriate adjustment.

Councilmember Shetler: This is probably getting off the subject a little bit here, but you bring up a good point or an interesting point to me, and that is, I know that to be selected as a co-attorney on a death penalty, that you're limited to the amount of cases that you can actually have, that you can actually be working on. But are you limited at all in the time that you spend in being involved in a supervisory capacity?

Steve Owens: No.

Councilmember Shetler: Alright. Thank you.

President Lloyd: Just one other question and this is like trying to predict the future. What are stock prices going to do, what is going to be the tax law next year. But based on your experience, the length of time for the trial, any ideas? I mean, it will be at least a year, right? By the time you get to trial and have a sentence?

Steve Owens: Well, we have a trial date set in April of next year. I think that's probably fairly realistic at this point. We have not received a case file. We're very early into the procedure. We don't know what kind of experts we may need or how long we may need to get them. But right now I think we're all working towards the concept that we try that case in April of 2011. Assuming there would be a conviction, there would have to be a sentencing within thirty days after the trial.

President Lloyd: Okay, and for the Council's point of view, the bills would flow each month, basically.

Steve Owens: Yes. I anticipate that what we'll have to do is come in for the Council meeting next month, ask for an appropriation. It will be a large appropriation. It will not be a request that will fully fund the case throughout its pendency. We are required by rule to bill every thirty days. We will do that and then that money will come through the normal payment process against the death penalty line item. We have to file our appropriation request within 120 days after the claim is paid. The Public Defender Commission meets four times a year, so those claims that are filed before their meeting will be taken up at that Commission meeting.

President Lloyd: Mr. Goebel, you're the liaison on this on the Public Defender office, so we appreciate any information you can gather.

Councilmember Bassemier: Russ?

President Lloyd: I think Mr. Goebel was first.

Councilmember Goebel: I'll be glad to do that. Steve is easy to work with, so we'll continue. Hopefully, we can keep costs down. Mr. Fluty, do you know what our current balance is? I don't have my spreadsheet with me for the General fund.

Councilmember Sutton: 1.3.

Councilmember Goebel: 1.3 million? Thank you.

President Lloyd: And then who was next? Mr. Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Now when you're going to bill us, once a month come

before us, are you going to do the same thing with the state? Will you be sending them a bill? Will you be getting anything from the state or when it's completely over?

Steve Owens: No sir. What will happen is, we will submit a claim to the court once a month. We'll submit our monthly billing statement. When that's approved, we will then submit those on a blue claim form for payment from the death penalty line item. What happens is, within 120 days after the payment of that claim, we have to file a request for reimbursement with the Public Defender Commission. They will take that up at their quarterly meeting. So it's possible that there will be claim – the reimbursement request filed that actually won't be heard by the Public Defender Commission for a couple of months, depending upon when it hits because they only meet once a quarter. They will approve those at their quarterly meeting. Once it's approved, then they will send that to the state entity that disperses the money and then there would be a reimbursement check coming in, in due course.

President Lloyd: Mr. Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: Yeah, I'd be remiss if I didn't really pat Judge Heldt on the back here. The two attorneys that he selected to be heading up the team are local attorneys and I know he picked them because of their expertise and their qualifications. But I think he was also being cognizant of the fact that, you pick attorneys from out of town and it's going to cost us greatly for the travel expenses back and forth and the lodging and the food and the whole business. And so I think he was keeping that in mind, as well. And I applaud him for picking expert attorneys that can handle the case here locally that can keep our costs down as well. So I do greatly appreciate that. Thank you.

President Lloyd: Questions? Comments? Obviously, I mean, this person deserves the best justice that he can get and we appreciate the work you gentlemen are doing on that. So, any other questions? If not, we'll take up this late transfer. Is there a motion?

Councilmember Shetler: Motion to approve.

Councilmember Bassemier: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Shetler, second Mr. Bassemier. Other discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. \$27,523 approved seven to zero.

PUBLIC DEFENDER		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1303-1710-1303	Public Defender	27,523.00	27,523.00
To: 1303-3948	Death Penalty	27,523.00	27,523.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

REPEAL REQUEST

President Lloyd: Now we'll go to item seven, repeal. I'll give that to Mr. Shetler.

PUBLIC DEFENDER

Councilmember Shetler: Basically, it's to repeal the request that was made earlier. And this is basically so that we can start looking towards, because of the death penalty that's going to be coming up and a new request that's going to come forward for next month. So we don't need a special motion for it?

President Lloyd: Should we set it in at zero or just withdraw? Just withdraw. Okay, so we need a motion to withdraw.

Councilmember Shetler: I make a motion that we withdraw the request from the Public Defender's office.

Councilmember Kiefer: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay motion Mr. Shetler to withdraw the request for repeal, second Mr. Kiefer. Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. The motion is withdrawn.

PUBLIC DEFENDER		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1303-1710-1303	Public Defender	27,523.00	Withdrawn
Total		27,523.00	Withdrawn

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

President Lloyd: Item eight, no items.

SHERIFF REQUEST TO FILL VACANCIES
--

President Lloyd: Item nine, new business. Sheriff request to fill vacancies. Is the Sheriff here?

Eric Williams: Good morning. Sheriff Eric Williams. I believe you all have a copy of my letter and subsequent amended letter with my request and I'd be happy to answer any questions, but they're fairly self-evident.

President Lloyd: The original letter was April 6?

Eric Williams: I believe so.

President Lloyd: And then when was the amended? The 21st?

Eric Williams: It was the addition of the court screener position to my original request.

President Lloyd: Okay. Any questions for the Sheriff on that? I guess one question I have, these are not all immediate vacancies, so as your letter stated, some of these would be hired over time.

Eric Williams: Well, the seven Confinement Officers are vacant now. The three Deputy Sheriffs will be vacant by the end of this month, I believe or they're vacant now as of today. The Court Screener is vacant as of now and the clerical position is vacant as of now. As far as my hiring schedule, we won't hire the Confinement Officers for a period of time. We're going to go through the interview process, but I've held off doing any kind of interviews pending your willingness to let me replace them. And then Deputies, we'll start the interview process and backgrounds, and we probably won't hire those until late summer.

President Lloyd: Jim?

Councilmember Raben: I think we need to go ahead and approve the request. The other thing, the other delay that can happen, there's so much training involved with these positions that, you know, if we delay it 30 or 60 days, it's – and the training process is months.

Eric Williams: The first year of a Deputy Sheriff is basically, they're in training that entire year while they're on their probationary period. Confinement Officers, substantially less than that, but still a significant period of time to get them up to speed where they can work the floor inside the jail on their own. The Court Screener, depending on who you hire for that, that doesn't take that long and then the Clerk, it's clerical duties, answering the phone. That position actually is one of the receptionists in the front lobby of the jail, you know, handling, taking money from visitors, checking visitors in, checking attorneys in, answering the phones for the facility.

Councilmember Raben: I'll move approval.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion to approve Mr. Raben. Is there a second?

Councilmember Sutton: Second.

President Lloyd: Second Mr. Sutton. Any discussion? Questions? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. And we do appreciate, there's a lag time here and that will help the county's budget.

Eric Williams: I will pledge to you that I will drag my feet as long as I can and not compromise safety and security.

President Lloyd: Right. Absolutely. Thank you, Sheriff. Seven to zero, approved.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

PUBLIC DEFENDER REQUEST TO FILL VACANCY
--

President Lloyd: Item B, Public Defender, request to fill vacancy. We already approved it. We approved the money, this is for the position to go from the two part-time to the one full-time.

Steve Owens: No. This – we have a full-time Executive Level II position that became vacant. And what I'm asking is permission to fill that position. The money is already in that line item. There may be, we're anticipating that we're going to fill this with a person who is coming in from out of the county. So there may be some slight savings, but it should not require a new appropriation.

President Lloyd: Okay, this is a letter dated April 15th that says, consider my request to hire a replacement for line item 1303-1640, right?

Steve Owens: Yes.

President Lloyd: Okay. And that's someone that left?

Steve Owens: Yes.

President Lloyd: Any questions for Mr. Owens? Mr. Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: You said out of town. Will we be considering their experience and their seniority from their past employment as they come in here?

Steve Owens: Well, yes. I mean, I do. I consider the experience and their past employment. Under the salary ordinance, as I understand it, if they've never been employed by the county, and they're coming in as a new attorney, they come in as a Step 1, Executive Level II, irrespective of their past experience. The only way I could get them any more money than that, assuming they've got many years of experience, is to go before Job Study and then try to work my way through that. I don't anticipate doing that.

Councilmember Shetler: That was my question. Okay. Thank you.

Steve Owens: I'm sorry. I didn't understand that.

Councilmember Shetler: No, no, no, well, that was going to be part two depending on – but thank you. You've answered it. Thank you.

Councilmember Sutton: Now we've received a letter on the 15th, Mr. Owens. Now, you say you've got a candidate. Was this advertised for? I mean, did you –

Steve Owens: Yes. We've advertised the position at various law schools, various web sites that are accessible to about a hundred law schools. We've had a number of resumes come in.

Councilmember Sutton: So you're looking for kind of someone new as opposed to predominately -- how much response did you get from your --

Steve Owens: We've had lots of responses. I think we've culled that down to about ten or eleven that we're interested in interviewing.

Councilmember Sutton: Alright. Thank you.

President Lloyd: Other questions? Mr. Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Steve, and this will be cost neutral as far as the budget?

Steve Owens: Yes, I would think it's going to be cost neutral, perhaps a slight savings. If we're bringing them in as a new hire and they're actually going to come in less than the person that was in that job.

Councilmember Goebel: And that will include, is there any kind of buyout or --

Steve Owens: Not that I can see. And I think it's cost neutral all the way around.

Councilmember Goebel: Thank you.

President Lloyd: Other questions? Okay, you made a motion, or not?

Councilmember Shetler: I am, yes, now. So moved.

President Lloyd: Is there a second?

Councilmember Bassemier: Second.

President Lloyd: Second Mr. Bassemier, motion Mr. Shetler. Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Owens.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

HEALTH DEPARTMENT REQUEST TO FILL VACANCIES
--

President Lloyd: Item C, Health department, two employees request, one vacancy fill. Mr. Heck is here. Questions for Mr. Heck? I'll ask a question. The two employee requests would be grant line funded?

Gary Heck: That is correct.

President Lloyd: And then the other one is a replacement?

Gary Heck: It's a replacement for a Deputy Registrar in our vital records. This position was used to partially fund the accrued payout last year of a long-time county employee. We weren't able to fill the position before the hiring freeze went into effect, which we would have done given the opportunity. So this is just a request to fill that position. We certainly need it in vital records. It's the division that generates the most service fees for the Health department and they're, I don't want to say woefully short-handed, but they've been working at their absolute limit and with long-term employees, when you have some vacation time coming up, I don't have anybody to help cover that office. We're getting additional requests and there's additional new items that they'll be required to do that the state legislators passed that's part of paternity affidavit applications on the web based system in the future, and we need to get somebody in place and trained before all of that happens.

President Lloyd: So they handle birth records, death records, birth certificates, paternity, a lot of that has to do with where you receive fees for those duplicate records.

Gary Heck: That's exactly correct. I think in the sheets I provided you, you could see that there's been some major increases over previous early years when we matched the fees that – right now, every birth that occurs in a county, it's that county that issues the certificates, same thing with a death, whether they're a resident or a non-resident. When the Women's Hospital opened in Warrick County, a significant number of Vanderburgh County residents, their physicians are associated with that facility. The births went to that facility. We've made up some of that money, if you will, in that they issued a combo certificate for \$10 and we were just issuing a single certificate for five, so we matched that. A combo means you get a full-size and a wallet size. It, in essence, it treated all Vanderburgh County residents the same, whether they gave birth in Vanderburgh or in Warrick County. And then in addition to that, there is paternity affidavits, paternity affidavits upon marriage, there's a variety of things that our staff does that's the initial step of establishing paternity, that will establish that before it – it doesn't have to go to court if both parties are in agreement and both parties agree and sign those affidavits. That takes a lot of time to do those paternity affidavits.

President Lloyd: On this list, what year was the Women's Hospital open for –

Gary Heck: It started about, I think it was 2002. There was some, we didn't have our fee increase here until 2006. And that's when you'll see the big jump. Another thing that happens through some anomalies, you'll see it went up one year and then down the next. Some major employers, at one point, decided for hospitalization purposes that every employee needed to be able to prove dependents, their dependents, and required birth certificates. And so, we had a major influx of requests for birth certificates in order to – folks to keep people on their health insurance.

President Lloyd: Any other questions for Mr. Heck? Mr. Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: How many employees do you have in that department?

Gary Heck: Two, and –

Councilmember Shetler: Currently?

Gary Heck: There's two in there now. We were set up for three and it's that third one that we desperately need.

Councilmember Shetler: How many employees do you have within the Health department that are not tied up to any kind of federal programs or state programs specifically that are in the Health department?

Gary Heck: There's about 45 that are county employees and the rest are, the other 20 or something are all grant employees. Unfortunately, we've looked at trying to see if we could do some realignments and some things, and it just, with everything that's going on with not only the H1N1, but there's three new immunizations that's required for all six through twelfth graders for school next year. And well, right now, I'm conducting, today we're having a clinic out at Central High School. We're just swamped trying to keep up with all the regular things that go on in the Health department and this is a major, the vital records is something that you need. A birth certificate is a primary source document for Social Security, for the Bureau of Motor Vehicles. If anybody, when you renew your drivers license, you're going to be required to take a birth certificate in. If you have a child who is going to get their drivers license for the first time, one of the parents has to take their birth certificate in, as well, under the new state laws. And we've just been overwhelmed in trying to keep up with the death certificates, it's just been very, very difficult to do it. We've tried to look at how we could switch staff around, and you're robbing from Peter to pay Paul the whole time you do it, and it just hasn't worked out very well for us.

Councilmember Shetler: Well, I guess my concern is, and my interest is that, in particularly larger departments that, where we can cross train, and get people that are working, and I know there's no particular day that people are going to make a rush, that you can predict that they're going to come in for death certificates, birth certificates on Mondays or Wednesdays. I know there's no particular time of season there might be, but I guess somewhat, unfortunately, I've had to go in and pick up certificates more recently and been in there a few different times, and I haven't been in a situation any of the times I've been in to feel as – it was, you know, a four or five minute wait. I mean, it wasn't, you know, real serious in my opinion. I didn't know if it was a situation here where this being a basic clerical function, if the line did get long out there, there wasn't a matter of somebody just ringing a buzzer or calling back and saying hey, I need some help, Jan, if you could come up for ten, fifteen, twenty minutes.

Gary Heck: Under the old days, that might have been possible, but with this new web based system that's in place, you have to be certified by the state and we have those other lines in all of our other offices as well. You were just fortunate that you were there at a time when it didn't require extensive research through the old handwritten birth and death books that are all stored in back of the Health department. It takes sometimes up to an hour to research all of the data needed to prepare a certificate. So if there was a way that I thought we could do this, otherwise, we would do it. We discussed it, or it was discussed I should say, at the Board of Health meeting, and this recommendation is really coming from the Board of Health because they don't feel we can not have somebody in this position full-time anymore.

Councilmember Shetler: Are you saying that the people in that office that do the certificates must be certified through some kind of training?

Gary Heck: Well, they have to go through the state and be, they have to pass, it's an on-line test through the state. We can choose someone to go in and do it, but they're not allowed to process a record until they pass that on-line web test. It's, whether it's called a registration or certification or state vital records approval, I don't have an exact terminology for it. But they're not able to do it until they satisfactorily complete all of that training that they have on line in order to pass that certification.

Councilmember Shetler: I know that you've come in for a couple of different requests and stuff, have we actually eliminated any personnel in your office over the last eighteen months?

Gary Heck: The only ones that were eliminated, or well, there has some been changes and there has been some positions that don't exist today that existed previously. This is the only one that remains an unfilled position. There has – I guess we're one lower in strength than they were before the hiring freeze started where a position, in essence, was given up in order to accomplish – and that's one of the nurse practitioners is what I'm recalling, is where a nurse practitioner position was eliminated.

Councilmember Shetler: And that's a more technical type of field where I do have a little sympathy to make sure, particularly with the H1N1 and all that other stuff that goes on out there. And that's what we're all about.

Gary Heck: Well, we're still waiting for the personnel review for our job descriptions. We're operating under 1993 job descriptions. That review has never taken place at the Health department yet. And I don't know that that would necessarily help us eliminate any positions unless we somehow restructured a lot different than the way we're operating today.

President Lloyd: I think it was Mr. Sutton and then Mr. Raben.

Councilmember Sutton: A couple of questions: you were in here last year, Gary, oh spring or so, and you had, oh, four or five different requests on a restructuring program that you put together for us, if you can recall back then, when your former position that you held no longer exists. Would that be a correct statement?

Gary Heck: It doesn't exist as the Chief Operating Finance Officer, but we reverted back to a Finance Officer position.

Councilmember Sutton: Which is a lower...

Gary Heck: There's been some cost savings but I wouldn't have termed it as eliminating a position. There was some restructuring, yes sir.

Councilmember Sutton: And wasn't there, didn't you realign the number of nurses as well in terms of their responsibilities? Maybe I'm...

Gary Heck: Well, we were able to fill a nurse position in order to help do the – there was a public health nurse position that had been vacant and we were able earlier this year to fill that position by – given permission by the Council, which we truly appreciate.

Councilmember Sutton: Now these grant positions that you're requesting, what is the length of time for these grants?

Gary Heck: Each of the grants varies. This one happens to be on a federal fiscal year so it operates from October 1 through September 30th and it will, so this particular position would go through the end of September unless it's renewed, and it's been renewed for the past twenty-five years.

Councilmember Sutton: Okay.

Gary Heck: It's for the Women's Infant and Children, WIC program.

Councilmember Sutton: And the county is responsible, how much is the county paying toward both of these two, these grant funded positions?

Gary Heck: None. I mean, the grant covers everything.

Councilmember Sutton: Okay. Now I was looking at, okay, on your other request, on this vital records position, now I recognize that the Women's Hospital has had an effect on, like I said, just the number of requests that you've got, but you had the big increase in 2006, --

Gary Heck: That was when the, that's when the birth certificate and death certificate went from five dollars each to ten dollars each.

Councilmember Sutton: Okay. But really, it's beginning to see a decline in the number, in the amount of income since 2007?

Gary Heck: Well, there's been a decline in income, but not a decline in the work. That's where these affidavit numbers and things that come in as well. So until someone goes on Social Security or needs to have copies of certificates, they don't come in to get a certificate. And so, you could have a large number of births or deaths, but until a certificate is required, there's no need for someone to come in and actually get one. If somebody is trying to get a passport, somebody is going to register for school, somebody is going to get a drivers license, somebody is going to make a change in Social Security, all of those things require a primary source document. It doesn't have to be a birth certificate, but the birth certificate is the number one certificate that each one of those other agencies request.

Councilmember Sutton: So we're working on almost a year that you've been without that vital records position. How have you guys been able to – what are you doing

to continue to keep the requests filled and the responsibilities taken care of?

Gary Heck: I try to have a part-time – we did have a part-time person following with what, we had a clerk that we were able to train, but then we also had a grant, lose a funding position in the sexually transmitted disease area. And when we looked at – and the person that was in there was a clerk that was under the Health department's grant and we did without as long as we could in the other area, until the H1N1 activity started to go down. And when activities increased in those other clinics, we had to shift this person back over there. And I don't see where that's going to end now. So we're at a point where I'm down to just those two regular full-time employees in there.

Councilmember Sutton: When did you make that shift back over to where they –

Gary Heck: First of the year. We did it the first of the year.

Councilmember Sutton: Thank you.

Gary Heck: You're welcome.

President Lloyd: Mr. Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yeah, just so I'm clear, we're talking about three positions. Two part-time that will be funded by a grant.

Gary Heck: With our request today?

Councilmember Raben: Yeah.

Gary Heck: Yes sir. There's two part-time positions for a grant under WIC, and then one Health department to fill a vacancy that's been in place and the vacancy was created primarily because we had to fund the accumulated payout last year.

Councilmember Raben: Now we're talking about the vital records person.

Gary Heck: This is the vital records person.

Councilmember Raben: Okay. What did you quote earlier? You have approximately 65 employees or –

Gary Heck: There's about 65 full-time equivalence when you count the county funded positions and all of the grant funded positions.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, and how many part-time?

Gary Heck: Well, in the full-time equivalent, there's four part-time people under the Health department budget, not counting the summer extra help for the mosquito, and in the other grant positions, in WIC, there's probably three or four part-time positions.

Councilmember Raben: How many bodies do you have under your roof?

Gary Heck: Probably sixty-nine warm bodies in all of our various roofs that are working part-time.

Councilmember Raben: You know, I, listening to the conversation, you know, that is a rather large office, sixty-nine people –

Gary Heck: It is three different locations: dental clinic, the WIC Fulton, and then the Health department.

Councilmember Raben: And I know there is different abilities, for sure, and there's different responsibilities and I think some of it, there's some seasonality involved. So, you know, I would think with an office of, that large, of 69 people, we could figure out a way to reconfigure the office to make up for one person. That just doesn't seem like that's a major hurdle. You know, as an example, I mean, you've got folks that are assigned to mosquito patrol, you know, that probably, that's seasonal. You know, I don't think I got bit by a mosquito in January. I mean, again, you know, there's enough seasonality flow within a department that big, that I would think we could make up for one person.

Gary Heck: Well, we're on three different floors and there's a – and I would have to go back and look, but there's eleven different reception points when you look at all the various divisions. Trying to cover all of those different spots, it's very, very difficult with the staff that we currently have because you're trying to stay open 8:00 to 4:30 for people to come in to be able to conduct business. And when you have that many various reception areas, it's difficult to do with the staff that we have.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, and we might, you know, as we get further into the agenda, and again, this is something new that I'm still having a difficult time swallowing, but, you know, the travel requests, maybe, you know, I'm sure that's got to put a burden on your staff because it seems like there is a lot of travel within the Health department and, you know, I mentioned last week, you know, where we can send one, I hope we're sending one and not two or three.

Gary Heck: And I think I assured you last month that that exactly is what is happening. And unless it's part of their job requirement where they need to attend this training because it is a job requirement, and that's primarily in some of the grants, that's exactly what we do. We only send one. But if it is a job requirement and if they are in a grant, we've continued those requests just because it's part of the overall grant agreement that says we'll send our folks to those trainings.

Councilmember Raben: Okay.

President Lloyd: We need to wrap this up. Mr. Kiefer and then Mr. Goebel.

Councilmember Kiefer: Gary, you were talking about all those different receptionists, how you have multiple receptionists, --

Gary Heck: Clerks and secretaries.

Councilmember Kiefer: Do they do more than just receive people in to the office?

Gary Heck: Of course. Uh-huh. Yes sir, they do. They, and for instance, in environmental, they not only receive people into the office, they process the permits for septic tanks, they do all of the licensing and permits for all the restaurants that are conducted here. They take dye fees to take and do a dye of the septic to see if there is a problem with the septic tank. There's, they all have multiple duties assigned to those particular offices. So, like I say, we look forward to the job review

because I think it's going to find that a lot of our folks jobs have changed since 1993 and they're doing a lot more today than they were doing back in 1993.

President Lloyd: Mr. Kiefer, you're personnel chair, so maybe you can talk to Mr. Deisher about that. I know they're on the list. I think he was still working on the Sheriff's department last time I checked. Mr. Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Gary, I think people who have come before us for replacements have come with the very same message each time, that they're asking people employed to do more work with less help and evidently you've gotten by, so, I don't know, maybe with the job descriptions or something we might have to, my feeling is, we might have to wait on that position. The grants are, I think, a no brainer, but maybe we could take a little closer look at it after Mr. Kiefer and Mr. Deisher get involved, too. I don't know what the consensus is here.

Gary Heck: I can tell you that I believe there is going to be a much longer wait for some of the services and I don't know how to answer all of their questions because I'm trying to do the best I can to relay to you the fact that we're doing the best we can to try to keep that wait limit as short as possible. Right now we have the funeral directors drop off their certificates before 10:00 and we try to get them processed by 2:00 that day to get back to them. I don't know that we're going to be able to continue to do a same day service on that. And it's an important, and that's because we have to enter this data into two different systems because the state's new web system doesn't meet the State Board of Accounts' requirements for doing the totaling of all the receipts. It will eventually, but we're not there yet. So Mr. Shetler was very fortunate the day that he was there that he didn't have a much longer wait because there's some people that have to wait an hour to get their certificates and it's because of the amount of time that it takes to process somebody who was there in front of them.

President Lloyd: You probably had a warning bell: uh-oh Councilmember, hurry up, hurry up.

Gary Heck: You were just fortunate that day.

Councilmember Shetler: Well, it's actually, I've been in there about five different times and I really hate to use an example particularly if it's isolated in my case there, but, and other times that I did. But we're also talking about backroom activity that can take place when funeral directors are dropping off things and they can pick it up at a later point in time. That, to me, indicates that minor stuff that someone else can be certified to do, I would think within the building, and, I mean, it's, again, it's kind of the thing we've been asking others to do. At this time, what I would really like to do is make a motion to separate this question and make a motion that we approve the two WIC employees that, so I'd make a motion that we approve that and then we can make a motion on the other position in a second.

President Lloyd: Okay, so your motion is to approve two new employees with the grant request?

Councilmember Shetler: Correct.

President Lloyd: Okay, is there a second?

Councilmember Kiefer: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Shetler, second Mr. Kiefer. Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. So that motion passes seven to zero.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

President Lloyd: Is there a motion, will we need to formally do the motion, and then have an up or down vote on the request to fill the vacancy?

Councilmember Shetler: I will formally make the motion to approve the request for the full-time position.

President Lloyd: Okay, is there a second?

Councilmember Sutton: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Shetler, second Mr. Sutton. Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: I'm going to vote yes, but just want to make sure we are really on course with going through and getting these positions updated and really get a chance to evaluate the strengths of each office where we can begin to evaluate responsibilities and more changes can be made because I think it really hampers our process here and what we're able to do, decisions we can make on whether a position can or cannot be considered vital to county business. But yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: I have to agree with no at this time.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: No.

Teri Lukeman: President Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Okay, I'm going to vote yes. It fails four to three. And I guess one other point that wasn't brought up, all the Health department fees, they're reviewed annually by the Commissioners, some of those are set by state law but, obviously, I think we want to encourage the Commissioners in areas where we can increase those fees, I think it would be a worthwhile exercise as we see the revenue kind of going up and down. Alright, thank you.

(Motion fails 3-4/Councilmembers Shetler, Goebel, Raben & Kiefer opposed)

President Lloyd: Item D, Coroner request to fill vacancy.

Councilmember Goebel: Can I make one comment prior to Gary leaving? I was just going to compliment you on – I was just going to ask one quick question on H1N1. Has anyone received a vaccination in recent months on that situation that you're aware of, or is it pretty much gone?

Gary Heck: Oh no, they still – are you saying, do we still offer the vaccinations –

Councilmember Goebel: Has anyone stepped in to receive one? You still offer –

Gary Heck: Yeah, they step into our office four days a week. We have walk-ins on Monday, Wednesdays and Fridays from 8:00 until 3:00 and on Tuesdays from 10:00 until 5:00. And there's someone who comes every day on those days and receives them. They're still being offered at the Central High School immunization clinic today from 3:00 to 7:00 and tomorrow from 3:00 to 7:00, in addition to the three new required immunizations that will be required for all sixth to twelfth graders starting next year.

Councilmember Goebel: And you're also going to offer those for Vanderburgh County's students at the Health department itself?

Gary Heck: We will during July, August and September, every Tuesday will be a

walk-in day just for back to school immunizations. And we're also looking to do these with schools as well on-site at schools and not just the public schools, but any school in Vanderburgh County, parochial or whatever.

Councilmember Goebel: I want to commend you for that because that's an extra burden you've got placed on your backs, too. Thank you.

Gary Heck: Yes, we're over 47,000 individual H1N1 vaccinations that have occurred in Vanderburgh County so far, and they're still counting, and we'll continue to do them as long as vaccine is available and people need them. Thank you.

CORONER REQUEST TO FILL VACANCY
--

President Lloyd: Okay, we'll go from warm bodies to warm and cold bodies: here's the Coroner.

Annie Groves: Annie Groves.

President Lloyd: Any questions for Ms. Groves? Request to fill vacancy. Part-time employee, correct?

Annie Groves: Correct.

President Lloyd: Any questions?

Councilmember Bassemier: You're losing employees because...?

Annie Groves: I've lost two for health reasons just recently because their backs, their doctors would no longer allow them to do the lifting that we have to do.

Councilmember Bassemier: I know it is hard work.

Annie Groves: It's, yeah, we had one the other day that was over 500 pounds.

President Lloyd: Other questions?

Councilmember Kiefer: I make a motion to approve.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion to approve, is there a second?

Councilmember Bassemier: Second.

President Lloyd: Motion Mr. Kiefer, second Mr. Bassemier. Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. Motion passes seven to zero.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

Councilmember Shetler: Real quickly, not to belabor the point, but the increase on the part-time wages, is that helping to retain other part-time or –

Annie Groves: They still pay more in Posey and Warrick than we do here so, you know, but I do have people that have applied, so I do have people that I can interview, so I'm hoping that we can get someone. Our death rate has just gone up so sky high, that, you know, if you go to work for Warrick County, you get paid to be on call. Well, you're not going to do anything because they're life-flighted here to Evansville, and the same with Posey. We get them all life-flighted. If you go on-call in Vanderburgh County, you're going to work all night. So if you have the chance to work in Warrick and sleep all night for more money than in Vanderburgh, I don't blame them.

Councilmember Shetler: Alright, thank you.

Councilmember Kiefer: They probably don't have openings, though, do they?

Annie Groves: Oh yeah, they do.

Councilmember Kiefer: Oh, they have openings?

Annie Groves: Yes, they do.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay.

Annie Groves: Thank you.

SUPERIOR DRUG COURT REQUEST TO HIRE SUMMER GRANT INTERN
--

President Lloyd: Item E, Superior Drug Court, request for summer grant intern. Please state your name.

Debra Mowbray: Debra Mowbray, with the Vanderburgh County Drug Court.

President Lloyd: Okay. Any questions on this request? Summer grant intern. Just roughly, what would the position be doing?

Debra Mowbray: Be helping do some drug testing and also doing some paperwork and learning some interviewing skills that I do when I go over to the jail.

President Lloyd: It sounds like a worthwhile request. Any discussion? Is there a motion to approve?

Councilmember Sutton: I had a question.

President Lloyd: Mr. Sutton.

(TAPE CHANGED)

Councilmember Sutton: What was the amount of that grant that you received?

Debra Mowbray: It's a grant from the Indiana Department of Corrections and for part-time work it's 16,000, but it covers our weekend people and one person that does drug testing.

Councilmember Sutton: Now the intern, --

Debra Mowbray: So it's in with the \$16,000 for the year of part-time work.

Councilmember Sutton: And how long will that intern be with your office?

Debra Mowbray: Starting like the third of June until school goes back into session, which is the end of August.

Councilmember Sutton: And that position will be paid how much?

Debra Mowbray: Eight dollars an hour.

Councilmember Sutton: Thank you.

Debra Mowbray: You're welcome.

Councilmember Raben: I move for approval.

President Lloyd: Motion to approve Mr. Raben. Is there a second?

Councilmember Kiefer: Second.

President Lloyd: Second Mr. Kiefer. Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. That's approved seven to zero. Thank you.

Debra Mowbray: Thank you.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

AUDITOR REQUEST TO REPLACE PART-TIME EMPLOYEE
--

President Lloyd: Item F, Auditor request to replace part-time employee. There is a letter dated May 3rd from Auditor Bill Fluty. Any questions on that? He's going to come around to the podium. Questions? Mr. Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: What's the part-time position do? I mean, what would be their daily activity?

Bill Fluty: They are helping with the exemption department. Also we have the new pink form I think many of you filled out. I think we probably have around 15 to 20,000 that we're going to be processing. So they will be helping with some of the daily work where some of the other people can go ahead and process those pink forms for the homestead verification. I've had this position since January that comes in a couple of times a week and works. She's leaving in May and this is just to fill out the rest of the year with a new person.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay, thank you.

President Lloyd: Mr. Goebel, did you have a question?

Councilmember Goebel: I think this Council is in a state of denial, so that's just my feeling on this position.

President Lloyd: Okay, any other questions? Is there a motion to approve?

Councilmember Shetler: So moved.

President Lloyd: Is there a second?

Councilmember Raben: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Shetler, second Mr. Raben. Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: I'm here. Yeah, I'm going to vote for it.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: I know this is part-time and I'm sure it's worthy, but reflecting back on a prior decision earlier for a replacement, I'm going to vote no.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: I'll vote no.

Teri Lukeman: President Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. Motion passes five to two. Thank you.

Bill Fluty: Thank you.

(Motion carried 5-2/Councilmembers Goebel & Kiefer opposed)

HEALTH DEPARTMENT TRAVEL REQUEST

President Lloyd: Item G, Judge Heldt, Steve Owens regarding death penalty, we've already taken that up when they had the appropriation request. Item H, travel requests, I'll turn those over to Mr. Shetler.

Councilmember Shetler: We have several requests from the Health department. I don't see Gary here any longer.

Councilmember Sutton: Ran him out.

Councilmember Shetler: You all should have had them in your files. I know one is going to Ft. Benjamin Harrison. Most of them appear to be, there is one here for a longer stay for a couple employees and that's down the road here, I think, it looks like to me in December is what that is set up for. There is one scheduled for Leavenworth, Indiana. I don't know if I have that – I probably do in this somewhere.

I'd be happy to try and answer any questions the best I can if we, a couple of these, because of the dates, look like they could be put off a little bit. Some of it's May 10th and May 11th, though, 12th.

Councilmember Raben: Yeah, I wish he were here. There is, as an example, Leavenworth, there's zero cost. I don't know if that's an oversight. And then we have Bedford, Indiana, training for two individuals at zero cost. And they may be zero cost, I'm not sure. I just wonder if that's a typo or –

President Lloyd: We can instruct these officeholders, if you have a zero cost travel, we don't want to see that come to Council. I mean, why would we want to see that? They could send their people out every day all over the country and if costs zero, I mean, that's their issue if they can serve the taxpayer or not.

Councilmember Raben: I would call attention to one. The STD/HIV prevention training in Cincinnati. It's not a state called meeting, and we are sending two people, that's kind of the point I made earlier. We should be sending one, particularly to meetings that aren't state called and that person should report back when they get back and help the others, you know, pass on their knowledge that they gain to the others. I have a question that quite honestly I'm not real sure so I'm going to direct this to the Auditor. On the ones where we get reimbursement where there are grants, I guess first, are we paying this travel out of our general fund travel line or is this coming out of theirs?

Sandie Deig: Theirs.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, well, that answers that then.

President Lloyd: If you wanted to cut the one health department in half to go for one employee, I guess you have the liberty to do that. But that's money in their travel budget as of right now. They have funds sufficient to do that. The department head is saying, hey, both these people work in this field, we need to cover it. So, I mean, I'll leave that to the pleasure of the Council.

Councilmember Kiefer: Like he said, they may be required as part of their duty to attend that.

President Lloyd: It's unfortunate that Mr. Heck had to leave.

Councilmember Shetler: Right. I think the question that Councilman Raben is really directing towards, and I understand if we needed certification and keeping your continuing education going on, but if that part's not necessary, the question is, can we afford to have two or three people out of the office. It may not be really costing us any more per se except riding along in the car and it may be a county vehicle and that's why it's zeroed out. But at the same time, we lose four warm bodies out of that office when we could be using those folks for doing other things. And I think that becomes the overriding question here. Do we need to be a little bit more judicious on that?

President Lloyd: I guess these are questions we would want to ask the officeholders and department heads. Apparently, the day you went for that death certificate, they weren't traveling, they were all there. Other questions? Why don't we make a motion to approve. If there's any change in the dollar amounts, we'll entertain that.

Councilmember Shetler: Alright. So moved.

Councilmember Sutton: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, there's a motion and a second to approve all travel requests as submitted.

Councilmember Kiefer: You mean all travel requests from the Health department?

President Lloyd: No, I thought we were doing all of them.

Councilmember Kiefer: Because I do have questions about travel requests from --

Councilmember Shetler: Make my motion the Health department.

President Lloyd: Okay, we'll just go with -- okay, there's a motion for five different travel requests from the Health department, all within their budget. So Mr. Shetler made a motion to approve. Is there a second?

Councilmember Sutton: I seconded it.

President Lloyd: Mr. Sutton seconded. Okay, roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. That passes seven to zero.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

COUNTY TREASURER TRAVEL REQUEST
--

President Lloyd: Item two, County Treasurer, state called meeting.

Councilmember Shetler: It's a request to go to the state conference, the Association of County Treasurers. I guess my only question to Rick would be that, one thing that could be very helpful for people involved in that, it can be a small price to pay for them as ambassadors of our county to help try to get that conference located in Vanderburgh County within a reasonable amount of time. And those kind of things do generate quite a bit of revenue for us as far as tourism is concerned and I would be in favor of us being involved in that.

President Lloyd: I believe under Z Tuley, when she was Treasurer, I thought we brought the Treasurers here one year.

Councilmember Shetler: Yes, she was very successful in that.

President Lloyd: Okay, so was that a motion?

Councilmember Kiefer: Can you restate the motion because I was –

Councilmember Shetler: I'll move to approve the Treasurer's office.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay, thanks.

President Lloyd: Is there a second?

Councilmember Raben: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Shetler, second Mr. Raben. I'll just ask for all those in favor, signify by saying aye.

(All Councilmembers voted affirmatively)

President Lloyd: Any opposed?

(No opposing votes were cast)

President Lloyd: Seven to zero.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

COUNTY ENGINEER TRAVEL REQUEST

President Lloyd: County Engineer.

Councilmember Raben: I move approval.

Councilmember Sutton: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Raben, second Mr. Sutton. Any discussion? All those in favor signify by saying aye.

(All Councilmembers voted affirmatively)

President Lloyd: Any opposed?

(No opposing votes were cast)

President Lloyd: Seven to zero.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

Councilmember Shetler: John is here by the way.

COUNTY ASSESSOR TRAVEL REQUEST

President Lloyd: Item number four, County Assessor, two travel requests. Is there a motion to approve?

Councilmember Sutton: Move approval.

President Lloyd: Is there a second?

Councilmember Bassemier: Second.

President Lloyd: Any discussion? All those in favor signify by saying aye.

(All Councilmembers voted affirmatively)

President Lloyd: Any opposed?

(No opposing votes were cast)

President Lloyd: Passes seven to zero. Thank you.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

VETERANS SERVICE TRAVEL REQUEST
--

President Lloyd: Okay, Veterans Service, I believe there is a question from Mr. Kiefer.

Councilmember Kiefer: Yeah, I noticed on these travel requests you have two different individuals traveling to the same location on the same dates and they're each asking for mileage, which my thought is, why can't they ride together? You know, they're going to the same location, same hotel and yet we've got two different cars traveling there, so they're each asking for mileage.

Councilmember Sutton: Councilman, I think, even further, the question is, do both need to attend?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yeah.

Councilmember Sutton: It's not stated called, I mean, it's just kind of an annual conference they have but...

Councilmember Kiefer: So anyway, you know, I guess, one thought is, they could ride together and then, I don't know, does the county have any pool vehicles that they could utilize?

President Lloyd: I believe we do. We do have pool vehicles.

Councilmember Kiefer: Well, maybe they could use that and ride together because I doubt they'd spend \$300 on gas to get up there and back.

President Lloyd: Okay.

Councilmember Kiefer: So we could approve it and just reduce one, the mileage.

(Inaudible – microphone not turned on)

Councilmember Kiefer: Dates, June 8th and 9th.

Councilmember Shetler: You know, we just got this in, I think, Friday, so my recommendation might be that we wait until the end of the month. This is – I know they're going to have to put some reservations in, I understand, but really we're getting this in at the last minute here and maybe we need to set up some kind of guidelines where people, department heads and etcetera get these in six to eight weeks in advance here, which is kind of tight on this.

Councilmember Goebel: Sometimes those meetings are not called until or notification doesn't come out until later than that.

Councilmember Sutton: And you also kind of put yourself in a risky situation with your lodging, if that's the place where the conference is taking place. And being in Indianapolis, yeah, there's tons of hotels but –

Councilmember Shetler: I would doubt if this was something that was called at the very last minute. I have a feeling that this was probably well in advance and I agree there are times that that comes up and we could make that allowance. But, as I'm looking through this, we've got a lot of requests in here that are taking place on May the 10th, May the 12th, May the 13th, you know, that three or four day notice, if we have any questions about it, you know, they're kind of out of luck, they're putting themselves a little bit at risk here. But my guess is that this particular request has been probably in the works for some time and we just got word of it. And I think there seems to be, from what I'm picking up here, some concern about it.

President Lloyd: If we, I'm sitting here trying to do this on a calculator, but if we subtract one of the mileages, the total request, \$729.56, if you subtract 152.80, \$576.76. Do we want to approve that and then ask them to come to the meeting rather than – we normally don't vote at Personnel & Finance, so that would fall to the June meeting.

Councilmember Shetler: I could go along with that, yes.

Councilmember Kiefer: Yeah, that would be okay.

President Lloyd: 576.76, okay, you want to make that motion?

Councilmember Kiefer: I'll make that motion to change it to the amount you stated.

President Lloyd: And is there a second?

Councilmember Shetler: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, we have a motion and a second for 576.76. And I would, I'm trying to think, that department is only two people in there, so that would be everybody in that department traveling, which is questionable as well. So we'll send a note to Veterans Service and ask them to come to our next meeting and maybe explain that. Okay, we have a motion Mr. Shetler – oh, Mr. Kiefer made the motion, second Mr. Shetler. All those in favor signify by saying aye.

(All Councilmembers voted affirmatively)

President Lloyd: Any opposed?

(No opposing votes were cast)

President Lloyd: Okay, seven to zero.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

Councilmember Raben: Just one general comment before we move on to the amendments. You know, several years ago, Ed and Royce, I think you'll recall at one point we maybe passed a resolution or maybe it was simply stated by the president or something that the county was not going to reimburse or pay for non-state called meetings. Do you remember that? And we worked within that for a few years.

Councilmember Sutton: Yeah, it's been a while back.

Councilmember Raben: It's something to consider.

President Lloyd: Our veterans on Council will have to recall that.

Councilmember Bassemier: Jim's right. Jim is right on that.

President Lloyd: Okay, I agree, it should be something to be considered.

Councilmember Kiefer: You may want to review that and update it then.

President Lloyd: Maybe we can try to pull that from the archives and present a newer version at the next meeting.

Councilmember Sutton: Yeah, if we went back and just started looking, just even this year, the amount of travel and the expense toward that, it begins to add up.

AMENDMENTS TO SALARY ORDINANCE

President Lloyd: Okay, item number ten, Amendments to Salary Ordinance, turn that over to Mr. Shetler.

Councilmember Shetler: I think everybody has received a copy of the Salary Ordinance amendments. The Sheriff department, total of twelve employees to amend the salary ordinance to approve hiring of eight new Confinement Officers at

\$34,948 apiece. Amend salary ordinance to approve hiring of two new Deputy Sheriffs at \$43,222 base salary. Amend the salary ordinance to approve replacing the Post Commend Receptionist at an initiation rate of \$25,742, after six months the step one salary would be \$26,961. Amend the salary ordinance to approve replacing a Court Screener at a start rate of \$29,697 and step up after six months of \$31,111. Public Defender, setting the salary at, that's line 1303-1630, setting the salary at \$52,894 for a Step 1 and after six months – that is that, okay. And then the Health department, approving the two employees to come out of the WIC program, at a rate of \$12.9759 per hour, that's account 213.4. Amend the salary ordinance to approve the hiring of a part-time employee in the Peer Breast Counselor up to \$9.50 per hour to be funded by the WIC program as well, that comes out of 213.8. Coroner, allow hiring a replacement Deputy Coroner at the rate of \$9.25 per hour. Superior Court, amend the salary ordinance to allow the hiring of a summer intern up to \$8.00 per hour from a grant in the Drug Court Division. And Auditor, allow hiring of a part-time employee replacement at a rate of up to \$8.50 per hour. That's the motion I'll make for approval.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion by Mr. Shetler, is there a second for salary ordinance amendments?

Councilmember Goebel: Second.

President Lloyd: Second Mr. Goebel. Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Sutton?

Councilmember Sutton: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. Salary ordinance amendments pass seven to zero.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

PUBLIC COMMENT

President Lloyd: Move on to item eleven, public comment. I think Mrs. Heiman had asked to come up and speak to Council.

Roberta Heiman: Thank you, Mr. President, Councilmen. Actually, what I'm here to talk about is something that would address a lot of these financial issues that our county and city is facing. Two weeks ago I was at a conference sponsored by Vectren and the city, they brought in a national consultant to help explore ways that we can stop this brain drain that this community has had for several decades now and start attracting more young professional people to live in this community and more twenty-first century jobs, twenty-first century employers that we need if this community is going to thrive. And this consultant said, you know, we're in a competition with every other community in this country trying to do that. And what we can offer that maybe some of them can't, our trump card could be our quality of place, our parks like Burdette Park, there's no other county in this country, I think, that could beat a park like Burdette, or things like the downtown river front, our Pigeon Creek Greenway, and she said that this quality of place has to include more things like that, more Pigeon Creek Greenway. Our trail on the downtown river front is a great start to something that can be really spectacular. Our trail at Burdette where the construction has started now to take it out to USI, that's a great start, but we need more (inaudible) we've done. The people who are interested in doing this have formed the Evansville Area Trails Coalition. It's a coalition of about thirty groups including our universities, our hospitals, Keep Evansville Beautiful, the Convention & Visitors Bureau, the Greenway Advisory Board, Burdette Park. We're interested in helping make this community a healthier, more vital community with safe routes for us and our children to walk and ride our bikes from where we live to our parks, our schools, our workplaces, our shopping areas, even to grandma's house. And in many parts of this city and county now, it's not safe for us to do that. We don't even have sidewalks, much less safe lanes along the street or bikeways. So we've looked at how other communities are accomplishing this, and what they had and what we didn't have was this non-profit coalition that can work with local government units and seek funds, engage the community in getting this done, seek national and state and federal funds to do it. So that's what we're all about and I'm here to invite you to our coming out event. We're sponsoring Evansville's first ever Walk And Roll Week May 17 to 23. We've got more than sixty events, all of them free except for canoe rides. The canoe ride will be down Evansville's water trail. We don't think of Pigeon Creek as a trail but, in fact, it is. And in some communities, now these water trails are major tourism attractions. We've got every kind of walk imaginable, every kind of bike ride for everybody. In the middle of this week, on May 19th, we're having a trails summit and we're bringing in some of the top urban trails people in the mid-west, people who've raised funds, who've helped plan, who've helped engage their communities in accomplishing what this can be here, and we think we can do it. So I'd like to invite you to that. It's going to be a day-long conference. I think each of you has, I hope each of you has received an email invitation to this, but I wanted to come and personally invite you to it. I think that we can all learn something that could, again, lead to something really spectacular for this community. I have something to give to each of you, and I wanted to give each of you this map that shows a little of, it's kind of our dream for what we could have here, but I was at a church health fair Sunday, passing this stuff out and people grabbed it up and they left me two short to give to each of you. So this is just information on our Walk And Roll Week and what we want to accomplish.

President Lloyd: Mrs. Deig can make copies if she needs...

Roberta Heiman: Thank you very much, and I'd be glad to answer any questions that you might have.

President Lloyd: The event on the 19th is – what's the location and...

Roberta Heiman: C. K. Newsome Community Center.

President Lloyd: It's all day. Is there like a kickoff?

Roberta Heiman: We're going to start at 8:30 in the morning with registration and coffee and then the programs start at 9:00 and then we'll go to about 3:00.

President Lloyd: Any questions from Councilmen? Mr. Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: No questions, but a comment, and no pun intended, but you guys are obviously on the right path. I, you know, a few years ago, went with a group to Lexington. One of the things I noticed, you may recall, I was pretty involved in the smoking ordinance to try to ban that in public places here in Vanderburgh County, and noticing in the places that do have the bans, mostly in college towns, Bloomington and Lexington and Columbus, Ohio and those kind of places, the young people are definitely looking toward healthy communities, which bicycling and the walking and all the things that you're describing fit right within that, and also being in the relocation business, we have an opportunity to speak with and be involved in why people relocate and where they do. And most of it centers around the kind of healthy environments that you're talking about, progressive communities are engaging and investing into that. And it is something that certainly could put us on the map. So I applaud you for your efforts.

Roberta Heiman: Thank you. And we are a college town, Tom.

Councilmember Shetler: Yes, we are.

President Lloyd: Other questions? Mr. Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: I just want to say thank you and congratulations for getting this started. Thank you.

Roberta Heiman: Thanks. And I do invite you to come. Thank you.

President Lloyd: Great. Thank you so much. Anyone else want to address the Council? Anyone else in the public? Okay, is there a motion to adjourn?

Councilmember Raben: So moved.

President Lloyd: Is there a second?

Councilmember Shetler: Second.

President Lloyd: We are adjourned.

(There being no further business to come before the Council, the meeting was adjourned at 10:02 a.m.)

VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL

President Russell Lloyd, Jr.

Vice President James Raben

Councilmember Joe Kiefer

Councilmember Mike Goebel

Councilmember Tom Shetler, Jr.

Councilmember Ed Bassemier

Councilmember Royce Sutton

Recorded and transcribed by Teri Lukeman.

**VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL
MINUTES
JUNE 2, 2010**

The Vanderburgh County Council met in session this 2nd day of June, 2010 in room 301 of the Civic Center Complex. The meeting was called to order at 8:34 a.m. by County Council President Russell Lloyd, Jr.

President Lloyd: Call to order the Vanderburgh County Council June 2nd, 2010, and we'll open the meeting. Attendance roll call please.

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

President Lloyd: I'll ask Councilman Raben to lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance. Please stand.

(Pledge of Allegiance was given)

APPROVAL OF MINUTES MAY 5, 2010
--

President Lloyd: Thank you. I hope you've had the opportunity to review the minutes from May 5th. Did anybody see any changes? If not, I'll entertain a motion to approve.

Councilmember Kiefer: So moved.

President Lloyd: Is there a second?

Councilmember Raben: Second.

President Lloyd: All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

(All Councilmembers voted affirmatively)

President Lloyd: Opposed, same sign.

(No opposing votes were cast)

President Lloyd: Thank you.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

APPROPRIATION ORDINANCE

President Lloyd: We'll move on to Appropriation Ordinance and I'll turn that over to our finance chair, Councilman Shetler.

PUBLIC DEFENDER

Councilmember Shetler: Yeah, I'd like to make a motion for approval on the Public Defender's office in the amount of \$250,000. This was outlined last week by Steve Owens. This has to do with the death penalty case that is coming up in the next twelve months. And this would be basically our obligation for that. It's going to be a 50% reimbursement from the state, but these typically have been running about 7 to \$800,000, so there may be a little bit more to come later in the year or next year.

President Lloyd: Any questions by Council? Mr. Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Real quickly, Mr. Owens, has the state honored the reimbursement fully as to their amount typically?

Steve Owens: Yes.

Councilmember Goebel: Okay, so we're pretty much guaranteed that amount, in this particular case.

Steve Owens: Capital cases always take precedence. They always reimburse them at fifty percent.

Councilmember Goebel: Thank you.

President Lloyd: Other questions? Mr. Raben? Okay, there is a motion to approve, Mr. Shetler. Is there a second?

Councilmember Goebel: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, second Mr. Goebel. And I think one thing that was brought out last week, Councilman Bassemier had asked about a monthly report. If we could just get a copy of what you guys send to Judge Heldt. Is that quite a bit of information or –

Steve Owens: We submit a detailed report to Judge Heldt under seal. And then what is sent to the Auditor's office is a summary of that report. I just spoke to Councilman Goebel, asked him if that was acceptable since he's our liaison. So I think what we would like to do is send you the summary of the report as opposed to the very specific detailed report.

President Lloyd: Okay, I mean, I think that would be a good solution to that problem.

Councilmember Bassemier: That would be okay with me, yes sir.

President Lloyd: Okay, if we could just get a copy of that, that you send to the Auditor, that would be great.

Steve Owens: That's fine. Thank you.

President Lloyd: Okay, thank you. Any other questions? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. Motion passes 7-0.

PUBLIC DEFENDER		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1303-3948	Death Penalty	250,000.00	250,000.00
Total		250,000.00	250,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

President Lloyd: I'll turn it back over to Mr. Shetler.

HIGHWAY

Councilmember Shetler: Next, make a motion for approval of the Highway fund appropriation of \$402. This is to basically get a couple of positions back in line of longevity, I think, was missed out in the calculations for the budget year of 2010 the beginning of the year and it just gets us on par, makes that equal. So \$402, and I make a motion for approval.

President Lloyd: Is there a second?

Councilmember Bassemier: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, I think Mr. Bassemier won the race. Any other discussion or questions? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. Motion passes 7-0.

HIGHWAY		REQUESTED	APPROVED
2010-1028	Truck Driver	171.00	171.00
2010-1060	Mechanic	167.00	167.00
2010-1900	FICA	27.00	27.00
2010-1910	PERF	37.00	37.00
Total		402.00	402.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

LEGAL AID/UNITED WAY

President Lloyd: Item C, Legal Aid/United Way, Mr. Shetler.

Councilmember Shetler: This is an annual request that comes out of basically United Way, who funds a portion of the Legal Aid, and this is to begin to withdraw some of those funds that have been put in there by United Way. It's a request for \$8,786 for the Legal Aid, which is what that money is designated for. I put that in the form of a motion.

President Lloyd: Is there a second?

Councilmember Goebel: Second.

President Lloyd: Second, Mr. Goebel. Any questions? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. Motion passes 7-0.

LEGAL AID/UNITED WAY		REQUESTED	APPROVED
4290-3280	Exam. Records/Audit	1,957.00	1,957.00
4290-3130	Travel/Mileage	1,500.00	1,500.00
4290-3700	Dues & Subscriptions	1,000.00	1,000.00
4290-3730	Continuing Education	1,000.00	1,000.00
4290-3990	Miscellaneous	2,120.00	2,120.00
4290-3410	Printing	1,209.00	1,209.00
Total		8,786.00	8,786.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

LATE TRANSFER REQUEST

President Lloyd: We'll go to item 6, transfers, a late request, Assessor/Reassessment. Mr. Shetler?

REASSESSMENT/ASSESSOR

Councilmember Shetler: Yes, the Assessor is here, Mr. Weaver. I'm not sure if we heard from him last week on that, but for Office Supplies and Dues & Subscriptions or from the Office Supplies to Dues & Subscriptions, a \$500 request. It's a transfer within the Reassessment and not for the General fund, so I put that in the form of a motion to approve.

President Lloyd: Is there a second?

Councilmember Raben: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, second Mr. Raben. Any discussion/questions? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. Request for transfer passes 7-0.

REASSESSMENT/COUNTY ASSESSOR		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 2490-1090-2600	Office Supplies	500.00	500.00
To: 2490-1090-3700	Dues & Subscriptions	500.00	500.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

--

President Lloyd: We'll move on to item number eight, old business. City-County government reorganization committee progress report. And I believe we have the chair of that committee here, Rebecca Kasha, to give us that report.

Rebecca Kasha: Good morning, welcome. I am the chair of the government reorganization committee and I was asked by Russell Lloyd to come and give you a brief update on the status, progress of our committee. I trust that all of you know the basics of what the committee has been charged with. We have been asked to come up with a plan to consolidate city and county government. That's the essence of our task. As a committee of twelve, we broke into six subcommittees, with three or four persons on each subcommittee. And I can give you a brief rundown on the status of each of the committees. I will do that in a second. What I have provided to you is the basic format that the governance committee has recommended to the

full committee and has been adopted insofar as the organization chart and the voting districts that are listed on the sheets that I have given to you. There is a map of the districts and those were drawn to closely align with current districts in the city and then to encompass two districts in the county sort of in a horseshoe shape, for a total of eight districts. The common council would be voted from those districts for eight, and then we will also have an additional three at-large commissioners for a total of eleven – I mispoke, commissioners – for a total of eleven people on the common council. The common council will replace, if you will, the current structures of County Council and City Council. The County Commissioners will be, I always have to think of a delicate word for these things, expunged, dissolved, whatever, and the mayoral structure is what is being recommended, so the new government structure of the combined government would have a mayor and an eleven member common council. There is three organization charts that were provided to you. The first one is our depiction of what the current government structure is, which I know you're all familiar with. You will see on the next page it's the proposal for what will happen to the elected offices involved in the process. None of the, what we're calling constitutional offices, but it also would include the Assessor, which actually isn't a constitutional office, but all of the elected county-wide offices will stay in place as is with a few exceptions insofar as some offices will take on some additional duties. I can go into detail on that if you are curious about that, but nobody, none of the offices are really taking on any major new duties, nothing certainly that would be outside of their typical areas of expertise and things they already do now. The Sheriff/Police debate, I suspect you all followed rather closely, we had extensive media coverage. The public safety subcommittee has voted to recommend to the full committee that all law enforcement duties come under the jurisdiction of the county Sheriff and that would take place over time as outlined in proposal that the Sheriff submitted to the subcommittee. That's a little too detailed to discuss in the format for this morning, but I'd be certainly happy to entertain any questions you would have about that at a later time. So the Sheriff's office will see a substantial expansion unlike any of the other county offices. We have, on the next page of your handout, then it shows what's happening to the boards and commissions, pretty much as I think you would expect. Boards and commissions would be appointed jointly by the common council and the mayor. In most circumstances we would take what the existing composition of the board is and mirror that to the new council. If it's a county board and the Commissioners had X number of appointments and the County Council had X number of appointments, those would go to the mayor and the common council respectively in the consolidated government. So that is sort of a shorthand explanation of the three handouts that you have. And then the map, I think, is self-explanatory. For a quick rundown on what's happening with the subcommittees – well, before I do that let me just say we believe that we will be having a conference call with some of the officials from Lexington next Wednesday. We believe, we are waiting for confirmation on that. We will certainly send out media notices of that if that is confirmed for that date. Now, on to the subcommittees, tax and finance is working on predominantly two issues: one is the taxing districts, the concept, which I believe will be proposed to the full committee, is that we would have separate taxing districts to ensure that residents of the county and city don't pay for services they don't receive. So for example, you might have a situation – I'm not sure what's going to be recommended, obviously, but I believe the talk is something along the lines of a general services taxing district, which would cover the entire county and so any services that are provided to county residents, county-wide, that would be included in your property tax. City residents that receive a higher level of services, that would be reflected in their tax rate as well. That's the basics of that because we know people are concerned about paying for services they don't receive and we

believe that this a plan that will ensure that that does not happen. Budgeting systems for the new common council and mayor will be the other main task of this subcommittee and that has been debated extensively in the tax and finance subcommittee and in the governance subcommittee to make a recommendation as to how that process would be undertaken. Parks and Recreation, that subcommittee's report is almost finished, we're waiting for final touches from the individuals involved on the city and the county side, but there is already a very high level of consolidation in that area as you well know and so there will be very little new and different coming out of that subcommittee because of the high level of consolidation. Planning and Zoning is working out a right to farm provision so that the farmers in our county have a level of comfort that as this new government takes place, that zoning laws in the city won't unduly disturb their farming operations. And there will be recommendations about what zoning codes will apply as this consolidated government takes place. It will probably be city would stay in as it is, county would stay as it is for X number of years and then the transition would occur over time. If a new building project in the county, for example, wanted to work under a new code that is adopted, they could do that for a certain period of time or they could stay with the old one until a date certain. Infrastructure subcommittee, the report has already been done and submitted to the committee as a whole. The primary finding in that was, again, nothing really rocket science, combining the garages and traffic and engineering. Public safety, I think I've already touched on that with the Sheriff and the Police situation. We also had a proposal from the township fire chiefs and the chief of the city fire department, their recommendation to the subcommittee was that a study be undertaken by people knowledgeable of situations like this. They suggested the, I believe it's the Association of Fire Chiefs, to undertake a study of what's the best way to combine the township fire departments and the city fire department. That would be undertaken over a couple of years. That is a very thorny and complicated issue because of the volunteer and paid people and staffing and equipment and that sort of thing. The government subcommittee, I've already said, mayor, common council of eleven, the idea at the moment is four year terms with no term limits. Whether or not the terms would be staggered, some of them being elected in one cycle, and some being in another has not been decided on. I think it was reported today in the paper that there is a recommendation for a deputy mayor, and that is true. I don't know what the name will actually be, I don't think that's anything of major significance, if it's deputy mayor, chief of staff or whatever. And the time line for the transition still is up in the air, when the referendum would take place, and when the new government would transition, that's something that is going to depend on when this plan gets completed, whether, I guess it would be a joint decision of what election cycle that needs to take place in and things of that nature. So I'd be happy to entertain any questions.

President Lloyd: Questions by Councilmembers? Mr. Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Good morning, and thank you. Well, actually, I've got several questions and mine may be quite unique the other questions or requests, but one of the immediate problems that I see and I think I hear – and, you know, I'm somewhat different than a lot of the other Councilmembers, where most of the area I represent today is outside the city limits. But under the current form of government there is seven members that represent the county, nine that represent the city.

Rebecca Kasha: Right.

Councilmember Raben: If we accept this as proposed today, the county has two representatives, the city still has their nine. So the thought of zoning issues in the county having the protection that, you know, we're mentioning here this morning going forward, I don't really see that they've got that security because that's quite an imbalance: two versus nine.

Rebecca Kasha: Well, I think you could look at it from the perspective that you actually have five, two that are elected from your districts and three at-large. I don't think that's an unfair way to look at it.

Councilmember Raben: Well, I do.

Rebecca Kasha: Okay, we'll just have to agree to disagree on that.

Councilmember Raben: It appears as you look at a map and I would certainly hope that this map isn't cut in stone, but it – I guess my first question is when we draw or draft maps for districts, why are they so cobbled out that it's confusing as to which representative you have? Why don't we make them more balanced, more squared off where it's not so confusing?

Rebecca Kasha: Well, I think that that is in part due to a couple of things. One is, they have to be contiguous, everybody in a district has to be contiguous, we have to have balanced populations. So there are pockets of populations in various places that, you know, necessitates when you're trying to get a balance, and this is almost completely balanced at about 21,000 people per district, that you do, you know, if you have too many in, you have to pop out around an apartment complex or something like that. I mean, obviously, our Surveyor could give you a better idea of how he's come up with that but there is a – my understanding, there is a computer program that does that. You give them what kind of information, you know, how many people you want in a district, how many districts and that's, we also ask that they stay closely aligned to the city districts.

Councilmember Raben: Again, I don't really understand that because just looking at it, I mean, it seems like you could square it off and I think I could probably do it and end up with close to the same numbers and at the same time provide more than two district representatives for our county.

Rebecca Kasha: We – okay, you want more county representatives? So you would say that an equal number of people represented should have more representatives, so 21,000 people in the city get one representative, but 21,000 people in the county get two?

Councilmember Raben: No, I'm saying that same representative could represent both what we know today is city residents in county. As an example, and for my purposes, I ought to fall in love with this map because these are precincts that are friendly to me, but again, I'm not looking out for myself, I'm looking out for county residents. Why couldn't we take some of the sixth ward into Perry Township where those are county residents into Union Township, why can't we take some of the Center Township within the city, let those representatives also represent more of German, maybe parts of Armstrong, again, it just seems like there's a huge inequity in county residents. And county residents are the ones that are really opposed to consolidation. And I think when they're clearer that their representation has gone way down, they're definitely not going to be happy with the situation.

Rebecca Kasha: Well, I guess I just don't see it that way. Certainly if you would like to draw another map to consider, we're always happy to consider those things.

Councilmember Raben: I would just like to see a blend, you know, if we're going to make change and –

Rebecca Kasha: Well, our concern was that people in the county would not be happy about sharing a representative who also would be perceived as representing city interests, that's why we tried to draw the map so that the person who came from a county district have predominately, if not – I think it's predominately county residents in their district. Now if I understand what you're saying, you want them to have city residents, traditional located city residents and county residents in their district?

Councilmember Raben: As much as anything, I want to make sure that the county residents are represented fairly. And with two districts for all county residents, to go from seven representatives to two is an imbalance. The city didn't change any. They still have nine representatives.

Rebecca Kasha: But that's based on population. I guess I just don't see – I'm not seeing your concern in –

Councilmember Raben: County residents do. And –

Rebecca Kasha: And, you know, like I said, I don't mean to belabor the issue, but I would be very pleased to have someone come and talk to me, anybody on the committee, about this, you know, sit down and talk with me and show me the map and whatnot. It's kind of hard for me as I'm sitting here to imagine Perry and these different districts drawn to include the things you mentioned.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, when we discuss this, there are no guarantees with anything.

Rebecca Kasha: Of course not.

Councilmember Raben: Again, in theory it sounds good, but you know, let's look at it in ten years and let's see if the county residents still have the same representation that they've had with this seven member panel and three County Commissioners.

Rebecca Kasha: Well, I mean, there is no questions that there is going to be a change.

Councilmember Raben: Equal representation?

Rebecca Kasha: No, I mean, I don't think there will be equal representation, there's simply not the same number of people.

Councilmember Raben: Will county residents have the same securities five years from now that they do today?

Rebecca Kasha: I think there's every reason to believe that they would. I mean, I would like to think that everybody who is elected to this common council has the best interest of the entire community at hand, and I don't think it's fair to assume that just because someone does not live in the county or is elected from a county

district, that they are out to do harm to the county, you know, what used to be the county.

Councilmember Raben: Lose three Commissioners and five Councilmembers, I disagree. Thank you.

President Lloyd: I'm going to jump in here for a second because I had talked to Becky Kaska and also Ed Hafer, one of the things, to me, it hamstringing you a little bit on these Council districts, you have to use the 2000 census data. And I think most of us would agree that we've had population move out to the north side and there has been growth on the west side in Councilman Raben's district, so I had contended that this map was probably obsolete the day it was drawn but you have to use the official numbers which is what the Surveyor did, so, I mean, that was one point. The second point, the practical point, this has to pass the City Council and the County Commissioners, so a political reality is you wanted to keep those city districts close to what they were currently to enable it to pass the City Council. I'm not saying that's right or wrong, but that's way it was drawn up, and so you have these huge county districts that I think if you did a census today, the population would be imbalanced in these districts.

Rebecca Kasha: And they will be redrawn in 2012 when we get the new census districts, is my understanding.

President Lloyd: And I'm going to stop, I've got some other questions, but I'm going to go to the Councilmembers, I think Mr. Shetler and then Mr. Goebel.

Councilmember Shetler: Yeah, just in, not to belabor the point, I think where Councilman Raben might be coming from is areas that are in the city that have a lot of rural type of ties to it like I do with no sidewalks and no curbs and very little city services, and we're included pretty much in the urban area, and that might be an area there where it could be expanded into the county, where you might have similar type of living conditions, I guess, if you will, and similar type of issues that it could be blended with the county and that in itself may help balance out by redistricting those slightly. My question or my point, Senator Luger, who was mayor in 1969 when Marion and Indianapolis combined, I think would be a valuable resource. And I don't know if anybody has formally contacted him and I know individuals have spoken with him from time to time, but I think in a formal sense either him coming down here or that committee going up there to Indianapolis or DC or wherever he might wish to entertain them for some questions, would be a valuable resource. There is no form of government that is absolutely perfect and a person that sat in that chair during that transition and then was also mayor throughout a good period of time thereafter to at least '74, could probably tell you the snake pits there and the problems that perhaps that if you had it to do over again, I would change this, I would change that, that I think would be very helpful to both city and county residents and so I don't know if that's been done yet or –

Rebecca Kasha: Have him come down in a public meeting forum?

Councilmember Shetler: I'm really speaking to address questions and to be helpful to the committee in some resource way. Not necessarily coming out to the public to endorse or not to endorse or specific, but really to address the nitty gritty type of questions on transition and practical matters. You know, you have a fire or an open burning ban in the city where you can't have a simple campfire, you can't burn, I live in a very wooded area and I can't, literally, because I live in the city, cut down trees

and I'm not allowed to have a fire to burn up that brush, but you can in the county. And how do you blend that when you become a city – they're important questions that need to be addressed.

Rebecca Kasha: Well, we've been working with the Farm Bureau and the people at the state agriculture department on those kinds of issues because this has been an issue in other cities.

Councilmember Shetler: And did it make sense to have the city police over or in charge of this or does it make sense to leave it separate? Whatever those issues are that I'm sure that there's things that are on his mind, if he had an opportunity to do it over again, he would change this or that, so we don't fall into the same traps and we could really make the better mousetrap here as we go about doing it.

Rebecca Kasha: Well, I would do what I could to try to get those people to come. We don't have a budget as of yet, our committee. We are trying to do things via Skype and via teleconference and that sort of thing. So to the extent that I can work within those confines and arrange that kind of thing, I'm happy to try to do that, but I will assure you that numerous subcommittee people have made those calls and contacts, not only now but in the prior three studies that have taken place. So, you know, it's certainly of no harm whatsoever to do it again, but those kinds of calls have taken place and they are encompassed within the subcommittee reports frequently.

Councilmember Shetler: My other concern is, is watching the township assessors dissolve and become a part of the County Assessor and seeing really that being done in a couple of months period of time was very straining on the county officials and everybody involved, of trying to implement that in a good flow to try to, you've got contracts that are out there on lease agreements in townships, all that stuff had to be somehow resolved and then folded into the space allotment within this building. Fortunately we had purchased the new jail, had some extra space here, but other counties around this state didn't have that luxury and they're still going through a real mess just in a simple thing like space limitations. Consolidating some of these departments could create that same chaos and that I would like to see for my own point of view here, is that a transition period of time would allow for, have a good smooth transition and that we don't see, you know, it passed on a referendum and then two months later, we have a new government and we're trying to find places to put people behind desks because there are none. It sounds easy but when you get into the practical side of it, I think you start running up against some real problems.

Rebecca Kasha: No, I am well aware of that concern and that issue, that things that people in other communities that have undertaken these efforts have indicated to us that, I mean, it's obviously something that's a, you know, a transition that involved moving people and things and organizations and different cultures and it's not something that we would plan to have occur overnight. I mean, that's certainly an issue that's well taken.

Councilmember Shetler: Alright, thank you.

President Lloyd: Next, I think was Mr. Goebel. You're going to pass? Okay.

Councilmember Goebel: I may come back, but I'll let the other Council people speak.

President Lloyd: Okay, Mr. Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: (Inaudible, microphone not turned on)

Rebecca Kasha: Well, that is one of those issues that we haven't ironed out yet. The governance subcommittee is looking at that. That's one of the remaining thorny issues that we still have. We are told that we should not extend terms, like to have someone who is now having a four year term serve a five year term to even things out. So based on that and given the notion that we would like to have city elections take place in a non-presidential year so that it gets the, you know, we have our, I should say, municipal, whatever we're going to be calling ourselves now, consolidated government elections in a non-presidential year. We would like to have that. So with those kind of elements in mind, we're trying to craft a plan, so I can't really answer your questions at this stage. I mean, obviously, with the staggered terms, there are going to be people who may run sooner than they thought, again, if they choose to run for the common council.

President Lloyd: Other questions? Mr. Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Well, I'll come back to it, as far as the districts proposed, this is pretty much, Becky, the way the organizational committee wants to go as of now? Is that – has this been approved or still up for discussion?

Rebecca Kasha: The committee has adopted that but all of the – I think until we issue a final report, that everything is potentially still on the table. This map has been out and discussed probably a month, it's been out. And we've been taking comments from various people about it. So if you have comments please feel free to enter, you know, we would entertain them. There's a governance subcommittee meeting this Thursday, I believe, at 9:00 at Central Library. They meet almost every week. Some elected officials have been there every meeting, some have not, but you're always welcome to come and anytime you want to give us input we'd be happy to have it.

Councilmember Goebel: It's good that it's televised so we can kind of follow as well.

Rebecca Kasha: Yes, that's true. We try to have them in this room so they're televised.

Councilmember Goebel: But this will be probably changed with the new census report so this probably is going to be obsolete right away, do you think?

Rebecca Kasha: Well, I think as Russ Lloyd said, when we get the new census numbers, to the extent that the districts have to be essentially the same population and contiguous, any population shift of any magnitude is going to force a redrawing of that district, how I can't say, but yes, they'll have to be reconsidered. And that would happen regardless of whether this goes on or not.

Councilmember Goebel: And I know this is probably paramount with your group, people living outside the city in Vanderburgh County, the real fear that they obviously have is they're going to be paying more in taxes and not gaining anything more in services and I know that's something you're trying to address aggressively. And hopefully that will be, I guess, stated at the beginning of every meeting so people can sleep at night at least because as Mr. Raben said, as an at-large, I represent both city and county, but people I've spoken to in the county are very

much concerned about that particular issue.

Rebecca Kasha: Yes,. And we hear that at virtually every meeting, too. People come and express that concern and we have our financial consultants working on those issues. As I said, the plan at the moment or the concept at the moment is to have different taxing districts that will reflect the services that you receive based on where you live.

Councilmember Goebel: Okay, I don't want to belabor, --

Rebecca Kasha: No, that's fine. It is an important point and that's something that bears repeating.

Councilmember Goebel: Okay, thank you. Obviously, public safety is the number one concern and the law enforcement is being addressed pretty much openly in the media. The concern most of us have also would be fire protection and that's going to be addressed after?

Rebecca Kasha: What has been recommended to the subcommittee, the public safety subcommittee by a joint panel, if you will, of all of the township chiefs and the city chief, is that a study be undertaken. They recommended the Association of Fire Chiefs to come up with a new plan for how fire protection would be provided. And that made sense to us. It's not, given the uncertainty, I guess, for lack of a better word of township government as a whole, given that most of the townships are staffed with volunteers, given the great growth in some parts of the county where there are only volunteer fire – something is going to change, probably, regardless of what we do and it's a much too thorny issue probably for anybody to get into without a plan in place. That's what they asked us to do and that made sense to the people on the subcommittee.

Councilmember Goebel: Well, that's got to be really difficult because you're dealing with two basic different entities. Is the organization committee favoring, do you think, keeping the system the way it is, with the volunteers in the outlying areas and separate from the EFD?

Rebecca Kasha: Um, I don't, I think that that is where the subcommittee is, that's what the subcommittee is investigating now but, of course, that is a concern. The volunteer nature of the fire departments, while they're extraordinarily well trained and dedicated, they are volunteers and they have other jobs and the township fire chiefs told the subcommittee that that is a concern they already have. They know that change is on the horizon for them. And to make everyone paid as opposed to a volunteer, I don't think that that's something that the budget is going to stand. So it's – you know, combining three levels of government, paid and unpaid, you know, that is a very thorny issue.

Councilmember Goebel: That's the point I was hoping you would go to, and thank you. That's a very difficult situation.

Rebecca Kasha: Yes, it is.

President Lloyd: Yeah, I was going to say, we can't afford to have city fire in the county, so whether there's some contractual arrangement with the volunteers, makes the most sense to me. I think Mr. Kiefer was next.

Councilmember Kiefer: Becky, first off, I'd like to say thank you because I know that you and the twelve members are volunteers and I know it takes a tremendous amount of time. I've been following it in the paper and you can see that it looks like there's meetings on a daily basis. Sometimes multiple times during the day and I appreciate that. Just one comment, you know, I'm comfortable with, you know, the eleven elected officials you're proposing, but I do think Councilman Raben makes a good point. One of the reasons why, you know, I thought, looking at the merger plan would be good for the citizens is to eliminate some of the confusion and you can see by the drawn districts that there is obviously some confusion on who represents who and what district they're in. You know, for example, I know Councilwoman Terry, you know, most of her district is in the city so it would have been nice to see, like you did in some of these other plans, an overlay showing the current county districts, current city districts, and see how they shift or change, it might make it a little bit easier to understand.

Rebecca Kasha: Alright.

Councilmember Kiefer: But, again, like Councilman Raben said, if there is a way to not make it look so gerrymandered, you know, so that way people –

Rebecca Kasha: I don't know, those look pretty straight to me.

Councilmember Kiefer: Yeah, people would understand –

Rebecca Kasha: I mean, there aren't any big dog legs, I mean, --

Councilmember Kiefer: People would understand what district they actually vote in and –

Rebecca Kasha: I mean, St. Joe is one of the major lines, US Highway 41 is one of the major lines, Lloyd Expressway is one, Morgan Avenue is one, Diamond Avenue is one.

Councilmember Kiefer: Yeah. But anyway, I, you know, again, you know, I understand that this is a very complicated –

Rebecca Kasha: I take that back. Highway 41 is not. Sorry.

Councilmember Kiefer: – very complicated thing and if there way you could overlay them showing current districts versus the new districts it might clear up some confusion.

Rebecca Kasha: Okay. I misspoke, I was looking at the lines instead of colors. Sorry, I've seen several versions of this map. Um, I would be happy to do that and I don't, I think the term gerrymander has a negative implication. We're were, obviously, not trying to accomplish anything –

Councilmember Kiefer: No, no, no, I know you weren't.

Rebecca Kasha: I know, but again, to make things contiguous and get the populations to balance, that's why they are funny shaped. You know, there was no attempt to preserve a republican district or a democrat district or anything like that. So that's, you know, we came to this pure of heart.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay, thank you very much.

Rebecca Kasha: You're welcome.

President Lloyd: And I would also like to thank you for this. This map is very handy, I mean, it's a nice summary. And also, remind the Councilmembers, we had received a copy of all the committee members so you should have that. If you don't we can get you another one, a list of all the committee members, because I've had calls from some of them and with questions or ideas. So they are reaching out to some of the elected officials.

Rebecca Kasha: And we thought that the most effective way to elicit response was to have something to work from. So to the extent, we went ahead and created a map so that you would have something to see and work from. So that was part of our modus operandi.

President Lloyd: Other Councilman, questions? Mr. Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Just a few general comments. You know, Councilman Goebel had some great questions, and Rebecca, and I guess I'm speaking to the entire committee, --

Rebecca Kasha: Yes.

Councilmember Raben: -- you have to understand how frightening this is for county residents that live outside the city. The city residents pretty much understand what they've got is what they're going to continue to get. But every time we make reference to what changes for the county, it's well, that has to be determined yet. We'll have to wait and see. I mean, there are no definites. I'm not hearing anything definite as to what are the real changes for those residents. So that's why they're frightened. That's what I'm hearing. Why can't we reach some of those definites in the next thirty days? Why can't we get there in sixty days? But I think they need a clear understanding of all the, you know, how are they going to be represented for fire? Are they going to receive sewers? You know, that's what they want to know.

Rebecca Kasha: I would agree with you and to the extent that I can get the myriad of people involved in this process, giving us feedback early in the process would have helped tremendously. I mean, we've had dozens of public meetings are there are a number of people that do come and express their concerns to us. The Farm Bureau came with a very helpful list of things that they had issues about and none of them really gave pause to us at all about it. But they gave us a list of things to work on. That was very helpful and to the extent, and I'm not talking to you, I'm talking to everybody out there, to the extent that you have concerns, please, that's why we have public meetings. All of the subcommittee meetings are open, all of our public meetings are open. We have public comment, we take written comments, we have a website. So to the extent that you have concerns that you don't feel are addressed, you have to bring them to our attention. And we can't address the concern until we know what it is. Fire, for example, I can't say, that's not an issue that's going to be resolved now. Will their current fire protection change at all in the foreseeable future? I would say not. Nothing that we're going to do as a committee or recommend is going to change the fire protection in the county. And the issues that face those fire chiefs that they brought to our attention are issues that are there regardless of consolidation.

Councilmember Raben: But you understand how important of an issue this is?

Rebecca Kasha: Of course it is.

Councilmember Raben: I want to know that my residence is protected and should I need the fire department, how are they going to respond? And when are they going to respond? And who is it going to be? You know, as important of an issue as that is, I would like to believe that we've already worked that out.

Rebecca Kasha: We have. Things will stay the status quo until we undertake this study by, as recommended, the Association of Fire Chiefs. And until then, nothing is going to change that isn't a product of some change that comes from the will of the fire chiefs in the townships or the city fire department. So things will stay as is, as far as things stand right now, and as far as fire department protection goes, in the city and the county. Does that answer your question?

Councilmember Raben: Not really.

Rebecca Kasha: Okay, what would you like me to say?

Councilmember Raben: It stays now, I mean, you're saying until it's later determined that it needs to be –

Rebecca Kasha: It's going to have, I think it's an issue that's going to have to be addressed. The fire chiefs would tell you that themselves. The nature of the volunteers is changing, the population in the county is changing. They know, they appreciate, and we took great delight in the fact that they came to us after having met already and brought us their recommendation. And I think that that would be taking place regardless of consolidation. I think they're that forward thinking and they are embracing these issues and initiating these changes because they appreciate that they are going to have to start doing operations a little differently to continue to provide the level of protection they provided in the past.

Councilmember Raben: Will they know what that change or that end result may be before this is put on a referendum?

Rebecca Kasha: Well, of course not, it's a two year study.

Councilmember Raben: Okay.

Rebecca Kasha: Okay, I mean, I appreciate where you're trying to get me to, they're voting for something they don't know about on fire protection. But what I can tell you is that nothing is going to change until that study takes place. They will have input into that study just like any other time that government has undertaken a study of some sort to determine the best way to go.

President Lloyd: So who is next? Mr. Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: I think the level of service we get township-wise and the cost factor, obviously, if we can keep it somewhat the way it is now, that would probably best serve all Vanderburgh County residents.

Rebecca Kasha: I think everyone agrees.

Councilmember Goebel: I don't want to go any farther. I just want to thank you and your group for all you've done. I think you've done this on a non-partisan basis, I think you've tried to incorporate and listen to all county residents and I thank you for bringing this out into the open and making everything public.

Rebecca Kasha: Well, you're welcome and I apologize that this, you know, we were asked to come bring a report to you and (inaudible) before we had all the answers. So to the extent that I leave you with a feeling of uncertainty, then that's just because those things are still under study.

President Lloyd: Okay, Mr. Shetler, I guess, and then Mr. Kiefer.

Councilmember Shetler: Again, I want to thank you all as well because I know you've put in tons of time. Like the Councilmen, I have had tons of calls from different ones, have asked different questions. Going back to the fire department just briefly because I know your background as an attorney and others I'm sure someone has investigated the current contract that they have with the fire department, the city firemen, the union contract, does that preclude in any way having a different set of semi-employees associated –

Rebecca Kasha: I think that is one of the issues that has to be worked out, yes.

Councilmember Shetler: And you also then have different age groups and different, all kinds of regulations that are in the city fire department as it exists today, that may not be the same criteria you have for an employee or semi-employee, whatever they're called, or volunteer, so all of that has to be kind of reconciled in the midst of this.

Rebecca Kasha: Right. It's a melding of rules and cultures and just like when we merged county corrections – community corrections, sorry, you know, those were people that had to come together and over time, and they will tell you know that it works extremely well.

President Lloyd: Mr. Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yeah, Becky, there was a, I guess, a question about the sewer department and the water and sewer is, obviously, the Evansville Water and Sewer department and they do serve county and I think they may even serve parts of other counties as well, so any time a sewer is extended, it usually comes through their rate base and not through taxation. I believe, right now, that there's a split rate base. If somebody is on water and sewer outside the city limits, I believe they pay a higher rate than somebody within the city. Has there been any discussion about levelizing that if this is merged that then there would be only one –

Rebecca Kasha: Ed Hafer is the head of that committee and I have not – we have not gotten back the final report –

Councilmember Kiefer: That might be –

Rebecca Kasha: – but I do –

Councilmember Kiefer: That might an olive branch to folks outside the city limits, to say hey, look, we'll reduce the rate because I think in order to extend services out to the county, they do charge a higher rate which many people believe is unfair.

Rebecca Kasha: Uh-huh, yes, I know that has been, that is an issue that has surfaced.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay, thank you very much.

Rebecca Kasha: Uh-huh.

President Lloyd: On a legal point, the water and sewer is a separate legal entity, but as of right now the mayor has the control of that by the utility board. So whether the proposal would change that is open to question. Mr. Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: I've heard a lot of, we've got to work this out –

Rebecca Kasha: Yes.

Councilmember Bassemier: – on some major issues. When is your deadline to get all of this worked out, these major issues before you get it on the November ballot?

Rebecca Kasha: I am telling people that have asked of late that I think that, well, our deadline to get it on the ballot would be August 2, that basically backs everything up a month. And I think we will know by the 10th, our next meeting the 10th, whether we can proceed with, on a time line that will get it on the ballot this fall or not. And if people on the committee are not ready and not comfortable to proceed then we won't. But unfortunately, just a lot of these things are still in subcommittee and they're in flux or they're with the attorneys or they're with the financial people, and they're just not something that have come my way yet to give to you all. You know, I'm trying to respect the subcommittee process and let them do their work.

Councilmember Bassemier: (Inaudible – microphone not turned on)

Rebecca Kasha: You're welcome.

President Lloyd: I couple of final questions. This is a little technical, the appointed department heads, does the common council have to approve those or does the executive just appoint them, or do you know?

Rebecca Kasha: I believe that the current thinking is that the mayor would have appointment, would make their department – appoint their department heads without common council approval. But there are joint appointments to boards and commissions.

President Lloyd: Okay, and I also hear the concern about taxes for county residents and so that's, I want to re-emphasize that.

Rebecca Kasha: Yes.

President Lloyd: The legislative bodies that would have to approve the final plan would be the County Commissioners and the City Council. Have you heard any feedback from them? Are they pleased with the process, not pleased or...

Rebecca Kasha: As a body, they have not given us a thumbs up or thumbs down as a body. We have been responding to questions from individuals as they come

up and take those concerns into consideration. I think overall most people that we've spoken to are pleased with the general framework but everybody has a particular issue here or there that is of particular concern to them and we certainly respect those issues and differences and do the best we can to do the right thing for the greatest number of people and for the community as a whole. And as you know, there's just not always a perfect answer.

President Lloyd: I think, I know all the Councilmembers, I don't know about Councilwoman Terry, but they've all received the Sheriff's plan and I think that's a good plan. I've not read the whole thing, I've looked at it, but I would encourage you to look at that plan. Regarding the timetable, as Mr. Bassemier had indicated, if it could be completed in July, does that allow for public relations or education of the public that this is a good plan and should be passed or is that part of your plan?

Rebecca Kasha: Well, you know, there's some question about what the role of this subcommittee is. Did I take this on to become the public cheerleader for it? I would do that because I believe in what we've done. I don't really know who is going to pick up the ball and be for it or against it. I would assume that there will be neutral bodies having public meetings like the League of Women Voters and the neighborhood associations will be having meetings on that and I think there will be public hearings before you all vote on – you all meaning government – votes on the plan. There will have to be a public hearing and two meetings, they can be joint meetings, of the Commissioners and the Council to consider those things and a vote can be even taken that night should they feel comfortable proceeding, and that would contract the time line somewhat. But I think that it doesn't, in some sense it doesn't make – it doesn't seem right to me to be educating the public about a plan that maybe isn't the plan that's going forward, so I've got a little problem about going out and making a big public relations campaign with this and then a month later go, oh, well, you know, those districts, those weren't really – they've changed. So I really am torn between how, what the best way is to go about that. But there will be public hearings before this is voted upon by the government officials. And if it proceeds, then I am ready and willing to be the public relations person to the extent my job and family allow.

President Lloyd: I mean, you get a pay raise, too.

Rebecca Kasha: Well, I'm making nothing now, so –

President Lloyd: I know.

Councilmember Raben: What is the reasoning why the County Council doesn't have a vote in –

Rebecca Kasha: I don't know. That was state legislature. We're operating pursuant to a state statute. But I would think that to the extent that you have appointed people to the committee, that certainly is your avenue for input and I'm a city appointment, a City Council appointment, but, you know, I certainly –

Councilmember Raben: But it has to be voted by the City Council and County Commissioners –

President Lloyd: They're the legislative bodies that pass ordinances.

Rebecca Kasha: That's one thing that's not my fault.

President Lloyd: And then, I guess, on the time table, if it does qualify for the ballot this year, this is an off-year election, you know, typically we have 35% voting, we may get it a little bit higher this year, but it's going, I mean, in my mind it's going to take quite a bit of education for the public.

Rebecca Kasha: No question, I think regardless of when this is, and the trouble then is when you're not in an off year and you're competing with all the other messages that are out there so there's pros and cons to any transition time line we put together.

President Lloyd: But by law, your committee could run for a year so you could run to the end of January of '11.

Rebecca Kasha: Right, and I would think, in theory, we could be reappointed for more time if that was the pleasure of the appointees.

President Lloyd: Okay. Mr. Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Becky, you know, one thing just kind of struck me, I think Councilman Raben was asking about fire protection, because I think county fire protection is administered by the townships, is there any plan to give this new merged government, the common council, oversight over township government budgets, because that's one of the things we struggle with here now is that they let us look at their budgets, but we don't have any control over their budgets and I didn't know if – because this plan doesn't eliminate any township –

Rebecca Kasha: No, in the ordinance, it established the committee and the responsibilities for this committee, the consolidation subcommittee, we were not directed and we're not permitted to do anything with township government.

Councilmember Kiefer: I understand, but I just –

Rebecca Kasha: And I would think that what you're asking would be an intrusion into township government that we're not allowed to make.

Councilmember Kiefer: But one of the things I think would be beneficial is if this new Council or if this County Council had some kind of approval rights over the township budgets. That's just a comment I'd like to make. Thank you.

Rebecca Kasha: Noted.

President Lloyd: Anything else? Thank you so much for coming, it's very helpful.

Rebecca Kasha: You're welcome. Thank you all for listening. I appreciate your comments and concerns, and welcome more of them.

President Lloyd: Right. And send any information to Mrs. Kasha or attend one of the committees, I'd encourage you to do that. Thank you, Becky. Okay. A lot of questions there.



President Lloyd: We'll move on to item C, Veterans Service travel request. Is there someone here from Veterans Service? Yes.

Jay Ball: Yes, Jay Ball.

President Lloyd: The reason we put this on here, in your request from last month you had both of you separate mileage, were you going to travel in different vehicles are were you traveling together?

Jay Ball: Yes, we're traveling in separate vehicles. It was Tammy's hope to go up Monday to the VA regional office to get herself acquainted with some of the people that we deal with on a daily basis.

President Lloyd: Okay, and I guess if you're both gone, is that office just closed?

Jay Ball: Well, yes, it would be.

President Lloyd: So you just put a sign on the door saying we'll be back Thursday or whatever?

Jay Ball: Well, it's sort of like when we go on two-day holidays, we put a sign up and put a message on the machine, we'll be at the state training, we'll be out for two days and we'll return on Thursday morning.

President Lloyd: I know Councilmembers at the last meeting were concerned, they said well, why wouldn't they travel up there together, but the county is to pay the mileage for both, but now what you're saying is Tammy Cassidy-Fehn needs to go a day early?

Jay Ball: Well, it's not necessary that she goes a day earlier, that was just sort of a option. But I think as you look from the past, our training has been cut down from three nights and four days to one night, so there's a substantial savings already from year to year.

President Lloyd: Okay, any other Councilmember questions? We would need someone to make a motion to add back that mileage if that's the pleasure of the Council. That's \$152.80.

Jay Ball: I think it would be, I think, you know, Tammy is a very good county employee and I think it would well be worth the while.

President Lloyd: This is IDVA: Indiana Department of Veterans, is that what that is?

Jay Ball: Yes. Association.

President Lloyd: Is that an annual called meeting?

Jay Ball: It's an annual state meeting.

Councilmember Kiefer: I have a question.

President Lloyd: Mr. Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Are there any county vehicles, pool vehicles that you could use that, I mean, do you have to take personal vehicles? Is there a county vehicle available that you can –

Jay Ball: I'm not aware of any.

Councilmember Kiefer: There's none. Okay.

President Lloyd: Other questions? Mr. Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Well, I'll just make a motion to get it on the floor.

President Lloyd: Okay, so you want to make a motion to add \$150.80 to the travel request from the Veterans Service?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Bassemier. Is there a second?

Councilmember Bassemier: I tried.

Jay Ball: Thank you, Ed.

President Lloyd: Okay, no second. Motion is not approved. So anyway, any other comments or questions? Okay, appreciate you coming in.

(TAPE CHANGED)



President Lloyd: Number nine, new business, Preliminary Resolution of the Vanderburgh County Council declaring an economic revitalization area for tax phase-in for redevelopment and/or rehabilitation of real property and for acquisition of manufacturing equipment located at airport industrial park subdivision, lot six, part of lot five, Enviropas, Inc and Terra Firma Properties, LLC. We have Ms. Martin here from GAGE, is there any questions for her? Or do you have anything to add?

Pam Martin: Pam Martin with the Growth Alliance for Greater Evansville. At the last meeting, the Council heard a description of the project and as President Lloyd explained, the resolution, preliminary resolution involves a request from Enviropas, they seek to undertake a project totaling \$940,000, which will create 13 jobs over the next five years. The company representatives are here today if you have any other questions. Issues before Council today in the form of this resolution are the determinations of the two phase-in periods for both real and personal property and the length of time for the ERA designation. And as you recall, the ERA is the time period or the window of opportunity during which the company has the opportunity to make the installation of the equipment. My recommendation on the scoring guidelines, as I explained at last meeting, resulted in a phase-in period of eight years for real property and seven years for personal property. Certainly those two determinations are at the discretion of Council.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, Mr. President, I move approval of the resolution for Enviropas, Inc. and Terra Firma Properties, LLC for real property for the period of eight years and personal property for seven.

Councilmember Goebel: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, our attorney just informed us that we need to do this in two separate motions.

Jeff Ahlers: That's up to you. You can do it in one motion or you can do it in separate. What did you just, I'm sorry, I was looking for the paper and you moved for what, Mr. Raben, in terms of years?

Councilmember Raben: Eight for real property and seven for personal.

Jeff Ahlers: Okay. Well, the motion can be made however you want. You can either first move to make it a revitalization area and then have a second motion to put the years in or you can make the motion just like you made it. So that's fine however you want to do it.

Councilmember Raben: The motion's been made.

President Lloyd: Any questions, discussion? Mr. Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: No, just seconded it.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Raben, eight years real property abatement, seven years personal property abatement has been recommended for Enviroplas and Terra Firma Properties, LLC. Any other questions? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: I'd just like to make a comment. I'd like to thank them for remaining in Evansville when they had an opportunity to open up and operate out of Texas, and so I think this is good for our community, and with that, vote yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Lloyd?

President Lloyd: I'm going to vote yes and I congratulate the gentleman and appreciate the faith you're showing in Evansville and Vanderburgh County and look

forward to working with you.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

President Lloyd: Mr. Ahlers?

Jeff Ahlers: In section four you've got a blank in there saying the designation of Economic Revitalization Area shall be in effect up to and including blank.

Pam Martin: Yes, and the Council needs to determine the length of time for the ERA designation. As you recall, it is not concurrent with the deduction period. This is a separate time with a deadline during which the company can install the equipment. Traditionally, in reviewing past actions on phase-in, the company has been given up to two years, up to March 1st, two years out because that is the end of the reassessment period. This is what has been done in previous resolutions. I would recommend two years, that Council make the ERA designation to 2012.

Jeff Ahlers: Okay, and I'd have to look at past resolutions. I don't recall that being something we've had to make a determination on.

Pam Martin: That's fine. And perhaps Council deferred that determination to staff.

Jeff Ahlers: We can put that in the final resolution next week.

Pam Martin: Correct. We can certainly –

President Lloyd: To be safe, we probably want to do a motion for that, for two years. So if you look at your resolution, section four, designation of this economic revitalization area shall be in effect up to and including two years from March 1st?

Pam Martin: It should be up to and including March 1st, 2012.

Jeff Ahlers: That doesn't need to be in effect the entire length of time for the deduction?

Pam Martin: It does not. As the DLGF has explained to me, this is a separate time period and it represents the window in which the company installs the personal property and the phase-in period that you establish by this resolution will begin with the completion of installation.

Jeff Ahlers: Can you make sure

**VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL
SPECIAL MEETING
JUNE 30, 2010**

The Vanderburgh County Council met in special session this 30th day of June 2010 in room 301 of the Civic Center Complex. The meeting was called to order at 8:31 a.m. by County Council President Russell Lloyd, Jr.

President Lloyd: I'd like to call to order the Vanderburgh County Council special meeting, June 30th, 2010 for consideration of an ordinance establishing the Vanderburgh County Income Tax Council percentage credit allowed for homesteads for 2011, and casting the votes of said County Council. Call the attendance roll please.

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

*Arrived shortly after roll call.

President Lloyd: I'll ask Councilwoman Terry to lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance.

(Pledge of Allegiance was given)

<p style="text-align: center;">APPROVAL OF 2011 HOMESTEAD TAX CREDIT ON FIRST AND FINAL READING</p>
--

President Lloyd: Thank you. This is a special meeting to consider one item, the homestead credit, and then after this meeting we'll have the regular Vanderburgh County Council Personnel & Finance. What we're going to need to do is I'm going to ask the Council to suspend two readings. We'll take a vote, if there's no objection then we will have two readings to pass this resolution in this one meeting. You want to explain that, Mr. Ahlers?

Jeff Ahlers: What we'll need to do here is take three motions. The first motion will be to have the vote on the resolution and the ordinance to be the first and final reading. If that motion passes unanimously, then you don't have to come back in a subsequent meeting to pass the ordinance again. So that's not your vote on the ordinance, that's just your consent to allow this to be the first and final reading of the resolution and ordinance. Assuming that passes, well, either way, there will be a vote on the resolution to cast the County Council's votes on the Income Tax Council for passage of the ordinance and then we would also pass the ordinance. So, three votes. Mr. President?

President Lloyd: So I would entertain a motion to allow for two readings to be completed in one meeting – first and final reading for the passage of the resolution and ordinance. Is there a motion for that?

Councilmember Raben: So moved.

President Lloyd: Okay, is there a second?

Councilmember Terry: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Raben, second Mrs. Terry. Roll call vote please – any discussion? Okay, roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. There being seven ayes and no objections, we'll have the two readings for the resolution and ordinance completed today.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

<p>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 2011 AND CASTING THE VOTES OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL ON SAID ORDINANCE RESOLUTION NO. CO.R-06-10-005</p>

President Lloyd: Now I would ask someone to make the motion for the resolution under item number four.

Councilmember Raben: I'll make a motion for this Council amending the percentage credit allowed for homesteads to the maximum allowed by state, not to exceed eight percent, to be funded out of local income taxes for 2011.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, that's resolution R-06-10-005. Is there a second?

Councilmember Goebel: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Raben, second Mr. Goebel. Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Glad to vote for this, very excited and it's the right thing to do. And with that, I vote yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. Seven-O, the resolution passes.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

<p>APPROVAL OF AN ORDINANCE OF THE VANDERBURGH COUNTY INCOME TAX COUNCIL AMENDING THE PERCENTAGE CREDIT ALLOWED FOR HOMESTEADS FOR 2011</p>
--

President Lloyd: Now, I would ask for a motion to support an ordinance of the Vanderburgh County Income Tax Council amending the percentage credit for 2011.

Councilmember Shetler: So moved.

President Lloyd: Motion Mr. Shetler. Is there a second?

Councilmember Raben: Second.

President Lloyd: Second Mr. Raben. Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: I'm going to vote yes. The ordinance passes seven-0.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

President Lloyd: Just as a footnote, Council has 28.5 votes in the Income Tax Council, so the City Council had passed this ordinance Monday, June 28th, so we are in accordance with them, and I'd like to say that, you know, my record, I've got five years on the County Council and four years as Mayor in support of the local ordinance for homestead credit, and I've got a clean record on that, and I think that it's something where we have the option of giving local property taxpayers a break on their taxes. And I believe out of the 92 counties, approximately 28 or so do allow a local homestead credit. So I'm proud to be able to do that. Any other discussion? Is there anyone from the public that wants to comment on this? If not, we'll entertain a motion to adjourn.

Councilmember Shetler: So moved.

President Lloyd: Is there a second?

Councilmember Raben: Second.

President Lloyd: We are adjourned and will take a couple of minutes and then we'll come back to Personnel & Finance. Thank you.

(There being no further business to come before the Council, the meeting was adjourned at 8:37 a.m.)

VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL

President Russell Lloyd, Jr.

Vice President James Raben

Councilmember Joe Kiefer

Councilmember Mike Goebel

Councilmember Tom Shetler, Jr.

Councilmember Ed Bassemier

Councilmember Stephanie Terry

Recorded and transcribed by Teri Lukeman.

VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL
JULY 7, 2010

The Vanderburgh County Council met in session this 7th day of July, 2010 in room 301 of the Civic Center Complex. The meeting was called to order at 8:33 a.m. by County Council President Russell Lloyd, Jr.

President Lloyd: I'd like to open the Vanderburgh County Council July 7th, 2010 meeting and call the meeting to order. Attendance roll call please.

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

*Arrived shortly after roll call.

President Lloyd: And for the Pledge of Allegiance, I'd like Councilman Shetler to lead us in that.

(Pledge of Allegiance was given)

<p>APPROVAL OF MINUTES JUNE 2, 2010</p>

President Lloyd: Okay, we have item four, approval of the minutes from June 2nd, 2010. Anybody see any changes? I'll ask for a motion to approve.

Councilmember Shetler: So moved.

President Lloyd: Is there a second?

Councilmember Goebel: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Shetler, second Mr. Goebel. Any discussion? All those in favor signify by saying aye.

(All Councilmembers voted aye)

President Lloyd: Opposed?

(No opposing votes were cast)

President Lloyd: Okay, that passes five-zero.

(Motion unanimously approved 5-0)

APPROPRIATION ORDINANCE

President Lloyd: We'll move on to item five, appropriation ordinance, and I'll turn that over to the Finance Chair, Mr. Shetler.

COMMISSIONERS

Councilmember Shetler: I'll make a motion for passage of the Commissioners request of \$108,000 coming out of the general fund. That will be replaced later on with a transfer from one fund to another. Oh, we're going to put that in at zero, and that's going to come out of a different fund as we talked about last week. So I recommend that we move that line item to zero and we'll see that same amount come out of a different fund.

President Lloyd: Okay, so motion for Commissioners, \$108,500 be set in at zero. On page two there is a transfer that would accomplish that same goal. Is there a second for that?

Councilmember Kiefer: I'll second that.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Shetler, second Mr. Kiefer. Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. That passes six-zero.

COMMISSIONERS		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1300-3331	Reorganization/Finance	38,500.00	0.00
1300-3332	Reorganization/Legal	60,000.00	0.00
1300-3333	Reorganization/Other	10,000.00	0.00
Total		108,500.00	0.00

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

BURDETTE PARK

Councilmember Shetler: Next, I make a motion to approve the request for Burdette Park on the part-time employees to the tune of \$53,825.

President Lloyd: Is there a second?

Councilmember Bassemier: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Shetler, second Mr. Bassemier. Any discussion? And we had Steve Craig in here last week to kind of go over that for us. If not, roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer:

Teri Lukeman: President Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. Motion passes six-zero.

BURDETTE PARK		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1450-1180-1450	Other Employees	50,000.00	50,000.00
1450-1900	FICA	3,825.00	3,825.00
Total		53,825.00	53,825.00

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

TRANSFER REQUESTS

COUNTY HIGHWAY
ASSESSOR/REASSESSMENT
PTABOA/REASSESSMENT
RIVERBOAT
CUMULATIVE BRIDGE

President Lloyd: We'll move on to transfer requests, Mr. Shetler.

Councilmember Shetler: Unless there is an objection, perhaps we could take these all at one time. First is the County Highway transfer request of \$16,300 from Gas & Oil account to Tires & Tubes and Drainage & Assessment. The second request is from the Reassessment/Assessor, from the Maintenance Contract of \$2,000 and Contractual Services of \$3,000 to Travel/Mileage \$2,000, Office Supplies \$3,000. Next is a request from the Assessor's office from Reassessment/PTABOA from PTABOA Member \$3,500 to Office Supplies \$3,000 and Travel/Mileage \$500. And we have a couple of late transfer requests, from Riverboat, Economic Development \$108,500, that's the request earlier by the Commissioners to Reorganization-Finance of \$38,500, Reorganization-Legal \$60,000, Reorganization-Other \$10,000. Cumulative Bridge account from Baseline Road project of \$20,000 to Maryland Street Bridge \$20,000. I put that in the form of a motion to grant all of those transfers.

Councilmember Kiefer: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Shetler, second Mr. Kiefer. We've got a motion to approve all the transfers as submitted. Just a point of order, I talked to the Commissioners on the Riverboat funding for the reorganization committee and they explained that pretty well last week. I told them there was no need to come this week for that. And the other things, they've been explained. Is there any questions of Councilmembers? If not, roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. Transfers pass six to zero, all of them. Thank you.

COUNTY HIGHWAY		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From:			
2010-2210	Gas & Oil	16,300.00	16,300.00

(Table continued next page)

To: 2010-2220	Tires & Tubes	8,000.00	8,000.00
2010-3840	Drainage & Assessment	8,300.00	8,300.00

REASSESSMENT/ASSESSOR		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 2490-1090-3540	Maintenance Contract	2,000.00	2,000.00
2490-1090-3530	Contractual Services	3,000.00	3,000.00
To: 2490-1090-3130	Travel/Mileage	2,000.00	2,000.00
2490-1090-2600	Office Supplies	3,000.00	3,000.00

REASSESSMENT/PTABOA		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 2490-1091-1180	PTABOA Member	3,500.00	3,500.00
To: 2490-1091-2600	Office Supplies	3,000.00	3,000.00
2490-1091-3130	Travel/Mileage	500.00	500.00

RIVERBOAT		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1490-3110	Economic Development	108,500.00	108,500.00
To: 1490-3331	Reorg-Finance	38,500.00	38,500.00
1490-3332	Reorg-Legal	60,000.00	60,000.00
1490-3333	Reorg-Other	10,000.00	10,000.00

CUMULATIVE BRIDGE		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 2030-4417	Baseline Road Bridge	20,000.00	20,000.00
To: 2030-4715	Maryland Street Bridge	20,000.00	20,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

President Lloyd: Okay, we’ll move on to item number seven on our agenda, repeals, there are no items.

ENVIROPLAS, INC AND TERRA FIRMA PROPERTIES, LLC
CONFIRMING RESOLUTION

President Lloyd: Number eight, old business, A, confirming resolution confirming the declaration of an economic revitalization area for real property and acquisition of manufacturing equipment located at Airport Industrial Park Subdivision Lot 6, and part of Lot 5, Enviroplas, Inc. and Terra Firma Properties, LLC. And this is the third and final reading on this tax abatement request. We’d already seen that at a prior

meeting. And we have Ms. Martin from Evansville GAGE.

Pam Martin: Good morning. We're here today as the president explained to act on the confirming resolution and to conduct an advertised public hearing related to the property tax phase-in request submitted by Enviropas and Terra Firma Properties for their property at 10100 Hedden Road. As you recall, the company proposes to do an expansion and expand their manufacturing capability at their facility. They propose to spend \$940,000 on this project, it will create five new jobs at the end of the project, and 13 new jobs after five years. I correct myself, it will create eight new jobs immediately. Using the county's established review guidelines, we determined that they would qualify for an eight-year phase-in on real property, and a seven year phase-in on the manufacturing equipment. Council approved the preliminary resolution on June 2nd and we're here for the confirming.

President Lloyd: Any questions from Councilmembers? We've kind of gone over this pretty well.

Pam Martin: Company representatives are here today in case there are more questions also.

President Lloyd: If there's no questions, then I'd ask for a motion to approve.

Councilmember Shetler: So moved.

Councilmember Kiefer: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, the motion and the second to approve the confirming resolution and the recommendation, what were the number of years of those abatements?

Pam Martin: For real property eight years and for personal property or manufacturing equipment seven years.

President Lloyd: Alright then, roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. That is approved six to zero. Great. Thank you and congratulations. Look forward to working with you.

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

2010 TAX PHASE-IN COMPLIANCE

President Lloyd: Item B, 2010 property tax phase-in compliance report, second and final installment. You should have a document from June 18th – a letter from GAGE, which shows all the property tax phase-ins for Vanderburgh County that have been approved by this Council, and any of those that are in non-compliance for whatever reason have been highlighted. And I guess we'll ask Ms. Martin if she has anything to add before we go to Council questions.

Pam Martin: The only thing I need to explain is, this is balance of the compliance review and report for 2010. As you recall, the granting or authorizing body is required to review compliance, review each active phase-in for compliance within 45 days of the May 15th deadline. This completes your work for the year. You have supporting documentation for any company that, following analysis, was found to be less than 100% in compliance. If there are any questions, I'll be glad to answer them.

President Lloyd: On the spreadsheet that we have, the first section would be real estate, and the second section is personal property.

Pam Martin: Correct.

President Lloyd: And I think in prior years what we've done on this, if we had specific questions for a company that Ms. Martin couldn't answer, then we would ask her to ask that company to come in at a later time. So is there any Council questions on the tax phase-in compliance? You've got, at the very right, there's a compliance percentage, so if the actual employment has come up short, it will show you less than 100%, and you've also got some that have been over 100%: AmeriQual Foods, Berry Plastics, over 200%, so, I mean, those are successful projects, but you've got some more due to the economy more than anything else that are under 100%. Mr. Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Just a question about Indiana Tube. Are they solidly remaining in this area, do you know?

Pam Martin: I have no information related to their future plans. I'd be glad to inquire of them if you request.

Councilmember Goebel: I don't think that's necessary. Their phase-ins are pretty well up anyway right now, so...

Pam Martin: Each one of them undergoes an analysis for both investment and job creation.

Councilmember Goebel: Thank you.

President Lloyd: One of the issues with them is, obviously, Whirlpool leaving town, so one of their largest suppliers. Any other questions from Council? We don't have

to do a motion on this? Oh, we do. Okay, I would entertain, we would take a motion to approve all these reports as submitted if there's no other questions.

Councilmember Bassemier: Second.

President Lloyd: Who made the motion?

Councilmember Shetler: I did.

President Lloyd: Oh, I'm sorry. Okay, motion Mr. Shetler, second Mr. Bassemier. I didn't hear that for some reason.

(Inaudible)

President Lloyd: Well, and I think some of this is just related to the economy, you've got some that are just slightly under 100%, those are economic conditions. Hopefully, next year we'll see a better report on some of this.

Pam Martin: I think the companies did, if I could make an editorial comment, I think they did a pretty good job of explaining in the written documentation what caused their situation this year.

President Lloyd: Okay, I'll ask for a roll call vote on this.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. These have been accepted six to zero. Thank you.

Pam Martin: Thank you.

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

<p style="text-align: center;">CONVENTION & VISITORS BUREAU PROPOSED BASEBALL/SOFTBALL COMPLEX PRESENTATION</p>
--

President Lloyd: Item number nine, new business, we had the SMG update last week at the Personnel & Finance, item A, so item B, Convention & Visitors Bureau, proposed baseball/softball complex, and I believe there's representatives here. We're going to let the presentation go first before we have public comment.

David Dunn: Good morning, Mr. President and members of the Council. On behalf of the Destination Evansville committee and the board of directors from the Convention & Visitors Bureau, my name is David Dunn. I chair the Destination Evansville committee which is heading up this project and we appreciate the opportunity to do a follow-up presentation and bring you up to date on the progress that we have made with this project since we last introduced it to you in January of 2008. As part of the update, the items that we intend to cover today would be an overview of our project, addressing the known concerns that had been presented to us since the first presentation. We want to give you an outline of our financing plan. We also want to outline what our operations plan will be for this complex. We will address the maintenance and capital needs of this complex moving forward. We will talk about the leasing of this property from the city, the impact of tourism to the community with this project. We'll talk about the presentations that we've made to date as well as the endorsements and approvals that we have received as well as are searching for. We'll talk about the time line of this project and then at the end of the presentation we'll entertain any questions from the Council. Before we get into the update, I'd like to briefly go through some of the projects that the Convention & Visitors Bureau has participated in in the past. Does anyone recognize this building? It actually is the first tourism capital development project that the CVB undertook shortly after establishing the tourism capital development account. It's the Pagoda, it's the offices of the CVB as well as the visitor's center, it's located right on the river and it's easy to forget where that building was shortly ago before we got involved with it. But other projects that we participated in include the LST, the Goebel Soccer Complex, The Centre, the Reitz Home Museum, the BMX track, the O'Day Discovery Lodge, the Mesker Park Zoo and Botanic Gardens, the Pigeon Creek Greenway, the African American Museum, the EMTRAC Museum, and then finally the Museum of Arts History & Science. We've committed \$750,000 to that renovation project. In total since the creation of the tourism capital development account, we have invested over 8.5 million dollars in brick and mortar projects similar to the ones that we've shown you. The current project that we're working on is what we call the park. And I share with you those prior projects because it's our estimation that the current project will generate more economic impact to the community than all of those prior projects combined. It will be the largest project that we will undertake to date. And when we talk about the park, we have to first understand that what we're asking the community to do is to embrace the concept of creating a nature and recreation area that literally goes from Lincoln Avenue to Morgan Avenue. If we think about the elements that are going to be involved in the park, we start with the area that's commonly known as the state hospital grounds, another area that is commonly referred to as the Lakeview Optimist Club fields, the Roberts Stadium campus, Wesselman Park, the Wesselman Nature Preserve as well as McDonald Golf Course. These are all of the areas that I'm referring to when we describe the park and the way that we hope to accomplish our vision and our master plan is through a series of connectors. The main connector, obviously, will be this pedestrian overpass over the Lloyd Expressway, but if you see, also on this illustration we have a series of trails and connectors that will allow us to connect all of the elements that will be associated in the park much better than what we have today. It's important to note that, while the park is our vision of what we think can

be developed into this world class nature and recreation area, the project specifically that I want to talk to you about this morning is the development of eight multi-purpose softball/baseball fields. When we first introduced this concept to you in January of 2008, there were a number of concerns that had been presented to us and we feel that in our new design we've addressed each of these concerns. I'd like to go through those with you so that you have an understanding of the difference between our original proposal versus our new design. Our original proposal called for the area which is known as the Par 3 Golf Course to be developed into five fields. Obviously, there was push back and opposition to the thought of losing the Par 3 Course, so this is one of the most significant changes in our new design. As you can see, we have rotated this set of pinwheel fields south and we have placed that on the Roberts Stadium campus. This dotted line here actually represents Roberts Stadium, it's the location of where the stadium is now. And it gives you a perspective of the size of this development and the amount of space that's necessary to complete the development. Another item that was noted to us of concern was traffic. Traffic was a concern for two primary reasons. There was a concern about the potential impact of traffic to Wesselman Park, and there was also concern about the potential impact to traffic to the residents along Boeke Avenue. In our original design the main entrance onto our complex would have been the entrance of Wesselman Park. Our original design called for a circular drive to go around our campus. There would have been ample parking to service it, however, we would have introduced vehicles into the park with our original design. With our new design, we have eliminated that concern. Our main entrance into our complex will be off of the Lloyd Expressway. This will be the main entrance into the complex and if you can see, I hope the people can see this, but with this area of parking, there is no direct vehicular access to the park. It's not to say that cars couldn't exit our campus, enter onto Boeke Avenue and then re-enter the park, but the point is that there is no direct vehicular access from our campus into Wesselman Park. Likewise, as we talk about the impact of traffic along Boeke Avenue, with the main entrance to our complex now coming off of the Lloyd Expressway, we anticipate to be far less activity along Boeke. Also, with this new design and the razing of Roberts Stadium, we're essentially removing a facility that could accommodate over 12,000 people and all the cars that would be associated with that kind of activity with a complex that on its best day with a major national tournament, we could accommodate about 2,000 people. So just the sheer number of participants that would be on-site are going to be less than what we have today and we feel that that would be a positive change with regard to traffic. Another concern that was voiced in our previous design was the potential loss of existing facilities or existing amenities that are associated with Wesselman Park. Mainly those would include the basketball courts, the sand volleyball courts, the playground and the handball court. And it's important to note that none of those existing facilities are going to be lost or eliminated. We are not in final design yet but we do anticipate affecting basketball, sand volleyball and handball. With our conceptual design, the playground is not affected, but once we get into final design, we may have to relocate and move the complex where it may, but what I want Council to understand is that all of those elements that are going to be affected are going to be relocated. They will be built new and the area that we are looking to do that in is going to be as close to the existing area as possible, and that's going to be somewhere in this general area right here, is where we anticipate. Currently, there are sand volleyball courts today and what we would anticipate is consolidating the courts that are on the softball/baseball side into one central area. We've got ample room to relocate the basketball courts and the handball court. Again, the playground, we do not anticipate affecting. But if we do in final design, we are committed to rebuilding it as well. The fifth item that had been noted in the past that was of concern, was the potential impact to this nature preserve, 200 acre hardwood natural urban forest, and there was a lot of

concern about the potential impact of our development to the nature preserve. Specifically, they were concerned about lights, they were concerned about water, surface water, runoff water, and they were concerned about noise. And again, I think that we have addressed those. With regard to lights, that's really been the easiest of the issues to address. We have aligned ourselves with a company called Musco Lighting. They're the premiere sports lighting company in the nation. And the technology that they have developed is really superior to anything that we've seen out there so far. They've been on-site on a number of occasions and taken light studies, and they have scientific data that can illustrate how their new technology is going to positively impact the current campus. And I use this illustration. This is the complex that is located in Newburgh. The Vann Avenue fields, they, too, are using Musco Lighting there. And what I'd like to point out is the fact that there is no light spill or what they call light pollution. Through directional lighting, what they're able to do is adequately light up the playing surface, but if you look closely, just a few feet past the outfield fence, you can see how dark it gets and actually, if you look in between the playing surfaces in the center building you can see how little light is actually spilling out. And then, of course, if you look in the background and you see the wooded area behind their complex, similar to the nature preserve that we will be contiguous to, there's just, there's no light spill. There's no light pollution. So without any doubt, we are confident that we are going to have a positive impact on lighting. And again, for two reasons. One is the elevation that they now install the lighting. They're putting the heads of the lights at a higher elevation and so it's more directional whereas the lights that are there now, they're more of a horizontal spray. And we will have a positive impact on the residents on Boeke Avenue as well as the nature preserve. With regard to surface water, by design, all of these fields are going to be graded and sloped from infield to outfield and if you look closely, there's this hint of blue at each of the outfields and what those are, are called bioswales, and they are designed specifically to accept any surface water that doesn't absorb into the natural turf. They are designed with planting materials that allow the water to be filtered, so if there is any chemicals, topical chemicals that are applied to treat the lawns, those will be filtered through. And once they're filtered through, they're going to go into a holding tank and then we will reuse that water for irrigation. So we feel that, not only have we addressed the surface water issue, but we have also addressed any potential impact of chemicals to the wildlife or the preserve. With regard to noise, we think there's three primary ways of us handling the concern of noise. And when we talk about noise, it's not the noise of children playing on fields, it's really the concern of a PA system or amplified noise, is what I think most are concerned about. It's important to note that we are going to design in our complex a PA system. It's primarily there because of life safety. We will have, as an example, lightning detection equipment on property so that we can be able to detect inclement weather as it's coming in. We also have to have the ability to communicate messages to large numbers if we need to evacuate or make an announcement, and also, when we are hosting major tournaments, you know, there's probably going to be times when we do use the PA system to announce the winner or announce the final teams or something like that. But the three things that we intend to do to address noise would be using technology, so we're going to use directional sound similar to what Musco is going to do with lighting, we're going to use direction sound so that we're not spraying sound outward, but we're directing it specifically to the audience. We're going to increase the budget, the landscaping budget so that we can utilize natural barriers and natural foliage to help mitigate the noise, and then the third thing is going to be a management control issue. We will establish policies and procedures on how we'll utilize the PA system and just like today, with the Parks Department league play, they're not announcing every player, every strike, every pitch. You know, they're not introducing music as batters come to the box, and we will also introduce policies and

procedures on how to utilize the PA system. And we think that by focusing on those three areas that we will have a big impact on mitigating potential noise. When we presented this concept to you in 2008, the price range that we were estimating was in that 10 to 12 million dollar range to develop these eight multi-purpose fields. The price tag has gone up with the new design and I'd like to address those reasons why the price tag is going up. The first and most obvious reason is the impact of Roberts Stadium. In our original design we were planning on developing the fields on top of the Par 3 course. Now that it's going on the Roberts Stadium campus, we've got a building to raze. And I'll talk to you later in this presentation about our financial plan, this is a self-funded plan using the Innkeeper's Tax, we have no assistance from the city or the county in any way, so as part of our budget, as part of our development budget now, we are budgeting the money necessary to raze this building.

Councilmember Kiefer: Do you mind if I interrupt just for a second, Dave? Has the city made any overtures to help with the tearing down of the stadium or is that out of the question? Any conversation with the city on assistance with the demolition? Or probably not?

David Dunn: There really hasn't. We have, and I'll talk to you a little bit later about why we like this site –

Councilmember Kiefer: Oh, no. I understand, the site is great, I just meant with the city, I didn't know if the city, what the conversation was with the city.

David Dunn: No. There's been really no conversation with the city with regard to them offering assistance with that part of the project.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay, thank you.

David Dunn: So, we've got that to budget. It's approximately 1.25 million dollars is our estimate to raze that building, so that's going to increase our overall budget by the 1.25. As I alluded to earlier, with regard to noise, we are going to increase the landscaping budget so that we can create natural barriers with berming and foliage so that we can help to mitigate noise. That's going to increase our overall development budget some. You'll hear later in my presentation that the convention bureau is going to continue to maintain this complex and so in order to do that, we are going to create and establish a long-term capital endowment, and so we've got to be able to fund that endowment, and so that's also going to increase our development costs as we establish that long-term capital endowment. The fourth area that is really kind of new to us right now as far as consideration, which may or may not have an affect on our development, is the idea or the concept of using artificial turf on these playing fields. We're just now starting to explore the thought of artificial turf but there are four primary reasons why we're excited about at least looking into it. The first is the fact that it extends the playing time on these fields. Right now we anticipate utilizing the complex during the months of March through October. Those would be weather months that we feel that we could get on these fields. By using artificial turf, literally, we could play year round depending on the tolerance of the athletes. But the artificial turf can handle a significant amount of water and within ten minutes of a significant downpour, they can be actually on the fields, so it really extends the usage of this complex. With regard to rain, one of the biggest drawbacks to tournament play is getting the tournaments in and if we were to develop a complex like this with artificial turf, we could literally guarantee a sponsor or a host that they could get their tournament in over that weekend, because we're not at risk of the fields being rained out or too wet. And generally, when play is stopped, it's not because the outfields are too saturated, it's because

the infields are too wet and they can't be prepped properly. Another reason why we're looking seriously at turf is the long-term maintenance. We estimate that it could save us somewhere between three and four hundred thousand dollars annually on the maintenance. Once the turf is installed, there really is hardly any maintenance to it whatsoever. The fields are chalked or lined, the infield itself would actually be artificial turf so it would be colored. It looks like dirt. But you just get on it and play. And whereas the natural surface, we've got to be prepping it for every single game. The final reason why we're looking seriously at turf is the impact to the nature preserve, and that is, by going to turf, we literally do eliminate any chemical whatsoever, we eliminate the use of heavy equipment that would have to be mowing all the time, so there's less emissions, so we feel like there's a positive advantage to looking at that. It does increase the cost of the project by about two to two and a half million dollars on the front end, so we're not sure whether we've got it in our budget to do that, but we are going to take a look at it. We now estimate that we could spend up to 18 million dollars. And part of the reason why it can't go beyond 18 million dollars, that is the outside limit of our ability to retire debt ourselves. We intend to bond this project and that is our bonding capacity. It's not to say that it's going to cost us 18 million dollars to develop eight multi-purpose fields, it's, what we intend to do, once we get the final design and we have our true costs understood, if we have the capacity to assist other elements of Wesselman Park, we'd to be able to consider that but we just, we can't yet until we know what our true and final costs are going to be. I'd like to segue into our financing plan. As I mentioned to you before, this is a fully funded project using the Innkeeper's Tax. Our Innkeeper's Tax is split two ways, we have an operations funds and a Tourism Capital Development fund. The Tourism Capital Development fund can only be used for brick and mortar projects to create and encourage tourism. This falls nicely into our charge. As I mentioned, we have bonding capacity up to 18 million. We're targeting two specific bonds: the Build America Bond and the Recovery Zone Bond. Both offer a rebate up to 45 percent of the interest that we would pay on the life of the bond. And so if we're successful here, it could generate as much as six million dollars through the life of this project back to the bureau and those monies are what we are anticipating setting aside for ongoing operations of the complex. Another source for us will be naming rights. This is going to be such a high quality project, it's going to be a family oriented project, the market that we're going after is youth sports and we don't have any doubt that there will be a number of corporations in our community that will recognize the value of being associated with this complex and we feel like there will be some value associated with the naming rights. With us today, we have representatives from our bond counsel and our accounting consultants, Karl Sturbaum and Bob Swintz are with us from Bose McKinney and Evans, with bond counsel, and the London Witte Group, which are our accounting consultants. They were selected primarily for the work that they have done recently with regard to the arena project, they were the lead on that project, they're with us this morning and certainly available to answer technical questions about the bonding arrangements during our Q & A. With regards to the operation, the Convention & Visitors Bureau will essentially be responsible for this complex after its developed. We intend to operate it ourselves, we'll maintain it ourselves, our intention is to hire a third party management company that specializes in sports complexes. And the areas that we're going to focus on are primarily two areas and this is what makes this project such a win-win for this community. The primary user of this complex is going to be the community, the local community. Weekday play on the fields will comprise of the adult leagues from the Parks Department. It could easily be play from high school teams, and then on the weekends is when we anticipate pursuing the out of town tournaments, regional qualifiers all the way up to major nationals. And what's nice about that concept is they don't conflict with one another. One group is playing through the week, the other group is playing on the weekends. And it would only be

during those times when we would be fortunate enough to host a major national which might be a ten-day tournament would we have to plan ahead with the parks department to reschedule league play, but we would know that a minimum of two years in advance, so it gives us ample time to work with Chris Rehn and his group with that. With regard to the complex itself, it's a multi-purpose facility for both hardball and softball, but the complex, especially from the tournament side, it's going to be designed for the youth. With hardball, whether it's local play or tournament play, it will – by design and the distance with the outfields, it's going to be designed for age groups up to around twelve to thirteen, maybe fourteen years of age. Softball at all ages is played essentially on the same dimensions and so we will pursue softball of all sizes and ages. But primarily what we're looking for are youth sports and that's what makes this complex so attractive is because the folks that we are going to be inviting in our community are going to be families. Families that are going to be bringing their children to participate in tournaments at this site. I really have already talked about capital, we are going to establish a long-term capital endowment and the reason for that is we want to ensure that we can maintain the quality of this complex not only from day one, but five years, ten years, twenty, thirty years from now, we want it to look just as good in the future as it does the day that we open. Likewise with the maintenance, we will be responsible for the ongoing maintenance of this facility and we're establishing an operating fund that allows us to do that as well as to ensure that if there is a shortfall in cash flow, that we've got that covered. We have no misgivings. This complex is not going to bring cash flow, it's not going to be a profit center for us. We hope that we get it to the point where it will break even, where revenues will offset our expenses, but if it doesn't, we will design the means to accommodate that. The property is city property and actually there's two separate parcels that we will be negotiating a long-term lease with the city on. The dotted line is representing the two parcels, the first set of fields are actually on Wesselman Park. The second set of fields, and the majority of the supportive amenities are on the Roberts Stadium campus. And they are both controlled by the Parks Department, and so we will engage with the Parks Department into a long-term lease for both of those sites. I'd like to touch briefly on the impact of tourism. Tourism is big business, it's really big business. Every other year we engage with a group called Certec, they conduct an economic impact study for us. As they look at the impact of tourism, the most recent study that was completed illustrates that the economic impact of tourism in Vanderburgh County is now approaching a half a billion dollars a year. The actual direct spend is 351 million dollars. When that money is reinvested in the community, it exceeds 483 million dollars annually and it's growing every year. You can see the impact of taxes. We're paying 146 million dollars annually in taxes. We are estimating that this complex will have a direct economic spend of over ten million dollars annually, so we're going to inject another ten million dollars of new money into our community with this particular project. We also estimate that during the time of construction that there will be 125 jobs that will be created. Currently there are over 6,000 jobs that are associated with tourism and we have an annual payroll that is approaching 100 million dollars a year. We've tried to be as transparent with our project and our plans as possible. We've made a number of presentations, we've gone before the arena project committee on two different public presentations. We've gone before the Wesselman Nature Society, we've presented to the Evansville Hotel Association, we've presented to the United Neighborhood of Evansville, and we've also presented to the Executive Board of the Chamber of Commerce. Likewise, we're meeting with you this morning, we are presenting to the Parks Board this evening, so we continue to get this project out front in the community. These are the endorsements that we have received so far as well as the approvals that we are seeking: the Convention & Visitors, the arena project committee, the Evansville Hotel Association and the Chamber of Commerce all have supported our project unanimously. The groups

that we are going to need authorization from in order for this project to come to fruition would be the County Council, we need your support and approval. We will also need the approval from the Parks and Recreation Department as well as the City Council, the Redevelopment Commission and the Area Plan Commission. It's a very complex project that we're doing. Normally, when CVB does a project, it's a check and a balance between our board and this body but because city property is involved and because we're bonding, there are a number of other agencies that we need to seek approvals from. This is the time line that we envision in order to get this project done. There is a sense of urgency as it relates to the bonds. The amount of rebate that exists today expires at the end of this year. The Recovery Zone Bond, which pays up to 45 percent rebate goes away completely at the end of this year. The Build America Bond reduces from 35 percent rebate to 28 percent after the first of the year, so there really is a sense of urgency on our part to get the approvals in place, get this project designed so that we can, in fact, sell the bonds and be able to take full advantage of the rebates to us. Again, it's an integral part of the financing plan that allows us to be able to maintain and to operate from. But as you see from the time line, we're going to have a busy summer. The agencies that I had alluded to, we're going to make either our initial second or third presentations depending on what's going to be required. But essentially, we need to be through final authorization by September in order for us to have enough time to complete the sale of the bonds by the end of the year. We anticipate groundbreaking on this now in the summer of 2011 and the project to be completed some time in the fall of 2012. That's the update that we're excited to bring to you this morning. We thank you for the opportunity to do so. I would certainly entertain any and all questions that Council may have.

President Lloyd: Thank you, Mr. Dunn. The way I'd like to do this, first I'll allow Councilmembers questions and obviously, you've got Mr. Dunn as well as the attorneys and the financial consultant. Then when Councilmembers have finished their questions, then we'd ask the general public to come and make any statements that they have. So I'll start with Councilmembers. Who wants to jump in there first? Questions, questions? Mr. Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: A couple questions regarding, basically, the financing. The revenue stream to pay for this is coming from the county tax on convention & visitors bureau tax that you have now and then does some of that come in from the food & beverage as well?

David Dunn: No. We get no subsidy from food & beverage. We get a flat amount of revenue from the casino, which is \$212,000 a year, but that goes into our operations account, that doesn't go into the Tourism Capital Development account. So the only source of income for the Tourism Capital Development would be that portion of the Innkeepers Tax.

Councilmember Shetler: And how much is that generating currently?

David Dunn: It's around 1.5 million dollars annually.

Councilmember Shetler: And then how much, specifically, out of that 1.5 will you need?

David Dunn: All of it.

Councilmember Shetler: And so then for 20 years?

David Dunn: Twenty-five to thirty years. The tax has been increasing somewhere between three and five percent annually, so any amount over and above debt service will be allowed for future capital development projects. But we do need to pledge the current revenue stream to offset debt.

Councilmember Shetler: The capital endowment or the perpetual fund or whatever, that will be funded through the bonding –

David Dunn: Correct.

Councilmember Shetler: – to the tune of about how much?

David Dunn: About two million dollars is what we see establishing the endowment at initially.

Councilmember Shetler: And then you're going to invest that and use the proceeds from that investment to help offset the cost for maintaining?

David Dunn: No, that endowment is only going to be used for long-term capital needs, so really for about the first five to seven years we don't anticipate spending any of that long-term capital at all. There will be another operating fund that we will establish that will be used for the maintenance and the operations. The source of that will come from naming rights and from the interest rebate off the bonds.

Councilmember Shetler: Now the interest rebate, that six million dollars, does that come at the tail end?

David Dunn: No, it comes back to us monthly.

Councilmember Shetler: The maintenance that you're talking about, how much do you project that to be on an annual basis?

David Dunn: Roughly a half million dollars a year. And that can be affected by as much as \$400,000 a year if we go with artificial turf. The majority of the cost to maintain this is the field prep.

Councilmember Shetler: The maintenance, is that also including the management of the facility as well?

David Dunn: Yes.

Councilmember Shetler: So management and maintenance, you're projecting to be in that half million dollar range?

David Dunn: Yes.

Councilmember Shetler: And once again, the revenue to offset that maintenance would be done by what method?

David Dunn: The naming rights, we –

Councilmember Shetler: And how much are you projecting for those naming rights?

David Dunn: I'm sorry, I don't know what the value of that is just yet.

Councilmember Shetler: I guess what concerns me a little bit is that knowing that in most fairly secured investments today, I guess you're not seeing a whole lot of revenue that you can derive off of that 3/4 percent, one percent, one and a quarter, people are here from the Treasurer's office, they can probably tell us better, what they're getting today, but not a whole lot of revenue is coming off of those. And so if we did get some big bucks coming off the naming rights, which I know many companies are a little bit reticent to do that today because of the things that have happened with the bigger ball parks and naming those and the costs, and that kind of has left a bad taste in people's mouths, so a lot of companies are shying away from that. But it would take a lot of money to generate, you know, that kind of an income that we're talking about here.

David Dunn: Again, that's another reason why turf is attractive to us because it reduces the ongoing maintenance significantly.

Councilmember Shetler: I know that there were some obstacles on that Par 3. Do you have any idea how much activity you're getting off – how much the city is doing on the Par 3 today?

David Dunn: I'm sorry, I don't. We've tried to determine the level of play but we've been unsuccessful being able to zero in specifically on the Par 3 play.

Councilmember Shetler: I mean, again, you're the messenger today, so I don't mean to be shooting at – but, from my point of view, that Par 3 seems to be like some of our other parks today, not all that well maintained and I know that there are several of the lights out. I'm not even sure if it's operable at night any longer because –

David Dunn: They don't turn the lights on at night any longer.

Councilmember Shetler: It seems to me that that original plan, I guess, I prefer it a little bit more so than I'm seeing here, that the Par 3 being relocated closer to McDonald's because I think that property over there on Morgan Avenue was traded out a few years ago with the National Guard on some property they had over there, and I don't know how much room it takes for a Par 3, and how much they have today. But it seems to me that they can consolidate their maintenance efforts and make it a whole lot more efficient combined with McDonald's and a Par 3 adjacent, than it is where it is today. That, to me, I guess, perhaps is making too much sense on the whole process here. The perpetual fund, though, you guys are planning to control that or the capital endowment fund, and also control the maintenance?

David Dunn: Yes sir.

Councilmember Shetler: Now will this be linked at all with the soccer facility?

David Dunn: Not at this time. It's not being planned to be linked. The Parks Department controls the Goebel Soccer Complex. They're responsible for that, so no, not at this time.

Councilmember Shetler: I would be interested if somehow that could be tied because I know the soccer facility has also been neglected on maintenance over the years and that's something that is I think a real valuable asset to the tourism as well, bringing in the families. That was a project you guys were very interested in and I would like to see that somehow at least tied together at least on the maintenance if it's at all possible, and management perhaps. It seems to me to make sense that we could coordinate that and also coordinate the efforts of not having a softball

tournament and a soccer tournament here at the same time and be able to tie those together a little bit better. I think that's all the questions I have right now. There's a couple of other things I might get back to a little bit later.

President Lloyd: Other questions for Council? Mr. Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Good morning, Mr. Dunn.

David Dunn: Good morning.

Councilmember Goebel: I think of all the presentations we've had before this Council in my time, this is the most thorough and best explained, and I really appreciate that. I think the nature of it, you've done a worthy job for us. I have a couple questions to go along with Councilman Shetler's idea. And I think it bears repeating right now, the funding of this will not at all come from property tax or local income tax, is that correct?

David Dunn: That's correct. Not only is it not intended to come with regard to the development, but it will not come from property tax with the ongoing maintenance or the capital needs of this particular complex. It's a fully funded project using Innkeeper taxes.

Councilmember Goebel: And basically the people who come from out of town to use the facility will be paying for the facility?

David Dunn: That's correct.

Councilmember Goebel: Thank you. As far as maintenance goes, the point that Mr. Shetler brought up as far as the Goebel Complex, have we lost some interest as far as national tournaments because of the maintenance of the Goebel Soccer Complex? I don't know if you're prepared to even comment on that today, but –

David Dunn: When you say lost interest, are you talking about from the Convention & Visitors Bureau losing interest?

Councilmember Goebel: No from national committees that might come here or state committees that might put on tournaments here. Have we lost any tournaments because of the field condition?

David Dunn: It's my understanding that following the recent state cup preliminary tournament that Evansville hosted, that there was a series of comments made by those who participated in that event about the condition of the complex. That has prompted the Parks Department to take action and they sprigged many of the fields to address the condition of the complex, the playing surfaces of the complex, in anticipation of the single largest event that we host annually, which is the Veterans Tournament in November. The Veterans Tournament has now become the single largest economic impact event that the community hosts outside of the Jehovah Witness convention. It's the largest single sporting event that we host and there was certainly some concern that the playing surface at Goebel would be in a quality condition that would allow that tournament to go on. And it would appear that the Parks Department is committed to making sure that that happens. But I understand your point and your comment and the Convention Bureau, we've got 1.6 million dollars of Innkeeper's Tax invested in that complex, so it is very near and dear to us and it is a huge economic engine for us. It draws a tremendous amount of tourism into our community and we, too, are concerned and want to make sure that the

quality of that complex certainly doesn't deteriorate any further than what it is and can remain the premiere complex that it was when it was developed.

Councilmember Goebel: Thank you. As far as maintenance, I think that the key point that you hit also was the fact that you will maintain this and keep it, not in pristine condition, but in very near new condition for a twenty year period of time, is that correct?

David Dunn: From our perspective, forever. You know, when we did our due diligence on what project to pursue, we traveled the country looking at different sportsplexes and the one thing that we walked away from, having visited so many of these communities is the easy part of this is to find the money to develop. The hard part is to find the monies necessary to maintain these over the course of time. And so many of these complexes are set up just like the Goebel Complex is set up, where it's reliant on the tax revenues from property tax and, you know, municipalities and communities are challenged across the country of making those tough decisions and when you're an elected official and you have to decide between fire protection and police protection or improving the playing surface at a park, then that's a relatively easy decision to make. And so often, we saw that community after community. And we were determined that that would not happen at this complex, that we wanted to make sure that it was as high quality tomorrow as it will be today.

Councilmember Goebel: I think youth sports really help any community. I think it would be a great thing to expand here, obviously. Anyone who has had children or grandchildren or anyone connected knows, going, traveling to another area for these tournaments, it's not an inexpensive venture, but the community that hosts, certainly does benefit. And for us developing more youth entertainment, more family –

(Tape changed)

I think is the way to go and it certainly improves our quality of life and I think it makes Evansville and the community much more attractive. Thank you.

President Lloyd: Mr. Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Dave, did you say what the lease rate was to the city, what the annual payment is to the city for that leasing?

David Dunn: I did not because we are just now engaging in that dialogue with the city, so we don't have any of the lease terms or specifics that I can present to you at this time.

Councilmember Kiefer: Well, I understand and that makes sense why they probably would not fund the demolition of the stadium if they're giving you the use of the property. I do like the concept because, you know, I'm always fearful that that stadium, if it remains there, it's going to become a severe eyesore to our community and I think that hurts us because it's on the main corridor through our city. What did you say, could you repeat what you said the cost, if you did all turf fields was?

David Dunn: It's going to add two to two and a half million dollars to the price of the development if we go to all turf.

Councilmember Kiefer: Yeah, okay, so it seems like almost a no-brainer that you should try to go to that all turf field if you can save \$400,000 a year, I mean, obviously, it doesn't take you seven-eight years down the road, boom, I mean, it's

paid for, so it just seems like if you can save that much money per year, you ought to pursue that with all interest and force. Okay, well, you know, and then looking at the project overall, really, all you – you already have softball fields if you look to the left, bottom left, you already have softball fields there, correct?

David Dunn: I was – yeah...

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay, now on the top left, I mean, you already have softball fields there, so you're not really change – I mean, you're obviously improving them and making them so much better, so really, the major effect is tearing down the stadium and putting in, you know, your complex there. So it really looks attractive to me.

David Dunn: At the Wesselman Park site, the fields that you were alluding to, currently there are five fields there today. There is the Babe Ruth hardball field and then there's the softball fields. And really, we're not introducing anything new as you indicated. All we're doing is just redeveloping, reconfiguring –

Councilmember Kiefer: Actually, you're reducing the amount of light that's going to be there now because of this new lighting.

David Dunn: Absolutely. Absolutely.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay, thank you very much, Dave.

David Dunn: Thank you.

President Lloyd: Let's see. Mr. Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Mr. Dunn, I know you put a lot of time and effort and others, into this project, and I can appreciate that. I tried to get a water park off the ground here a few years back and I do know the effort. Also, I've been on Council long enough that I've supported a lot of the projects in the past: the Pagoda, soccer complex and the Reitz Homes, the African-American Museum. Your numbers look real good, I think it's a good concept, I don't know if the location is good, but, to me, I think your timing is bad. I think, I'd like to see the stadium, the new stadium completed and up and running before we take on an eighteen million dollar, another eighteen million dollar debt. But I can appreciate what you all are doing. But that's my feelings and, in the future, yes, but right now I think its timing is wrong. Thank you, sir.

President Lloyd: Ms. Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Actually, I think most of my questions have been answered, because my main concern was sustain ability and you've covered that. Just in thinking about the constituents that I serve, in terms of marketing youth sports, what type of outreach will you do for those that are less fortunate and wouldn't have the opportunity to participate in something like this?

David Dunn: Well, with it being – are you talking about the local youth?

Councilmember Terry: Uh-huh.

David Dunn: With it being at this location in the city, then what we like about this location is the fact that there is public transportation that is provided to the site to

make it more convenient for them versus looking at a site that may be further out in the county. But we certainly want to make sure that all youth have access to the complex and are utilizing both hardball as well as softball.

Councilmember Terry: Uh-huh. And I also appreciate you including the numbers about job creation. That's before the project is completed, but I definitely would be interested in also knowing once the project is completed, how many jobs would be available in our community as well. Thanks.

David Dunn: Okay.

President Lloyd: Let me throw a few questions out. The Convention & Visitors Bureau board members all approved this, is that correct?

David Dunn: Yes, sir. It was a unanimous approval from the CVB board.

President Lloyd: Are any of those members here?

David Dunn: I'm not sure.

President Lloyd: I think we have some staff members, I see. So you're the spear carrier.

David Dunn: I'm carrying all the water today.

President Lloyd: A couple of questions. I don't know if you addressed the number of parking spaces that were going to be...

David Dunn: I didn't, but it's a great question, Mr. President. Currently, on the site of Roberts Stadium, there are currently 3,300 parking spaces that are supporting Roberts Stadium. The consultants that are helping us design this complex tell us that we need to develop approximately 70 parking spaces per field, it's an eight field complex, so they're suggesting that we need 560 spaces total.

President Lloyd: You said 70 per field?

David Dunn: Seventy per field. So we need, they're suggesting that we need 560 parking spaces to accommodate the play on these fields. It was important to us that we design this complex adequately so that we were not encroaching into the residential area or that we were not adversely affecting any of the amenities that are currently there, specifically, Swonder and Hartke. And so by design, we're at 750 parking spaces, with our concept design. And if we can get a few more in, we will. I don't want it to – what we like about the new design is that we're going from gray to green. We're eliminating so much of the asphalt and turning it into green space but yet providing adequate parking on campus. So we're going to stay cognizant of that and we want to make sure that we have adequate parking, but as much green space as possible, as well.

President Lloyd: Will this encroach at all on Swonder Arena?

David Dunn: No.

President Lloyd: So they have sufficient parking on their own. They don't use the current stadium parking at all, or do you know?

David Dunn: I do not know that. I've made a point to go out there often just to see and I've yet to see – when I'm there, there's adult league play going on, too, so there's certainly cars parked in Roberts Stadium's parking lot, but to me, it looks like it's coming from softball rather than the ice arena.

President Lloyd: Okay, and this would be situated such that, like for Hartke Pool, could they use these parking spaces, as well?

David Dunn: If they're available, sure.

President Lloyd: Okay. Do you – you're going to bring in all this dirt or tear out the asphalt, are you going to raise the elevation or is that part of the cost or you're going to try and keep it the same elevation?

David Dunn: The topography is going to change somewhat, but essentially, the elevation is going to be the same as what you see it there. You know, there's a significant amount of grading that's currently in place on that Roberts Stadium campus and so we'll have to address that, but I don't see the elevations changing dramatically.

President Lloyd: And then, on the maintenance, you had indicated, I guess if it was grass, approximately 500,000 a year.

David Dunn: Well, the overall budget, we were estimating to be about \$500,000 a year, most of that is on field prep, yes.

President Lloyd: Okay, well, that would be announcers and concessions and all that stuff, you'd have some revenue coming from some of that.

David Dunn: Well, the revenue stream that we're most excited about is on the tournament play. That's why we need to be as aggressive as we can with pursuing these weekend events.

President Lloyd: You had a two million long-term endowment capital fund but then also for operations, you wanted to set up a fund as well. How much was that?

David Dunn: Well, we don't have a number set up in that yet, the source that we're going to utilize would be monies generated from naming rights, as well as the monies that would be coming back to us on the monthly rebate from the interest off the bonds.

President Lloyd: It's, I mean, I guess to the average person, this is a little convoluted because you've got a county agency, which is the Convention & Visitors Bureau, you're using Food & Beverage tax, which is a county-wide tax, --

David Dunn: We're not using any Food & Beverage.

President Lloyd: Oh, I'm sorry. I mean Innkeepers Tax, I'm sorry, which is a county-wide tax, and that is going to be used to fund bonds to take out a long-term lease on the parks district land, so I mean, they're going to continue to own the land, but you're going to have a lease, and I guess, the Convention & Visitors Bureau, as part of their bond, you would own all the improvements.

David Dunn: Right.

President Lloyd: And then the revenue from the Innkeepers Tax is going to make the bond payments. I see the urgency because of the bond provisions for the – let's see here – the Build America as well as the Recovery Zone, what is the probability of being able to tap those if you get all your approvals done? I mean, the Build American, do they, is there a criteria set for those or do they just accept all comers?

David Dunn: They accept, there's no cap on that. The Recovery Zone does have a cap – I'm told that it's roughly \$7,000,000, so it's just a question of whether the county has any other projects that they had intended to also utilize with that Recovery Zone. I'm not aware of any to date, so we would try to pursue as much or all of that as we can. That's the one that pays the 45 percent rebate back.

President Lloyd: And that expires January 1, 2011?

David Dunn: Or December 31st. I'm told that it's yet this year, so end of the year, yes sir.

President Lloyd: Okay, I mean, we hear debate in Washington about both of these but as of right now, they are available.

David Dunn: Correct.

President Lloyd: Okay. But the financing, approximately 1.5 million would basically take all of the Innkeepers Tax. It would be a set amount of approximately 1.5 million per year for 25 or 30 years and so those funds would not be available for any other projects other than you'd start seeing, as it increases each year, the increase would be available for use by the Convention Bureau.

David Dunn: Correct. And we anticipate it increasing just due to the effect of the project. I mean, we're going to bring more tourists into our community just because of this project.

President Lloyd: Using all that revenue, does that have an effect on the bonds, the interest rate or the rating or anything?

David Dunn: Not that I'm aware of. I would probably defer that to bond counsel –

President Lloyd: Do they have an opinion on that?

Bob Swintz: Mr. President, members of Council, I'm Bob Swintz with the London Witte Group. Just to clarify, we looked at the current revenues of about 1.5 million dollars. And when we say we're going to use all of that, we would pledge all of that to the payment of the bonds. The reality is, I think, that you were getting to, is that we would structure debt service at something less than that, maybe around a million dollars to provide an internal coverage amount so that it would make the bonds more marketable and it would help on the interest rate and the rating. As the years went by and revenues grew and we had that internal coverage amount, those would be available for other projects. They wouldn't be held or tied up, we would fund debt service over a period of months and then excess revenues would be available for other projects.

President Lloyd: On the Innkeepers Tax though, I had not looked in prior years, but has there ever been a time where that declined from one year to the next, do you know of?

Bob Swintz: We have the historical amounts. There may have been some years where there was some decreases. Generally, it has increased. Here in Vanderburgh County, as we just went through with all the arena financing, the Food & Beverage Tax, and your other taxes have been pretty stable, even over this last couple of years with the economic declines. So we have not assumed any growth but we would assume there would be growth going forward.

President Lloyd: I mean, to sell the bonds you just have to have, this is the amount, fixed amount, and then that's what you use for the calculation.

Bob Swintz: Right.

President Lloyd: Does it have to go 25 to 30 years for that amount of principal?

Bob Swintz: We would probably look to do a 30 year bond for this, yes.

President Lloyd: Does anybody else, Mr. Shetler, have a question for the bond counsel?

Councilmember Shetler: With regards to the bonds, would the bond holders have like a covenant over that surplus at all, that you can't get below a certain amount or anything?

Bob Swintz: It would be our intent not to. If we needed a million dollars a year in debt service we would set up a mechanism to capture that first million dollars and then make the rest of it free. I've been involved in deals where if coverages fall below a certain level in future years, you have to capture more or do something, but we didn't do that on the arena and I wouldn't expect that we would start with that premise. A lot would depend on the bond market. If they dictated that, we may have to consider it but not initially.

Councilmember Shetler: I guess my two biggest concerns is it's really, I don't know if it's really you or David on this point, and more editorializing than it is a question, I guess, but the price tag is concerning me and it, you know, fifteen - eighteen million dollar price tag, when I think back just a few, seems to me, short years ago, on those soccer fields and we spent whatever, three to five million dollars. And now we're looking at something five or six times that amount. It seems a lot, to me. That part concerns me. The other thing is, is that we are pretty much exhausting, you know, your opening comments about all the things that have been done with the Convention & Visitors Bureau monies and stuff over the years and how much you've improved the quality of life for our county through those projects, be it the Reitz Home or the BMX track and all the other things that have gone on, I'd hate to see us exhaust all of it for one particular project and not have anything available for another Council or for another body in three to five, seven years, that would like to turn around and say, hey, I think this will be good for our community. We need some money, and there's nothing available.

David Dunn: It's a great comment and a great assessment. We, too, studied this long and hard and the reason why we are more comfortable with it is the fact that this project by itself has the ability to create more impact on the community than all of those projects combined. It can generate more activity for us than all of them combined and so that's why we were more comfortable with it. But you're right, by doing a project of this size and it being, and we're the sole funding mechanism for it, it's going to tie up the majority of our money for a significant period of time.

President Lloyd: I had one other question. Are there other Convention & Visitors Bureau or that type of agency doing bonds in the state of Indiana?

David Dunn: I'm sorry, I couldn't answer that. I don't know.

President Lloyd: Do you guys know if there is any other ones? Tourism bureaus or convention bureaus doing lease/bond type deals.

Bob Swintz: I'm not real sure. Obviously, in Marion County they have a capital improvement board, same up in Ft. Wayne.

President Lloyd: If you could speak into the mic please.

Bob Swintz: Sorry. I'm not aware of any entities like this that are doing bond deals. Like I said, Marion County, up in Ft. Wayne, they have capital improvement boards, which kind of serve that same function and are doing bonds, obviously. Karl? I'm just not aware of any.

President Lloyd: And there wouldn't be any other backup coverage besides the Innkeepers Tax that you know of or...

Bob Swintz: One thing that we did on the arena bonds, as you may know, we had three revenue sources that we were going to use, and we used the county option income tax as a back up for that. It was purely for marketing at that point. It just provided better access to the market. It may be something we'd want to explore with this, too. Again, that would provide better interest rates, better access to the bond market, and it's fairly common. I think the county has actually done that on another deal.

President Lloyd: The county, yeah, they may have pledged COIT on some of their other, Burkhardt Road bond, or whatever.

Bob Swintz: But the idea is, as we talked about with the coverage, we would build in coverage so that there would have to be a drastic reduction of the Innkeepers Tax before you would even get close to that.

President Lloyd: So, I mean, it could be Food & Beverage or some other, but anyway, you would look at the possibility of backups, which you hope you never have to use.

Bob Swintz: Right. It's very common.

President Lloyd: Ms. Terry had a question.

David Dunn: Can I comment on that? I think it's important that Council realize that Vanderburgh County has a unique piece of legislation that creates the Innkeepers Tax, so most of the other communities throughout the state fall under what's called the uniform Innkeepers Tax, and so if there's changes to the language of that tax, then it affects all of those counties. Vanderburgh County, however, has its own unique piece of legislation that establishes this tax and so changes that are made to the uniform would not have any affect on what we do here in Vanderburgh County.

President Lloyd: Ms. Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Final question. How many hotel rooms are within a five mile

radius and then can you give me a rough estimate of the typical revenue that will be generated for a softball tournament?

David Dunn: Well, I'm not sure I can tell you within a five mile radius. There are over 4,000 hotel rooms in Vanderburgh County that are paying Innkeepers Tax. And our estimate of the impact of this project is that it would generate somewhere between 30 and 35,000 room nights annually just with the weekend tournaments that we would pursue.

Councilmember Terry: Thank you.

President Lloyd: Any other questions from Councilmembers? Mr. Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Dave, if it's going to create 35,000 room nights per year, will that then spin off you think some new construction in hotels? Do you envision that there might be some new hotels sprouting up because of this?

David Dunn: I don't know that just this complex being developed would encourage a developer to come to Evansville. There's far more –

Councilmember Kiefer: I'm just curious, if it were on the fringe and this puts it over the top where like oh, this makes it attractive.

David Dunn: It could.

Councilmember Kiefer: And I don't know if you know anything about the standing of the hotel that's going next to the stadium, Browning, I don't know.

David Dunn: I don't know anything about that development.

Councilmember Kiefer: I'm just curious because I thought if this would create any spinoff jobs as far as new construction, that would be great or maybe restaurants, you know, I'm sure projects like this create demand for restaurants as well.

David Dunn: Well, when you bring that many more people into the community, they have to be serviced in some fashion, and if it causes a developer to see an opportunity, then obviously it could spin off into continued development growth.

Councilmember Kiefer: I've got to think Kiplee's and maybe Turoni's would like this project.

David Dunn: Sure.

Councilmember Kiefer: One thing I just want to note, when I was at the stadium committee meeting where you made this presentation, a couple of guys that aren't here today that were there, Jim Farney who is with Bernardin Lochmueller and Mike Shoulders, expressed that one of the problems we have right now with the current stadium situation is when it rains, you know, that water gets displaced and, you know, with this project they said we probably wouldn't, you know, it's less likely to have any flooding condition due to that displacement of water because this project has so much more green space, plus if you look, I think there is so much more parking, you're spreading the parking out, too, I mean, even though you've got 70 per field, you've got four fields up toward the top.

David Dunn: You're right. The initial report back from the civil engineers suggests

that the changes that we are making to this site will have a positive impact on the flooding concerns that exist today. And it's for those reasons. In addition to that, because we're replacing so much asphalt with green space, that water is allowed to saturate versus running off into the storm lines. Also, the water that flows to the bioswales, we're going to capture that water and not introduce it, we're going to reuse that, we're going to keep that in holding units and use that as part of our irrigation.

Councilmember Kiefer: I thought that was attractive. Thank you.

President Lloyd: I think our attorney has a question.

Jeff Ahlers: I just had a question for bond counsel. In terms of, what is it specifically, given the current financing plan that you would need from this Council and the time table? Is it, is there an ordinance, is there a resolution, is there, I mean, what specifically, would you anticipate would be needed from County Council?

Karl Sturbaum: We would be looking – sorry, I'm Karl Sturbaum with Bose McKinney and Evans. We would be looking for an ordinance appropriating the Innkeepers Tax. The CVB has the authority to allocate it, to transfer it to any other body, but we would need you to conduct the statutory procedures on appropriating the proceeds. We would also, you would be involved approving the park area as an economic development area, we would be establishing that, so that we could use the lease structure with the Redevelopment Commission and the Redevelopment Authority as the lessor. And then the last thing would be if there, well, your participation in the allocation of the recovery zone would be appropriate although I think that's probably Commissioners, ultimately, you would want to back that one up. And then if it's determined that there is a backup pledge of COIT, you would be involved in making that pledge to the Redevelopment Commission. So those are the four things that we would be looking for.

Jeff Ahlers: When you say backup pledge of COIT, are you suggesting that in order for this financing mechanism to work that it would require pledging or approving the pledging of funds beyond just the Innkeepers Tax?

Karl Sturbaum: We don't know that. The coverages that we have been looking at are about 120% coverage from Innkeepers Tax. It's a question of whether, it's a tradeoff between what the interest rate on the bond is going to be and whether it makes more sense to pledge a backup of the county's allocable share of COIT as a backup for the bonds.

President Lloyd: And that would be something that Council would have to decide.

Jeff Ahlers: When would you know that as part of the process in terms of, when would Council be advised as to whether or not a pledge of COIT would be required for the bond?

Karl Sturbaum: It would occur after all the preliminary approvals are done, so sometime probably in September or October.

President Lloyd: Any other questions from Council? Mr. Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: It's my understanding today, we just basically give an approval or not and is the 18 million dollars a set amount or will that be involved with the attorneys from both counsels or any other group? Or are we here to say yes or

no totally to what's been asked for?

President Lloyd: Well, we don't have any kind of detailed financial plan. I guess the range was twelve to eighteen million.

Karl Sturbaum: I think what we're looking for, Mr. President, is a non-binding approval that we can continue to go forward with the project and subject to further negotiations with Council.

President Lloyd: Okay, any other questions? If not, we'll entertain the public comments on this. And thank you. What I'd like to mention here for the public, those of you that have gone before the Area Plan Commission, we'd kind of like to use those rules. I know Mr. Bassemier is our representative on that body now, and a number of us have sat on that. So state your name and address, and we'd like factual, brief remarks and don't repeat what others have said, and then be courteous and respectful. So, public comments, please.

Sylvia Niemeier: I'm Sylvia Niemeier. Can you hear me okay?

President Lloyd: Your address please?

Sylvia Niemeier: My married address is 129 South Iroquois, and my family's home is 516 North Boeke Road, right across from Wesselman Park there. And I have lived across from Wesselman Park almost all my life. I love that park. One of the degrees I got, a BS in biology is because of working in the nature center for almost a year as a volunteer, and I have seen a beautiful, beautiful park. And what is happening is, over time, everybody keeps taking a portion of the park and it keeps going smaller and smaller. Good Samaritan Home took some, National Guard took some, and a long, long, long time ago the city wanted to make a great big golf ball complex and the neighbors, my parents, and family neighbors got together and we got the state nature preserve in the back, otherwise, there would not be any trees there now. It would be a golf ball complex. Now what's happening, in the front of the park is, they want to make it a baseball complex. And the neighbors and all, we got together two years ago and didn't want this, and what all they've done is just changed it and modified this project just a little, bitty bit. And what's happened is Par 3 Golf Course got a petition together so they would not take their Par 3 Golf Course because those were the people that were complaining two years ago. So now they got their golf thing so they're not complaining. What Mr. Dunn doesn't tell you is in moving where the baseball complex all and everything is, they have to put in the volleyball and the baseball, well, there's a whole bunch of trees and a lot of animals that are living in there, there are four endangered species in that park. And I don't believe there has been a study, an unbiased study on what affects are going to be for the animals. I'm all for the wildlife. You've got lots and lots of places you could put this ball complex, seven of them. And the mayor has even said three times he was going to put it in Goebel Soccer Field because he didn't want to bother the nature or the residents. And I still feel this location should go somewhere else. Goebel Soccer Field, there's six or seven other locations that would not bother nature or residents. And on his comments on just some of the things like, with the lights, I feel like they made the lights brighter over there, I live across there, I help my parents out, I'm over there all the time, I think after the May meeting they made them brighter so now they can put the little shades over them. Oh wow, it's a little dimmer. And for the noise, I brought that up to the mayor in one of the town hall meetings, he said something about the speakers. But even if you have the speakers that are behind the stadium for the soccer, you can hear that going through the woods on the trails. And besides the ball complex, with the speakers, even if they limit like little Tommy Smith coming up

to bat, even if they don't say that, you're still going to have speaker noise and where my family's home is, even the windows rattle when you have the speakers going. And it's just terrible. If you want to, you can come sit on the lawn or on the porch of Boeke Road, see how much traffic it is. Even putting this over into the other part where they come into the stadium and all of this, you're still going to have lots and lots of traffic. And the other thing is just like putting grass where the stadium is, whoopity do, a few little lanes of grass is not going to help the animals out. You're not going to have raccoons there and everything else because you're going to be tearing down trees and more wildlife in the other spot. And yes, I have a hydrology degree, a climatology degree a science degree, and another science degree, so I'm well educated on this. And I know daggone well the runoff and pesticides are going to get into the water in the wetland. And I will take on anybody that wants to argue this point. And the other thing you'd better add to the budget, I don't care if this ball complex goes to Goebel Soccer Field or somewhere else, but it does not need to be located in Wesselman Park. And I just want to read you one little thing and I'll leave you alone. Property owners along Boeke Road and neighboring streets near Wesselman Park and Roberts Stadium, do you realize this proposed ball complex will affect the value of your home in a negative way? This proposed ball complex will operate five to six months a year day and night. The noise will be from loud speakers, concession stands, and approximately 700 cars with an expected 1,500 people. So you're going to have way more traffic in there. And also they want to add seven more tennis courts. So don't forget about that. That's another project, seven more tennis courts and where are they people going to park? They are going to cut the trees down. Okay, and remember the noise will be outside for long periods of time, not like a short event in an enclosed Roberts Stadium. Calls to two real estate agents confirmed that homes on Boeke, Iowa, Virginia, Michigan and Franklin will all decrease in value. This area totals 203 homes. I'm just going a block out. With an average present value of \$125,000 each, these impacted homes will total \$25,375,000 in real dollars. Even a modest 10 percent decrease in value results in \$2,537,500 loss and a 20 percent impact is more likely. When the question at the Evansville Convention Visitors Bureau meeting was raised about the negative affect to homeowners near Wesselman Park, Mr. Dunn answered, maybe we can compensate them somehow. Well, Mr. Dunn, how about you come up with \$2,537,500 as a start. Because we have to live there and you can put this complex in, like I said, Goebel Soccer Field, somewhere else where it will not bother nature and it will not bother residents. If you would please go to Wesselman Park and see where they're going to put these ball fields down, you will see there's lots of oak trees, they may not be a hundred years old, but they're like twenty-five years old, they're beautiful oak trees. And then over in the other spot where they're going to go to put the basketball and volleyball, there's lots of other old trees and wildlife. And that will be destroyed. And then they're going to put in more concrete for paving and parking lots. So, in a nutshell, if you want the project, please put it somewhere else. Don't put it in Wesselman Park. You are very, very lucky to have a park like Wesselman Park in the city. I've traveled lots and lots of places, there's hardly any cities that have a park like Wesselman Park. And I also talked to the mayor on Roberts Stadium and came up with some ideas of even keeping Roberts Stadium. Lots of big events could go into Roberts Stadium, you could turn it into even a public activity center, up at the top you could have bicycling, roller blading, all kinds of stuff like that. So I really think these things needs to be looked into more. I think a lot of projects are just kind of crammed down people's throats and you just don't see it. So if you get a chance, go to Wesselman Park, look at those pretty trees, watch those birds, look at the animals and see what all is going to be destroyed. Thank you.

President Lloyd: Any other public comments? Yes sir.

Ron Denton: Ron Denton, 2339 East Franklin. I've lived across the street from the park for 30 years and at one time there was seven baseball diamonds in Wesselman Park. It's down to five, they only play on three, the other two, they don't use. So they need to look into why do they need eight fields when they can only use three out of the five or they're eliminating. At one time there was 1,500 softball teams in Evansville. Now it's down to 250. I'd like to know where the demand is for this park. You know, to put all this money into something that people aren't backing any more. The companies, Bristol Myers and Whirlpool and them used to have their own leagues, they don't sponsor them anymore. There's no demand for it and Mr. Dunn said at the neighborhood association meeting that girls softball was booming across the country. I asked him how many teams we had here in Evansville. He didn't know. I think some more research needs to be done. I know right now the park is open until 11:00 and as far as the noise, at times, you have to shut your windows if a baseball game is going on, you can hear them. And if they have these tournaments on the weekends, they would go from eight in the morning until 11:00 at night, and if these are outsourced to a third party, would they abide by the parks rules of 11:00 of closing, because some of these tournaments would go till 1 or 2 in the morning, you know, and we'd have to listen to it. Another thing is, they want to move these eight basketball courts, four volleyball courts and handball courts over next to Good Samaritan. Well, the back half of Good Samaritan is hospice, so would you want your parents or somebody to be there and guys yelling and screaming out there all night till 11:00 at night? I think some more studies needs to be done on the parking, too, because at times when they have tennis tournaments over there, they're parked up and down the roads. You can't find a parking place. If they've got volleyball tournaments, you need the parking, there's no parking. I think Sylvia was right, they need to move these sports complexes outside the city, not in residential neighborhoods and take the parks away from the public. This is a neighborhood park. It's not a sports complex for Mr. Dunn and them. I just appreciate your time. Thank you.

President Lloyd: Thank you very much. Other public comments? Yes sir.

Jacob Pendleton: Jacob Pendleton, 772 South Lombard. I want to first thank you guys for letting me come and speak to you on this. I'm vice president of the Evansville Hotel Association. And on behalf of the association, I'm coming to you with support of this. The recommendation of this sports complex is not only a great addition to our community, but it also is an excellent return on our investment. This complex will be an asset to local baseball and softball because they will be able to use this complex during the week. Hotels in Evansville obviously pay the occupancy tax and the purpose for this tax is for capital project such as this. Thank you so much for allowing me to come speak to you today and we support this.

President Lloyd: Great. Thank you. Anyone else from the public to comment? Okay, got one more.

Pepper Mulherin: Pepper Mulherin, 2707 Malibu. My only question is, it's touted as a multi-purpose field and I understand that for early youth, but it appears that there's a void for the age over fourteen boys baseball, and there may not be a market for that area. But if age fourteen is the maximum space, is there any consideration to retro fit at least some of the fields to accommodate that market if that's appropriate?

President Lloyd: I think he indicated high school, that there was –

Pepper Mulherin: He did say high school but then he said the maximum age for baseball was fourteen, so that leaves it only as a singular purpose for the high

school market unless I misunderstood.

President Lloyd: Okay. Do you want to answer that, David?

David Dunn: At this time, due to space constraints, we don't see us developing the complex to accommodate high school or college level hardball. When I referenced high school, I apologize, but what I meant was softball. Softball dimensions are played at essentially the same at all ages whereas hardball dimensions vary depending on age groups, so when we do say multi-purpose, we do mean hardball and softball. Softball at all ages, hardball up to approximately age fourteen at this time.

President Lloyd: Any other comment or –

Pepper Mulherin: I would just be interested to see, I mean, it may be cost prohibitive to increase it to accommodate the high school for boys, but it might be (inaudible)

President Lloyd: I guess for baseball, send them to Bosse Field. Other comments from the public? Okay, thank you. Council, any recommendation or action from Council? Yes, Mr. Shetler.

Councilmember Shetler: I mean, I have some reservations, particularly about the covenants that could be placed upon some of our revenue streams, particularly the idea of COIT being restricted in any fashion. But by the same token, I do think the Innkeeper's money is there for a purpose, it's there to help grow their business, to grow the businesses of our restaurants and other facilities in Evansville. In today's day and age, I think that this is really the best time perhaps to invest in our community and try to do what we can to grow with the local businesses, so I would be in favor of us pursuing the activity with some caution on the restrictions on our other financial streams.

President Lloyd: So that's a recommendation to move forward. And I would agree, I mean, I would like to see a more detailed financial plan. One thing, their completed financial plan, to issue a bond, it has to come back to this body for approval, so what we're doing here, if it's an affirmative vote, it would be to allow them to continue this process and moving forward. So I guess there's a recommendation from Councilman Shetler. Is there a second to that?

Councilmember Goebel: Second.

President Lloyd: Second Mr. Goebel. Any further discussion? Roll call vote please. Oh, Mr. Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: If this is approved, I'd like to see it built somewhere else instead of on that property on Roberts Stadium. I agree with these folks here, it should be built somewhere else, (inaudible – microphone not turned on) out in the county. I supported the soccer complex out there. If we're going to approve this, right now I'm against it because of the (inaudible).

President Lloyd: Okay, and this recommendation is for the plan that they brought forward which would be on the Roberts Stadium area. So, alright, roll call vote please. We need a yes or a no.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Lloyd?

President Lloyd: As I indicated, I would like to see a detailed financial plan when we're talking about that kind of money. We hear from taxpayers all the time about government wasting money at all levels and I don't want us to be put in that situation. We'll still have to do final approval on the financing plan but just to move the project forward at this stage, I'll vote yes. It passes five to one. Thank you.

(Motion carried 5-1/Councilmember Bassemier opposed)

CIVIL TAXING UNIT BUDGET REVIEW
--

President Lloyd: We'll move on to item C in our agenda, civil taxing units review. That is going to be set for September 29th, 2010 at 9:00 a.m. And by civil taxing units, we mean the Evansville Vanderburgh Airport, the Evansville Vanderburgh Library, and the townships, so those are budgets that we review. They've already prepared their budgets and we make a recommendation to the state.

CENTRAL DISPATCH REQUEST TO HIRE PART-TIME EMPLOYEES

President Lloyd: Okay, we'll go to item number four, Central Dispatch additional staff member. Anybody here from Central Dispatch? Okay, there's Jo Anne. And we'd ask for the rest of this meeting, please keep your comments brief so we can get out of here before noon.

Jo Anne Smith: Good morning, Jo Anne Smith, director of Central Dispatch. You should have received a packet with information regarding the request to hire a part-time person at Central Dispatch to fill a telephone operator's position. We have over the years had a police dispatcher who did not answer 911 calls at all, a county dispatcher who does answer 911 calls. This puts that dispatcher in a very precarious situation as it does the citizen and the deputy. The letter that I have sent to the Council is the recommendation from the Central Dispatch board to proceed with the hiring of a part-time person. This would take more than one person to fill a part-time job but it would be a part-time, no benefits position that would do nothing but answer 911 calls. We would have someone 24 hours a day. The information in the packet that you were given gives some information concerning the fact that the

county dispatcher must answer 911 calls and can get in a situation where they are with a citizen that they cannot put on hold and they have a deputy who may have a traffic stop far out in the county with his closest backup ten minutes away, and that puts them in a very dangerous position as well. If we had this part-time telephone operator position, which possibly could be funded with 911 funds, I believe, we could, in fact, eliminate the need most of the time for the county dispatcher answering 911 calls.

President Lloyd: It looks like the information you gave us, your 911 calls are up in nine years approximately 25% or so.

Jo Anne Smith: Yes.

President Lloyd: And the dispatch runs are up about, it looks like over 30%.

Jo Anne Smith: Yes. Our business has increased.

President Lloyd: Have you had a staff increase since 2000?

Jo Anne Smith: No.

President Lloyd: Okay.

Jo Anne Smith: There has not been a staff increase in fifteen years.

President Lloyd: Okay, and I think you've made a pretty good case on this. Any questions from Council? Mr. Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: And we can pursue using 911 funds to fund this position?

President Lloyd: I wish Mr. Raben was here. I think we can. I mean, the county's portion is, we do use 911 funds for this. And this is a city/county department and I believe our portion is 30 –

Jo Anne Smith: One third. It's a one-third / two-third split.

President Lloyd: But the county side, we do use 911 for the operation portion, so I would say yes to that. Mr. Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Jo Anne, is this typically a teamster position or a union position or is it non-union?

Jo Anne Smith: This would be a non-union part-time position. It would not take anything away from our dispatchers at this time because all this person would be doing is answering the phone. They would not be filling a dispatch position that would take away from the teamsters.

President Lloyd: So this is part-time.

Jo Anne Smith: It will be a part-time position.

Councilmember Kiefer: And is it a permanent, part-time?

Jo Anne Smith: Yes. This part-time position is a stepping stone to where it's going to have to go eventually. Eventually you're going to have to have telephone

operators. Our business only increases and over the years, I started out as a telephone operator thirty-two years ago. The police department had telephone operators at one time. And ideally, having telephone operators at the dispatch center gives you a pool to choose from when you have to hire new people and it also gives a place for your people that would like to retire but can't afford to, to step down to. So it will fill a dual purpose.

Councilmember Kiefer: But it's not displacing work that would normally be done through the union.

Jo Anne Smith: No. As a matter of fact, the union employees are very excited about the fact that they will not be put in that position where they're dispatching county sheriff deputies and taking 911 calls at the same time.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay, thank you.

President Lloyd: Mr. Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Has this been approved by the City Council?

Jo Anne Smith: It's been presented to the City Council, yes.

President Lloyd: So we're only voting on thirty-three percent of it, but, I mean, we need to take a vote one way or the other. Yeah, we can say subject to City Council. Okay, is there a motion to approve?

Councilmember Bassemier: So moved.

President Lloyd: Mr. Bassemier, motion to approve. Is there a second?

Councilmember Shetler: Second.

President Lloyd: Second Mr. Shetler. Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: I'm going to vote no at this time. Thank you.

Teri Lukeman: President Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. So it's five to one, that motion passes.

(Motion carried 5-1/Councilmember Kiefer opposed)

Jo Anne Smith: Thank you.

JOINT BUDGET HEARING DATE

President Lloyd: Okay, item E, just a point of information, the city-county joint budget hearing where we'll actually, will have the Central Dispatch budget among the other joint departments, will be July 28th at 3:30 p.m. and that will be in this room.

COUNTY ASSESSOR TRAVEL REQUEST

President Lloyd: Okay, item number F, travel requests, I'll turn that over to Mr. Shetler.

Councilmember Shetler: Okay, first we have a request for County Assessor for sending three up to a state convention, I believe it was. I guess my question is to the County Assessor, I notice that you've got three people going and mileage for all three. Are they going to be driving up in the same car? Do they get along? Do they like each other?

Jonathan Weaver: Good morning, Jonathan Weaver, your Vanderburgh County Assessor. Yeah, we all get along pretty well.

Councilmember Shetler: Can we eliminate that down to one?

Jonathan Weaver: We could possibly do that.

Councilmember Shetler: And then the other question that I have, which probably should have come first, but do we really need three people to go?

Jonathan Weaver: Yes.

Councilmember Shetler: And could you elaborate on why we might need three people to go to a conference?

Jonathan Weaver: Yeah, two are looking to take a USPAP class: Uniform Standards of Appraisal course, and myself.

Councilmember Shetler: Okay, is that anything that's offered locally, that class?

Jonathan Weaver: Not at this point in time.

Councilmember Shetler: Ivy Tech doesn't offer that or have anything that's closely related or...

Jonathan Weaver: They're working toward their Level III, so this is a course for the two staffers to earn their Level III.

Councilmember Shetler: How many people do we have that have Level III's currently?

Jonathan Weaver: Four of us.

Councilmember Shetler: And this will give you two additional?

Jonathan Weaver: Yes.

Councilmember Shetler: And I assume these people are in positions where that is not only just enhancing their education, but it will enhance the office, they're in a management position so that it will be an asset to the office. Is that –

Jonathan Weaver: They're top advisors, yes.

Councilmember Shetler: Well, that's my main concern is that we cut the mileage down to one, instead of for three.

President Lloyd: Okay, I'm sitting here doing rough calculation here. There's three of them at \$800, it was \$78 per diem. If we knock two of that off and just allow the mileage for one, that would be 800, 722 and 722, a total of 2,244. Is that what you want to do for your motion, then?

Councilmember Shetler: Let me ask one other question. Is this coming out of the general fund or is this coming out of Reassessment?

Jonathan Weaver: Reassessment.

Councilmember Shetler: This is what we approved earlier, I assume, transferring the funds around and this was to allow for that.

Jonathan Weaver: Yes.

Councilmember Shetler: Okay, yeah, that would be my motion.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion for, I guess \$2,244, which subtracts mileage from two out of the three. Is there a second?

Councilmember Goebel: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Shetler, second Mr. Goebel. All those in favor signify by saying aye.

(All Councilmembers voted aye)

President Lloyd: Any opposed?

(No opposing votes were cast)

President Lloyd: Okay, motion passes six-zero. Thank you.

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

HEALTH DEPARTMENT TRAVEL REQUESTS
--

President Lloyd: The other travel, Mr. Shetler.

Councilmember Shetler: Health department has a request for three individuals and they're going to a couple different places. As before, Health department has several different ongoing things that they need to be involved in as far as training and I think most of these all deal with that. One is going to Indianapolis, one to Petersburg and one to Jasper. So I don't think anybody is here from the Health department to answer any specific questions.

President Lloyd: Dr. Nicholson was here and I think he left.

Councilmember Kiefer: I move that we approve.

President Lloyd: Okay, is there a second?

Councilmember Terry: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Kiefer, second Mrs. Terry. All in favor signify by saying aye.

(All Councilmembers voted aye)

President Lloyd: Any opposed?

(No opposing votes were cast)

President Lloyd: It passes six-zero.

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

VOTERS REGISTRATION TRAVEL REQUESTS
--

President Lloyd: Voters Registration.

Councilmember Shetler: I'm sorry, I don't –

President Lloyd: Indiana Voter Registration Conference it looks like. Not state called, but each requesting \$300 travel.

Councilmember Kiefer: Are they traveling together?

President Lloyd: The two directors.

Councilmember Shetler: Apparently, they were traveling separately.

Councilmember Kiefer: I'm okay with it if they travel together. You know, I mean, they're going to the same place, same location, same time.

President Lloyd: What's it show for the mileage?

Councilmember Terry: Hundred and twenty.

President Lloyd: On each one?

Councilmember Terry: Uh-huh.

President Lloyd: Okay, so we want to take the mileage off of one of them and then that total would be for, that would be 160 and 300.

Councilmember Kiefer: That's my recommendation.

President Lloyd: Okay, is there a second?

Councilmember Shetler: I'll second.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Kiefer, second Mr. Shetler. One for 300, the other for 160. All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

Councilmember Goebel: Wouldn't that be 180?

President Lloyd: 180, I'm sorry. 180. I don't have my calculator. Alright, 180 and 300, all those in favor signify by saying aye.

(All Councilmembers voted aye)

President Lloyd: Any opposed?

(No opposing votes were cast)

President Lloyd: It passes six-zero.

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

COUNTY COMMISSIONERS TRAVEL REQUEST
--

President Lloyd: County Commission.

Councilmember Shetler: I think that's already taken place and we didn't get any specific things, so.

President Lloyd: \$56.40. Is there a motion to approve?

Councilmember Kiefer: I move that we approve.

President Lloyd: Is there a second?

Councilmember Shetler: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Kiefer, second Mr. Shetler. All those in favor signify by saying aye.

(All Councilmembers voted aye)

President Lloyd: Opposed?

(No opposing votes were cast)

President Lloyd: Six-zero, motion passes.

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

SUPERIOR COURT REQUEST TO FILL VACANCY

President Lloyd: Item H, Judge Robert Pigman, we heard Judge Pigman last week on his request to fill a vacancy. There didn't seem to be any problem with that. Is there a motion to approve that?

Councilmember Shetler: So moved.

President Lloyd: Is there a second?

Councilmember Kiefer: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. Motion passes six-zero.

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

COUNTY CLERK REQUEST TO FILL VACANCY

President Lloyd: Item I, County Clerk, request to fill vacancy, is there a motion to approve?

Councilmember Kiefer: I move that we approve.

President Lloyd: Is there a second?

Councilmember Terry: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Kiefer, second Mrs. Terry. Any questions? County Clerk, and I believe, I had a conversation with the County Clerk and I know she's a little shorthanded. There was an employee that was terminated, so –

Councilmember Goebel: Did we not at the last meeting bring back an employee in the Clerk's office? My thinking then was that because of the problems inside the Clerk's office as far as people being there working and other issues, she had extenuating circumstances, that we would allow the new position to be filled, but I'm not so sure if we need to add another one this month.

President Lloyd: Okay, let's have the County Clerk come forward, please. I believe she's there in the back. Questions I can't answer, I'm sorry.

Susan Kirk: The purpose the last time was to get my staff back up to par where we could handle the work, okay? So I thought that was the whole idea, that now we're going to keep it this way. I did terminate one employee and I want to take the part-timer and put that person in the full-time and then replace the part-time, so that I can stay on that even keel. You know, you heard 911, Judge Pigman, it's unfortunate, but our business is going up. And as I had told all of you before, believe me, if, hopefully, our business decreases enough, I will be the first one to come and tell you. And the first thing we'll do is get rid of the part-time position. But right now, I really need the staff. I'm trying to make some changes to where I can accomplish that goal of maybe in the future, start with elimination of the part time. But right now, I need it. I need the staff.

President Lloyd: For the last year, are you shorthanded one or two?

Susan Kirk: Well, we were short – let's see, you denied one and then there was a part-time, so we ran short that one, and had the part-timer. And it's been, like I said, rather rocky. I did send out an email to all of you kind of explaining some of the situation that we still have. So if I can just keep my staff at this number until, hopefully, there is a change for the better and we don't have as many cases filed. Tim VanCleave just ran a report just the other day and we're already up, you know, the high numbers again and so nothing has changed. We are still having the high number of cases filed. So if you can just allow me to keep this number until things change, I would appreciate it.

President Lloyd: So this person, is this to replace the person that was terminated?

Susan Kirk: This is to replace the person that was terminated.

President Lloyd: Okay, what position is that or what is it called?

Susan Kirk: I don't remember the exact name of it, but that position goes into the court, spends a lot of time in the courtroom during trials and stuff, plus does paperwork.

President Lloyd: It's not someone that sits in the office all the time, it's someone more that goes back and forth to the courts?

Susan Kirk: Yes, they go to court every day.

President Lloyd: Circuit/Superior Appeals & Venue Clerk.

Susan Kirk: There you go. They go morning and afternoon, Judge Heldt's court.

President Lloyd: Okay, Mr. Kiefer.

Councilmember Kiefer: Thank you. Just a comment. One reason why I support this

is because I don't want the department heads to be – have their hands tied in terminating employees, you know, if she thought that, well, I can't replace an employee that I need to terminate, well, then, I'll just keep that employee on.

Susan Kirk: Good point.

Councilmember Kiefer: And I think the department heads need to have the ability to terminate somebody and not have their hands tied behind their backs. So that's one reason why I support this.

Susan Kirk: Thank you.

President Lloyd: Other questions? Mr. Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: I think what we noticed in the recent months, it's almost been a deluge of requests and I don't know if we – the question or statement has been given to me is, so the hiring freeze is over. And is that the case? Then you no longer have to come to us.

Susan Kirk: Mr. Goebel, this is what I understood the last time I was here when most all of you voted for the employee, to give me the employee back, the whole idea was to keep the number of employees what it is now, not to go back and take one away now and go back, backtracking. I thought the whole idea was for me to be able to keep the number of employees I have now until things changed. So now, to say no, then why did you vote to let me have an employee if now you're going to take it away? I guess that's –

Councilmember Goebel: Well, I understand what you're saying and I know, Susie, you come here and you're very well prepared and you make a great argument, but my thinking was that you were almost doing without, more... the one employee we didn't grant because you had the extenuating circumstances. And that was the reason behind my granting –

Susan Kirk: We still have the extenuating circumstances, though. I can't go into – I emailed all of you, but publically, it's things that you –

Councilmember Goebel: It should stay that way. But maybe we can weather the storm, in my mind, anyway, a little bit longer, and see what happens if something else changes, then, maybe we can get by for a while longer because you do have a part-time, do you not?

Susan Kirk: I do, but we were having difficulty being short the employee.

Councilmember Goebel: And you have a –

Susan Kirk: So I came back to get the other employee back, keep the numbers the same. By denying this one, then there was no sense in even coming back before to ask to have the employee replaced. Nothing has changed in the last couple of months as far as, you know, --

Councilmember Goebel: I understand that. You also have a proposal with the courts as far as fees and things, creating perhaps funding for another part-timer?

Susan Kirk: Yes, we're trying to do that. We're looking into that. Porter County does it and I've been speaking with her, trying to come up with – well, the judges are going

to have a meeting and decide if they will do that or not, implement the late fee charge. Also, we're working on, we're trying to get – we're waiting on the state but once we can get JTAC to update some of our programs, like we're going to start with misdemeanor and traffic, we're going to have one of the companies, like we did with child support and came in for those who did not pay their – it used to be \$20 – service fees. I mean, all we did was sit back and they would just give us a check. We ended up collecting 3 or \$400,000. And if we can get, we're waiting on the state and as soon as that starts, grant you, it's a little bit more work for us, but it generates quite a bit of money. These collection agencies come in and just, I don't know, it's great. So we are trying to generate money the best that we can.

President Lloyd: Mr. Shetler? Questions?

Councilmember Shetler: I guess basically my concern is, is I know how tight our general fund operating budget is becoming and I am fearful of what it's going to be in the future. And that's why each and every person that has come here today and before, I've asked, is there another alternative? Do you have another fund where this can come out of or another means that we can do this as opposed to taking it out of the general fund. With as many employees as there are in that office, I know it is a lot to ask, but everyone today –

(Tape Changed)

– as well as in public in many areas are being asked to sacrifice and do what they have to do in order to keep the taxes down in order to, you know, keep our costs down to the bare minimum. This is coming directly out of the general fund, I don't know that we have any other alternative but to look at this thing and to say that we really cannot afford and that we have to look at cuts. If we don't, I think we're going to be, I mean, we have to look at holding the line somewhere, otherwise, we're going to have to make some significant cuts, reducing, mandatory going in and reducing the number of employees that you have in your office and or cutting salary levels and stuff, none of which I want to do, but I think, given the future of what we're looking at with the state imposed guidelines, we may not have a choice but to do that in the next couple of years if we don't start taking advantage of eliminating through attrition. So that's where I'm coming from. It has nothing to do with you, it has nothing to do with your office and the function and I greatly appreciate all of what you all do down there. It's just that I think we need to start looking for some ways to reduce the size of government and through attrition, I think is the less painful way on individuals to do that. So that's where I'm coming from.

President Lloyd: Let me just state for Mr. Goebel, the hiring freeze is not over. I hope at the end of this year we would have less employees than we had at the beginning of the year. But obviously, we have to look at all these situations. Yeah, we won't have more, I can tell you that. Okay, any other questions?

Councilmember Goebel: I just think this body has done everything it can to preserve the jobs of employees that are here, but through attrition, we've not replaced some, and I think that is the most prudent way and the least painful way for everyone involved. And –

Susan Kirk: Well, like I said, it just doesn't make any sense for me to come back the time before and you grant me the employee so that I can get my numbers back up so that we can run the office. Then I terminate an employee and come back and now you're going to take one away again. I don't – that doesn't make –

Councilmember Goebel: I understand that logic, --

Susan Kirk: It doesn't many any sense.

Councilmember Goebel: My logic was that you were having people who were not able to do the job, and you were in an emergency situation. That's why we replaced the one that left. And now, since you have that person, maybe we can --

Susan Kirk: Well, we still have, it's not there yet.

Councilmember Goebel: I understand, and I believe everything you're saying.

Susan Kirk: And Councilman Kiefer brings up a very, very good point, so --

Councilmember Kiefer: Yeah, I just, that's how I'm justifying this. I just don't want a department head not to be able to terminate somebody if -- I mean, I'd rather have a termination and replacement than an employee that's not doing the job continue on, because you'd rather have them at fifty percent than zero percent.

Susan Kirk: Well, I tell you, you know, like I've told you before, I am very conservative. I want you to go find another officeholder or anyone in the building, basically, that came down here and took a wall down to save the county \$2,000. I did it. I asked, you know, how much is it going to be to take it down, the Building Authority said \$2,000. I said, are you kidding me, \$2,000 to take a wall down? Yeah. I said, forget it, I'll do it myself. So I came down and I took it down myself. Of course, I would like to get those bids now. I'll take the walls down for a thousand dollars a section, great money there. So I do try to save money in a lot of ways. If I thought I could, believe me, I would, but I think it is a mistake now to go backwards again and not allow me to fill this position. You're backing the truck up again. There was more than one problem that we had. We still have some problems and it's, you can't go in and just start firing people like that. It doesn't work that way. Not here it doesn't.

President Lloyd: Well, unfortunately, we can, but we don't really want to do that.

Susan Kirk: Well, we can and then it ends up costing you money to do that.

President Lloyd: Right, we also want to serve the taxpayers like we're supposed to.

Susan Kirk: That's true. So, I mean, like I said, I want to save money but, whatever.

President Lloyd: Okay, is there a motion to approve?

Councilmember Kiefer: I move that we approve.

President Lloyd: Is there a second.

Councilmember Bassemier: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Kiefer, second Mr. Bassemier. Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Lloyd?

President Lloyd: I'm going to vote yes. It passes four to two.

(Motion carried 4-2/Councilmembers Shetler and Goebel opposed)

Susan Kirk: Thank you very much.

VETERANS SERVICE REQUEST TO FILL VACANCY

President Lloyd: I skipped item G, Veterans Services, request to fill vacancy. I think Mr. Shetler had an idea on this one. Why don't you come forward please. Veterans Services, request to fill vacancy. Please introduce yourself.

Jay Ball: Jay Ball, Veterans Services.

President Lloyd: Okay, you didn't give us a letter, so what was the request?

Jay Ball: Oh, I thought you had gotten a letter to fill the secretarial job. The letter was sent to the office.

President Lloyd: Okay, so I guess we've got a little bit of movement between positions here. You're the new director and this request was to fill the assistant director?

Jay Ball: Well, down the agenda there, I believe you'll see, there is a salary request. That was for my salary and Tammy Cassidy-Fehn, who is the secretary, and was going to take my position. So then we would be hiring a secretarial position with a starting salary of \$21,000, what they come in at. So that puts our salaries for us three at \$14,000 less than what it was last year.

President Lloyd: Okay. I believe the Council has to approve putting the person into the Assistant Director and then, there's two things here, we would also have to approve hiring a secretary, isn't that right?

Sandie Deig: But the secretary is not on the agenda.

President Lloyd: Right, but the secretary is not on the agenda, so we're not going to deal with that. What we're dealing with here is the request to fill vacancy of

Assistant Director. Mr. Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: You know, actually, at this time, Mr. Deisher has been doing a study throughout the county on personnel. I think this might be a good opportunity for him, it's a small office and I don't know if he's already done this office or what, but I think this would be a good opportunity to really consult with Mr. Deisher and refer this to the Personnel Committee for review and looking at just to see if we need two chiefs and one person in there as the clerical to be supporting that. I'm not sure what that arrangement should be today in that office and I think we need to look at the workload and just see right where we are on that before we go further.

Jay Ball: I believe you're correct in saying, I don't believe any of you know what the arrangement is in our office because we've never been visited by anybody from the Council or the Commissioners. There's roughly 13 - 14,000 veterans in Vanderburgh County. Last year, the federal government paid 48,000,000 in expenditures to Vanderburgh County alone for those veterans; 24,000,000 of it went for disability claims, compensation, pension claims, and our office is directly involved in filing those claims. And believe me, with this war going on, our National Guard, men and women have served at least three tours in Iraq and Afghanistan and it looks like it's going to continue that way. And we work directly with them.

Councilmember Shetler: Yeah, I still stand, I guess, on my point and that is, I really think since we're going through this county-wide study on each department that we ought to leave it up to the professionals or the experts to look at it. Perhaps they may come up with the realization that we need one director and two clericals and maybe not a director and an assistant director and a clerical. They may come up with an idea that maybe we need a director and one clerical. I have no idea and I'm not trying to say that I do know and trying to anticipate or speculate on what they might come up with. But I think with those guys being out there trying to do the study, that would be the appropriate place and then take it up through the Personnel Committee.

President Lloyd: So what you're saying in your motion would be to refer this to the Salary Administration Committee, which Mr. Kiefer is the chair on it and they would determine, I guess, the other possibility is, you would just have two people there, one secretarial and one director, or three people, but you said maybe two secretarial.

Councilmember Shetler: That's a possibility. I mean, there's a lot of ways this could be thought out, particularly if we're talking about as much administration as what you're describing, I think. I mean, they may look at it that way. Again, I'm not speculating on what the outcome would be, I'm just suggesting that we are going through this study and I'm not so sure that we should try to interrupt that or interfere with that at this point in time and we ought to let that process take its course, and then refer it to the job study.

President Lloyd: Any other questions? Mr. Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Just, Tom, did Tim Deisher say how long it might take for a small department like this? I mean, is that something that you think they could get done pretty quickly?

Councilmember Shetler: Yeah, I think so. I don't think that would be any problem at all.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay.

Councilmember Shetler: It may have already been done. I'll have to talk with Tim to find out.

Councilmember Kiefer: Yeah, worst case scenario, we just postpone this and we could have it appear before the committee to review them.

President Lloyd: I think the motion is to not do this at this time and refer it to the Job Study Salary Administration to –

Councilmember Kiefer: Exactly. That's what I'm saying. I'll second that.

President Lloyd: Okay, is there any other discussion? Roll call vote please.

Councilmember Terry: I have a question.

President Lloyd: Yes, Mrs. Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Is she currently doing the work of the Assistant Officer?

Jay Ball: Yes.

Councilmember Terry: And not being compensated. She's still at the salary of 28–

Jay Ball: Correct.

President Lloyd: Well, then, who is –

Jay Ball: And I'm not being compensated yet either for moving up to the director position.

Councilmember Terry: Tammy is still the secretary now, doing the work of the assistant officer.

President Lloyd: Okay.

Councilmember Goebel: You requested – maybe I'm unclear, but your request is to move you up and Tammy up, is that correct?

Jay Ball: Well, the way I've understood it, and it's not been very, I've not gotten very much follow back from the Commissioners, I have been appointed the director, just not getting compensated. I think that's on the list here for salary increases down at the bottom. So there's three issues, I guess.

Councilmember Goebel: Well, you're surviving right now with two, correct?

Jay Ball: Correct.

Councilmember Goebel: And do you think you could survive a little longer on two while we have this study taken care of?

Jay Ball: There again, now long is it going to take to have the study?

President Lloyd: I guess I would urge Mr. Kiefer, if he can set a date in July, that would certainly be helpful, before budget maybe, and just get that knocked out.

Councilmember Kiefer: I mean, I'm going to be out from the 10th through the 17th, but any time after the 17th, we could have that.

President Lloyd: According to Mrs. Deig, I guess the increase for you as the Director has gone through the Commissioners, so, I mean, that's going to take effect. So you're going to be taken care of. But the other two is what we're kind of trying to address here.

Councilmember Goebel: The turnaround on this replacement or two new titles could happen within a month's time, is that correct?

President Lloyd: Yes. But I think, and I guess maybe we need some information from you, if your workload has increased, take a look at those job descriptions. We need to see what changes have gone on in that office. I suspect these positions haven't been looked at for a long time.

Jay Ball: Oh, I think it's probably been two or three years ago, they were looked at. We had to do a whole new job description for each position, for the Commissioners.

President Lloyd: Okay, well, we've got a motion and a second on the floor we've got to vote on and that would be to take the request for the assistant director and I guess do a study of those two positions, determine what the job description would be, what the duties, what the rating would be by the Job Study before we act on a request to change that title. Move that person. So is there any other discussion from Council? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Lloyd?

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

President Lloyd: Yes. Okay, six-zero. So that goes to Job Study and we want to see them have a meeting in July and I hope Mr. Kiefer can work that into his schedule.

Councilmember Kiefer: After the 17th.

President Lloyd: Okay, sounds good. Thank you.

Jay Ball: Excuse me. Is there any need for me to be here for this amendment to the salary ordinance coming up later then?

President Lloyd: No, that's just the Council is going to write that into the Salary Ordinance and we'll just take that. Thank you.

SHERIFF REQUEST TO FILL VACANCY
--

President Lloyd: Okay, item J, Sheriff request to fill Community Corrections grant employee.

Eric Williams: Good morning, Vanderburgh County Sheriff Eric Williams. I'm not sure I want to be here right now with this request and the last line of questioning. I would tell you that this is a grant position, I'm not asking to add hours, I'm just asking to divide the hours up a little bit further for more people for scheduling purposes.

President Lloyd: Part-time position within an existing grant. Any questions for the Sheriff? Is there a motion to approve?

Councilmember Kiefer: I move that we approve.

President Lloyd: Is there a second?

Councilmember Goebel: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Kiefer, second Mr. Goebel. Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. Motion passes six-zero.

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

Eric Williams: Thank you. I would make one comment because I don't want this to drag on, but I think Councilman Kiefer's point was well taken, there is a fear amongst officeholders out there that you might be better off not firing somebody and just keeping them at fifty percent as opposed to taking a chance of not getting them replaced into your line item. And I think that's – for the officeholders to hear you say that, I think that will go a long way because that fear does exist.

President Lloyd: I think, I mean, the county, we don't want to be carrying bad employees if we don't have to. So, I mean, --

Eric Williams: But sometimes that's difficult to carry that message to this body when you're looking to replace a person without going into great detail as to why you're missing that person now. And sometimes this may not be the forum for that conversation.

President Lloyd: Okay, very well put. Thank you.

PROSECUTOR REQUEST TO FILL VACANCY

President Lloyd: Item K, Prosecutor request to fill vacancy. The last shall be first.

Regene Newman: Good morning, Regene Newman.

President Lloyd: The letter you sent, or I guess Mr. Levco sent, full-time receptionist in Child Support with part-time help, is that correct?

Regene Newman: Yes.

President Lloyd: Okay, and part-time is paid out of incentive funds, so it's not the county general fund.

Regene Newman: Right.

President Lloyd: Any questions for Ms. Newman? Is there a motion to approve?

Councilmember Terry: So moved.

President Lloyd: Is there a second?

Councilmember Kiefer: Second.

President Lloyd: Motion Mrs. Terry, second Mr. Kiefer. Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. Motion passes six-zero. Thank you.

Regene Newman: Thank you.

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

BOARD APPOINTMENTS

President Lloyd: Item L is board appointments. I believe this is a formality of having Stephanie Terry take the place of Royce Sutton on these boards. Have you been given that list?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

President Lloyd: Okay. Is there any that we need to vote on? Okay, alright, so that will be, every Councilmember should get that new board list.

AMENDMENTS TO THE SALARY ORDINANCE

President Lloyd: we've made it to item 10, Amendments to Salary Ordinance, I'll turn that over to Mr. Shetler.

Councilmember Shetler: I think everybody received a copy of the Salary Ordinance Amendments dated today, July 7th: Burdette Park, Superior Court, County Clerk, Community Corrections, and Prosecutor, all of which we voted on earlier today. The only one that's not on there is the Veterans Services because we put that off. Any questions? I move that we pass the Salary Ordinance amendments.

President Lloyd: Okay, Salary Ordinance Amendments, July 7th as submitted. Is there a second?

Councilmember Goebel: Second.

President Lloyd: Second Mr. Goebel, motion Mr. Shetler. Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. Salary Ordinance Amendments pass six-zero.

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

PUBLIC COMMENT

Is there any member from the public that wants to comment to County Council?
Okay, item number twelve, adjournment. Is there a motion to adjourn?

Councilmember Bassemier: So moved.

President Lloyd: Is there a second?

Councilmember Goebel: Second.

President Lloyd: We are adjourned.

(There being no further business to come before the Council, the meeting was adjourned at 11:06 a.m.)

VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL

President Russell Lloyd, Jr.

Vice President James Raben

Councilmember Joe Kiefer

Councilmember Mike Goebel

Councilmember Tom Shetler, Jr.

Councilmember Ed Bassemier

Councilmember Stephanie Terry

Recorded and transcribed by Teri Lukeman.

**VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL
AUGUST 4, 2010**

The Vanderburgh County Council met in session this 4th day of August, 2010 in room 301 of the Civic Center Complex. The meeting was called to order at 8:32 a.m. by County Council President Russell Lloyd, Jr.

President Lloyd: I'd like to call to order the meeting of the Vanderburgh County Council August 4th, 2010. Could we have the attendance roll call please?

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

President Lloyd: I'd like to ask Councilman Goebel to lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance.

(Pledge of Allegiance was given)

APPROVAL OF MINUTES JUNE 30, 2010 SPECIAL MEETING JULY 7, 2010 COUNTY COUNCIL MEETING
--

President Lloyd: Okay, I'd like to point out, we didn't have a transformation, this is Ryan Schultz as our Council attorney today, not Jeff Ahlers, so we're going to work on getting him a name tag. Item number four, approval of minutes from June 30, 2010 Special Meeting, July 7, 2010 regular meeting. Is there a motion to approve those minutes? Has everybody looked at those?

Councilmember Goebel: So moved.

Councilmember Kiefer: Second.

President Lloyd: All in favor, signify by saying aye.

(All Councilmembers voted aye)

President Lloyd: Any opposed?

(No opposing votes were cast)

(Motion unanimously approved 5-0)

APPROPRIATION ORDINANCE

President Lloyd: Okay, we'll move on to item number five, Appropriation Ordinance,

Local Roads & Streets. In the absence of Mr. Shetler, I'd like Mr. Raben, former Finance Chair, to take the appropriation ordinance.

LOCAL ROADS & STREETS

Councilmember Raben: Okay, thank you, Mr. President. Good morning. First on the agenda, well, the only one on the request for appropriations, Local Roads & Streets for the county garage under Tires & Tubes in the amount of \$15,000. I'll move approval.

President Lloyd: Is there a second?

Councilmember Kiefer: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Raben, was that Mr. Kiefer, second?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

President Lloyd: The gentleman from the garage is not here.

Sandie Deig: He was called.

President Lloyd: Right, well, he called me, too, said he would be here. So he must have an emergency. Any discussion or, Jim, did you have a chance to go out there? Okay, any comments from Council on the tires and tubes? Okay, roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. In my brief conversation with Mr. Walsh, he indicated that I think it was the paver tires that were worn out and this would take him into next year, so I vote yes. That motion passes five to zero.

(Motion unanimously approved 5-0)

(Discussion continued on page 3)

TRANSFER REQUEST

SHERIFF

President Lloyd: Item six, transfers, the Sheriff, Mr. Raben.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, these are corrections from what was stated and approved in the budget. I'll move approval of the Sheriff transfer as listed.

Councilmember Kiefer: Second.

President Lloyd: Motion Mr. Raben, second Mr. Kiefer. Any discussion on the transfers? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. Transfers pass five to zero.

APPROPRIATION REQUEST LOCAL ROADS & STREETS CONTINUED FROM PAGE 2
--

President Lloyd: I'll call Mr. Walsh forward. We already voted on your – do you want to have an explanation on the tires and tubes?

Chris Walsh: Chris Walsh, Vanderburgh County Highway department. As it's kind of come to my attention, I guess in 2008, the budget was cut and the number that they had put in, in 2008 was a pretty close number to what these tires would run in a year's period of time, and that's about what we're doing again this year so, you know, its been a very, very hot summer, it was a pretty terribly cold winter, we're doing the best that we can.

President Lloyd: So because the hot weather came in earlier, that wears the tires out faster?

Chris Walsh: Yeah, I could take you out and show you. Every truck that I have that comes up to the paver, it's like 260 degrees temperature, just the material coming in. Every one of those tires wear down very quickly and those are commercial grade tires so they're quite expensive. We have like 110 pieces of tired equipment.

President Lloyd: Okay, but it's not just the pavers, it's other equipment?

Chris Walsh: Yeah, it's the paver, the grader, we're doing a couple of things to try and slow this up. One thing we've done in the 2011 budget, we kept the same overall budget but I've appropriated monies a little differently to make the one account a little bit larger, so that should keep me from having to come before you.

President Lloyd: Any questions from Council? Mr. Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Chris, what exactly does 15,000 buy you? I mean, is this like, how many new tires or...

Chris Walsh: What we're looking at now is getting our tires refitted for the winter. We've pretty well, it looks like we've done what we've done with the heat related, now I've got to get these tires, get through the rest of this season and the paving season, then get these tires ready, studded and that, for the winter which I'll start doing in October.

Councilmember Kiefer: So, like how many vehicles, how many vehicles does that take care of?

Chris Walsh: We'll probably do 20 in the winter time snow.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay.

Chris Walsh: But we've had issues with the grader tires. Some of the equipment, we're pretty good at making the equipment last longer, but the wheels on some of these older pieces of big equipment, they get condensation inside the wheel, I have a lot of tire repairs coming out because they pitted real bad and I'm trying to put a couple things in place to slow that down and get that cost trimmed down. But short of buying new wheels.

Councilmember Kiefer: But for the public to understand, I mean, these aren't just cars and trucks, these are –

Chris Walsh: Commercial grade, very big tires.

Councilmember Kiefer: Yeah.

President Lloyd: Mr. Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Chris, how is your equipment holding up? I think you're still short a mechanic, aren't you?

Chris Walsh: Yes, and we've put in for, which I'll be back in a few weeks for next year's budget to fill that line item. Just off the top of my head, in one account, if I could get that position filled, I could do more things. I had a gradall go down. The local supplier wanted around \$5,000 to repair it. We repaired it in-house for, I think, less than \$2,000. Those are the kind of things, if I could get that other mechanic to help, you know, like I've said, we have somewhere in the neighborhood of 120 pieces of equipment that I'm trying to constantly keep up, upgrade and keep going, so I'm pretty desperately needing that mechanic spot.

Councilmember Bassemier: So in other words, you're saying you'll save money if we get you a mechanic instead of –

Chris Walsh: – show you time and time again, other than that instance where I can do that, yes.

Councilmember Bassemier: Thank you.

President Lloyd: Mr. Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Just a brief comment. For those that are listening or those in the audience, I voted for this appropriation, my firm does not have this contract. But I, Chris, I do have one suggestion on the condensation within the wheels and what have you. You might look into, if you don't already have, driers on your airlines and stuff.

Chris Walsh: Yeah, we'll look into it because that is starting to become an issue with the age of the wheels and that on these.

President Lloyd: Any other questions? Okay, thanks for coming in, Chris.

Chris Walsh: Thank you.

SUPERIOR COURT REQUEST TO FILL VACANCY

President Lloyd: Item number seven, repeals, we have none. Item number eight, old business, we have none. Item number nine, new business, we're going to take item B, Superior Court request to fill vacancy so we can move Judge Pigman along. So nine B.

Robert Pigman: Thank you. This is chapter two of the request I made a month ago, I was here requesting replacement of employees that were leaving from our misdemeanor division and our small claims. At that time, small claims was the most pressing need and you approved that. You indicated that day you wanted to defer the vote on the misdemeanor employee until later, and I guess today is later. So I'm here requesting that. To refresh your memory, our misdemeanor court handles approximately 35,000 cases a year. The docket has gotten to the point where we have almost two full misdemeanor sessions. We have our regular misdemeanor court sessions that run Monday through Friday at 8:15 in the morning and 1:30 in the afternoon. Our Monday night traffic court session, which recently we've had to add an extra session there, and then we have every month nine or ten additional sessions of misdemeanor court that are heard by either senior judges, magistrates or the regular judges just to keep up with the docket that we currently have. So misdemeanor probation, it does much of the administrative work for those who are not sent to jail, but given probationary sentences. Most of these are drunk drivers and unfortunately, that caseload has not gone down any. So we need to fill this position.

President Lloyd: Right, and I think that's what you indicated last month, that the caseload is not going down. There's, you can't really make do without a full-time position here.

Robert Pigman: I don't believe we can, not at this time.

President Lloyd: Okay, and unfortunately, in our community, more traffic accidents and drunk driving. Any questions from Councilmembers? Okay, roll call vote please. Oh, we need a motion and a second.

Councilmember Bassemier: I make a motion.

President Lloyd: Motion from Mr. Bassemier. Is there a second?

Councilmember Raben: Second.

President Lloyd: Second Mr. Raben. Okay, roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. Approved five to zero. Thank you, Judge.

Robert Pigman: Thank you.

(Motion unanimously approved 5-0)

HEALTH DEPARTMENT REQUEST TO FILL THREE VACANCIES
--

President Lloyd: Okay, we'll move back to nine A, Health department, request to fill three vacancies. And we have Dr. Nicholson here.

Ray Nicholson: Dr. Ray Nicholson, the health officer for Vanderburgh County. I'm here mainly to hopefully fill the full-time Deputy Registrar position for our vital records. This is a very, very important position and we're really hurting in the office for not having it filled. It is not feasible to bring another employee into that office because, as I understand it, the job really doesn't exist until you all say so. The position requires special training and certification for this and it's kind of like a well installer who has to take special lessons and then be certified as a well installer. The new rules from the health department from the state require vital records to certify all custody for paternity cases. The clerks interview each person individually, the parents have to bring in DNA evidence and these cases are very complicated and require about an hour of their time to do one case. The second major thing that's occurring is on January 2nd of 2011, all death certificates have to be filed electronically. This sounds like it would be an easy thing to do, but the funeral directors and the physicians have to apply for pass codes. It took me over three weeks to get my pass code with the help of our registrar. And finally, when we did get it, we tried to file one death certificate electronically, and essentially, because our registrar, Erica Mitchell, and I presented our program at the state, so we were about

as knowledgeable as anyone in the room, this was with the other health officers throughout the state and also some people from vital records from the state office. And we gave this lecture, we came back to file this thing electronically, it took us an hour and fifteen minutes and six calls to the state before we finally got it done and then it turned out that it was turned down anyway. We didn't do it the way they said. So the point I want to make is that our office is going to have to train about two to three hundred funeral directors in this and about a thousand physicians in this area on how to do this. This will be a monumental job. The office is also responsible for collecting all fees for vital records and also for the rest of the department. It think it's very essential that we fill this and the office staff right now has been doing a monumental job. They've had to work some overtime in order to get the job done. I'll be glad to answer any questions and I do have Erica Mitchell with me in case you have any specific questions of her.

President Lloyd: Okay, the Health department has three requests. One is a full-time Deputy Registrar, the other one is WIC grant full-time Secretary/Bookkeeper on a grant, and then a part-time Bookkeeper on a grant. But we're dealing with the Deputy Registrar. And this position has been vacant, it was one that helped to fund Mr. Elder's retirement, is that correct?

Ray Nicholson: That's correct.

President Lloyd: The new starting salary for that, \$19,360, and it is a COMOT II, and I guess my other question would be if the job has changed somewhat, maybe it needs to be re-rated, you know, COMOT II is the starting level of a clerical position, so that's something to think about. Any questions from Council on this? Mr. Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Are we moving on just the replacement at this point, on the one position?

President Lloyd: I mean, I guess we could –

Councilmember Goebel: Or all three?

President Lloyd: Well, the other two are on grants, probably not going to be as –

Councilmember Kiefer: Let's segregate them.

President Lloyd: Yeah, let's segregate them. Maybe put the two grants as one and this one as one. Any questions from Council?

Councilmember Raben: Just as a matter of correction. The starting salary would be \$18,491.

President Lloyd: My mistake.

Gary Heck: I think the 19 is, there's a six month –

Councilmember Raben: That's correct, after six months it moves to –

President Lloyd: Okay, that's what's in the salary ordinance, so that's the step increase. Is there a motion to approve? Anybody want to make a motion?

Councilmember Raben: So moved.

President Lloyd: Is there a second?

Councilmember Bassemier: Second.

President Lloyd: Motion Mr. Raben, second Mr. Bassemier. Any discussion? Mr. Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Obviously, the two grants, you know, that won't affect our bottom line here. You've been operating without this position for how long?

Ray Nicholson: Since last May, I believe. Its been very difficult. You want to remember there are two new requirements that are coming up. This requirement for paternity begins July the 1st of this year and the requirement for the electronic death certificates is coming on in January of 2011. So those are going to be two additional duties.

Councilmember Goebel: And this person will handle exclusively those types of issues?

Ray Nicholson: No, all three will work together.

Councilmember Goebel: Thank you.

President Lloyd: Other questions? Okay, roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: I think it's a tough one here. I know we've got new changes in law but I still think perhaps we can try to see how it goes, and I'm voting no on this one.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: I think I'll follow that lead, let's play it out a little longer and see how the changes in July, give that a little more time and make adjustments in January if need be. So I vote no.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: I'll concur with Councilmen Raben and Goebel, I'll vote no.

Teri Lukeman: President Lloyd?

President Lloyd: I'll vote yes, two to three, motion fails.

(Motion fails 2-3/Councilmembers Goebel, Raben & Kiefer opposed)

President Lloyd: Let's go to WIC grant Secretary/Bookkeeper and part-time Bookkeeper on grant.

Councilmember Raben: I'll move approval for both grant requests.

President Lloyd: Is there a second?

Councilmember Goebel: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Raben, second Mr. Goebel. Any discussion?
Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes, those two are approved five to zero. Thank you.

(Motion unanimously approved 5-0)

COUNTY CLERK REQUEST TO FILL TWO VACANCIES

President Lloyd: We'll move on to item C, County Clerk, request to fill two vacancies.
Madam Clerk.

Susan Kirk: Good morning. Well, being that Judge Pigman was already here, he pretty well explained as I've explained, is that our caseload is not going down. I e-mailed each one of you and let you know that Tim VanCleave had run another report and we're actually up from what we were even last year, which was a record breaking year. So I have two positions. One position is the certified clerk and what she does is, she sends out all certified mail plus she has to re-enter when they come back a part of that. Now she's already sent out over 20,000 this year plus has entered the returns for circuit-superior probably another 8 or 9,000, so it's a very, very busy job and I'm requesting that one plus we have misdemeanor traffic, we have one of our employees that's found a better job and she's moving on. These are two good employees that we're losing, by the way. And I'm going to have Mary Ann, she's from misdemeanor traffic and I just want her to briefly explain almost the same thing that Judge Pigman did, but needless to say, this is our office. And, Mary Ann, would you do that? And while she's doing that, I'm going to hand out a paper showing that I have, actually, three are going to be on medical leave, FMLA.

President Lloyd: What's the position number on the misdemeanor traffic?

Sandie Deig: 1540.

President Lloyd: Okay, 1460 is a Certified Mail Clerk and 1540 Misdemeanor Traffic Ticket Clerk.

Susan Kirk: So Mary Ann Weightman is just going to give you an idea of what they're going through.

Mary Ann Weightman: Good morning. Our office has twelve people right now, (inaudible) trying to cover everything with twelve people, and losing one to the probation office, she's actually a court clerk. She is responsible for going into each court session. They also put on every bench warrant that has to be put on. I also have another one that will be leave for at least two months as well, that will leave me down to one court clerk. I often have two courts going on at the same time. Our case is like Judge Pigman said, are at 35,000 for last year, we're already up to 20,000 for this year. They're not going down. For July 26, we had 1,279 cases scheduled for night court, so there were two sessions. That's happening about every other month now. If I take another employee from another position and have them cover the court, then their work is going to get behind. Everything we do is time specific because of court proceedings, jail matters and BMV requirements. So I really need to fill this vacancy.

President Lloyd: How is the caseload compared to prior years?

Mary Ann Weightman: It's up.

President Lloyd: Misdemeanor traffic?

Susan Kirk: Everything has gone up. With the 64,000 that we, well it was over 64,000 last year. Everything is up. Nothing is going down, so it's just one of those bad things. Like I said, when we're busy, that's not good news. And what I would also like, and I emailed all of you, too, looking back, when I didn't have to come before Council to get a replacement, I hardly ever had any replacements. And it seems like once you made that rule, I don't know if you've jinxed us or what, but it seems like I'm here every month. Anyway, I am requesting that if you will please, because of the time that it takes to come before Council, I'm doing without an employee. Especially beings that I'm going to have, I've already got one on FMLA, I'm going to have two more coming up with FMLA. If there would be any way that you would let us at least finish the year and hopefully next year, at least maybe until June of next year until we run, we'll run another report at the end of the year as far as our caseload, then Tim does it around in June, and believe me, if things go down, I will come back and let you know, like I said, we will let the part-time position go, but I'm just asking the Council to please let us go at least until June of next year to where when I have to make a replacement, I can do it pretty quick because Sandie has been extremely helpful as far as letting us know, you know, when we can pay out so that we can fill that position quicker. So anyway, I'm asking you if you will please consider that today, also. So it's two employees and if you'll let us at least go to next June before I have to start requesting coming before Council again.

President Lloyd: Okay, the letter you received was for Certified Mail Clerk replacement and then the email is Misdemeanor Traffic Court Clerk. I'll leave it up to Councilmembers if you want to have a motion for both of them at the same time or do them one at a time. Is there any questions for the Clerk? Mr. Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: How do you handle the medical leave as far as picking up the workload, just for everyone's benefit?

Susan Kirk: Well, you know, we may have people scheduled for vacation time because we just can't, we just have to get the work done, so it does, you know, kind of messes up schedules once in a while. It's just not easy to do and especially when you get down to where you're going to have three off and that doesn't include those who, you know, get sick with something else or take a vacation or a personal day, they've earned their time, they should be able to take it. But it causes an extremely bad hardship on some of the other employees having to give us maybe something that they had scheduled and because of what I just gave you, obviously, if I were an employee and I had a vacation scheduled, but my co-employee has something like this that they have to deal with, with a child, yeah, I'll give up my vacation to help that person. So that's what we're looking at.

Councilmember Goebel: Could part-time help in either one of these cases?

Susan Kirk: Not unless you want to give me another part-time person on top of what I have.

Councilmember Goebel: And the other question I have, which of the two positions you're requesting today would you think is the most important?

Susan Kirk: Mike, this is the problem, you know, as far as importance goes, every one in my office is important, okay? They all have their jobs to do. One might be a little bit more difficult than the other, but they are all important.

Councilmember Goebel: I'm not doubting that.

Susan Kirk: Well, I'm not going to say one is more important than the other. All of this work has to be done and whether or not you deem it important, it has to be done. If the person that you deem isn't as important as the other one doesn't do that job, then the important one can't get their job done because now they've got to pick up the one that you felt was not important.

Councilmember Goebel: Well, I'll rephrase that, obviously, they are important to you and I used maybe the wrong term, but which would your department have the most trouble doing without?

Susan Kirk: Both of them. It's just, no matter what the job is, it takes time. Like I said, the certified clerk, she's done already over 20,000, that's just sending them out. It isn't a matter of, oh gee, hit the button and everything just goes. All of this takes work. You have to sit down and enter each one and then when it comes back you have to process it that it was returned whether, you know, it was or was not returned. So I can't, right now, as far as the difficulty of the job, it's the time, we just don't have the time to do this. And, I mean, Judge Pigman, I think, explained it very well. We're just overloaded. I wish we weren't, believe me, I wish we weren't, but we are. And we can do it by cut (inaudible) having another part-time employee, I really don't think we want to go there as far as a part-time employee not getting benefits. I don't really think you want to go there. But if you want to, I'm ready for you.

Councilmember Goebel: Okay, and you've answered these questions very well (inaudible).

Susan Kirk: Thank you.

President Lloyd: Mr. Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Ms. Kirk, don't you have to meet some kind of a state deadline on your work that's...

Susan Kirk: Yes, Councilman Bassemier. Everything we do is time sensitive. Everything. When a case is filed, during the case, you know, just because we have 64,000 new cases, that doesn't count how many times my staff has to go back and get in cases that date back ten years. And everything we do according to statute is time sensitive. I can't think of anything other than ordering supplies that is not time sensitive.

Councilmember Bassemier: Thank you.

President Lloyd: Other questions? Mr. Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: So, basically, you are doing, you're going to be minus five employees, is that correct, with the medical leave?

Susan Kirk: Three. I sent you two –

Councilmember Goebel: Including the two you're requesting.

Susan Kirk: The two and now this one, that makes three that's going – I've already got one off, --

Councilmember Goebel: You'll have three on medical leave and you're requesting to fill other spots. Is that correct? Five total?

Susan Kirk: I'm going to have three staff members, two are on their way on Family Medical Leave, as far as them replacing, it's just the other people in the office, obviously, have to try to pick up those duties. You know, if nobody ever took a vacation or a sick day or a personal day or had any problems like this poor lady, we'd be good. But it doesn't work that way. Like I said, they've earned that time and I cannot deny them – I mean, they're good about making some switches. But to say well, I'm sorry, we've just got too much work, you can't go. You can't do it. You can't do it.

President Lloyd: Mr. Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Really what we're looking at is two, possibly three, soon on FMLA, and two employees that you're already short, so we're really talking five. If we didn't approve any of these you're going to be short five people in the coming months.

Susan Kirk: That would be correct.

Councilmember Goebel: That is my question.

President Lloyd: Other questions? Do we want to take them both together or separate? Is there a motion to approve?

Councilmember Kiefer: Let's move that we take them both together, and I make that in the form of a motion.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion to approve, is there a second?

Councilmember Bassemier: Second.

President Lloyd: Second Mr. Bassemier, motion Mr. Kiefer. Any other questions? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: You know, when the medical leave people come back then perhaps we can do without, but I'll vote yes for the two to fill today.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Because there's going to be five people total and you have some missing, I can see where that's a hardship, so I'm going to vote yes on these two. Thank you.

Teri Lukeman: President Lloyd?

President Lloyd: I'll vote yes, and that's approved five to zero for both positions. Thank you.

(Motion unanimously approved 5-0)

Susan Kirk: Thank you. So I've got to come back when I replace somebody again, is that what you're saying?

President Lloyd: That's correct.

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Susan Kirk: Okay.

President Lloyd: Thank you.

SHERIFF REQUEST TO FILL FIVE VACANCIES

President Lloyd: Item number D, Sheriff request to fill five vacancies, and you have a letter from the Sheriff.

Eric Williams: Good morning.

President Lloyd: Morning, Sheriff. I had sent you an email, just a question on how the annexation, I guess, to some extent, would reduce some of the over the road deputy duties and if you had factored that in or if you were looking at that, and that's just within the big scheme of trying to hold our numbers level on employees.

Eric Williams: Yeah, absolutely, and I think it's a very fair question. It's something that was discussed during the annexation issues and with us on a regular basis. And to answer your question about how we monitor our patrol jurisdictions and how we divide people up, we monitor that all the time. I will tell you, though that the most recent annexation, really had a very small impact on the actual activities that we do in the calls for service. If you remember, the section that was annexed was primarily business, and so what it eliminated from us was some accident runs and some shoplifting runs. There were very few, if any, residents in that area. I thought I'd share a couple of numbers with you just looking back at calls for service, at the year ending 2008 between 2000, the Sheriff's office had a 47% increase in dispatch activities over that period of time, ten years or so. In that same period of time, or eight years, in that same eight year period of time, we didn't increase our staff load out on patrol or put new people out there. So I would tell you that we're already under staffed out there and the annexation probably helped us to redeploy some people into the residential areas of the county that were probably seeing a little bit of a lack of service from us. I could tell you, the other dilemma that that annexation created for us was that it created, and I don't know if peninsula is the right word, but it created a city peninsula out in that section of the county for us. The annexation goes to the county line from, basically, Lloyd to Morgan Avenue. Well, that still leaves that whole southeastern corner of the county that's full of residents, Angel Mounds boat ramp area and the area that was hit by the tornado, that area, that we still have to provide patrol to, which was part of that patrol jurisdiction. So we're still spending a lot of time traveling through that peninsula, for lack of a better word, to provide services to those people. Like I said, it had very little impact on us and I think the city would tell you that it increased their runs some, but they've been able to manage that with the addition of maybe one person to cover all three shifts. I don't even know what they added, but I think their plan was to be able to handle that within, because it was all business community. I don't know if that answers your questions about that.

President Lloyd: Well, and that's true that the south Knight Township is what you're talking about. It's still county, I guess, south of Pollack Avenue, roughly. Mr. Goebel, question?

Councilmember Goebel: Sheriff, is there probably, it probably cannot be done with jurisdiction restrictions, but is there any way that the two law enforcement agencies can work out a deal so we don't have to cross?

Eric Williams: I think anything is possible. You know, obviously, the city is in the county, so the Sheriff's office has jurisdiction county-wide. And we have talked even during the consolidation meetings about some, if the option were approved through consolidation that both agencies are going to remain intact, that we at that point sit down and do some mutual aid agreements to shore up some of those lines to make our patrol jurisdictions much more contiguous with one another. Some examples of that that are already in place though, the Sheriff's office, through mutual aid agreements with the Evansville Police department, we provide police services at Goebel Soccer Complex, Moutoux Park, Dogtown, Angel Mounds, which are actually city owned facilities, but because they are so far outside the city limits and we're already patrolling those, it didn't make sense for the city to have to dispatch cars those distances. So we're already doing that in cooperation with the city. So, yeah, I would say that anything is possible and I don't know that that's a bad idea when this all kind of shakes itself out and we find out where all the lines are going to end up being.

Councilmember Goebel: I think that would be worth your while, too, and I know

you're way ahead of the game on this one anyway.

Eric Williams: Chief Hill and I have talked about it. Former Councilmembers have talked about it with us and we don't disagree, it's just very difficult to do at this time with all the transition that's in the works and all the discussions that's in the works, but we're prepared to sit down and talk about that if it makes more sense.

Councilmember Goebel: Well, I'm glad to hear you're open to it. Thank you.

President Lloyd: Mr. Raben?

Councilmember Raben: A few general comments. I've stated before that, you know, consolidation, what it does offer, and I think the Sheriff even mentioned this, that there's a lot of areas outside the county that never saw a patrol car. And as he stated, a lot of subdivisions, I can think of one subdivision out in McCutchanville that's got approximately 6 or 700 building site lots, I don't know how many homes are in it today, but, you know, those are 15 - 20 mile per hour streets. It takes a while to cruise those streets. So I think there are some areas that people are finally seeing a presence that they didn't normally get to see. So a little bit more of it probably still wouldn't hurt. One important fact that you left out was the new high school on Highway 41, that, I'm sure, is going to stretch him a little further. But if you think of how big this county is, and it's not the biggest by any stretch of the imagination, but, you know, if he has to pull somebody from I64 in the 41 area to the far southwest corner of the county, you know, even with all the bells and whistles and lights and buzzers, it still is probably 15 minutes travel time, bare minimum. So, and then we've got a lot of rail crossings within the county that even offer bigger dilemmas so I don't, again, I don't see that that consolidation or that annexation has any impact on his force. I mean, I think it just makes them a better force.

Eric Williams: And I think that's resummerizing kind of what I said, and that it did have an impact on our actual calls for dispatch runs for services but it was fairly minute and they pretty much amounted to shoplifting runs and crashes on Burkhardt Road there. So we did see a reduction there, but what it has been able to do, it allows me to redeploy some resources and spend more time in the Keystones, the Cambridges, those new subdivisions out by the university. I think you also have to remember that University of Southern Indiana continues to grow and that's in our patrol jurisdiction. We spend an increasingly larger amount of time in that area with the increase of students that are there. And as Councilman Raben mentioned, one of the biggest issues my office is getting ready to face is the new North High School located at Baseline and 41, which will be almost 2,000 students out in the county daily driving to and from (inaudible) that we didn't have before out in the county, and that's going to be a major change in how we operate in that area. So it did have an impact but I think it's allowed us to serve the residents out in the county better.

President Lloyd: Mr. Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Eric, you said you had a 47% increase?

Eric Williams: Yes.

Councilmember Kiefer: The County Clerk was in here, she was talking about her increase and her workload increase, the judge was in before her, he's talking about his, I mean, per capita, how do we sit? I mean, are we in one of the worst crime capitals or, I mean, explain to me what's going on?

Eric Williams: I can't give you any empirical data to address that, but I will tell you that comparatively, we're probably no worse off than other similar situated communities that are experiencing the same issues that everybody is seeing. I just spent two weekends ago with all the sheriffs from across the state and they're all talking about the same issues, the lack of funds, the increase of work, but if I could provide just a little commentary, based on sitting here this morning listening to the judge, listening to the County Clerk and now listening to me and the increases we all are seeing, that is all part of the criminal justice system. And I think that further accentuates the idea that the criminal justice planning commission that we have here, that hasn't been meeting regularly because we haven't felt like there's been much of a need, there really is a need because there is truly a domino effect. The busier my people are, the busier the city police become, the busier the Clerk becomes. The busier the Clerk becomes, the busier the judge becomes. The more active the judge becomes, the fuller the jail becomes. It's a cycle and they all are so heavily dependent on one another that any decision that I make can affect all those. Any decision one of those people make can affect me and other entities. And that's why it's important all of us continue to communicate and let each other know what our offices are doing and how we're impacting one another. The criminal justice planning commission does serve a purpose and there is a need to talk. I would tell you, there is a couple of things I wanted to add today while I had an opportunity on the floor, number one, just to let you know, we may be coming to you for some medical expense money. We've got an inmate right now that is probably going to be incredibly expensive to us, more so than we've dealt with recently. There's not much I'm going to be able to do about it. We're doing everything we can to curb those costs and hold them in line, but I have to provide those services. I will tell you that the jail right now is at, is as high as it's been in a while. Last night at midnight we were at 567. This morning it was at 545 and that was primarily due to a large trip to prison we made during the night to move some people out to prison. Five of my eight housing units are now over capacity, so that includes the female unit and four of the male units are over capacity and the facility has been over capacity steadily for the last 45 days. It's nothing new, but it's not going down, so it's something we're going to have to continue to monitor and doing everything we can to keep in check. I don't think it's a huge problem for my staff to continue to survive, but those numbers are higher. One of the things that we're seeing is that there is an increase in the number of short term people being sentenced to the facility from the local courts. They're being sentenced to do time there and I can't say that I blame the courts for doing what they're doing because they're seeing a frustration of people not appearing in court, not doing what they're supposed to do and sometimes the only way to get their attention is to spend some time in the jail, but that causes an increase for us and we're seeing that increase and the numbers are reflective of that.

President Lloyd: What is the rough averages of male and female population in the jail?

Eric Williams: I could tell you that, just to give you an idea of the, here's the report from last night: there were 567 total prisoners, 69 of those were housed in the female unit, and there were 16 additional held in the housing or the booking and the medical unit. So 69, 70, 85 out of 567 for quick math.

President Lloyd: And the number of females?

Eric Williams: I don't have enough toes and fingers to do it in my head.

President Lloyd: Does that include the females?

Eric Williams: Yeah, 567 is inclusive of males and females.

President Lloyd: Okay.

Eric Williams: Those numbers are available on line. I post them on a fairly regular basis, you can get to those and hopefully, in the very near future, that will be a live report so you can click on it at any time and see those numbers on the fly, who is in jail, what they're there for and numbers and how they're breaking down to give everybody a little bit more access to those so they can make better decisions on who is staying and who is going.

President Lloyd: How did we ever get by with a 250 bed jail?

Eric Williams: Well, I would say that we were at capacity basically the day the new jail opened up because at that point in time, we had almost double the number of inmates in house, out of house. We were paying over a million dollars a year those last couple of years to other facilities to house Vanderburgh County inmates. But, you know, this is not an opportunity to say I told you so, or this is what we said, but everybody that did an analysis of our facility said you need to be building about 700 beds when we built this one. We didn't, and we're doing a great job getting by with it. It's meeting our needs today, it's designed for future expansion should that ever come to us, but I don't think this was any unexpected occurrence.

President Lloyd: Let's see, Mr. Kiefer and then Mr. Goebel. Mr. Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Sheriff, I know those numbers are posted you just mentioned on the website, but, I mean, is a lot of this activity, is it sex crime related, drug related, both, I mean, violent crimes, I mean, what kind of criminal activity are we talking about here?

Eric Williams: We run the gamut. As a county jail, we get it all and that's one of the difficulties of running a county level jail. We see everybody from the public intoxication arrestee to the homicide murderer, we've got them all. I could tell you, though, that generally, we see about 85% of our population is there for some addiction related reason. It doesn't mean they're there for a drug charge, but the charge they're there for had some affiliation or has some reason for being there because of some kind of addiction, drug abuse, alcohol abuse, whatever. One of the most common crimes and it's not really a crime in itself, but we have a lot of people that churn through our facility because they're there for failure to appear. They have thumbed their nose at the court system and said, you know, they didn't show up when the judge ordered them to be there, the judge issues a warrant for their arrest, so their new charge is failure to appear while their original charge may have been misdemeanor theft or conversion or PI, disorderly, you know, a minor offense, but they're churning through the system and they're coming back through, and really, the most costly event that occurs in the jail is booking a new prisoner. That's the most labor intensive, it's the most costly event that occurs. So as our bookings continue to rise, our costs continue to rise, and right now, we're on track to break all our records for number of bookings this year.

Councilmember Kiefer: Thank you.

President Lloyd: Mr. Goebel.

Eric Williams: That's probably not what you wanted to hear.

Councilmember Kiefer: Well, I'm just interested to know.

Councilmember Goebel: I think that's an interesting point, 85% due to some type of addiction and –

Eric Williams: That's a rough number.

Councilmember Goebel: And you work mainly on housing and not on working on curing addictions, right?

Eric Williams: Yeah, we have no facilities, no capabilities, no staff on hand at the jail to deal with those kinds of issues. I think it's important to remember as we churn those numbers through the jail, the average length of stay in our facility still hovers just a little over 24 hours. Of the 12,000 we anticipate booking this year, give or take a few, that average length of stay will be just a hair over 25 hours, so they churn through the system so there's not a lot of time there. Now we have a significant portion that stays longer periods of times and if financial times were different and I felt comfortable asking you for it, I'd be up here asking for a detention center case manager. And their role would be something to the effect of to start working with these people. And we're not going to make a huge change while they're there, but to get them on track with the local providers to get a plan in place and to get the attention of the other resources that are out there to get them on track for recovery. You know, we're able to do a lot more of that in the community corrections complex because we have them there for extended periods of time and through the DOC grant, we have those kinds of people that can make those connections.

Councilmember Goebel: Well, I don't think we want to go there today, but your gut feeling, will this particular number of units that we have in the jail suffice for down the road a pretty good distance or are we going to have to out source again if we don't do something else?

Eric Williams: You know, we were very, very fortunate in the design of this facility to give the Sheriff's office a lot of latitude in how it was put together, and we kept a lot of that in mind. We're going to be capable of housing space-wise people, staff might be able to keep up, but the space, we should be able to keep up with these numbers and a few more yet. Now it all depends on, you know, if the Civil Liberties Union intervenes, if we get sued again, but right now I think that any basis they would have for a lawsuit don't exist because we are providing for them, they're safe, they're secure, they're getting food, you know, we're taking care of their needs, we just don't have a regular bed for them to sleep in sometimes and we have to put them on what we call a sled bed, which looks like a flat bottom canoe turned upside down on the floor. So, you know, I couldn't tell you that. I will tell you that I personally wish I had another few housing units out there so that I have a lot more flexibility in being able to house inmates safely, being able to do some classifications better and keeping certain inmates away from other ones. It's a pretty well known statistic that if you put a couple decent, and I know that this is a stretch, but inmates in there that are not very problematic with one problem person, that problem person will impact the others and their behavior and their future dramatically. And that's why classification is so important inside a facility like ours. And we've really got our hands tied right now, because we've got no open space. The other opportunity that's out there for us if we had the space, is I could be housing federal inmates and state inmates, particularly female inmates for the state and other jurisdictions, paying the bills for ourselves and as we needed the space, I'd kick them out and move on. But we're not there yet. The facility is designed for expansion should that ever come. Right now, I'm not advocating that but I think we're eventually going to have to talk about

it unless there's a dramatic change of direction in the criminal justice system as a whole here.

Councilmember Goebel: Thank you.

President Lloyd: Mr. Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Sheriff, change the subject a little bit, talk about the old jail (inaudible – microphone not turned on) I was talking to Dave Rector and he's trying to set us up a meeting here in the near future and I was kind of kicking an idea around with him. I know there's a lot of money sent out of town for juveniles, and I was just wondering, (inaudible) this a regional juvenile detention center, is that a possibility in your mind?

Eric Williams: Well, I think anything is possible and I know when we were talking about moving to the facility out on Harlan Avenue, one of the concepts was to turn the existing jail into juvenile detention, move juvenile courts into the ground floor and put basically a juvenile center over there. I know the need exists, whether it's possible or not, I think anything is possible, we'd need to get a lot of players to the table to discuss that. But it seems like it would be viable space. You know, one of our concerns and I thought maybe you were headed down the path of reusing it as a jail, you know, one of the concerns we have for that would be that you'd have so much duplication of efforts: you have two kitchens now, two kitchen staffs, you have supervisor staffs in two locations, you have medical staffs in two locations, so to use that as an ongoing jail facility, I don't know. Now the original campus plan for the current jail had space set aside for a juvenile facility. Now, with that money, if we constructed a juvenile facility we would be able to share resources from the jail like we do community corrections as far as kitchen services, (inaudible) and those things, so you weren't duplicating a lot of those things. But to answer your question, yes, I think it's possible and it is feasible.

Councilmember Bassemier: And the reason why I said that, we're getting – we're paying over half a million dollars right now on an empty building, and I think they're trying to get some people in there but with no luck, --

Eric Williams: Juveniles are much more expensive to house than adults because of the state's requirements for different kinds of programming that's required for juveniles as opposed to adults.

Councilmember Bassemier: (Inaudible) – we're paying way up there right now to send juveniles out of town.

Eric Williams: I'm not interested in getting in the juvenile housing business, but if you'd like my attendance, I'd be happy to be there.

Councilmember Bassemier: Thank you.

Councilmember Raben: That has changed, though, Ed, we're not spending the money we used to. The state is picking the tab up on that now. We'll probably spend 250,000 this year where we used to spend a million and a half or two million dollars.

President Lloyd: Well, and when you look at the increases, and since 2000, the county population, we've maybe increased 3 or 4,000 people and I don't think that's all criminals that came here, but we've got more laws, the legislature passes more

laws, I don't know that they sunset very many, so that's something, I guess, Mr. Goebel can look into if he's successful in his venture.

Councilmember Bassemier: That's one reason why I brought it up, I know we're not paying as much as we did in the past, and (inaudible) tri-state or whatever, regional, rather, we can bring money in and help offset other costs.

President Lloyd: We've had a wide-ranging discussion, I guess we'll move back to this letter. The process servers, those are positions that constantly turn over on part-time?

Eric Williams: Basically, we used to have ten line items for part-time process servers and what we did was, a few budgets ago, converted that to one line item that I paid all those people out of so there was no need to have a set number. We kind of always hovered around ten, right now I believe we've got six that are serving all the papers out in the county. We've let some of them go through attrition, trying to see where we were, what we could get by with, what we could have the deputies do, we're having some of the deputies deliver the papers in their districts as opposed to them while they're out driving around anyways, why not deliver a paper, so we're doing some of that, but what we're finding is that we peaked out on the number of hours that we're giving those part-timers, because most of them are retirees and they're not capable of working (inaudible) and I'm not asking for new funds, I'm just asking for the latitude to put a few more people in there to divide the hours up. And much as Clerk Kirk said and Judge Pigman said, as their workload goes up, all those people are getting papers on the street, you know, we're serving papers to those people.

President Lloyd: And then the court screener is just to replace one that left?

Eric Williams: Correct.

President Lloyd: Okay, same with the Merit Deputy?

Eric Williams: Correct.

President Lloyd: Okay. Any questions from Council or does anybody want to make a motion to approve either all at the same time or do you want to break it up?

Councilmember Kiefer: I move that we approve all at the same time.

President Lloyd: Is there a second?

Councilmember Goebel: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Kiefer, second Mr. Goebel. Any other questions? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. Motion passes five to zero. Thank you, Sheriff. Very informative.

(Motion unanimously approved 5-0)

Eric Williams: Thank you, I appreciate it. And the other thing I was going to comment, and I know most of you, several of you were there periodically, but the county fair was last week, was very successful, we had very little incidents out there. We had a good representation of the office there and received several comments. I'm just glad it was last week, and I wouldn't have said that last week until this week got here, but I'm glad it was last week and not this week.

President Lloyd: I saw a lot of your balloons out there.

Eric Williams: Likewise.

President Lloyd: Thank you.

TRAVEL REQUESTS

President Lloyd: Okay, we'll move on to travel requests, item E, I'll turn that over to Mr. Raben as finance stand in.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, it looks like we have the Treasurer, let me find my list here. I wasn't ready for handling all these. Okay, the Health department has three travel requests, the County Assessor has one, the County Clerk has two and the Treasurer has one, along with Legal Aid. I don't have any questions with – it looks like the ones – there's three of them that are state called. I really have no questions with the state called meetings, I don't know if anybody has any questions on the non-state called meetings.

President Lloyd: Any questions from Councilmembers?

Councilmember Goebel: Can a couple of these travel together instead of paying mileage?

President Lloyd: Right. I guess the County Assessor, we've got mileage for two individuals: 600 miles to Kokomo.

Jonathan Weaver: Yeah, they can travel together.

President Lloyd: Okay, so we could knock the mileage off one of those. I mean, it's a state called meeting in Kokomo, 500 miles.

Councilmember Goebel: Is that not the same situation with the County Clerk...I have two different forms.

Councilmember Kiefer: There are two different numbers, too.

Councilmember Goebel: This is confusing.

President Lloyd: Mrs. Deig indicated they did travel together. So one of those mileages need to be cut in half or knocked off. Okay, the two that went to the Child Support Conference traveled together, oh, and there is a difference in cost on that.

Councilmember Goebel: Well, they're both giving mileage. If they traveled together – am I reading this incorrectly? This second page?

President Lloyd: It looks like they both received \$120 for mileage, so one of those needs to be knocked off. Excuse us while we get this organized.

Councilmember Goebel: We've got two different forms. As long as they both don't get the mileage, we can work that out, I guess. And I think Sarah said that's the way it happened.

(Inaudible)

Councilmember Goebel: So we just disregard the second form?

(Inaudible)

Councilmember Goebel: Front page.

President Lloyd: I mean, we could take a motion for all of these, delete the one duplicate travel request or is the –

Councilmember Goebel: I think Sarah says there is not a duplicate on the mileage.

Councilmember Raben: There's an old form. The request is for the two people to ride together.

President Lloyd: Okay.

Councilmember Goebel: In both cases for Assessor and for Clerk.

President Lloyd: Okay.

Councilmember Raben: So with that I'll move that those changes be made to the record, I'll move that we approve all travel requests, and after I get a second, I would like to make one more statement.

President Lloyd: Okay, Mr. Raben, approve all except for the County Assessor, County Clerk, that they would combine those trips and go together. Is there a second?

Councilmember Goebel: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Raben, second Mr. Goebel. Any discussion? Jim?

Councilmember Raben: I hate to keep harping on Health department requests for travel, but I think that has a little bit to do with their need for keeping a full staff and, you know, looking here, they've got five people now that's requested travel for – there is only a fee for one of them, but none of them are actual state-called meetings, so you know, this is every month you have a great number of employees out of that department off for training. And I think –

President Lloyd: You're referring to the Health department?

Councilmember Raben: Yes. So, you know, I think that's a lot of their staffing issues, you know, if you've got five or six people out at a time, you know, every couple of weeks, yeah, they're going to be short on staff. So I think they need to send as few a people as possible and hopefully these people, when they come back, can instruct or brief others within the department. But it does seem like a lot.

Councilmember Bassemier: Jim, aren't some of these trips, they're mandatory, they have to have this training? I mean, they're required to have it, in service training, they're required to?

Councilmember Raben: If they're state called meetings, yes, but I think if they're not state called, it's at the discretion of the health officer whether or not the employees go. So, you know, again, training is great. I mean, it makes us all better at what we do, but I think, you know, they may need to be a little more careful about sending out two and three people to the same conference. You know, I think one person can take good notes and come back and tell others, you know, within their department or within that office, you know, what it was all about. So that's just my comments.

President Lloyd: Mr. Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: I still don't – I can't make sense out of the County Clerk's. One individual is driving and getting the mileage, \$141, this is a very minor amount, but the other individual is not driving, same conference, \$135. Am I reading that correctly? I take it back. She is picking up the parking and the hotel room, and the other person is picking up the mileage. Now I see, thank you. I'm sorry.

President Lloyd: Okay, I believe that's what the motion was for. Any other questions?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yeah, I've got a question.

President Lloyd: Mr. Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: If people are going to these conferences and say the activities don't start until 10:30, I guess, you know, that would be 9:30 Evansville time, if they were going up to Indy, so it would probably be too much to ask them to try to drive up that same day? You know, because you've got lodging costs for each individual. Is there a possibility that we could eliminate the lodging and have them drive up the same morning if activities don't start until 10:30? Just a question.

President Lloyd: Well, they'd have to leave at 6:00 or 5:30 a.m., so I guess that's a call for that office or that officeholder. But, you're welcome to question any of that.

Councilmember Goebel: The Clerk's people are staying in the same room, are they not, so that's a pretty good deal.

President Lloyd: Okay, any other questions? All those in favor signify by saying aye.

(All Councilmembers voted aye)

President Lloyd: Any opposed?

(No opposing votes were cast)

President Lloyd: Travel requests pass with modifications, five to zero.

(Motion unanimously approved 5-0)

AMENDMENTS TO SALARY ORDINANCE

President Lloyd: Nine D, Rick Davis, we had that report last week, very thorough report on cost savings related to the printing. So we'll go to item ten, amendments to salary ordinance. Mr. Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Okay, first I move we amend salary line 1050-1531 Civilian Shift Differential as previously adopted, it's an additional \$2,200. Salary line 1050-0021 Sergeant setting the annual salary in at \$54,597. This correction is due to incorrect date in the salary ordinance. Salary line 1050-0029 Sergeant setting in the annual salary at \$53,063. 1050-0035 Deputy Sheriff setting the annual salary at \$44,016. 1050-0057 Deputy Sheriff setting the annual salary at \$44,499. 1050-0066 Deputy Sheriff setting the annual salary at \$44,258. 1050-0099 Deputy Sheriff at \$43,989. 1050-0236 setting the annual salary at \$34,159. I also move we amend salary ordinance to approve replacing four part-time Process Servers at the rate of \$9.5730 per hour as per the 2010 salary ordinance. I also move that we amend salary ordinance to approve hiring of one new Deputy Sheriff at \$43,222. Health Department, we have two line items, 2134-1170 to approve replacing the Secretary/Bookkeeper. This is a COMOT V position with a starting salary of \$22,964. After six months that would go to \$24,057. Salary line 2137-1990, approve replacing the part-time extra help to perform duties as a LHMF Bookkeeper/Assistant to the Finance Officer. The part-time rate will be set at \$11.9759 per hour. And then County Clerk, amend salary ordinance to approve line item 1010-1460. This is replacing the Circuit/Superior Certified Mail Clerk. This is a COMOT IV position with a starting salary of \$21,120. After six months that would go to \$22,119. The current employee is retiring in September. And then salary line 1010-1540 replacing the Misdemeanor Traffic Ticket Clerk. This is a COMOT IV position with a starting salary of \$21,120. After six months, that would go to \$22,119. This employee is transferring to another position within the court system. Superior Court, 1370-1780 approve replacing the Misdemeanor Probation Department Secretary. This is a COMOT IV position. The employee being considered to fill this position is a COMOT IV, Step 3, with an annual salary of \$30,338, and I make that in the form of a motion.

President Lloyd: Is there a second?

Councilmember Goebel: Second.

President Lloyd: Motion Mr. Raben on the salary ordinance amendments. Second Mr. Goebel. Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. Motion passes five to zero.

(Motion unanimously approved 5-0)

PUBLIC COMMENT

President Lloyd: Move on to item number eleven, public comment. The public may address the Council. We've got Mr. Bill McKeon, I believe.

Bill McKeon: Thank you and good morning to everyone.

President Lloyd: Please state your address.

Bill McKeon: 2611 Deerfield Drive, Evansville. I don't know if you're cognizant of it or if this is within your jurisdiction, but it's my understanding that there is no county ordinance governing the decibel readings within the confines of this county. And we have a new airport extension going on. I've already spoke to the County Commissioners, I've spoke to the mayor and I seem to be getting nowhere. The only person that's been very effective in helping is Lloyd Winnecke of the County Commissioners office. And I just wanted to know if you people, if it's within your jurisdiction to establish an ordinance indicating what the decibel reading should be. Right now, according to the EPA, the United States government, it's a local community responsibility. And as far as, I did have the local EPA gentleman out, and he got readings of 75 and 72 for two particular air flights coming in to this airport. And I don't know, I'm frustrated and I need your help and I need someone's help, not only myself, but the community out there in the Malibu Park. And I was wondering if this is the right approach coming to you people or should I seek, or is this the right (inaudible) or where should I go?

President Lloyd: Let me just give you a couple of observations. For a county ordinance, the Commissioners would have to write that and pass that on the noise. Now, the city does have a noise ordinance. Would – you're saying no?

Bill McKeon: No, they don't

President Lloyd: Oh, they used to.

Bill McKeon: They have one for automobiles, but they have none for air pollution for

aircraft. They do have, like I said, I've researched that. In fact, before I came to the meeting, thanks to this young lady over here, which I'm very grateful, she sent me down to the office and I did get the ordinance, it refers to vehicles.

President Lloyd: Okay, and then you said there was like a decibel reading, 75 and 72, how is that related to health? I mean, are those very high or –

Bill McKeon: Well, it's above what is required.

President Lloyd: What's a normal reading?

Bill McKeon: Well, 70 is supposed to be, I believe, the correct one, and within the EPA it mentions 55 outdoors and 45 indoors. It does affect your health and just for clarification, there has been, and California and the Pittsburgh airports have been fined because they violated it, and then the people responsible, which would be here, in this case, the Evansville board, or the airport – I'm sorry –

President Lloyd: Airport Authority.

Bill McKeon: Airport Authority, they would be responsible for any lawsuits that are instituted, and we're not going that far, and just, like I said, we're just ordinary citizens living in the county. We don't complain, we're satisfied with what we've got. We get good service and the Sheriff is here, and we have the Sheriff coming through once in a while, and we're just a happy community out there. And yet, all of the sudden this airport comes in and they claim one minute it's the FAA ruling, and then they change and then, if you listen to those people, their stories change every week. And you get no satisfaction. I've met with the Airport Authority twice, I met with the county, like I say, twice. I met with the mayor and it's just frustrating.

President Lloyd: You know, well, on the airport, it is in the city, the city annexed the airport, so they would fall under the current noise ordinance, but I guess you have airplanes coming in, they're flying through the county to get to the city, so they're making, I guess, if they're overly loud, that's a violation in the county. So, but I guess City Council would be another place, and I don't know if you've talked to them, where they would try to modify a current noise ordinance.

Bill McKeon: I intend to, Mr. Lloyd. I intend to go to theirs as well. I'm going to use every means possible to see where I can get satisfaction.

President Lloyd: Right, I mean, I'm sympathetic to that because I know they're changing their flight patterns due to the expansion.

Bill McKeon: Yeah, what I don't understand, to be honest with you, is they're taking 2,400 and some feet from the northeast and moving it – or from the south – and moving it to the northeast. Originally, we were told that what they were doing was they were extending it because they needed a buffer zone because of some aircraft exceeded the runway at Chicago Midway Airport, that they needed a thousand foot extension so that if the plane overshoot the runway, it would more or less go into a beach type sand, which would slow it down and it wouldn't say, run into Oak Hill Road. But then later, it comes out that they are just moving 2,400 feet from one end of the runway to the other, which doesn't make any sense. And that particular case moves it right into our backyards. And I know the County Surveyor has been before the Commissioners as well as I and, of course, he's more effective than I because he's liable to be the luggage man after a while. The planes are going to be right next to his door, so he could take the luggage out of the planes.

President Lloyd: Right, he lives in Malibu, which is adjacent to the airport.

Bill McKeon: Yes, that's where we are associated with.

President Lloyd: We do have an airport expert here, Mr. Bassemier. I don't know if there's anything you wanted to add, Ed?

Councilmember Bassemier: Well, I just, Sir, I assume you've been to those meetings they've had in the past on the expansion. Why don't you contact Bob Hanneken, he's with R.W. Armstrong, you probably talked with him. You're kind of laughing, he's the expert in that field, so –

Bill McKeon: Yeah, I know –

Councilmember Bassemier: – and I know he knows all the regulations, the FAA, city ordinances, county ordinances, and I understand that we're, or they're not breaking any regulations, so I'd contact him.

Bill McKeon: Well, I appreciate that, Mr. Bassemier. I mean, we've met with him and, of course, you know, when you ask him a question, he's from – representing an Indianapolis firm and most of the people they've sent down is from Indianapolis. And when you ask him a question, they have no relevance of what the heck is going on in this community. And he's one of the ones that changes from day to day. And when you question him, what they present is a proposal, and you'll say this is that. And he'll say, well, it's only a proposal. This is not concrete. And you get no satisfaction from that gentleman. So I'd be wasting my time. I've already met with him, and let me put it this way, he's oil and I'm water, and we don't mix.

Councilmember Bassemier: And the reason why they use that firm is because of the expert in the field. They did have a local firm but they've used them in the past and he's made sure we've passed all the regulations with the FAA and I have a lot of confidence in him, so I'm sorry you couldn't get anywhere with him, but –

Bill McKeon: Well, again, if we got honest answers, I might have faith in him. But again, you know, when you're told – to give you an example, I had a fight with the Indiana DOT about a road, 57, and this extension is going to interfere with that. And when you ask him, he'll say, well, that's not my problem. That's the DOT. Well, the DOT is not extending the airport, it's his project. At least he could tell us what they're going to do, but he'll say I don't know. And one minute they're going to put a berm up with trees. Well, now they're not. And one minute they're going to do this, and now they're not, so how do you get satisfaction from a gentleman that changes his stories in midstream?

Councilmember Bassemier: I can't answer that, Sir.

Bill McKeon: Well, then, that's why I say, I don't have faith in that gentleman.

Councilmember Bassemier: Well, you'll have to talk to them. I'm just in charge of security, and so –

Bill McKeon: Right. I've talked to them, okay, and I've talked to Mr. Working on several occasions and he's resigning.

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes, he's gone.

President Lloyd: But I don't think there's any connection between you talking to him and him resigning. I think he's just resigning.

Councilmember Bassemier: And I'm sorry, just keep pursuing it and –

Bill McKeon: I appreciate your input but I don't accept –

Councilmember Bassemier: It don't sound like it helped you at all, but maybe it's –

Bill McKeon: You can't.

Councilmember Bassemier: Maybe it's a civil suit.

President Lloyd: You know, anyway if you could get the noise ordinance, the current noise ordinance from the city, then maybe you can ask the City Council to make modifications or you can take that to the Commissioners.

Bill McKeon: I will, and I appreciate you listening and all of you and, at least I've gotten some information that I should go to the city and I'll do so. I thank you very kindly for your time and for your input.

President Lloyd: Thank you, Mr. McKeon.

Bill McKeon: Thank you.

President Lloyd: Any other questions from Council? Any other member of the public want to address the Council? Mr. Williams, the Sheriff.

Eric Williams: I've been emailing back and forth with my bookkeeper hoping to be able to tell you this when I presented the first time, but just to let you know to end on a positive note, because of the hiring freeze and the slow down in doing this and some changes in our hiring practices, so far this year, we've got about \$240,000 in our personnel line items surplus that will come back at the end of the year provided nothing changes. So just the slow down has created an impact. So on a positive note, there will be that kind of savings.

President Lloyd: That's an encouraging note.

Eric Williams: But I might need to spend that on some kind of device to write tickets to the airplanes. I may need a jet or something.

President Lloyd: Okay, great, that's good news. Thank you, Sheriff. Any other comments, public, any other comments from Council? Motion to adjourn?

Councilmember Raben: So moved.

President Lloyd: Is there a second?

Councilmember Kiefer: Second.

President Lloyd: We are adjourned.

(There being no further business to come before the Council, the meeting was adjourned at 9:50 a.m.)

VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL

President Russell Lloyd, Jr.

Vice President James Raben

Councilmember Joe Kiefer

Councilmember Mike Goebel

Councilmember Tom Shetler, Jr.

Councilmember Ed Bassemier

Councilmember Stephanie Terry

Recorded and transcribed by Teri Lukeman.

**VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL
BUDGET HEARINGS
AUGUST 17, 2010**

The Vanderburgh County Council met in session this 17th day of August, 2010 in room 301 of the Civic Center Complex. The meeting was called to order at 8:30 a.m. by County Council President Russell Lloyd, Jr.

President Lloyd: I would like to convene the opening for the Vanderburgh County budget hearings for 2011. Attendance roll call please.

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

President Lloyd: I would like to ask Councilman Raben to lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance. Please stand.

(The Pledge of Allegiance was given.)

President Lloyd: The mechanics of this, we will have our officeholders present their budgets, also due to the length of our meeting we'll try and get a break in at 10:00 or 10:30, we'll see how the meeting goes. I would like to open up with a few remarks and then we'll get into it. Last year this County Council performed a miracle when we cut the General Fund budget by \$250,000. This year we're going to need to perform another miracle, and we have less to work with. Let me explain. On the revenue side, our property tax revenues are growing maybe a little over one percent at best, and the recession in the general economy is finally hitting county government, and we're going to see that in 2011. We know that the local income tax revenue, which is the one percent that comes out of paychecks in Vanderburgh County is going to be hit hard in 2011. The money that's withheld is remitted to the State of Indiana and then they send it back to us. We know that, in prior years the county has received about \$15 million, we call it COIT, C-O-I-T, and we know this is going to drop two to three million dollars in 2011. Somehow we're going to have to make this shortfall up. I know our County Auditor, Mr. Fluty, is talking to the State trying to get the exact number, but we know it's going to fall by a substantial amount. Miscellaneous revenues are growing, but they're not going to be able to make up this kind of shortfall. So, when we look at this budget we have to realize there's no sacred cows. In the computer area, the requests for hardware and software in our budget is up, the request was a 29 percent increase, we know that's not sustainable. Our computer budget has increased 8.8 percent a year for the past four years, and this Council is going to have to look to find ways to reign this in. In personnel, we have to be committed to right sizing county government. At this point, I feel county government still has too many employees. This Council has implemented a hiring freeze, and I hope we'll continue to do that next year, but it's made us look carefully at open positions and try to find the best combination for county government. We're fortunate that through the conservative actions of this

Council in prior years, we haven't had to make drastic steps of layoffs or firings, but we need to look at all departments in county government, whether it's the courts, whether it's the Sheriff, whether it's other areas, and we need to cut unnecessary employees. If we have revenue streams that will support an employee, we need to use it, whether that's a grant, whether that's miscellaneous revenues that are allowed to be used for employees. It will help our county General Fund if we can find other means to support employees in addition to having our departments look at areas where we can either eliminate employees or go to part time. To summarize, this is going to be another tough budget year. I don't know if we can find money for employee raises, but that's certainly something we're going to try to do. We know our employees did without last year. The old cliché is we need to do more with less. Going forward, in 2011, we're going to continue to ask our employees and our vendors of Vanderburgh County to try to do more with less. Thank you. We'll go on to individual department budgets. Coming up first, if I can find my list here, where is that, oh, the County Treasurer, Mr. Davis.

TREASURER

Rick Davis: Good morning, everybody.

President Lloyd: Good morning.

Councilmember Terry: Good morning.

Rick Davis: Rick Davis, Vanderburgh County Treasurer. For those of you at home, a month ago I gave a very detailed description of our budget for the Council, due to our in-house printing project, so, I will be brief today because you guys have already had the major rundown. Basically, our office has cut nearly \$71,000 out of our budget. We were able to eliminate an employee due to some restructuring. We dropped our printing budget from \$65,000 to \$15,000, which is an 11.9 percent decrease in our budget from last year to this year overall. To eliminate an employee doesn't sound like a lot, but we had only 13 in our office to begin with, and we're now down to 12. There's also a reassessment part time account that we have, we are eliminating it completely. We do not need any part time help. So, that's another savings of \$2,000. So, that's it in a nutshell. I just want to thank the Council for helping me with the printing project. You were very supportive from the very beginning, and you've obviously seen some of the benefits in the first year automatically. I'm very happy to report that basically the \$73,000 savings in our budget and you were a direct result of that. I appreciate it. I would also like to thank my co-workers, because eliminating an employee did put a little more work on everyone in the office. They do a fantastic job, we only have 12 people in there, and I would like to thank them. I get to stand here and take some of the credit for this today, but they deserve all of the credit because they work extremely hard.

President Lloyd: Questions from Council? Mr. Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Rick, on your Printing, you did say, is this correct \$65,000, 2010, and you're requesting for 2011, \$20,000, is that correct?

Rick Davis: I'm actually, I amended that, it's \$15,000.

Councilmember Bassemier: Okay.

President Lloyd: Mr. Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: Rick, truly you have done an outstanding job. Greatly appreciate that. We brought this up when you discussed the printing a couple of weeks ago, I really do feel like it's really important though that we account for the usage of that machine by other departments. What is really under the gun this year is the General Fund. In some of those areas if we can push some of that, those expenses, bring in revenue from other funds, then that would, I think, help us greatly. It may be nickle and diming here or there, but it could be, you know, accurately accounting for another \$30,000, \$40,000, \$50,000, and we're truly trying to look underneath every rock and stone that's out there to see if that's available. So, I don't know if you've put in procedures yet to do that. That was only a couple of weeks ago, but, you know, if not, hopefully, by the first of the year something like that could be implemented.

Rick Davis: Absolutely. I'm open to any suggestions. As I mentioned before at the last meeting, our office has helped out with the Auditor's office in folding some documents, we'll help out the Assessor's office in printing and folding documents. We printed the poll books for the Election Office for the primary. We anticipate doing that again in the General Election, and even the Sheriff has asked our help in printing and folding and stuffing 10,000 tax warrants. So, I'll be able, I'm open to suggestions, and I will try to help out as many departments as I can in that area. I did get some statistics for you guys, you asked last time. The folder/insertor can handle up to ten million fold and stuffs. For the first year so far we're only at 76,000. So, that thing has a long life ahead of it, if we give it proper care and maintenance. The printers that we purchased, I came before this body at the end of last year, I had gone to Old National Bank and they had a couple of earlier models of this particular printer, one of them had five million prints on it, the other had four million prints on it. The two that we have down there now have basically a half a million prints combined on them. So, both of those still have a long life left in them. We also have nine maintenance kits to go in them. We haven't used a single one. You don't use them until you hit 300,000 a piece. So, the maintenance kit is basically like rebuilding an engine and putting in a new transmission in a vehicle, in an automobile. So, the equipment that the county purchased has a long life ahead of it. We'll try to utilize it as much as possible.

President Lloyd: Other questions? Mr. Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Rick, I would like to also thank you for the job you've done and make this Council's job a little bit easier by coming up with cost savings to the county and taxpayer. In the one job that you have not replaced, was that through attrition? You just simply didn't replace that person, instead of letting them go?

Rick Davis: That is correct.

Councilmember Goebel: Thank you.

President Lloyd: Any other questions? Okay, I mean, I would like to also echo what the Councilmember said, we appreciate the cost savings, that you were able to reallocate the work without the employee. It looks like bringing the printing in-house has been quite a benefit to the county. Appreciate that work.

Rick Davis: Thank you.

President Lloyd: Thank you.

Rick Davis: A big thank you to my co-workers. They picked up the load.

President Lloyd: Right.

Rick Davis: Thank you.

President Lloyd: Alright, thanks, Rick.

WEIGHTS & MEASURES

President Lloyd: Next would be Weights and Measures. We had that at the joint budget hearing, unless any other Councilmember had a question on that budget. Mr. Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: I talked with Loretta yesterday, of course, she won't be coming back until September the 1st. She's kind of concerned with her utilities and she's working on that. She, it's going to be a guessing game with her. So, she'll see us in September.

President Lloyd: Right, that was the one thing in the joint budget—

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

President Lloyd: —there was a question about the utilities. Okay, well, hopefully, we'll have better data by then.

SUPERIOR COURT

President Lloyd: Next department, 1370, Superior Court. Judge Dietsch.

Terry Dietsch: Good morning.

President Lloyd: Good morning.

Terry Dietsch: Welcome, Ms. Terry. I haven't had the opportunity to welcome you.

Councilmember Terry: Thank you.

Terry Dietsch: I will be happy to answer any questions that anyone has.

President Lloyd: Page 89. I think most of the increases with the employees would be step increases.

Terry Dietsch: How many step increases?

President Lloyd: I mean, because we asked for flat line to determine....we'll determine whether there's going to be any raises, general raises—

Terry Dietsch: Yes, right.

President Lloyd: —but, I mean, you've got some step increases in here.

Terry Dietsch: We're not addressing that this morning, are we?

President Lloyd: No, no.

Terry Dietsch: Okay.

President Lloyd: Any questions from Council? I guess, one question I would have while the others are looking, page 94 you've got Youth Care Center, large item in the budget. It looks like we're projecting about a \$50,000 increase, one point six million, is that, do you have any other information on that?

Terry Dietsch: No, that's pursuant to the contract.

President Lloyd: Okay.

Terry Dietsch: I might draw the Council's attention to this, 2011, I think will be the last year of that contract between the Council and the Commissioners and the Center.

President Lloyd: Okay.

Terry Dietsch: I presume someone is going to be taking a look at that shortly, after 2011.

President Lloyd: Okay, so, whether the Commissioners want to renew that contract, but we've got to take a look at that, but, obviously, we have to have somewhere to send the young people.

Terry Dietsch: Correct.

President Lloyd: So, okay. Mr. Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Good morning, Judge.

Terry Dietsch: Good morning.

Councilmember Goebel: On page 92 of this book, Court Administrator, it's 1690-1370. That seems to be a larger increase. Do you have that information in front of you?

Terry Dietsch: We did that because that matter is going to have to be taken up with the Job Study people, part of your Council, at a later time. Obviously, that will be adjusted one way or the other.

Councilmember Goebel: Okay, thank you.

President Lloyd: Okay, Superior Court, any other questions before we move on? Mr. Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: Just a couple, the, I guess, the Patient/Inmate Care, I mean, currently for the six months it's been running at about \$122,000, a little bit below the budget, and I noticed that you've got the same budget figure in there from last year. I guess, that's a number that's somewhat fluid that you don't-

Terry Dietsch: It is, and I made a point to take a look at the figures as of the end of July, and we're going to be right on the edge, I think. We may or may not make it, hopefully, we will.

Councilmember Shetler: Okay.

Terry Dietsch: I've discussed this preliminarily with Judge Niemeier, and we're going to make every effort to make certain that amount isn't exceeded.

Councilmember Shetler: The, going back to the youth detention, the one point six, you said that's by contract, does that mean that's per inmate, or is that just a lump sum contract per month?

Terry Dietsch: You're talking about the Youth Care Center?

Councilmember Shetler: Yes.

Terry Dietsch: Yes, no, my, the contract that was negotiated, and it's been a long time since I've looked at it, was negotiated for a sum certain for each of the ten years, and it increased by a certain percentage each year. We are now at the, for 2011, that will be the last year of the contract.

Councilmember Shetler: Right.

Councilmember Raben: I think it....real quick, if I recall, I think we're paying per bed. I think it's 26 beds and there's like a three percent increase annually or something like that within the contract.

Terry Dietsch: Yeah, and the particulars I'm not familiar with, but the contract itself sets out the payment that is to be made each year during the contract and a specific amount.

Councilmember Shetler: So, in other words, if we have fewer inmates, for whatever reason, that isn't going to...we're not going to affect any savings by that?

Terry Dietsch: Correct.

Councilmember Shetler: Okay.

Councilmember Raben: No, but, I think, real quick, I think it was mentioned at one time that there would be possibly credit given if other counties--

Councilmember Shetler: Filled those beds as opposed to us.

Councilmember Raben: Right, we committed initially, or the county committed initially to that set number of beds, but I don't know that we've ever seen any credit given towards other counties taking opportunities of those empty beds. I don't--

Terry Dietsch: Well, I was not a party to that contract. Those issues are things that should be addressed before the next contract is entered into.

Councilmember Shetler: The same thing on Juvenile Home Detention, a budget of \$38,000, and it appears at the six month level it was going below that by some dollars, but do you project that to be—

Terry Dietsch: We never know--

Councilmember Shetler: Right.

Terry Dietsch: —what the population—

Councilmember Shetler: Pretty fluid.

Terry Dietsch: — is going to be. It could turn out, and we hope it's going to turn out to be less than that.

Councilmember Shetler: Right. I guess, the other question I have is on the Law Books, because I noticed, and it seems to me that might be something a little bit more—

Terry Dietsch: That's the perennial question.

Councilmember Shetler: Yeah.

Terry Dietsch: We are attempting to negotiate now a new contract with West Law. We have a preliminary proposal. Whether we're going to be able to accept that or whether we can do better, we don't know at this time. However, last year we asked for \$29,000, Council allowed \$26,000, and we went over that. So, for this year we assumed that \$29,000 and added ten percent to that, because we don't know yet what the costs are going to be for 2011. We're hoping that it's going to be better, but we don't know that.

Councilmember Shetler: Is that like a standard subscription then that you'll pay a monthly or —

Terry Dietsch: No—

Councilmember Shetler: —by quarterly?

Terry Dietsch: These are law books that come in volumes.

Councilmember Shetler: Right.

Terry Dietsch: And, periodically, and we have no control over this, new volumes will be published. In addition, during the year, or during the years, when there's no new volume, pocket parts are printed to keep up with the changes made by the legislature in all the areas of the law. You have to pay for the pocket parts also. So, you know, those things add up, Mr. Shetler.

Councilmember Shetler: Alright, thank you.

President Lloyd: Alright that's contractual with West Law, so it's mainly subscription, right?

Terry Dietsch: Yeah, but–

President Lloyd: On-line subscription for legal?

Terry Dietsch: –what we're trying to do is to get the best price we can.

President Lloyd: Right, and it's multiple terminals all the way through the court system. Okay, other questions on Superior Court?

Councilmember Terry: Can you also tell me on the Home Study/Adoption, there hasn't been any funds expended, but there's a \$10,000 request there?

Terry Dietsch: Well, I checked, and there's another \$1,600 that we haven't added to this yet. We don't know what that's going to be for a year. The reason for that is this, prior to 2010, the cost of the home studies for adoptions, generally, family adoptions for those who could not afford the cost of a home study, and a home study is mandatory, was paid by the State.

Councilmember Terry: Okay.

Terry Dietsch: No longer. So, we're new in the cost end for the county, and we just arbitrarily picked a figure.

Councilmember Terry: Okay.

Terry Dietsch: We hope it's going to be considerably less than the \$10,000 we've requested. We will have a much better idea at the end of the year what to ask for in the future.

Councilmember Terry: Okay, thank you.

President Lloyd: Anything else? Mr. Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: This is a question in general, on page 95, the very first item, Copy Machine Lease, you're requesting \$7,000, it's just not, is this a special type of copy machine that meets your–

Terry Dietsch: Four of them.

Councilmember Goebel: Four of them? Do we have a county-wide program that plans for, just in general, not just for the courts?

Bill Fluty: They're working on that, it's called refresh. I think, Matt Arvay and his group have been working on that to get the county to actually participate in that. The city has gone to kind of a different way of how they look at copy machines, and, I think, he's presented it one time, but we haven't really bought on to the plan yet.

Councilmember Goebel: Okay, it just seems like we might have some cost savings if we do come up with a general plan for the entire, all the offices.

Bill Fluty: In a nutshell, what it is trying to do is reduce copy machines as it evolved with computers over the years, people would have a computer and a copier, or a fax, or a printer at their desk. Now, it's going to try to move back to have a

centralized printer, where you will send that and make your copies from that. It would actually reduce those and the maintenance and the toner and try to reduce costs that way. It's just a different concept than we're familiar with.

Councilmember Goebel: Okay, I hope we continue pursuing that. Thank you.

Terry Dietsch: Mr. Fluty, if either of those options were to occur or a combination of those, would that be on a bid basis?

Bill Fluty: I, you know, I'm not the guy to answer all of these questions. Matt is, and I think, Tim, you're pretty familiar with all of this. He would be your expert in that area.

Terry Dietsch: Well, I was just curious.

Bill Fluty: Uh-huh. I'm kind of on the fringes of it. I think the city is doing that right now, which is reducing "x" amount of printers and copiers and going to a centralized copy machine or printer, and actually people will be coming out of their desks to go to one. There's a savings to that.

Terry Dietsch: Thank you.

President Lloyd: Other questions for Superior Court? Okay, we'll move on to, I guess, Judge, are you going to take the Drug Court?

Terry Dietsch: No. I wasn't aware of that.

President Lloyd: Alright, 13—

SUPERIOR COURT SUPPLEMENTAL ADULT PROBATION

Terry Dietsch: I am going to do the....do you have any questions on the Supplemental?

President Lloyd: Okay, well, let's go on to 2620, Superior Court Supplemental Adult Probation, which is page 145. So, you don't want to jump in on Drug Court? Okay, that's alright.

Terry Dietsch: Well, I will attempt to answer whatever questions you might have.

President Lloyd: Alright, well, let's go to Adult Probation since we've turned the page here. This budget is basically flat. It went up fifty dollars. Any questions? Mainly, these are probation officers that serve the court, serve all the judges?

Terry Dietsch: That's right.

President Lloyd: It looks like most of them—

Terry Dietsch: What we have done over the years is some of the probation fee money, we had used that to bring the salaries in line with the State minimum, and by that we didn't have to use General Fund, County General Fund. So, in effect we saved the county money. I did a calculation years ago, and it was, I think we had saved like \$55,000 or so, and that was years ago.

President Lloyd: So, these employees are full time, but 80 percent or 90 percent of their salary is paid for by fees through the probation?

Terry Dietsch: Well—

President Lloyd: Or fees through the courts?

Terry Dietsch: —their salaries are basically paid like any other employee, however, to bring those salaries in line with what the State required, we augmented those salaries by use of the Probation Users Fee.

President Lloyd: Any questions of Council on this one? Okay. The judge graciously agreed to try to take any questions on Drug Court. That's page 99.

SUPERIOR COURT DRUG COURT

President Lloyd: You can report back to Judge Trockman.

Terry Dietsch: I thought that he was going to be here this morning.

President Lloyd: Okay. This budget is up about \$3,900. It looks like mainly a step increase, employee and insurance, and nothing else really. Any questions on this? Okay.

Terry Dietsch: Step increases are going to be granted?

President Lloyd: Right, those are granted, right, by contract. Okay, thank you very much, Judge Dietsch, appreciate it.

CIRCUIT COURT

President Lloyd: Okay, we'll move on to department 1360, Circuit Court. That's on page 83. We have Judge Heldt here.

Carl Heldt: Good morning.

President Lloyd: Good morning.

Carl Heldt: Members of Council, Carl Heldt, Circuit Court. I also have Karen Angermeier with me, who is our Administrative Assistant. The county, the General Fund budget, I think, is flat, other than step increases. I will be happy to answer any questions you have.

President Lloyd: Okay, 1360, any questions from Councilmembers?

Councilmember Raben: Just a quick question, Judge, as Russ stated at the opening of the meeting, we're going to be making cuts, maybe deeper than we've made in the past few years, and yours being one of the, a fairly large budget, if cuts are necessary to make, do you want to offer any suggestions?

Carl Heldt: You know, I know that I've had employees working weekends on their own time. I sure can't get along with any less, fewer employees. I would like to have more than what I've got.

Councilmember Raben: I'm not referring to employees, but other accounts like supply accounts.

Carl Heldt: Well, we have done something in the past year, haven't we, Karen? (Inaudible) have taken over some things. Tell them what it is, if you would.

Karen Angermeier: Last year we moved approximately \$6,000 in General Fund money of copy machine supplies, which is copy paper into our User Fee budget, along with some copy machine expense last year.

President Lloyd: Okay.

Carl Heldt: We'll sure consider it, but, you know, we've been pretty flat the last couple of years. We're sort of going downhill, I think, and as you said last year no good deed goes unpunished. I appreciate your concerns, and I know what your job is, and all I can say is we'll think about it and if we can help out we will.

President Lloyd: How is your case load compared to prior years? Is it up as well?

Carl Heldt: It's up.

President Lloyd: Mainly in the misdemeanors? Or other things?

Carl Heldt: No, no, I don't have—

President Lloyd: Oh, you don't have misdemeanors.

Carl Heldt: Circuit Court doesn't have misdemeanors. It's the felonies, and I don't know the exact figures, but I know it's up.

President Lloyd: Okay.

Carl Heldt: You can see it in the court calendar and probably in the jail population as well.

President Lloyd: Okay. Just for, even though our population is growing by a small amount, more criminal activity for some reason.

Carl Heldt: Well, at least, maybe they're catching more, I don't know. We had two alarms from the Sheriff about female population, we had another one today or yesterday that the female population is growing to the extent that it's causing a problem, because they've got to dedicate a pod to the females when they get more females than they can handle. So, we have been inventorying the female population to see what we can do to put them on the fast track, some of them, or see if some of them can have their bonds lowered. We did that about a month ago and it looks like we have to do it again. So, it's a concern I know for the Sheriff. He could probably speak to it better than I.

President Lloyd: Okay.

Carl Heldt: I'm give your speech, I guess.

Eric Williams: Keep going.

President Lloyd: Okay. Any other questions on Circuit Court? Mr. Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: I'll go back to the same question I asked considering copy machines, is that for a number of copy machines that you lease, too? You handle that in-house, correct? We don't have a county-wide lease program? Okay, thank you.

Carl Heldt: I would hope that when they look at these printers and copy machines and getting up and walking from place to place, I hope they consider the time cost of having an employee walk, you know, back and forth, a hundred times in a day, away from their desk. I hope they'll think about that.

President Lloyd: Right, that's not—

Carl Heldt: I don't know if you're the person to talk to, but—

Bill Fluty: That's also a concern in my office as well. I know it's being presented, and it's actually a concept of allocating "x" amount of dollars every year for copies, copy leases and then kind of reducing the machines that we have presently.

Carl Heldt: The thing is I have employees spending an hour a day walking back and forth across the office, and I'm not saying that to be the case, I don't know what the case is, I think that would be something that we need to look at.

Bill Fluty: I think that's been discussed. I think what's happening that maybe some of your office personnel can participate and some couldn't is what they're looking at.

Carl Heldt: I assume they're thinking about that.

Bill Fluty: Yes, they are.

President Lloyd: Right, I mean, that's a productivity issue, and sometimes when you walk across the office you have to stop and chat with somebody or whatever. It's a trade off. Any other questions on Circuit Court? Okay. We'll move on to Circuit Court/Supplemental Adult Probation.

CIRCUIT COURT/SUPPLEMENTAL ADULT PROBATION

Carl Heldt: As Judge Dietsch said for their Supplemental, this comes from, the income doesn't come from the county taxpayer at all. It comes from probation user fees. Also, the fees that we are generating from the Department of Correction for the community transition program, which is a program where some inmates are brought back early and placed in an intensive probation program for the last couple of months of their sentence. I think it's flat, except there's a big jump in insurance that you probably have noticed, and I'm told that's because we have some people that weren't on county insurance and now want to be. So, once again, this is, doesn't use county funds.

President Lloyd: Right, and that's page 142, 143 and 144. Right, the insurance jumping about \$40,000. So, you've got some employees that want, by their right want to choose county health insurance. Okay. You've got a vacancy for Probation Officer, is that just someone that's not going to be replaced?

Carl Heldt: We do? Where is that?

President Lloyd: Oh, 1460-2600. It looks like it's not, it's not been a person for several years.

Karen Angermeier: Yeah, that was an employee that retired.

President Lloyd: Okay. Alright.

Councilmember Goebel: Did you not, did you pick up one as well? 1620-2600?

Bill Fluty: (Inaudible. Mic not on.)

Karen Angermeier: A lot of these smaller amounts are due to the judicial center pay guidelines that we have to pay a little bit more. Once you get to the guidelines at 15 years and above, the State minimum is higher than the county's, and that's where you see a lot of these extra amounts come into play, and people with masters degrees.

President Lloyd: Any other questions on Supplemental Adult Probation? Alright, thank you very much, Judge Heldt.

Carl Heldt: I don't want you to think I'm brushing you off on that, but let us look into it.

President Lloyd: Great, thank you much.

CLERK

President Lloyd: Okay, department 1010, County Clerk, page 1. County Clerk, Ms. Susie Kirk.

Susan Kirk: Good morning.

President Lloyd: Good morning. Any questions for the Clerk? Mr. Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: So, I don't guess there's any room for cutting any employees or not filling positions? Trying to be funny here with you this morning.

Susan Kirk: Well, you know, at least we have judges, the Sheriff, me, we can all vouch that the case load is going up. I think the judges, the Sheriff and me, if the case load goes down, will be the first to come up here and try to cut, as I've said every time I've been up here. So, but it is up, it's not, I'm not dreaming this. It's unfortunate that we are busy.

President Lloyd: From 2010 this budget is up \$16,000, not a large increase.

Susan Kirk: We had a few step increases.

President Lloyd: You've got a large increase in Office Supplies, which is on page four.

Susan Kirk: Well, we always have to come back and ask for more.

President Lloyd: Right.

Susan Kirk: We always ask for what we use, and then you give us less and then we come back and have to ask for more.

President Lloyd: You have \$100,000 on Record Storage, which is 3603, is that going to hold? We're with Kinder, the same contract?

Susan Kirk: Yes, we're doing very well. My staff is, as far as destruction of records, so instead of, you know, it keep going up every year now, we've held it....I don't know, this is about our third year now to hold it right at the \$100,000 mark. That includes some of our scanning and microfilming too. So, we're at least getting rid of as much as we're bringing in.

President Lloyd: Okay, by doing scanning and microfilming you're able to destroy paper records?

Susan Kirk: Well, yes and no. The statutes, depending on what the records are, some you have to keep forever, some are like 25 years, some are ten years, you know. Now, there will come a point, I will forewarn you where we will be totally caught up on the destruction of records, and at that point in time, if things still stay the same, with case loads going up or even staying as they are, it would start to back track again and we'll start having to file more than what we're getting rid of, because we'll be, like I said, we'll be pretty well caught up. But, so far we're doing pretty good with that.

President Lloyd: If the offender is a male or female, that doesn't make any difference to you, does it?

Susan Kirk: Well, no, we prefer non-female, non-male and just go home and be nice and not even come to our office, but it looks like the girls are getting in trouble now. That's pretty bad, it used to be it was always the boys.

President Lloyd: Other questions for the Clerk?

Councilmember Shetler: Russ?

President Lloyd: Mr. Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: The Office Supply, or Office Furniture, \$1,000?

Susan Kirk: You know, we just keep that there kind of in case. I don't even think we've even used anything with that this year. It's just, like I said, one of those kind of a back up type thing, if something happened we could go ahead and buy something, but I'm not going to fight you over that one. If you want that \$1,000 have at it, and if we have to get something we'll do the best that we can until we can get Council to approve it.

Councilmember Shetler: Thank you.

President Lloyd: Mr. Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: The Maintenance Contract, request for \$20,000, exactly what is that?

Susan Kirk: It's printers that we have over there, for the most part. Right, Tim? It's pretty well the printers?

Councilmember Goebel: 3540.

Susan Kirk: It's pretty well printers.

Councilmember Goebel: Maintenance Contract.

Susan Kirk: The maintenance contract for the printers. We have, of course, we have one kind of big one, and, then, again, almost everybody has one, but they're not maintenance, it's the big ones that we actually do the maintenance on. Misdemeanor Traffic, they have a bigger one down there. I'm not too sure what some of the other is, but I will check with Tracy and get you a line item list of exactly what those maintenance costs are, but they are, that's what we pay. That's not a, you know, padded amount. That's what we pay, but I will get the Council, I can e-mail you, like I said, an itemized list of exactly what that \$20,000 goes to. I'll even give you the printer number.

Councilmember Goebel: That's fine. It just looks like maybe less was expended than the amount that you had requested over the past few years, not by a whole lot.

Susan Kirk: Well, and this is why, because of my administrator, Tracy, she is always checking to see who's got the best deals. During that time we have switched, you know, like they may have another printer that's less maintenance costs, maybe you get more copies, toner is cheaper. She's continually doing that. So, that's why sometimes that's a little bit cheaper is because she's a good shopper.

Councilmember Goebel: Tell her to keep up the work.

Susan Kirk: We certainly will.

President Lloyd: Other questions? Ms. Terry?

Councilmember Terry: I just have a question for clarification, just for personal knowledge, Extra Help, can you explain that to me just a bit? Then, I guess, in relation to, I think you're eliminating a Bookkeeper/Clerk?

Susan Kirk: The Extra Help, the line item that was the one that was eliminated?

Councilmember Terry: Uh-huh.

Susan Kirk: We use that as part time help.

Councilmember Terry: Okay.

Susan Kirk: That's our part time person.

Councilmember Terry: Okay.

President Lloyd: Other questions? Okay, I guess, the Council's satisfied with that. We'll move on to 1210, Election Office, page 60.

ELECTION OFFICE

Susan Kirk: Well, at least we've saved over \$200,000 there by switching companies. So, I'm happy about that one. Always remember, the city pays us back for this one.

President Lloyd: Right, this is 2011, so the budget, \$431,000, and the city, all of that staff use the city would pay for.

Susan Kirk: Yes, they, if you'll notice, especially line item Contractual Services, 3530, they will pay that also, because the billing system, the way it is now, compared to what ES&S was, it's very definitive as to what each year, what those Contractual Services are for that election. Always before it was a little difficult to bill the city, you know, figuring it out was kind of a guesstimate, but now we know, for a fact, and I told them this is what you need to budget. So, we will be reimbursed for that, for the whole thing.

President Lloyd: And, there's several others around the state using that same vendor, right? And that's worked out well?

Susan Kirk: Yes, it's, and it will, a lot of them folded just because ES&S waiting, you know, they kept waiting until the last minute, but what, three of us held out. I think when the other counties that are using ES&S, when those contracts are up, they will move on to RBM so that they can have a cost saving and actually know what it is going to cost. We did even save a little bit of money from what they projected. Not much, but a few thousand dollars, just from RBM from the primary election.

Councilmember Raben: Did we, back to Contractual Services, do we need to even budget that since we're being reimbursed?

Bill Fluty: In the past you've budgeted some portion of that, probably 50 percent of that, and then, for the primary, and I think the primary is a little cheaper as I remember, but not much. I think Susie can tell you where she spends the most money. Then, they reimburse us somewhere in June or July and we put that money back in for the fall election. So, that's been done in the past. It's just how you would like to do it.

Susan Kirk: We basically just send them a bill.

Bill Fluty: Yes.

Susan Kirk: It's all itemized and they pay as you go.

Councilmember Raben: Next year is a city election, though.

Bill Fluty: That's what I'm talking about. Well, but you need the money before you're going to get, you're not going to get the rest of it back until after November. So, she needs up front money to handle the primary, then we'll bill them for the November, but bottom line, you're going, you know—

Councilmember Raben: (Inaudible. Mic not on.)

Bill Fluty: With direction here, because I think, I don't think it's as simple as taking each one of these line items and cutting it in half.

Susan Kirk: That's correct.

Bill Fluty: Because you spend differently.

Susan Kirk: Sometimes, actually the primaries can cost us a little bit more, only because we have to open like in February because we have filing and different things to do just to prepare for the year. Whereas in the general election we open the day after Labor Day. So, there's less time, but then sometimes more employees. It would be, I'm like Bill, I guess, half and half, but I would be kind of afraid just to cut it in half and then have to come back and get more money. We're going to get reimbursed. Of course, it's all taxpayers money, so it's kind of—

Councilmember Raben: Yeah, I know—

Susan Kirk: —immaterial.

Councilmember Raben: —I'm just trying to remember what we did in the past. I think the last city election we didn't budget for. I don't think we included it in the budget.

Susan Kirk: You didn't. I'm just telling you what this budget is. Okay? Then, now if you want me to, I can go back and give you....say if we even did maybe two thirds, if we could do two thirds of this and have a little buffer. If you want to cut that back, that's fine, by two thirds. I can go through here and whittle it down or just take a third out of every line item, if you want to. Or I'll do it for you. Then we can get reimbursed and finish out the year. But, I can't turn in, you know, I have to turn in the whole budget, what it's going to cost for the year.

President Lloyd: I think it's helpful to have the whole cost of that contract, and then we need to decide how we're going to handle that. Mr. Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: Question for anybody, has the unification committee decided exactly if it's going to '11 or '12 yet on the referendum?

Susan Kirk: I was going to say, it's '12.

Councilmember Shetler: I mean, is that a definitive—

Susan Kirk: Well—

Councilmember Shetler: —because I know that they pushed it off from '10, but I don't know, I didn't know if they defined that.

Susan Kirk: Well, the reason being is, if they, and I assume this is part of it, I shouldn't just automatically say, but if they have the referendum in the city, then I've got to redo this budget, because—

Councilmember Shetler: That's my point.

Susan Kirk: –we don't have all–

Councilmember Shetler: Right.

Susan Kirk: – of that.

Councilmember Shetler: Yeah.

Susan Kirk: It was my understanding, just from what I've heard and seen, is that they are going to wait until, if they couldn't get it on this one, they were going to wait until 2012, just cost effective, the whole county, so forth and so on. What's one more year? So, that's the way I understand it, unless something drastic changes.

Councilmember Shetler: So, let me, so the way you're understanding that is that if the referendum would be on the ballot in '11, the county would have to absorb the entire cost of the election? Is that what you're saying?

Susan Kirk: Well, now, no, no, no, no.

Councilmember Shetler: Okay.

Susan Kirk: What we would have to absorb would be–

Councilmember Shetler: Would be the county outlying.

Susan Kirk: –the county precincts. Now then, I can't tell you, normally the city pays for this. It's a city election. I'm not going to say that somebody from the city's not going to come to you and say, well, hey, you've got a county thing on there, and maybe you ought to at least pay part of it. I'm not going there. That would be up to probably the President of the Council and the President of the City Council to decide that, but they always have paid for it in the past. So, I think the thing to do, and the thing to look forward to is they are going to pay this amount for the city. If there is a referendum, the county then is going to have to pick up the county precincts–

Councilmember Shetler: Right.

Susan Kirk: –and pay for the polling places. We'll have to, you know, absentee ballots, it will just be one of those things to where it's going to be a lot more work for us to keep track of what did we do in the county, so that we're not, you know, getting things mixed up. Like I said, absentee ballots, stuff like that that we send to the county.

Councilmember Shetler: Underneath the Rent, you're showing that you paid out on a scale of about \$7,300 for this year. Yet, for next year you have it budgeted for \$4,600.

Susan Kirk: That's right, because it's a city election–

Councilmember Shetler: Right.

Susan Kirk: –and there's fewer polling places.

Councilmember Shetler: Okay, that's just rent for the polling places. I'm thinking about the rent for the Election Office itself. Is that in there then?

Susan Kirk: No, the Building Authority, I don't know who pays that. The County Commissioners pay that.

Councilmember Raben: That's in the Commissioners.

Susan Kirk: All this is for polling places. This would be, you know, if it's like a public place, a library is \$15—

Councilmember Shetler: Right.

Susan Kirk: —a private place, a church, \$50.

Councilmember Shetler: Yeah, I understand.

Susan Kirk: Of course, you know, that's what that is. So, it's less because there's less precincts.

Councilmember Shetler: Alright, thank you.

President Lloyd: The reorganization, the only thing I would add to that, to do it in 2011 we would have to have a change in State law. The way the ordinance was written, it was in a general election year, and a city election is a different type of election. It's a special election.

Susan Kirk: A municipal election they call them.

President Lloyd: So, but, I mean, our legislators could do that. It would kind of be up to the committee. I don't know, I don't think we'll have the information by the time we need to finish this budget. But, we'll kind of watch that and see. Right now it would have to be 2012. They could do '11, but the legislature would have to have help on that. Then, the county would have to pay their portion, and whether the county could do vote centers or something, hopefully, something cheaper than a general election. The county, you're just talking about one question.

Susan Kirk: We are, until the State allows any more counties to participate in vote centers, I've got some of the information. Grant you, there would be up front costs, it would be a while before we could save any money, but that's what we really want to do. But, it's, I don't know, I can't remember if it's the Senate or the House that keeps holding that up. Also, I want to let you know that we are, more than likely, we're probably about 80 percent sure that we are going to try to do the late fee, remember I, on the courts, late court costs. Remember me sending you that stuff out?

President Lloyd: Yes.

Susan Kirk: Yes.

President Lloyd: Yes, I remember.

Susan Kirk: Okay. It is more work for the staff to do that. The gal, and I can't think of which county it is right off hand, she sent me quite a bit of information. What they did was, for the money that was generated, their Council allowed them to keep 40 percent of that to actually do the work. So, the county was picking up 60 percent. I don't know exactly how much money it's going to be yet, but I think it's going to be quite a bit. Also, I'm trying to see, because we have Capital Recovery, we've had them for several years that's brought in, gosh, probably close to \$250,000. We just get a check every now and then for late fees and child support, the administration costs, not, you know, fathers that aren't paying, but I'm going to see if there's some way that maybe Capital Recovery, if there's some way we can get like an interface or whatever for them to do it. Then, that way, the county just gets the whole shabang. We're talking, you know, I'm sure it would end up being around \$100,000 a year. So, that will help quite a bit too.

President Lloyd: I think it was Porter County that was doing that. Does that sound right? On the late fees.

Susan Kirk: It could be. Porter, I know, we dealt with elections so much, I'm still, I'm getting my election and some of the County Clerk stuff....it may have been. But, she's, like I said, she said that that's what their county decided to do was go ahead and do it. The judges are in agreement, they had a meeting, and they agreed that, yes, we're going to try to do that, it's just that we have to change around some of the practices and some of the computer, you know, stuff to do it. But, hopefully, I hope that by next year we're going to be up and running with it. So, that will just generate extra dollars.

President Lloyd: What would be an example of a late fee? Would it be someone that's late paying a fine?

Susan Kirk: Yes.

President Lloyd: And, it would be a \$25 late fee?

Susan Kirk: The judges will work with that, and probably work with you also. Are you the liaison just for the courts, or just me?

President Lloyd: Jim Raben.

Susan Kirk: They'll probably be working with both of you up front, you know, just to kind of see what we want to do here with it when we get to it. We're just not quite there yet. We're just trying to figure out the procedures and how we can implement it with not enough staff.

President Lloyd: The Commissioners are over fees. So, I think they would have to approve it as well, like when they do the fees.

Susan Kirk: Yeah, there's quite a little dog and pony show that we have to go through just to get to where we can begin. But, I just want to be sure and have, you know, everything lined up, costs, duties, what do we have to do, to be sure that, you know, we're not missing something. But, that will generate some money. It's coming, just not quite yet.

President Lloyd: Did you have, Mr. Goebel, a question?

Councilmember Goebel: Back to the Election Office, if the referendum would come to play next year, do you have any definite idea of how much that would cost the county itself to set up the voting places outside the city limits?

Susan Kirk: If you look at last year's budget, I don't have that with me, but that would give you just about what that would cost. Because it would be the county, I don't, off the top of my head—

Councilmember Goebel: No, I mean, could you find that out and give us that information?

Susan Kirk: Oh, absolutely. I will e-mail you the budget that we had last year, and, well, yeah, and it will show you...and the polling places. The polling places, the workers, the inspectors, judges, clerks, it says what that is for all 131 precincts, and you can see what the difference is.

Councilmember Goebel: Well, I would think that would be reduced, because it's only one question for the people in Vanderburgh County living outside of the city.

Susan Kirk: I know.

Councilmember Goebel: It would just be a one question ballot.

Susan Kirk: You would think that it would, but you still have to have the judge, two judges, two clerks, an inspector. You still have to have the four, of course, that doesn't cost to put the machines out there, but, no, you still have to go through all of that if you only have one teeny, tiny thing on the ballot. You still have to do it. It's the law.

Councilmember Goebel: Okay, I think that would be good for public knowledge to see what the cost would be.

Susan Kirk: Okay, I'll do that.

Councilmember Goebel: Especially for a special referendum.

Susan Kirk: I'll give you the difference. Do you want it broke down into each one?

Councilmember Goebel: No, just the general ball park figure what it would cost the county.

Susan Kirk: Uh-huh.

President Lloyd: Can you tell us how many precincts are in the county?

Susan Kirk: I knew you were going to ask that question. In the county, just outside county?

President Lloyd: Yes. Outside the city.

Susan Kirk: Maybe, let's see, probably 40.

President Lloyd: 40-ish?

Susan Kirk: Armstrong, Center is ten, German is seven, Knight is four, Perry is ten, Scott, five and Union. Did anybody add that up?

President Lloyd: Roughly 40.

Susan Kirk: There you go.

President Lloyd: Well, and if you went to vote centers, that cost is going to be less. According to this budget book, in 2010 we expended \$98,000, that doesn't sound right, does it?

Susan Kirk: Just for what?

President Lloyd: Oh, that's half a year, I'm sorry. 2008 we spent \$241,000 on elections, and that was Presidential, so it was probably a little bit more expensive.

Susan Kirk: It is, where you come into larger voter turn out is basically absentees and stuff like that. Although, because of our libraries, we voted 27,000 people early in 2008. So, and we, that's not paper, that's actually going to the libraries and voting on the machines. Of course, we had to pay the staff, and we will have that again this year. We'll have the libraries open, I'm going to figure, go back through here again, maybe instead of 15 days, maybe ten. If it's not going to work, maybe a week before the election just to make sure that we've got the money to fund that. So, but we will have the early voting.

President Lloyd: But, I think, if you went to vote centers that cost would go down. So, but, if you could do five or six vote centers for those 40 precincts—

Susan Kirk: Oh, my gosh.

President Lloyd: —it would save quite a bit of money.

Susan Kirk: Yeah, it's, the way they have it now, for every 10,000 voters you're supposed to have a vote center. Although, the three counties that are doing it have more vote centers than that.

President Lloyd: Yeah.

Susan Kirk: Because that's really, you know, and your cost is, obviously, we need up to date, we would have to have laptops in every one of the vote centers, more than one laptop, and the software to go with that. So, that's really your cost there, but you're going to save, in the long run, you're going to save quite a bit of money. So, because the libraries have just been so gracious to let us use their facilities for free. We are the only county in Indiana with six, including the Election Office are (Inaudible) sites.

President Lloyd: (Inaudible) combining them. Okay, a lot of questions there that are probably beyond the scope of this hearing. Any other questions on the Election Office? Alright, thank you so much, Mrs. Kirk.

Susan Kirk: Okay, thank you, and when I come back, remember the judge, Sheriff, everybody said numbers are up. When I come back to fill my employee position,

unless you just want to let me go ahead and do that today so we can actually start working.

President Lloyd: Can't do it today.

VOTER REGISTRATION

President Lloyd: Voters Registration, 1220, which is on page 62.

Tony Bushrod: This is Connie Carrier, I'm Tony Bushrod, we're with the Voter Registration Office. I'm sure you all don't have any questions. It's the same as last year.

President Lloyd: Questions from Councilmembers on Voters Registration? Yeah, this budget is a flat budget. Although, there's one item floating around, the letter from the Secretary of State.

Tony Bushrod: That's being worked on.

President Lloyd: Okay, well—

Tony Bushrod: You all don't have time for it right now.

President Lloyd: No, if you want to just give us an update on it.

Tony Bushrod: (Inaudible).

President Lloyd: Okay. I don't know if, was that distributed to Council?

Sandie Deig: I have them here.

President Lloyd: Oh, okay. Go ahead and distribute them please.

Connie Carrier: Basically, what the State mandates, now they want money for.

President Lloyd: In a nutshell, the federal government had been reimbursing states—

Connie Carrier: They ran out of money.

President Lloyd: —for voter registration lists, a state-wide list, which is what we're on, we've been on for several years. Now, we've got a letter from the Secretary of State asking that the county, if you look at page two, they're asking Vanderburgh County to fund approximately \$66,695 for maintaining the state-wide list. Did you guys have—

Connie Carrier: The Election Office too.

President Lloyd: Okay.

Tim Van Cleave: Which is why I'm involved.

President Lloyd: Okay, do you guys have anything to update on this?

Tim Van Cleave: Fundamentally, if you look into that, there's also another \$11,000 charge that they want in the last attachment for network connectivity. We believe that we could probably reduce that by letting the Election Office go onto the city-county network. There would be some licensing charges that the State did not pick up when they initially purchased those for connectivity licenses. These are Microsoft products. Then, with the removal of that state network connection, it would probably be prudent to also have a back up internet connection for election day and election night activities, in the event that our primary provider should have a failure, we would have a fall back to a different provider to try to connect to. That back up would be less than the \$11,000 that the State is wanting to charge for theirs at present pricing.

President Lloyd: Where they're coming up with this, I guess, on page seven it's got Vanderburgh County total voters 137,061, percent of the whole state's voters, 3.2 percent. They, I guess, they prorated that two million dollars through every county, and they would prorate Vanderburgh for \$66,695.

Tim Van Cleave: They are basing that—

President Lloyd: Based on voters?

Tim Van Cleave: —on past years support costs. That's making the assumption that the vendor that supports the State application does not have an increase. So, it is typical for three to six percent increase in software maintenance costs (Inaudible).

President Lloyd: It says voters as of July 2010, so would that be our registered voters for Vanderburgh? Is that what—

Connie Carrier: Yes.

President Lloyd: Okay, so, we're at 137,000?

Connie Carrier: Yes.

Councilmember Kiefer: Mr. President?

President Lloyd: Yes, Mr. Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: I think, also it says from July 1, 2011 to June 30, 2012, so it looks like our potential expense would be half of that \$66,695, instead of the whole amount.

President Lloyd: Right, that's a good point. I guess, they're fitting that to the State's budget year. It starts July 1.

Tim Van Cleave: That's assuming they don't bill it all at one time.

Councilmember Kiefer: Oh, okay.

Tim Van Cleave: That's where we get into that difficulty in the State budget.

Councilmember Kiefer: So, you're saying they could bill us the entire amount this year, instead of prorated over the two years.

Tim Van Cleave: In 2011. They have the funds to cover this year.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay.

Tim Van Cleave: What they're trying to do is put a notice out for the county governments to know that if the State does not fund this software initiative, that that cost will fall back to the counties. It is possible that the State legislature will fully fund this.

Councilmember Kiefer: So, we need to contact our State legislators, basically?

Tim Van Cleave: That was the first paragraph of the letter.

Councilmember Kiefer: Right.

President Lloyd: Okay, then, Tim, you had indicated the, page nine, Vanderburgh's cost on the SVRS Network Solution. You think we could take that in-house and save that \$11,000?

Tim Van Cleave: Yes. I believe the network connectivity licensing that the Voters Registration would need is about \$225-\$230 a computer. So, somewhere around \$1,100-\$1,200. That's a one time cost. If we are able to do the enterprise agreement plan with Microsoft for the whole county, then we wouldn't have to necessarily come up with this specific money out of this budget. That would come out of the Computer Services budget for the enterprise agreements. Then, like I said, it would be wise to have a back up internet connection, because once, right now the back up plan if the city-county network was to go down on election day, our plans are to go down to the Voters Registration Office and use their State connection as our back up. During the day there are questions about where polling sites are, and if somebody is a valid voter, if you can't access the election system on election day, you can't direct those voters to the proper place. So, that is very important to have that connection to the State website. They are in and out of that all day long on election day. Then, of course, we use it to post the results to the internet at night.

President Lloyd: So, this letter, at this point, is a proposal from the Secretary of State? It still has to be enacted by the legislature? Any other questions on this? Mr. Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: Not on this, I do have a question for both Connie and Tony. I know that in the last several years we have taken an ax to your department fairly sharply, particularly in the Deputy areas and stuff. I kind of, am somewhat familiar with the operation or the office, if any office, I guess, is in this building seasonal, it would seem to me that the Voters Registration Office has a lot of down time.

Tony Bushrod: No.

Councilmember Shetler: There's certainly some—

Connie Carrier: No, we don't anymore.

Councilmember Shetler: Well, there's certainly some very hectic times of the year when registration is going on and other things, but, I think, there's a few times during the year that it slows down or mellows out. I'm just wondering if it wouldn't be more prudent for us to look at trying to supplement our full time Deputies with a couple part time people, particularly in those busy times. Perhaps, instead of having just two Deputies, maybe we would have, end up with four Deputies at a part time or seasonal type of job that could afford some savings here to the county in the long run, both through reduction in benefits and reduction in actual outlay, you know, dollars per hour.

Tony Bushrod: Are you finished?

Councilmember Shetler: Yes.

Tony Bushrod: We register people, people die every day, people move every day, people go to jail every day, we must upkeep these records on a daily basis, the voter registration records for Vanderburgh County. People register just to come in to get I.D., to go to the license branches to get I.D.'s. A voter registration card is one of the first things that they need when they go to get I.D.'s. We're always busy.

Councilmember Shetler: Alright, I understand registration is an on-going process to some degree, but there are busier times than others. I mean, you get a push by both parties, you know, prior to the election, and I don't remember the exact windows that you have to actually do it, but there are voters registration drives that certainly have an impact on new registrations that are there.

Tony Bushrod: There has been in the past.

Councilmember Shetler: Yeah. How many registered voters do you have right now on the rolls?

Tony Bushrod: About 134,000-135,000, it changes daily.

Councilmember Shetler: Yeah, and, see, we have, what, a population count and kids and everything of 170,000. So, I mean, we're not taking those people's, we're not updating the list, you know, I don't think on a daily basis as it is.

Tony Bushrod: The lists are updated daily. We receive death notices from the State, we receive incarcerations from the county.

Councilmember Shetler: Is that all kind of electronically done?

Connie Carrier: Yes.

Councilmember Shetler: You know, automated.

Tony Bushrod: Yeah, in a hopper, yeah.

Councilmember Shetler: Right.

Tony Bushrod: And, that has to be processed.

Councilmember Shetler: Right.

Tony Bushrod: In a timely manner.

Councilmember Shetler: Right, I don't know if you guys were here in the beginning, but as Councilman Lloyd pointed out, we are in a very difficult situation this year.

Tony Bushrod: We understand that.

Councilmember Shetler: We've been really very unique among other counties in the State in that we have not laid anyone off, and that we have not been in a position here to have to ask for, you know, real drastic reductions in anything, and yet we've been able to maintain a balance. We are going to be hit with a three million dollar deficit in our COIT account, which is going to impact the General Fund. We need to look for some areas for making some cuts and to try to do what we can to make it, yet at the same time be very efficient. I don't know that this is going to be a great savings to switch it from some part time people to full time people, but I would estimate that you're probably looking at at least \$30,000 that could be saved by trying to augment the full time people, the two full time people with some part time seasonal workers.

Connie Carrier: It's too intense to try to train part time people. We had to go to Ivy Tech for training on this computer.

Councilmember Shetler: Right. What you end up with though, in a lot of cases, particularly, you know, there are regular people who want to come back year after year. You have that in the Election Office, I mean, we have people that you can pretty well count on that year after year they're going to be back. Maybe, you know, one doesn't show up out of the four, or five, or six, but it tends to be a fairly good thing for them. The timing is right. It's mom's that want to be home with their kids when they're out after school, it's, you know, maybe some early retirees, but there are plenty of people out there looking for that kind of work.

Connie Carrier: We've always invited any of you to come down and see what we do and no one ever has. I think you get the impression we're, we don't do much.

Councilmember Shetler: No, I'm not saying that—

Connie Carrier: You did.

Councilmember Shetler: —I'm just, I'm saying that I'm not so sure that we can't make that office a little more cost effective by using some part time rather than a couple of the full times that we have there. That's all. I'm not indicating that you guys are sitting on, your know, your thumbs.

Tony Bushrod: That's your opinion, right?

Councilmember Shetler: Pardon?

Tony Bushrod: That's your opinion?

Councilmember Shetler: Yes, that is correct. Yes, it is my opinion.

Tony Bushrod: Okay.

Councilmember Shetler: Alright.

President Lloyd: Let me ask a question, and I've had conversations with you in the past, both of you, the State computer, it's slower than what we had before, isn't it? Or is it? Or have they gotten all of the bugs worked out of it?

Connie Carrier: Right now they're like, what, five years old?

Tony Bushrod: Yeah.

Connie Carrier: And they are very slow.

Tony Bushrod: At certain times of the day, you know—

Connie Carrier: We have to restart it.

President Lloyd: Okay.

Tony Bushrod: So, you know, while that's coming back up, we're filing, doing transfers, death notices.

President Lloyd: Because when you're making changes, that's going into that State data base.

Tony Bushrod: Right.

Connie Carrier: Yes.

President Lloyd: Right, okay. So, is that real time where if you made a change in the morning it would be available in the afternoon?

Tony Bushrod: Yes.

President Lloyd: '08 was extremely busy.

Tony Bushrod: Right.

President Lloyd: How did you guys get by in '08?

Connie Carrier: Two part time helpers.

President Lloyd: Okay.

Connie Carrier: Mostly they filed.

President Lloyd: Okay.

Tony Bushrod: Then we came in on Saturdays and Sundays.

President Lloyd: Okay.

Tony Bushrod: Connie and I.

President Lloyd: Okay, then, so '11 you'll have a city election, which the last city election you had the two extra people as full time Deputies. So, I guess, we'll have to see how that goes.

Tony Bushrod: Okay.

President Lloyd: Any other questions? Mr. Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yeah, just a question, Tony, you mentioned that folks come in to get voter registration cards prior to getting identification?

Connie Carrier: Yes.

Tony Bushrod: Right, they come in to register to vote.

Connie Carrier: To get a drivers license or I.D.

Tony Bushrod: To get a drivers license or I.D.

Councilmember Raben: That seems like a hole in the bucket to me.

Connie Carrier: We've been getting a lot of those.

Tony Bushrod: Yeah.

Councilmember Raben: How do we give voters registration cards to people without identification?

Tony Bushrod: State law.

Connie Carrier: The last four digits of your social security number.

Tony Bushrod: Now, if they send something through the mail, then they've got to show proof, but, I mean, they can come in and not have anything.

Councilmember Raben: The last four digits of their social security number?

Connie Carrier: Uh-huh.

Tony Bushrod: Right.

Councilmember Raben: You don't even have to have the whole social security number?

Connie Carrier: We (Inaudible) both, social security number. The system will tell us if they are dead or alive.

Councilmember Raben: That's a little scary.

Connie Carrier: The federal Social Security website too. That's how we know.

Councilmember Raben: It seems like an invitation for voter fraud. Okay, thanks, but it's State law, huh?

Connie Carrier: State law.

Tony Bushrod: Yeah.

President Lloyd: So, if you put in that number though—

Connie Carrier: It will come up, what is it, alive, deceased—

Tony Bushrod: Right.

Connie Carrier: — doesn't recognize.

Tony Bushrod: Right.

President Lloyd: Okay, but anyway someone could come in and if they give you a social security number, let's say I had lost all of my I.D., I need a voter registration card, and if that number doesn't show as a match with anything, then you have to issue a card to them?

Tony Bushrod: Or they may already be registered—

President Lloyd: Okay.

Tony Bushrod: —and just getting a copy of their card.

President Lloyd: Okay.

Connie Carrier: Just to try and get an Indiana drivers license or I.D.

President Lloyd: Does that happen very often?

Tony Bushrod: Yes.

Connie Carrier: It happens a lot.

Tony Bushrod: On a daily basis.

Connie Carrier: (Inaudible) changed their, excuse me, recommendations to get a drivers license or I.D., you need extra identification.

President Lloyd: Okay, well, that's the keys to the kingdom, right, a drivers license? Any other questions? Alright, thank you very much. 1371, Drug and Alcohol Deferral Service, page 97.

DRUG AND ALCOHOL DEFERRAL SERVICE

Deloris Koch: Good morning, Deloris Koch, Program Director. We've asked for no increases except one step increase for an employee. No other changes.

President Lloyd: Right, and this budget increased approximately \$2,900, which is the step increase that you indicated.

Deloris Koch: Yes.

President Lloyd: Any questions for Ms. Koch? Mr. Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: This is a question that's come up the last few years, Rent?

Deloris Koch: Right.

Councilmember Shetler: Alright.

Deloris Koch: So far, talking to the landlord I don't anticipate any changes in the rent—

Councilmember Shetler: Where are you currently?

Deloris Koch: —over next year.

Councilmember Shetler: Are you still in the old—

Deloris Koch: We're still in the old court, in the Court Building.

Councilmember Shetler: In the Court Building across from the Courthouse?

Deloris Koch: Yes.

Councilmember Shetler: Okay.

Deloris Koch: But, it's not the court office building, it's called the Landmark Building actually.

Councilmember Shetler: Right.

Deloris Koch: We're still there. So far I don't anticipate changes in the lease agreement.

Councilmember Shetler: You know, once again, my issue with this, and, I know, I think, Joe, you may have worked on this last year—

Councilmember Kiefer: Yeah.

Councilmember Shetler: —checking on it and stuff.

Councilmember Kiefer: Ed and I met with her, and I went through the property. I mean, it's a cheap deal, but the issue is, is we've got all of this vacant space in the Civic Center.

Councilmember Shetler: Well, we have the Old Courthouse that we're maintaining that's, I don't know what the occupancy rate there is, but it's huge.

President Lloyd: It's at least 50 percent vacant.

Councilmember Shetler: Or, yeah, the vacancy rate. Then, this building here is, you know, we've got some issues here that we're having to absorb. I hate spending \$15,000 outside of, to, you know, for anyone else for any other reason. I understand

the issues before, the privacies and some other issues, but I just, again, you know, we've got a tough time here and we need to look at everything we possibly can.

Councilmember Kiefer: I think making a switch long term would save us some money, but I have a feeling that initial switch, this year, if she went to the Old Courthouse we probably would end up spending more than \$15,000 making the move, but long term, obviously, it saves us money over the course of several years.

Deloris Koch: My biggest question is who foots the cost to prepare the space for our moving in? Who's going to remodel, refurbish, refurnish whatever area we may be moving to?

Councilmember Kiefer: That's what I meant by the initial cost of the move would probably exceed the \$15,000.

Deloris Koch: Does that come out of my budget or your budget? You also spoke, I believe, with Mr. Rector—

Councilmember Kiefer: Yeah.

Deloris Koch: —about space here in the Civic Center and the expense there.

Councilmember Kiefer: It's kind of the chicken or the egg type deal, I mean, you know, we could spend the money and it's going to exceed the \$15,300, but it would save us money, you know, year three, four and five, you know, down the road it's going to save us the money.

Councilmember Shetler: But, we, you know, keep in mind, we are paying rent in this building for vacant space.

Councilmember Kiefer: No, it's the move cost.

Councilmember Shetler: I understand that, I understand that, but, we are already paying the rent on this building for the vacant space, space that's not being occupied, the county is absorbing that.

Councilmember Kiefer: And, we still have expenses to operate the Old Courthouse too.

Councilmember Shetler: That's right.

Councilmember Kiefer: I mean, there's no question. I mean, I'm in favor of making a move, it's just that we're going to have some initial costs to make the move that would probably be greater than the \$15,300.

Councilmember Shetler: Right.

Councilmember Kiefer: But, it's worth it for the long run.

Councilmember Shetler: I think that's an investment worth looking at, and biting that bullet. Otherwise, we're going to keep putting this off year after year, and keep piling up the \$15,000. To me, it's just not making sense.

Deloris Koch: I think, maybe, a kind of a longer term plan on making that transition would be a good idea to plan ahead.

Councilmember Kiefer: Deloris, if you're open to it, I mean, I would be glad to reinstate some meetings and we could look at a couple at either the Courthouse, the Old Courthouse or the Civic Center to come up with a plan, and we'll just have to, like Councilman Shetler said, we would have to bite the bullet for this year if we did that.

Jeff Ahlers: I don't know what the security is here in the Civic Center, so the Old Courthouse might be, because they have night classes, right?

Deloris Koch: We don't, we're not presently doing any evening—

Jeff Ahlers: Oh, okay.

Deloris Koch: —at our office. We use contract agencies outside to do those now. That's not so much a concern these days.

Councilmember Kiefer: The thing about....it's probably a discussion for another day, but I think the space that Dave Rector has available that that could be segregated because it has separate entrances, so, I mean, you could actually do something with that space and segregate it from the rest of the Civic Center. So, that way maybe it would eliminate the security issue, because they could close off access to the rest of the Civic Center. Because they have their own separate entrance. I mean, that's a discussion for another day.

President Lloyd: Mr. Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: I talked with Dave Rector yesterday, of course, he's going to be here tomorrow, but he's trying to get with the Commissioners as we speak to set up another meeting to talk with us to try to see what we can do with the old jail and other entities that's outside the, like her office, and try to bring them inside. So, he's, and we can ask him tomorrow, he'll be here.

President Lloyd: That was going to be my question, is, it's the Commissioners are the ones that sign the rent contract? Or do you know?

Deloris Koch: The rent contract?

President Lloyd: Yeah.

Deloris Koch: No, I don't think the Commissioners signed it. We, I signed it—

President Lloyd: Okay.

Deloris Koch: —and we submitted it for approval.

President Lloyd: To the Commissioners?

Deloris Koch: Yes.

President Lloyd: Okay, so, you signed it with the Landmark Building?

Deloris Koch: Yes, sir, or with Youth, Incorporated is the landlord now.

Councilmember Shetler: Yeah. When is the term of that?

President Lloyd: Yeah, when does it expire?

Deloris Koch: Right now we're going on a month-to-month agreement on the previous lease.

President Lloyd: And, they agreed to hold the rent steady at this point?

Deloris Koch: They haven't—

President Lloyd: Oh, they haven't agreed to that?

Deloris Koch: They haven't indicated any thinking that they might increase anything at this point.

President Lloyd: Okay, well, we, I think, Mr. Kiefer and Mr. Bassemier, if you guys could work on that. Obviously, the Commissioners are the operational head on this.

Councilmember Shetler: In the meantime, I would like to see us, if we can, hold off on signing, making any kind of an agreement on that until we get this resolved.

Deloris Koch: (Inaudible) long term lease.

Councilmember Shetler: Yes.

Deloris Koch: Sure. Now, that's, essentially, we're just going month-to-month at this point.

Councilmember Shetler: Right. Okay, thank you.

President Lloyd: I think that sounds great. Any other questions for Drug and Alcohol Deferral? Okay, thank you, Ms. Koch. We appreciate it.

Deloris Koch: Okay, thanks.

AREA PLAN COMMISSION

President Lloyd: Next on our list is 1240, Area Plan Commission. I believe that was considered at the joint hearing. Any cuts we make will be September 1.

SURVEYOR

President Lloyd: Next on our list, 1060, Surveyor, page 34. Welcome, Mr. Bill Jeffers.

Bill Jeffers: Thank you, President Lloyd. Bill Jeffers, Vanderburgh County Surveyor. I'm not proud of this budget submittal. I would have liked to give my employees a small raise. I don't see any decrease in the cost of living. When I go shopping I don't see any decrease in the cost of groceries. Those of us who have grandchildren are, as you probably all know and realize whether you have them or

not, we're helping our kids and our grandchildren because they're in the same boat as the rest of folks today, without, you know, seeing any raises at their jobs, and seeing the increased costs of groceries, etcetera. So, I'm not proud of it, but there it is. I was asked to submit it same as 2009, same as 2010, no increases in two years. That's what I did, except for 1060-1130, a PAT IV, step four increase, which is automatic the first of the year, and, that's Party Chief, and 1060-1150, Rod Man, PAT II, step three increase automatic at the first of the year. That's my only two changes other than FICA and PERF, everything else remains the same. Again, I'm not proud of it, it's not a very creative budget submittal, but it was as requested, and I understand the necessity.

President Lloyd: Well, and we haven't completely shut the door on a pay increase. We're still looking at that. If we can find ways to cut enough out of the budget, I mean, I think everyone on Council would like to see that.

Bill Jeffers: Sure. I'm not speaking just for myself, I know every office holder, including those on the Council feel the same way. I just made the statement.

President Lloyd: Right, and, I mean, I can appreciate that, and I know we would all like to see that, and, hopefully, we can come up with something. Any questions for the Surveyor on this budget, the Surveyor's budget? Mr. Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: Not really a question, just to bring up a point. I'm thinking, I might be incorrect on this, but, you know, the county does do the step increases so that they do get some kind of pay increase every so often. I don't think the city does anything on a longevity whatsoever on some kind of step increases that I'm aware of. But, again, I'm not—

President Lloyd: Then, again, the labor contracts, they do have some step increases—

Councilmember Shetler: Right.

President Lloyd: —but the non-labor, or the non-union employees, I don't believe they have that.

Councilmember Shetler: Right. So, that might be an area, and, I don't know, since you're standing here and you brought the question up, that could be looked at maybe in the future as some kind of a trade off there of using, utilizing the money that is going for that to increase salaries across the board. I'm not suggesting that. I'm bringing it on the table and asking you as an officeholder, since you brought up the subject, if you feel like that might be something...and I'm hitting you with (Inaudible).

Bill Jeffers: I think the county has a great system of government, has good structure. As an officeholder I appreciate what the County Council has done with their step increase program for county workers, and I certainly hope that if a merger of the two entities takes place that our pay increase system prevails over the city's pay increase system. Or that the blending of the two benefits the workers, the workforce in the most beneficial way. That's not up to me, that's up to you guys and the Metro Council if it ever comes to be. I just wish we could give our workers, our employees an increase that would reflect their true cost of living increase year to

year, but that's apparently not in our hands to do. That has a lot to do with State policy, State taxing policy.

President Lloyd: Any other questions on the Surveyor's budget? Okay, we'll move on to Surveyor's Perpetual Fund, which is page 148.

SURVEYOR CORNER PERPETUATION

Bill Jeffers: In the Perpetuation Fund, those monies are collected through the Recorder's Office, the County Recorder's Office. When she records a deed, five dollars for each deed goes into the Corner Perpetuation Fund, and by law, by Indiana statute, that's intended to be used to recover, remonument and perpetuate the section corner monuments that were laid down by the Congressional surveyors in the early 1800's. Every deed in the county, every parcel of property is tied to one of those section corners, so that's the purpose of that. We're required to recover and document five percent a year, but we do way more than that, according to our statute. We also, in addition to that, identify them on a GIS mapping system that's open to everyone in the public, including private surveyors and engineers to utilize our data for longitude, latitude and elevation above sea level. That saves the citizens a lot of money, because that does, that gives them a point to start their surveys. That's the purpose of it, but I don't know how long we can maintain this budget, considering that land transfers are, you know, down. That used to get \$40,000-\$50,000 a year, five dollars per deed transfer, but today we don't get that type of income. We're doing the best we can. I would only say that we've submitted this budget, we don't always spend everything in every line. Anything we don't spend reverts back to that fund and can only come back out to be spent for this purpose. It can't be transferred anywhere else outside of this program. So, we simply submit the same budget we submitted in 2009 and 2010, except for Dues and Subscriptions, which, I believe, we transferred everything in our office under Dues and Subscriptions over to line 3700, because almost everything we use in our office is tied to this program, GIS and AutoCad subscriptions, that type of thing. So, we are saving the General Fund that \$4,150. That's an insignificant amount in the overall scheme of things, but that's what we did last year.

President Lloyd: What was your fee income last year for the deed transfers?

Bill Jeffers: I couldn't tell you off the top of my head, but it was down to around, I believe, \$26,000, from a high of maybe \$42,000-\$45,000 during the housing boom.

President Lloyd: Do you know, is 2010 looking any better?

Bill Jeffers: I can't give you that answer. I would have to consult with the County Auditor to get that figure. I can e-mail it to you.

President Lloyd: Okay, that would be alright.

Bill Jeffers: We used to get a running figure from the County Recorder every quarter or so. I haven't seen that recently. So, I can't give it to you off the top of my head.

President Lloyd: But, in, I guess, typically, like you said, because of the activity of the deed transfers and home building—

Bill Jeffers: Right.

President Lloyd: —etcetera, it was 40,000-\$50,000 a year.

Bill Jeffers: Used to be.

President Lloyd: Yeah, then, in '09 it plunged, or maybe even '08 it plunged to about \$26,000, or something like that.

Bill Jeffers: Around that, yes, sir. And, that's why we only pay the Assistant to the Surveyor, that would be 2650 up there—

President Lloyd: Right.

Bill Jeffers: —we're only paying half of that salary out of this fund, we used to pay the entire amount. We're not able to do that any longer. So, we're paying, I believe, \$22,000 out of General, and \$20,000 out of this fund.

President Lloyd: Is that five dollars State mandated, or could that be raised?

Bill Jeffers: Yes, sir, that's by statute.

President Lloyd: That's by statute, okay.

Bill Jeffers: I believe it costs around \$17 to record a deed, a certain amount of it goes to the Recorder, which supports that program, and then five dollars comes to this account here for each deed.

President Lloyd: It would be interesting to see the year-to-date. Did you have a question, Mr. Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Just a quick question. Bill, how many section corners do we have in this county?

Bill Jeffers: Approximately 2,012.

Councilmember Raben: Really? Wow.

Councilmember Kiefer: That sounds pretty exact.

Councilmember Raben: Yeah, that's more than an approximation.

Bill Jeffers: That's theoretic. I'm sure there's some out in the middle of the Ohio River we'll never find, but that's what we're supposed to have.

President Lloyd: Other questions on this? Anyway, we'll look at that year-to-date. I mean, hopefully, with the economy recovering that will move up.

Bill Jeffers: I hope so. Yes, sir.

President Lloyd: I think '09 was the bottom. Okay.

SURVEYOR MAPS

Bill Jeffers: Then, our Map Fund, those are simply, that's just simply money we collect or take from the General Fund to operate, buy paper supplies—

President Lloyd: That's page 134. Page 134 is the Surveyor's Map Fund.

Bill Jeffers: —ink pen cartridges for our plotter, that type of thing. We have radio and pagers in there, but we don't use those anymore. We just call someone's cell phone in the field. So, that's zero now. Basically, we're just producing maps upon request. They may be district maps for the voting districts, they may be maps for the County Sheriff for his motor patrol. I'm trying to create a book for him. Citizens come in and ask for maps, we charge them so much per map and then that goes back into the fund.

President Lloyd: Okay.

Bill Jeffers: Of course, what we might do for the Sheriff or the Voters Registration, that doesn't get charged. So, we do have to ask for some money occasionally, but we try to be self sustaining. It's kind of hard.

President Lloyd: Isn't this another fund that State law says that you have to have a Map Fund?

Bill Jeffers: Supposedly the only two government offices who can issue an official map are the County Surveyor and Area Plan Commission. Now, GIS Department does produce maps in conjunction with both of those departments, and they're very helpful and produce high quality maps, but they're supposed to be issued, supposedly, through the County Surveyor or the Area Plan Commission only. So, we work together with both of those agencies, GIS, APC and the County Surveyor try to work closely together to make sure the maps all coincide with one another.

President Lloyd: I guess, legally, a legal map, those would be the only two agencies that issue a legal map?

Bill Jeffers: APC and the County Surveyor.

President Lloyd: Right. Questions on the Map Fund? Okay, Mr. Jeffers, thank you very much.

Bill Jeffers: Thank you.

President Lloyd: We'll move on to Convention and Visitors Bureau, page 157, budget item 3570.

CONVENTION AND VISITORS BUREAU

Bob Whitehouse: Good morning, President Lloyd, members. I'm Bob Whitehouse, the Interim Director for the Evansville Convention and Visitors Bureau. We would open by saying that we're having a better year than what I think we had anticipated last year, due to a lot of diversity in the accounts that we've been bringing in to Evansville. The revenue stream has not decreased as we thought it might, according to the Smith Travel Research, which is the people that we use to track

us. We're actually up for a number of reasons, and that is that, I think, the economy in Evansville seems to be a little stronger than it might be in other areas that we track in comparison to us, and that our partners in the Hotel/Motel Association are doing an outstanding job this year of continuing to bring in the diversity of accounts that we have.

President Lloyd: Okay, questions for Mr. Whitehouse?

Councilmember Kiefer: Mr. President?

President Lloyd: Yes, Mr. Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Bob, first I would like to comment and say nice picture in the paper in the other day.

Bob Whitehouse: Yeah, I think....did you recognize me with the hair?

Councilmember Kiefer: What I was going to ask is, the Director's salary, do you anticipate that you're going to be able to fill that position with that level of salary?

Bob Whitehouse: On that question I would have to say that the board hasn't shared that information with me.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay.

Bob Whitehouse: In other words, I don't know.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay. Any, so, they haven't shared with you like how long it might take them to fill the position?

Bob Whitehouse: I know it's ongoing right now, that they're on a search, and that they're continuing to look for someone. It's a nationwide search. They're utilizing SearchWide, Incorporated, and it's ongoing.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay, I was just curious, because, you know, if it takes six months, well, obviously, that's going to save us some money, but it might hurt us too getting new business into the area. But, also, I would be curious to just know if it's going to be able to get the job done at that price, or if it's going to take \$100,000, or maybe it gets done less than that too.

Bob Whitehouse: They haven't shared any of that information with me.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay, thank you.

President Lloyd: Who's the board member in charge of the search?

Bob Whitehouse: Right now it's Stacey McNeill with Aztar.

President Lloyd: Okay.

Bob Whitehouse: The committee is David Dunn and Kristen Tucker and Stacey's in charge of it.

President Lloyd: Okay. Mr. Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Mr. Whitehouse, I was curious, on the six months expended, you know, you've got zeroes, why isn't that put in what you've spent so far? Now, this is in the blue book. You know, everybody else has got their expenditures for six months and yours is all...I was just wondering why that's not put in there. I was just curious, I mean, it's not that big of a deal to me, but—

Bob Whitehouse: Councilman, I don't know, I'm, again, in the dark on that. This is prepared primarily by the board, and I was asked to present it. I can get back with you.

Councilmember Bassemier: I would appreciate that, because that's important, if you've got, you know, if you spent \$15,000 and—

President Lloyd: I think Bill Fluty might have an answer.

Councilmember Bassemier: Okay, I'm sorry.

Bill Fluty: Ed, you might not remember this, but, actually, their expenditures are within their own budget.

Councilmember Bassemier: That is correct.

Bill Fluty: This, all we have is what we budgeted for them last year. They, normally have provided in the past what their expenditures are. This is produced out of our software system and their expenses are not in there.

Councilmember Bassemier: Okay.

Bill Fluty: Nor are their—

Councilmember Bassemier: I was just kind of curious.

Bill Fluty: So, it's not something you'll ever, have ever seen in this actual budget book.

Councilmember Bassemier: No, because I do remember it used to be in the past.

Bill Fluty: Not in this book.

Councilmember Bassemier: Not in this one?

Bill Fluty: No, it never has been.

Councilmember Bassemier: I was thinking one other time we did see that. So, I guess, we had to request that if we want to see it.

Councilmember Raben: I don't think we see the airport's expenditures, believe it or not.

Bill Fluty: No, you won't. You won't see the airport's either.

Councilmember Bassemier: No.

Bill Fluty: But, he could, they've provided that in the past.

Councilmember Bassemier: But, you guys ask for it. You guys ask for it in time you can get that.

President Lloyd: Mr. Shelter has a question.

Councilmember Shetler: I noticed recently in the news media that, I guess, there's been a law suit filed on an appointment issue and stuff. Do you know if the \$18,000, first of all, if the \$18,000 for Legal Services is going to be adequate to help defend that suit? Secondly, in here it doesn't appear to be, but any kind of reserve fund set up in case they would have a negative result on the case?

Bob Whitehouse: Once again, I hate to go back to that, but they haven't shared any of that information with me. I do know that they have insurance on that, the directors and all, but, they haven't shared what the cost is or how that is proceeding at all right now.

Councilmember Kiefer: Follow up question to Councilman Shetler, can you ask, since you don't have the information, could you ask whoever the appropriate people are that make a report to us—

Bob Whitehouse: I would be happy to.

Councilmember Kiefer: —because I would be interested to know the answer to his question. Then, also, how they are doing on the search for the new Executive Director.

Bob Whitehouse: I would be happy to.

Councilmember Kiefer: Thank you, Bob, appreciate it.

President Lloyd: Other questions for Mr. Whitehouse? I guess, to finish what you had stated earlier, you said revenues are up for oh 10, roughly how much? Or, what percentage?

Bob Whitehouse: Right now about two to three percent, about 2.8 percent. A lot of that, you know, what has happened when the Smith Travel Research comes out, what they do is compare apples to apples because they've taken out the extra rooms that the Executive Inn had, we're now down to in the neighborhood of 2,800 total rooms to sell and those figures are off of the 2,800. We've been able to maintain a lot of the accounts, we have a lot of repeat accounts, and that's the backbone of the industry.

President Lloyd: As of right now, not having a convention hotel, that's still not being seen by you guys? Or, it's, or do you have any comment on that?

Bob Whitehouse: It's an ouch.

President Lloyd: Yeah.

Bob Whitehouse: I mean, obviously, it would be a tremendous asset for us. There's a number, I just came back from a trade show in Louisville and it's a question that is being asked. Right now most of the meeting planners that I meet with are putting out RFP's for 2013 and 2014. So, in anticipation of that, we're cautiously going forward.

President Lloyd: Okay, so a lot of planners are working on 2013 and 2014, and we don't have a time table at this point. Although, I think it's something that we've asked the Mayor and the Redevelopment Commission, we need that. Any other questions? Okay, we'll move on to 3600, Tourism Capital Improvement, page 160.

TOURISM CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT

Bob Whitehouse: We have only two obligations and those are to the museum for 2010 and 2011. A total of \$350,000 for 2011 and \$400,000 for 2010. Both of those will be paid commensurate with the time that they start their actual construction of the museum expansion and that they have raised the funds needed to go ahead. Other than that, all of the money will be put aside for the projection on the park and ball fields.

President Lloyd: Okay, and this money comes strictly from Innkeepers Tax?

Bob Whitehouse: Yes.

President Lloyd: Right. It's, I know, we had Mr. Dunn with the, gave us a lengthy presentation on the ball fields, but the funding of the Innkeepers is approximately \$1.2 million a year, something along those lines. But, anyway, this is the distribution in prior years. So, you're saying the only commitments you have, is it \$300,000 in two separate years to the museum?

Bob Whitehouse: It was \$400,000 for this year, in the 2010 budget, and in the 2011 budget has \$350,000 set aside. Other than those two commitments, everything will be dedicated to the ball fields.

President Lloyd: And, those are both the museum capital improvement, the Evansville Museum.

Bob Whitehouse: Yes.

President Lloyd: Okay. Mr. Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Do you know when the projected start time will be for the renovation of the museum? Are they pretty close on their funding drive?

Bob Whitehouse: I know that Mr. Vezosso, the president has met with Rita Eykamp, and they've gone over that, but as to an exact date, no, sir, I don't.

Councilmember Goebel: We are close, is that correct?

Bob Whitehouse: From what I understand, they are.

Councilmember Goebel: Thank you.

President Lloyd: Other questions of Tourism Capital Improvement? This is Innkeepers Tax, correct, Jim? Right. Food and Beverage is the one dedicated to the Vanderburgh Auditorium and Convention Centre.

Bob Whitehouse: Two percent of our—

Councilmember Raben: Pennies.

President Lloyd: Two percent.

Councilmember Raben: Two pennies of it.

President Lloyd: Other questions for Mr. Whitehouse? Thank you very much.

Bob Whitehouse: Thank you.

President Lloyd: Thanks, Bob. We're going to take a break before we get into the Sheriff. That will be lengthy. So, ten minutes, come back at approximately 25 after.

(Meeting was recessed at 10:15 a.m. and reconvened at 10:28 a.m.)

President Lloyd: I would like to reconvene the Vanderburgh County budget hearings 2011. Next on our list would be department 1050, the Sheriff, and that's on page 14.

SHERIFF

President Lloyd: Good morning.

Eric Williams: Good morning. What was the page number?

President Lloyd: Fourteen.

Eric Williams: Not that I'm going to use it, but I ought to just have it open.

President Lloyd: Okay, we have our Sheriff here, did you have any items to note before we start with questions?

Eric Williams: I guess, I could start off by saying Clerk Kirk and the judge were correct, and I will be the broken record that we are in a booming business, and business is up right now. When we get to the jail's budget I have some current jail numbers for you just to give you some ideas of what the numbers are looking like in the jail. But, I think, in all respects, for the most part, my budget is relatively flat. There were some increases, and those increases are really reflective of asking for the same numbers that I asked for last year prior to them being cut. So, I'm asking for the same thing, not exactly what I got. There's the two employees that are in there, which I figure will be the bulk of the line of questions. But, I would just, I would prefer, if you don't mind, to just answer your questions.

President Lloyd: Questions for the Sheriff? Mr. Bassemier, did you have a question?

Councilmember Bassemier: No.

President Lloyd: Okay, I guess I can start. Any increases are mainly step increases?

Eric Williams: All of the personnel increases will be related to longevity increases, those kinds of things, other than the two deputies that are in there.

President Lloyd: Right, on page 20 we've got a request for two new deputies. If you wanted to explain that.

Eric Williams: Sure. That is in response to what we're going to be dealing with starting next year and then in full force the following year, which is the new North High School which is being constructed at Baseline and 41. That is a new entity for the Sheriff's Office, we have not had a high school in our primary law enforcement response jurisdiction for as long as I can remember. There may have been one way back in history before annexation, Harrison's may have been originally, I don't know. But, that's going to change how we handle things out there. It's my belief that I would like to have a full time presence in that school, at all times, during their open hours, a school resource officer, a high school of that size. Just to give you some ideas, and I've gotten most of this from the EVSC, the junior high on that campus is scheduled to open in August 2011 with an estimated student enrollment of 776. The high school is scheduled to open in January of 2012 with an estimation of 1,597 high school students when they open. They expect to have, I think there's planned between 2,500 and 3,000 parking spaces on that campus, 275 staff and faculty on the campus at any given time, for a total of about 2,648 students and staff on that campus when school's open, which makes it the biggest high school and junior high school in our community. They're going to be way out into the county where we're going to be the primary law enforcement response. So, my request is to hire two school resource officers, deputies to place into that school. I would have one in there on a full time basis, and the other one would be the back up for them on vacation days off. On the days off, or when the regular deputy is assigned in there, the other one would be taking care of the other school's that are out in the county, which includes Scott, Oak Hill, Cynthia Heights, West Terrace, Perry Heights and the new North and then the Catholic schools that are in the county would be Resurrection, Corpus Christi and St. Joe in the county, then we also have Evansville Day School in our jurisdiction. Based on our estimates right now, that means when all of those schools are in operation, there's going to be about 6,200 students out in the county receiving their primary law enforcement/crime prevention services from the Sheriff's Office. That is basically the crux of my request for those two persons so I can basically implement and start a school resource/school liaison program for those schools out in the county. We've been very fortunate, we've been able to handle that with patrol personnel, detectives, just kind of taking it on a shift basis, or as needed basis, but we're to the point now where we really need to have some continuity in service for those people.

President Lloyd: How much was the middle school population?

Eric Williams: On that campus, the new North Middle School, from the EVSC they're estimating 776, which to give it a comparison, the two other junior highs out in the, or the other junior high that will be out in the county, Perry Heights, is estimated to be about 459. Scott will drop because of that change, they'll have about 658, Oak Hill 658, Cynthia Heights 541, West Terrace 545, Resurrection 377, Corpus Christi 187, and St. Joseph 139. Again, those are projected estimates.

President Lloyd: Mr. Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: I was wondering if you could be a little more exact on those school populations for us?

Eric Williams: That's the best I could come up with.

Councilmember Goebel: Thank you. As far as school liaison, is this basically the same plan as the EPD has with the city schools? Or the schools inside the city?

Eric Williams: I would call it similar in nature. We're going to take a little different approach than they have, but, basically the concept is to have full time law enforcement in that high school so that there's a continuity of service, a go to person inside the school for the incidents and activities that occur, but, more importantly to just begin to build rapport and relationships with the student bodies in there so that we can be ahead of the curve and know when problems are developing and be able to work in concert with the staff and faculty out there to keep things from getting out of hand. One of the keys to that is having the same go to person there all the time, as opposed to having rotating people, a different guy every day, because you can't build that relationship if it's a different person every day.

Councilmember Goebel: Will these two deputies handle traffic and things like that before and after school?

Eric Williams: I think they will be available to do that. They're going to be on that campus and be able to do just about everything, but I would guess that in the initial stages of this facility opening up, based on their traffic patterns and how it looks out there, we're going to spend a lot of time out there as an agency.

Councilmember Goebel: Thank you.

President Lloyd: What did you indicate the estimated open date was?

Eric Williams: EVSC says they plan to open for the fall of August 2011, this following year for the junior high, and then for the, January of 2012 for the high school is their current plan right now. That's what I got from them in the last few days.

President Lloyd: So, technically, you wouldn't necessarily need these people until the very end of the year, or even 2012?

Eric Williams: Correct, technically, to have them active, the problem that I have is I've got a year of probation with a Deputy Sheriff. I've got academy, and we would like to begin selecting the people so we can get them into some specialized training in dealing with high school and middle school law enforcement/crime prevention and youth resource. But, no, as far as putting them on line in those schools right away, no, it wouldn't occur until those dates, but we would have some lead time to make it happen.

President Lloyd: Other questions from Council? Mr. Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: Yes, a couple of positions.

Eric Williams: Sure.

Councilmember Shetler: Position 221, Custodian, \$36,000 or \$37,000?

Eric Williams: 221?

Councilmember Shetler: \$37,000.

President Lloyd: What page is that?

Councilmember Shetler: Twenty two. Is this—

Eric Williams: Okay.

Councilmember Shetler: —Custodian of what? Which building, which facility, all of the facilities?

Eric Williams: Basically the Command Post. That's the one that we handle ourselves. Obviously, the Building Authority takes care of the jail and the administration. That Custodian also ventures over to the Training Center periodically, but her primary responsibility is the Command Post.

Councilmember Shetler: Okay, and this is one person—

Eric Williams: One person.

Councilmember Shetler: —that's....okay, and then the Grounds Keeper, which is 220, 212, I think it was, up a little bit further, yeah, twenty eight and change.

Eric Williams: That's a person, that person is assigned to the Training Center. They do maintenance on the Training Center, cut the grass, keep it trimmed, take care of the firing range. That person has some added responsibilities, helps at the Command Post in document movement, when we, that's where we store a lot of records and evidence. But, the other thing that they also help with is the fleet maintenance. We try to do a lot of our stuff in house as far as repairs, wiring, the things that don't require a mechanic or somebody that's specialized. That person does a lot of those things also.

Councilmember Shetler: I noticed in here on Vehicles you have \$300,000, how old is the fleet getting to be?

Eric Williams: Actually our fleet's in fairly good shape. I'm fairly proud of the way it's looking right now. The reason that it has been maintained is because we've had a good program with the Council of replacing approximately nine to eleven cars, based on cost, prices and what we can cannibalize from old vehicles on an annual basis. So, we're kind of keeping it turned over and getting out of that practice of having 30 or 40 cars bought, or 20 here and then none for a few years, and having that smaller amount has truly made a difference. I actually think the fleet's in great shape. The fleet we're being able to maintain a little better and the vehicles are lasting longer.

Councilmember Shetler: So, what kind of rotation is that, every five?

Eric Williams: The average, I would say the average, and this is not a quote, I would have to get you the actual stats, but I would say the average age of a vehicle in our fleet right now is between four and five years. Most of the fleet vehicles are lasting probably eight years.

Councilmember Shetler: Okay, and mileage in that period of time? Do you have a rough idea, just an average?

Eric Williams: You know, it just depends, but most of our fleet probably, if I averaged the fleet out, there's probably between 80,000 and 100,000 miles on the average vehicle.

Councilmember Shetler: As it goes out of service? Or would you have it currently?

Eric Williams: No, at the average. They are far higher than that when they go out of service.

Councilmember Shetler: At the end, okay. One area, could you maybe explain, Overtime—

Eric Williams: Sure.

Councilmember Shetler: —what actually comprises that number?

Eric Williams: The vast majority of merit overtime comes from holiday pay, court time, and then late runs. Those are the ones that are kind of out of our control for the most places. A late run would be a Deputy Sheriff takes a run, you know, his shift ends at 2:00, gets a crash at 1:30 and is the primary, he's going to work that until at least he can close up the reports and go home. So, there's going to be some comp time that develops there. Now, our process to, we don't pay on the fly, we use comp time, everybody gets comp time, then we go to 80 hours and when you break the 80 hours threshold of accrued comp time, to avoid those comp time banks from getting unmanageable, we automatically pay you back 40 with these funds. It allows us to stage and predict where we're going with our comp time, plus it allows the employee to help self manage. If you're an employee that likes to have a little extra cushion in your comp time bank for whatever may come up, you know that when you get to 80 we're going to pay you back the 40, there's no ifs, ands or buts about it. So, if you're getting in the 70's, you start to be a little more aggressive, looking for some opportunities to take some of that comp time back off so we don't pay it out. I think it's been fairly successful in allowing the employee to help us self manage those comp time bank accruals. Because one of the things that we ran into trouble several years ago was getting these very large comp banks built up, which are really just an unfunded liability that's hanging out there for us. So, this system has worked very well.

Councilmember Shetler: Do we have any special events that are part of that?

Eric Williams: For example, the marathon that was run. We funded that out of that, but then we since totaled all of those costs up, worked a contract out with the Commissioners, verified all of the fees and we billed them back for every dollar that was spent and put that back into the General Fund.

Councilmember Shetler: Billed the Commissioners back, or billed the—

Eric Williams: No, we billed the marathon—

Councilmember Shetler: —okay, the marathon.

Eric Williams: The people that put on the marathon, they paid those costs. But, so, it was really just a—

Councilmember Shetler: Wash.

Eric Williams: —washed through it. But, as far as special events that generate overtime, there aren't any real significant ones for us. The 4-H Fair really doesn't, the Frog Follies really don't. We, you know, major events that were unexpected are generally where the overtime would come from, but I would venture that the vast majority is from holiday and those kinds of pay, holiday pay.

Councilmember Shetler: Alright, thank you.

President Lloyd: Other questions for the Sheriff? Let me throw a couple out here.

Eric Williams: Sure.

President Lloyd: When we're looking at the two new deputies for the new high school—

Eric Williams: Right.

President Lloyd: —do you, you guys are probably out at Scott School every day, aren't you, because of the traffic situation, or not?

Eric Williams: We spend time out there. Once, you know, the first start of the year we put a lot of resources into all of the schools out in the county to get everybody adjusted to the traffic patterns. Every year one of the schools changes their in and out directions and the parking directions and it takes a while for parents to get used to that, but we try to monitor them, but as far as spending time out there on a daily basis, probably not just for traffic. We know that the day shift in the morning they try to hover around the schools as they do in the afternoon, but after the first few weeks we're not out there every single day, unless there's a problem.

President Lloyd: Because there are a lot of traffic accidents or violations, or not violations, but anyway, incidents out there?

Eric Williams: At Scott?

President Lloyd: Uh-huh.

Eric Williams: It's a problematic school in as much that it's such a growth out there and they've taken up a lot of the parking, and a lot of the traffic that flows into that subdivision in behind Scott and creates gridlock more often than anything else. As far as major crashes, you know, we have a few fender benders out there, but we've been very fortunate. Now, obviously, Old State Road there is pretty wide open, and if you're not paying attention, you can come up on Scott fairly quickly. We have some speeding problems, but we spend, our traffic enforcement guys spend quite

a bit of time in the school zones out there. I hear the complaints from the people that they meet.

President Lloyd: Is there any other school in the county that has more, I guess, more work or hours that you guys have to put in than Scott?

Eric Williams: Cynthia Heights because of its location on 65, you know, there's some traffic issues there. Resurrection sometimes creates issues because of the weird traffic patterns around that school, you know, because it kind of lays in that little quadrant between 65 and New Harmony Road and short 65 there. So, that causes some problems for us. You know, probably the easiest school for us to deal with is West Terrace, because it's kind of off by itself. Day School does create problems, just because of Green River Road, but it's a small enough school and they don't create huge problems, for a few days it will be a problem, but, you know, it's located right there at the corner of North Green River Road and Lynch. The traffic pattern out there is constantly evolving with the growth anyway. So, it's, that area in general is just in a constant state of issues.

President Lloyd: The, you know, we know the city did some annexation on the east side and north side—

Eric Williams: Sure.

President Lloyd: — so, I just wonder did you look at the possibility to cover the new North High School, reassigning deputies instead of adding two new ones?

Eric Williams: Yeah, we've explored that, and kind of like when we had our last conversation about that, I've pledged to the high school I'm going to do whatever it takes to get people out there, if I have to come up with some other plan. I'm looking to you for help first. That's my first resource. I think that we have an obligation to those kids to be out there and be visible and do those things. When I looked at the annexation, the way I described that is that they really didn't annex all that much when it comes to volume of calls. They annexed some businesses, they annexed some crashes and some shoplifters—

President Lloyd: Right.

Eric Williams: —but they didn't annex really any (inaudible). They left us with a peninsula going through the eastern part of the county where we're still in and out of there anyways. My guys are still making runs, or at least standbys, because, you know, it's my direction to my people, I don't care whether you're in the city limits or outside the city limits, it's all Vanderburgh County, the city is in the county, and if you're driving down Burkhardt Road, regardless of whether it's been annexed or not and there's a crash right in front of you or a citizen needs help, you're going to stop and deal with that problem. It's not one of those, well, it's the city I'm going to drive on by. That's not how we operate. I would tell you that with the growth, and I think the number that I gave you and I've got it here again from 2000 to 2008, the county's calls for service have increased by 47 percent. So, we're seeing mass increases in our activity with no increase in staff. We are trying to operate more efficiently, effectively and do those things, but as we see that growth in the northern part of the county, and I can't help but imagine that things like the Baseline overpass, a new North High School out there is going to do nothing but fuel the

growth and the activity in that part of the county, which is a long way away from anything the city might be about annexing. Now, obviously—

Councilmember Raben: Can I—

Eric Williams: —I'll go on and state this, because I'm surprised it hasn't been asked yet, I think this issue is one of those kind of leads us down the path of, you know, what about the consolidation issue between the law enforcement agencies. Obviously, the Evansville Police Department is losing a North High School, but I don't, those aren't my people, I'm gaining the responsibility of a North High School and those people aren't lateral between the two agencies at this point in time. So, you know, in a consolidated agency that may not be the same issue.

President Lloyd: You said the forty percent increase in service calls was over what period?

Eric Williams: Between 2000 and 2008. They haven't given me the 2009 stats yet out at dispatch, but I expect them to be on the same trend.

President Lloyd: Okay, but you're right, you've got Knight Township south and that is—

Eric Williams: Which is all residential.

President Lloyd: Right.

Eric Williams: You know, where the modular housing is there, and there's a lot of activity and growth in that part of the county right now. It is busier. Then we look at some of the major developments in our county, they're fairly far north, Keystone being one, Cambridge being one, there's lots and lots of development around the campus at USI which we're responsible for, and those are all, you know, I hate to say this, but the cornfields didn't call 911, but the houses are, and that's what we're replacing, houses where cornfields used to be.

Councilmember Raben: Can I make a quick statement while we're on the subject?

President Lloyd: I was going to say that Knight Township area is in my Council district too, by the way. Go ahead, Jim.

Councilmember Raben: Before we get out of this part of the discussion, you know, we mentioned the number of runs and what have you at Scott as it is today, you have to remember that at Scott the kids don't drive. You know, it's a parent, it's an adult, or they're on a bus. You know, when you start bringing a thousand plus 16 year old new drivers and young drivers crossing a lot of scary intersections. I mean, it's a frightening thought that they're going to be pulling on and off of Highway 41 twice a day, and for most of them, traveling a lot of new roads. So, I, you know, it's a serious matter. It's going to be a serious matter, and it doesn't go away. You get a new young driver each year for the first time driving to North High School.

Eric Williams: It is very similar to the, every school that has kindergartens we get a lot of new kindergarten parent drivers into schools, and those are really parents that we have to spend a little time getting them educated to the traffic...you know, they figure it out and get it. I expect the students will too, but this is all new terrain,

all new area, new intersections, new traffic patterns, and a lot of change in that...this is just the tip of the iceberg for that part of our community.

Councilmember Raben: I don't know that we've got another school crossing or school district with 20,000 to 30,000 trucks a day traveling across the front of, you know, through the intersections these kids are going to be traveling through.

Eric Williams: One of the disadvantages of that, because I think that's an important aspect as we look at traffic patterns in that area, is, at least in the schools that are kind of near 41, further into the city, traffic has been broken up by repeated stop lights. The first stop light they're going to hit at Baseline Road is the first one after they have been at speed for a period of time. So, we are going to have a lot of traffic concerns and issues, and we are going to spend a considerable amount of time out there trying to make, get everybody educated and get people in and out of that school as safely as we possibly can. Plus, we're also going to be adding, you know, they're obviously building a football stadium and all of the athletic events, so, we're talking about events that didn't used to occur out there with people from lots of other communities coming to that part of our community now at all hours doing lots of...it is just going to be a major change in the way Scott Township looks. I would much rather be prepared for it than try to react to it.

President Lloyd: Other questions? Mr. Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: I want to go back to those two positions real quickly.

Eric Williams: Sure.

Councilmember Shetler: Have you explored the possibility of doing contractual services outside, to do those activities?

Eric Williams: Contracting with who?

Councilmember Shetler: With some kind of private service on the janitorial services or—

Eric Williams: Oh, those two, I thought you meant the Deputies.

Councilmember Shetler: No, no, no. I'm sorry, no, not the Deputies, no. I'm going back to my original two people.

Eric Williams: No, we've not explored that, per se. I think there's probably an opportunity to look at those two positions. I think that, with attrition that we can probably do something with those a little differently. They both work hard. They both get a lot done. I'm proud of the Command Post and the cleanliness and the upkeep and that. I mean, that's our responsibility and that person does a great job, but I think there is opportunities.

Councilmember Shetler: Are those personalities, those people that are in there, are they capable of moving someplace else in the department if a vacancy should occur?

Eric Williams: (Inaudible)

Councilmember Shetler: I don't mean to put you on the spot.

Eric Williams: Well, that would be a tough question.

Councilmember Shetler: Yeah.

Eric Williams: They're both very capable for the jobs for which they were hired.

Councilmember Shetler: Right, I understand that.

Eric Williams: To assess somebody in our, and this is one of the dilemmas we face within our agency a lot. We get people in one assignment, we hire them for one job—

Councilmember Shetler: Correct.

Eric Williams: —but then an opening comes up and they want to slide into that job because they've been a long term county employee, but somebody I hire to be a Clerk/Typist and answer the phones and file records, is not necessarily the best suited to be in one of the housing units guarding prisoners.

Councilmember Shetler: Right. Okay.

Eric Williams: I understand your question—

Councilmember Shetler: Yeah.

Eric Williams: —and I don't know—

Councilmember Shetler: And you answered it—

Eric Williams: —(Inaudible) answer it.

Councilmember Shetler: —very well. The, is it possible to explore the possibility of what it may cost to have that contracted out?

Eric Williams: Sure. I'll be glad to look at it and get some quotes and some ideas from some of the local companies that provide those services to give you a comparative to provide kind of the same services, where that would put us. Probably we could do a time study on the one at the Training Center and look at how much of the time is actually being spent doing fleet maintenance that we could compare to what the garage costs us as compared to what he's costing us and the other services.

Councilmember Shetler: Yeah. I'm generally not necessarily in favor of privatizing—

Eric Williams: Nor am I, but I think it's worth taking a look at.

Councilmember Shetler: —but I think in those two situations, since they're unique in that it may be possible that there could be some cost savings there by the time we add on all of the fringes and everything to it.

Eric Williams: And, I would throw out too the idea that, you know, it may be another opportunity, because I know the city has done a lot of this in contracting with the Building Authority to take on some of their outlying buildings to do the maintenance and custodial work on those, even though they're not actually owned by the Building Authority, that maybe at least the Command Post may be an opportunity for something like that. I would be happy to talk to Dave Rector about that and see what his thoughts are.

Councilmember Shetler: Alright, thank you.

President Lloyd: Other questions? Just, I think this is a perpetual question, I know Councilman Curt Wortman, a former member of this body, he was proud of that Command Post out there, I think probably a question that I always ask is that something that could be moved? I mean, what is the advantage to having that right across the street from the jail?

Eric Williams: Good question, and I think we've answered this a couple of times, but I think it's important for people to hear. With the right facility you could move it. There is no magic about that specific location, other than it's very good for our community that coming in on the 41 corridor one of the first things you see is a big Sheriff's star as a place to get help and look for assistance on the side of 41. It's easy to describe people to get to. It's fairly centrally located for me to disperse manpower into the county. Beyond that, what the jail, we're located right across the street, it would beg the question, well, it's not that far away. There is no space currently in the jail that is conducive to what we do. If we had constructed the jail a little differently, or we could basically pick the Command Post up and attach it to the jail and have separate entrances and those kinds of things, I don't know that you couldn't do that. I think we have a lease that's good for several years left on the Command Post. We explored those options as we prepared to renew the lease to negotiate a better deal with the Airport, but one of the big concerns is having a location that is on the same campus with your jail, is the same place that you keep all of your law enforcement. A couple of reasons, number one, that's where you keep weapons, ammunition, and things like that and we have very little of that around the jail for obvious reasons, and another thing is it's separate entrances. One of the things you don't want to ever have happen is have the victims of a crime that are coming in to work with your law enforcement people, your detectives and investigators of a crime scene come in and sit in the same lobby with the family, friends and visitors of the inmates that are in jail, and/or pass each other as somebody's bonding out or being released. It sounds pretty simple, but separate entrances are pretty important when you're talking about those two dynamics. We just don't have that capability in this facility as it stands today. I absolutely think it's always appropriate to be exploring that option though.

President Lloyd: The last question from me on this, are we in good shape on the Court Screeners as far as security in and out of this building?

Eric Williams: I think that it's a lot better than it used to be, and it's a long way from being perfect, but I don't know that in a building like this, with the exceptions that we've been forced to make with the dynamics that occur in here that we're ever going to have a perfect solution. But, I can tell you that they do a good job, they find lots of things that we wouldn't have found historically coming into this building, even historically may not have been problematic, we don't know, but we're finding those things. I think people are becoming used to it, there's a much better accountability

of who comes and goes from this building, so we know who's in and out here. I, quite frankly, I've gotten far more....I've gotten complaints, I'm not kidding anybody, but I've gotten far more compliments about it's nice to know that we're doing that, that people are being checked and people aren't just coming in here free will, with whatever they may have on them. So, I've gotten more compliments, they feel better about going through that. And, as time has gone, I think the regular users of this facility have gotten very used to the system and can streamline through fairly quickly. We don't see the big delays that we kind of expected and that occurred for the first 30 days. People have adapted very well.

President Lloyd: But, in this budget, the personnel to handle that security is sufficient?

Eric Williams: Yes, at this point in time I am not going to ask for any additional help in that area. I think that we're doing fairly well. There's scheduling issues, you know, when this building's going to be open, there's some last minute things that occur from time to time that cause us some problems, but so far we've been able to handle it.

President Lloyd: Okay, any other questions? Mr. Raben?

Councilmember Raben: I just, to go back to the Rent, just to give those that maybe weren't serving on the Council back when Bill Nix was President of the County Commissioners, he worked real close, I believe with the Sheriff on looking at moving the Command Post, and at the time, after his research, and that's what he does, you know, that's, his professional side of him is an engineer and what have you with Industrial Contractors. I think the estimate was in the millions, was it not, to –

Eric Williams: It was high enough that the lease at the Command Post became very, very attractive.

Councilmember Raben: Yeah, and also at that same time, I think when the, when the Airport was somewhat served notice by the discussions on moving it, the Airport reduced our rental rate.

Eric Williams: They became a little bit more aggressive.

Councilmember Raben: Because they were concerned about the response time, if we're on the other side of the tracks, should they need an emergency, or need, you know, assistance. I think that was also considered back then too, do we want all of our cars on that side of the railroad track if the tracks are blocked.

Eric Williams: Right.

Councilmember Raben: So, just giving you a little brief history on where we've been on the sub-station.

President Lloyd: That reminds me too, page 25, Rent, there's a decrease.

Eric Williams: Which is reflective of that lease.

President Lloyd: Okay, so that's the Command Post lease.

Eric Williams: Like I said—

President Lloyd: We got a concession.

Eric Williams: — they became a little bit more willing to work with us on that lease when we really were seriously looking at relocating.

President Lloyd: Then overall, for those that count numbers, the Sheriff budget plus \$473,276, which is a five point six percent increase. Okay, we'll move on to Sheriff/Jail, page 26.

SHERIFF/JAIL

President Lloyd: You were going to give us population.

Eric Williams: I can tell you that based on my records we have, in the last three days hit our high in this new facility. Two days ago we were at 572 in custody. You know, I could show you the report, but everyday you see a yellow that's where we're over capacity. This morning we were at, or last night our official total for last night was 564. You know, it's crowded. As the Clerk said, and as the judge said, there's a lot of things going on, and, you know, it's kind of a vicious circle, the chicken or the egg, who knows, but when one of our work goes up, it usually is reflective on all of us. I'm not here asking for assistance in the facility at this point in time. I think that we're able to sustain, while it's tough on my people, you know, it was staffed and designed to be at capacity of 512 and when you add more people to that, not only are you adding more people to watch, but you're adding more people in tighter areas where more problems occur. I plan to keep everybody in the loop on the jail population and how it continues, you know, whether it recedes a little bit or continues to move ahead. I may be back asking for assistance in there, but right now the advantage of the design of that facility is we are far, far more flexible than we were in the old facility. We're able to be more creative when we're crowded. We're able to do some more things to help weather the storm, if that's all it is, is a storm right now.

President Lloyd: Questions about the jail?

Councilmember Raben: The Civilian Uniform Allowance, Eric, is from \$2,750 to \$8,000?

President Lloyd: What page, Jim?

Eric Williams: Hold on a second. Let me catch up to you. I've got them in my notes over here.

President Lloyd: 1751, Civilian Uniform Allowance.

Councilmember Raben: (Inaudible. Mic not on.) has changed quite a bit.

Eric Williams: Well, I show my 2011 requested, \$2,750.

Councilmember Goebel: Can we change that?

President Lloyd: Well, we've got, it's showing \$8,000 for 1751.

Eric Williams: I don't know, that's not what my numbers show. The addition of medical employees when they became part of the union. I think there is some latitude in that number though. I think that was our real budget number, but that's one of the areas that, you know, we spend a lot of money, I can tell you that we spend a lot of money out of Commissary to cover the cost of uniforms so we're not up here asking for it. But, that was the result of medical becoming unionized.

President Lloyd: Then, Clothing Allowance is up \$9,000 to \$69,000. The same thing?

Eric Williams: Probably.

President Lloyd: Okay.

Eric Williams: Training, in the 1050 or 1051?

President Lloyd: Page 50 or 32.

Eric Williams: Well, it went from...I'm asking, it was \$15,000 last year and I'm asking for \$20,000. I asked for \$20,000 last year, and you set it in at \$15,000. So, I'm just asking for the same amount I asked for last year. Is that correct?

President Lloyd: I think we set it in at \$5,000.

Eric Williams: 3310?

President Lloyd: Yeah.

Eric Williams: Okay. Well, then my numbers are different than yours.

President Lloyd: Oops.

Eric Williams: But, that happens. I would love to have \$20,000, but I'm pretty sure I'm not going to get it.

President Lloyd: That's just training related to the jail for employees?

Eric Williams: Now, it depends on which one you are talking about. We've got 1050-3310, Training, and then you've got 1051-3310, Training.

President Lloyd: We're in 1051.

Eric Williams: Okay, then we got \$5,000 last year and I'm okay with that again this year.

President Lloyd: Okay. Mr. Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: The, in your prison population, or not prison, but your inmate population what would you estimate the percentage might be of people who might have some kind of psychological issue or problem?

Eric Williams: As a measurable percentage, I think statistically if I told you that probably ten to fifteen percent at any given time have a significant emotional/mental

issue to deal with, that would probably be a fair estimate. I would tell you that at any given time we estimate between 80 and 85 percent of the population there are for some addiction related reason. I think that experts would argue that those two are somewhat related in some respects. But, yes, again, you know, one of the things that I would love to have at some point in the future is a mental health worker in the facility to help start to gauge where people are at in the system and what the right recourse for them is, what avenues they might take when they get out, what public availability there is for mental health providers out in our community to get them in touch with them.

Councilmember Shetler: Now, let's, let me just, just cause I'm asking the question here—

Eric Williams: Sure, no, please do.

Councilmember Shetler: — okay, let's suppose that we, you know, invest in that and then let's say that a trained person determines that there's an obvious psychological issue here, and that rather than being incarcerated into the jail, that it be far better for them to be taken to some other facility that actually deals more specifically with a psychological problem, would that not relieve then, perhaps, the county of having to pay the expense of the incarceration? And, would then, if they are on some kind of Social Security/Disabilities or anything of that nature, would it not be absorbed through Social Security?

Eric Williams: I think in the picture you've painted theoretically, yes, there are opportunities there. I think that the problem that we come up with is if they're in jail they're there for some criminal charge. So, we've also got the courts aspect of it of deciding that we're prepared to release them from this and move them to some other facility and let them get the treatment they need and not deal with the criminal charge. I think that's one of the problems that we continually fight there is that you've got individuals there in the facility that need mental help but they've committed a crime. They need some kind of mental health assistance or counseling, training, medication, whatever, but on the street they've been accused of a crime, so, the system is holding them accountable for that crime and not treating them for the mental health issue that's in place.

Councilmember Shetler: So, in some respects, I mean, not only would we be doing a better service to that person who's been incarcerated for a period of time, but we also might be getting them the help they really do need, directly, you know, the psychological services, and could be saving the county perhaps some money in the long run, because the burden financially would be shifted off of local to the federal, which I know we're still all taxpayers at that level, but, I mean, it is there for that reason, and it's—

Eric Williams: I think theoretically that that makes some sense. I think there are opportunities there. I would like to have the mental health professional in my facility just to help make the facility run smoother. So, that we are providing the counseling and the treatment while they're in our facility to make it run smoother. I couldn't pledge to you that that would create any savings, but it would make for a more efficient and a better facility to operate in how we deal with the people that are in there. You would like to think that it might make for a better facility down the road. It's kind of like the basic health care, my recidivism rate in this county is about 66 percent. You know, two out of every three that get booked have been there before.

So, if I can make them a healthier inmate, they may not recidivate. We may get to the problem and keep them from coming back. They may come back, but they may be in better shape and cost us less in medical money the next time. It sounds kind of ridiculous to say that, but, you know, if I at least get a healthier inmate it's going to cost me less.

Councilmember Shetler: Alright, thank you.

President Lloyd: Other questions on the jail? The total increase on the jail budget, \$124,108, which is two point six percent. Reasonable.

SHERIFF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

President Lloyd: Okay, let's go on to Sheriff Domestic Violence, page 33. It's only one line.

Eric Williams: This is a grant.

President Lloyd: Right.

President Lloyd: There's, you don't see any change with that grant?

Eric Williams: Not unless the grant rules change, which happen.

SHERIFF MISDEMEANOR HOUSING

President Lloyd: Okay, move on to Jail Misdemeanor Housing, 2780, page 151.

Eric Williams: It's money from the State from their required....they divide up a pool of money every year between all of the counties to...it came about when they quit taking misdemeanors into the prison system and forced counties to keep misdemeanors as opposed to sending them to the Department of Corrections. That's their way of back funding some of that. It's not a parity for what the cost is, but it's what the State provides.

President Lloyd: That's plus \$5,800. Any questions on Misdemeanor Housing?

SHERIFF COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS

President Lloyd: Okay, we'll move on to Community Corrections, 1361, which is on page 86. Sheriff Community Corrections, any questions for the Sheriff? This one, the overall budget is up a small amount, \$21,254, which is one point four percent. It looks like no employment changes other than step increases.

Eric Williams: I would venture to guess that that whole entire percentage is related to that.

President Lloyd: Right. Any questions on Community Corrections? Okay.

SHERIFF MISDEMEANOR OFFENDER

President Lloyd: Then we have Misdemeanor Offender, page 150, 2760.

Eric Williams: That should all be personnel.

President Lloyd: Yeah, this is a small budget. What's this related to?

Eric Williams: It's grant money.

President Lloyd: Oh, it's grant money. Okay. Segregated for the grant and it went up about \$1,900. Any questions on Misdemeanor Offender? Okay. That will do it for the Sheriff. Thank you very much for coming.

Eric Williams: Thanks, I would just point out that, again, I said this last time, it's some good news that, you know, while the hiring freeze is in place, and, you know, we're going through a few more hurdles as office holders, it's forced us to look at some things, and just to give you an idea, you know, in the 2009 budget by staging my hiring and letting them pool up and leaving them open as long as we possibly could before we had to fill those gaps, I believe my office and personnel dollars returned almost \$300,000 to the budget last year, which could almost entirely be attributed to that staging and leaving line items open, without losing any employees when it was all said and done.

President Lloyd: Okay, we appreciate that. That's good. Thank you, Eric.

COUNTY COUNCIL

President Lloyd: Okay, we'll move on to account 1480, County Council, page 107. Any questions on County Council? The large items, Insurance and Computer Services. I had asked Matt Arvay to come in on the Computer Services. You should have a separate hand out. The long legal pad, or legal sheet, and if you look there's a number of columns there, but it does show you the trending in the county's computer costs, 2008, \$1,534,000, go to the final column, second from the end, 2011, \$2,175,566 is the request. I thought, based on some of the comments that I'd heard from the Councilmembers that for the increase we wanted to see if Matt could come in and help explain that. Councilmembers had questions. Now, we have in our budget, it's line item number 3860, this is for all of the computer processing, except the courts, we show, I guess, we flat lined it \$1.7 million, which is obviously low, and I think this year we're going to come in, if you take just June 30th times two, \$1.9 million approximately. So, anyway, Matt, if you might want to explain the increase, the four hundred and some thousand increase.

Matt Arvay: Sure. Matt Arvay, CIO for Vanderburgh County. The total increase that Councilman Lloyd referenced is really attributed to three proposed projects. One is a new financial system for the county. The second one would be a PC refresh and licensing, Microsoft licensing program for the county. The third would be a facilities support enhancement. Do you want to just go at them one at a time? Okay, we'll take the PC refresh and license compliancy program. As computers age, in the past individual departments purchased computers. A few years ago Council tried to control that a little bit by making sure that departments submitted PC requests in their budget submittals. Subsequently, since that time, the city has implemented a like program where we were able to negotiate down computer costs by using the bulk purchasing power of the city and negotiate down rates. What we would like to do is implement the same thing on the county. The first phase of this would replace 315 desktops, 65 laptop notebooks, which would all be over five years old by the time January of next year, and then the real critical piece would be

also the licensing. That licensing takes into consideration Microsoft Office, which is Word, Excel, things of that nature, Outlook, which is the e-mail system, the client side e-mail. The client side Sequel server, when we have the new tax and billing system, ProVal, the proposed financial system, Sequel server is the data base on the back end, and you need a client side license to use that application to be compliant and to access that information. So, what's in the proposal is to purchase 522 licenses that would encompass everybody in the county minus the courts. The courts have their own refresh program. A few years ago they purchased the necessary Microsoft licensing at that point, and they feel at this point they are fine and taken care of. I believe 2013 would be the courts and a few other offices would be five years old, that would be the Assessor, Auditor, Recorder, Treasurer. At that point the courts would entertain maybe getting into an EA agreement at that time, and they're large enough to have a separate EA agreement outside the county.

President Lloyd: How many laptops did you say?

Matt Arvay: There would be 65 in this first phase.

President Lloyd: Okay.

Matt Arvay: And, 315 desktops.

President Lloyd: Okay, and the total cost of the PC refresh, estimated?

Matt Arvay: With licensing included, \$1.1 million, \$1,141,798.

President Lloyd: Okay.

Matt Arvay: I did take the liberty to see if we could get a quote to lease this equipment and software over five years, and I was able to get a 2.99 percent rate just to use as a baseline, which would make the annual payments, which is what I submitted, \$243,562 a year over five years. If you used that 2.99 percent.

President Lloyd: Okay, then, let's just get through these then we'll go with the questions. So, the next item was, was it the FASBE?

Matt Arvay: The financial system—

President Lloyd: Yeah.

Matt Arvay: —for the county?

President Lloyd: Yeah. So, this is getting off the VAX mainframe?

Matt Arvay: This is getting off the VAX mainframe, a 20 plus year old piece of equipment.

President Lloyd: Right.

Matt Arvay: Very hard to share information with departments. Very time consuming for the Auditor's office in maintaining budgets and the P.O. process and payroll and different things of that nature. So, this system that's proposed would be Tyler Technologies, which is the system that the city went through an RFP process. We

had many demos, on-site demonstrations that the county took part of, and when the city signed the contract I had it written in the contract that the county would have two years, if they felt the need, to get a 57 percent discount if they wanted to move forward with Tyler. So, they could take advantage of the RFP process that had already been completed and move forward. I did talk to County Attorney Ted Ziemer and he said that would be an appropriate way that the county could move forward with Tyler due to the fact that it would be services and software based, no hardware would be included.

President Lloyd: Which departments would be on that?

Matt Arvay: The county Auditor would be the major user.

President Lloyd: Treasurer?

Matt Arvay: The Treasurer may have some access. Bill?

Bill Fluty: It's going to impact all county offices sooner or later. They view FASBE now to look at their revenues and expenses, some that have revenues, but it hasn't impacted across the board. But mostly housed in the Auditor's office.

President Lloyd: And then the city, are they completely off the VAX now?

Matt Arvay: No, the city is going to take about a two year implementation time line. They are heavily into the financials right now, finalizing the chart of accounts, they started with purchase order processing, contract management, bid management, they've talked about revenue aspects with the Area Plan Commission and the Building Authority, and then we're –

President Lloyd: Cell phones off, please.

Matt Arvay: So it's going to take about eighteen to twenty-four months on the city side and the financials, we're shooting for to start the brand new budget year in January on the new system.

President Lloyd: Okay, and so what's the estimated cost of that?

Matt Arvay: The estimated cost is \$575,405. I did, again, get a – we wanted to lease it, a lease quote and that's what I submitted in the budget would be year one of the lease at \$160,234.25, is what it comes to.

President Lloyd: And then what would be the time frame of the county getting off of the VAX? Would it be within a year or would that be longer?

Matt Arvay: Yes.

President Lloyd: Within a year. Okay. And then what was the third item?

Matt Arvay: The third item is a facility's management and support enhancement. Currently, what I do is I have to take a look at the amount of devices and support personnel that we have and what that impact is on the user community so one of the things I did is I went out and everybody probably recognizes the name Gartner. They're an independent third party group that is not affiliated with any hardware

resellers or support provider companies, and they go out and they do a lot of assessments and they look at government, private industry and they kind of look at marketing trends. And what I did was, I gathered some numbers and one of the matrixes that they have here is a low stressed IT department, an average and a high, and when we talked about help desk, they say you should have one help desk person for every 275 calls. Well, currently, we're averaging, this year if we prorate it, we're going to have about 6,600 help desk calls this year. So when you look at the computer -- we have about 750 on the city side and on the county it gets a little bit different because we have some desktop support that the courts do and we have the Sheriff that has some support personnel. So what I tried to do was in the PC refresh, we have 919 computers total would be desktops, laptops, notebooks. I said okay, we know we have 367 computers outside of the two organizations I just mentioned. On the court side we do all the call triaging, so although the courts support personnel handle the desk tops, they still can call 5100, we document everything, and then we transfer that call on to the courts personnel. So I said that probably had an estimated 35% impact on staff. We've still got to document the help desk call and we've got to transfer it to get it fixed, so I reduced that down to about 139 computers and I subtracted the Sheriff's office. So on the county side there is about 506 computers that the computer services, out of the 919, support on the desktops. So total, we have about 1,256 computers that the computer services department supports. And we have four and a half help desk people there, four full-time help desk staff and we have a supervisor, help desk supervisor that also in addition does many other jobs, security, things of that nature. So if you look at the support ratio, we're about one for every 279 computers.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, can we -- Matt, of the 506, does that include, as an example, the health department?

Matt Arvay: Yes.

Councilmember Raben: Okay. County Highway?

Matt Arvay: Yep, everybody except courts and Sheriff.

Councilmember Raben: Everybody but court and Sheriff.

Matt Arvay: Now the courts, we still support all the servers, backup, disaster recovery, internet connections, but what I'm just referencing here are desktop computers and laptops.

President Lloyd: Was this 78,000, this facilities management?

Matt Arvay: Yes.

President Lloyd: Okay, so that's additional seven or eight thousand.

Matt Arvay: To the facilities management.

President Lloyd: And that's mainly for help desk employees?

Matt Arvay: Yes, that would be two help desk employees.

President Lloyd: Anything else in the increase before we get into questions?

Matt Arvay: That is it.

President Lloyd: Okay, so those are the three things. Okay, Jim, go ahead.

Councilmember Raben: What I would like to see is, of this overall refresh program, your software, everything, I would like a breakdown by department, by office.

Matt Arvay: We have that.

Councilmember Raben: You do have that.

Matt Arvay: I can supply it, we do have that.

Councilmember Raben: You know, a suggestion here, Mr. President, is one, I don't know why, when the Health department, as an example, has its own levy, why we're paying for that out of general fund. The Assessor's office, we have reassessment funds, we could probably, there is GIS related stuff here probably, right, the same computers probably are running GIS programs.

Matt Arvay: The GIS monies really aren't for the desktop, it's more for the servers.

Councilmember Raben: I understand, but that could also qualify into Reassessment, because we use GIS for reassessment.

Matt Arvay: Okay.

Councilmember Raben: I guess I'm asking for your help with the breakdown and then identifying where we can point some of this hundreds of thousands of dollars into other areas that don't affect our property tax, and wouldn't affect this budget as much. But we've got a lot of other monies out there, you know, the Recorder's office, that's got a fund bigger than we're able to spend, you know, we can probably augment some of their computer costs to the Perpetuation fund. There's a lot of areas, a whole lot of areas and when you think about it, you know, there's fees collected everywhere, the Prosecutor's office, you know, we might need to break this whole computer budget back out and put it in those other lines or other budgets where it doesn't affect property tax or our general fund.

Matt Arvay: And we do have a breakdown. This was a topic, a business topic that went to an ITAC subcommittee, so we had business leaders and individuals from across the enterprise participate and they did a very good job of putting together the numbers, looking at different hardware options and if you don't mind, I'd just like to mention, because they put in a lot of volunteer time: Rick Davis, County Treasurer; Jenny Collins, City Controller; Gary Heck, with the Health department; Ben Miller, the Building Commissioner; Tim VanCleave of the courts; Z Tuley, the County Recorder and John Staples of computer services. So the ITAC subcommittee is a volunteer group that they volunteer their time and they wanted to take a good hard look at these numbers and I really give them a lot of credit for taking the time to make a recommendation to me.

President Lloyd: I think that's an excellent idea by Jim Raben, that we could look at allocating some of these costs, and we'll talk to the Health department tomorrow, but I believe they do have a grant for some PC's. I don't know if you guys

communicated with them. So, I mean, there's other opportunities for revenue. You're right, that this doesn't have to be in the general fund. Mr. Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: Yeah, actually, I had down in my notes along the same lines and thinking that – the only thing I would like for us to see is attach some kind of caveat onto it that we don't get into the problem of some departments running off then and getting 22 inch screens or, you know, and others doing 17 and all the problems that we dealt with before when it was divvied up a bit more, that we can set those controls, I think, on it in the beginning and so that there is clear understanding of what we expect to be bought out of that money for the different departments.

Councilmember Raben: I agree with you 100% and in our earlier conversation today, talking about not everybody having a printer at their desk. In the real world, that doesn't exist. In the private sector, you know, you might have to walk from here to the back of this room to a common printer. So I like a lot of what I heard today, just in regards to that. But, you know, I hope we're looking at, you know, as we talk about particularly this much money, we're screwing down to as small a detail as – you know, does this person really use a computer enough that it merits even a computer sitting at their desk? You know, is it something they click on once a day to retrieve emails or are they actually, is their day filled with running programs within their computer? I find it hard to believe that we need the 506, well, it's actually more than that, for the county.

Matt Arvay: It's 919 total.

Councilmember Raben: Yeah, I can't imagine that we need 919 computers. I think the county only has what, 700 employees?

Matt Arvay: Right, and one thing I would suggest, that maybe you still allow the asset management aspects to run through the computer services so we can make sure that the 22 inch monitors do not pop up, that we help manage what's purchased and signed off on, and we have set a standard what everybody should get, and as far as the additional machines, yeah, they're out there. We probably need to work together on some of these programs –

Councilmember Raben: Well, that's the things you should be doing. I mean, as we look at that, we need to be identifying those. I think, I mean, you know, it sounds to me like we've got room to cut a couple hundred computers out of the whole network. And do we have people that we're buying laptops for that also have a PC on their desk?

Matt Arvay: Well, see, the problem on the county side is the elected official aspect. The elected officials deem what they feel is necessary for their staff to do their job so we really need to find a way to work with the elected official to see if we can trim back on the amount of computers and what they deem would be necessary for their staff to fulfill what they feel is their obligation. That's where we struggle a little bit as the computer service provider because we do not dictate to elected officials how they run their office.

Councilmember Raben: How do we get such a huge imbalance? I mean, give me an example.

Matt Arvay: We have public kiosks out there, you have machines potentially that are sitting in boardrooms that may not be used, but you know, again, we have to update the antivirus, we have to keep those machines up to date, otherwise, they become a threat to other machines, to other systems. So if that machine is on the network, we haven't determined, you know, again, the elected office, is it a valid computer or not, does it have a job responsibility or not. If it's on the network, it's our responsibility to make sure it's safe, up to date, with patches, so it does impact our labor. So, I think, again, we need to look at a way to work with a lot of the elected officials in other departments. The other departments would be the Commissioners.

Councilmember Raben: I would think as a Council we would like to know where those exist. Where there is not somebody assigned to that, where they're using their sign on every day. I'd like to know, I'd like to be able to identify where all those units are at.

Matt Arvay: We definitely have a break down by department, maybe the idea is to ask that department head or officeholder to confirm the business use of the computers that we have for your department.

Councilmember Raben: I mean, if we have them sitting in a boardroom, I don't know who in this building really has a boardroom, but if we have, if we're replacing those computers, I think those days are gone. I think those –

Matt Arvay: We don't have that many boardrooms around so that wouldn't be your couple hundred, a lot of them are your public kiosks and just other functions that that officeholder or department head feels they need it for. I think really the next step would be to have them validate the need for all the machines in their office and then make some decisions from there.

President Lloyd: I mean, I don't know if you have people that have desktop computers, but they're always on their laptop, and they're leaving the building with a laptop. Those are the kind of things that you're looking at.

Councilmember Raben: Right, they don't need, if you have a laptop in this building you don't need a desktop.

President Lloyd: You should have a docking station for your laptop.

Matt Arvay: Right. Right.

Councilmember Shetler: And do you have mobile devices that are counted in that number as well?

Matt Arvay: Just laptops, no phones.

Councilmember Shetler: Okay. I mean, you have to go through some kind of security check and make sure those are clean, though, as people are trying to access? Yeah, exactly, if someone has an Iphone where they're able to access.

Matt Arvay: No, you're accessing information through the internet. They're not connected to our inside network.

Councilmember Shetler: It's not going through your server and –

Matt Arvay: Well, it's coming in through the internet and they're already passing through security devices, but they're not coming through their Iphone running an application at this point, they have laptops out there that we have VPN concentrators on. In other words, that's secure tunneling from a laptop in the field through the Internet to our inside systems. We don't really have anything on the phones other than our websites, stuff like that that they access.

Councilmember Raben: I know I'm asking for you to do a lot of homework, but along with what percent of what department is part of this overall, I would also like a list of the 65, who holds the 65 laptops and do they have PC's assigned to them as well.

Matt Arvay: We definitely have the breakdown of the laptops and what departments. But do they have an assigned desktop in addition, we'll get with the department head or elected official and ask them on behalf of Council.

President Lloyd: Any other questions? Mr. Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes. I concur with Councilman Raben, I think he's brought up some very good points because it seems like we have more than one per employee and maybe that's a little bit heavy. In fact, it is. As far as replacement, when you have, when you replace computers that are five years or older, and then get the proper licensing, what exactly do we include in the replacement of let's say, a desktop, is that everything? Monitor and all?

Matt Arvay: Yes.

Councilmember Goebel: What do we do with a perfectly good, functioning monitor that doesn't need to be replaced?

Matt Arvay: Well, if it is, you can just trickle that down. I mean, you can trickle down, you usually replace the total system when you replace them. If you want us to try to break down the monitor cost versus the desktop, I mean, we can do that.

Councilmember Goebel: Monitors are about like these? Those things last it seems like more than five years.

Matt Arvay: Some of them do.

Councilmember Goebel: I think most of them do. I haven't seen one yet to go out. I mean, it's about like a television screen, maybe we could save some money in that regard.

Matt Arvay: I'll take a look at that.

Councilmember Goebel: Thank you.

President Lloyd: Other questions on the computer line item? Okay, well, I guess we've given you a few things to work on, Matt. Thank you. Why don't we go to, while we're on computers, the court computers, item 3461 Court Technology, and

that would be Mr. VanCleave. And there is a revised budget request, has 456,461 in the last column and he's going to explain that.

Tim VanCleave: Good morning, Tim VanCleave. I'm the executive IT director for the Vanderburgh County courts. I'd like to start out by just mentioning that technology does need to have a role as a tool for the environment and one of the things that you've heard is the recurring statement from public safety and the courts is the amount of cases filed. The courts filed over 64,000 cases last year and technology is a cornerstone in conjunction with the staffing to accomplish the productivity to cover those without significantly increasing the court staff. I did a little bit of research and back in 1978, before technology, well, I guess I should say the technology was a typewriter and everything was done by paper based, it took about 84 employees to handle that 25 - 26,000 filings. As you can tell by that 64,000 number, case filings have doubled annually since then. That's not counting the supplemental filings that come in –

(Tape changed)

– 5,000 filings during the year. Needless to say, you all are quite aware that the court has not doubled their staff since 1978, but yet they're able to continue handling and processing these increases in case filings. So as we take a look at that, I just wanted to kind of put that out, it's been a while since I brought that up and technology does, it is expensive. And as you take a look at this particular budget, we are asking for a small increase. A couple of items that had been brought up and discussed was a maintenance agreement for the arraignment system which helps in reducing the cost for transportation from the jail facility to here as well as security.

President Lloyd: That's the fourth item from the bottom, Video Arraignment, so that would be \$16,500, new item in the budget. And that's for video conference with prisoners at the jail.

Tim VanCleave: Another item that's been a line item in the budget that we show is the script logic, which is part of our court security for the computer devices that we've had in there as a placeholder showing that that would start in 2011. We are estimating that at \$12,500. And then, of course, we talked a little bit about the state voters registration which would be an Election Office item, but we would probably flow that information through this particular budget. But I just wanted that out there so that we know that that could be something that we are faced with in 2011. The biggest item that we have coming forward is the Courtview, which is our case management system for the courts, which is the cornerstone application that is used. Over the past two to three years, we've been working with the vendor who has indicated that they've noticed that our number of connections has been increasing. But in our discussions with them, we have concurrent licensing which means that as long as, it doesn't matter how many people are connected, the number of connections at any given time have to be equal to or less than the licensing. And they were having difficulties in getting the definition from their software providers as to what does a concurrent license mean. As an example, a user in the courts may have two sessions going to Courtview, which is similar to me holding on to this podium with two hands. The question is, does that count as one license or two? Well, we finally worked through that and that only counts as one license. So as we were reviewing the license count situation with them, we were able to realize that we weren't exceeding to the level that had initially been

indicated. And I kept asking them for ways to prove the concurrent license and they were struggling until this year to accomplish that, and they have brought enough evidence forward, that does bring concern to me that we need to start talking about it and try to address the connectivity to Courtview. Right now we are looking at doing business the way we do today, which is extending that out to the Sheriff's office, police department, EPA, DMD, several other offices that use this information where we are now needing maybe somewhere between fifty and one hundred licenses to increase. And that doesn't sound too bad until you hear the retail price of a license today is over \$4,000. So, and shooting in the middle there, about seventy-five licenses retail would be somewhere around \$366,000. So the question is, is that a wise investment? That's where we start to work on looking at, how is Courtview used, are there other alternatives that we can do to provide the same information? Because turning off access to these other agencies, only turns into more work back because they still need the information, how they get the information is they pick up the phone and call the court staff or the Clerk's staff and take them away from the other duties that they're trying to accomplish. So the question is, how do we balance the information distribution with the human labor costs. We met with President Lloyd last week and we do believe that there are some other ways that we can move forward and not necessarily have to incur that licensing cost. So it would involve deploying some new technology, but we think that we can cover that under budgeting for the courts that have been perpetuated since we've deployed Courtview. So if the county does decide to go forward with the county refresh program that Mr. Arvay was just talking about, the courts could start to work towards a 2011 or a 2012 deployment of the next phase of the court technology plan that we've been working on since 2002 now. So that's a big piece to the puzzle that we are looking at in moving forward. We actually did not budget additional significant amount of money for addressing that because we haven't really looked at all the options but we did increase about six percent on the Courtview license or Courtview maintenance line item with some anticipation that there may be some increase there. We would also like to move forward with the enterprise agreements. As we move forward now because it does appear that the lease rates for hardware and this software at 2.99 percent is at a good number, which would save money over the long term if we can get a five year lease.

President Lloyd: Any questions on the court system? I guess one of the things that came out of our discussion, the police, the Evansville Police, they don't need full licenses, and obviously, the county shouldn't pay for those on Courtview. One of the things that we're looking at is kind of like a group type of view system. I mean, the police aren't in there making changes to the records, only the courts are doing that. So really, all they want to do is view, so there's a scaled down type of way to do this without having to buy that license, right?

Tim VanCleave: Right. Courtview offers a public access module that is significantly less with an unlimited number of users that provides that insight into the court records, but doesn't have the ability to enter any data. The one downside of that is that it doesn't allow the printing of docket sheets or the court calendar, which does have some bearing on the operations in the outside agencies, but we believe that there is another method that we can deploy and provide that same service and not incur that significant cost because with each Courtview license, there is a recurring cost each year that then perpetuates forward. That is the best scenario that we see right now moving forward. There are some other options that we are still looking into such as licence control software that when we see inactivity from a user it would log them off and free up the licenses. We have looked at going on

to the state system, but with what we've already talked about with the state voters registration, there is always hesitations about moving to that because it may or may not ultimately save any money here at the local level. We are looking at interfaces that might allow us to distribute the information differently, but a lot of times there's a lot of programming costs that go into those, so probably not as cost effective as the solution that we've already talked about. But we're looking at several other options as well. But the one with the public access, with report generation seems to be the most cost effective fit.

President Lloyd: Other questions for the court computer? Thank you very much. Anything else in County Council's budget? Insurance, I guess the only question I'd have to Mrs. Deig, are we going to hit our 2010 budget amount of 9.8 million?

Sandie Deig: Yes.

President Lloyd: Okay, so we are not going to be underfunded for Insurance.

Councilmember Raben: I would also like to do what I mentioned on the computers with insurance, the offices, you know, where we can push it off on reassessment, where ever we can move Insurance, we need to try to break that out. I mean, like the Assessor's office as an example, if we can put that on Reassessment, let's do it. And that's a question if we can or can't. I'm not saying – we need to check to make sure that the Reassessment fund can pick up the Insurance side.

Councilmember Shetler: But at least the employees that are already being paid underneath those other funds ought to – that insurance appropriate for them, it should be.

Councilmember Raben: Well, most of your grant lines have the insurance in there. But we do, again, we've got some other offices that I think have funds that, where the statute allows us to pay insurance out of those, I want to move them there.

Councilmember Shetler: Agreed.

President Lloyd: Okay, any other questions on County Council budget?

911 EMERGENCY SERVICE

President Lloyd: Okay, we'll move on. Next would be 911 Emergency Service fund, and this is actually the Central Dispatch, it's page 155. We already had that under joint budget, unless anybody had any other questions on that.

LOCAL EMERGENCY PLANNING COMMISSION

President Lloyd: Okay, we'll move on to the next one, 2861 Local Emergency Planning, page 153. Any questions on that? It looks like there's a decrease in that budget.

LOCAL DRUG FREE COMMUNITY

President Lloyd: If no questions, we'll move on to account 3280, Local Drug Free Community, page 154. Is that, oh, here we go. I thought someone administered this.

Wanda McCarter: Hello, my name is Wanda McCarter, I'm the current program director for the Substance Abuse Council.

President Lloyd: Wanda McCarter?

Wanda McCarter: Yes.

President Lloyd: We show at least at this point, no change in this budget.

Wanda McCarter: Correct.

President Lloyd: Are you funded by grants, as well?

Wanda McCarter: We are funded through the countermeasure fees.

President Lloyd: Where are you guys located?

Wanda McCarter: We're located at 501 John Street, suite four.

President Lloyd: But we don't show any rent here, so I guess that's funded by grants?

Wanda McCarter: Yes, that's also funded under the Discretionary funds. They are the fees collected for anyone facing alcohol or drug abuse charges. They were set up by the Governor's Commission, and governed by the Indiana Criminal Justice Institute.

President Lloyd: How much would that be? Like for a typical instance, what's the fee?

Wanda McCarter: I'm not sure without – it can range anywhere from 200 to 2,000.

Councilmember Goebel: They basically pay for their own monitoring, correct?

Wanda McCarter: Yes, and any fines levied.

Councilmember Goebel: Thank you.

President Lloyd: And as far as you can tell, I mean, the program will be continuing as is with the grants?

Wanda McCarter: Correct.

President Lloyd: Okay, in the state budget?

Wanda McCarter: Yes.

President Lloyd: How many employees you guys have?

Wanda McCarter: One.

President Lloyd: That's you.

Wanda McCarter: That's me.

President Lloyd: Okay. Any other questions?

Councilmember Goebel: Do you have any problems with your employees?

Wanda McCarter: No, so far they're working out pretty well.

Councilmember Goebel: Thank you.

President Lloyd: Okay, we appreciate you coming in.

Wanda McCarter: Thank you.

RECORDER

President Lloyd: 1040 County Recorder, page 13. Getting down to the wire.

Z Tuley: Z. Tuley, Vanderburgh County Recorder.

President Lloyd: Any questions for the County Recorder?

Councilmember Raben: It's been a long wait, wasn't it?

Z Tuley: Yeah.

President Lloyd: I guess one question I would have, how are the fees coming in versus prior years? Are they down like the Surveyor indicated?

Z Tuley: They've been down but compared to the year, they're just about steady. But there have been particular months that were down. But we're back on an upswing right now.

President Lloyd: What was 2009, roughly?

Z Tuley: 2009...I'm not like Eric, I can't come up with this stuff off the top of my head. Based on this report that I have in front of me, it was like a half million. But it also indicates that it might have been like for eight months or seven months. But the number of documents are holding steady as well.

President Lloyd: So for '09 roughly half a million in fees?

Z Tuley: It's going to be a little bit more than that. It's probably close to seven by the time you wrap up. Unless we take another dive. This is why this is so hard to predict because we could head on to another slow spell again.

President Lloyd: But '10 so far is better than '09.

Z Tuley: It's about steady.

President Lloyd: About the same. Okay. Overall, this budget is only up \$6,000, 1.5%.

Z Tuley: And that was due to longevity in both cases.

President Lloyd: Would it help Councilmembers if we knew what the fees were coming in? I mean, if you could get us that, maybe just a summary.

Z Tuley: And it helps you...because I can provide whatever you want, but...

President Lloyd: I mean, is that something useful, Jim?

Councilmember Raben: About the total fees taken or...

President Lloyd: Yeah.

Z Tuley: Because they go into the Recorder's Perpetuation.

Councilmember Raben: It would be interesting to know what the Recorder's Perpetuation fund amount is to date.

Z Tuley: Today?

Councilmember Raben: The balance.

Z Tuley: It is 800,000. We are fee based, established by the state. They set the rate, they also sat and established what it can be used for and what it cannot be used for.

Councilmember Shetler: Could we review that again? I know we do that every year, but can we review just exactly what money can be used for?

Z Tuley: There are some gray areas as to what that money can be used for. I have spoken to the State Board of Accounts about it at length, and they have determined that when it gets into a very gray area, right now they just kind of take a hands off position on most of it unless it's clearly misused, and then they will come forth and say you can't do that. But there's not a set of established items, I can tell you in general, operational, you had mentioned earlier that perhaps the Recorder could pay for its own. I think in the whole scheme of a computer refresh program, it's not going to assist the county in any great numbers. However, I don't object, and it's not against state policy for the Recorder to purchase their own computer equipment, our own screens, our own equipment that causes or that is involved with the upkeep and availability and the processing of the documents. So that would obviously –

Councilmember Raben: I think the only thing that it really states is that it cannot be used on salaries.

Z Tuley: That's really clear.

Councilmember Raben: Yeah, that's very clear. I think you can pretty much use it for whatever it takes to maintain that office from that point on.

Z Tuley: I don't know, I didn't ask that. I do have a contract and it was for putting on the old data that was not on the computer system and so since this contract hires people to get it on the computer system, it was clearly eligible.

Councilmember Shetler: And then what about other departments that interact with you, be it Treasurer or Auditor or –

Z Tuley: I did not get an exception with the Area Plan because I was needing one of those larger printable plat maps and so I did agree to partially fund an Area Plan large plat printer and I did not get an exception on that. So that was good to go. I didn't fund it entirely because it wasn't going to sit in my office for my needs, but I didn't have a problem with footing what I felt like was our share of the bill. And we do have customer demands for that and we do have some of that on the computer, we just lack the ability to be able to print it. And so in light of the public and the Council needing to tighten up their budget and the public expecting us not to do too much duplication, I felt like it was financially responsible to assist and have a joint machine that we all used than for me to up and purchase my own.

President Lloyd: And then when you need those printouts or maps, you should be at the head of the line, right?

Z Tuley: We are.

President Lloyd: That's good.

Z Tuley: We are not having a problem with the system set up. Area Plan has been extremely cooperative, very helpful. And oh, another advantage to having it set up this way, in order for Area Plan to print it, it has to be scanned into their equipment as well, so now they also have access to that same map that we use. So its actually benefitted them as well.

President Lloyd: Okay, good. Other questions for the Recorder?

Z Tuley: Thank you.

President Lloyd: Okay, thank you.

CORONER

President Lloyd: The last department, Coroner, 1070, page 36. Good morning.

Annie Groves: Hi, Annie Groves, Vanderburgh County Coroner. When I submitted my budget this time, I comprehend the economy, the way things are right now. I have asked for no increases, it's the same budget that I have for 2010. If I can have that same budget again, I could make it providing we don't have a disaster. I would also like to say that at the end of the year I'm going to have to do some transfers because our caseload is up 35% from where it was last year at this time. And as you well know, I can't control that.

President Lloyd: So there's more deaths?

Councilmember Kiefer: More crime and more deaths. Man, it's depressing sitting here.

President Lloyd: Questions for the Coroner? Mr. Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: I just saw, your report the other day to the media was a very good one and helped shed some light on what you have to do day in and day out.

Annie Groves: Thank you.

President Lloyd: Other questions? This budget is up \$8,668, 1.5%.

Annie Groves: And that's from step increases and FICA and...

President Lloyd: Right. Autopsies is one we constantly ask about. It looks like this year is going to go above the prior or the budgeted amount and you're indicating that's due to more deaths?

Annie Groves: Thirty-five percent increase.

President Lloyd: Okay. I hope we're having the same number of births or we're losing ground. Mr. Shetler.

Councilmember Shetler: Getting all those autopsies, that's kind of my question I get into every year. I know one of the things you've indicated in the past is that what affects us is the major hospitals in the area are here. So if there is a death, we end up being responsible many times for those autopsies in southern Illinois, western Kentucky people. One thing that caught my eye the other day is when the person drowned in the Ohio trying to swim across it or whatever happened there. And the autopsy was being done in Madison – oh, is that because it was in the Ohio River at the time?

Annie Groves: The way it is at the Ohio River, it's where you bring the person out at, and the Coast Guard and the Department of Natural Resources goes to the first available place. So the first available place for them was in Henderson. So therefore, it's Henderson's body.

Councilmember Shetler: Oh, I thought they came out of the – did it come out in Dogtown or did it come out of Newburgh?

Annie Groves: No, they went in Newburgh beach, but the way the person was found, they were able to, the closest place to take the body to was to the Henderson side.

Councilmember Shetler: Can we, you know, maybe, I understand that's been the protocol in the past, but maybe get a better handle on in controlling that and particularly if it's a Kentucky person that we can automatically just say hey, emergency personnel, take that over to Henderson and –

Annie Groves: I have no control over that. That's the Department of Natural Resource and the Coast Guard. So that's federally mandated, it's not state or local.

Councilmember Shetler: Oh okay, alright.

President Lloyd: The number of autopsies, now you do receive work from other counties, right?

Annie Groves: Yeah, we do. In Indiana, if the person dies, if someone is life flighted or transported in from Posey County and they die here, we do bill them back for all the work that we do. We bill them for the autopsy, we bill them for the toxicology, we bill them for our morgue fee, the transport, and that all goes into the general fund. However, we cannot bill Kentucky and Illinois and I know over the weekend we had six cases all were motor vehicle accidents, everyone of them came from Illinois.

President Lloyd: Why can't we bill them?

Annie Groves: State law won't permit it.

President Lloyd: Oh, okay.

Annie Groves: But state law will permit us to bill Indiana. However, they can't bill us either, if one of our people die over there.

President Lloyd: Okay, any other questions for the Coroner? Okay, thank you very much.

Annie Groves: You're welcome.

President Lloyd: We will take our recess and reconvene tomorrow at 8:30. Thank you for coming.

(The meeting was recessed at 12:07 p.m.)

**VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL
BUDGET HEARINGS
AUGUST 18, 2010**

The Vanderburgh County Council met in session this 18th day of August, 2010 in room 301 of the Civic Center Complex. The meeting was called to order at 8:30 a.m. by County Council President Russell Lloyd, Jr.

President Lloyd: I would like to reconvene the Vanderburgh County Council 2011 budget session. Attendance roll call please.

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

President Lloyd: I would like to ask Councilman Goebel to lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance. Please stand.

(The Pledge of Allegiance was given.)

President Lloyd: Thank you. Before we get started, we receive a publication from the National Association of Counties, I don't know if Councilmembers received this yesterday, but if you looked at page four the headline is, "Budget Shortfalls Force Counties to Cut Vital Staff, 37 Percent of Counties Lay Off Sheriff, Police and Fire Personnel in Cut Backs." So, a real tough situation for a lot of counties in this recession. We're hoping that we're not in that position, but, obviously, we want to do everything we can to limit employees and new expenditures. We'll move on to our scheduled agenda. The first department would be number 1303, Public Defender Commission, and that's on page 77.

PUBLIC DEFENDER COMMISSION

Steve Owens: Good morning.

President Lloyd: Good morning.

Steve Owens: Steve Owens, Public Defender. The only thing I would have to point out as to our budget requests for this year is on page, actually it's on page 78. There are two corrections, line item 1770 is listed at \$38,302, that should be \$38,202, and line item 1820 was listed at \$38,230, that should be \$40,072, forty thousand seventy two dollars. There is a step increase that will come into effect during the 2011 year that I did not anticipate, or I did not see when we were preparing the budget originally.

Councilmember Raben: (Inaudible, microphone not on)

Steve Owens: Jim, that would be 1820, Administrative Assistant. She will hit a ten year step increase in January of '11.

Councilmember Raben: What was the amount?

Steve Owens: Pardon?

Councilmember Raben: What was the amount?

Steve Owens: The correct amount should be \$40,072. It's a PAT, I believe it's a PAT IV position.

President Lloyd: Could you repeat the first one, please?

Councilmember Terry: Yes, thank you.

Steve Owens: The first one would be 1770, Paralegal, we had it set in at \$38,302, it's actually \$38,202.

President Lloyd: Okay, a hundred dollars.

Steve Owens: Yes, sir.

President Lloyd: Okay, is there any questions for Mr. Owens? If you look on the budget, the very last item, Death Penalty, \$250,000. That figure, obviously, that does not include what's been expended so far in 2010.

Steve Owens: No, it does not. Nor does it include what's been appropriated in 2010. That's the figure that we anticipate we probably will need in 2011. As you know, that case has been venued to Clark County.

President Lloyd: They set a trial date in '11, right? What is it, April?

Steve Owens: That trial date has been moved. It's now late April of '11, yes.

President Lloyd: Okay. Would you anticipate it being completed in '11?

Steve Owens: Yes.

President Lloyd: Okay.

Steve Owens: Well, as far as the initial trial of it, yes, I do.

President Lloyd: Then it's an automatic appeal?

Steve Owens: There will be an appeal, assuming there's a conviction, an appeal to the Indiana Supreme Court, then potentially a petition to transfer to the United States Supreme Court.

President Lloyd: Okay. Mr. Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: Can you refresh my memory, how much did we appropriate this year for that? Was that about a hundred?

Steve Owens: Tom, I think it was two hundred and fifty –

Councilmember Shetler: Two hundred and fifty? Okay.

Steve Owens: – (Inaudible) for.

Councilmember Shetler: So, now we'll have, if this is approved, half a million dollars, more or less, in reserve to cover that?

Steve Owens: That's correct.

Councilmember Shetler: And our portion is half, 50 percent?

Steve Owens: Yes, the State will–

Councilmember Shetler: So, that should be more than adequate to cover?

Steve Owens: I don't know if I want to go that far. We're hoping that certainly would cover it.

Councilmember Shetler: I'll remove the more. It should be adequate?

Steve Owens: Well, we're hoping that that's going to be adequate to cover it. We've already filed our first reimbursement request with the State for the first three months worth of capital expenditures. They will consider that at their next meeting, which I believe is in September. They reimburse at 50 percent, so we should be getting some money back already before the end of this year.

Councilmember Shetler: What, and, I'm kind of going along the lines of cash flow in this, that two hundred and fifty that's been appropriated, how long, how far will that get you into next year? Assuming that everything stays on schedule?

Steve Owens: I don't know. I can't answer that question, how far is it going to get us into next year. We're still in the process of obtaining experts and still working on the case, obviously. How that's going to fare, I can't tell you. I would anticipate, and we think, at least at where we are right now, that the two fifty will get us through the end of this year, hopefully, into next year, but how far in to next year I can't tell you.

Councilmember Shetler: Again, the trial is set for?

Steve Owens: I believe it's the, well, I know it's the latter part of April, I can't give you the exact date.

Councilmember Shetler: And, the probability of that staying on schedule?

Steve Owens: I would say, right now, it's pretty good.

Councilmember Shetler: Pretty good? Okay.

Steve Owens: Yes.

Councilmember Shetler: So, we will need that half a million dollars between now and a year from now, for sure?

Steve Owens: Well, we've already appropriated two hundred fifty--

Councilmember Shetler: Right.

Steve Owens: --that's already in the account. I would anticipate we're going to need, obviously, somewhere around two hundred and fifty for next year. You're going to have some trial costs that I cannot accurately predict at this point. Then, there's going to be some appellate costs, and the appeals are not inexpensive. I think we're up in the \$60,000 or so bracket on the Wilkes appeal, and we pretty well have completed that.

Councilmember Shetler: And, you, how long do you have to file for an appeal after the court decision? Assuming that's--

Steve Owens: Thirty days after, we file the notice of appeals thirty days after sentencing, and then it takes a while to prepare a transcript. These are very lengthy trials, generally speaking, so, it's months before the appeal is actually perfected.

Councilmember Shetler: Alright, thank you.

President Lloyd: Mr. Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Could there be another one pending? From reading in the paper I was thinking there was another one could be pending coming up here in the near future.

Steve Owens: I think you're asking the wrong guy.

Councilmember Bassemier: Oh, okay.

Steve Owens: The people that file those are sitting back here.

Councilmember Bassemier: Okay.

Steve Owens: I don't know. I don't know whether they're going to file another one or not.

Councilmember Bassemier: Okay.

Steve Owens: I would hope not.

Councilmember Bassemier: Thought maybe you might have some heads up.

Steve Owens: They don't usually tell me in advance what they're going to do.

Councilmember Bassemier: Okay. Thanks. We'll just wait till he gets up here. We'll just wait till he gets up here before I ask him if that's a possibility. Thank you, sir.

President Lloyd: Mr. Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Steve, did you mention that the prior capital case is, we're pretty much through with that as far as our county financial responsibility?

Steve Owens: Pretty much. We filed the Petition for Cert with the United States Supreme Court. That has not been ruled on yet. Assuming that's denied, we're done.

Councilmember Goebel: Okay.

Steve Owens: If it's, obviously, if it's granted we've got some other issues that we'll have to deal with, but, I would anticipate we're pretty completed with that. We've got all of the bills in, everything's been paid.

Councilmember Goebel: Do you know, off the top of your head, how much that cost Vanderburgh County?

Steve Owens: Including the appeal?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Steve Owens: \$600,000 plus.

Councilmember Goebel: Okay, and how much have we spent so far in the current case? Would you know?

Steve Owens: I'm going to give you a rough figure, because I'm not (Inaudible).

Councilmember Goebel: That's fine.

Steve Owens: I hadn't really prepared for that question. I'm going to guess it's about sixty.

Councilmember Goebel: Okay, and we have allotted two hundred and fifty. So, we've got—

Steve Owens: We have, if you'll recall, we had transferred some money from another line item to initially fund it, then we appropriated two hundred and fifty. So, we started out to complete this year with somewhere around \$272,000, roughly. If we've spent sixty, we've got around \$210,000 or so left.

Councilmember Goebel: Okay, thank you. Purely from a financial standpoint, for our county and for all of the counties, is there any movement that you're aware of underfoot to do away with death penalty? Because, I think, the cost, financially, is much higher to go through this process. Has it been brought up at all to your knowledge in the State?

Steve Owens: I don't think there's any serious effort to abolish the death penalty in Indiana. The number of death penalty requests have been falling for the last several years, partially because of the cost. We probably are, have the fewest number of pending death penalty cases in Indiana right now that we've had in the past ten years.

Councilmember Goebel: Okay, and the automatic appeal to the State, that is mandated?

Steve Owens: Yes.

Councilmember Goebel: And, we must fund that?

Steve Owens: We have to take that, we have to do an appeal to the Indiana Supreme Court, obviously, and then beyond that we see.

Councilmember Goebel: Thank you.

President Lloyd: Mr. Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yeah, Steve, what is our process for submitting those claims or the reimburseables? Do we do that monthly or weekly?

Steve Owens: The, you mean, for the reimbursement, Jim? The reimbursement claims have to be submitted within 120 days in capital cases of the date they're paid. So, we paid the May, the late April, May and June have already been submitted for reimbursement. The July expenses were just paid in August, so, we'll probably wait until, I don't know, September, roughly, to make another reimbursement claim. We try to lump them together. The Commission only meets quarterly, so we gain nothing by submitting them monthly, particularly.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, I was concerned about how quick we're trying to get our money back into the county General Fund.

Steve Owens: Well, we went ahead and submitted the first ones so they would be considered at the September meeting, even though we weren't outside the time lines. Obviously, I don't know where our August bills are going to be at this point. It's unlikely, I don't anticipate, although it's possible that we might submit a second request for the July and August bills, if we can get them in there before the September meeting. I'll just have to see how that rolls. We're now dealing with Clark County, so things go to Clark County and come back and that slows the process down a little bit.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, this is another one of those budgets that we need to look hard at moving the Insurance line into this budget, where we would get 40 percent of that back from the State.

Steve Owens: You're already getting it.

Councilmember Raben: Oh, we're—

Steve Owens: It doesn't matter—

Councilmember Raben: Okay, so we're breaking that out.

Steve Owens: —what account it's coming from. You're already getting 40 percent of the insurance back.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, even though it's not reflected in your budget we're still getting it? Okay.

Steve Owens: That's right.

Councilmember Raben: That's all.

President Lloyd: Other questions for Mr. Owen? The only, I guess, maybe a bigger picture type question, you've had some shifting around of personnel where you, I think, you lost a full time and added a part time, or the other way around. Do you anticipate these personnel would serve your needs, or do you look at maybe having some other part timers?

Steve Owens: We've been making the move from part timers to full timers.

President Lloyd: Okay.

Steve Owens: So, as we are losing part timers, we've been consolidating those into full time positions. I would anticipate we're going to continue to do that. The one thing that's going to hinder that more than anything is just the physical space, in terms of the number of offices we have available to put full time people in. I think we can probably absorb, and we may have towards the end of this year, there may be some part time openings, I may come back to you then and ask to consolidate that into a full time. We probably can absorb one more full time office.

President Lloyd: What, and on your support staff, are there any personnel where you could maybe take a full time and make them part time? Or, are they, do you have enough support staff for the attorneys, or do you have too many attorneys?

Steve Owens: Well, the Public Defender Commission pretty much limits our support staff. They have two different standards. They have one that's adequately supported and one that's inadequately supported. That's defined by the number of secretaries and paralegals and investigators. We operate in sort of a dual mode. Some of the attorneys are considered to be adequately supported, some of them are inadequately supported. If we were to cut support staff, it's going to cut the number of cases that the adequately supported attorneys can handle, which would not be a good thing for our office or the attorneys. We are marginally supported right now. I think, two years ago, I think we made a proposal to add an additional paralegal and an additional investigator to help bring us up to being adequately supported across the board, the Council did not want to approve those positions. So, we've gone to this hybrid situation.

President Lloyd: How many attorneys do you have?

Steve Owens: Presently, I have five full time attorneys, 12 part time felony attorneys, four juvenile/civil attorneys, and three part time misdemeanor attorneys.

President Lloyd: Out of those numbers how many would you say are inadequately supported?

Steve Owens: All of the misdemeanor, all of the juvenile, and three of the full time attorneys are inadequately supported. The 12 part time felony attorneys, and two of the full time felony attorneys are adequately supported.

President Lloyd: So, are you, I guess, the management of the office, you want to adequately support the more serious crimes at this point? Or, does it matter?

Steve Owens: I'm not sure I understood your question.

President Lloyd: Well, it sounds like the felonies would be adequately supported, I mean, those may be more serious crimes in light of people going to jail and things like that.

Steve Owens: Well, that's the way we have set it up. We don't receive reimbursement for misdemeanors. We don't receive reimbursement for civil/juvenile cases. We could handle a few more juvenile delinquency cases with the attorneys we have if we had some additional support staff. The three attorneys who are handling felony cases in that office, the full time lawyers, including me, if we had additional support staff we could increase our numbers a little bit. Again, we're going to run into some issues in terms of the physical location. Where are you going to put these additional people? But, it would increase some numbers a little bit. I don't know, I haven't sat down and churned the dollar numbers as to if we added an additional investigator and paralegal, in terms of what it would cost the county, if we would gain a whole lot at this point.

President Lloyd: How many did you say were misdemeanor part time?

Steve Owens: We have three part time misdemeanor attorneys.

President Lloyd: Three. So, I count 24 attorneys, based on those numbers.

Steve Owens: Five, 12, 17, four, 21, that would be about right, yes.

President Lloyd: Now, one other thing, the part timers, don't they also use their own law office staff to assist in these, or not?

Steve Owens: They do.

President Lloyd: Okay, they're billed back to the Public Defender Office, or not?

Steve Owens: Are they billed back to the Public Defender Office?

President Lloyd: I mean, like if they're doing time on a public case.

Steve Owens: No.

President Lloyd: Oh, okay. It's part of their—

Steve Owens: They're using their private staff for typing or to answer phone calls, they don't bill that back to us.

President Lloyd: Okay. Any other questions on the Public Defender? Just for the record, budget increase, \$228,595, 12 percent, but it's, the bulk of it is the Death Penalty, which was zero last year. Let's move on to....oh, Mr. Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: To follow up real quick on Jim's point, the computer system that's all used through here, do you report that back into the State for getting reimbursement? Any of the costs that's associated with that?

Steve Owens: Any time we get any additional equipment, computers, telephones, we have that broke out by whoever is providing it. We do seek reimbursement for that, yeah.

Councilmember Shetler: Okay, do you work through Tim or Matt?

Steve Owens: Well, it's been a while since we've done the computers, I don't remember. It seems like Tim, it seems like the last time we got computers for the office, Tim gave us a figure as to what those computers, what our share of that was. We put that in for our reimbursement request.

Councilmember Shetler: Alright, thank you.

President Lloyd: Any other questions for Public Defender? Alright, thank you very much?

Steve Owens: Thank you.

President Lloyd: Next is department 1080, Prosecutor, page 39.

PROSECUTOR

President Lloyd: We have the Prosecutor's budget expert, Mr. Brown.

Doug Brown: Yes, good morning.

President Lloyd: Good morning. Councilmember questions for the Prosecutor? Mr. Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: I asked Mr. Owens about, is there a possibility of another murder case pending?

Doug Brown: I'm not sure which case you're talking about.

Councilmember Bassemier: Okay.

Doug Brown: Really, this probably wouldn't be the appropriate forum to discuss that. I would be happy to talk with you.

Councilmember Bassemier: Sure.

Doug Brown: Not that I'm aware of.

Councilmember Bassemier: I figured that would be the answer, but, okay, thank you.

President Lloyd: Other questions? Mr. Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Doug, the salaries, those are all just step increases, basically?

Doug Brown: Basically, yeah, well, actually, our budget has gone down because of the employee that we're not replacing. Mr. Levco had been here speaking of that before.

Councilmember Goebel: Okay, thank you.

Councilmember Raben: Doug, in your past experiences, I don't know how many death penalty cases since you've been with the Prosecutor's Office you've been part of, but how much of a role does the family of the plaintiff play in whether or not something goes to a death penalty or not?

Doug Brown: I couldn't put a percentage on that, but Mr. Levco always meets with the family extensively, and, you know, takes their views into account when he makes his final decision. Some family members don't want the death penalty, some do, but he tries to, he doesn't try to, he always does talk to all of those people. I'm not sure how many cases we've had, probably five or six since Mr. Levco has been Prosecutor. I know, he has more people on death row than any other Prosecutor.

Councilmember Raben: You know, and, I guess, where I'm going with this is, you know, if the family is insistent upon it, you know, that's understandable, but where they're not, you know, at the extreme cost that it costs the taxpayers to fund one of these, I hope we're cognizant of that.

Doug Brown: He's very cognizant. I think he's also been involved in some State-wide committees actually studying the death penalties and the costs. Is it really worth it?

Councilmember Goebel: What is the average cost of going through the process of a typical death penalty compared to let's say keeping an inmate behind bars?

Doug Brown: I could not begin to answer.

Councilmember Goebel: Okay.

Doug Brown: I mean, it's a cost on one end versus the other end. I mean, the county is picking up so much of the cost for the actual trial versus the taxpayers, Department of Correction, the long term care of the inmate. So, I can't really answer that question.

Councilmember Goebel: Thank you.

President Lloyd: Mr. Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Thank you, Doug, I'm not a legal person, so, my questions may sound very simple to you, but, you know—

Doug Brown: Sure.

Councilmember Kiefer: —for me, I don't understand the legality of all these things. If you, you know, you're trying a death penalty case, if for some reason he doesn't get the, the Prosecutor doesn't get the verdict on the death penalty that he wishes or hopes for, what then happens? I mean, is life sentencing still a possibility?

Doug Brown: It depends on how it's filed, but, yeah it goes into a sentencing phase at that point. Actually, it's what they call bifurcated trial. I mean, there's two elements, there's the element of proving the actual charge itself—

Councilmember Kiefer: Right.

Doug Brown: –then there's the element of determining whether he should get the death penalty or not. Even after it's, if the jury comes back that there should be a death penalty, the judge could ultimately as the decision maker, he can decide not to give the death penalty.

Councilmember Kiefer: Right, so, ultimately, there's a possibility that he could just wind up with life without parole?

Doug Brown: Yeah.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay, alright. Thanks, Doug.

President Lloyd: Mr. Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: Doug, I'm noticing on the Law Books, yesterday the judges came in, we're dealing with about \$12,000-\$15,000, I think, that they're needing, you're needing, requesting \$8,000, the Public Defender was just here, he had \$5,000, you know, we're talking \$25,000-\$30,000 for law books around this same building. Is there any way, I mean, does it make sense at all for that to be consolidated into one library where everybody can have access to it?

Doug Brown: We would be willing to work with anything as far as that goes. Most of ours, a lot of ours are done online. As far as physical law books, we don't have that many subscriptions anymore. We don't even have a full library of cases anymore. We have, our law books are very limited. So, we've cut down, if you've looked at our budget from years past, it's gone down, down, down.

Councilmember Shetler: Right.

Doug Brown: So, we would be willing to work with anything. Most of ours is done online.

Councilmember Shetler: Now, that stuff that's online, do you have to, I guess, subscribe to that–

Doug Brown: Yeah.

Councilmember Shetler: –and is that per user?

Doug Brown: It's not per user–

Councilmember Shetler: So, different attorneys–

Doug Brown: –we have a contract for our whole office, our we hooked in the whole county with that, I'm not sure. No, it's just us, but everybody has–

Councilmember Shetler: So, the office has one license for it. You don't have to worry about individually–

Doug Brown: It's all included. We don't get charged for each....there's one package for our whole office.

Councilmember Shetler: Okay. Alright, do you know if that package could be done through, like say, Vanderburgh County in general, instead of, say, Prosecutor's Office specifically, so that the judges and everybody would have that same kind of license and we wouldn't have to duplicate that?

Doug Brown: I assume it would. I mean, I would say that would be an area where we have a lot of flexibility. We would be willing to work with whatever the county came up with.

Councilmember Shetler: Alright, thank you.

President Lloyd: Ms. Terry?

Councilmember Goebel: Will you check on that?

President Lloyd: Oh.

Councilmember Goebel: I'm sorry.

President Lloyd: Did you, you didn't have a question? Oh, sorry.

Councilmember Goebel: I was going to say, will you check on that possibility, Doug?

Doug Brown: Yeah, we'll call our representative—

Councilmember Goebel: I think that could be significant savings.

Doug Brown: —and see what they say. Obviously, it would be up to the judges and other members of the legal community, but, yeah—

Councilmember Goebel: But, all of the other departments, basically, work online as well, is that correct?

Doug Brown: Yeah, I think that's just the way it is now. There's very few, I mean, our library is more of a storage room than a library.

Councilmember Goebel: I think Councilman Shetler had a great idea. Thank you.

President Lloyd: Other questions? I guess, since we asked the Public Defender, can you give me roughly how many attorneys you have?

Doug Brown: I can, just because....we have 17 spots, 16 are filled right now with full time attorneys, five part time attorneys.

President Lloyd: Okay, and as of right now, that one spot is just being left open?

Doug Brown: It is being left open, and what we have done is we've moved, we're not going to be asking for the matching grant in our drug program. That person, starting in January will be in our regular set of attorneys.

President Lloyd: So, I guess, on the scales of justice, the Public Defender and the Prosecutor they're about equal in number of attorneys.

Doug Brown: The Public Defender doesn't have to prove anything.

President Lloyd: That's obviously, it's the quality of the work the attorney does. In this budget we're only up \$5,000 and that would be the main reason that we have the one attorney missing. So, less than one percent increase. Any other questions on the Prosecutor? We'll go to 1081, Prosecutor IV-D, page 42.

PROSECUTOR IV-D

President Lloyd: What does this area specifically deal with?

Doug Brown: That's child support.

President Lloyd: Any questions for Mr. Brown? About an \$8,800 increase. Okay. Going once, going twice. We'll move on to 1082-1085, Prosecutor Grants, page 44.

PROSECUTOR GRANTS

President Lloyd: One director, and that's check recovery, so, is that a State grant?

Doug Brown: Our check recovery program, I'm not sure what's on there with that, but that's privately—

President Lloyd: I guess, it says Prosecutor Fees, that's probably just the department was called that for a number of years, it's probably just a grant.

Doug Brown: That may well be the case, yeah, it is now farmed out, its worked quite well for us.

President Lloyd: Okay. Now, on page 45 you've got Drug Law Enforcement Program, that budget's been cut in half. I guess, that's related to the State?

Doug Brown: Well, that's related to us moving, we're not going to be asking, we're not having to pay the full matching grant, because we're pulling one employee out of that and putting them into the regular line item and then not filling that position.

President Lloyd: So from your point of view, that grant didn't change, you just don't have a person in that line item?

Doug Brown: Correct.

President Lloyd: The money is basically the same?

Doug Brown: Correct.

Councilmember Raben: How much are we bringing in on that grant, Doug?

Doug Brown: As far as forfeitures and things of that nature? Do you know off the top of your head?

Regene Newman: (Inaudible. Not at microphone.)

Doug Brown: And, that's another thing we've farmed out because it was far more efficient to have it privately done and get a percentage than using one of our employees to actually spend the time working on the forfeitures.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, so, as an example, where this budget is \$88,000, we're making up \$28,000 out of the County General?

Doug Brown: Do you want to come up here?

Regene Newman: That actually, that grant is no longer in effect. If you remember last year we had two people we talked about putting them on the General Fund, and instead we just kept the match open and funded their salaries through that. So, we don't get federal money for that anymore. This year we're going to take one of those attorneys and move them to the General Fund to where that match is just funding the one attorney. Then the forfeiture money that we get in, it also funds a secretary in our office that's not on the General Fund.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, so, this will actually make three people that will have shifted from a grant line into the General Fund?

Regene Newman: Yes, from the beginning of the grant, yes.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, you know, that's always been the Catch-22 with these grants, and, you know, we've always been very clear that when the grant runs out that—

Regene Newman: Right.

Councilmember Raben: —you know, we don't always fund it. I don't know that we've had an opportunity to discuss that until today, but, you know, obviously, we can have some more dialogue between now and September when we finalize these budgets, but, I'm not real fond of that. Again, we'll discuss this more, I guess.

President Lloyd: Any other questions on the grants? Page 46, that amount's the same, Witness Assistance. Page 47, that amount's the same, flat, no change. Any other questions on grants? Okay, we'll move on to the next department, 2630, Prosecutor Pretrial Diversion, page 147.

PROSECUTOR PRETRIAL DIVERSION

President Lloyd: That one's just, basically, flat. Slight increase in insurance. Mr. Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Doug, again, my apologies, can you tell me a little bit more about what this Pretrial Diversion is? I mean, what's the purpose?

Doug Brown: It's been around for a long time. In a nutshell, it's for first time offenders, 99.9 percent are misdemeanor cases where they are actually, they get a, they've been arrested, they have an opportunity, most crimes, misdemeanors qualify, not drunk driving and things of that nature, they go through a program where they get some counseling, they do some community service and if they stay clear from anywhere from a year to 18 months, the charge is dismissed eventually. That program is primarily funded by users fees.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay. Yeah, because it looks like it doesn't have that big of a budget total.

Doug Brown: No, and the person that's been in there has been in there for over 20 years.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay, great. Thanks, Doug.

President Lloyd: Mr. Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Do you do, like, what, random drug testing to ensure that they're staying clean? Or, how do you—

Doug Brown: As far as, people on that program?

Councilmember Raben: Uh-huh.

Doug Brown: Random drug testing has not been a part of that program. Generally, the people in there aren't necessarily, have substance abuse problems. I'm not saying that couldn't happen, but that's not been part of the program.

President Lloyd: I guess, one other question that hadn't been brought up, Mrs. Kirk, the County Clerk had mentioned a \$25 late fee that the judges, I guess, are looking at doing for violators that don't pay their fines on time, etcetera, etcetera. Your office has been pretty good on looking at available revenues. I don't know if there's other things that the State has passed, law-wise, that...do you know of anything that the Prosecutor's Office would be looking at for additional fees coming in?

Doug Brown: Not that I'm aware of at this time.

President Lloyd: Okay. Alright. Mr. Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Doug, when you have fees and things that aren't paid, do you guys place liens on their properties or anything?

Doug Brown: We don't. We don't, and, generally, if someone doesn't pay their....most of the, we, actually, on that program, we take the fees up front. So, if they don't pay it they're not going on the program.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay.

Doug Brown: That has helped us a lot, obviously.

Councilmember Kiefer: Yeah.

Doug Brown: So, and people have incentive because they want to get the case dismissed—

Councilmember Kiefer: Sure.

Doug Brown: —so they want to get on the program.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay, thanks.

Councilmember Raben: We prevent a lot of, we help our overcrowding situation too.

Doug Brown: Yes.

Councilmember Raben: I'm sure it's a vital program.

President Lloyd: Any further questions of Mr. Brown and the Prosecutor's Office? Alright, thank you very much for coming.

Doug Brown: Thank you very much.

President Lloyd: Okay. We'll move on to 1300, County Commission, page 71 is where we start. There's quite a few of those.

COMMISSIONERS

Troy Tornatta: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen.

President Lloyd: Good morning.

Troy Tornatta: Troy Tornatta, Vanderburgh County Commissioner.

President Lloyd: You're pinch hitting for Mr. Melcher?

Troy Tornatta: Yes.

President Lloyd: Okay, I know I talked to him, I think he was kind of nervous about this. I told him there was nothing to be nervous about.

Troy Tornatta: Well, he informed me that he had in-service at his job, so, he had to be at that. So, I said I would do the pinch hitting.

President Lloyd: Right, you're familiar with this body.

Troy Tornatta: Yeah.

President Lloyd: Questions for the Commissioners budget?

Troy Tornatta: I'm going to go out, go ahead and pass out some information. We have, I think most of you have got, have received your CAJE information on kind of the wishes of CAJE, with the transportation situation. We are passing out something from Burdette Park for the CCD budget request for 2011, that encapsulates why Steve believes in his numbers. Youth Resources has a document that we're passing around, that's why they've sent us that information, we've put it in the budget, but, obviously, that's something you guys need to go over. Then, the Vanderburgh County Soil and Water Conservation District, as we know, they're going to have to move out of their location, and that's the price increase in their line item. So, it just is pretty self explanatory. I figured I would get that straight to you.

President Lloyd: I guess, I'll start out while they're looking, page 72, Property Tax Refunds, Judgements and Refunds we've set in a dollar, but you've got some pretty big numbers there. Is that just because we have no idea what that will be?

Troy Tornatta: Yeah, we just keep the line item open.

President Lloyd: What are those payouts related to? It would be line item 3220 and 3230. Are those like Sheriff's sale?

Troy Tornatta: Bill, that's appeals, are they not?

Bill Fluty: (Inaudible. Microphone not on.)

Troy Tornatta: Sorry.

President Lloyd: Page 72, 3220, 3230, Property Tax Refunds.

Bill Fluty: Let me catch up. Judgements and Refunds is where you're looking?

President Lloyd: Yes, and the one before it.

Bill Fluty: Yes, that's appeals.

Troy Tornatta: Yep, and we've already got that amount set up. I mean, we calculated a certain amount for the appeals?

Bill Fluty: No. What you do, that comes off the cash.

Troy Tornatta: Right.

Bill Fluty: Actually, right now as the appeals come through, when we send money back through a 17T process, they've appealed successfully, that goes through the process, we send them their money back if they've paid. If they go back three years, they get refunded for three years. Then, at the end of the year we'll settle this. What we'll do we'll take it off the cash for settlement. It could be in Knight Township, it could be in Scott Township, and we do it through each township and it reduces their distribution accordingly for how the appeals fall in each township. So, that's an unknown number.

Troy Tornatta: Right, but we're pretty conservative when we....to make sure that we have that cash balance there.

Bill Fluty: Well, the cash balance isn't there. The cash is coming off property taxes that are paid.

Troy Tornatta: Okay.

Bill Fluty: So, it's a reduction of the property taxes that you bill, Because you've actually over billed.

Troy Tornatta: Right.

Bill Fluty: They've either, they've paid or they've appealed and they're getting their money back. So, it's coming off of the billing, or the collections is what it's coming off of.

Troy Tornatta: Right.

Bill Fluty: So, it's a reduction of collections, which then in turn is a decrease in the property tax distribution to the units. So, the units would be working with less. So, it's a shortfall of their budget is what it is.

Troy Tornatta: Right.

President Lloyd: Other questions? Mr. Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: The USI Mets grant, or whatever, the \$25,000, I thought I had been hearing and picking up that that was going up?

President Lloyd: Page 74?

Councilmember Shetler: Yeah, I think so.

Troy Tornatta: What had been worked out is there will be, the city, the board that controls that for the city, the Board of Public Works, I believe, voted that they would discontinue certain services, but it would be a modified schedule, and that would still keep us in the same amount. It would put the city in the same amount, and USI would pick up the difference.

Councilmember Shetler: So, the \$25,000 commitment by the county is firm?

Troy Tornatta: Yes.

Councilmember Shetler: Thank you.

Troy Tornatta: Before we leave, if we can address Self Insurance. That's one of the papers that you have in front of you. It's the one that says 4281 Analysis of General Fund Self Insurance Fund. We don't often deal with the self insurance at this body. It's been this same cost for the last maybe 15 to 20 years, and it's been right at \$190,000. I think it's set in the same this year.

President Lloyd: It's on page 71, line 3001.

Troy Tornatta: \$190,550. What I can best describe as utilization of the tools we've been given in the past, the Highway Department has picked up about \$63,000 in addition to this \$190,000 in the Self Insurance Fund, and it's actual funding number is 4282. We had continued to pull out of 4281 and not 4282. So, 4282 actually has a balance of about \$428,000. I think, in the past what we've found is gas tax would take care of the highway budget, at some point that would totally take care of the highway budget and we would shove certain amounts into that budget and it would be covered. As we know, we have exceeded the gas tax levy, and we are now pushing into General Fund in the Highway Department. So, I really don't think it's, there's any reason to keep the Highway Department with this Self Insurance Fund, and would just advise the Council to transfer that fund or to pull from that fund until it's depleted and then put it all into one fund. In addition to that, as you can see on that sheet, over the past ten years we've seen a deficit of about \$705,000. Obviously, this is due to property and casualty issues, litigation, the receipts are where we've done subrogation to bring those dollars back, but you can see the expenses far outweigh what we've seen in receipts. Even in 2007, the County Council added to that fund to make sure that it kept the balance above zero. We believe that we're probably going to have to add to that fund, but maybe one way

to do it is to charge those outside offices, outside of the General Fund, per employee and start figuring it on a per employee cost. Obviously, that's part of the budget, not part of the individual's cost, but it should be figured on a per person cost. So, in this case, where the Health Department might have, not banging on you, Gary, but where the Health Department might have a certain amount of employees, maybe we charge the Health Department for that and they'll have to put that in their budget under Self Insurance. Then, we'll draw from them at some point, and draw from any office that would have employees that would fall under the Self Insurance piece.

Councilmember Raben: We've had this similar discussion yesterday on our regular Insurance line item as well, shifting it where we can into other budgets.

Troy Tornatta: I think we've pretty well done that on the insurance, it's just that on the Self Insurance line we've not touched that. So, what is recommended in number eight on your analysis sheet is that we're probably going to have to look at \$100,000 boost in Self Insurance. As we've seen costs rise, as we've seen everything rise, we've not put any more into this budget, and we've seen a depletion of it, but that's okay, we still have money in it. For all intents and purposes, if you look at your year-by-year, starting in 2009, we did a focus switch and really put attention to this bill, because this is where we thought that we could draw some attention and potentially save some money. So, in 2009 we came down from \$499,000 to \$285,000. Now, don't get me wrong, this is not a magic wand that we waved over it and all of a sudden legal fees went down, this was just an attention to detail. We were able, we had two people that we were paying to do a job, now we're only paying one. The person that we're paying the percentage, we just pay them a flat fee of sixty three, \$66,000 to do that, and they run the whole legal side of all these claims. So, we just have one person doing it instead of having a couple of people working on it. So, that saved us some money there. Then, we did concentrate on getting some of this litigation taken care of, and taken off the books. We addressed it and so, now, we've got more litigation off the books, so, we've tackled it pretty intensely. As you see, \$231,000 is where we are to date, we just had a claim come in that was pretty substantial to boost that to that level. We think that, you know, we could see another \$50,000 or \$60,000 still for the end of the year in this piece, but we are trying to stay on top of those issues.

President Lloyd: Questions on that? So, what you're saying is, line item 3001, boost that \$100,000?

Troy Tornatta: Well, figure out how you want to do it. If you want to move the sixty three, in fact, the Highway budget, on page 111—

Councilmember Bassemier: 114.

Troy Tornatta: It's 3001.

President Lloyd: That's page 115, Self Insurance in the Highway budget.

Troy Tornatta: It has \$68,250. I would throw that over into the County Commissioners fund. There's no real rationale why you would have it over there today. Then, what I would look to do is to potentially look at the Health Department and any other departments that could add to this fund to get to that number.

President Lloyd: Okay, the County Highway is outside the General Fund.

Councilmember Raben: Yeah, but we're supplementing that with General Fund monies now.

Troy Tornatta: To more than the tune of \$68,000.

Councilmember Raben: Right.

President Lloyd: Right, right, right. Okay, any other....Bill, do you have a thought on that?

Bill Fluty: Well, right now, yes, there is the balance that's dedicated to the County Highway, but it's in a cash card. It can, if there's a shortage in the Commissioners line item, through this body or through direction from this body, that money can be moved into the Commissioners line item. That's always been a possibility. The claims have been low at the Highway, and that money's just, we usually let Self Insurance just roll over into the next year. It was kind of a back up if we fell short at any time in the original Commissioners line item. So, it's always been there, kind of a safety valve, but, obviously, you don't need that much in the County Highway is, I guess, what you're saying, and that's true. So, but it can be changed by this body, if—

Troy Tornatta: Yeah.

Bill Fluty: —right now we're kind of at zero in the Commissioners line item. So, if any more claims come in, you don't have the ability to pay, but you do have this money as back up.

President Lloyd: Okay, other questions? Mr. Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Are we done with this section? If we are, I had some other questions.

Councilmember Raben: Before we move off of this—

Councilmember Goebel: Are we going to move it?

Councilmember Raben: —so, okay, is there a reason not to move it? I mean—

Bill Fluty: You can. Right now, if more claims come in, as Commissioner Tornatta said, and he's anticipating we've got what, five months left in the year, I'm sure they're not going to have enough money, we can, as soon as one of these come in, you can authorize to move whatever you need over from there. It will be a journal entry, if you would like to do that.

Councilmember Raben: But, in moving it to their line item—

Troy Tornatta: But, at the same time—

Bill Fluty: I'm not—

Troy Tornatta: —if there's a quick reaction we can take it out of the Highway Fund.

Bill Fluty: Remember, it's, how do I say this, I'm not moving from fund to fund, I'm moving it from a cash card, which is different. So, that's why I can do it. So, I'm not moving the \$62,000, but we can do that.

Troy Tornatta: You can set the \$62,000 into ours and zero theirs out for the budget purposes. For future purpose about using the funds I don't see any reason why if there's a claim that has to be paid that Bill couldn't pay that out of the Highway Fund, so you wouldn't necessarily have to transfer all that money over if you didn't want to at this time, but to make it cleaner, you would probably want to transfer that money over at some point, if that's the decision you guys are making.

President Lloyd: Mr. Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Will this offset then the request for \$100,000 more on the other line item?

Troy Tornatta: Well, I mean, I'll just kind of point back to this form and where the trends are. We believe the litigation, as you've heard from the Prosecutor and the defense attorneys and probably from Superior Court, you're going to hear that everything is going up. There's more litigation, there's more people trying to sue and to take people to do whatever they've got to do to get right. So, in this case, what I'm saying is, the trend from what they're telling us is it probably needs to be about \$100,000 or as close as we can get to it. As you see, with \$400,000 we feel like we've got a little bit of a buffer there, but that's all we've got. So, we either do it at budget time, or we have to come back to the County Council and ask for a big number.

Councilmember Goebel: Thank you.

President Lloyd: Quick question, on page 73, Purchasing Department. Is that working out sufficiently where we have the shared Purchasing? Because, I know, we're going to, I guess, we're keeping that same \$69,000, that would be the county's share?

Troy Tornatta: Yes.

President Lloyd: I mean, is that, as far as you're concerned, that's responsive to what you need?

Troy Tornatta: Right. Yeah.

President Lloyd: Okay. Just, I don't know if you saw it, but we did ask Mr. Arvay to come in yesterday and we had a presentation on the computer, and one of the things that Council's going to be looking at is funding some of those increases through charging other departments, or charging outside the General Fund, where we can, as well as maybe there's situations where the State could pick up some of that. So, I mean, we're cognizant that we've got a big issue to deal with there, quite a bit of money, and, I think, they're not overly satisfied with some of that. I know, you and I have had conversations to that extent.

Troy Tornatta: The Commissioners offer still stands that we would take that line item back.

President Lloyd: Oh, the computers?

Troy Tornatta: Yeah, since we sign the contracts and looking at kind of the flow of what we do here, now, it's not going to change the General Fund, we all know that, but just where that is positioned, it would make more sense since we sign that contract that we throw it in the Commissioners budget, and, then, obviously, the Council would have to approve it. Furthermore, getting us to work ever more closely on this very important item.

President Lloyd: Well, we can take that up with the majority of the Council. Well, you guys can have travel back, do you want that?

Troy Tornatta: No, that's you.

President Lloyd: Since we're handing stuff back.

Troy Tornatta: I think that's the proper place.

President Lloyd: Yeah, since we're handing things back.

Troy Tornatta: You guys get to find out where people are going and how much they're spending. I think that's appropriate.

President Lloyd: Mr. Goebel, next, I guess.

Councilmember Kiefer: Go ahead.

Councilmember Goebel: (Inaudible. Microphone not on.)

Troy Tornatta: No.

Councilmember Goebel: Troy, on page 73, 3620, the Copy Machine Lease, I noticed that's gone up a bit, do you have a different company or machine? Line 3620.

Troy Tornatta: Xerox. We had about seven increases over all, and that wasn't one of them. Are you talking...last year it was the same, and that's a contractual line item.

Councilmember Goebel: No, I know, it was budgeted last year, I was just looking at the history of it all.

Troy Tornatta: The history?

Councilmember Goebel: Uh-huh.

Troy Tornatta: Okay.

Marissa Nichoalds: I show it as \$18,500 for last year and this year.

Troy Tornatta: Right, they're talking about what's been spent.

Marissa Nichoalds: Oh.

Troy Tornatta: It's been \$13,000 in the past.

Marissa Nichoalds: Uh-huh.

Troy Tornatta: I can get back to you on what the situation with that is.

Councilmember Goebel: Well, once again, I'll make a point that if we went county-wide with a computer leasing program we might, or a copy leasing program or ownership, we might be able to save some substantial amounts.

Troy Tornatta: Right.

Councilmember Goebel: Thank you.

Troy Tornatta: That's a good point.

President Lloyd: Mr. Kiefer is next.

Councilmember Kiefer: Thank you. Troy, I was wondering on the Rent, on page 73, number 3600, Rent, how is that increase calculated? Although it's only 3.8 percent, it's still a big number increase, you know, \$182,000 plus increase. How is that Rent increase calculated?

Troy Tornatta: That would be a David Rector question.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay.

Troy Tornatta: I don't know if David's here.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay, I was just curious, because, you know, our inflation, I mean, I don't know, our inflation rate is not that high. So, I was just curious how he came up with that number. I would be just interested to know. Then, a follow up question, on the line item 3280, Examination of Records, is this something that just occurs every so many years? Because, I noticed expended 2010 you had \$31,000, but you only budgeted 100, and now we're budgeting 100 again, you know, is that—

Troy Tornatta: Probably, to me it's kind of like, should be a dollar, and keep the line item open, because there's no real reason to have \$100 sitting in that line item, but, I think, Bill can probably explain more.

Bill Fluty: Examination of Records is a fee that the State Board of Accounts returns to us after they've audited either the county, or if they've audited the city, we would pay, but then we would get, we would take that back out at settlement. We wouldn't lose any money. So, right now, we usually put it in at a dollar, then again, it comes off the cash—

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay.

Bill Fluty: —so, we just have to have a place—

Councilmember Kiefer: So, even though we spend it—

Bill Fluty: This is kind of a place holder to pay it out of.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay.

Bill Fluty: That's all it is.

Councilmember Kiefer: So, even though we expended \$31,505, we will get that money back is what you're saying?

Bill Fluty: It depends. Now, if that's a county audit for county, that's an expense. Now, if it's the city's we may pay more, but we would get that reimbursed and that would go back into Miscellaneous Revenues. So, the dollar is just a place holder so we have a place to pay it from is what I'm saying. We would pay that from the cash.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay.

Councilmember Shetler: So—

Troy Tornatta: If you've done a dollar, I would make it a dollar, instead of \$100.

Councilmember Kiefer: No, I'm just curious, because I thought, well, hey, if we needed the money there, you know, I mean, why purposely put in the \$100 if you're going to have to spend \$31,000, if it's something mandatory that you've got to spend.

Bill Fluty: I reduce it from that taxing unit's distribution in December.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay.

Bill Fluty: So, that's how it happens.

Councilmember Shetler: Are you saying that all of the auditing for the State Board of Accounts, that fee would come through the county first and then we would subrogate back on the party that....I'm thinking of Knight Township right now is what I'm thinking of, has just gone through an extensive audit and appears to not having any money left. So, are we going to be saddled with that?

Bill Fluty: I would say, there is an audit there, and there will be a cost to that audit and it will be sent to us and we'll pay that, and then we'll take it back from Knight at a later date, but we always get our money.

President Lloyd: Good luck.

Councilmember Shetler: Can they put that on that same credit card they've been using?

Bill Fluty: Remember, we give them the money, we distribute the money to them, so, I can always hold it back. So I can assure you, we'll get our share.

President Lloyd: Mr. Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Troy, on Hillcrest Washington, have we looked at the real, the contract recently on that?

President Lloyd: Page 72.

Councilmember Raben: Does the county really realize the true value of that for what we pay for it? Are we funding the entire Hillcrest Washington Home for this?

Troy Tornatta: Um—

Councilmember Raben: Do you know?

Troy Tornatta: James, that's—

Councilmember Raben: I don't mean to put you on the spot.

Troy Tornatta: No, no, and, I mean, I understand, Jeff, that's probably more in line with what you deal with on contracts with the Youth Home.

Councilmember Raben: We can have this discussion at another time—

Troy Tornatta: Yeah, and I can—

Councilmember Raben: — if this is not appropriate.

Troy Tornatta: —here again, I can find out that information and what's done, but, it seems to me, in the past, we've had a State mandated financial obligation to take on that Washington Youth Home, or we wouldn't have it in the budget. So, that just serves from sitting over here for a few years, but, I can check and see what that is—

Councilmember Raben: Yeah, it might be—

Troy Tornatta: — you know, it's been on the CPI, and, in fact, the past two years we've went back to some of these entities and said, relook at your CPI. Do we want to go a negative, because that's where you've been? And, they said, okay just zero it out. So, we've tried to stay on top of that.

Councilmember Raben: You know, maybe, and it may be available to the Commissioners office, I don't know, but, maybe some quarterly or annual reporting. I'm just very curious as to what all services they offer, what we're spending this much money on, and, you know, I guess, my second question is, is there other counties utilizing their services that possibly we're footing all of the bill for it?

Troy Tornatta: Uh-huh.

Councilmember Raben: So, anyway, it's something to look at. I apologize, I didn't mean to put you on the spot with that one.

Troy Tornatta: That's fine.

Councilmember Raben: That's a tough question.

Troy Tornatta: Do we, do our Computer Services, do they pay rent today?

Councilmember Raben: No, it would be part of the rent within this building. Yeah, I'm sure the city and county pay—

Troy Tornatta: Do they pay rent for their space?

Bill Fluty: I believe they're, it's broken down between city and county, the rent is. Everybody pays rent for their square footage is how it's worked.

Troy Tornatta: Right.

President Lloyd: If they're paying, they turn around and bill us, I would assume. I mean, that has to be part of, in their cost.

Troy Tornatta: Yeah, but, I mean, do we pay all of their costs?

President Lloyd: I think we pay all of their costs plus a profit to them.

Councilmember Raben: (Inaudible. Microphone not on.)

Troy Tornatta: I guess, what I'm saying is if another company came in this building, would they have to pay rent?

President Lloyd: I would think so.

Troy Tornatta: So, I'm just trying to figure out, why, if this is an outside company why they're not paying rent.

President Lloyd: I'm sure they are.

Councilmember Shetler: My guess would be that they, even, I'm not so sure that that's the most prudent way to do it though, because I'm sure their contract calls for them to up it. So, if they upcharge 15 percent or whatever the cost would be, their expenses, then the county, when we can actually give it at our cost would be paying the 15 percent profit that they're marking it up. So, I'm not so sure that that would be—

Troy Tornatta: Well, I'm not so sure I've ever heard of a business that only has one client, and then we're paying all of their expenses. I mean, if you're coming in this building, you know, in this case, I hope you've got another gig somewhere, because I don't know why we're paying their rent. I mean, you rent from us and you give us the services we require, we're not saying we're paying your bills. I mean, that's—

Councilmember Shetler: I don't know, that's a contractual thing, I think that the Commissioners signed and dealt with.

Troy Tornatta: Well, I didn't sign it, and that's why I'm not real interested in moving this forward if we don't have some of these issues under tow.

President Lloyd: Well—

Troy Tornatta: I don't want to keep paying more percentage because of their expenses—

Councilmember Shetler: I mean, just, usually contracts like that are, I mean, first of all, Council doesn't do contracts—

Troy Tornatta: Right.

Councilmember Shetler: —I mean, as you know, that's the Commissioners responsibility.

Troy Tornatta: Right.

Councilmember Shetler: But, secondly, most of the contracts that are written like that, usually, you know, it's on a cost plus basis on those kind of expenses. I would hate to pay them profit on an expense that they're paying to us. I mean, that part doesn't make sense to me, but, I hear what you're saying.

Troy Tornatta: I think, we're trying to do the same thing. We're trying to cut costs and find ways to increase revenues. If we can do one of the two, we keep the tax rate as low as possible. That's also making sure that we have the right vendor in here for the right cost and utilizing their expansiveness to not only have, if we choose to do that here, that's fine, but my only point is, if we have, if we're paying 100 percent of their expenses, they've got a profit in there somewhere. So, let's us do it in-house and we'll be able to return some money back to the taxpayer.

Councilmember Shetler: Yeah, that's a question, I guess, for a different day, but, and that's precisely my point though is that if they, we charge them \$10,000 rent and they have it figured in there to put 15 percent profit on it, then we're going to put up another \$1,500 on top of that \$10,000 that's going to go out the window. I just don't see any sense in us doing it, if that's the way the contract's written. I don't know. It's not our responsibility. Our responsibility is to kind of sign the check after you guys have negotiated the contract.

Troy Tornatta: Well, it's just, as Joe points out about the, you know, how things are figured, I mean, I could tell you we could make some money back on that \$150,000 to \$180,000 by watching whoever's in here for rent and charging them rent for what they're doing. In that case if I can deal with the contract, but it's going to be a stricter contract that looks at our services, sees what we're getting and we're going to pay for those things that we would pay for an outside contractor on a --

(Tape changed)

— going to pay for all these other fees. I'm sorry we're the only client that they have, along with the city, but if that's the case and we're paying their entire bills, I mean, you see what I'm saying, we could do it on our own.

President Lloyd: That contract expires September of 2011, is that right?

Troy Tornatta: I believe so.

President Lloyd: Okay, well, I would hope we would take a close look at that before it gets renewed. If you want to ask Mr. Ziemer to send a copy of the contract to Mr. Ahlers, I mean, the Council would be happy to look at it.

Commissioner Tornatta: I would be open to talk about everything. Let me say this, I am not complaining at this point about the services we're getting. I think the people bust their butts to get the city and the county taken care of. We're looking at efficiencies and cost measures and this is just one place that we need to entertain those thoughts.

President Lloyd: Before we get out of the Commissioners budget, on your rationale sheet you've got 3600, Rent, increase less than one percent. I think Joe calculated and I went and checked it, it's 3.8 percent.

Councilmember Kiefer: Yeah, 3.8.

President Lloyd: Whether that's also for utilities or whatever, I don't know, but, anyway, it's not just one percent. It says a letter from the Building Authority indicated one percent, well—

Commissioner Tornatta: Of course, that was a line item inserted by the Building Authority, and I think Dave Rector could clear that up.

President Lloyd: Okay, but, anyway, the hard dollars is 3.8 percent.

Troy Tornatta: I understand. It wasn't factored in, but I didn't think I would have to explain about that.

Councilmember Kiefer: Mr. President?

President Lloyd: Yes.

Councilmember Kiefer: You know, I think yesterday we talked a little bit about it, you know, we have a lot of vacant space, obviously, you know, with either bringing in county, other county offices into a vacant space, or renting that space to private sector if there's a viable client out there might be worthy of examining. But, anyway, look forward to getting together, I know Ed and I had talked about getting together with either you and Dave Rector and stuff, and we still look forward to doing that, and appreciate you taking the time on that.

President Lloyd: Okay, overall this budget is up \$162,000, which is one percent, you know, pretty decent.

Councilmember Raben: One last question.

President Lloyd: Yes.

Councilmember Raben: Troy, the Commissioners wouldn't necessarily have a problem if we didn't entertain their increase and set it at pretty much what this year's level was?

Troy Tornatta: Yeah, I mean, our duty is to pass along some of these, this information and let you disseminate what things are there. Obviously, we'll have dialogue, and I always appreciate that, at least I know where you're coming from on some of these circumstances. I know how tough 2011 will be, the toughest time of the year realizing that property tax caps and some of the things that have pulled

away from the county for the, you know, whether it's State or federal or whatever the situation is. We understand it, we want to try and work as diligently as possible.

CCD/COMMISSIONERS

President Lloyd: Let's go to CCD, page 124. Any questions on CCD?

Troy Tornatta: I think the only you'll see in here is a rationale for the Parks and Playground for Burdette Park. Just, I'm sure Steve will rehash this, but in talking to Steve there's going to be two slides that are going to go down probably in the next couple of years. We're spending money to try and repair those on a weekly basis, and, I believe they're 15 or 16 years old. I will tell you, we've had conversations with pool, the pool suppliers of equipment and those who do commercial aquatics and to get any type of significant piece in there, you're looking at a million dollars. So, obviously, none of these are going to touch that, but just to kind of set you up, if we're going to continue with that aquatic center out there and the level that we're going to continue, we need to kind of think about how we're going to address some of these issues.

President Lloyd: So, that's major repairs for the slides?

Troy Tornatta: Well, probably it's discontinuing that slide and looking at a new attraction in its stead.

President Lloyd: Okay, questions on CCD?

Councilmember Raben: You're saying that's above and beyond what we have listed here?

Troy Tornatta: Well, I'm just giving you a little forecast, a little vision of what we're looking at out at Burdette Park. So, if this money, if we choose not to do anything out there, just know that the time's coming when if we're going to keep that park at the attraction level that it would stand, we're going to have to address some of these issues at the aquatic center.

Councilmember Raben: Okay. I'm just looking through some of this, it looks like the filter system, is that priority? Is that something that needs to happen by business year 2011?

Troy Tornatta: That's a Steve question.

Steve Craig: Steve Craig, Manager of Burdette Park. James, on that, two years ago we replaced one of our major filter systems on our swimming pools, it had rusted through the filters from inside out. The other side at that time was not in that bad of shape. We did rebuild that one and put new sand in it at a minimal cost for the price of it, but I see it going out in the next year or two also. What this is pooled up with is the cost of it, IDEM did an audit on the county this year, and the way that we're set up probably is not kosher at this time, and we're wanting to address this situation. We are grandpa cloused in because the pool is fifty something years old, but if we put this new filter system in, then we just need to tie everything up together and do it, you know, according to the way we should be doing it now.

Councilmember Raben: Maybe because there's so many items, maybe we need to prioritize these as we go through them. So, as an example, in the filtration system, where would that be in your list of priorities?

Steve Craig: Probably about where it's at, well, I guess—

Councilmember Raben: Number one?

Steve Craig: Yeah.

Councilmember Raben: Okay. On the next item, anyone stop me if they have other questions, on the next item on the floating animals—

Steve Craig: That goes back to Troy brought up a point, if we're going to keep that facility operating like it is, you know, this is something that, these are 10-12 years old, they're wore out. We didn't even use one of them this year, but when we keep this facility up to its operations, we bring money in. You know, I'm one of the few departments, I hope to turn back \$900,000 to the county this year, but to turn \$900,000 of my budget back to the county I have to take care of what I got. If we start cutting back on stuff like this, and then, I, you know, see where the income starts going back because we no longer have the nice facility we had before. So, it's one of these things, you make an investment, you know, we have a lot of kids in there. I think it's important.

Councilmember Raben: So, it's still your number two?

Steve Craig: I would say it is.

Councilmember Raben: On your number three—

Steve Craig: You can throw the pick up truck out, if somebody's got one that's useable. I have about six vehicles right now that are surplus, but, we haven't bought a truck. We've got one pick up truck we've bought in 14 years.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, we have, you have bought an RTV or maybe—

Steve Craig: We've bought utility vehicles in the park—

Councilmember Raben: Yeah.

Steve Craig: —that we use for maintenance, but we can't take them to town. We get to the part where the vehicles that I've got, after they, you know, I've got six of them that were surplus, had six departments come in and convince you guys, those weren't road worthy and then they were handed to us to use. So, you know, that's the position I'm in. I'm just looking at every once in a while I need—

Troy Tornatta: And they are rough. I mean, if you've been out there, not every door matches.

Councilmember Raben: Number four, would that, where does that stand, would that now be your third priority?

Steve Craig: That would be number three, yeah.

Councilmember Raben: That would be your number three. Okay. The tennis court crack and refill?

Steve Craig: I would say that's there too, because we have heavy use on our tennis courts and that, and the maintenance of a tennis court is they get cracks in them and that and you have to fill them and resurface them. I think it's been six, seven years since we've did that one, but the cracks are getting wider, as the winter goes through and you get water in them it just, it's one of those progressive things with asphalt.

Councilmember Bassemier: Steve, is that just, excuse me, Steve, is that just for the materials? Because you can do that in-house, or the County Highway could probably do that tennis court.

Steve Craig: That's total price of somebody doing it. They, you know, they come in and clean them all out and cut them and, you know, I had a company come out and give me an estimate of what it would be. They go through every crack in there and cut them, clean them, then they fill them—

Councilmember Bassemier: Well, I know you've got a lot of skillful guys out there at the County Highway, could that be a possibility that they could do it?

Steve Craig: There's a possibility we could do that. I mean, I'll look into it, as long as we get it done. We can repaint it, I have no problems with that, you know, once it would be done, but I can go through the County Highway if they've got time and that. I know they have the machine, they redo my roads every year.

Councilmember Bassemier: Sure.

Steve Craig: It does a super job.

Councilmember Kiefer: Chris is right behind you somewhere, so.

Steve Craig: We'll put some work on that.

President Lloyd: Okay, let's keep the questions to CCD. Are you finished, Mr. Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yeah, (Inaudible. Microphone not on.)

President Lloyd: Mr. Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: A question on that tennis court, this is a suggestion, have you checked with the, what is it the Evansville Tennis Association or something? I know they took over the courts out at Wesselman's and they redid them. They had a fund drive, they redid them, and I think they have kind of, I don't want to say ownership, but they have a lease agreement or something with the Parks Department of Evansville and the, I guess, it's city-county Parks Department, but you might want to check into those folks and see if they would be interested in taking that on. Maybe that would relieve us of the liability.

Steve Craig: I can do that also. I don't know, I always kind of like to take care of my own stuff, but—

Councilmember Shetler: I like other people's money though.

Steve Craig: OPM's not bad. The last one, James, I guess, you've got it on the list, the reason that I did have it last, I just had a meeting with Structurepointe, and we had purchased 30 acres through the Evansville Visitors and Convention Bureau several years ago and we've been going through an on-going study with them on what we need to do with the infrastructure and that to prepare this property to be a viable part of the park in the next, you know, ten years or so. The first thing that they came up that they suggested that we do was to put in a retention lake across from our offices. That was dual purpose, at the present time our offices, I've had water in them there in the last several years and we have a bad problem with flooding, not necessarily from the river, but from runoff flooding, and when they went and did the study on the new 30 acres, the reason they gave us was that this water is coming out of these valleys way too fast. Years ago there used to be a retention lake there, it was removed for reasons that I don't know, but, it was, they came back and told us if we needed to do anything, you know, to pursue and to progress with this 30 acres, was that we needed to put this retention lake in. They honestly think that will cause, or cure the problem of the offices flooding, because the lake would fill up and let the water off slowly. That's what it's designed for. I just had a meeting with them, and we do have the drawings for it and everything, so, basically, it would be ready for bid. But, they said that it will cure most of our storm water flooding.

President Lloyd: And, that's number six?

Steve Craig: That's number six.

President Lloyd: Any other questions on CCD? Alright, thank you...or, Mr. Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: Not on those projects, but on the next page on the chalet.

President Lloyd: Yes.

Councilmember Shetler: Is it possible to get for us a, how many chalets do you have now that you're renting?

Steve Craig: Six.

Councilmember Shetler: Six? That you could get a list of those, and how much income they're bringing in on a weekly, monthly, yearly basis so we can just see if that \$200,000 is a worthwhile investment?

Steve Craig: Yes.

Councilmember Shetler: Alright, thank you.

Steve Craig: I can do that. Any other questions for me?

President Lloyd: No, but we have Burdette Park later.

DRAINAGE BOARD

President Lloyd: Let's go to 1260, Drainage Board, which is page 69. Any questions on Drainage Board? It's a flat budget. It's not very big.

RIVERBOAT

President Lloyd: Okay, if not we'll move on to 1490, Riverboat, which is page 110. We have a detailed list of expenditures there. Questions on Riverboat? Mr. Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: Yeah, I'm going to start off on the Economic Development, is it the GAGE, the money to help out with GAGE, is that in Economic Development on that top line there?

Troy Tornatta: Yes.

Councilmember Shetler: How much are we, how much of that goes to GAGE?

Troy Tornatta: \$150,000.

Councilmember Shetler: \$150,000?

Troy Tornatta: Uh-huh.

Councilmember Shetler: I have some serious reservations on that, I guess, from the standpoint that, you know, I guess, we, we're putting up the cash there. I'm not seeing the city, they're kind of doing in-kind services and trade outs and stuff, and, yet, we're supplementing, you know, one of their directors by the tune of \$30,000 out of that fund. I have some real issues with that. It seems that most of the activities that have been taking place out of the GAGE have been things that traditionally were done by the City of Evansville; downtown revitalization, Freedom Festival, that was done by a totally outside, independent volunteer group that was very successful for years, the Thunder on the Ohio, things like that that were traditionally done by other groups, and now we've taken up the burden of that, particularly financially. I just don't know if we're getting our money's worth. I have real reservations about sticking that much money into this.

Troy Tornatta: The liaison, at one point I was the liaison to that group, and Councilman Winnecke was for this body. I'm sure you got reports back from him, positive or negative. Since Councilman Winnecke is Commissioner Winnecke, only one of us can serve on that board, and because he has ties to Fifth Third as well, he is serving a dual interest, yet I still have not heard any negative activity from him, and would only say that, you know, if you have a question on any of the activity, either this liaison for this body or ask Commissioner Winnecke. He might be able to at least give you a heads up on the direction. It was my understanding that all of the money that was paid to the DMD director was paid out of separate city funds, and supplemented by the city in addition to what they gave. If that has changed, that has since changed since I have been off that board.

Councilmember Shetler: I don't, I could be wrong on that, but I'm thinking that the city's contribution is all in-kind. It is a trade out, you talked about rent a few moments ago, that GAGE pays no rent on the city owned building, and that trade out of that is the city's contribution, along with a few other trade outs that they've made on some other properties and other things that they're doing, but as far as actual cash outlay they have no responsibility on that at all. That's borne by private businesses contributing and our \$150,000 contribution then.

Troy Tornatta: Okay, and I was not aware of that, but I will check back with Commissioner Winnecke and see where he comes out on the answer to that question.

President Lloyd: I mean, I guess, if you want to boil it down, the question is, does the county receive any benefit from GAGE for that \$150,000? I mean, just as an observer, not on that board, I would question that.

Troy Tornatta: I, the only thing, and this is how it was started, now, where the focus is now might be a little more skewed, where it started with Joe Wallace was bringing the incubators in. He brought in Crane for some of their, to put the incubator in, the Crane incubator so that we could have some of their patents and try and move those on into business. So, I mean, there were some definite qualities of that that I think benefitted Vanderburgh County.

President Lloyd: Right, if you're talking about growing businesses and high tech businesses, but somehow they've gotten away from that, and, I just question the county's payment there that it doesn't, to me it doesn't seem to have any benefit to the county.

Troy Tornatta: The good thing about this process, obviously, we've got a couple weeks to talk about it, and we've got a few more weeks before we'll have to set it. So, we're open, and willing to talk about it, and, in this case I would defer you to Commissioner Winnecke, but I'm sure we can talk about it on the Commission floor and get the (Inaudible).

President Lloyd: Let me ask a quick technical question, have we paid GAGE for 2010?

Councilmember Kiefer: I think we have. I thought they showed....we haven't?

President Lloyd: I mean, I guess, at one point—

Councilmember Kiefer: Maybe they just (Inaudible).

President Lloyd: —I was told that we gave them a check at the beginning of the year for the whole year.

Troy Tornatta: That was in 2009.

President Lloyd: Okay.

Troy Tornatta: I'm not real sure for 2010. Do you know?

Marissa Nichoalds: (Inaudible. Not at microphone.)

Troy Tornatta: Has it been sent to us?

President Lloyd: So, they may not have sent the county an invoice?

Councilmember Kiefer: I don't know. I thought—

Troy Tornatta: With interest.

Councilmember Kiefer: Yeah. I thought they showed, because I sit on that board, I was appointed, and I thought I saw in one of their financial reports that they either submitted a bill or they were paid. They're influx, they don't have a director now, and they, so, they have had some concerns. I think to address Tom's concerns, I know that they have abandoned or are abandoning the events type projects and trying to narrow their focus down to helping small, you know, the small businesses, where Greg Wathen's group would then focus more on some of the larger groups. But, I do know they have asked Greg Wathen to join the board, or I think they have, you know, so they can get some more input inside on how to better focus.

President Lloyd: Maybe Bill Fluty can check on that and just see if the county paid them for 2010.

Troy Tornatta: It is. It's paid.

President Lloyd: Oh, we did pay it? Okay, great.

Councilmember Kiefer: Yeah, that's what I thought. I thought I remembered seeing it on one of their financial reports.

Troy Tornatta: Obviously, their focus now is if you're not going to make a nickel, you're not going to have an event.

Councilmember Kiefer: Right, that's some of the things they're trying to do. I think they're trying to refocus.

Troy Tornatta: That's a good plan.

Councilmember Kiefer: You known, probably the best guy to have come in here would be Dan Bugher—

Troy Tornatta: Yeah.

Councilmember Kiefer: —he works at Vectren. He was the president of the board, so he would probably be the best guy to come in and answer questions.

Troy Tornatta: Yeah, absolutely.

President Lloyd: Well, and these are all in the Economic Development line item, that's why these questions are being battled around.

Troy Tornatta: Sure.

President Lloyd: Economic Development Coalition, I attend those board meetings and that's regional development of trying to recruit businesses, and, I mean, I can see the value of that, but, I just question the value of what we're getting for the GAGE. Mr. Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: You know, and I'm just kind of piggybacking on the fact that what we've reported earlier is the fact that the COIT money is going to be two and a half million dollars short—

Troy Tornatta: Right.

Councilmember Shetler: – so, we have to look at two and a half to three million dollars. That means every fund that we have sitting out there that before appeared to be some kind of a cash cow available for, you know, dealing with projects and stuff, we need to look hard at–

Troy Tornatta: It's in play.

Councilmember Shetler: –restricting those and cutting some of those back and stuff. So, otherwise, you know, we will have to lay off people, and it would have to be laid off in necessary services as well. So, I mean, it's, other than the fact that I'm not seeing our value for our investment being utilized there, but I also feel that we've got to cut back here too as well, and use this money for some other departments perhaps.

President Lloyd: Okay, other questions on Riverboat?

Councilmember Bassemier: I've got a question.

President Lloyd: Mr. Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: This might be a question for Mr. Heck, but on that Dental Clinic, now that grants ran out, right? For, was that, they were paying \$80,000, or St. Mary's was paying part on that grant, help me out here.

Troy Tornatta: Well, do you want to....are there anything, is there anything between, because we're jumping down to Dental Clinic, do we need to talk about any of the others, or can we jump down there?

Councilmember Bassemier: Well, you was on–

President Lloyd: Riverboat, the Dental Clinic has a line item in Riverboat, let's just take Dental Clinic right now.

Troy Tornatta: Okay, alright. Essentially what the hospitals bought in, and that's when Royce and Councilman Royce Sutton and Councilman Winnecke were working on this package. They went to St. Mary's and to Deaconess and got their buy in. Since that time, they were told, it's much like a grant that we've seen in the past from federal or state or whatever, and they will go away. They've been preparing for this to go away at some point and for us to pick up the slack. It was roughly \$40,000 per group to pick that up, and, so, that's kind of where we are right now. We have raised our service fees, we're trying to do this in a way that is going to make sure that we keep as many people as healthy as possible to try and lower the overall costs, but–

Councilmember Bassemier: Oh, I think it's great, I mean, it's a wonderful program, but, I was just kind of thinking, I wasn't on the Council at the time–

Troy Tornatta: Right.

Councilmember Bassemier: –but, I remember St. Mary's, I mean, everybody was for this.

Troy Tornatta: Right.

Councilmember Bassemier: But, has anybody asked them to go ahead and take over where the grant no longer covers?

Troy Tornatta: Well, you know, not to put words in any hospital's mouth, but the thing that they see is, they don't know if they're seeing a decrease in the individuals walking into their emergency rooms. That's what we have to be able to show that we're decreasing those amounts, and, unfortunately, I think, it's just getting worse. You have more people that utilize the system because of just assistance needs, and they need to have that work done, and now they have a conduit to get that work done. They have to go through the process with the Dental Clinic, and it's, I mean, this is not come on in and sit in a chair we're going to crank a couple of things and get out of here. I mean, they run them through, they're getting information from them, they set them up appointments, they have to go back and hit that appointment if they're not first up in the chair and that can all be explained, you know—

Councilmember Bassemier: The point I'm trying to make is, you know, we think it's important enough and we're going to fund it with Riverboat—

Troy Tornatta: Right.

Councilmember Bassemier: —it seems like to me, and they know it's a good program, and I'm sure they've got more funding than we have, why don't they help us out here?

Troy Tornatta: Well, I mean, we've asked.

Councilmember Bassemier: Okay.

Troy Tornatta: In fact, they have people on the Dental Clinic board. So, you know, it's out there, it's just not hitting their budgets, and I think that they're looking at their costs and how they're doing business as well.

Councilmember Bassemier: Okay.

Troy Tornatta: So, much like Tom said about GAGE, I don't know if they're seeing the benefit of it to fund at that level, although we can explain where that benefit's coming from—

Councilmember Bassemier: Okay.

Troy Tornatta: —I don't know, and that's just what I've gotten back.

President Lloyd: But, what you're saying is for the hospitals, people aren't coming in there with toothaches or mouth problems? They can't measure that in the emergency rooms?

Troy Tornatta: Well, I think they're still seeing the volume of people—

President Lloyd: Right.

Troy Tornatta: —coming in with those issues.

President Lloyd: The Dental Clinic hasn't stopped the volume in the emergency rooms.

Troy Tornatta: Well—

Councilmember Raben: So they say.

Troy Tornatta: —so they say.

President Lloyd: Right.

Troy Tornatta: I mean, it could be 30 or 50 percent higher if we didn't have the Dental Clinic.

President Lloyd: Right.

Troy Tornatta: So, to me there is a value.

President Lloyd: But, it's hard to measure, or impossible to measure.

Troy Tornatta: Yeah, sometimes.

President Lloyd: Other questions on Riverboat. Mr. Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Just one of my concerns on the Dental Clinic has always been servicing outside of Vanderburgh County. Are we still providing dental service to folks outside of Vanderburgh County?

Troy Tornatta: There is a small percentage. I will defer that to Gary Heck when he comes up here. Have you already (Inaudible)? Where is Gary? Have you done—

Councilmember Kiefer: I mean, I know there's a sliding scale or something like that, but I just, I would like anybody outside of Vanderburgh County to pay full cost. Either that or we need to contact those counties and see if they want to participate in our program, you know, so we can get—

Gary Heck: I'll be happy to address it when it's my turn.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay, that's just, I just hate Vanderburgh County paying for people outside of Vanderburgh County.

Troy Tornatta: We've talked about that. They're looking into that and they're very much aware of that situation.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay, thanks.

President Lloyd: Other, yeah, Mr. Shetler and then Ms. Terry.

Councilmember Shetler: What's the total revenue that we receive off the Riverboat annually? Maybe that's a question for Bill?

Troy Tornatta: \$500,000 in that line item.

Councilmember Shetler: No, the total revenue.

Troy Tornatta: \$1.5 million.

Councilmember Shetler: No, the total revenue that we receive from Riverboat, not the expense.

Bill Fluty: 2.2.

Councilmember Shetler: \$2.2 million? Are there any restrictions on that fund as far as what it can be used for?

Bill Fluty: No.

Councilmember Shetler: It can be used for operational or capital or whatever this Council would desire to use it for?

Bill Fluty: It is really General Fund money. So, you could use it for anything you would like.

Councilmember Shetler: Right, thank you.

Troy Tornatta: Tom, how this is worked out, and the way that this board set it up when they got that money was that we were going to keep it out of the General Fund usage, however, one could do anything they want to especially in tough times, but the movement of that money was to never rely on it as a General Fund mechanism. Therefore, if there was ever a pullout, to conservatively say that if it went away, just some of these programs would go away, not the reliance of the General Fund. That's how it was set up, just background.

President Lloyd: Ms. Terry?

Councilmember Terry: My question is on the Initiative Based Assistance program, just looking at history, I think this year's what is being proposed is lower than it's ever been. Can you kind of give me a little bit of background of why such a large decrease there?

President Lloyd: Is that welfare to work?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

President Lloyd: Or the other name for it.

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

President Lloyd: Line 3111.

Troy Tornatta: The Commissioners looked at the program that has been running for a period of time and it has several components, one of the components would be child care, one of the components would be a safety net and a vehicle--

Councilmember Terry: Repair.

Troy Tornatta: –fix up mechanism. The vehicle fix up part is about \$23,000, the, obviously, the lion's share of that goes to the child care side, and we do think it's important, but we have been entertaining doing something on a bus route, and we believe both are very important to our community. The problem is, as we've alluded to several times, the budgets are tight, we don't have that type of money to throw around. So, we sat down with Lieberman and Associates and their board that talks about, and a very educated board, and they talked about the child care side and how much they spend in child care, there are some inconsistencies and we, I wanted to address with them, you know, if they only get one year on assistance, and that's to try and boost them to get their job, to get their finances in line in that one year to try and make a go of it. Part of it is child care and there's not, there's not a line for child care that's equal from one person to another. One person can choose that they want to spend a higher rate, and they're going to pay for that, or if one person chooses to spend a lower rate, they're going to pay for that. My question was, in year number two when they weren't on the service, were they spending \$80 a week and on year number three when they weren't on the service are they spending \$180 a week, and then year number four did they go back to \$80. So, my question is only this, knowing that \$97 is an average fee on child care with their numbers, maybe they only fund \$75 out of that fee, putting a \$20 or \$25 or \$30 weekly stipend on the individual that wants to take that out. Still making sure that they can, that it's very affordable to take care of their children, and that would save, pull that money back that we spent considerably and then we would have more money to put in the transportation side.

Councilmember Kiefer: Mr. President?

President Lloyd: Mr. Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Troy, does that program, do they pay that money directly to the recipient, or do they pay the bill directly to the daycare?

Troy Tornatta: To the daycare with a voucher. I mean, they have a voucher that they have from that daycare—

Councilmember Kiefer: Program.

Troy Tornatta: –and they, I would assume they go through all of the accreditation processes to make sure—

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay.

Troy Tornatta: –that they're able to do so.

Councilmember Kiefer: How, and is the voucher system the same thing for auto repair—

Troy Tornatta: Yes.

Councilmember Kiefer: –and everything? So, they're not actually putting cash in the hands of the recipients?

Troy Tornatta: No.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay, that's good.

Troy Tornatta: No, it's a voucher that comes, for instance, if we get something that comes to us after there have been three submittals, now, on the car side there's three submittals, I don't know if it's the same for child care which is, here again, a little bit of an issue.

Councilmember Kiefer: Yeah.

Troy Tornatta: But, there's three submittals, and those submittals come back and whoever gets the job—

Councilmember Kiefer: Right.

Troy Tornatta: —and I think it pays up to \$775 per incident, or per car for one time, and that's it.

Councilmember Kiefer: So, does Lieberman, do they track these people after they have used them to see—

Troy Tornatta: No.

Councilmember Kiefer: —you know, later did they find a job? Or, I mean, is there any success that can be measured to say, hey, we spent “x” amount and this is the success that's come from it? You know, 95 percent have gotten jobs because of our work, or is it just purely a welfare program?

Troy Tornatta: Very good question. I asked essentially the same question, what were they doing before with child care, what did they do during child care, what did they do after child care and how is the success of continuing the service just with the children? I think the same question needs to be asked just overall how the program served the people and what the exit rate is and how successful it is. So, we've started it. We haven't gotten that far yet, because we know child care is the biggest number of what we're spending.

Councilmember Kiefer: I wonder if it would work better, I mean, of course, Lieberman could explore this, but maybe just contract with one vendor, you know, like St. Vincent's or somebody that has a well known, exceptionally good program and maybe give better discounts.

Troy Tornatta: I think the problem is they're so full and it's proximity. I mean, if a person is on the far east side and they have to come downtown, that's more of an issue, you know, to spend that time. No, I mean, I think we're open for anything.

President Lloyd: When you look at this, so the welfare to work was basically cut \$250,000, \$100,000 went to Dental Clinic, \$150,000 to Transportation Service. I mean, that's what was done in the Riverboat budget.

Troy Tornatta: If, you know, here again, this is a time when we need to talk and tweak and make sure that we have the numbers in the right spaces. I've asked for Lieberman to get that back to us so we can have a better look at what their needs would be if they kind of tweaked their program a little bit, and, so, hopefully, we can get this all back so we have a better number for closing the budget.

President Lloyd: Okay, anything else?

Councilmember Bassemier: Real quick—

President Lloyd: Mr. Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: —Troy, that's probably one of my questions you just answered, but, the administrative costs, you're cutting it one, seventy thousand, down to \$170,000 for the total, do you remember what the administrative costs was and what do you think it's going to be now?

Troy Tornatta: I think the administrative costs is ten percent.

Councilmember Bassemier: Okay, I know, Joe's right, at one time we tried to get, you know, have a meeting with them in here at the Council, but it never happened. So, anyway.

Troy Tornatta: I believe it's ten percent.

President Lloyd: Okay, Mr. Shetler?

Councilmember Bassemier: Okay, thank you.

Councilmember Shetler: Just, real quickly, it seems to me that the Commissioners, to me it's kind of the responsibility maybe to give the direction to Lieberman to set the criteria on those disbursements though.

Troy Tornatta: Right, we can do that—

Councilmember Shetler: Rather than them just...because you said it was, in some cases it was at \$80 and some cases \$180 a month, it just seems to me that you guys would level the playing field here and set the criteria, that that would be your responsibility to do that.

Troy Tornatta: Yeah, and we've actually taken that to task, but we have to have more information. So, we've sent it back to them to go to the drawing board and give us information. If they can't do that, then we'll have to set it without that knowledge. Now, that's a slippery slope, so, I would rather have the knowledge in hand before I try and work on how their programs are going. But, I mean, we've found out that morsel of information, I think we've got to address it, and that's what we're saying right now. It's probably a thing where more people are going to have a little bit of skin in the game, and they're not going to be 100 percent tuition. Or, if they are, they have to find that child care at that level. That's the onus on them.

President Lloyd: Okay, we need to keep going. To finish this, we've got the people from CAJE here, they're supporting the transportation. If you want to stand, so we could recognize. Those that are for the north side bus route please stand so the Council can see. Okay, thank you, appreciate you coming. Let's move on to, well, Dental Clinic, any other questions on that, page 130? If not, we'll move to Burdette Park, page 101.

BURDETTE PARK

Gary Heck: Do you need the Health Department?

President Lloyd: No, let's just get the Commissioners done, and then we can do Health Department. Burdette Park, we've had some conversation on that. I guess, one point of order, Steve, you had mentioned \$900,000 coming back to the county, but to get that \$900,000 we're spending \$1.4 million. So, it's not like it's \$900,000 and it doesn't cost us anything. Page 101, Burdette Park, any questions?

Steve Craig: Russell?

President Lloyd: Yes.

Steve Craig: I would like to, I don't know if this is appropriate right now, but I would like to make a cut to my own budget.

President Lloyd: Okay, that is always appropriate. We encourage that of all presenters. So, which line item?

Councilmember Bassemier: What page?

Steve Craig: It's the other employees, 1100-1450, account number. The reason I'm doing this is when they did the minimum wage, two years ago they raised it from \$5.85 to \$7.25, and at that time we took the amount of hours that we had in the park for seasonal and part time help and it came up to about 72,000 hours and figuring at \$1.40 a person, that's a little bit over \$100,000 that we were automatically going to have to raise everyone's wages. So, at that time I had no idea where we were going to come up with \$100,000, which I've not come back to you guys yet for money to cover that, and we made several cuts in several different areas of the park. I talked to all of my department heads about cutting back on their staff, without jeopardizing safety issues at the aquatic center, the EMT's, the day camp, and at the beginning of this year when it went to seven and a quarter and we sat down and did this I had no idea how much I was going to need, but at the present time it looks like that we're going to get, come in at a lot lower than adding \$50,000 to it. My department heads did a good job with their cuts and cut back on personnel, and I would like to take it back to \$500,000 as a request right now.

President Lloyd: Okay, in line item 1180-1450, the request is changed to \$500,000, knock \$25,000 off.

Councilmember Raben: Can we take a question on that line?

President Lloyd: Go ahead.

Councilmember Raben: Steve, how many full time/part time people are working into a year?

Steve Craig: Are you talking about a part time person that works the full year?

Councilmember Raben: Yeah.

Steve Craig: I probably, I think we've got it down to about 12 or 13, but you have to take a look that some of them might only work eight hours a week, or 16 hours a week, or they might be on call. I have people that's been with me for 10 or 12 years that I only call them when I need them and they come in when we have big events or something. But, I know where we're going with this, and most of the people, I probably have four or five that get a full day's or a full week's pay, work five days, six or seven hours a day, but outside of that they're just part time people that we use as needed. A lot of them are college kids that go to USI, come in and work on weekends, stuff like that.

Councilmember Raben: Four or five that are working five days a week though?

Steve Craig: I would say that was about right, that are steady five days a week.

Councilmember Raben: And they're, what are they doing? Just a lot of general stuff?

Steve Craig: Well, yeah, one of them oversees the housekeeping, other ones are maintenance people that works with my maintenance men. One of the things I got, my four employees all get six weeks vacation, being that they don't take any of it during the summer, most of the vacation is taken during the winter. Down to two people a lot of times during the day, but they do general maintenance, firewood, splitting of the wood, just general maintenance in the park. They do help with repairs with my full time employees.

President Lloyd: What was the number on those? Those part timers?

Steve Craig: Pardon me?

President Lloyd: What was the number, the number of those?

Steve Craig: I think there's five of them or six, I don't know, it's somewhere, I would have to sit down and take....I have, you know, several of them that work year round, but they're not—

Councilmember Raben: Okay.

Steve Craig: —they don't work five days a week.

President Lloyd: Anything else, Jim? Other questions on Burdette Park? This budget, on page 104, the increase would be \$85,000, subtract \$25,000 based on what Mr. Craig said, \$60,637 increase, that's 4.3 percent. Big budget. Okay, I think we've talked about Burdette. Let's move on to 1440, the Centre, page 100. Thanks, Steve.

THE CENTRE

President Lloyd: I'm trying to get through the Commissioners.

Darren Stearns: Hello, Darren Stearns, Assistant General Manager with SMG.

President Lloyd: Any questions on the Centre budget? Mr. Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: Since the question was brought up earlier about the computer folks on paying rent, do you guys pay rent, SMG, to the Centre?

Darren Stearns: No.

Councilmember Shetler: Alright, thank you.

President Lloyd: Other questions? For 2010 how are our revenues? I know, you've come to us before and we've had pretty favorable reports.

Darren Stearns: We're more inclined with our 2008 numbers than we are with 2009. 2009 was a very good year, so, we're pushing along, we're a little bit short on the conventions that we've had for 2009. That being said, we are probably seven to eight more shows put into the theater itself to try to help offset that compared to what we had last year. I think we had 18 shows, and, I think, we're up to 25 this year.

President Lloyd: Do you know roughly what the year-to-date revenues are? A rough number.

Darren Stearns: Through June, or, let's see, we're up to July now, I don't have the, of course, August numbers, up through July we're probably in the revenue-wise of around 1.2.

President Lloyd: Okay, and that's more like '08?

Darren Stearns: Yes.

President Lloyd: Okay. Any questions on the Centre budget? Mr. Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: You said you've increased the number of shows?

Darren Stearns: Uh-huh.

Councilmember Goebel: And, that's because of the loss of conventions?

Darren Stearns: Well, what we did was we just put a bigger, wider net out for something. We're looking for anything we can to offset that.

Councilmember Goebel: Are these well attended?

Darren Stearns: Some of them, and some of them are different. We've got a six show Broadway season this year. We've added some more of the family shows, we've got three different family shows this year compared to other local ones. So, yes, some of them are, we do have some shows that have not been attended very well.

Councilmember Goebel: Okay, well, I would hope that you would promote as many as possible, because it seems like there is an appetite.

Darren Stearns: Correct, so, the way we would do that is we work with local promoters, because, of course, we don't risk any of the county's money. So, we

have to find a promoter that will bring the show. So, that makes it a little bit more difficult, but we're working on it.

President Lloyd: Mr. Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Darren, do you guys have some kind of measuring, like occupancy factor, like, you know, how often is it occupied? What percent is it occupied with events throughout the year versus other communities of our size? You know, like are we, you know, booked 75 percent of the time? Whereas, the other communities of our size might be only booked 60 percent? I mean, I don't know what the numbers are, I'm just throwing something out, but how do you measure your success ration on bookings and the percentage, you know, of your total space available?

Darren Stearns: Well, what we usually do—

Councilmember Kiefer: And days.

Darren Stearns: — with our reports to the County Commissioners is we will give the number of events we've had for the month and the event days. The thing that will be difficult to do, and we've done it in years past as far as other buildings is we can do event days, but their event days might be different than ours in that their event day is one meeting room, like Walnut A, where our event day might be the entire exhibit hall is booked.

Councilmember Kiefer: Yeah, but, I guess, what I'm trying to get at is total potential, you know, 365 days, total potential and total square footage available, how much of that is occupied? You know, I mean, you couldn't book, you know, 400 days, because there's not that many days, you know, so, I mean, you know, and you couldn't book so much square footage because there's a limited amount. I'm just trying to get at is there a measurement that shows, hey, we have "x" amount of square footage and "x" amount of days, out of that we're 70 percent booked.

Darren Stearns: No, we have not done it that way before. I mean, it could be done that way. We would take the square footage, and, like you said, the 365 days, other than what holidays that we are closed—

Councilmember Kiefer: I mean, I would like to see how we stack up against other communities of our size. You know, there's got to be other communities that we can measure against to how we're performing versus—

Darren Stearns: Oh, I know, I'm sure, and we can look into that. I guess, like I said, my only, not necessarily concern is, I don't know if that's the way that they actually are figuring out their occupancy rates as well.

Councilmember Kiefer: Yeah, that might be—

Darren Stearns: It might be on event days, or square footage per year type of event. I mean, so it would be apples to apples, I don't know if they would do it that way.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay.

Darren Stearns: But, we can. It was done a couple of years ago.

Councilmember Kiefer: There's probably some kind of industry standard. I just don't know what it is.

Darren Stearns: Sure.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay.

President Lloyd: Other questions? Mr. Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: Yeah, do you have staff, or someone on staff, that sells to conventions?

Darren Stearns: Yes, we do.

Councilmember Shetler: Are they finding any difficulty with the lack of a hotel associated with the facility today?

Darren Stearns: Yeah, it makes it more difficult. I'm sure it does for the CVB. The way our contract works actually with the Centre is we are responsible for booking meetings and conventions 18 months and in, the CVB is the lead on chasing events 18 months and out for conventions. In which case they'll go out and bring back an RFP for us to work with them on and see about bringing the convention in. So, we don't have a lot of, we're not searching for a lot of the bigger conventions because they're usually, as you know, if you've been to them, are decided way more than 18 months out, but then they would bring it back to us as far as an offering on it. I do know that the CVB has been trying to help with bussing, as far as if we can bring them in and bus them from the hotels, but, you know, that's just a, it's a logical thing that they're going to want to stay as close to where their meeting is as possible.

Councilmember Shetler: And, on the rent, on those meeting rooms and stuff that we have over there, do we comp those at all, ever?

Darren Stearns: We don't comp the meeting room rents without authorization.

Councilmember Shetler: From?

Darren Stearns: The County Commissioners.

Councilmember Shetler: Alright, so, it is done then?

Troy Tornatta: I haven't seen any, not unless there's been, if there's been a county or city use we will allow the city to use, I think they use it for some of their police training. We'll allow them to do that. If the Sheriff's Department wants to hold an inauguration or, you know, bring some officers up to the Sheriff's Department, we've allowed them to do that. Unless it's a city-county use, to my knowledge we haven't comped anything for anybody.

Councilmember Shetler: Alright.

Troy Tornatta: Let me say this, there have been, as far as some bigger events, Girls in Bloom we've comped, but for the boys side we comped the Boy Scouts. So, we were trying to keep parity between some of the groups, but their food and their draw was such that their food bill was going to be substantial.

President Lloyd: Any other questions on this? While we've got Darren up here let's go to Convention Center Operating Fund, page 161.

CONVENTION CENTER OPERATING FUND

President Lloyd: That's basically a flat budget. I guess, my question would be Utilities, are we going to come in, is the \$450,000 sufficient? Or, is that, how does that look compared to '10?

Darren Stearns: Well, what we did was when we budgeted for '10, it looks like we're going to be a little bit under—

President Lloyd: Okay.

Darren Stearns: — for '10, so, that's why we were comfortable leaving it alone for 11. Mr. Rector gave us our gas estimate, so, we feel pretty comfortable with that.

President Lloyd: Okay, that's good news. Any other questions on this? Alright, thank you very much. Superintendent of County Buildings, page 81.

SUPERINTENDENT OF COUNTY BUILDINGS

Councilmember Raben: Troy, we probably should have offered you a stool.

Troy Tornatta: I probably could have sat down. Everything's pretty flat. The one thing that we have seen is an increase in occupancy of the Old Courthouse. We have hired somebody in in that place to try and fill the thing, and it's at 70 percent occupancy right now. Revenues somewhere in the range of \$150,000 for the year, and could be a little stronger if they had been in there a whole year. So, we think we're seeing at least a \$20,000 increase year over year. So, we feel like we're paying a few more bills over there.

President Lloyd: That's good news. Any questions on the Superintendent of County Buildings? There was a nice write up in the newspaper about the renovation of the courtrooms.

Troy Tornatta: That's going to be a pretty nice setup.

President Lloyd: Any questions? Okay, well, we're done with that one. Do you, are you doing Veterans Administration or not? Oh, he's here.

Troy Tornatta: He's here.

President Lloyd: Okay, alright, any other questions for Commissioners?

Councilmember Bassemier: One quick one.

President Lloyd: Mr. Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Troy, could you get with Dave Rector, I know he was just here and set up a kind of a meeting in reference to the old jail and how we can, I think we've only had one meeting and Joe and I would like to meet with you and Rector and see what we can, how we can renovate the old jail.

Troy Tornatta: Well, originally, I think, I was on that, and had talked to Joe about using his expertise in the real estate business to try and see what the use could be for that facility. I think, Commissioner Melcher might have wanted to serve on there. So, he took that on. What we're finding right now is there's a little bit of issue with a company coming in and having everybody screened and whatever and is that an impediment on their business. There's \$500,000 worth of tax free bonds this Council would have to pay off before we could enter into any agreement with anybody from the outside. We talked to the city, the city wants no more space. We as a county, in talking to Councilman Raben, believe that we could use the space that we have occupied right now to do what we need to do. Now, are there some outside things, as far as outside county businesses, we don't think that there's really any outside county businesses that we would benefit from moving into that space. So, to renovate anything right now before we know who the end user is going to be might be building just to tear down and build over again. So, we've got it cleared out, we believe that we're prepared if somebody wants to come in, we'll activate that measure and put them into the building, but I don't think we need to spend anymore money up there in that space, but there are some things that are outside of this building for storage and what not, I mean, if we're cutting some corners or cutting some dollars we need to entertain. So, I know that might not be what everyone wants to do, but it's something that should be on the table.

Councilmember Bassemier: You know, that's what I want the meeting about, to see what kind of a tenant we could get in here.

Troy Tornatta: Yeah, right now, we've searched and there's just not a big appeal for that space for an outside tenant, but we're still looking, but, maybe we could use, we have, I'm sure in other areas we have record storage that we can entertain.

President Lloyd: Okay. Thank you. One point on the Riverboat, I made a factual misstatement, GAGE does calculate our tax abatements and they do our compliance on tax abatements. I see Pam Martin back there, that reminded me. They do do that for the county, as well as the city. So, that is a needed service. Okay, I think we're done with the Commissioners.

Sandie Deig: (Inaudible, microphone not on.)

President Lloyd: Mrs. Deig wanted to know when the GAGE payment was made. She'll provide that copy. We're going to do Veterans Administration and then we're going to take a five minute break. So, Mr. Ball is here, if we could do his budget real quick, page 70.

VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

President Lloyd: Good morning.

Jay Ball: Good morning.

Troy Tornatta: Let me get all of this stuff.

President Lloyd: Any questions for Mr. Ball, Veterans Administration? We've got a decrease in this budget, I guess, related to, we've had some personnel changes.

Jay Ball: Right. I think the issue, you know, we're still wanting to hire the Secretary/Clerk Typist.

President Lloyd: Excuse me, you've got \$40,000 in Burial Allowance, is that going to be sufficient?

Jay Ball: It has been in the past, but, you know, as the veterans are aging, especially the World War II and Korean veterans, hopefully, it will be enough. It's going to be plenty this year it looks like.

Councilmember Kiefer: What's the average cost per burial?

Jay Ball: Well, the county gives \$100 towards the burial and \$100 towards the setting of a marker.

Councilmember Kiefer: So, \$200.

Jay Ball: Yeah, at the maximum.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay.

Jay Ball: Not all of them use the setting of a marker.

President Lloyd: Any questions for Mr. Ball? Okay, I guess, the Council is satisfied with your budget.

Jay Ball: Okay.

President Lloyd: Great, thank you for coming in.

Jay Ball: Thank you.

President Lloyd: Or, Mr. Goebel has a question.

Councilmember Goebel: On the Typist, is that a full time position?

Jay Ball: Yes.

Councilmember Goebel: Had you considered a part time?

Jay Ball: Well, we would like it to be a full time position.

Councilmember Goebel: Okay.

Jay Ball: I mean, if we have to consider part time, we would, but, you know, we're still coming in at like nine percent under our last year's budget with that being a full time job.

Councilmember Goebel: Yeah, and that is noticeable. We appreciate that, but that position is not filled at this point?

Jay Ball: Correct.

Councilmember Goebel: Thank you.

President Lloyd: I guess, that kind of brings up, just briefly, what are some of the duties that you guys have over there?

Jay Ball: Well, our main thing right now is filing disability claims for veterans. When you see the backlog, I don't know if you read the backlog in the VA system, we're filing hundreds of claims for the returning Iraqi and Afghanistan veterans, pension claims for older veterans. It's something, it's always been there, but it's a Catch-22 now with the assisted living and nursing homes. You probably see these ads in the paper for assisted living talking about veteran's benefits. It's very time consuming and the paperwork to do them.

President Lloyd: I mean, mainly with the federal government? Those are the ones—

Jay Ball: Correct.

President Lloyd: —where most of the work is generated? Mr. Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Well, we certainly appreciate the job you do, and the services, unfortunately, are more needed now, probably, than any recent time.

Jay Ball: It has been, yes.

Councilmember Goebel: Thank you.

Jay Ball: I appreciate that.

President Lloyd: Any other questions for Mr. Ball? Okay, thank you very much for coming in.

Jay Ball: Thank you.

President Lloyd: We're going to take a five minute recess. We'll start up again at quarter till and we'll start with the Health Department.

(The meeting was recessed at 10:40 a.m. and reconvened at 10:45 a.m.)

HEALTH DEPARTMENT

President Lloyd: I would like to reconvene the 2011 Vanderburgh County budget hearings. We're moving to 2130, Health Department, page 125. We have Mr. Gary Heck here, the Administrator. Any questions on the Health Department? You had, Gary, you'd indicated that you had some savings you wanted to bring to the Council's attention.

Gary Heck: I do, the only thing in our budget that I would like to, there are only two line items that we have asked for an increase, and those are based on contractual arrangements. One of them is account 3000, the Bond and Insurance, and on the advice and recommendation of the Old National Insurance consultant, they advised us to use eight percent as an increase, which would cover the increased cost in the property, general liability, professional liability and our auto insurance. That's an eight percent increase. So, that's an additional \$9,948, based on that

recommendation. Then, the only other line item that we've requested an increase is in account 3600, the Rent—

President Lloyd: Yes.

Gary Heck: —and this is based on, our lease arrangement is made with Southwestern Behavioral Healthcare, formerly Southwestern Mental Health Center, and it's based on the Consumer Price Index all urban consumers, non-seasonally adjusted, and it's the September rate that's published in October. Looking, last year there was actually a decrease, and our rent was actually decreased last year. Based on the activity so far this year, in January it was 2.5 percent, February it was 2.0, so, we've been sort of tracking right at the two, two point two percent increase. So, we're, without having a crystal ball to know exactly what it's going to be, we're projecting a 2.276 percent increase.

President Lloyd: You know, at the Health Board meeting I had asked, in a lot of urban areas rents are going down, commercial rents are going down, but, you indicated that they said plus two percent.

Gary Heck: That's what it's, well, that's what the contract calls for. It's whatever that Consumer Price Index is. So, we track that same amount, and it's based over the past 12 months. So, in January it actually had increased, the increase was 5.544, and that equates to a 2.559 percentage increase.

President Lloyd: Okay.

Gary Heck: So, whether we get there or not is a whole other story, but that's it. In the salaries we always let the County Council make that determination as you have advised us in the past. We have included any of the longevity step increases that any of the employees that we have would be entitled to for next year, and we've shared all of our information with Mr. Deisher so he can double check to make sure that we're all on that same page.

President Lloyd: You're up, this budget's up \$144,000, four percent, but you've also got, under Dental Clinic, plus \$100,000.

Gary Heck: Yes, I mean, that money that's in there, we do have \$100,000 in the Health Department's budget that's set up to be able to continue to run the Dental Clinic just because of....you've heard in the past about the hospitals were involved in a grant arrangement for the first two years, and that time has come and gone. Then, that's what this money is set up to try to handle.

President Lloyd: So, between the Commissioners and the Health Department does it cost roughly \$280,000 to run the Dental Clinic?

Gary Heck: It costs close to a little over \$300,000 this year.

President Lloyd: Okay.

Gary Heck: And, but, we do have patient payments—

President Lloyd: Right, the ones that can afford to pay, do pay.

Gary Heck: Well, we're on a sliding fee scale, so everybody pays something, even at the lowest level. If they happen to come in from another county, then we have, we had the County Attorney research this and we have a Vanderburgh County resident and then anybody outside of Vanderburgh County pays a separate, higher fee. It's the same theory as in-state and out-of-state tuition at a State university. They followed those same exact rules.

President Lloyd: Do you get very many out-of-city or out-of-county for the Dental Clinic?

Gary Heck: That's, to address Councilman Kiefer's question, 95, or, excuse me, 85 percent of all of our patients are from Vanderburgh County. The remaining 15 percent comes from other counties in Indiana or from Illinois or from Kentucky. We serve a tri, you know, Evansville-Vanderburgh County serves the tri-state.

President Lloyd: I mean, that is surprising. Mr. Shetler had a question.

Councilmember Shetler: Yeah, let me go to that, the rules that are established, you said follow the same guidelines as out-of-state tuition

Gary Heck: Well, the theory on how they arrived at that.

Councilmember Shetler: Well, wait a minute my question is that, as I understand, like USI, neighboring outside counties don't pay it, so is that what you're telling us?

Gary Heck: No. What I'm saying is the legal theory that would allow us to charge a separate rate is based on that theory.

Councilmember Shetler: So, you don't use the same criteria?

Gary Heck: Oh, no.

Councilmember Shetler: You're just using the same mind set of charging outside—

Gary Heck: That's how the—

Councilmember Shetler: Okay.

Gary Heck: – County Council arrived at it was legal for us to charge separately.

Councilmember Shetler: Alright, fine. I just wanted to make sure that we weren't—

Gary Heck: No, everybody pays—

Councilmember Shetler: – because, I'm assuming that 15 percent that's coming from outside are people that are neighboring—

Gary Heck: They are—

Councilmember Shetler: – you know, adjacent—

Gary Heck: –and they all pay.

Councilmember Shetler: – I mean, they're not coming from Cook County or something in Illinois, they're coming from White, you know, whatever.

Councilmember Kiefer: That's a long drive.

Councilmember Shetler: Yeah.

Gary Heck: It would be a long drive. Everybody does pay. So, that's where the Health Department, I don't know, if you didn't have any other questions on the Health Department, I did want to share with you a couple of things. One of them, I would like to introduce two of our staff members, because you may not have had a chance to put a face and names and title together, but Paulette Hoffman, our Finance Officer, is with us today, and also Ginger Patton, she's the Administrative Assistant to the Health Officer and the Administrator. I wanted you all to at least know those folks, so, in case you ever needed something and you couldn't reach Dr. Nicholson or myself, they will be in a position to be able to help you as well.

President Lloyd: If we have questions, just go to them?

Gary Heck: They could certainly answer them, and they would do a wonderful job at it.

President Lloyd: Okay.

Gary Heck: Part of what I also wanted to share with you is the value added that the Health Department does. The community Dental Clinic was also another CAJE advocated project, this goes back to about, well, several years, but in 2005-2006 was when it was formalized. Since June 26, 2006 when we opened our doors through July 31st of this year, we've produced \$1.46 worth of patient treatment for every dollar that we have spent. So, that's one measure of how you look at return on investment.

President Lloyd: Are you talking about the whole Health Department, or just the Dental?

Gary Heck: Just the Dental Clinic. In the Dental Clinic, when you look at our total operating costs and then you subtract the revenues that were collected, now, this wouldn't include any subsidies that would come from any of the other county sources, you get a net operating cost, and when you look at the total cost of the dental services that we've provided, which was \$1,522,423, and if you divide that by the \$1,042,663, you're going to come up with the \$1.46, which is the return. Now, our goal is \$1.60, so we still have a ways to go to be able to reach that, but we're making progress and we're working towards that. During that time period we've served 4,035 patients, 2,083 are male, 1,952 are female. We've produced 21,161 different services during 10,007 patient visits. Over 92 percent of our patients don't have dental insurance or medical insurance, that's 300, excuse me 3,731 of the 4,035. Over 94 percent of our patients are between the ages of 21 and 70, so, that's 3,798 of the 4,035. You'll remember that we were specifically asked to address the adult population that was under served for dental care. They're not being served by basically any other group, with the exception of the Impact Ministries, and they have a dental clinic, and it's, they are on a much more limited type of scale, and they just can't, between the both of us it's hard to meet all of our needs. But, we're certainly making a good crack at it.

President Lloyd: Okay, I mean, I think we've got a pretty good handle on the Dental Clinic.

Gary Heck: Well, let me go on then to the—

President Lloyd: Why don't you—

Gary Heck: —prescription drug cards.

President Lloyd: Okay. Briefly.

Gary Heck: I will. The Vanderburgh County Health Department has administrated, has been administering this program on behalf of the county, and as of this past month Vanderburgh County residents have saved over three million dollars in price savings, \$3,072,390. That's 27.74 percent is the amount of money that's saved when they use their National Association of Counties prescription drug card.

President Lloyd: So, like a 27 percent discount?

Gary Heck: That's what it amounts to. It's a savings that anybody who's a resident of Vanderburgh County is eligible for, as long as you're not covered by your insurance. If your insurance doesn't cover a particular prescription drug, then this program will pick it up. It also considers pets as household members. So, if you have a pet that has been written a prescription drug, you can have it filled at the pharmacy and they qualify for the discount as well.

President Lloyd: Just don't get them mixed up.

Gary Heck: No, you certainly wouldn't want to do that. Also, I wanted to let you know that we've, you were talking about the computers, we were able to, the Health Department is in better shape today to respond to emergencies because of the H1N1 immunization effort that we held last year. One of the things that we were able to do during that was to beef up some of the infrastructure that will allow us to have equipment and materials so that we could not only take care of the H1N1 immunization effort as it was there, but now that that's over with both equipment and materials stay with the Health Department that we can use in the future. We were able to acquire 25 new computers and also pay for the software and the software insurance, and these were furnished to all of our Public Health Nurses and the staff that entered data into the CHIRP program, which is the State-wide immunization registry program.

President Lloyd: Where did that grant come from?

Gary Heck: Federal government passed—

President Lloyd: For H1N1 you were able to purchase 25 computers?

Gary Heck: For use during the H1N1 effort, and now that that's over it's there to help serve—

President Lloyd: Right.

Gary Heck: —the future and continue to do that.

President Lloyd: You don't have to give them back?

Gary Heck: Don't have to give them back, but that's money that the county won't have to spend when you look at making sure that we're in compliance—

President Lloyd: Right, we had an extended discussion yesterday about the computerization cost. So, I mean, this is, that's great news that you guys were able to do that.

Gary Heck: And they'll, I'm sure you covered the select agreement which is the company enterprise agreement which is one of the things that's required. Well, this money also covered all of those expenses for those computers. We've also identified another grant source that will allow us to purchase another 25.

President Lloyd: What was the value of that roughly, the 25 computers?

Gary Heck: The computer hardware itself was roughly \$45,000, and then the software was \$19,800 initially, and then there was an additional cost of probably right at \$20,000 for the extended select service agreement under the State's quantity purchase agreement. So, all of that goes through January the, excuse me, June 30th of 2012. So, all of those expenses are already covered.

President Lloyd: And those were basically brand new units?

Gary Heck: Brand new units, the Dells that were under the State quantity purchase agreement using the Windows 7 enterprise, 64 bit. So, it's, we're state of the art when it comes to operating systems and the computers that we have.

President Lloyd: That's great.

Gary Heck: On those 25 units.

President Lloyd: Yeah, that's great work on that.

Gary Heck: We've identified another grant that will also allow us to acquire another 25, when the time comes.

President Lloyd: Wow.

Gary Heck: So, that's money that you will be able to save in other areas as we can move forward. One of the things that we haven't realized the actual total savings yet, but we are in the process of consolidating the Fulton WIC clinic back to the Oak Park professional building. We will be able to request rent assistance from that grant to help pay for rent for next year. We won't be able to do that until after December of this year.

President Lloyd: Is that the lease?

Gary Heck: That's a lease. We hope that that funds, will actually put us in a position where we would also be able to help share some of those costs associated with that. So, I wanted you at least to know what we are working on. We also have a second reading of an ordinance with the Commissioners as we look at our service fees, fees for services, and those will be modified at the August 24th Commissioners

meeting, and as soon as the county can participate in the Tyler Technology project where we'll have the point of sale cash registers and the State Board of Account receipting, we should be in a position where we can actually charge for additional services we haven't been able to charge for, because we couldn't do the receipting in a timely manner. It's just too cost prohibitive to write out an individual receipt for each and every transaction.

President Lloyd: So, that would be software that would allow you to print receipts?

Gary Heck: Print receipts and meet the State Board of Accounts requirements for deposits with the Auditor's office and the Treasurer's office.

President Lloyd: Great.

Gary Heck: And that's where we hope to be at this time next year where we'll actually have additional revenue streams coming in to the Health Department.

President Lloyd: Okay, question, Mr. Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: Would there be any merit to partnering up with a nearby school to put, your outside clinic for example? Whereby that grant money, if they've got room in that school to operate a clinic. Because I'm making an assumption here that those are used primarily for families, and a lot for children getting vaccinations and stuff, as well as some other family type services that, it might be an ideal place and it may be a way for them to be able to recoup some revenue off of the rent from other government entities.

Gary Heck: Dr. Nick has been in discussion with the School Corporation and with USI, there's a new, in the Glenwood Academy there's an effort to do some of those exact things. The Health Department would be one component of that particular project. So, it is possible to at least discuss that. Public health is different from individual health in that we try to prevent disease for the entire community. We're not necessarily concerned about the health of just one individual. That's an individual physician's responsibility. So, there is a little bit of difference in what we're trying to accomplish. So, but, as much as we could do so, possibly, we're always open to see how we can serve the community better. So, we would be interested in doing that. We did explore, you all asked us to check on some webinars so we could avoid some travel and training costs, and we have explored that. We've got three different scenarios that we've shared with Computer Services, and we hope to be able to move forward on that probably within the next two months. One of the things that, the internet connection that we have for that particular service has to be on an independent one different than the county or the city network, because there's some firewall and security issues. We've got that already arranged, so, now it's a matter of making sure that we've got the grant funds in place to move forward. We hope to be able to have that in place within the next three months. If we do that, we hope to be able to reduce our travel requests that come to this Council, because we could be able to then participate in training from our own building and be face to face just like in a distance learning classroom.

President Lloyd: Other questions for the Health Department? Mr. Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: This is nothing you've requested right now, but, obviously, you've been doing a lot with the immunization, the new immunization for school

children, and I've read that a lot of the families have not complied. Is there going to be an operation by the Health Department maybe to go out to the individual schools and inoculate at EVSC cost or something like that?

Gary Heck: Well, we haven't ruled anything out other than we've made it, we've tried to do everything we could before school started to have the greatest opportunity for parents to get an early start. We met and went into schools at the end of last school year. We've had walk-in clinics at the Health Department over the entire summer. We've done radio blitzes to encourage parents to come in. We've conducted clinics at the Centre on August the 5th and 6th that were disappointing to us in that there weren't that many people. We're doing the best we can to try to accommodate everyone. We don't have the staff to go individually to each and every school for the entire year. So, we're going to see what we can do to work out trying to get something done, but our goal is to try to protect as many people as possible, but, quite honestly, we feel it's time that the parents kind of step up to the plate and accept the responsibility of parenthood, which means they do have the responsibility to be concerned about their children and to make sure that they do receive the immunizations that they need to be protected. So, but, we'll do our best.

Councilmember Goebel: Well, I know you are. You've done a great job, but, obviously, the people, the parents who have not yet brought their children forward probably are going to be reluctant to do so. If the schools say you can't come, those are the very students we probably need to have in school.

Gary Heck: Our issue isn't necessarily going to the school, it's making sure that when we go to the schools that the schools have already requested and received the parental permission, those waiver slips, and as long as they have an adequate number, and I'm not, I don't know whether to tell you that would be, if there's 300 students in the school, if they had a hundred students that needed them back, I don't know what that percentage is, but it needs to be worth our while to actually be able to go out there to do it. Of course, if you've protected one more child, you can always take that attitude that you're that much better off.

Councilmember Goebel: Okay.

Gary Heck: There is some dollar and cents issues here where you, it's counterproductive to go out and just vaccinate two kids, when you could have gotten all of the rest of them at the same time if you can.

Councilmember Goebel: We'll leave that to you. Thank you. I know we got off the subject.

Gary Heck: You're welcome, sir.

President Lloyd: Any other questions for the Health Department? Ms. Terry?

Councilmember Terry: I just wanted confirmation again on the Dental Clinic, I hate to go back to it, but—

Gary Heck: That's okay.

Councilmember Terry: –the negotiations with the hospital, you’re saying there’s no, absolutely no opportunity for even half of the grant that they’ve been providing for the last two years?

Gary Heck: My understanding is that when they were approached by not only discussions with the Health Department, but with the County Commissioners and the previous County Council folks who had arranged that previously, it was made known it was a time limited type of project, and that after that point in time it would be like the expectation from the hospital’s part, it would be like any other program or service that the county offered. That’s where we are today. That’s where the requests for the assistance from the Riverboat portion–

Councilmember Terry: Right.

Gary Heck: –and then also the fact that the Health Department has put in a separate line item, up to \$100,000, to help support that. We have tried to write grants to a lot of other groups and agencies, but every foundation that we approached, with the exception of Kresge’s, has a specific preclusion that if you’re a tax based government facility–

Councilmember Terry: Right, you can’t get it.

Gary Heck: – you can’t come to them. They only want to fund 501C3 type organizations.

Councilmember Terry: Right.

Gary Heck: The Kresge Foundation is different, and we’re in discussions with the ECHO Community Health Clinic to try to work on a combined grant. Right now the ECHO Community Health Clinic funds some of the homeless patients that they serve for dental services. We do a referral service with them. We’re hoping to expand that to other under insured and uninsured adults, and the Kresge grant would help us be able to pick that up, but we have to make our way through all of the paperwork to get that done.

Councilmember Terry: Right, right.

Gary Heck: It’s the only foundation or grant source that we’ve found that doesn’t specifically preclude us from applying in the first place.

President Lloyd: Let me, our attorney has a question for you.

Jeff Alhers: Two things, I guess, on that point, I guess, you guys could look into, I don’t know if it makes any difference to make it a 501C3, if you’ve got the grants lined up.

Gary Heck: We, there’s been some discussion to perhaps try to do that where a broader group could help then serve the Impact Ministry, the Sheriff’s office has their own dental services from time to time and they may need additional dental services. It’s a group that could pick up a much broader than just the group that we’re actually looking at.

Jeff Ahlers: One of the other questions I had that, I guess, and seeing all of this unfold the last two or three years that, I guess, I've not understood is that, you know, like, for example, lawyers in the community donate time and money to the volunteer lawyer program or to Legal Aid Society. You know, medical doctors donate time and money to various clinics or the hospitals, and it just seems that the thing that's been missing in all this is where are the dentists? You know, what about the Dental Associations donating time or money. I mean, to me it seems like this would be something that would be of interest to them. This is what they should care about, and, so, has anybody approached them?

Gary Heck: The First District Dental Society has been very supportive of the project. They were, they provided a committee that helped put the business plan together in the first place, they helped work on the advice for purchasing and outfitting the Dental Clinic to start with, they actually had a major fund drive and named one of the operatories after one of their members who died, unfortunately, a year or two ago, Dr. Reibold, and they raised \$40,000 for the operation of this at that time. They've been actively involved in a lot of things. They, the surgeons, the oral surgeons accept referrals for patients, and, I guess, it's like attorneys who do pro bono work, there's some similar arrangements that are there where they either donate or they accept whatever, if there is any type of Medicaid surgery reimbursement involved they perhaps could be eligible for that. So, the dentists do a lot, it may not be the exact same as writing a check each and every week kind of thing, but the dentists, the First District Dental Society has been very, very supportive of the community Dental Clinic. So, but it is a different type of, it may not be exactly what some folks would like to see people do.

President Lloyd: Okay, one more question, Mr. Shetler? Oh, you don't have it? Okay. Mr. Kiefer? Mr. Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Gary, until, I mean, I don't think it was ever conveyed to us initially that Deaconess nor St. Mary's were in it for the short haul. I think it was once they got us in business they walked away from it. You know, when you talk about 4,000 plus patients, there's no doubt in my mind that we've relieved a lot of burden from them. Now, they can say what they want, but, you know, that's had to take a lot of their troubles away from their area into ours. So, you know, I think there probably needs to be one last push, before we approve this budget, to get them to get back into this thing with us.

President Lloyd: Okay.

Gary Heck: Are you asking me to make that request?

Councilmember Raben: Yes, before we approve a budget—

Gary Heck: Okay.

Councilmember Raben: —because I'm looking at this, like many others, that, hey, these numbers are astounding, you know, they say that they've not seen any, you know, change in their flow, and I don't believe it.

Gary Heck: Well, I'll be happy to make the request, sir.

President Lloyd: Or, you could talk to the Commissioners and work with them on it as well.

Gary Heck: Okay.

President Lloyd: Any other questions on the Health Department? We need to get moving. Thank you very much.

Gary Heck: I guess you all knew we won the Leadership Evansville Award, the community Dental Clinic, as the project for government and public service work.

President Lloyd: Congratulations.

Gary Heck: Just so you know we're recognized by a much broader group too.

President Lloyd: Leadership, okay, congratulations.

Gary Heck: Thank you.

President Lloyd: Alright, Co-Op Extension Service, page 64.

CO-OP EXTENSION SERVICE

President Lloyd: Good afternoon.

Susan Plassmeier: Good afternoon. Susan Plassmeier with the Extension Service here in Vanderburgh County. Our budget's really pretty simple. We kind of flat lined everything. In the salaries, the 1000 level we've got two increases, but those are both step increases. Then, the only other thing that we're asking for is that \$361 in Contractual Services that we've not been able to get for the last three years. That is not all salary, it also includes our computer services through Purdue. We do not utilize the county computer service system, so our software is through Purdue and our maintenance and trouble, they take care of us. It also helps us subsidize, we have four paraprofessionals that are USDA grants through the federal grant, through the Stamp System that work with limited resource families here in Vanderburgh County teaching nutrition education.

President Lloyd: What line item is that?

Susan Plassmeier: That would be in that Contractual Services of 3530 that we're \$361 short.

President Lloyd: Okay. So, that's, compared to last year you've added \$361?

Susan Plassmeier: Yep, that's it, other than those step increases.

President Lloyd: And that's for a connection to Purdue?

Susan Plassmeier: That, it covers a multitude of things. That helps to, with salaries with our Purdue educators, it helps put some of their benefits, it also helps, it's our computer lines. We have a two way computer system, telecommunication system with Purdue where we can do trainings. Also, it helps the support with the family nutrition program assistance.

President Lloyd: Okay, the total budget increased \$4,302, which is 1.3 percent, pretty minimal.

Susan Plassmeier: And, the majority of that was the salaries and steps.

President Lloyd: Right, you had the two step increases.

Susan Plassmeier: Yes.

President Lloyd: Mr. Shetler has a question.

Susan Plassmeier: Yes?

Councilmember Shetler: The travel, you guys have to go back and forth to Lafayette a lot, or other places?

Susan Plassmeier: We do have, they're trying to minimize that and do as much as we can with the two way and Adobe Connect trainings and stuff, but there is still some travel a couple times a year to Purdue and back. We also, we are out in the community a lot, and, so it's also the transportation costs going out and doing programming in the communities.

Councilmember Shetler: Is there a company vehicle there?

Susan Plassmeier: No.

Councilmember Shetler: Okay, that was the point that I was going to make is on the webinars and you guys are trying to utilize those as much as possible, okay, thank you.

President Lloyd: There may be an extra vehicle at Burdette.

Susan Plassmeier: Yeah.

President Lloyd: That's terrible. Any other questions for Co-Op Extension? If none, okay, thank you very much.

Susan Plassmeier: Thank you.

President Lloyd: Next department would be County Highway, 2010, page 111.

HIGHWAY

President Lloyd: Mr. Walsh?

Chris Walsh: Good morning, Chris Walsh, Vanderburgh County Highway Department.

President Lloyd: Any questions on Vanderburgh County Highway?

Chris Walsh: The only increases were a longevity increase. It was contractual.

President Lloyd: I guess, one item that I'd noticed when I went through this, 1850, Union Overtime, through six months we've spent \$48,000. I believe we had to do a transfer on that, or an appropriation. We're budgeting \$50,000, is that unrealistic? Or can we do a better job managing where you don't have as much overtime?

Chris Walsh: It's just so weather related. It just depends on the season and how the weather strikes us. We felt like that was a pretty good number though.

Councilmember Raben: A lot of that is so dependent on if you get your snowfall on Saturday morning—

Chris Walsh: Right.

Councilmember Raben: —they're working Saturday and Sunday, you know, removing snow. Oh, by the way, I mean—

Chris Walsh: We go back to the five day work week long before the snow could impact to make that day difference with any of that.

Councilmember Raben: By the way, I think the crew, again, did a great job this year of cleaning the snowfall.

Chris Walsh: Thank you. They take a lot of pride in the snow removal.

Councilmember Raben: I mean, it's interesting to hear them, you know, you hear them come by your house at 3:00 in the morning grading snow. They did a good job.

President Lloyd: Mr. Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: A pet peeve, I guess, from back a few years ago when you had no control over the cost, but do we have adequate supplies of calcium chloride now?

Chris Walsh: Yeah, we've actually switched to a product called beet juice. It's more environmentally friendly.

Councilmember Goebel: Right.

Chris Walsh: And the cost has dramatically dropped. Several years ago it wasn't feasible to use it, the cost was so high on it. Now, it's at or below the cost of the calcium chloride. I'm putting a few things in place that should help us as much as possibly 30 percent savings on this calcium chloride or beet juice.

Councilmember Goebel: That's great.

Chris Walsh: I'm hoping to have that in before the first snow starts this year.

Councilmember Goebel: Good, thank you.

Councilmember Raben: You know, the former Superintendent a few years back said the jury was still out on whether the beet juice was effective or not, but you think it's what it's supposed to be?

Chris Walsh: Yes, sir, you know, I've looked at surrounding states and municipalities and what they use and the science tells me that this product not only is environmentally friendly, more so than the calcium chloride, but also works as well or better. So, it seemed to be a no-brainer. We've traveled to other municipalities, you know, I'm not trying to reinvent anything, but when I see something done very well, as in the case of Jasper, even though they have a smaller number of roads, we've kind of mirrored ourselves off of them. Mr. Duckworth started it when I was there last time, I've just tried to kind of continue it with him and add a few of my own little things.

Councilmember Raben: You know, one of the neat things about that product too, we talk about overtime, I mean, we can spread that in advance of the storm. So, we can do it on regular business hours two days, or 24 hours out in advance.

Chris Walsh: We do a pre-treat, and then we actually treat the salt, and what I'm going to try to put into place is to where we can pick and choose as we treat that salt as to save some of the money, apply it to the different routes that need it, and not put it as much on other routes that won't, may not need it.

Councilmember Raben: I might remind everybody, this budget has to meet State's approval. Bill, we usually submit this when? Before the State for their approval.

Bill Fluty: We actually do it later in the year. When the revenues, when we get more revenues in, closer to the end of the year.

President Lloyd: Other questions on County Highway? Mr. Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: This is maybe a question for Bill. Why do we not do something on a depreciation allowance? Particularly for our heavier equipment and things in funds like this? Would that be appropriate? Yes.

Bill Fluty: You mean on his equipment?

Councilmember Shetler: Yeah.

Bill Fluty: How are you—

Councilmember Shetler: Well, you know, so that you have some kind of reserve fund back that we don't get hit with a half a million dollar, you know, dozer or something like that all at one time. Because most of the equipment, a lot of times he's talking about bigger type stuff.

Bill Fluty: Normally, I guess, our reserve account is really our CCD account. Often, anytime that he has equipment that he wants to buy, that's where it comes from. He doesn't have the revenues to support his budget as it's presented with the gasoline tax. We supplement it through COIT dollars, but, normally when there's a big purchase it comes from CCD. So, that is where we're going to, normally, when he buys trucks or gradalls or so forth and so on. The other opportunity is to come out of either the Riverboat account or come straight out from the General Fund.

Councilmember Shetler: I mean, I've kind of noticed this on several of our different things, the only one that seems like they do that is the Airport does have an

allowance there for depreciation on, you know, in their accounting system that they're using, but we don't tend to do that.

Bill Fluty: Well, I don't think we've ever been able to afford to put money back on a regular basis to redo his fleet.

President Lloyd: That's just governmental accounting, they don't, a lot of times do not count for depreciation.

Councilmember Raben: Along with that, the airport is spreading their budget out amongst the airlines. I mean, that's totally different. The airlines are paying them in advance of equipment, you know, future equipment. Here it's just, you know, money out of our pocket.

Councilmember Shetler: I mean, I understand underneath our General Funds and some of those, but some of those areas that we could get different funds that I didn't know if it made sense to look at that a little bit harder and changing some of our accounting principles there that might, you know, allow us to get some money from some of those outside sources.

Councilmember Raben: Well, I think we do that though. Correct me if I'm wrong, Chris or Bill, but, you know, we'll buy equipment out of the Cum Bridge Fund, as an example, or Local Roads and Streets that are separate funds. It may be a dump truck that the bridge crew uses some of the time, but we're hauling asphalt in it during the summer months.

Chris Walsh: That's correct, but when you get into the bigger pieces of equipment, the \$300,000 pieces of equipment, I don't have that kind of room in these kind of budgets. We squeak by to try and put this truck up for bid that we're hoping will go out next week.

President Lloyd: One quick question, the last item in the budget, University Parkway, are we done with that? Or is that—

Chris Walsh: I believe that would be a John Stoll question.

President Lloyd: Okay, I'm not sure why it's even in your budget.

John Stoll: That came about several years ago when, I believe it was the Major Moves money that was distributed around the State, that was where the money came in. We haven't budgeted any more Highway Funds for that, it's all been Road and Street and Bridge Funds since.

President Lloyd: Maybe the State told us to put it in the Highway budget, the County Highway, or we just thought that was a better way to track it.

John Stoll: I thought it came as a Highway distribution.

President Lloyd: Hmm?

Bill Fluty: It had to go in the Highway Department when it came in.

President Lloyd: But, that, so, we won't get anymore money for that? I mean, there's work to be done on University Parkway, but this doesn't affect that anymore?

John Stoll: Right, we haven't requested it mainly because there's not sufficient funds in the Highway Fund to cover it. That's why we try to keep all of the requests in the Road and Street and Bridge Funds.

President Lloyd: Okay. Any other questions on Highway? An increase of \$123,000, three percent. If not, let's move on to Cumulative Bridge Fund, page 117.

CUMULATIVE BRIDGE FUND

President Lloyd: Any questions from Council? About \$228,000 increase.

John Stoll: There were two items that I failed to put on the request.

President Lloyd: Okay.

John Stoll: First was account number 3141, Communications. I had intended to put \$1,750 in there, that covers the cell phones for the Engineering Department. Then, the other one was account number 4429, Engineer Equipment. In years past we've asked for \$15,000, it looks like we could back that off to \$10,000 for next year.

President Lloyd: 4429, how much?

John Stoll: \$10,000.

President Lloyd: Oh, \$10,000, okay, we're going backwards. Yes, Mr. Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: Equipment Repairs, \$40,000 budgeted, but so far, at least our thing shows that you've only expended \$1,811. So, I mean, is there...I've noticed in the past you've kind of been along that line of \$30,000 to \$35,000.

Chris Walsh: Yeah, and we're, we've got several equipment repairs coming up. You know, the age of the equipment, it's just a hard predictor. I have pieces of equipment in the fleet that are 20 plus years old and I'm trying to get several more years out of them. We're just trying to do the best on anticipating what the overall—

Councilmember Shetler: In 4250, Miscellaneous Equipment, what is that used for? It's \$35,000 budgeted.

Chris Walsh: That would be like, say, last year, I think we used that to get the mini excavator. We actually bought a piece of equipment out of it, and this year I don't know that I've spent, what I've spent out of that.

Councilmember Shetler: Seventy, yeah, \$7,500 and change. Is there anything you're anticipating spending out of that next year?

Chris Walsh: Yeah, we're going to have to, I'm starting a little more of an aggressive maintenance program to take some of these older pieces of equipment and extend some of the life on them. That's where we were going to look to help us with that.

Councilmember Shetler: Okay, thank you.

President Lloyd: Other questions on Cumulative Bridge?

Councilmember Raben: This is a good account for any equipment to come out of.

Councilmember Shetler: Right.

Councilmember Raben: Again, this is it's own tax rate separate of the General Fund.

Chris Walsh: I want to say that this year to help us with the...we had a truck get totaled during the, one of the snow storms, and I believe that that money, some of that money is going towards the new truck that we're wanting to put out.

President Lloyd: It looks like the major projects projected, you've got Old Boonville Highway and Maryland Street Bridge?

John Stoll: Yes, the Maryland Street Bridge, ideally we would like to get federal funding on that. If we can get federal funding, the \$500,000 requested would cover our local match and our inspection costs. If we're unable to get federal funds then I will be making another request in the 2012 budget and it will probably be in the neighborhood of a half million dollars again in order to be able to complete the project. The Old Boonville Highway bridge is out between Green River and Burkhardt, and that's just a bridge that's recommended for replacement based on our bi-annual bridge inspection.

Councilmember Goebel: What are the chances, John, do you think of getting that grant for Maryland Street?

John Stoll: So far it looks pretty good. I've been working with the MPO and there are going to be available federal funds that we can pick that up. We've gone ahead and supplemented the contract with a consultant to go ahead and do the environmental studies since that's one of the requirements to get the federal funds. So, everything looks pretty good so far, and I would hope that early next year we'll know one way or the other.

Councilmember Goebel: Thank you.

President Lloyd: Any other questions on Cumulative Bridge? Let's move on to Local Roads and Streets, 2160, page 131.

LOCAL ROADS AND STREETS

Councilmember Raben: Chris, how many miles of road will we have paved by the end of the paving season?

Chris Walsh: Twenty one, I believe 21 was the number we were going to hit. We have, in that mileage there's several kind of projects we helped with, Burdette walking path out there, we have a lot of spot paving projects going on, and then John's office and mine has kind of combined to do something, I believe's a pretty big money saver, in that he's contracting out to mill Evergreen Estates, a good portion of that, and then we're going to come back in, crack seal it and pave, which

should show a pretty substantial savings had you contracted it out. But, your answer is 21 miles, I believe is what we're—

President Lloyd: You've got the big decrease in University Parkway, what's that about?

John Stoll: Based on the numbers we're looking at right now, that should be sufficient to get the project to construction. Just over the last week we've been working with INDOT to try and find what available funds they show on the federal side, and we've got some discrepancies on the dollars. They need to shift some funds around based on what the MPO has shown as our available funding, federal funding sources, but, long story short, it looks like with these funds, the \$300,000 plus the federal funds that we think are obligated to this project we should be able to get it to the final segment out for bid in December or January.

President Lloyd: Wow.

John Stoll: The only drawback to this is, it looks like this would max out the federal money, which would mean any unforeseen change orders would end up having to be 100 percent locally funded. So, this should cover us to get it to bid, but if we run into problems, then I would have to come back for another appropriation to make up any shortfalls.

President Lloyd: Okay, any other questions? So, this budget, because of that, mainly, it's a decrease of \$605,000 over the prior year.

Councilmember Goebel: Mr. President?

John Stoll: There was one other thing that I wanted to point out too. I didn't mean to interrupt.

President Lloyd: Mr. Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: On the, excuse me, on that phase, exactly from what point, point A to point B are you talking about?

John Stoll: This would finish the project from Marx to Diamond.

Councilmember Goebel: All the way to Diamond?

John Stoll: Yes. The estimated construction cost is right around nine million, and it looks like the federal money is there, so, we won't have to split it into two more segments, we'll get it all done in one.

Councilmember Goebel: That begins when?

John Stoll: We hope to have it out for bid in December or January.

Councilmember Goebel: Okay.

John Stoll: Which would mean construction would begin February or March. There are regulations that prohibit cutting trees down after April 1st, so, construction, it may

just be right-of-way clearing, but construction should begin some time in March, if we're able to get everything worked out with INDOT.

Councilmember Goebel: Thank you.

President Lloyd: Construction time table, about a year?

John Stoll: That will probably take about two.

President Lloyd: Two?

John Stoll: Because it's about a mile and three quarters.

President Lloyd: Okay. Mr. Raben, question?

Councilmember Raben: John, 2481, Traffic Department?

John Stoll: That was what I wanted to point out, we did not request any funds in that this year because it looks like if the current balances are encumbered at the end of this year, it should be sufficient to cover all the costs for 2011. We would have to come back and request additional funds again in 2012, but with encumbrances it did not look like any money would be needed for 2011. The same thing with Traffic Lights.

President Lloyd: Wow.

John Stoll: When the City-County Traffic Department switched the traffic signals to LED lenses rather than incandescent bulbs it drops the electric bill from around \$100 per signal per month to around \$25. So, with that cost savings, with encumbrances there will enough money to cover the costs in 2011, but, once again, 2012 we'll be back down to needing additional funds again.

Councilmember Raben: Okay.

President Lloyd: Fabulous. That's great news. Any other questions on Local Roads and Streets? Alright, gentlemen, thank you very much.

LEGAL AID

President Lloyd: Legal Aid was dealt with in the joint budget session. There's no one here from Legal Aid. We'll move on to 1090, Assessor, page 48 and page 137.

ASSESSOR

President Lloyd: I bet you thought we may not get to you.

Jonathan Weaver: Oh, I don't know. Good morning, Jonathan Weaver, your Vanderburgh County Assessor.

President Lloyd: Any questions for the Assessor? His general budget is page 48, and then the assessment budget is 137. Mr. Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Mr. Weaver, on your Extra Help, you're asking for a little bit more. Could you tell us the reason why? From 2010 you asked for \$40,000 and now for 2011 it's \$100,000. Is that because we're, you need a full time person and you're trying to make up the difference with the Extra Help?

Jonathan Weaver: Well, that's one of the reasons, yes. This is, we're talking about the Reassessment Fund now. Yeah, we're in that State mandated reassessment right now. We're using that \$40,000 as we speak. We have about three part timers right now. We have two on the Welfare to Work program and that's working out great. I mean, we've had seven this year from Welfare to Work, and two of them, or one of them we've hired on a part time basis now, and we're hoping maybe to hire a second one shortly. But, basically, that's because of the reassessment coming up. I really appreciate the Council's support on this, because where some counties are spending upwards of seven figures, you know, we're trying to do it in-house here and save a lot of taxpayer money.

President Lloyd: Okay, on the regular County Assessor's budget we've got an increase of \$20,559, which is 1.18 percent, but if you go to the reassessment, obviously, we've got a request, quite a bit of requests for expenditures there, plus \$106,000.

Jonathan Weaver: Yeah, if I can comment, the General Fund increases are due to step increases.

President Lloyd: Right.

Jonathan Weaver: Staff works hard and they appreciate that raise.

President Lloyd: Mr. Shetler, question?

Councilmember Shetler: Yeah, are we still sending two people out to houses, residences as they go out and measure and stuff?

Jonathan Weaver: Yes.

Councilmember Shetler: Okay. How many people do you have total in your office that are doing that?

Jonathan Weaver: Eight.

Councilmember Shetler: So, you have four teams?

Jonathan Weaver: Four teams, yes.

Councilmember Shetler: Alright, thank you.

Jonathan Weaver: Two residential, two commercial.

President Lloyd: Mr. Raben?

Councilmember Raben: I don't have a question, just a general comment. Yesterday we had discussed the opportunity to move your office's percentage of insurance or what amounts for your insurance, along with computer, the computer

department, IT and shifting that to reassessment. Do you have any qualms with that?

Jonathan Weaver: I guess, okay, so, right now—

Councilmember Raben: Whatever your insurance, whatever the price tag is for insurance for your employees shifting that from the General Fund into Reassessment, along with whatever Matt Arvay's department, whatever percentage your office, your functions are, our overall bill for IT shifting that as well. (Inaudible. Mic not on.) shifting that to Reassessment in the hopes of that being helpful with all the cuts that we need, you know, from the property tax side shifted onto Reassessment.

Jonathan Weaver: This is the first I'm hearing about it, but the only thing taken out of the General Fund right now for us are our salaries, and, I guess, the insurance that you're talking about, or the FICA.

Councilmember Raben: It's not actually in your budget, but it's coming out of General Fund in the County Council's budget.

Jonathan Weaver: Well, the only, I guess, I'm open for discussion at another time. I guess, my only concern is the Reassessment Fund is supposed to be used for about eight specific things. So, that would be my concern in being compliant with the law.

Councilmember Raben: I think it does say though that you can pay salaries and insurance with it.

Jonathan Weaver: Salaries, I'm not sure about insurance though.

Councilmember Raben: Yeah, I think you can, but, anyway, it would help. Everything that we can shift out of the property tax side into the Reassessment side, you know, the ultimate goal might be at some point to maybe offer county employees a raise this year if we get to the point we need to get to, and it would be a huge help getting us there. So, anyway, we'll discuss it more between now and then.

Jonathan Weaver: Cool.

President Lloyd: I guess, just looking at these numbers on the Reassessment budget, which is page 137-138, is, what is different in 2011 versus '08 or '09, or 2010 where you've got roughly \$260,000 budgeted? Your request for '11 is \$379,000.

Jonathan Weaver: A lot of that has to do with the reassessment. You'll notice that the part time is up two and a half times. We're counting on six people at seven days a week, or seven hours a day, Monday through Friday all year. That would account, that would pay for six people, seven hours a day, Monday through Friday, for the year. Then, we're still going to dip in and make ourselves available to the Welfare to Work program. We utilized unpaid internships this year from USI. We're going to reach out to those universities again to get some bodies in the office. So, we're looking at ways to cut costs.

President Lloyd: For Travel/Mileage do you guys have access to vehicles? Or do you have to reimburse people?

Jonathan Weaver: We reimburse people. That cost right there, we got an e-mail from the county insurance agent, surprised that we're using our own vehicles, and we would like to ask your permission to maybe buy four vehicles through some, you know, if the Sheriff's Department gets rid of some, or—

President Lloyd: Burdette Park.

Jonathan Weaver: —well, we tried to use Burdette Park, but their vehicles are, I don't know, they're unfit for our use, but, we're even looking at the possibility of renting cars through Enterprise for six months, 24 weeks.

President Lloyd: Do you think that, I guess, we would need to do a cost analysis, would it be cheaper to rent a car or to just pay mileage?

Councilmember Raben: I don't really understand—

Jonathan Weaver: I would really like your assistance on how to go about (Inaudible).

Councilmember Raben: —the insurance side. As long as you're paying mileage, if they're on business time, as long as you're paying them mileage or giving them vehicle allowance, that covers, that's why you pay them the mileage or vehicle allowance is to reimburse them for the cost of operating that automobile and insurance. So, we might, you might want to double check that with them, Jonathan, I don't think they're correct on that.

Jonathan Weaver: We had an accident in late June with someone, and there are some insurance questions there.

Councilmember Raben: If they use their own vehicle and weren't being compensated for it, like you've said, down here at Office Depot and pick up a box of pens, that's different. If they're out measuring properties and you're paying them a per diem or a mileage or you're just paying them a flat vehicle, monthly vehicle allowance, that's totally different. That's completely different.

Councilmember Kiefer: They need to notify their insurance company that they're using it for work purposes, and that might be where the glitch is, because they didn't, you know, they get a discount if they're just using it for personal use and not business use.

Councilmember Raben: When they're not being paid to use their vehicle, if it's, whether or not they would be covered, but as long as, you know, if you've started your reassessment season and said, hey, we're going to pay everybody a hundred dollars a month vehicle allowance, let's say, that puts the onus on them.

President Lloyd: Mr. Shetler, question?

Councilmember Shetler: Yeah, last year I think we budgeted for 23 Level II certificates, people with Level II.

Jonathan Weaver: Okay.

Councilmember Shetler: I know that that's gotten a little bit out of hand and we've had more than that, I guess, that have applied.

Jonathan Weaver: Well, what do you mean by out of hand?

Councilmember Shetler: Well, it hasn't been, I guess, really managed, and we've gone over that budgeted amount of 23, and there's been a request in for some additional funds, an additional appropriation by your office to help fund that, to get it up to the level that you have in your office today. It looks like, to me, that the request for next year is actually for 34 Level II's, plus one elected official, so 35 total Level II's in your office. How many are really necessary? I mean, does everybody in the office need to be a Level II? I mean, I'm certain that you've got some people that are just, you know, whether they're just answering the phone or they're doing some other kinds of work that may not be really involved in what's necessary out of a Level II certificate.

Jonathan Weaver: Well, this is part of that cross training philosophy, where anybody that handles real property is, the law says that they need to have their Level II. So, we have, my notes here have 33 Level II's budgeted for next year. That's getting, that's saving \$2,500.

Councilmember Shetler: Let's see, they're \$500 a piece, at 34 would be \$17,000, plus an elected official gets a thousand. You're asking for \$18,000, so that's how I came up with my numbers.

President Lloyd: Okay, 34 out of how many total employees?

Jonathan Weaver: 39.

President Lloyd: Okay.

Councilmember Shetler: So, basically, everybody in the office?

Jonathan Weaver: We're talking about personal property department not having Level II's, but when you touch a sales disclosure and you're in the assessing software, you know, we need to have our Level II's, plus it gives us credibility and education background to, it gives us good credibility to the taxpayer.

President Lloyd: Well, I mean, that's probably true, I just, I would question if all of those people work in real estate would they need that extra certification? Now, you're saying that they all are involved in some type of real estate duties where they need specialized training Level II certification?

Jonathan Weaver: Sales disclosures, the appeals department, the real estate department.

President Lloyd: Okay, we're just trying to get a handle on this. Any other—

Councilmember Shetler: Yes.

President Lloyd: Go ahead.

Councilmember Shetler: Let me go further, since last year we did, you know, basically go along with the 23 that was requested and that was put in and it went over, do we expect that you're going to honor this 35 next year? Or will we see some additional dollars being requested and that may go over it?

Jonathan Weaver: Well, it's going to depend on turn over and all of that sort of thing. You know, in my opinion, the more Level II's, the better off you are. At this second I think we have everyone that needs to be a Level II. So, at this second, I don't plan on sending anybody else to get their Level II. We will be needing to work on our Level III's, and we'll be bringing some courses to Evansville next year for that so we can begin that. We did have three or four this year that went out and earned their Level II, so that's why you're looking at the increase for 2010.

Councilmember Shetler: Of course, from our perspective, what's important here is that we have people who live within the budget, that we're told something today and next year they understand that and they follow that guideline. If everybody kind of runs amuck about it, then it's going to be difficult to keep a handle on county expenses here. So, I mean, you understand our perspective on it?

Jonathan Weaver: Yeah, and are we making an additional appropriation or is that just a transfer? It's a transfer?

President Lloyd: Okay, any other questions on Assessor or the Reassessment Fund? If not, we'll move on to Property Tax Assessment Board of Appeals, page 139.

PROPERTY TAX ASSESSMENT BOARD OF APPEALS/REASSESSMENT

President Lloyd: There's a couple of increases here, Office Supplies and Contractual Services. What would those be related to?

Jonathan Weaver: Again, just asking for your help so that we can get the reassessment done.

President Lloyd: Okay, any other questions on that? Okay, thank you very much.

SALES DISCLOSURE

President Lloyd: Sales Disclosure Fees, page 156. Is that you?

Jonathan Weaver: Yes.

President Lloyd: Oh, I'm sorry. I'm trying to throw you out and you're still here. Any questions on Sales Disclosure Fees?

Jonathan Weaver: That's pretty level.

President Lloyd: Yeah, this is a flat budget. I guess Council's satisfied with that.

Jonathan Weaver: Great, thanks for your time.

President Lloyd: Thank you. Appreciate it.

AUDITOR

President Lloyd: Okay, we'll go to County Auditor, page seven and page 135. For those that are interested in the Parks and Recreation, we're down to the last one. Any questions of County Auditor? Here he comes.

Bill Fluty: Bill Fluty, County Auditor. The General Fund budget just reflects step increases.

President Lloyd: It looks like all of the miscellaneous items are flat.

Bill Fluty: That's correct.

President Lloyd: Page 135 is Reassessment for the Auditor, and that budget is actually decreased by \$1,000 in Printing, or, no, Training went from \$1,000 to zero. Any questions for the County Auditor? Thank you, you've been most helpful.

JAIL BOND

President Lloyd: Jail Bond, page 162. Basically, an amount that's a legal amount based on the bonds that were sold for the jail.

Bill Fluty: That's actually the amount that we will pay next year for those bonds.

President Lloyd: Principal and interest?

Bill Fluty: That's correct. Twice a year.

President Lloyd: Do you have an idea of what the balance is roughly? The balance on that bond?

Bill Fluty: To pay that off? I could get that to you, but right now that was a 30 year note, I believe, or 25, so, it's quite a way off.

President Lloyd: Issued like in '04 or '03?

Bill Fluty: I believe that's correct.

President Lloyd: Okay, any questions on Jail Bond?

President Lloyd: Okay, it's my understanding that the last one, Bond Debt Repayment, that fund, that bond was paid off, is that correct?

Bill Fluty: That was the USI overpass bond payment.

President Lloyd: Okay, the end of '09 we paid that off. So, the county does pay its debts. Thank you very much. Any other comments before we close this session? Okay we will recess until September 1st. Thank you very much.

(The meeting was recessed at 11:56 a.m.)

VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL

President Russell Lloyd, Jr.

Vice President James Raben

Councilmember Joe Kiefer

Councilmember Mike Goebel

Councilmember Tom Shetler, Jr.

Councilmember Ed Bassemier

Councilmember Stephanie Terry

Recorded by Teri Lukeman and transcribed by Teri Lukeman & Madelyn Grayson.

**VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL
SEPTEMBER 1, 2010**

The Vanderburgh County Council met in session this 1st day of September, 2010 in room 301 of the Civic Center Complex. The meeting was called to order at 8:30 a.m. by County Council President Russell Lloyd, Jr.

President Lloyd: I'd like to call to order the Vanderburgh County Council September 1, 2010 meeting. Attendance roll call please.

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

*Arrived shortly after roll call.

President Lloyd: For the Pledge of Allegiance I'd ask Councilman Bassemier to lead us.

Councilmember Bassemier: Everyone please stand.

(Pledge of Allegiance was given)

APPROVAL OF MINUTES AUGUST 4, 2010

President Lloyd: Okay, you have before you the minutes from the August 4, 2010 meeting. Is there any changes or is there a motion to approve?

Councilmember Shetler: So moved.

President Lloyd: Is there a second?

Councilmember Raben: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Shetler, second Mr. Raben. Any discussion? All in favor, signify by saying aye.

(All Councilmembers voted aye)

President Lloyd: Any opposed?

(No opposing votes were cast)

President Lloyd: Six/zero.

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

APPROPRIATION ORDINANCE

SHERIFF

President Lloyd: Okay item five, appropriation ordinance, the Sheriff, we'll start with the Finance Chair, Mr. Shetler.

Councilmember Shetler: Thank you. The Sheriff is here, he answered questions on that last week. I have papers everywhere with the budget and everything else, so I apologize. Anybody have any questions? If not, I make a motion for approval.

President Lloyd: Motion to approve. Is there a second?

Councilmember Terry: Second.

President Lloyd: Motion Mr. Shetler, second Ms. Terry. This is for the utility line item or is this for all of them. This is just Utilities? Okay, roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. Motion passes six/zero.

SHERIFF		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1050-3200	Utilities	12,000.00	12,000.00
Total		12,000.00	12,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION

Councilmember Shetler: I don't think anybody was here last week for the Cooperative Extension. Do we have anybody? Is the \$2,100 for Travel & Mileage?

Susan Plassmeier: Did you forward the information I sent?

Councilmember Terry: I did forward the information. Was that clear?

Councilmember Shetler: Yeah, are there any questions? If not, motion for approval.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion to approve, is there a second?

Councilmember Raben: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Shetler, second Mr. Raben. Any questions on, it's \$2,100 additional. Okay, roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. Motion passes seven/zero.

Susan Plassmeier: Thank you.

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1230-3130	Travel/Mileage	2,100.00	2,100.00
Total		2,100.00	2,100.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

CIRCUIT COURT

President Lloyd: Circuit Court.

Councilmember Shetler: The judge is here and he answered questions last week concerning Circuit Court appropriations. I would move approval.

President Lloyd: Is there a second?

Councilmember Raben: Second.

President Lloyd: Motion Mr. Shetler, second Mr. Raben. Any questions, discussion? We did talk about this last week. Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. Motion passes seven/zero.

CIRCUIT COURT		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1360-2270	Juror Meals/Lodging	2,000.00	2,000.00
1360-3723	Psych. Evaluations	2,000.00	2,000.00
1360-3903	Petit Jurors	10,000.00	10,000.00
1360-3944	Special Reporter	4,000.00	4,000.00
Total		18,000.00	18,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

BURDETTE PARK

President Lloyd: Burdette Park.

Councilmember Shetler: I saw Steve here, I think he sent out an email to everyone giving some explanation on that. But if anybody has any questions for Steve, he is here to answer any questions concerning the appropriation. I would move approval.

President Lloyd: Is there a second?

Councilmember Raben: Second.

President Lloyd: Motion Mr. Shetler, second Mr. Raben. Any questions on this Burdette Park \$57,913? Yes, Councilman Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: And this will be reimbursed? You don't have to come up.

Steve Craig: (Inaudible, comments not made from the microphone.)

Councilmember Goebel: Okay, thank you.

President Lloyd: Any other questions? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. Motion passes seven/zero.

BURDETTE PARK		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1450-1180	Other Employees	25,000.00	25,000.00
1450-1900	FICA	1,913.00	1,913.00
1450-2310	Laundry & Cleaning	2,500.00	2,500.00
1450-3200	Utilities	25,000.00	25,000.00
1450-3580	Vehicle Repair	3,500.00	3,500.00
Total		57,913.00	57,913.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

REASSESSMENT/ASSESSOR

President Lloyd: Reassessment fund, Reassessment/Assessor.

Councilmember Shetler: This is for the amount of \$3,463. This is for some additional Level II certifications that came up during the year. We talked to the Assessor at length on this. I would move for approval. If anybody has any questions, he's here with staff to answer those.

Councilmember Bassemier: Second.

President Lloyd: Motion Mr. Shetler, second Mr. Bassemier. Any discussion? We did have a thorough discussion last week. Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. Motion passes seven/zero.

REASSESSMENT/ASSESSOR		REQUESTED	APPROVED
2490-1090-1972	Level II Certification	3,000.00	3,000.00
2490-1090-1900	FICA	230.00	230.00
2490-1090-1910	PERF	233.00	233.00
Total		3,463.00	3,463.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

CIRCUIT COURT SUPPLEMENTAL ADULT PROBATION

President Lloyd: Move on to Circuit Court Supplemental Adult Probation fund.

Councilmember Shetler: Again, the judge was here last week on this. The \$25,000 being requested for additional insurance, line 1920. I would move approval.

President Lloyd: Is there a second?

Councilmember Kiefer: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Shetler, second Mr. Kiefer. I think the judge indicated these were employees that decided to take county health insurance and had not in the past, so that’s where that was from. Any other questions, discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. Motion passes seven/zero. Move on to transfers.

CIRCUIT COURT SUPPLEMENTAL		REQUESTED	APPROVED
2600-1920	Insurance	25,000.00	25,000.00
Total		25,000.00	25,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

TRANSFER REQUESTS

TREASURER SUPERIOR COURT SALES DISCLOSURE	SHERIFF REASSESSMENT/AUDITOR COUNTY CLERK (LATE)
--	---

Councilmember Shetler: We have requests to transfer from the following departments: the Treasurer’s office in the amount of \$7,346, and we have requests from the Sheriff’s department for a transfer in the amount of \$19,000, Superior Court in the amount of \$555, Reassessment/Auditor in the amount of \$1,000, County Assessor in the amount of \$500, I guess that’s the Sales Disclosure, and then the Clerk, we’ve got one on a late transfer notice on that. And again, I’m not finding that one real quickly, but I would move approval on all the transfers.

President Lloyd: Is there a second?

Councilmember Raben: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, this is a motion for all the transfers. Any questions, discussion on any one of those? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. All the transfers pass seven/zero. Thank you.

TREASURER		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1030-1260-1030	Surplus Refunds/ Liquor Permits	5,668.00	5,668.00
1030-3410	Printing	1,678.00	1,678.00
To: 1030-1270-1030	Second Deputy	7,346.00	7,346.00

SHERIFF		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1050-1130-0080	Deputy Sheriff	11,000.00	11,000.00
1050-1130-0081	Deputy Sheriff	8,000.00	8,000.00
To: 1050-1130-0009	Sergeant	19,000.00	19,000.00

SUPERIOR COURT		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1370-1390-1370	Chief Probation Officer	555.00	555.00
To: 1370-1780-1370	Clerk/Secretary	555.00	555.00

REASSESSMENT/AUDITOR		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 2490-1020-3310	Training	1,000.00	1,000.00
To: 2490-1020-1990	Extra Help	928.00	928.00
2490-1020-1900	FICA	72.00	72.00

SALES DISCLOSURE		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 3300-3370	Computer (Data Mgmt)	500.00	500.00
To: 3300-3310	Training	500.00	500.00

COUNTY CLERK		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1010-1400-1010	Deputy Clerk	580.00	580.00
To: 1010-1971	Accrued Payments	500.00	500.00
1010-1900	FICA	40.00	40.00
1010-1910	PERF	40.00	40.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

SUPERIOR COURT REQUEST TO FILL TWO VACANCIES

President Lloyd: Item seven, no repeals, item eight, no old business. Item nine, new business, item A Superior Court, request to fill two vacancies. Judge Trockman and Judge Niemeier, and you’ve got letters from them. Any questions on that? And these are not new, they are replacements. The one for Judge Trockman is a state funded grant, so it will cost the county nothing. But it’s a PERF position. Any questions? Roll call vote please. Oh, we need a motion and a second.

Councilmember Shetler: I’ll so move.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Shetler, is there a second?

Councilmember Terry: Second.

President Lloyd: Second Ms. Terry. Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. Those two requests from Judge Trockman and Judge Niemeier pass seven to zero. Did you want to add anything, Judge?

Wayne Trockman: I think maybe I'd better not, at this point, but thank you. I think that Council is aware that this is all fully funded from the state. And a great opportunity for our program, and so thank you for your continued support.

President Lloyd: Alright, thank you much, Judge, appreciate it.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

CIRCUIT COURT REQUEST TO FILL THREE VACANCIES
--

President Lloyd: Item nine B, Circuit Court, three vacancies, Supplemental Adult Probation, and here's Judge Heldt.

Carl Heldt: Good morning. Carl Heldt, Circuit Court. These are three replacement part-time people, fully funded by the adult probation user fee fund, so there's no affect on the county budget. We need them and ask that the vacancies be filled. Also, we're asking that the hourly, these are all hourly people, and that we be allowed to pay up to \$11.00 an hour to get these folks. Cherie Wood, Chief Probation Officer is here if you want any details on the work that they do.

President Lloyd: What are we paying them now?

Karen Angermeier: The only position we're asking to upgrade the pay is the Court Liaison intern because that person needs to be at least a senior in college or graduated, so we're asking to pay that position up to \$11.00 an hour. The other ones will remain up to \$9.00 an hour.

President Lloyd: Okay. On a part-time the salary ordinance does allow it. Okay, any questions for the Judge? And you've got the letter from him to that effect. Is there a motion and a second to approve?

Councilmember Shetler: So moved.

President Lloyd: Motion Mr. Shetler, is there a second?

Councilmember Bassemier: Second.

President Lloyd: Second Mr. Bassemier. Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. Approved seven to zero. Thank you, Judge.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

COUNTY CLERK REQUEST TO FILL VACANCY

(Because the podium microphone was not working properly, some of the comments made from the podium are inaudible)

President Lloyd: Item C, County Clerk request to fill vacancy. Good morning.

Susan Kirk: Good morning.

President Lloyd: Did we have a letter or email for this? Yeah, there was a letter. This position is...

Susan Kirk: It's the Small Claims Clerk, they work the front counter, they put on cases, they do add-ons. The bad news is, the cases are already up from where they were last year. So we're not decreasing (inaudible), we're up.

President Lloyd: Okay. So this is to replace an existing vacancy?

Susan Kirk: Yes.

President Lloyd: Any questions for the County Clerk?

Councilmember Shetler: Yeah, how many total employees in the office?

Susan Kirk: We have, including me, there's 53 full-time and (inaudible) part-time.

Councilmember Shetler: And is it possible to look at shifting more of the full-time positions and responsibilities into some part-time positions?

Susan Kirk: Do you want to talk about benefits for part-time people?

Councilmember Shetler: No, to kind of restructuring the office with a blend of full-time supplementing some of the workload with part-time people that might help us to reduce the overall cost of the operation and at the same time make it somewhat efficient. Again, my experience has been, and speaking with other folks in business, is that there are a lot of very talented people out there that are looking for part-time work today. Some of them are looking for part-time that might be seasonal in nature, they're looking for work that, you know, a lot of the kids that are in school, some of them are looking for work while kids are out of school, some of them are looking for specific hours of the day. Many, like I said, are very talented and have, are very well educated, they just would like to have a little extra money to help supplement the family budget. And we can, sometimes those people can be found at a bargain price, if you will, because of their willingness to work and get back into the workforce for a variety of different reasons. And didn't know if that may be a possibility to start supplementing some of the full-time with some of those part-time that are available out there.

President Lloyd: Any other questions? Mr. Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: The person who resigned, and we have had to pay her accrued time and things like that, when does the balance sheet zero out, so that —

Susan Kirk: Well, you just did a transfer, so it should be the 7th, is that correct, Sandie? We did a transfer from another line item in payroll into that one to take care of that buyout, so is that —

Sandie Deig: You're talking about the one that's leaving in September, not this one.

Susan Kirk: Yeah, that's true. So we should be able to move this one —

Sandie Deig: It's approved.

Susan Kirk: Yeah, ready to go. She didn't really have much time left, that was one of the problems.

Councilmember Goebel: Have we eliminated or have you eliminated any positions in your office?

Susan Kirk: No.

Councilmember Goebel: They're all still filled?

Susan Kirk: Well, we've got the one part-time person instead of the full-time person that we had, so we're down to, you know, the one part-time, that's the loss that we've suffered so far. So, again, I will reiterate, our cases are already up in June. Tim Van Cleave can vouch for it. The judges can vouch for it, everything is up. It's bad news but it's unfortunate.

Councilmember Goebel: I don't think anyone disputes that. You're doing a great job over there. All the offices are.

Susan Kirk: Well, and because of that, we really can't afford to do part time. As a matter of fact, if these cases keep rising every year, we're going to be back asking at least for more part-time help because it's going to be impossible to get the job done. Yes?

Councilmember Kiefer: Susie, what is the total caseload? I mean, how do you measure? I mean, what's the numbers?

Susan Kirk: Well, Tim, he runs this report and last year we were over 64,000 and I emailed all of you the statistics on that last year, I believe. And he ran another report so, basically, if you want to make it easy, you take 64, cut it in half, well, we're already over half of that now. So small claims is up, we had, for instance, just a couple of weeks ago, you know, they came in and they had over 200 cases to file in one day. It's just, you know, between people losing their jobs, they can't pay their bills, the foreclosures, it's just, crime – I wish it weren't that way. You know, I wish everything was better to where our caseload was going down. But it isn't. The only thing I think that's probably going down is the marriages.

President Lloyd: Marriage is down, divorce is up? Hmm.

Susan Kirk: Yeah, it's just, you know, money problems can cause all kinds of marital problems, too. So, like I said, I hope that you trust my judgement. I am not up here just trying to hand something over. We have facts and figures to show that our caseload is up. And right now is not the time to be cutting back nor do we want to go to any part-time help and talk about the benefits and stuff like that.

President Lloyd: We, last year the Council had requested you to take, I guess we've taken one full-time and made it part-time and that's where you are and you haven't had any other –

Susan Kirk: And they're working 35 hours a week.

President Lloyd: And you haven't had any other staff changes.

Councilmember Kiefer: Susie, could you ask Tim or whoever could help you with the report, I'd be interested to see like a five-year trend on your caseload to see –

Susan Kirk: We gave you a ten-year trend when I emailed you.

Councilmember Kiefer: That was last year?

Susan Kirk: Yes, the one I sent that –

Councilmember Kiefer: Could you resend that out?

Susan Kirk: Yes, I can do that. Yes, it goes back ten years. And Tim came before

you just the last time, I believe, and gave you a pretty good report of some of the numbers, the caseloads and stuff like that. Some of it you may not understand, but if you just look at the numbers, you see they're up. Because everything is divided down into each, you know, there's like little letters that designate what kind of cases they are, it's a little complicated, but like I said, you look at the end results and you see the numbers are up.

Councilmember Kiefer: I probably still don't have that if it was a year ago, so if you wouldn't mind resending that, that would be great.

Susan Kirk: I will do that. And we'll give you the new report, too. I'll send you a ten-year and then the – well, wait a minute, I think Tim does, when he does our half year in June I think he includes that. Either way, I will re-email that to all of you.

President Lloyd: For whatever reason, our population is growing by a small amount, but there's more accessing of the legal system.

Susan Kirk: It is. You know, we're such a litigious society anymore. You can't make a mistake, you know. If I accidentally step on your toe, you're going to sue me and more than likely you're going to get a little money. So we've made society more litigious plus, of all the problems just because of the economy.

President Lloyd: Good business for the attorneys.

Susan Kirk: Yes, that's true.

President Lloyd: Any other questions of the Clerk?

Councilmember Raben: Just a general comment, you know, I've mentioned this before, you know, when we look at, not just Susie's office but every office, I wish, you know, if it were affordable, I wish it was possible at some point to move towards some efficiency studies within offices. You know, with the computerization and the new software we buy, we're getting ready to appropriate millions of dollars for computers for next year, and support staff and software, you know, we should be able to increase our caseload today versus ten years ago in every department in every office. And somebody coming in and looking through a different set of goggles or glasses, I think would be beneficial. And I don't know that you've got to tear the whole Civic Center apart, but start with some of the larger offices or branches, you know, because I think we do things the way we do it just because we always have. You know, well, that's the way we've done it for the last ten years. I don't know that we're doing everything as efficiently as possible and I'm not going after you or any one department, but again, I think some outside fresh eyes would be beneficial to the county. And again, I know the cost would be high, I don't think you can do the entire Civic Center, but a couple of the larger offices, you might be able to spread a little bit of that into the smaller ones once we find out the benefits of any change made in the bigger ones. So again, I've preached that several times and I still, I wish at some point over the next twelve months, the county or maybe the Commissioners could find that appropriate firm to come in and do just that.

Susan Kirk: Well, that's just it. When you explained, over the last ten years we should be able to do that, well, we have. There have been no new employees in the Clerk's office since back in the 70's, even before that. And we have streamlined. We do have computer updates and things like that but you have to remember in our case, we keep getting more every year and we have adapted to it. But it's getting to a place where now streamlined or not, we're about as streamlined and you're

going to get. I mean, we've worked with the Sheriff's department, the Prosecutor's office, the judges' offices, the police department, the state, to try to come up with interfaces, anything that's going to make our jobs go a little bit quicker. And we have done that. We're in the process now of (inaudible) the state. We're getting a (inaudible) actually to try to help us a little bit and streamline a little bit more. And that's exactly what we have done with the caseload histories, the same amount of employees. We have streamlined until we – and we're barely keeping up now, but the caseload keeps increasing. You can streamline as much as you want, but you've got to have somebody to be able to do that job. And we're getting reasonably close to that now if this continues to go up.

Councilmember Raben: Well, I think there, you know, again, not that every official or every department head is not doing everything they can, I honestly believe that everybody is putting their best foot forward, but you know, there are people, believe it or not, smarter than us that –

Susan Kirk: Well, I'll agree –

Councilmember Raben: – that could find some duplications in what we do, you know, do we have duplications within your office? Are we moving the same piece of paper, is it crossing too many desks. I mean, it's –

Susan Kirk: Well, a lot of that, yes, Councilman, some of that is, and that's just because that's the way the law is. So you need to get in touch with your representatives to get some of that stuff changed.

Councilmember Raben: Anyway, we're not going to work that out today and we've got a –

Susan Kirk: When we got computers, we were going to have no more paper. And now we have computers, paper, microfilm, scanners, we've just, we (inaudible) cut back any paper because that's the law. We have to do that.

Councilmember Raben: Well, we're not going to figure this out today and we've got a budget to pass, but you know, at some point, I really would like to see the county move in that direction with at least a few of the larger departments.

Susan Kirk: (Inaudible) – like I said, I'm one of these people, I don't even put trash in my little trash basket, because I don't want to pay for that little bag to get changed every day. I carry it in to the other room. So I'm pretty stingy actually, so anyway, like I said, I hope that you trust my judgement and (inaudible).

President Lloyd: Any other questions for the Clerk? Mr. Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Mr. President, I'd like to make a motion to approve.

President Lloyd: Is there a second?

Councilmember Kiefer: Second.

President Lloyd: Motion Mr. Bassemier, second Mr. Kiefer. Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: It's just, it's not a matter of me not trusting your judgement, and it's not a matter of me feeling as if you haven't done the best you can on it. I know that many people, when private business is forced to, over the past three years, to really dig deep and to find every available cut that they can in order to survive the economy. I really don't feel that government should be any different. I think it was, Mr. Raben said it very well, with all the automation that we have today and the equipment and stuff, we ought to be able to find and squeak out a little bit more efficiency. Even looking at a new way of looking at how to hire and use employees, so I'm going to have to vote no. We need to find ways to hold the line on the budget and to actually cut expenses the best we can. So, again, I vote no.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: At this time I'm, again, I'm going to vote yes. I'm going to give you the benefit of the doubt and I know we have eliminated one more person, but simply to allow more time to keep searching, as Tom said, for those efficiencies. The next time, I probably won't be as favorable, but I'll vote yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: I'm going to echo Councilman Raben's comments and vote yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Lloyd?

President Lloyd: I'm going to vote yes, so that's five to two. Motion passes, thank you.

(Motion carried 5-2/Councilmembers Shetler and Goebel opposed)

HEALTH DEPARTMENT REQUEST TO FILL VACANCIES
--

President Lloyd: Item D, Health Department, request to fill one part-time and two vacancies.

Gary Heck: Gary Heck, Vanderburgh County Health Department. I'd be happy to explain the request.

President Lloyd: You should have received a little packet of information from the Health department on this. Any questions? You might want to restate what these positions are.

Gary Heck: The part-time position is for a part-time vital records clerk. This vacancy

goes back to last year. It was part of the accrued payment package for the retiring executive director. We finally saw the light of Mr. Shetler's advice that we should try part-time people and that's what they're (inaudible) to try to do. The only difference this (inaudible) other full-time members of the vital records is we wouldn't ask this position to do any of the more complex paternity affidavits which would require much more experience than just to help handle the front desk and handle the requests for birth and death certificates and answer questions.

President Lloyd: And then is the other one the dental assistant?

Gary Heck: One of them would be for the chair side dental assistant, which the dentist needs in order to be able to function. And the other one we had may have been a late request but we were given permission to hire the, under the WIC grant, a secretary bookkeeper the last time. One of the WIC clerks was able to accept that position and this would be to fill that grant WIC clerk's position (inaudible).

President Lloyd: So the WIC clerk, that's a grant and doesn't cost the county anything.

Gary Heck: That's correct.

President Lloyd: Mr. Shetler.

Councilmember Shetler: What's the approximate savings on going from that full-time to the part-time in vital records?

Gary Heck: It would probably be up to 32 hours and probably the savings would be off of the benefit package, which if a county employee were to have family coverage, that could be about \$19,000, and then when you look at the difference in salary, it's probably, would be about one/fifth of whatever the salary difference would be. So if they're in a \$20,000 position, let's just say, then it's going to save \$4,000 for that. So when you put the two together, probably (inaudible) over the course of a year.

Councilmember Shetler: Alright, thank you.

Gary Heck: You're welcome.

President Lloyd: Other questions for Mr. Heck? Is there a motion and a second? Is there a motion to approve?

Councilmember Goebel: Move for approval.

President Lloyd: Is there a second?

Councilmember Shetler: I'll second.

President Lloyd: Motion Mr. Goebel, second Mr. Shetler. Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. Motion passes seven/zero. Thank you, Gary.

Gary Heck: Thank you.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

COMMISSION ON HOMELESSNESS ANNUAL REPORT

President Lloyd: Item E, Commission on Homelessness Annual Report. I asked that be rescheduled due to the crunch of time we had with the budget, item E, so we're going to hear that, is that going to be at the Personnel & Finance?

Sarah Nunn: Yes.

President Lloyd: In September or October?

Sarah Nunn: September.

President Lloyd: Okay, so it will be at our next meeting.

TRAVEL REQUESTS

President Lloyd: Item F, travel requests, start with the Health department.

Councilmember Raben: Mr. President, I'll move approval of all travel requests.

President Lloyd: Let me make a point of order here. Number five, the County Commissioner, that was, I guess, Mr. Tornatta traveled to Indianapolis for a judge swearing in, he withdrew that. So we had one withdrawn. So one, two, three, four and six travel requests. Any questions? You said to approve all of them except for five?

Councilmember Raben: Right.

Councilmember Shetler: I'll second that and I have a quick question for Gary. But the last time, maybe the time before, that you came before us about travel requests, we talked about the possibility of trying to do some of this stuff by webinars. What's the progress on that?

Gary Heck: The progress on that is that computer services advised us that we needed to have a second internet connection, that the way the webinar streaming works, we wouldn't be able to use the county basic network internet connection. We do have a secondary internet connection at the health department and we're in the process now of submitting the request to confirm the quotes that the state provided us with (inaudible), so as soon as we get the quotes back from computer services and we're in a position to purchase and test the equipment, I would say probably within the next month, we should be functional and operational.

Councilmember Shetler: Any feeling on how much that may be saving, could save the department?

Gary Heck: Well, when you look at, a lot of our grant and professional nursing and environmental health specialists are required to have trainings and recertifications, most of those trainings are in Indianapolis or some of them are actually out of state, Cincinnati, it would probably save, I would say conservatively, \$10,000 a year in – if you include time and travel, it would probably be close to \$20,000 a year when you look at the amount of time someone would need to be off to go travel to and from, if there were lodging involved for overnight stay. So it could be a substantial amount of money.

Councilmember Shetler: Alright, thank you.

Gary Heck: You're welcome, sir.

President Lloyd: Other questions? Mr. Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: This is not for Mr. Heck, it's just an observation, again, I brought it up in the past and it goes to the Auditor. I have no problem with the state mandated or required Auditor's conference, I just don't understand why it would happen in October on an election year when, by statute, many Auditors will be moving on and perhaps the Auditors might want to reconsider and have that after – I know you don't control this – but the Auditors might want to move that till after the election so that the new Auditor elect, whoever that might be, would go to the conference and really get a great start on the position that begins in January. I know there's some things that have to be done yet, but I would think a lot of the Auditors might be, by term limit, not continuing next January. Is that correct?

Bill Fluty: That is correct.

Councilmember Goebel: Okay, maybe you could bring that idea up.

Bill Fluty: I can do that.

Councilmember Goebel: Thank you. But I have no problem with the travel allowance.

President Lloyd: Other questions on the travel? Okay, we had a motion by Mr. Raben, second by Mr. Shetler, roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. The travel requests pass seven/zero. And also Area Plan was on there. That was the last one.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

AMENDMENTS TO SALARY ORDINANCE

President Lloyd: Item 10, Amendments to Salary Ordinance, I'll turn that over to the Finance Chair.

Councilmember Shetler: I think everyone has received a copy of the Salary Ordinance amendments. I would put this in the form of a motion for approval as submitted to everyone.

Councilmember Raben: So moved.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Shetler, second Mr. Raben. Burdette Park, Assessor/Reassessment, Treasurer, Sheriff, Superior Court, Auditor/Reassessment, Circuit Court, County Clerk and Health department all included in that. Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. Salary ordinance amendments pass seven/zero.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

PUBLIC COMMENT

President Lloyd: Item eleven, public comment regarding this meeting, is there anyone from the public that would like to speak? And this is the regular Council meeting, our budget hearings will follow shortly. Yes, come up, please. State your name and address, please.

Martha Crosley: My name is Martha Crosley, I live at 5511 Stringtown Road and I talked to some of you folks on the phone regarding the ball park (inaudible) Wesselman Park and I've talked to a lot of people about the ballpark (inaudible). I've watched you people struggle with this budget issue. I've been to a couple budgetary meetings and you really work hard on this and having been in business for 32 years, I understand exactly what budgetary issues can be. And they're not easy. You're dealing with people and your responsibility is the people of the county and the people who work for the county. It's very hard. And I don't know exactly when this took place, but apparently, the CVB or Mr. Dunn came before you and requested \$425,000 to proceed with investigating the ball complexes in Wesselman Park. And I don't know if he spent all that or not, but he's sure making a big show of it. I don't think that \$425,000 should have been spent. It seems to me that you could get a whole lot better plan for your money, you wouldn't have to spend \$425,000, so I don't know where its gone and I don't know whether you have requested an assessment from him of where this money has been spent. I would certainly, as a citizen, like to see that. I have here some papers I'm going to pass out to you in just a minute of someone who threw together a plan for free at my request and he's a respected architect in this area, environmentally sound and very knowledgeable about things. He's been an architect in this area for, what, thirty years. Also the money that they're requesting to put the ball complex together, 15 to \$18,000,000. Mr. Goebel, you may know when the Goebel Soccer Complex was put together, do you know how much was spent to put that complex together, because I don't. I don't have the figures on that and I don't know who to ask.

President Lloyd: It's about four and a half million, I believe.

Martha Crosley: Thank you, sir. Well, let's see, four and a half million versus eighteen million. What's wrong with this picture? You're struggling with money,

we're struggling to get what, two to three million dollars out of the county budget and the CVB is trying to talk you into letting them spend eighteen million dollars of the taxpayers' money to put in ball complexes which will be used by a small percentage of people in this town for part of the year, and you're struggling with two to three million dollars out of this budget for all year for all the county employees for all the people of this county. I am not against the ball complex. Please, don't get me wrong. If you can put this ball complex together for four and a half million, six million, eight million, I could see that, but eighteen million dollars is whacko, to put it bluntly. Mr. Dunn is asking for help from you folks for Recovery Zone and Build America Bonds, and if you look back, if I could read to you just a small section of your Council meeting. This is minutes from your Council meeting July 7th of this year. Mr. Ahlers asked, basically, what is it that you want from this Council? Is there an ordinance, is there a resolution, is there, I mean, what specifically would you anticipate needing from the County Council. And Karl Sturbaum, who is from Boze McKinney and Evans in Indianapolis, who is the attorney firm that was contracted by Mr. Dunn to access these bonds and also London Witte, I believe, they're the bond firm, London Witte was here at that meeting as well. But Mr. Sturbaum's response to Mr. Ahler's question was, and I'll just read this as it states, "Sorry, I'm Karl Sturbaum from Boze McKinney and Evans. We would be looking for an ordinance appropriating the Innkeepers' Tax. The CVB has the authority to allocate it, to transfer it to any other body, but we would need you to conduct the statutory procedures on appropriating the proceeds. We would also, you would be involved approving the park as an economic redevelopment area, we would be establishing that so we could use the lease structure of the Redevelopment Commission and the Redevelopment Authority as the lessor. And then the last thing would be if their, well, your participation in the allocation of the recovery zone would be appropriate although I think that's probably the Commissioners, ultimately, you would want to back that one up. And then if it's determined that there is a backup pledge of COIT, you would be involved in making that pledge to the Redevelopment Commission. So there are the four things that we would be looking for." Let's break those down. Let's talk about recovery zone bonds and redevelopment bonds, Rebuilding America Bonds. This is a little piece of paper off the internet, anybody can get it from Barnes and Thornburg, which many of you know is a huge law firm in Indianapolis as is Boze McKinney and Evans – take one and pass it around. I don't know how many there are, please make sure every Councilmember gets one, I would appreciate it. I have three pages. The first page underlines the definition of a recovery zone bond. And I'd like to read that to you. Recovery zone bond is defined as any area designated by the issuer as having significant poverty, unemployment, rate of home foreclosures or general distress. I would like you to consider in your mind the Wesselman Park area. Would you define that as having significant poverty, rate of home foreclosures, general distress? Would you define it as that? Well, if you can't define it as that, then they can't get recovery zone bonds to meet it. That's the definition of how you get recovery zone bonds. So that's a problem. You go to the second page, we find that some cities in the state of Indiana are allowed their own recovery zone bond funds to apportion out, and these are facility bonds. That means they are bonds that are accessed by businesses, not by government. There are other recovery zone bonds that governments can access. Evansville, the city of Evansville, has over \$7,000,000 that it can apportion out in recovery zone bonds. You turn to the last page, Vanderburgh County, and I'm assuming since you are the monetary committee for Vanderburgh County, that you would have over \$4,000,000 to apportion at this point, unless you've done some already that I don't know about. I would like you to think about that a minute. I would like you to think about the fact that not only is the CVB asking you to help them spend \$18,000,000, they're asking you to access some of this money with recovery zone bonds when the definition that they have doesn't meet the definition that the law says. So something, something's got to give here.

Something is not working. Please think about that. And lastly, on the commentary that Mr. Sturbaum said, they would be possibly asking you for a backup pledge of the county income tax. Well, you people have been struggling with the county income tax here for how long? My gosh, why would you back up something that costs \$18,000,000 for a ball complex when you're struggling to make payroll for the people that you have in your employ? Why would you put that on the line? You couldn't. That's nuts. That upsets me as a citizen to think that anyone would ask you to do that. I think it's wrong. There is a big split in opinion of the public. If you read the editorial section of the newspaper, you will see almost every day, commentary on the ball complexes, or commentary on Roberts Stadium. And people are kind of getting this all lumped together when it really shouldn't be. The ball complexes are one issue, Roberts Stadium in another issue and they should be taken independently. If the ball complexes are something that you want to support, fine. But let's look at various other locations. They don't have to be tied to Roberts Stadium. They can be put elsewhere. And I offer this up to you, I have some papers here that some of you may find interesting. The first is, this is not the picture that you may be used to looking at from Mr. Dunn of the diagram of how he would propose doing the complex in Wesselman Park. This is a diagram from Mr. Bill Gaiser, who said, well, gee, you know, a nice park to do this in that really needs improvement in the city is Kleymeyer Park. I don't know if you know where Kleymeyer Park is. It is right on First Avenue and Diamond Avenue intersection. It is adjacent to, if you cross the Greenway and Pigeon Creek, Garvin Park, and he has made some interesting notations here. Let me pass these around to you. I'm not selling this as the ideal location, I'm not pushing locations. I'm just saying, let's get other ideas on the table. The last time other ideas were on the table, I think, was '07. The last time that he looked at other locations was the last time around when this ball complex idea came up for Wesselman Park, and I don't believe he's looked at locations since. In the Kleymeyer Park area, there is enough room to put in eight ball fields, practice areas, parking and still keep the football field that the little league plays on at the very front of the park toward First Avenue. The recommendation could be to bridge Pigeon Creek in a couple of areas so that other amenities at Garvin Park could be used such as the swimming pool or the tennis courts or basketball courts or whatever, playground things for the kids, and this park is in very much need of improvement. It is also sitting on the edge of the brown field zone that the federal government has been looking at and it is near a more or I should say less affluent area. It is near some poverty, it is near some children that would greatly benefit by having this here. I mean, let's look at the people of the city. And they might actually like to use these facilities. So this is another idea. We've talked about, well, gee, that could be put by Goebel Soccer Complex, there's land up there, here's the third idea, as opposed to Wesselman Park. You also know that real estate situations change on a daily basis. I know for a fact that there is an area on Burkhardt Road, south of Lynch, it is about 46 acres and it's on sale right now. It's on sale right now for probably more than Mr. Dunn wants to spend for it, it's about three million dollars, but it just came up for sale. Things come up for sale all the time. You can approach people and look at their land and say here's what we're trying to do with the city, would you be amendable to, are you in the market for selling your land? And we need to look at these things and he's not looking at them. I have a couple more papers here and then I won't paper you out anymore.

President Lloyd: You know, Ms. Crosley, we're also, if Council intends to move this thing forward, it would have to come in a public meeting so we'll have other opportunities and we appreciate all this information. The other type of bond that I guess Mr. Dunn talked about was Build America.

Martha Crosley: Build America bonds, recovery zone bonds are a type of Build

America bond, is my understanding. Yes, and I'll hurry this along for you because I just think it's important to give you things to think about.

President Lloyd: Okay, appreciate that.

Martha Crosley: You're looking at papers that show Kleymeyer Park, Wesselman Park and the Goebel Soccer Field. And the reason I'm passing those out to you is this: please spread all of them out in front of you and look and see where all the population is. Look closely at Wesselman Park and see how many homes are there across Boeke Road. See how many people are being affected that really don't like it. I have talked to many people who live in that area, some of whom have been fighting this ball complex since '07, that really are highly concerned about noise pollution, light pollution even with the hot Musco lights that Mr. Dunn talks about. There still has to be security lighting all night long which will shine in these people's windows. There are major, major concerns. And when you talk about noise pollution, one of the solutions that has been brought up from the environmental folks that Mr. Dunn has hired with his \$425,000, have said well, let's put berms up, let's put trees up, and that will block a lot of the noise and stuff and these people on Boeke Road. One last paper, and I'll show you why that won't work. The paper that you're looking at will make no sense at all when you see it, but it's another Map Quest. I want to give everybody a chance to get it in their hands. That paper that you're looking at an area on the north side of Evansville. It shows Stringtown Road running vertically on the right side of your paper, on the left side of your paper, it shows First Avenue running vertically. On the left side of your paper, Central High School is circled in red. On the right side of your paper, that's where I live. And you'll notice that there are trees, there are houses, there is land, there is probably a good quarter of a mile in between those two places. And ladies and gentlemen, there have been occasions when I can hear Central High School in my house with the doors and windows shut. So there is no way in the world you can tell me that the people along Boeke Road are not going to be disturbed by this complex. And it doesn't have to be there because there are other places it could be put where there are businesses adjacent that, you know, they'll welcome somebody there. It's like, hello, come on over, do some business. There are open fields that could be adjacent, but not in Wesselman Park. And one last comment, I'll say two last comments: the dearest thing to my heart in this whole process is Wesselman Woods. I hope that you all get an opportunity to read the letter from John Bacone, the head of nature preserves for the state of Indiana, and also the letter from the Evansville Audubon Society. There is nothing else like Wesselman Woods around in Evansville, in the state of Indiana, or in the whole country. Why on earth would you risk even a one percent chance of messing up a unique feature of this city, one percent chance by putting in something that could remotely affect the animals and plants and the wetlands in the park and in the preserve? This is your charge. We are in charge of handling and respecting this land. It is up to us to save it for the next generation, and the generation after that, and the generation after that. And we have continued over the years to encroach. When Roberts Stadium was built in 1959 or '58 or whenever it was built, it was just the biggest thing since sliced bread and it was wonderful, and we were not as environmentally enlightened as we are now. If we were environmentally enlightened, we maybe wouldn't have put it there. We might have done some permeable paving. We might have done some things that were different. I'm not a big proponent of keeping Roberts Stadium. I think Roberts Stadium needs to be torn down because of a whole lot of economic issues. I've talked to gentlemen from the Park Board and they have explained a whole lot of stuff and I think that that land ought to be put back in park land to serve as a buffer, and that kind of thing needs to be looked at. My recommendation to you at this point is to slow down. Get an overall plan for the area, for the park system, for

the county, an overall plan for the whole enchilada, people, before we move forward on details of the plan. If you don't have the big picture, you can't deal with the small details. Please reserve your vote, please reserve the time to think. Please get a good understanding from all sides of this issue, not somebody like Mr. Dunn, who I'm sure is a fine man, but who is a business man coming in with a slick presentation that says this is going to be great, because I know people who can pick that presentation apart quite easily. I thank you for your time.

President Lloyd: Any questions for Ms. Crosley? Okay, appreciate you coming in and giving us all that information. We'll digest it.

Martha Crosley: Thank you.

President Lloyd: Okay, is there a motion to adjourn? We'll take a seven minute recess and then we'll start our budget meeting at 9:35.

Councilmember Shetler: Motion to adjourn.

President Lloyd: Motion to adjourn this meeting. Is there a second?

Councilmember Raben: Second.

President Lloyd: We are adjourned. Thank you.

(There being no further business to come before the Council, the meeting was adjourned at 9:28 a.m.)

VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL

President Russell Lloyd, Jr.

Vice President James Raben

Councilmember Joe Kiefer

Councilmember Mike Goebel

Councilmember Tom Shetler, Jr.

Councilmember Ed Bassemier

Councilmember Stephanie Terry

Recorded and transcribed by Teri Lukeman.

**VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL
BUDGET HEARINGS
SEPTEMBER 1, 2010**

The Vanderburgh County Council met in session this 1st day of September, 2010 in room 301 of the Civic Center Complex. The meeting was called to order at 9:40 a.m. by County Council President Russell Lloyd, Jr.

President Lloyd: I'd like to call to order the Vanderburgh County Council 2011 budget hearings. We are back in session, September 1st, 2010. Attendance roll call please.

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

President Lloyd: For the Pledge of Allegiance, I'd like to ask everybody to stand and Councilman Raben please lead us.

(Pledge of Allegiance was given)

President Lloyd: Thank you. Before we start, just a couple remarks. Welcome to our budget hearings. This has been a difficult budget for the Council. We are anticipating tax revenue local income tax losing about two and a half to three million dollars next year and that's the one percent tax that people pay on their paychecks. It goes to Indianapolis and they remit it back to the county. Where in a normal year, we would get about fifteen million, we're looking at twelve and a half to thirteen. Some of the goals that we undertook for this year's budget was, first of all, let's preserve all necessary county services. Things that we are required by Indiana law to continue to maintain: county jail, sheriff department, county courts, county highway, and then also the government offices in this building as well as Burdette Park and some of the other things that county government entails. We looked at having no additional employees, the county has continued a hiring freeze and we're looking at ways where we can possibly streamline government. But one of the things that I had asked at the beginning of the year, since the employees had had a zero percent pay increase in 2009, we'd asked the Council to look hard to see if we could come up with the funding for an employee pay raise for 2011. Also, this budget we chose to undertake no new initiatives. We're having a very difficult time funding all that we have so we asked for no new initiatives, no new employees. Finally, we've got improvements to pay for at – there's new computerization that the county is going into contract with. We paid over 2.4 million dollars for all the computerization in county government, more devices than employees, which is kind of an amazing thing, but some employees use multiple devices. We've also got improvements that need to be done at Burdette Park to keep that an attractive facility as well as road projects: north Green River Road being one of the more prominent and others. So to get started here, I'd like to thank the members that have put in a lot a hard work. Our new finance chair, Tom Shetler, I know he's had to spend a lot

of time on this under the tutelage of Jim Raben. We've got a new minority leader, Mike Goebel, who worked with the minority members of Council. I'd like to thank all of you for your hard work on this and we'll undertake this at this time.

SOLID WASTE DISTRICT PUBLIC HEARING
--

Before we get into the county budgets, a new legal requirement is that in a public hearing, the County Council adopt the Solid Waste District budget. The Solid Waste District is a quasi independent operation that they receive their funding from tipping fees. They're actually under the administration of the city of Evansville, but the county also has administrative jurisdiction. So you should have a Solid Waste District budget in front of you and we have the executive director, Mr. Joe Ballard, is here, who can kind of give us a brief summary and answer any questions. So this is item four A, Solid Waste District budget.

Joe Ballard: Okay, thank you, President Lloyd. Let me just make a couple of comments and I can take any questions if you like. I guess first of all, as you said, we're a, I guess, from my political science days, we're a separate independent district. We're neither city nor county, but both in another way. We're a county-wide agency. We are funded actually by fees from the landfill. We're not tax supported or anything like that so we get two dollars per ton of all the waste that goes into the landfill. The last couple of years, that had been going down pretty drastically. It has come back up in the last four or five months, so I'm sure we'll be fine. We do recycling and waste reduction, that's our goal or whatever, so as my little joke is, when I go to speak to somebody, I want you to generate trash, because I get money from that, so I can ask you not to generate trash. And they all scratch their heads as do I. But that's the way it's funded. Last year we reduced our budget from 2009 by \$78,000 or sixteen percent because of less money coming in. We laid off one staff member, cut a number of things. This year the money is a bit better as I said, especially in the last four or five months, but we cut our budget again by 8.7 percent or about 37,500. So we now have a very tight, frugal budget, two staff members, our budget is \$392,000. We contract with different private companies and not for profits to do our programs for us and we administer the programs. So the Household Hazardous Waste Day or Tox Away Day, we do that. Our electronics, our computer recycling day, the monthly drop or bi-monthly drop-off recycling days at the old Walmart on the westside and Evansville Day School and the 4-H Center. We contract with Wesselman Woods to do those for us. But we're still the ones in charge of those. I can take any questions if you'd like.

President Lloyd: Mr. Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: Just a point, Joe, and essentially, your revenues are down because you rely a lot on industrial waste that may happen. With production of an industry being down, therefore, less waste going into the landfill. So a good economy means a lot of good garbage out there, as well.

Joe Ballard: That would be correct, yes. When we started the Solid Waste District, we did a – me and a guy from USI's technical assistance center, which I don't believe they have now, we did an industrial survey. And I believe seventy-five percent of the waste that goes in this landfill, Laubscher Meadows Landfill, in this county is from industrial and commercial. That's the great majority of it, of course, so when the economy is booming, we get trash. When the economy is slow, not much goes in there and we have less money coming in.

Councilmember Shetler: And the positive thing that you guys do is really keep things that could be recycled and reused and, or somehow in the economy, those things are kept aside through the programs that you administer through this funding that takes place. And again, no property taxes, it's all money that comes out of fees that are placed for, primarily the industrial people who are placing their scrap.

Joe Ballard: And I guess I would say, with industrial people, from an industrial standpoint, they pay for their trash, so it's to their advantage to reduce their waste. I mean, that's a cost savings to them to reduce the amount of waste they generate. And a lot of industries are into doing that. I guess Toyota would be a primary example. They talk about a , they have a zero waste program at Toyota, whether they've achieved that I don't know. But that is their goal.

Councilmember Shetler: Right, thank you, Joe.

President Lloyd: Other questions? Mr. Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Joe, I just want to commend you: it looks like you've got a good, tight budget here and pretty conservative, and you only have two employees then?

Joe Ballard: Yes, myself and Susan Jeffries. She is the administrator or Assistant Director and it's just the two of us. We do have some funding for a part-time person. We had a retired person that worked at some of these recycling days and spent time in the office. With only two people, there's occasion when neither of us are there, something like that, so he would fill in. And he works for the Census Bureau part of the time, too, and he's sick right now. He got bitten by a brown recluse spider and he's been on dialysis, so I don't know what's going to happen. The last time I talked to him, he said he's doing better. But we don't have him at this – he hasn't worked for a couple of months, anyway. But yes, it's two people, basically.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay, thanks, Joe. Good job.

Joe Ballard: Thank you.

President Lloyd: Other questions? Just a point of information, all the Commissioners serve on this board and then I'm the Council representative, so you appointed me to that board and I would agree with what Joe had said about the trash does follow the economy. But obviously, the Solid Waste District, the public education, we take quite a bit of material that could just be thrown out into the fields or the woods and it gets recycled. The electronics recycling, we've seen tremendous growth as people get rid of televisions, old computers, and things like that. So it's worked out really well and it's been a great partnership with the community. So we would need a motion and a second to approve this budget. The only other point I'd make is that the increases are, since this is administered by the city, it's the city increase, which I believe is two percent salary increase?

Joe Ballard: Yes, that's correct.

Councilmember Kiefer: I move that we approve.

President Lloyd: Is there a second?

Councilmember Shetler: Second.

President Lloyd: Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: I vote yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. Approved seven/zero. Thank you.

Joe Ballard: Thank you.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

COUNTY DEPARTMENT BUDGETS

President Lloyd: We'll move on to item five, Finance Chairman Tom Shetler and we'll start with the individual county department budgets, the blue book.

Councilmember Shetler: Okay, I brought with me today a red pen, and last year I brought with me a pencil sharpener. The pencil sharpener was to keep in mind that we need to keep a sharp eye on the budget last year and get it down to the point we could. This year is to remind me that really only the federal government has the ability to write in red ink. We don't have that ability. We have to live within our means. It is mandated by state law for us to do that. The cuts, the things that we're recommending are being done because of really a decrease in funds that we have available to us. So this will be reminding me today that we have to keep our budget down to a point that we cannot allow any additional funds to go over into deficit spending. First I'll move that all salary lines including FICA, PERF and Insurance will be set in at our September 8 meeting. I have before you copies of some proposed budget cuts. What I intend to do is go through department by department, go through those budget cuts, I will make a motion to approve the budget with these cuts in mind as we go through it. Please stop me if you have any questions. At that point then we could vote on the motion at that point, and then take under

consideration any questions or disputes that we have that regards that. So we'll just kind of follow along with a given motion right now to approve the budget as submitted and with the following amendments to the submission.

Councilmember Kiefer: And do you need a second for that motion? Or is that done at the end?

President Lloyd: You're going to do a motion for each department then?

Councilmember Shetler: No, going to do a motion up to the point for, a motion and a second now, and approval up to the point that we have a question or a dispute on something and then we'll stop it, approve everything that's been done prior to that time, then deal with the question or dispute and go forward from that point on.

Councilmember Kiefer: I'll second that then.

CLERK

Councilmember Shetler: The first department on page one, the County Clerk, again, the recommendations are that account number 1990, the request was for \$15,470, that we make a cut of \$5,470 in that, so that's a change that makes it, that line item \$10,000. The next line is 2600, request was for \$75,000, to cut \$20,000 out of that line, making that \$55,000. The next is account number 3540, the request was for \$20,000, making a cut of \$5,000 in that line, for a new number of \$15,000. Line 4210, account number 4210 request was for \$1,000 for Office Furniture and I'm recommending to cut that \$1,000. There are some surplus furnitures available to us in the basement of this building and other places, so that there would be nothing approved on that. The total cuts in that department as outlined are \$31,470. Any questions, any comments, any further additions? The next then would be the Auditor's budget and that is on page seven –

Line Item	Description	Requested	Cut	Approved
1010-1990	Extra Help	15,470	5,470	10,000
1010-2600	Office Supplies	75,000	20,000	55,000
1010-3540	Maintenance Contract	20,000	5,000	15,000
1010-4210	Office Furniture	1,000	1,000	0

CLERK IV-D

President Lloyd: Okay, so if a department like County Clerk IV-D, if you skip it, then that's approved, no change?

Councilmember Shetler: Yes. County Clerk IV-D and no changes to be made to that. It is as submitted.

Councilmember Bassemier: Do you want to go ahead and make a motion and a second and vote it and that one is done, or are you going to do them all the way –

President Lloyd: We're going to keep going until there is a question and then we'll take a motion on everything that's been submitted.

Councilmember Raben: And Tom, it might make it easier for you just to put in the amount you want to set in rather than having to go through the request, the cut

amount, because we have that before us, just give the amount you want to set each line item in.

AUDITOR

Councilmember Shetler: Thank you, coming from experience there, James. Appreciate that. Okay, page seven, the County Auditor, account number 2600 set that at \$10,500. Account number 3530, set that at \$4,000. Any other questions or additions in the Auditor's office?

Line Item	Description	Requested	Cut	Approved
1020-2600	Office Supplies	11,500	1,000	10,500
1020-3530	Contractual Services	5,000	1,000	4,000

TREASURER

Councilmember Shetler: County Treasurer, on page 10. Actually came in for a late change himself setting the line item 3410 to a number of \$15,000. Any questions?

Line Item	Description	Requested	Cut	Approved
1030-3410	Printing	20,000	5,000	15,000

RECORDER

Councilmember Shetler: Next is the Sheriff's department, nothing on the County Recorder's office, as submitted on page 13.

President Lloyd: Just one point on that one. We had some emails back and forth on whether the Recorder's Perpetuation fund would contribute funding towards the computerization, and you saw that calculation, but I guess we weren't able to get an agreement with the County Recorder, so there's 800,000 in that fund and we had requested 91,000 towards 2011 computerization, but we weren't able to reach an agreement on that. So I guess, if we could reach any kind of agreement prior to the 8th we could change that. Is that correct?

Councilmember Raben: Yeah. And I think it's important, you know, where that fund is healthy enough to pay their percentage of computer services, we need to try to shift those funds there.

President Lloyd: It would certainly help the County's general fund budget if they would, you know, it's money sitting there that I'm not sure they have any kind of budgetary request for that \$800,000, where they could assist the county, and I had pointed out to Z Tuley that this was a one-time request. Whether another Council would come back and ask in a future year, that's a different story, but at least we thought it was a fair way to allocate that. So we'll see if we can come up with that.

Councilmember Shetler: And I might point out that this is not the only department that was asked of. What we have tried to do is to seek out other funds that don't affect the general fund per se, that we might be able to divert some of the expenses over there, freeing up some general fund monies for possible salary increases and the like. So that was something that's been requested of a few different departments along the way that have other funds available to them.

Councilmember Goebel: How much was that amount?

Councilmember Shetler: That’s going to affect about \$91,000. Adversely affect 91,000.

President Lloyd: And I guess the reason we brought that up is we’re passing up the Recorder’s budget and I believe there was no changes to that budget.

Councilmember Shetler: That’s correct.

President Lloyd: But I wanted to point this out, that she does have that Perpetuation Fund that we requested some assistance for the computer hardware/software license maintenance, etcetera.

Z Tuley: Do you need me to come forward?

President Lloyd: Do we have any questions for the Recorder on this?

Councilmember Raben: I’ll, between now and September, Z, I’ll assign myself with the task to work with you on this, okay?

Councilmember Shetler: Alright, thank you.

SHERIFF

Councilmember Shetler: We’ll go on to the Sheriff budget, page 14. Line item or account number 1130-0199 set that in at \$9,000. Line 1130-0115 set that in at zero. Line 1130-0116 set in at zero. Account number 1210 set in at \$63,000. Account number 1750 set in at \$133,750. Account number 1911 set in at \$396,666. Account number 2210 set in at \$225,000. Line item 2220 set in at \$12,000. Line item 2230 set in at \$80,000. Line item 3200 set in at \$25,000. Line item 3310 set in at \$15,000. Line item 4230 set in at zero. Line item 4290 set in at zero.

Councilmember Raben: Can I make a brief (inaudible). I did have some dialogue with the Sheriff prior to today’s meeting. One of the requests that has been zeroed out is in regards to the liaison officer for the new North High School, and as everyone recalls, the junior high opens in August of next year, the high school, the first of 2012. The Sheriff is looking at coming back to us in June or July of next year requesting that for the balance of 2011, to begin training and moving towards the direction of putting a liaison officer in that school. Along with that, I think he’s working on getting a pledge from the Evansville School Corporation to help offset some of that cost. So just letting everybody know that, and I think this is one that we’re going to look very favorably at supporting in mid-year of next year.

Councilmember Shetler: Any other questions or comments on the Sheriff department?

Line Item	Description	Requested	Cut	Approved
1050-1130-0199	Part-time Clerk	16,910	7,910	9,000
1050-1130-0115	Deputy	43,222	43,222	0
1050-1130-0116	Deputy	43,222	43,222	0
1050-1210	College Incentive	70,000	7,000	63,000

(Table continued on next page)

1050-1750	Clothing Allowance	135,000	1,250	133,750
1050-1911	Sheriff Retirement	402,717	6,051	396,666
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
1050-3200	Utilities	28,000	3,000	25,000
1050-3310	Training	20,000	5,000	15,000
1050-4230	Motor Vehicles	300,000	300,000	0
1050-4290	Vehicle Maintenance	24,000	24,000	0

SHERIFF/JAIL

Councilmember Shetler: Next is Jail, now on page 26. And account number 1301 set in at \$13,000. Account number 1750 set in at \$66,000. Account number 2260 set in at \$650,000. Account number 2600 to be set in at \$20,000. Account number 3310 set in at \$5,000. Any questions?

Line Item	Description	Requested	Cut	Approved
1051-1301	Civilian Overtime	15,000	2,000	13,000
1051-1750	Clothing Allowance	69,000	3,000	66,000
1051-2260	Food	675,000	25,000	650,000
1051-2600	Office Supplies	25,000	5,000	20,000
1051-3310	Training	20,000	15,000	5,000

SHERIFF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

Councilmember Shetler: No change to the Sheriff Domestic Violence on page 33.

SURVEYOR

Councilmember Shetler: On page 34, the County Surveyor, no changes to that budget.

CORONER

Councilmember Shetler: We go to page 36, the County Coroner, line item 1210 set in at 61,067. Line 2710 set in at \$1,000. Account number 3190 set in at \$4,000. Any questions about the County Coroner’s office?

Line Item	Description	Requested	Cut	Approved
1070-1210	Assistant Coroner	66,067	5,000	61,067
1070-2710	Color Film	2,500	1,500	1,000
1070-3190	Travel/Mileage	5,000	1,000	4,000

**PROSECUTOR
PROSECUTOR IV-D
PROSECUTOR GRANTS**

Councilmember Shetler: Next is the Prosecutor's office and Prosecutor IV-D, and Fees-Check Recovery, and Drug Law Enforcement Program, the Victims/Witness Assistance Program, and Domestic Violence, there are no changes to be made to that department. Any questions?

ASSESSOR

Councilmember Shetler: Next is page 48, County Assessor. No recommended changes to that department.

ELECTION OFFICE

Councilmember Shetler: Next, that brings us to the Election Office, which is on page 60. And this is fairly extensive. I'll give you the rationale on it first. Real quickly, some of this is a matter of cash flow. We're recommending to appropriate half the recommended amount for the year, that's because next year is a city election year. We will be billing the city for the expenses that are incurred, so we will receive that money that will actually help us to then pay for the fall election, so that we wouldn't need to encumber any other or get any other money appropriated at this point in time. So half the budget will work for us as far as cash flow is concerned. So, Tom, this is fifty percent of everything?

Councilmember Shetler: That is correct.

Councilmember Kiefer: Does he have to read in each and every one of these line item numbers?

President Lloyd: I think so, legally.

Councilmember Raben: You can enter them (inaudible – microphone not turned on).

Councilmember Shetler: Submit this as part of the record? Okay.

Councilmember Kiefer: Can we do it that way to make it easier?

Councilmember Shetler: Why don't we – have we made a motion on the prior part and then we'll make a separate motion on this to submit that, and then we'll go on. So I don't know if we did make a motion, if not, I make motion on the other and –

Councilmember Kiefer: And I second.

Councilmember Shetler: – approve and get a second.

President Lloyd: Okay, there's a motion on all the prior budget changes by Mr. Shetler, second Mr. Kiefer. Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. That motion passes seven/zero.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

Councilmember Shetler: Okay, now on the Election Office, I would move for approval as submitted. I think you all have a copy of that. The effective bottom line would be \$215,530 and do I need to put anything more specific?

Jeff Ahlers: Well, I would just, so that there is not a misunderstanding on the record, that you're not moving for approval of the budget as submitted, but approval of the budget as amended by your submitted cuts that are being made as an exhibit and incorporated into the record. Is that correct? Is that good for you?

Councilmember Shetler: Okay. So moved.

Councilmember Kiefer: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Shetler, second Mr. Kiefer on the Election Office budget, which the budget that's being requested will be all, one hundred percent reimbursed by the city, is that correct? I believe that's correct. Okay. Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. That budget is approved, seven/zero.

Line Item	Description	Requested	Cut	Approved
1210-1110	Board Member	2,400	1,200	1,200
1210-1120	Election Assistant	40,000	20,000	20,000
1210-1130	Absentee Teams	6,000	3,000	3,000
1210-1140	Canvassing Board	1,800	900	900
1210-1150	Assistant Canvassing Board	1,000	500	500
1210-1160	Election Inspector	22,360	11,180	11,180
1210-1170	Election Judge	32,680	16,340	16,340
1210-1180	Election Clerk	47,160	23,580	23,580
1210-1200	Election Attorney	1,200	600	600
1210-1210	Ballot Aids	2,500	1,250	1,250
1210-1900	FICA	3,060	1,530	1,530
1210-1910	PERF	116	58	58
1210-2290	Election Board Meals	400	200	200
1210-2600	Office Supplies	1,000	500	500
1210-2700	Other Supplies	4,000	2,000	2,000
1210-3120	Postage/Freight	500	250	250
1210-3130	Travel/Mileage	1,000	500	500
1210-3410	Printing	3,000	1,500	1,500
1210-3420	Legal Advertisement	1,000	500	500
1210-3520	Equipment Repair	500	250	250
1210-3530	Contractual Services	250,244	125,122	125,122
1210-3570	Janitorial Services	2,500	1,250	1,250
1210-3600	Rent	4,600	2,300	2,300
1210-3610	Legal Services	1,040	520	520
1210-3630	Equipment Lease & Rental	1,000	500	500

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

VOTER REGISTRATION

Councilmember Shetler: On to Voter Registration on page 62, no changes.

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION

Councilmember Shetler: Page 64, County Extension. The recommendation there is on line 3530, and that's to reduce that by \$361, making that \$72,934 to set in. Any questions?

Line Item	Description	Requested	Cut	Approved
1230-3530	Contractual Services	73,295	361	72,934

AREA PLAN

Councilmember Shetler: Next is Area Plan Commission and there's no changes recommended there.

DRAINAGE BOARD

Councilmember Shetler: No changes in the Drainage Board.

VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

Councilmember Shetler: Veterans Services on page 70, one recommendation. Line item 4210 which is Office Furniture, again, I think we can direct them to go to the basement and see what we have available in surplus, but to set that 4210 in at zero. Any questions, comments?

Line Item	Description	Requested	Cut	Approved
1270-4210	Office Furniture	500	500	0

COMMISSIONERS

Councilmember Shetler: Next is the County Commissioners budget on page 71, to set line 3040 at \$18,962. Line 3500, actually is going to, there was a math error there and it needs to be set up to \$45,117. Line 3620 to be set at \$13,500. Line 3750 to be set in at \$66,365. Line 3931 to be set in at \$20,000. Any questions or comments?

Line Item	Description	Requested	Cut	Approved
1300-3040	Soil & Water	21,907	2,945	18,962
1300-3500	Human Relations	43,970	(1,147)	45,117
1300-3620	Copy Machine Lease	18,500	5,000	13,500
1300-3750	Purchasing Department	69,568	3,203	66,365
1300-3931	Youth Services	25,000	5,000	20,000

WEIGHTS & MEASURES

Councilmember Shetler: Weights & Measures on page 75, account number 2210 to be set in at \$4,000. Account number 2300 to be set in at \$1,200. Account number 2600 to be set in at \$400. Account number 3130 to be set in at \$300. Account number 3520 to be set in at \$1,200. Account number 3580 to be set in at \$1,200. Account number 4250 to be set in at \$500. Any questions or comments?

Line Item	Description	Requested	Cut	Approved
1302-2210	Gas & Oil	5,000	1,000	4,000
1302-2300	Uniforms	1,250	50	1,200
1302-2600	Office Supplies	500	100	400
1302-3130	Travel/Mileage	400	100	300
1302-3520	Equipment Repair	1,500	300	1,200
1302-3580	Vehicle Repair	1,500	300	1,200
1302-4250	Miscellaneous Equipment	1,500	1,000	500

PUBLIC DEFENDER

Councilmember Shetler: Public Defender, and I might explain a little bit there. Public Defender, account 1770 to be set in at 38,202. Account number 1820 set in at, again, another math error, it needs to be set up to \$40,072. And account number 3948 to be set in at zero. Now that is the Death Penalty and the recommendation on that is to try to set that in this year for an appropriation so that we can encumber the money for next year.

Councilmember Goebel: I failed to meet with the Public Defender but I’ll inform him if you haven’t already.

Councilmember Shetler: No, I actually rode up on the elevator with him and I did not discuss that with him. But that money is not being cut from there. The money is being transferred essentially into this year is what our task will be later.

President Lloyd: We want to fund the death penalty in 2010, so we’re going to appropriate 250,000 in this year and that’s why we’re not going to have anything in the 2011 budget.

Councilmember Shetler: Bill, did you have anything further to add on that? Alright, any questions?

President Lloyd: I mean, that line item will still be there if something comes up?

Councilmember Shetler: Correct. Hopefully, there won’t be because I think this would put us up to – with our match of a million dollars for the death penalty, which would be more than enough to carry in most circumstances.

Line Item	Description	Requested	Cut	Approved
1303-1770	Paralegal	38,302	100	38,202
1303-1820	Admin. Assistant	38,230	(1,842)	40,072
1303-3948	Death Penalty	250,000	250,000	0

SUPERINTENDENT OF COUNTY BUILDINGS

Councilmember Shetler: The next is the Superintendent of County Buildings, and that line 2210 to be set in at \$300. Line 2300 to be set in at \$500. Line 3510 to be set in at \$750.

Line Item	Description	Requested	Cut	Approved
1310-2210	Gas & Oil	400	100	300
1310-2300	Uniforms	700	200	500
1310-3510	Other Operating	1,000	250	750

CIRCUIT COURT

Councilmember Shetler: Next is Circuit Court, and line 3620 to be set in at zero. That will be picked up again later on. That’s another area where we transferred money out of the general to another fund.

Line Item	Description	Requested	Cut	Approved
1360-3620	Copy Machine Lease	7,000	7,000	0

SHERIFF/COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS

Councilmember Shetler: Community Corrections, any questions about Circuit? Community Corrections line item 1850 to be set in at \$50,000.

Line Item	Description	Requested	Cut	Approved
1361-1850	Union Overtime	55,000	5,000	50,000

SUPERIOR COURT

Councilmember Shetler: Superior Court line 1690 be set in at \$67,284.

President Lloyd: What page is that?

Councilmember Shetler: I was looking for that and I hadn’t found it yet.

Councilmember Goebel: Page 92.

President Lloyd: Oh, I see it. Thanks. 1690-1370, okay.

Councilmember Shetler: That would have to actually go to Job Study for approval. It’s reclassifying that particular employee, so that’s why that’s being set back to today’s level. The line item 3903 is to be set at \$40,000. 3941 to be set in at \$7,000. Line 3949 is to be set in at \$8,000. Line 4210 needs to be added to \$4,000. And then it’s taken away again. I don’t understand that entry. It’s over my head on that accounting procedure there. Line 4220 is \$2,000 and 4220 is also another account entry to zero it back. Any questions?

Line Item	Description	Requested	Cut	Approved
1370-1690	Court Administrator	76,576	9,292	67,284
1370-3903	Petit Jurors	50,000	10,000	40,000
1370-3941	Guardian Ad-Litem	10,000	3,000	7,000
1370-3949	Home Study/Adoption	10,000	2,000	8,000
1370-4210	Office Furniture	0	(4,000)	4,000
1370-4210	Office Furniture	1,000	4,000	0

Line Item	Description	Requested	Cut	Approved
1370-4220	Office Machines	0	(2,000)	2,000
1370-4220	Office Machines	1,000	2,000	0

DRUG & ALCOHOL DEFERRAL SERVICE (DADS)

Councilmember Shetler: The next is the Drug & Alcohol Deferral, line 3600 at \$7,650, line 3780 to be set in at \$100. Justification on that 3600 is that’s rent, and we are hoping to try to get that department to look at moving into one of our county facilities where there’s ample room and stuff.

Councilmember Kiefer: And that gives them mid-year –

Councilmember Shetler: They’ve got six months.

Councilmember Kiefer: Yeah, six months to get that accomplished.

President Lloyd: And they indicated they were on a month to month lease. So give them time there.

Councilmember Kiefer: I think it’s a good move. No pun intended.

Line Item	Description	Requested	Cut	Approved
1371-3600	Rent	15,300	7,650	7,650
1371-3780	Client Refund	250	150	100

THE CENTRE

Councilmember Shetler: No changes in The Centre.

BURDETTE PARK

Councilmember Shetler: Burdette Park, which is on page 101. Line 1180 to set in at \$500,000. Line 2220 set in at \$2,500. Line item 2310 to be set in at \$9,500. Line 3200 to be set in at \$145,000. Line 3550 to be set in at \$25,000. Line 3700 to be set in at \$1,000. Any questions or comments?

Line Item	Description	Requested	Cut	Approved
1450-1180	Other Employees	525,000	25,000	500,000
1450-2220	Tires & Tubes	3,500	1,000	2,500
1450-2310	Laundry & Cleaning	11,000	1,500	9,500
1450-3200	Utilities	150,000	5,000	145,000
1450-3550	Repairs to Bldgs & Grounds	30,000	5,000	25,000
1450-3700	Dues & Subscriptions	2,079	1,079	1,000

LEGAL AID

Councilmember Shetler: The next department is Legal Aid, page 105. Line item 3140 to be set in at \$1,125. Line item 3410 to be set in at zero. Line item 3730 to

be set in at \$200. Any questions, comments?

Line Item	Description	Requested	Cut	Approved
1460-3140	Telephone	1,500	375	1,125
1460-3410	Printing	500	500	0
1460-3730	Continuing Education	500	300	200

COUNTY COUNCIL

Councilmember Shetler: Next is County Council. Line item 1920 to be set in at \$10,000,000. Line item 3461 to be set in at \$456,461. Line item 3520 zero. Line item 3860 to be set in at \$1,527,550.

Councilmember Kiefer: What was that number again?

Councilmember Shetler: Okay, I'm sorry. It's \$1,624,550. I'm sorry, I didn't get the – that was on the \$90,000 change there from the Recorder's office. So if we can get that worked out, that may be revisited between now and September 8th.

Line Item	Description	Requested	Cut	Approved
1480-1920	Insurance	11,270,133	1,270,133	10,000,000
1480-3461	Court Technology	412,366	(44,095)	456,461
1480-3520	Equipment Repair	200	200	0
1480-3860	Contractual Computer	1,700,000	75,450	1,624,550

Councilmember Shetler: Okay, the next is the Riverboat.

Councilmember Raben: Hey, can we discuss that just a moment?

President Lloyd: Okay, we're on County Council budget, page 108 and 109.

Councilmember Raben: Yes, and this is, while we're on Contractual Computer anything in regards to technology, I would like between now and our final meeting, I think this body needs to pass an ordinance of some sort or, not an ordinance, but a resolution. I know there's been a request made and it was filled by Matt Arvay to give us a breakdown on how many desktops, how many laptops and so on and so forth. We know that the number is significantly higher of computers than we have county employees. I think there needs to be a serious push on our end to try to limit those numbers. I don't think you should have the opportunity, other than in certain circumstances, to have a laptop and a desktop. You know, I don't think you need both. I think if you have a laptop, you lose your desktop. But I think there's a substantial amount of replacement equipment that we can eliminate. I think the number is in excess of 200 more computers than we have employees. So I would like to see this number drastically dropped even between now and September. I think, you know, we need to force that issue and come back and even chop more from this.

President Lloyd: A little bit, and I've spent a lot time on this. A little bit of that number, a printer is a device so that counts as a machine, so I mean, an employee can have two things, a computer and a printer, right?

Councilmember Raben: But there are employees that have desktops and laptops.

President Lloyd: Right, and I know –

Councilmember Raben: The laptop, you can have a monitor for your laptop, you can have a keyboard, but you don't need both.

President Lloyd: Right, I mean, you can have a docking station for a laptop if you take that laptop out in the field rather than having another desktop there. And I don't know how prevalent that is. Mr. Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Thank you. Speaking about the computer services, I'm not sure how long this contract runs, but you know, I think we need to get together with the city and look at maybe getting some competitive bidding on this or maybe even doing an evaluation if it makes more sense to bring it in-house. I mean, this is a big budget item on computers. I know when we do Health care, which is a big budget item, we will look at more than one vendor or one supplier for insurance. And I think we need to constantly evaluate things in that direction for the computer services, as well.

Councilmember Raben: Good point.

President Lloyd: Real Quick. And some of the increase, the original computer budget for the county was 2.4 million, which is just a huge amount of money. The PC refresh with licenses is about 500 machines. We asked that that be dropped in half, and a five year lease, we're budgeting about \$121,000. The accounting software for the financial statements that the Auditor and Treasurer have to use and it actually goes with the city, the old VAX program, we've got to get off that. It's a 20 year old piece of equipment. We're moving that to the CCD budget, \$160,234, which is a five year lease. And then the computer area had requested two new employees for county government as computer support and we cut that, which was \$78,000, so we changed that to zero. I mean, we tried to do everything we could on this budget.

Councilmember Raben: And I understand, but I think there is still more room. I think things are a bit out of hand and I think we've gotten too used to being able to get what we want, and I think we're beyond that point today. So we need to take a hard look at it, and you know, when we're talking about from a contractual side where you've got the support, you know, the outside support. You know, if anyone of those laptops or desktops that you remove from the system is that much less work that we have to do to maintain them all. I'm confident, at least I am in my own mind, that it's not fixed. That we're not doing the best we can do at the cheapest possible cost we can do. And that's all I'm saying. I think we need to look at this hard, maybe we don't accomplish it between now and September, but we need to look at it as hard as we can and hopefully have a better grasp of and controls of these expenses by next year.

President Lloyd: Well, and it makes sense to be on the same system with the city. I mean, I think there's a lot of advantages to that. So the city is a signer to this contract, so is the County Commissioners, and you need to get with them and I know there's some questions and I know one of the Commissioners has some dissatisfaction, so I mean, that's something we need to talk to them about. I believe the contract runs through September of 2011. Mr. Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: You know, one of the things that we need to look at real hard and I agree with James wholeheartedly on that, is it becomes awful attractive when they bundle the computer stuff together and they say for every hard drive and this and that, you get a new screen for thirty bucks or fifty bucks extra. That's all it's costing you. And you think that's not much, but when you multiply that times \$1,000 units, the next thing you know, it's thirty, forty thousand dollars. I think it would be very prudent of us to really analyze that closely. We're at a point now, most screens, at least around our offices and stuff, are – they'll last for six, seven, eight, ten years. Much longer than the life of the computer itself. I like to see us try to use those, maybe buy ten or fifteen that we can shelve and as they go down, that we have a place to go to pick them up off the inventory. But there's no sense on replacing every – a new screen for every computer that's bought and purchased. Just ways we can make some cuts.

Councilmember Raben: There's a lot of systems, a lot of areas where a simple refresh is all you need. And I hope I'm not dragging, the intent is not to drag anybody in to this conversation, but as an example, within our jail, our high security jail, you know, we've got computers that were replaced the last go around, the last refresh, and a little bit of money put in each one to refresh them and they're now overseeing the security of our jail. So I think it's just too easy to say they're three, they're four, they're five years old. You know, I need a new computer. I think that's not how I live my life at home, that's not how I run my business. I think we need to stretch all this stuff out as far as we can do it and we need to find where there's waste, and that's where there's a computer monitor sitting on a counter that we turn on, you know, one week out of the year. I'm sure we've got that in a lot of areas throughout this Civic Center, and you know, I don't mean to belabor this, but I think, you know, this is too much money to keep allowing to be spent like it's being spent.

Councilmember Shetler: Alright.

Councilmember Kiefer: Well said.

President Lloyd: Mr. Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: I concur. I think we're cutting a hundred dollars here, fifty dollars there, and we're looking at 2.4 million. We have to look very deeply into this and I don't buy the thing that it's every five years you get rid of it. If it's still working properly, and it can be refreshed, I think we really need to make the lifetime continue. Thank you.

President Lloyd: Anyone else? Okay. We're coming into the Riverboat. Why don't we take a motion for everything –

Councilmember Kiefer: And that includes all the previous ones that we haven't voted on, is that right?

Councilmember Shetler: So I make a motion to approve all those since the last motion.

Councilmember Kiefer: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, we've got a motion to approve all the changes detailed since the last motion.

Councilmember Bassemier: Question?

President Lloyd: Mr. Shetler, and second Mr. Kiefer. Mr. Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: We're going to do the Riverboat separate?

Councilmember Shetler: Correct.

President Lloyd: Yes. Any other discussion on the current motion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. That motion passes seven to zero.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

RIVERBOAT

President Lloyd: Now we're on the Riverboat fund.

Councilmember Shetler: Alright, thank you. First, line 3110 –

President Lloyd: Or let me stop you on this one. Since we've got a number of people from the community group, CAJE, before we make these changes to Riverboat, I guess, do you have anybody that wants to speak on this? There is a line item in here for transportation service, which would be the north side bus route as well as the dental clinic, some other things. Anybody that would wish to speak on this for a minute or two, a couple of minutes? As a representative of the group?

Mark Rigney; Good morning, my name is Mark Rigney, I chair the transportation committee of CAJE, Congregations Acting for Justice and Empowerment. I actually hadn't planned on saying anything today. So my hope is that in a year where there is a very tight budget that all due diligence is used in making a balanced county budget that reflects the best possible work for the county and at the same time, that if a particular will that CAJE represents is not included in today's budget, we sincerely hope that it will be considered for the long term as an excellent piece of good public policy that can rear its head again next year and until it is done. Any questions for me?

President Lloyd: Okay, thank you very much. Anyone else want to speak on this? Yes, please come forward so you can be on TV. Please state your name and address.

John Ward: My name is John Ward and I'm a member of CAJE and I have some experience in working with budgets and –

President Lloyd: What's your address please?

John Ward: 2324 East Chandler.

President Lloyd: Thank you.

John Ward: And the question I have is, as the projection or the real assets or revenue increases during the year, is there a possibility of opening the budget to consider these requests? So that if, for example, CAJE would find matching funds, would there be something in the county that could match that, that would really enhance job opportunities for a lot of folks that are out in this particular area? So that's my question.

President Lloyd: Is there a Councilman that wants to address that?

Councilmember Raben: I can address that. There will still be, there's no definite's with this because it's Riverboat funding, you know, assuming that their attendance stays level. But this budget that we're going to pass isn't going to completely spend the unappropriated balance down, okay, so at any point next year, yes, we can consider more appropriation requests out of Riverboat.

John Ward: But that's next year, I'm talking about this year's budget. Is it ever open for additional requests during the –

Councilmember Raben: I mean, if the question is, is there an unappropriated balance in Riverboat? Yes, there is.

John Ward: Okay, thank you.

President Lloyd: Other questions or comments? Mr. Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: I just need guidance here. I'm in favor of the transportation service, I think it's going to be good service and I did meet with several of the members and I don't want to say no to this whole budget, I just need guidance, I just want to support the transportation service.

President Lloyd: Well, we could vote on that one separately if Mr. Shetler would be

agreeable to that.

Councilmember Raben: There's four lines, let's just take the four lines, or there's five –

President Lloyd: Go line by line? Ms. Terry?

Councilmember Terry: What would be the unappropriated balance right now for Riverboat?

Councilmember Raben: Bill has that. I don't have it with me today.

President Lloyd: On the Auditor's financial statement, as of August 5th, \$1,026,808 is the general fund unappropriated, right?

Councilmember Raben: No, the Riverboat.

President Lloyd: Oh, Riverboat is \$642,385. I'm just saying what's available right now, August of 2010.

Councilmember Kiefer: Stephanie, one of the things I was hoping to do with this transportation program is work with the city. You know, what I'm fearful of is, if we fund this 100%, if we fund this then our chances of getting matching funds from the city is going to be about zero. So one reason why I would prefer to wait on this is to give us a better chance to get some opportunity for shared funding from the city.

Councilmember Terry: And I'm comfortable with that. I just wanted to kind of know where we are and what the possibility was of us revisiting this again.

President Lloyd: Mr. Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: Yeah, a point of clarification, though, the \$640,000 and change that appears to be a balance, that money is revenue that would go into the general fund. And being two and a half to three million dollars short on COIT money, we basically are going to have to be looking at whatever is left in there to help supplement that. So it's not that that money will be sitting idle and left there unused. That money is to be earmarked for the county budget to make up the difference of that two and a half million dollar shortfall.

President Lloyd: Mr. Goebel?

Councilmember Kiefer: And potentially, that shortfall could come in greater than what we're anticipating.

Councilmember Shetler: Right, and the other fortunate thing, if there is any good side to a bad economy, I guess, is that Aztar, you know, the Riverboat has been doing rather well during these times, and so that income stream is actually up slightly from what it has been in the past. But not near enough to make up that two and a half million dollar deficit, obviously. So it's money that we're counting on.

President Lloyd: Mr. Goebel and then Mr. Bassemier?

Councilmember Goebel: As far as the transportation service, I think not only do we reopen it or keep our minds open on that possibility, but we also consider perhaps

a different or alternative method of running a pilot program. Why do we have to go through METS and not go through a private carrier? That's all.

President Lloyd: Mr. Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: I'm going to have to disagree with Mr. Kiefer about 150,000 if we support this today, nobody else is going to get on board. I disagree. Being in the transportation business for fifteen years, this is just an opening and \$150,000 won't cover the expenses of this route. That's just a starting point and they're wanting to start this as a pilot program to see how it works. It could work only six months. I say let's give it a chance, but \$150,000 will not cover this cost. And like I said, I disagree that nobody is going to jump on this and approve this, so just –

President Lloyd: Well, and I guess that figure I quoted you on the general fund balance, that 1,026,000, we're going to take \$250,000 from that and put it towards the death penalty case. Now we will get reimbursed some of that but that's going to hit in 2010. The other thing, I guess, Jim Raben, you had pointed out at one of the other meetings, the cost per rider was pretty high on this. We were talking about –

Councilmember Raben: I can't recall the amount, but it was –

President Lloyd: \$10,000 a rider or something – it just seemed high. And that's the city METS quote, so whoever had mentioned looking at a private carrier, or that was you. That certainly is –

Councilmember Goebel: I think we could go that route and possibly provide the transportation at less cost and if it does build and we can show evidence that this is definitely something needed, perhaps we can then evaluate or expand. And I don't know if we've looked in that direction or not. It doesn't mean we're not in favor of it. Certainly, there is a need.

President Lloyd: Okay, any other questions? Okay, so you're going to proceed taking each line for a vote?

Councilmember Shetler: Line by line here. Line 3110, that is Economic Development, the recommendation is to set that in at \$436,000.

Councilmember Kiefer: Is that 488 –

President Lloyd: I think we had changed that.

Councilmember Shetler: Sorry.

President Lloyd: Because, I mean, we had originally proposed a cut, what \$64,000, that was going to be all of the county's lobbying. We would propose to cut one firm and that was 12,000.

Councilmember Shetler: Okay, sorry, \$488,000, change on that, and that, again, the explanation's been given there. So I move for approval.

President Lloyd: Is there a second?

Councilmember Kiefer: Second.

President Lloyd: Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. That line passes seven/zero.

Line Item	Description	Requested	Cut	Approved
1490-3110	Economic Development	500,000	12,000	488,000

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

Councilmember Shetler: Line 3112, which is the Infrastructure/Drainage, the recommendation is to set that in at \$450,000.

President Lloyd: Is there a second? We skipped a line, but we can go back to it.

Councilmember Terry: Second.

President Lloyd: Alright, motion, this is on line 3112, Infrastructure/Drainage. Motion and a second. Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. That line item passes seven/zero.

Line Item	Description	Requested	Cut	Approved
1490-3112	Infrastructure/Drainage	500,000	50,000	450,000

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

Councilmember Shetler: I looked over a line, I had it down at the bottom of the page and it's in the second line, it was 3111, the recommendation is to set that at \$300,000. Recommendation by the Commissioners was to put that at 170, the County Council's recommendation is to increase that to 300,000. If I recall from the presentation by the County Commissioner was that there was no real guidelines that's been set in that area. The thinking is that we need to establish some guidelines that's universal to everyone who is participating in that program. If more money is necessary, that would certainly be something we would be open to next year to look at that once they have the guidelines in place. I think putting this amount sets, forces them to put some hard guidelines in there that will make it fair to all recipients.

Councilmember Kiefer: And that's for the Initiative Based Assistance Program?

Councilmember Shetler: Correct.

Councilmember Kiefer: So we're adding money to that, which is, that's good. Thanks.

President Lloyd: Okay, so that's a motion to set that in at \$300,000. Is there a second?

Councilmember Terry: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Shetler. Second, a tie between Mr. Kiefer and Ms. Terry. Any other discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Just a statement before, and I do appreciate putting some more dollars back into that line item. And as the liaison representative for the Council, I will definitely work with the advisory committee in working to get a more defined structure and distribution of assistance. So my vote is yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: I got a broken arm from that one, I think, you twisted it so hard, Stephanie. But it was the right thing to do. 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. That line item passes seven/zero. Next?

Line Item	Description	Requested	Cut	Approved
1490-3111	Initiative Based Assistance Program	170,000	(130,000)	300,000

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

Councilmember Shetler: Next is, we did 3112, so the next one is 3761, to set in at \$130,000.

Councilmember Raben: I'll move approval.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Shetler, second Mr. Raben. Any discussion?
Dental Clinic.

Councilmember Shetler: Keep in mind, some money is in the Health Department for that as well. There are some monies in the Health Department for that as well.

President Lloyd: Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. Motion passes seven/zero. Next?

Line Item	Description	Requested	Cut	Approved
1490-3761	Dental Clinic	180,000	50,000	130,000

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

Councilmember Shetler: Line 4231, that's the Transportation, and my only comment is that I do appreciate Mark, brevity is the soul of wit. Thank you for your comments. And as has been stated, it is something that could certainly be revisited and other alternative sources of revenue sharing more with the city, some things like that, may certainly be possible which may make this more palatable both economically and otherwise for many of us. So the suggestion is to set that in at zero. So that's a motion.

President Lloyd: Motion to set it in at zero. Is there a second?

Councilmember Kiefer: Second.

President Lloyd: Motion Mr. Shetler. Second Mr. Kiefer. Any discussion? Mr. Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: I just want to make a comment. Same thing. I talked to many members of the CAJE organization. They're always very cordial, very informative, good group to work with, and I appreciate what they've done and I do think they got it to a good starting point, that we can launch further investigation such as what Councilman Goebel said and also some discussions with other parties. So I think there's future opportunity to work with them, but with this year's budget and the way we're cutting and with the COIT and other things, I support this as it's set today. So that's the only comment I want to make.

Councilmember Bassemier: Mr. President?

President Lloyd: Mr. Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: I really think somebody needs to step to the plate here. Maybe it's not 150,000 but maybe we can set something in and if they don't get it off the ground, and they don't spend it, we can get that back, so if we don't show other departments and the other business owners down that corridor, they might not want to give, so I think we ought to put something there and not put it in at zero. That's my comment.

President Lloyd: Okay, well, as of right now, the motion on the floor is for zero and there's a second. Any other discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: I think with the idea of opening with something, I'll go along with Mr. Bassemier's recommendation and say no.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Lloyd?

President Lloyd: In this difficult situation, I don't see us funding this initiative, but I'm certainly willing to look at other alternatives. But for this vote, I'll vote yes, so that will be four to three, set in at zero. Thank you.

Line Item	Description	Requested	Cut	Approved
1490-4231	Transportation Service	150,000	150,000	0

(Motion carried 4-3/Councilmembers Terry, Bassemier and Goebel opposed)

Councilmember Raben: You know, just a thought, I mean, if the thought is to get this up and moving, which it's a little concerning that you had actually made the comment, Ed, that 150 is a drop in the bucket of what it's going to actually cost. I would like to know what the thought is, you know, the real cost would be. But because we did increase the Initiative Based Assistance Program 130,000, I don't know what the Commissioners -- initially, the request was for 170 and we've made it 300. You know, if this is to help people find work and what have you, that might be the appropriate line item to fund it from, initially. Just throwing that out there, if

their –

(Tape change)

– to get it moving because the vote didn't pass here today.

Councilmember Terry: Of course, we definitely wouldn't want to do that because they need childcare assistance as well, if they're going to go to work.

Councilmember Raben: Just letting you know that that's an option.

President Lloyd: Okay, we have one comment from the public before we leave this area.

Mark Rigney: At the risk of risking my new tenure in brevity, the number that we have from the County Commissioners in terms of the cost was generated not by us, but by METS at the Commissioners request. And the number that is included is \$150,000 for operating costs. Mr. Kiefer is correct that that includes virtually no contribution from the city other than infrastructure in terms of parking a vehicle and working with an existing dispatcher. The additional 20,000, because I believe the total that they asked for was 170,000, the additional cost is for the purchase of a vehicle deferred over the course of four years. So that's where those numbers came from. I hope that's a helpful explanation. So as far as we know, that is the cost of operating the route.

Councilmember Kiefer: Mark, I don't think, you know, you or your group can consider this necessarily a dead issue based upon today's vote. I think what you're getting is, tentatively yes, we're interested in investigating it more and open to opportunities later in the future. But at this point, we're allocating zero, but that doesn't mean that you're shut out and the issue is over at all.

Mark Rigney: I understand. We're pleased that there is long term interest being generated. I just wanted to clarify the numerical figure before that got lost in the translation. Thank you.

President Lloyd: Thank you. Any other comments? Okay, we need to move on. Mr. Shetler?

HIGHWAY

Councilmember Shetler: Next is County Highway, garage, that will be page 115. Recommendation is on line item 3001, to set that in at zero.

President Lloyd: What's the reasoning on that?

Councilmember Shetler: Again, that's transferring into a fund that get's it out of the general fund.

President Lloyd: Okay, someone else can pay for it. Some other fund. Is that a motion? Or we're going to go back to the procedure, we're going to keep going until someone has a question.

Councilmember Shetler: Any questions, comments?

Line Item	Description	Requested	Cut	Approved
2010-3001	Self Insurance	68,250	68,250	0

CUMULATIVE BRIDGE

Councilmember Shetler: Next is Cumulative Bridge on page 117, line item 3141 is actually to, that was set in at zero, to set it in at \$1,750. Line item 4429 to set in at \$10,000. Any questions?

Line Item	Description	Requested	Cut	Approved
2030-3141	Communications	0	(1,750)	1,750
2030-4429	Engineer Equipment	0	(10,000)	10,000

COMMISSIONERS/CCD

Councilmember Shetler: No changes on the Auditor/CCD fund, no changes on the Coroner/CCD fund, no changes on the County – I’m sorry, there is, on the County Commissioners/CCD then, that would be the next page, and that is page 124. Line 4130 to set in at \$174,000.

President Lloyd: We’re going to add a line item –

Councilmember Shetler: 4950 would be a new line item and that would be Computer Financial Services and that would be placed at \$160,235.

Line Item	Description	Requested	Cut	Approved
2031-1300-4130	Park & Playground	200,000	26,000	174,000
2031-1300-4950	Computer Financial Package	0	(160,235)	160,235

HEALTH DEPARTMENT

Councilmember Shetler: Health Department, I have no changes on the Health Department.

LOCAL ROADS & STREETS

Councilmember Shetler: No changes on Local Roads & Streets.

**SURVEYOR MAPS
AUDITOR/REASSESSMENT
ASSESSOR/REASSESSMENT**

Councilmember Shetler: Surveyor, Property Reassessment/Auditor no change, Property Reassessment/Treasurer no, Property Reassessment/County Assessor, which is on page 137, line 1990 and that would be set at \$80,000. And line 3860 to be set at \$191,000. Questions, comments?

Line Item	Description	Requested	Cut	Approved
2490-1090-1990	Extra Help	100,000	20,000	80,000
2490-1090-3860	Contractual Computer	0	(191,000)	191,000

**PROPERTY TAX ASSESSMENT BOARD OF APPEALS/REASSESSMENT
CIRCUIT COURT SUPPLEMENTAL ADULT PROBATION**

Councilmember Shetler: Next would be Circuit Court Supplemental. Nothing on the Property Tax Board of Appeals, PTABOA, Area Plan, County Commissioners, so we're at Circuit Court Supplemental Adult, which is on page 142, and that's to set that in at \$12,000, I'm sorry, line item 3620 and that's to set that in at \$12,000. That's the transfer, if you recall back a while, a couple motions ago, Circuit Court, we took seven out of and put \$7,000 into this account then.

Line Item	Description	Requested	Cut	Approved
2600-3620	Copy Machine Lease	5,000	(7,000)	12,000

Councilmember Shetler: No changes on any of the rest of the areas of the budget that I have. So a motion to approve the budget from where we stopped a while back here. I think it was from Highway Department on up to, well, through the rest of the budget.

President Lloyd: Legal Aid/United Way is the last one.

Councilmember Bassemier: Well, I got a question on –

President Lloyd: Okay, well, there is a motion, is there a second?

Councilmember Kiefer: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Shetler, second Mr. Kiefer. Question, Mr. Bassemier?

TOURISM CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT

Councilmember Bassemier: 160? Are we –

President Lloyd: Are you saying page 160?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes, page 160. That's the Sports Complex. We're getting ready to wrap this up and I've got some questions on 160.

President Lloyd: Page 160.

Councilmember Bassemier: Yeah, that's the Sports Complex and we're talking about approving \$1,170,000 to go towards, I guess, the Sports Complex out there at the stadium, is that correct?

President Lloyd: Okay, this is in the Convention Bureau, Tourism Capital Improvement Fund, page 160. I'm not sure that that's what that's dedicated for. And I guess we need to find out.

Councilmember Bassemier: Well, its got Sports Complex.

Councilmember Raben: Yeah, it actually is. That's one that we'll want to make the appropriate adjustment to in September.

Councilmember Bassemier: And, Tom, what did you set that in at?

Councilmember Shetler: That, actually, I haven't yet. Part of my motion that I'm going to amend that went from the County Highway to the end of the budget was to also set aside the 2000, 3000 and 4000 accounts as listed. We would post those as listed, so that wasn't really dealt with until just now and we need to move that one out of there.

Councilmember Bassemier: We're going to take that separately then.

Councilmember Shetler: Right.

Councilmember Raben: Well, we can – before we act on anything on this today, I don't think any of us know if any part of this might be for contractual stuff like engineering and all the feasibility studies they've already done, but what we do today, we can fix at our final meeting in September, so –

Councilmember Bassemier: So you want to table this? You –

Councilmember Raben: We can let it stay in there as it is today and when we finalize our budget September, what is it, September 16?

President Lloyd: 8th.

Councilmember Bassemier: I'm not sure I feel comfortable with that. Let's say we all vote it in today and then we've got to vote it back in, I mean, address it again, and –

Councilmember Raben: Yeah, unless you know that there's no contractual obligations for the work that they've already had done, that this accounts for. I don't know the answer to that question, so that's why I said. Any one of us are welcome to get that answer for what this speaks for between now and next week. I just, before we –

President Lloyd: I think Mr. Bassemier would like us to pull this budget out, Tourism Capital Improvement, is there any thoughts to that?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yeah, I think that's not a –

President Lloyd: Approve everything else and pull this budget out.

Councilmember Bassemier: So we get all –

Councilmember Kiefer: Approve everything else and pull that part out.

Councilmember Bassemier: And then we can address it, if that's okay with you?

Councilmember Raben: Yeah, I thought you were talking about zero this out today.

Councilmember Bassemier: No.

Councilmember Shetler: I will amend my motion to exclude that.

Councilmember Kiefer: And I will amend my second.

President Lloyd: Okay, so 3600 Tourism Capital Improvement \$1,545,000 is not in your motion and we will consider that September 8th.

Councilmember Kiefer: Correct.

President Lloyd: All other amendment changes.

Councilmember Bassemier: Right, and the reason why I'd like to do that, I'd like to find out if that, if we're going to have to back those bonds up with the County Option Income Tax like she mentioned and these other bonds. I think we've got – she's right, we have some unanswered questions here. And that would be great if we could get some of those answers by the next week or so, that would be great. Thank you, sir.

President Lloyd: Any other questions? Then the seconder, was that you, Mr. Kiefer? Are you –

Councilmember Kiefer: Yeah, I amended the second. Thank you.

President Lloyd: Okay, any other questions? Roll call vote please?

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. Budget amendments approved seven/zero.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

President Lloyd: Do we have, Mr. Shetler, any kind of idea of what the total we've approved today?

Councilmember Shetler: We are in the neighborhood of \$63,790,359. Not that I'm giving you an exact number or anything, but –

President Lloyd: Right, okay, so that's what we've cut so far and then that does not include any proposed pay raise for county employees.

Councilmember Shetler: That's correct. That's where we're sitting at the present day.

President Lloyd: What was that number again?

Councilmember Shetler: \$63,790,359, which is pretty flat from last year. It's pretty equal to where we were last year.

President Lloyd: I think last year was 63,590,000, something like that.

Councilmember Raben: Yeah, 2.5 million in cuts is what –

Councilmember Shetler: Almost 2.6 million dollars in cuts.

President Lloyd: Okay, thank you for all your hard work. Any other matters to come before the county budget hearing? We will recess until September 8th. Is there a motion to recess?

Councilmember Raben: So moved.

President Lloyd: All in favor?

(All Councilmembers voted aye)

President Lloyd: Thank you. We're recessed.

(The meeting was recessed at 10:59 a.m.)

VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL

President Russell Lloyd, Jr.

Vice President James Raben

Councilmember Joe Kiefer

Councilmember Mike Goebel

Councilmember Tom Shetler, Jr.

Councilmember Ed Bassemier

Councilmember Stephanie Terry

Recorded and transcribed by Teri Lukeman.

**VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL
BUDGET ADOPTION MEETING
SEPTEMBER 8, 2010**

The Vanderburgh County Council met in session this 8th day of September, 2010 in room 301 of the Civic Center Complex. The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m. by County Council President Russell Lloyd.

President Lloyd: I'd like to open the meeting, Vanderburgh County Council final 2011 budget hearing, September 8, 2010. Attendance roll call please.

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

President Lloyd: Is there a motion for approval of the minutes, or we don't have that, do we? Scratch that. Okay, this is the final budget hearing and our purpose is to complete this adoption of the county 2011 budget, establish the salaries and all employee benefits and also recommend to the state what would be the proposed tax rate for the county. Today, the chair will only recognize Councilmembers until after the finance chair has completed his duties. At this time I'm going to ask Councilman Tom Shetler, the finance chair to begin with the corrections, amendments, and additions to the 2011 budget. Councilman Shetler?

<p style="text-align: center;">2011 SALARY ORDINANCE, SALARIES FOR CVB EMPLOYEES, FICA AND PERF</p>
--

Councilmember Shetler: First I make a motion that all eligible full-time county employees receive a one and a half percent raise for the year 2011 as listed in the 2011 salary ordinance for all salaries in accordance with the county salary ordinance. All Convention & Visitors Bureau employees receive a one and a half percent raise for the year 2011. Move that all salaries and rates as listed in the 2011 salary ordinance be approved and make the salary ordinance a part of the record. All FICA and PERF to be adjusted accordingly.

Councilmember Raben: I'll second that motion.

President Lloyd: Okay, that's a motion, right?

Councilmember Shetler: Correct.

President Lloyd: Motion Mr. Shetler, second Mr. Raben. Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Councilmember Kiefer: Mr. President? I just wanted to say, I think it's good and I'm glad that we're able to give this one point five percent raise and I think it's done

because of the hard work of this Council cutting the budget and finding places to get that money to give that pay raise.

President Lloyd: Thank you, and I would echo that, that it was one of our goals this year to find a way to give the county employees a pay increase. This was a very difficult budget and it looks like the future budgets are not going to be any easier, but I'm glad we were able to do that in 2011. Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Again, I'd like to say, I'm not taking a salary increase and also I'd like to see all the county employees get a two percent raise instead of one and a half percent raise. I think they deserve the same amount as the city is getting, so I'm going to vote no. I think the county employees deserve a two percent. They deserve more, but I think asking for a half percent more is not out of the question. Thank you, and I vote no.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. Motion passes six to one.

(Motion carried 6-1/Councilmember Bassemier opposed)

President Lloyd: Go back to Councilman Shetler.

SALARY ORDINANCE EXHIBITS A THROUGH H
--

Councilmember Shetler: Okay, in the Salary Ordinance, move that Exhibits A through H be approved as listed in the 2011 Salary Ordinance. That would be towards the back of the book in the Salary Ordinance that you all received.

President Lloyd: So this is List A?

Councilmember Shetler: A through H. I'm moving that we approve the whole section.

Councilmember Bassemier: What page is that?

Councilmember Shetler: Basically, let's see, page number would be page 1, but it's in that last section that says salary schedules. What we're doing is adjusting all the salary schedules by one and a half percent, essentially.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion by Mr. Shetler. Is there a second?

Councilmember Raben: Second.

President Lloyd: So in your Salary Ordinance, it's, as he indicated, the salary schedule. Second Mr. Raben. Any discussion? So this is a one and a half percent increase on the salary schedules. If not, roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. Salary Ordinance changes pass six to one.

(Motion carried 6-1/Councilmember Bassemier opposed)

President Lloyd: We had a request from the County Recorder to speak to Council before we approve these budgets. I'd like to ask Z Tuley – is she here? There she is. Come forward please. Good morning.

Z Tuley: Good morning, Z Tuley, Vanderburgh County Recorder. I have been asked by this Council to fund my own computer services support. I think that there

are a few things that I would like to say. I think that funding my own computer support and looking to assist the county in its financial needs is a matter of perspective. My job is to record and preserve the records of this county. This is exactly what I'm doing with the Perpetuation Fund that was established to fund this goal. I won't break this fund and become a financial burden to this Council. I am, and I will continue to spend out of the fund in a responsible pace that keeps up with the incoming revenue that I have coming in and the ability of my staff to keep up with the new recordings and the current customer service demands. This Council currently only supplies salary, insurance and PERF for my staff. The perpetuation fund supplies every pen, paper, toner cartridge, printer, copier and all of these items are burdensome for you to have to supply to all of the other offices. The Recorder's office is a revenue generator for the county general fund. For every \$18 deed, the County General Fund receives \$8 of that. \$5 stays in my office, and \$5 goes to the County Surveyor. The Perpetuation Fund is not invested separately, and therefore does not have the interest flowing back into that fund. Rather, I still believe that it is invested as general monies on deposit and that interest, therefore, flows back into the County General Fund. I also consider the request to be a little unfair. There are other county offices and city/county shared departments that acquire user fees such as my office, the County Surveyor, as I mentioned before, is one of them. Are these offices receiving the same request from the Council to supply funding for their computer services with the contracted MRC Corporation? As far as I know, they're not. However, I do realize that the same state that has lifted the financial burden of my office that you have to bear, has also put forward unfunded mandates and extreme cuts to every county. Finances were better yesterday than today, and they're perhaps better today than they will be tomorrow. Last year at the AIC, I believe it was Tony Wolfe from Gibson County that was talking about the potential damage of county revenue from the tax caps. These financial woes are expected to continue until 2012 and after that, the full impact is still not known. Within the bounds of Indiana Code, I have been cooperative when the opportunity has presented itself. Last year, computer services and MRC expressed the need of a new server. I put forward \$16,000 out of the Recorder's Perpetuation Fund to secure my office a new server, which was then added to a farm so that my office as well as other offices in case of breakdown, would be backed up by another server continuing to run. Two weeks ago, I expressed to this Council that I was willing to pay for my own computer refresh program and today I will offer to pay my fair share of the 2011 MRC, that the Recorder's Office bears. I recognize your financial difficulties, however, I did not create them. I did not, at any time, decline to comply with your request. This request was dropped on me a week ago yesterday and it takes time to retrieve State Board of Accounts opinions. I have read Indiana Code 36-2-7.10 many times, and I felt like your request may fall into a gray area. So, therefore, I asked the State Board of Accounts to give me their opinion. The County Recorder may use any money -- emphasis on the word, may, which means can -- if it was a requirement as a must, it would read, shall -- in this fund without appropriation -- I'm trying not to read the whole thing, not to skip anything, but just for speed's sake, computer service support for county's Recorder system is an important part of the record keeping system and equipment. Therefore, during an audit of the county, we do not take exception to the use of the Recorder's Perpetuation Fund for the computer support in the Recorder's Office. However, we would expect that the Recorder would show us the documentation to support the amount paid. Since this contract covers computer support for more than just the Recorder's Office, the contract alone will not be sufficient. The county will need to provide the documentation showing the calculation of the \$97,000 is a reasonable calculation of the cost of services. They did not find the attached simple

math of \$97,000, the 5.36% to be adequate. So, therefore, I am going to request that documentation. I would like to review it and forward it to the State Board of Accounts for their approval as well, to make sure that they meant what they said and give them what they need. So given the current financial struggles of the county, as law allows, I will directly pay the MRC or Matt Arvay line or whatever, for computer support, once the supporting documentation has been submitted. I suspect, although, through the email, Russ, that you sent me, it states it was a one-time request, I believe that the Council will continue this practice and I believe that the Recorder's Office will be expected to pay their share of computer services every year from now on. Therefore, I will be seeking bids for computer services as a responsible officeholder should do. I will be expected to pay these services, so then I expect to be able to have some say in the vendor. I also expect to have some say in the services rendered and how much those services cost. And perhaps I can save money with a separate vendor, and perhaps I can't, but I'll be looking into it.

President Lloyd: Questions from Council? Mr. Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Z, I just want to say thank you. I appreciate your cooperation and help with this matter. And I do agree with you, that if you're paying, I think it's a good idea to check with vendors and it's a sore spot, I think, for a lot of county officeholders as well as people in the city, on computer services. So I think that's a good idea and thank you. Appreciate it.

Z Tuley: You're welcome.

President Lloyd: I guess one comment, the calculation was done by the number of devices divided by the total budget, but what we can do is provide that for each department, and then it's possible that number could change.

Z Tuley: It is possible. The 28 computers that I have, --

President Lloyd: Well, it's 28 devices, so I guess that would also be printers and whatever.

Z Tuley: Fourteen of the -- I think I have 28 computers. Fourteen of those are view/print only. They are not functional in any other way.

President Lloyd: Those are available to the public to look at recorded deeds and --

Z Tuley: Correct.

President Lloyd: Okay. Mr. Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Will you, I think it would probably be good if the President of the Council sent computer services a memo stating or requesting all the requirements that Z has laid forth and make it as easy on her as possible to submit the approval to the state.

Z Tuley: Thank you.

President Lloyd: Okay. I guess a question maybe for the County Auditor, we don't, I guess we don't necessarily have a figure to use at this time. How would you

recommend proceeding? This is the final budget adoption.

Bill Fluty: I guess with Z saying she may, but today, I guess you could raise the computer service line item by that \$97,000 to account for it.

President Lloyd: Well, as of right now, we assume that it would not be done, and so we didn't account for it.

Bill Fluty: You could appropriate it at a later date. Two options.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, we need for today, we need to go ahead and reduce computer services line by 97,000.

President Lloyd: Okay, assuming that this would be approved by State Board of Accounts?

Bill Fluty: And, if not, you would just appropriate and –

President Lloyd: Have to go back and fix it.

Bill Fluty: That's correct.

President Lloyd: Okay. And I know the Council Attorney had looked at the statute on the Recorder's Perpetuation Fund. We wouldn't have asked the request if we didn't feel that it was a legal request. But it is, I mean, there is a possibility you'll have different Council members next year. There may be some reason Council would not request this. I think that's why, at least from my end, it was a one-time request and obviously, we would see how things are next year. You may have – the 800,000 in the Perpetuation Fund, you may have other plans, uses, needs for it and I don't think it would be fair to ask for a multi-year agreement. I think it's got to be done one year at a time, and we just happened to do it this year. So we appreciate your work on that.

Z Tuley: You're welcome.

President Lloyd: Any other questions? Mr. Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: I don't have any real comment on Z's situation. I think it was pretty clear and she's done her homework. Just in general, we brought up some specific ideas about monitors, people having two computers and things like that. Are we going to look further into that or do we have any control once we pass this budget?

President Lloyd: I think we could send Jim Raben into the offices, he can rip out the computers.

Councilmember Raben: Possibly, maybe between now and next year, if we could ask computer services, Matt Arvay, to come before Council and just talk about some of these things in general, and we might need to give them what the pleasure of the Council is moving forward. Can we do that?

President Lloyd: I think because it's become such a large line item, I think we spent more time in Council on the computer budget than we have in the past, but I think

it's been necessary to bring attention to it. So we could bring him here and discuss the computer budget at some future meeting.

Councilmember Raben: So, Mike's point, you know, we need to establish guidelines that he uses going forward, you know, where we don't have people with laptops and desktops, you know, reiterate our position on 27 inch monitors and things of that nature, so a little guidance from the Council certainly wouldn't hurt.

President Lloyd: Okay. Any other, Mr. Goebel, question or –

Councilmember Goebel: I just think that's a pretty large component of our budget and we should probably have a clearer idea of exactly how the funds are being spent.

Councilmember Shetler: And keep in mind, that's why it is in our budget so that we do have control over that as it gets disbursed, so the point is well taken. And that's precisely why it was done that way so that we will have control over that, so we have time.

Councilmember Goebel: Okay, we do have time.

Councilmember Shetler: We have time. And they'll report to us as they start the refresh and the new computers and all that so we have a general idea, that would be great.

President Lloyd: Okay, any other – great. Thank you very much. Thanks, Z.

LIST A/CORRECTED POSITION TITLES AND SALARIES
--

President Lloyd: Okay, we want to head on to item six. Mr. Shetler.

Councilmember Shetler: Yeah, okay, if you all will take note of the List A, you might double check the listings of the salaries and the position title changes in the budget book. And I would move that we approve List A and make it part of the record.

Councilmember Kiefer: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Shetler, second Mr. Kiefer. Any questions, discussion? Mr. Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Has nothing to do with salaries, right?

Councilmember Shetler: Yeah, List A does.

President Lloyd: It's all salaries on List A. It's Sheriff, Public Defender and Superior Court. There's some technical corrections, I believe, to comply with state law.

Councilmember Shetler: These are all positions that are dictated by state law to be within a certain percentage of the Prosecutor's salary and stuff, so that's where that comes into play.

Councilmember Bassemier: State law. Okay, thank you.

President Lloyd: Any other questions? Mr. Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Do you have a second?

President Lloyd: Yeah, Mr. Kiefer. Okay, roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. List A passes, corrections, seven to zero.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

LIST B/ADDITIONAL CUTS/ADDITIONS/CHANGES

Councilmember Shetler: Okay, I think all of the Councilmembers have received a List B, which is some additional cuts or additions that have been made. I would like for you to make one further change based on the County Recorder's comments a few moments ago, and that is to change the County Council's line 1480-3860 Contractual Computer from \$1,624,551 to \$1,527,551. That reflects the \$97,000. If there happens to be a discrepancy on the 5.6% or whatever that figure we were using, if there is a discrepancy on that, it will be a matter of change, a small amount of money there, so I don't think that it will affect that greatly. I move that List B be made part of the record, and approved as such.

Councilmember Kiefer: Second.

President Lloyd: Discussion? Do we want to bring up, let's bring up the Convention & Visitors Bureau, since that's on this budget. Krista Lockyear and Kristen Tucker. We were handed a memo by the Convention & Visitors Bureau about the Tourism

Capital Improvement Fund request, Sports Complex.

Krista Lockyear: Thank you. Krista Lockyear and Kristen Tucker on behalf of the Convention & Visitors Bureau. Members of Council, we understand you wanted a written rationale for the line item for the sports complex. The board of the bureau has voted to allocate all of the unrestricted capital tourism funds to development of the sports complex. We didn't provide a written rationale previously because this was done last year as well. So I apologize for not having done that. But, again, the board just wants everybody to be aware that they don't want those unrestricted funds to be available for any other projects other than the sports complex. As we all know, it's still in the development and design phase, so I don't have exact numbers for you and as those come forward, of course, you would be presented with those.

President Lloyd: Questions from Council? Mr. Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Ma'am, a month or so ago, it was mentioned, the bonding company was here and they told us, naturally, the whole idea is to fund this with the Innkeepers Tax. Also the bonding company said that we would also probably back it up with the County Option Income Tax, is that true?

Krista Lockyear: That's an option that the financing department is looking at or the group that the CVB has hired to look at funding. We've also received some indication that that may not be a preferred backup plan, so they are looking into options for bonds that would not require County Option as a backup as a debt service item.

Councilmember Bassemier: But we don't know for sure?

Krista Lockyear: No, we don't. It will depend on timing of the bond issue and what type of bonds we do ultimately pursue.

Councilmember Bassemier: But they're going to want it backed up by more than just Innkeepers Tax?

Krista Lockyear: It's possible, and again, the financing folks that we've hired are looking into the availability of backing it up only with Innkeepers but we just don't know at this point. And again, some of that will depend on the final figures for the complex itself.

Councilmember Bassemier: But they won't guarantee it's only going to be with Innkeepers Tax?

Krista Lockyear: At this point, we just don't have those figures.

Councilmember Bassemier: Okay.

Councilmember Shetler: I might point out to Council real quick that the very last item on the List B that you have, we were reducing that from \$970,000 down to \$200,000, and that was to make sure, we did give them tacit approval a few weeks or a month or so ago, to at least complete the footwork that they started some time ago, so that they could bring a solid program to the county and to the entire community on this. And we gave them the okay to proceed on that. This would

allow them enough seed money to continue on with that and proceed as we had directed them a month or so ago. So it is not giving approval for this project in any way, shape or form, but merely to come up with the financial details, the architectural designs, the things that they're going to need to come up with a good, solid plan for our community.

Councilmember Kiefer: Mr. President? Krista, I have a question. I know there's a public hearing coming up, I read it in the newspaper. Is the location and obviously the costs are not finalized because you just said that they don't know all the costs, but is the location pretty much, is that pretty much pinned down that it's there at the Wesselman's Park area or is there still some opportunity that there is consideration for another location?

Krista Lockyear: The Parks Department has and the Department of Natural Resources have both indicated that before they absolutely give the approval on that location, that we provide environmental impact studies, if you will, it's not exactly that technical, but studies on the potential impact of noise, light, traffic, in the area on Wesselman Park. We're in the process of doing that, have contracted with some engineers that are referred to in that memo that I provided you, to do those studies and we should have those available for the Parks meeting. I believe at the Parks Board meeting or shortly thereafter, the intent would be to finalize Wesselman Park as the location.

Councilmember Kiefer: I think some of the heartache, at least from constituents that I hear, are one, on the cost of the project. Again, a lot of complaints that, you know, hey, eighteen million, or whatever, is way too much money, so I don't know if that's something that's being taken into consideration on the overall price tag, because there's probably going to be a few people losing some elections because people are concerned about the price tag. And I don't know if that's been expressed to you or not.

Krista Lockyear: We have heard that and, again, as I indicated, that design has been somewhat of a moving target. If you recall a couple weeks ago, the board hosted a two day public input session where folks from the softball/baseball community and the general public were invited to come in and give their input on the design. There were a few developments that occurred as a result of that, there was a greater buffer provided close to Wesselman Woods, some practice areas, and some things that may change the final price tag on that project. Keep in mind, the Roberts Stadium site, as it stands now, has a continued cost versus bringing it down will eliminate some of that continued cost. So there's some give and take in the price tag, at this point, and the Bureau has approved a not to exceed amount. There's not been a set price tag or total cost determined at this point. And that's still part of that design.

Councilmember Kiefer: I think, and I don't want to speak for everybody on this Council, but I think the overall cost is probably going to be one of our biggest concerns.

Krista Lockyear: Understood.

Councilmember Raben: Mr. President, we've kind of gotten off on a conversation that's for another day. I think we need to stick to budget matters and, again, just to say it once again, as Tom pointed out, in acting today is probably providing enough

money for contracts that they may already be committed to and nothing beyond that. This is in no way a signal or an approval for the complex. So we might be letting you out of the trap on what you already have committed, but no further than that today.

President Lloyd: Well, the proposal on the memo is to take the request down to \$200,000, and with the rationale, the Council could raise that in the future pending the project going forward if that would be approved. And I know, just real quickly, I know, Mr. Dunn, we had had conversations about lowering the cost of the project and I know he's working on that and also, he was going to get us a schedule from the bond attorneys about, I think he's working on that as well, so we wanted to look at those things, too. Mr. Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: And just to reiterate, this is not out of taxpayer dollars, this is out of hotel fees, the \$200,000 we're approving today, so it's really, it's cost neutral to the Vanderburgh County residents.

President Lloyd: Right. Any other questions? Okay, appreciate it. Thank you very much.

Krista Lockyear: Thank you.

President Lloyd: Okay, we'll go back to Mr. Shetler. We need a motion and a second on List B and we had the one change on the computer.

Councilmember Raben: I'll second that motion. I don't know if there was a second or not.

President Lloyd: I don't think you made a motion yet, did you?

Councilmember Shetler: Yeah.

President Lloyd: Oh, okay, I'm sorry. Okay, motion Mr. Shetler, second Mr. Raben. Any other discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. List B, motion passes seven/zero. Turn it back to Mr. Shetler.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

2011 INSURANCE BUDGET

Councilmember Shetler: I think everyone has received on their desks, the insurance budget for the year 2011. I would move that the County Council approve the 2011 insurance budget as listed. These figures represent the county's share of the current health plans with the total employee contribution of eight percent. These figures are for full-time and county employees and it does not include insurance for Superior Court magistrates, make this as part of the record, if you would please. So that's in the form of a motion.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion for the Insurance budget as listed. Is there a second?

Councilmember Kiefer: Second.

President Lloyd: Motion Mr. Shetler, second Mr. Kiefer. Any discussion? This would be continuing the practice that we've had a long time for the total insurance, the employee portion. Okay, roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: As I mentioned earlier, I'm not going to take a salary increase. I'm also not going to take the health insurance from the county. But I'm going to vote yes for everything else. I'm not taking out the county health insurance.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. That passes seven/zero.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

2000, 3000 AND 4000 ACCOUNTS

President Lloyd: Move on to establish county tax rate, Mr. Shetler.

Councilmember Shetler: I would move that all other 2000, 3000 and 4000 accounts for the 2011 budget be adopted as previously approved for the following: 911 Emergency Service, Area Plan Commission, Auditor, Auditor/Reassessment, Bond Issue, Burdette Park, Circuit Court, Circuit Court Supplemental Adult Probation, Convention & Visitors Commission, Convention Center Operating Fund, the Coroner, the County Treasurer, County Assessor, County Assessor/Reassessment, County Recorder, County Clerk, County Commissioners, County Commissioners/CCD Fund, County Council, County Highway, County Cooperative Extension, County Surveyor, Cumulative 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-Check Recovery, Prosecutor Drug Law Enforcement Program, Prosecutor IV-D, Prosecutor Pretrial Diversion, Prosecutor Stop Domestic Violence, Prosecutor Victims/Witness Assistance Program, Prosecutors 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, Voters Registration, Weights & Measures. And I hope I don't need to repeat that.

Councilmember Raben: Just glad to hear somebody else have to read that this year. I'll second.

President Lloyd: Okay, there's a motion for all 2000, 3000 and 4000, Mr. Shetler, second Mr. Raben. Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. Motion passes seven/zero.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

COUNTY TAX RATE

President Lloyd: Now we'll go to item 9, establish county tax rate.

Councilmember Shetler: Make a motion that the County Council set a county tax rate as deemed appropriate by the Indiana State Tax Commissioners following their review of our budget.

Councilmember Raben: I'll second.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Shetler, second Mr. Raben. Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes, and hopefully that rate will stay constant or be only a tiny amount of increase, but, I mean, all our hard work goes into that, and we're trying to keep that property tax rate as low as possible.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

CUMULATIVE BRIDGE TAX RATE

President Lloyd: Move on to item ten, Cumulative Bridge tax rate.

Councilmember Shetler: Move to set in the Cum Bridge tax rate at three cents per one hundred dollars assessed valuation.

Councilmember Raben: I'll second.

President Lloyd: Motion Mr. Shetler, second Mr. Raben. Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. Cum Bridge rate passes seven/zero.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

<p>COUNTY OPTION INCOME TAX DESIGNATION TO LOCAL ROADS & STREETS FUND</p>
--

President Lloyd: Move on to item eleven.

Councilmember Shetler: Motion to set in one million dollars from the COIT to Local Roads & Streets Fund.

Councilmember Raben: I'll second.

President Lloyd: Okay, this is a long-standing practice of this Council that we would take a million dollars out of the COIT funds that we receive and put it in Local Roads & Streets, with the hope of funding additional road projects as well as supporting that department financially. We're able to do that this year, we'll just have to see how things look next year with the cut in the COIT. So, I mean, it's difficult, I'm glad that we're able to do that this year. Any other discussion on that? This has been going on for at least ten years, right, Jim? Ten years or so. And I think part of it was motor vehicle highway monies are reduced to some extent to counties, and the Council wanted to supplement it.

Councilmember Raben: Correct.

President Lloyd: Okay, roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Thanks for the background information, and my vote is yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. That passes seven/zero.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

President Lloyd: I guess to try to close this up, I'd like to thank all the Councilmembers for their work on this budget. Difficult budget, and that's why we're looking at ways to alleviate the pressure on the General Fund and we know next year that General Fund balance is going to be going down. I'd like to thank our new finance chair, Tom Shetler, for his work on this budget and the staff that's helped us, Sandie Deig, Sarah Nunn, and Teri Lukeman. And then I also wanted to mention Bill Fluty has had sixteen years in the Auditor's Office, eight as Chief Deputy and eight as Auditor, and for Councilmembers, he's been a very valuable resource and he knows where the funds are, the different funds, and when we have difficult financial questions, he's very helpful to us in that regard. We appreciate all your help, Bill. And we know next year, you're going to be somewhere else. You're not going to be in the Auditor's Office, but anyway, we look forward to seeing you and wish you the best. Any other members of the Council have any other closing thoughts on this budget? Mr. Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: Yeah, I would like to thank, really, all the department heads and all the elected officeholders. You know, not only just putting this budget together, but I think throughout the whole year, we've seen fewer requests for additional appropriations this year than I think we have in a long time, and that's to be commended, I think for each and every officeholder that's out there, that they really have recognized the difficulty that we have before us with the state, as Z had mentioned earlier, setting some unfunded mandates on us and requirements. And not that I think that's a bad thing, I think keeping the cost of county government down is a good thing, I just wish the federal government could take our example at heart and follow our lead of following with a balanced budget. But I do want to thank all of the elected officeholders and department heads for all that they've done not only for this budget, but throughout the whole year on holding down the line on the cost of government. So, thank you.

President Lloyd: Alright, that's very well said. Mr. Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Just to add to that, I think the fact that we were able to balance the budget and offer a one point five percent increase this year and particularly to maintain benefits for the employees is a tremendous statement for the work that went through this Council. And I also would like to say, as Mr. Shetler mentioned, that department leaders and elected officials came through with basically flat lined requests and that made this work a lot easier. So, thank all of them.

President Lloyd: And I would echo that, too. Thank you, all the elected officeholders and department heads. We saw some budgets even decrease. I mean, there's been a lot of hard work and we've just got a certain amount of revenue, property tax revenue, COIT and a few miscellaneous funds, and that's what we have to deal with. We can't manufacture money or make up new amounts of money, so it's been difficult, we know it's going to be difficult in the future. And if there's not anything else, any member of the public want to comment on the budget before we wrap this up?

Councilmember Shetler: I might just point out real quickly, kind of going through

some numbers here. Last year, we approved or had a budget set up of \$63,570,000 and some change. This year, it looks like we're at \$63,404,000 and some change. So, job well done by all. Thank you.

President Lloyd: So actual dollars going to be decreasing \$170,000 or so. That's well done. Alright, is there a motion to adjourn the county budget hearings?

Councilmember Shetler: So moved.

President Lloyd: Is there a second?

Councilmember Kiefer: Second.

President Lloyd: We are adjourned. Thank you.

(There being no further business to come before the Council, the meeting was adjourned at 9:40 a.m.)

VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL

President Russell Lloyd, Jr.

Vice President James Raben

Councilmember Joe Kiefer

Councilmember Mike Goebel

Councilmember Tom Shetler, Jr.

Councilmember Ed Bassemier

Councilmember Stephanie Terry

Recorded and transcribed by Teri Lukeman.

**VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL
SPECIAL MEETING
SEPTEMBER 8, 2010**

The Vanderburgh County Council met in special session this 8th day of September 2010 in room 301 of the Civic Center Complex. The meeting was called to order at 8:48 a.m. by County Council President Russell Lloyd, Jr.

President Lloyd: I'd like to call to order the special meeting of the Vanderburgh County Council September 8, 2010. Attendance roll call please.

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

President Lloyd: For the Pledge of Allegiance, please stand. I'd like Councilman Goebel to lead us.

(Pledge of Allegiance was given)

TRANSFER REQUEST

ELECTION OFFICE

President Lloyd: Thank you. We have one item on the agenda for the special meeting, or no, we have two items, I'm sorry. The first item is a transfer, so I'll turn that over to the finance chair, Mr. Shetler.

Councilmember Shetler: Yes, you'll recall we discussed this, I believe, last year, late spring, the idea of on the voting by remote locations, if there was a shortage, if we couldn't come up with some more efficiencies that the Clerk would come back and ask for an appropriation or a transfer to keep the remote locations active, and that's what this is for. We need to put the money in there immediately and then I'm looking that we may have an appropriation come down the line here in a little bit on that. But this is, for the time being, a transfer from line 1170 to 1120, for an Election Assistant, \$15,000. The County Clerk is here if anybody has any questions.

Councilmember Raben: I make a motion to approve.

President Lloyd: Okay, is there a second?

Councilmember Shetler: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Raben, second Mr. Shetler and Mr. Bassemier. Any discussion? I guess for the public's point of view, this would allow early voting to start October 11, two weeks earlier than the current money that is available. So this would allow people to vote in the five public libraries prior to election day for

three weeks instead of one week. So, any other questions? Madam Clerk, do you have anything to add?

Susan Kirk: I just want to let the Council know, that actually, even though you're appropriating this money, you know, just like in 2008, if those 20,000 people that voted at the libraries voted by mail, it would have cost more money. So I don't want the taxpayers to think that because you're granting this, that it's just, oh, it's going to cost more. Actually, when you even it all out, it's going to be about the same, whether we, you know, it's just more convenient for the voters. Okay?

President Lloyd: Mr. Goebel, question?

Councilmember Goebel: Susie, is this a comparable time to the '08 election? The three week window or do we have a longer time in that presidential year?

Susan Kirk: Normally, in this election, I wish my crystal ball worked, because it would tell me how many people are going to show up. But the election board voted to either have early voting ten or fifteen days, depending on the election, only in general elections. So, because we're not sure what the turnout is going to be, it may be big again, who knows? We would rather be prepared rather than not prepared.

Councilmember Goebel: Was there, in '08, though, a three-week window like now?

Susan Kirk: That's when we voted over 20,000 people at the libraries.

Councilmember Goebel: Okay, thank you.

President Lloyd: And then the starting date for absentee voting would be October 4th, which is 30 days prior?

Susan Kirk: Correct.

President Lloyd: And that would be in the Civic Center –

Susan Kirk: In the Election Office.

President Lloyd: Room 200?

Susan Kirk: 214.

President Lloyd: 214. Okay, any other questions? Typically, this not being a presidential year, you'd have less turnout.

Susan Kirk: That's true. Normally, this is the lowest voter turnout, but you know, things are kind of stirring up a little bit and you're never too sure, and we only have one day, it isn't like we can say, oh yeah, we'll come back and appropriate money. We have to be able to work. Hopefully, maybe we'll be able to give you some back. Return some.

President Lloyd: Right, I think this is a good thing for the public that they can vote in the libraries, which they seemed to take that with gusto in '08.

Susan Kirk: It is. It's, and like I said, when you weigh the cost, it's really not costing that much because if they didn't do it there, they'd be doing it by paper ballot, which

we still have to have people hired up there to do it. So it's really not going to be a bigger cost to the taxpayers.

President Lloyd: What are the hours for early voting?

Susan Kirk: Monday through Thursday it's going to be from noon until seven, and on Friday it will be from noon until six.

President Lloyd: And then what's the Election Office?

Susan Kirk: The Election Office is from eight to four, and then the two Saturdays prior to the Election we'll also be open from eight to four.

President Lloyd: Okay. And there's no, anybody can vote absentee for any reason? I mean, there's no, you don't have to be out of the county?

Susan Kirk: That is correct. Early voting, you can vote just because you want to vote early. Otherwise, if you're voting by mail or by travel board, you have to have a reason.

President Lloyd: And you would have to live in that location, what, thirty days prior to the election. So, like if you register to vote, you have to register prior to October 4?

Susan Kirk: You do. You have to register thirty days prior to election. If you should move within that thirty days, when you go to the polls and vote, there is a VRG4 form that the poll workers will fill out, that will transfer your registration, so the next time you go to vote, you'll go to the new spot.

President Lloyd: Okay. Any other questions from Council? Great, thank you very much. There is a motion and a second, any other discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. The transfer passes seven/zero.

ELECTION OFFICE		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1210-1170	Election Judge	15,000.00	15,000.00
To: 1210-1120-1210	Election Assistant	15,000.00	15,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

BOARD APPOINTMENT TO VANDERBURGH COUNTY REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

President Lloyd: Okay, and then we have an appointment to the Vanderburgh County Redevelopment Commission, and I'd like to appoint Jan Meeks, Realtor with Summit Real Estate to that board to fill the unexpired term of Bob Musgrave, who resigned. Any questions on that? All those in favor, signify by saying aye. Or, I'm sorry, we have to have a roll call. I'm trying to speed things up. We need a motion and a second for that.

Councilmember Shetler: So moved.

President Lloyd: Is there a second?

Councilmember Terry: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Shetler, second Ms. Terry. Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. Appointment approved seven/zero.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

President Lloyd: Any other discussion before Council? If not, entertain a motion to adjourn.

Councilmember Shetler: So moved.

President Lloyd: Is there a second?

Councilmember Terry: Second.

President Lloyd: We are adjourned. Thank you.

(There being no further business to come before the Council, the meeting was adjourned at 8:55 a.m.)

VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL

President Russell Lloyd, Jr.

Vice President James Raben

Councilmember Joe Kiefer

Councilmember Mike Goebel

Councilmember Tom Shetler, Jr.

Councilmember Ed Bassemier

Councilmember Stephanie Terry

Recorded and transcribed by Teri Lukeman.

**VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL
TAXING UNIT
BUDGET REVIEW
SEPTEMBER 29, 2010**

The Vanderburgh County Council met in session this 29th day of September, 2010 in room 301 of the Civic Center Complex. The meeting was called to order at 9:03 a.m. by County Council President Russell Lloyd, Jr.

President Lloyd: I would like to go ahead and start Vanderburgh County Council’s review of civil taxing units, September 29, 2010. Could we have the attendance roll call please?

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

President Lloyd: For the Pledge of Allegiance I would like Councilman Kiefer to lead us. Please stand.

(The Pledge of Allegiance was given.)

President Lloyd: Okay, this is the review of the civil taxing units. These are other units of government, and the legislature has deemed the County Council to have a public hearing and review on these budgets. These are non-binding votes that we send a recommendation to the Indiana Department of Local Government Finance on these budgets, although, obviously, we can make recommendations or differ from the agency, and then that would go to the State to, for their determination. Any questions from Council before we get started? It’s something we’ve done in the past, the last couple of years. Okay, item 4A, Evansville-Vanderburgh County Public Library will be first up.

EVANSVILLE VANDERBURGH PUBLIC LIBRARY

Marcia Au: Good morning, President Lloyd, Councilmembers. I’m Marcia Au, Director of the Evansville Vanderburgh Public Library. I’m here this morning to answer any questions that you may have about our budget. Before that, however, we would like to show you a very brief three and a half minute presentation of our 2009 annual report, which may help put some of the budget numbers in perspective for you when you see the kind of work we’ve been doing.

President Lloyd: Okay.

Marcia Au: So, with that–

President Lloyd: Great.

(Video presentation was given.)

Marcia Au: Those are highlights of our 2009 service to this community. I would like to say that we work with over 37 organizations within the county, including Aurora. I was glad to see Ms. Hayes here this morning. We do participate in their annual client affair that they have and have been working with other organizations to speak to some of those same issues. As we were putting together our budget I thought it might be helpful today, and we have two very quick slides that will show you where our 2009 revenue sources came from. The pie chart is pretty easy to see. I'm a visual person myself, so I appreciate visuals. Property taxes, of course, is the larger part of that pie, but also County Option Income Tax, which makes up 26 percent of our annual budget, miscellaneous taxes, excise, CVET, banking taxes, fines/fees a much smaller part, and federal/state revenue a very, very small part. The next slide will show us our 2009 operating fund expenditures. We're working with 2009 because that's our latest complete year. Salaries at 58 percent, which is well below the national average. Supplies and services, which is everything except materials, which is 16 percent. So, that will include all of our utilities, building works, contract services, etcetera. Then, our target, again, for 2011, and we should be right on track for pretty much those same percentages both for this year, 2010, and next year, 2011. Personnel, between 55 and 60 percent; materials, 15 to 20; supplies and services, 25 to 30. We thought that might, Council might find that helpful knowing where we bring it in and where it goes to. There was, in your packet, included a return on investment for 2009 from the money that we brought in, total monies, including the tax monies. We put out approximately \$353 worth of services to each person in Vanderburgh County. We're working with our legislature to make sure, we're active legislatively to gain every advantage we can for providing library services to this community. That includes things like the Department of Energy grant that we were able to get and put solar panels on the roof at Central. We're involved currently in strategic planning, which we're looking at alternate revenue generation, building efficiencies and collaborative programming. Again, reducing cost and still providing world class service to the residents of Vanderburgh County. Workforce planning, we look at every job opening, we look at how every job is done, we're looking at work processes to make sure that, again, we're using every dollar wisely. I think our benefits management is extraordinary. We're looking at only a five percent increase in health care costs, and actually this year we were rebated \$75,000 that went into our general fund from our insurance plan based on the excellent use that we've had. We're looking at technology and process efficiencies. We're going to be moving to what we call fat client computer, which is computer with hard drive to thin client technology, which will not only use less energy, it will become much more efficient and will require less replacement costs. So, with that, I would also add that in October we will bring back to you a request to refinance our general obligation bonds. We refinanced our lease bonds in 2005 saving both percentage and number of years, and in 2011, if the rates are well below what we have now, we'll be refinancing, but we will need Council's approval before we go to do that. Again, we're anticipating a savings, both shortening those loans and reducing the interest rate. So, with that, I would be happy to answer any questions. I have Greg Hager here, who is the Director at Willard Library, and he could answer any questions you might have about the Willard operation. As you know, as the county library, we actually submit the budget for Willard. It's the special library fund. You did have information in your packet about their finance as well. So, with that, I would happy to entertain any questions.

President Lloyd: Questions from Council? Mr. Kiefer, then Mr. Shetler, then Mr. Goebel.

Councilmember Kiefer: Marcia, first I would like to say, you know, say thank you. I can tell by your presentation you guys really do a lot for the community and it looks great, the number of lives that you touch. Just would be interested to know, on the gold sheet, you have proposed tax rates versus certified tax rate.

Marcia Au: Yes.

Councilmember Kiefer: Can you explain a little bit about the difference between the certified and the proposed tax rate and the differences between the two?

Marcia Au: The proposed tax rate are the advertised rates. That's what DLGF advises us to advertise, and then when it's actually certified, you'll see in, I think, every case here, it's lower. We have to advertise at the rate at which they tell us we need to in order to be able to achieve our budget. So, that's the difference, so it falls back. It would never exceed this amount.

Councilmember Kiefer: I know, and I understand that, but I was just curious, how do you make up the difference between the certified tax rate and the proposed tax rate? Because you're submitting the proposed based upon your budget, right?

Marcia Au: Based on the budget, and on 85 percent of the total assessed value.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay.

Marcia Au: As that changes and we have, we know what the actual rate is, it's a process, Joe, that always is, we always end up with reduced. So, we're not making up a difference. It's just that, and maybe Mr. Fluty could add to that explanation a little bit about the difference between what's advertised and what's certified.

President Lloyd: Mr. Fluty?

Bill Fluty: When she's preparing her budget she doesn't know what the net assessed valuation is, but, by law, if she would advertise the higher number too low and the assessed valuation would come in different, it would prohibit her from collecting the taxes needed. So, this is inflated for that protection. As soon as the net assessed valuation comes in, it will come back closer to a similar rate of last year.

Marcia Au: It's really an issue of process.

Bill Fluty: Yes.

Marcia Au: And the timing of the process. We have to do it before we have all of that information. So, as soon as we get it, then, when it's certified, it certifies at the lower number.

Councilmember Kiefer: So, it looks like your annual increases on the certified side are much smaller than what it looks like you're getting on the proposed side.

Marcia Au: Correct.

President Lloyd: Over last year proposed it's like 2.8 percent.

Councilmember Kiefer: Yeah. Okay, thank you.

President Lloyd: Mr. Shetler was next.

Councilmember Shetler: Alright, is there an increase in your budget or a decrease in your budget from 2010?

Marcia Au: Just—

Councilmember Shetler: Overall.

Marcia Au: —under half a percent increase, about \$56,000 increase over last year.

Councilmember Shetler: Do you have any additional employees that you're budgeting for in 2011 that you don't have in the 2010 budget?

Marcia Au: I think most of our changes in our employees, if you will allow me, when we have a position vacated, we many times restructure that. So I believe the only thing that we have that's included is we're taking a foundation development position from part time to full time for next year. We really think, in the long run, that will be good. If you'll notice the personnel portion of the budget, that's actually a decrease over last year, which, again, was a decrease over the year before. So, we have 148, I'm sorry, 158 FTE, 117 full time, 92 part time positions budgeted for next year. I believe only one of those is new.

Councilmember Shetler: Okay. You had mentioned, the person you had just said, you know, elaborated on a little bit on the, is that like a grant writer then you said?

Marcia Au: That will include—

Councilmember Shetler: Or foundation.

Marcia Au: — some grant writing, yes.

Councilmember Shetler: Okay, do they, does that position also do lobbying efforts at the state?

Marcia Au: No, we don't lobby. Actually, the—

Councilmember Shetler: I don't mean in the sense that we think of lobbying for causes, as much as seeking out whether or not, you know, if there are funding mechanisms available through the federal or state government through different grants.

Marcia Au: Actually, I'm more that person. I stay in touch through the Indiana Library Federation, served as the legislative network coordinator for about 18 years, just stepped down from that job, but, am still involved with legislation at that level. We work for libraries across the state, not just for EVPL.

Councilmember Shetler: Alright, you know, I might suggest, and I don't know if this would be of any service or not, but the County Commissioners, six or seven years

ago engaged a law firm basically to do some lobbying efforts for them to be able to seek out funds that could possibly be available. I know that, at the time, we picked up quite a few extra dollars that we didn't know that would be out there that, you know, the Association of County Governments, or whatever, all these other federations did not really pick up, you know, for us. You may be able to just, you know, call the Commissioners up and say, hey, maybe that guy could help us out a little bit, or put us on the radar scope here, and maybe there would be some extra monies there, I don't know.

Marcia Au: I would be happy to do that.

Councilmember Shetler: One other question, that is, do you have a pay increase anticipated for the year 2011?

Marcia Au: One percent across the board for all staff.

Councilmember Shetler: Okay. Alright, thank you.

President Lloyd: Mr. Goebel was next, then Mr. Raben.

Councilmember Goebel: Marcia, if you could, I'm sorry, if you could explain the library improvement reserve fund. I know you added that into—

Marcia Au: We've always had the library, well, since its inception we've had the library improvement reserve fund available to us to use. I would say we use it in lieu of capital projects. It's money that we may put aside and designate, in the same manner we designate for the regular budget for projects. We'll use those for technology, overhauls if you will, building, next year part of that, well, almost all of that money will be designated for replacement of the HVAC plant at the Red Bank branch, which is in sore need of replacement. So, that's what we use that money for, and we try to set aside some every year so that we don't have to take from some other operating account, particularly for facilities projects.

Councilmember Goebel: Okay, so, this is, in this particular case, would be bricks and mortar?

Marcia Au: Yes.

Councilmember Goebel: Okay.

Marcia Au: And many units across the state, many library units have had capital projects funds. Now, the changes in the regulations regarding those funds have, most libraries are now phasing those out, because it impacts their bottom line on total levy increase. But, we've never had one here, so, that's, in fact, what we use library improvement for.

Councilmember Goebel: Okay, and just aside, I think what the public libraries offer all Vanderburgh County residents is just phenomenal, and the way that you stay ahead of the game and the programs that you provide, it really makes this community look like a progressive, forward thinking, forward moving community. Thank you.

Marcia Au: You're quite welcome, and we're quite pleased to offer that service and work with the county and the city in any way we can.

President Lloyd: Mr. Raben.

Councilmember Raben: Yes, how many employees does the library have?

Marcia Au: 116, and 92 part time, and that vacillates a little bit depending on vacancies, but those are the positions that we have currently this year.

Councilmember Raben: 92 part time?

Marcia Au: It's 158.41 FTE. That operates eight locations, and provides 24,400 plus hours of public contact service every year.

Councilmember Raben: Alright. You know, one of the items, as you look at your breakdown, and if you could go there, would be employee benefits.

Marcia Au: Certainly.

Councilmember Raben: In looking at these expenses for 2010 and projected, or requested for 2011, it seems, it's overwhelming the amount of the money for 116 full time employees, looking at, and the only thing I have to compare that to is our Vanderburgh County budget, which is about, this is about 20 percent of what we spend for 650 employees.

Marcia Au: Twenty percent of—

Councilmember Raben: Of the cost for 650....could we go through those items, one through 17, and just kind of discuss those? I see, you know, as an example, health insurance, I mean, the life insurance and so forth. What all is included? What benefit package are we offering full time employees?

Marcia Au: If I could back up for just one moment, I would (Inaudible) to say that we have a significant number of employees with either bachelors or masters degrees, so it would be more akin probably to the School Corporation's budget in terms of personnel, in just terms of pay, salary scale, and we do stay on top of the salary scale. We do market analysis, we do job evaluation on a regular basis to make sure that we're in the market, not below and not above, but for this area, okay? So, just, I want to make that point, because sometimes if you're not comparing apples to apples in terms of the kind of employees that you're working with, you could, things could get out of whack. Now, you had a question about the life insurance—

Councilmember Raben: Let's just go through the benefits one by one if we can and kind of explain to us and, if you compared it to, you know, what's available and what we manage within our standard county budget.

Marcia Au: Okay, well, social security and medicare, of course, are federally regulated. As you can see, that's actually less dollars. Unemployment, there's an addition there, because for the last several years the state has run a credit. We're self-funded for that. If we weren't self-funded and we paid into the state pool that number would be much larger, but, in fact, we had an employee who was collecting who was not supposed to be collecting, and he's having to pay back in. He's since

moved away from the community. So, we've had some credits. Those credits are going to be exhausted in this next year, so, that's the reason for that. Dental insurance, pension, pension, again, is given to us, the percentage is given to us by the state. If you have an older workforce, you're going to end up having to pay more into the state pension. Every year we get a new number, and, Jan, what was that percentage? Seven and a half for next year? I thought it went to nine and a quarter next year. Yes, it was 7.5 this year, it's going to 8.5 next year. So, again, we don't have any control over that.

President Lloyd: Are you guys in PERF, or is it a separate library—

Marcia Au: No, it's PERF.

President Lloyd: Okay, so you guys are in PERF. They send us, and I'm assuming they compute that for every unit. So, if you have much younger employees that number is much lower. Vision, health, those are pretty standard, and our employees all pay a portion of those costs. Uniforms—

Councilmember Raben: What percentage do they pay?

Marcia Au: Well, I'm not going to be able to tell you for vision and dental, because I don't have those numbers, I don't think, let me just look here very quickly. For the health insurance, for a single payer, they pay ten percent, for family we pay 64 and they pay the rest. Let me just see if I can get that number. I brought so many sheets of numbers here. No, I'm sorry, I don't, I don't have those, but we could certainly provide you that information, if you, I would be happy to get that to you. Disability, occupational/medical screening, I mean, disability insurance, I'm not sure whether the county offers that. We've offered it for a number of years, and that's a very small increase.

Councilmember Raben: So, the employee assistance, what is that?

Marcia Au: Through Welborn, and it's been, it's been more heavily used possibly this year than it has been in previous years. But, if you have someone who is going through a traumatic event, a divorce, a family illness, they do counseling on a number of fronts. They do mental health counseling, they do financial counseling, and some very basic legal service. We've had that for a number of years. You asked about the life insurance, that's basic life insurance, replacing salary up to, I think the cut off is \$50,000. That's while they're an employee only. None of our benefits, with the exception of carrying people who are 62 and retire from 62 to 65, we have no pension that the library is responsible for beyond PERF. Occupational/medical screening, because we have custodial people on staff and they have to keep up their shots, etcetera, we have that included in there. Then, the deferred comp plan, which we've had for probably about ten years, at this point. Were there any other questions?

President Lloyd: Let me throw out a question while he's looking. Is Willard on the same basic employee benefit plans?

Marcia Au: Actually, they participate, but if you would like to speak to that. They participate with us in our health plans.

President Lloyd: Okay.

Greg Hager: We do participate in a collective health plan as part of the same employer group.

President Lloyd: Right.

Greg Hager: Other benefits that Willard provides, we provide through AFLAC Insurance.

President Lloyd: Okay, are you guys in PERF, the state pension?

Greg Hager: Yeah.

President Lloyd: Okay. Was that, any other questions, Jim? Okay, let's see, who was next? Anybody else? I should have asked this earlier, but, I guess, on the rainy day fund, you just made a policy decision to use those funds on other capital projects?

Marcia Au: No, we made a policy to use those funds in an emergency.

President Lloyd: Oh, okay.

Marcia Au: So, and the carry over to next year will be approximately \$1.2 million. It's about what the state recommends you keep, and not knowing what the tax cap—

President Lloyd: Right.

Marcia Au: —cuts are going to bring to us next year, we want to make sure we pay our bonds. We have enough money to provide the services that the county has come to expect.

President Lloyd: You know, the other question I had on the County Option Income Tax, we know from the county's point of view it's going to be a reduction next year due to the recession. I don't know if you had factored that into your revenues or not.

Marcia Au: Yes, we did.

President Lloyd: Okay, which is a problem.

Marcia Au: Yes. I think that will probably continue to decrease over the next several years. If we can believe the information that we're getting from the state, and we are. So, we will continue to look at budget, very careful budgeting, or budget reductions.

President Lloyd: The other thing is, I know you were partnered with Work One, so a lot of people that have lost their jobs go to the library and use your online services, which—

Marcia Au: Very heavily.

President Lloyd: Heavily, and, I guess, that traffic's gone up quite a bit—

Marcia Au: It has.

President Lloyd: – in the recession.

Marcia Au: We're also providing free classes at East Branch Library, Vincennes University is providing some additional training. We work with Ivy Tech, 37 organizations, and we've been hit very, very hard this year by people who are, have been outsourced or otherwise are looking for jobs, or looking for skills. Our computer classes, which again are free, have been just full to the brim, and we've added extra sessions so that we can help provide, people who come in who don't know what a mouse is. You might chuckle, but that's a sad state of affairs in this day and age when many of the corporations require you to apply online.

President Lloyd: Right.

Marcia Au: When they have to apply for their benefits and they don't know how to, you know, get into the computer system. So, we do really (Inaudible) one on one, as well as classes for folks.

President Lloyd: Right, I mean, that's just, there's a lot of services that we may not be aware of that the library certainly does a wonderful job on. Mr. Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: When your employees retire, are they on some kind of insurance plan? Can they stay on the plan?

Marcia Au: They can only stay on from 62 to 65.

Councilmember Bassemier: Then medicare picks up.

Marcia Au: Then they have to cycle off, and there's a state organization, the retired, REPA, the retired employees have a supplemental plan. Then, of course, medicare, they would have that, but we don't, we don't pay, and it's 50 percent. They pay 50, we pay 50.

Councilmember Bassemier: Okay, that's, thank you.

President Lloyd: Other questions? Mr. Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yeah, you know, with the reduction in COIT that you've got calculated in, what are you using to make up that loss in revenues?

Marcia Au: We're not necessarily making it up. We're budgeting smarter.

Councilmember Raben: Okay, we're not changing the property tax.

Marcia Au: We're not, well, what do you mean by changing?

Councilmember Raben: Rate.

Marcia Au: The rate here that we've advertised, I guess, the 13, last year we advertised .013, I'm sorry, .1292 for operating, and we're advertising, and it came in at .1084. This year we've advertised at .1328, and I'm guessing it won't come in more than at .11-something. That's just a guess, but we're spending more wisely. We're not increasing budgets for materials. We're not adding, we will be cutting some additional part time staff through attrition as jobs become vacant, not rehiring.

And we hope to make extra efforts for grants, which will allow us to continue and evolve some programming that will be more beneficial to the community, and which we won't be having to charge the taxpayers for.

Councilmember Raben: Did you quote on what you think it will come in at?

Marcia Au: I'm just guessing, based on previous years' experience, and I can't go out four numbers, but I'm guessing it will be a .11-something.

Councilmember Raben: Okay.

Marcia Au: That's eleven cents on the one hundred dollars.

Councilmember Raben: Increase.

Marcia Au: Well, tax rate.

Councilmember Raben: Right.

Marcia Au: It's not an increase over the previous year.

Councilmember Raben: But, it's, the, yeah, this year it's .1084.

Marcia Au: Yes, it's just a little over ten cents.

President Lloyd: Okay, is there a motion to approve the library budget?

Councilmember Shetler: So moved.

President Lloyd: Is there a second?

Councilmember Bassemier: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Shetler, second Mr. Bassemier. Roll call vote please?

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

President Lloyd: Thank you, Marcia, very informative. Appreciate it.

Marcia Au: Thank you very much.

President Lloyd: We'll submit that to the state with no changes.

TOWN OF DARMSTADT

President Lloyd: Okay, 4B, Town of Darmstadt. Get your Darmstadt budget out. Good morning.

Mallory Lowe: Good morning. I'm the Darmstadt Clerk Treasurer, Mallory Lowe. Our budget should be a lot simpler than the library's. We didn't have any tremendous changes this year. We did over inflate just a tad in our MVH and Local Road and Street, just hoping to get the money to pay for roads. But, I believe those will both probably get cut down in the spring. Otherwise, everything else is about the same as it was last year. If you have any questions.

President Lloyd: Questions for Darmstadt? Did your budget, overall, go up?

Mallory Lowe: Slightly, in a couple of the funds, I believe, general just went up about \$10,000, our MVH went up \$34,000, not much more than last year.

President Lloyd: Okay, any other questions? Mr. Shetler, this is in your district, any questions for Darmstadt?

Councilmember Shetler: Any salary increases?

Mallory Lowe: No, we didn't have any last year and not (Inaudible) this year.

Councilmember Shetler: Thank you.

President Lloyd: You generally run a pretty tight ship up there. If not, I would entertain a motion to approve the Town of Darmstadt as submitted.

Councilmember Shetler: So moved.

President Lloyd: Is there a second?

Councilmember Raben: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Shetler, second Mr. Raben. Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. Passes 7-0, will be approved by Council as submitted.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

President Lloyd: Thank you.

Mallory Lowe: Thank you.

EVANSVILLE VANDERBURGH AIRPORT AUTHORITY

President Lloyd: Item 4C, Evansville Vanderburgh Airport Authority.

Doug Joest: Good morning, I'm Doug Joest, the Interim Manager and Treasurer of the Evansville-Vanderburgh Airport Authority. I'm here to answer any questions about our budget.

President Lloyd: You have one of your staff on Council, Mr. Bassemier.

Doug Joest: Yeah, I told him not to help me.

President Lloyd: Alright. Mr. Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: Doug, looking over the personal services here, the employees that you have listed, out of these positions, how many of them are currently vacant?

Doug Joest: Okay, there's currently three vacant positions on this list: the Airport Manager, the Assistant Manager, which were people that left, and there was a position in there, Assistant Chief, that was not filled. Its never been filled, but it was in the budget.

Councilmember Shetler: Okay, and that's never been filled, it's never–

Doug Joest: Right.

Councilmember Shetler: –their position was put in....the Assistant Manager has been vacant for?

Doug Joest: About a year and a half.

Councilmember Shetler: Okay.

Doug Joest: And, Mr. Working retired about two or three months ago.

Councilmember Shetler: Okay, well, obviously they're out looking for a Director–

Doug Joest: Yes.

Councilmember Shetler: –and dealing with things?

Doug Joest: I consider myself a candidate.

Councilmember Shetler: Yes.

Doug Joest: Hopefully, I'll get serious consideration for that.

Councilmember Shetler: I don't mean to put anybody, tie anybody in a position here where they come in and they feel as if they need more people, but, by the same token, what better time, you know, to really look at this and to say, you know, we don't have an Assistant Fire Chief or something. I mean, we've created that position, yet we've never filled it. I know that the request for next year is actually down from what the request was last year, but it's still \$50,000, plus other things that we would be budgeting for. Myself, I would, you know, it follows along the philosophy that we tried to put in play here for the last couple of years, and that is, you know, when we have vacancies, if we have an unnecessary position, I don't necessarily want to say, I guess, without knowing further, but we have a position that's, you know, vacant from the get go, this tells me that perhaps it's not as necessary as it might be that we would, you know, maybe eliminate that position so that there's....it makes it a little bit more difficult if the new boss, be it you or someone else, walks in and says hey, I want an Assistant Chief, you know, or whatever.

Doug Joest: Well, one reason it's been vacant is because, like everyone else with the economy we've been cutting back, and we decided not to fill that when, you know, just because it was in the budget, we didn't fill it. Obviously, I've left things

in this budget with, just to provide for flexibility when the new manager, be it myself or someone else, can come in and rearrange the organization, based on current events.

Councilmember Shetler: This question perhaps may not be for you, maybe it's for our colleague here that could answer it, but, you know, as I see it too, I know that you're within the City Fire Department, I don't know, quarter of a mile, half a mile, it's pretty darn close to Lynch Road, and then we're dealing with the volunteer there at McCutchanville—

Doug Joest: Right.

Councilmember Shetler: —that's probably a quarter to a half mile the other way. So, is there a cooperative agreement with those? I mean, I assume that if they get the message they are going to get there quickly in an emergency.

Doug Joest: That's a good question. Just, what, three weeks, maybe two weeks ago, we had, we're required to annually have an emergency plan exercise to go through our written plan that the FAA has approved. We had over 19 agencies out where we went through a desktop exercise. We went through that whole process if we would have an incident at the airport. Certainly those organizations are critical to that, but there's hospitals and so on and so forth.

Councilmember Shetler: So—

Doug Joest: But, to your point, this person would do, if we would decide to fill that, that person would do more than just direct the firefighting activities, because fortunately that's a very rare occasion. That's more of the TSA enforcement rules we have to live by day in and day out. That was the purpose of why that position was established, but, again, we've been making do without filling it.

Councilmember Shetler: Well, my recommendation would be that we strike that position from the budget book, and then, again, after a person has been settled into the position if they want to come back and argue to reinstate that, then I think that's a proper time myself.

Doug Joest: That's fine. We can do that.

Councilmember Shetler: But, I would like to make a motion, I guess, is that appropriate in this....I don't know whether.

President Lloyd: Yes, what line item is that?

Councilmember Shetler: That's 136.

Doug Joest: It's the last, yeah, 136.

President Lloyd: Oh, Assistant Chief.

Doug Joest: It's the last position on the list there. In fact, I cut it, it was in for \$57,000 last year, I just cut it back to \$50,000.

Councilmember Kiefer: So, the motion is to take that to zero then?

Councilmember Shetler: To strike, yes, to strike that position entirely from the budget.

Councilmember Kiefer: I'll second that.

President Lloyd: Okay, a motion and a second. I guess, we'll just vote on that. We'll just vote on these motions as they come up. Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Abstain.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes.

(Motion carried 6-0/Abstention by Councilmember Bassemier)

President Lloyd: So, when we submit our recommendation on the budget, we'll ask that that be stripped to zero. It passes six to zero. Okay, further questions? Mr. Shetler.

Councilmember Shetler: Yeah, let me, along the same lines then, the Assistant Airport Manager, that's, again, been vacated for 18 months.

Doug Joest: Correct.

Councilmember Shetler: Now, sitting where you're sitting today, and using your knowledge of being in the previous position as Treasurer, do you feel like that's a position that, in today's world, now, I know if we get back to the same levels, because we've been running at a deficit here for the last couple of years—

Doug Joest: Right.

Councilmember Shetler: – and we had to tap into using tax funds for operation, which we hadn't done in the 25 years prior to, but I understand, that's the economy and we need a vital airport.

Doug Joest: I can address that, too.

Councilmember Shetler: Yeah, but we need a vital airport, and I don't want to, you know, put the airport in a situation here where it's going to create a problem, and we're not going to be able to service the public adequately or anything like that. But, by the same token, this is kind of along the lines we're dealing with here on Council for the last couple of years, is trying to get folks in a mind set of austerity and they just, since you've got these sitting here, I'm just wondering if that isn't something that we could look at well.

Doug Joest: For the long term, we need that position. I mean, I'm a busy guy right now. I'm going to need some help. Whether, or, the airport is going to need some help whether I'm the ultimate Airport Manager or someone else. We'll need somebody to kind of oversee the specific FAA operations, which is kind of what the Assistant Manager, that's the role he fulfilled when he was here. Now, I'm kind of doing that and the Manager and Treasurer's job. I don't know if that answers your question.

Councilmember Shetler: Right, yeah, I know right now, it's overwhelming, I'm certain.

Doug Joest: It's alright.

Councilmember Shetler: Alright, thank you.

President Lloyd: Mr. Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay, just out of curiosity, you have these percent changes down here, and every one of them is different, you know.

Doug Joest: That's because some employees have step increases because of their years of service.

Councilmember Kiefer: Well, some, I mean, I understand that, but every one of them has a different number. You know, starting from the top on down there's a different percentage number.

Doug Joest: Well, if you look under the position, that's the number of people in those positions, and that's the accumulated amount for those positions. The increase, for example, I've got four, the second line–

Councilmember Kiefer: So–

Doug Joest: –112.

Councilmember Kiefer: So, are all of those maintenance technicians paid differently?

Doug Joest: They're slightly. It's under union contract, but because of their tenure with the airport they have different pay rates, because every three years, basically, people get a \$750 step increase.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay.

Doug Joest: So, that will distort the average rate.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay, right. Okay, but what about like the Airport Manager? There's one there that's showing a 5.63 percent increase, and that's the position that's not filled yet.

Doug Joest: Right.

Councilmember Kiefer: So, I guess, why would we be hiring at \$116,497? Why not at \$110,285 or something? Or, I mean—

Doug Joest: That could be, that's just, I'm sure there was a step increase in there. Also, in some of these positions, there wasn't a raise last year.

Councilmember Kiefer: So, if, for example, you were hired into that position, what would your pay be in 2011? If you were hired into and started January 1, 2011, what would be your pay?

Doug Joest: I guess, it would depend on what the board would establish the starting rate.

Councilmember Kiefer: So, it would not be necessarily at \$116,497?

Doug Joest: Not necessarily, no, we don't...particularly in these open positions, I don't envision that's the rate we're going to hire at. That's just the number that's in the budget. It could be that between a Manager and an Assistant Manager there might be a blend there. I just wanted the dollars in the budget to cover us. Again, not spend all of the dollars that are there. I just wanted some room for me or the ultimate Manager to have some amounts to work with.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay, I guess, I'm just confused why it was scheduled at that higher amount. But, what you're saying is you may not use it, it's just an amount that you've got in there.

Doug Joest: Right.

President Lloyd: I guess, while we're in that subject, was there a general wage increase for airport employees?

Doug Joest: This budget was prepared last spring, and there's a three percent in there. There was a handful of administrative people that didn't get raises several times over the past several years, and there was a higher percentage in there for like three or four people, or five.

President Lloyd: Okay, the county, I guess, our general wage increase was 1.5, and the City of Evansville was 2.0.

Councilmember Shetler: Do you guys follow the city? Or, do you just do whatever? I mean, I don't mean it that way.

Doug Joest: In the past we did whatever you let us, to be honest.

Councilmember Shetler: Yeah, okay. Alright, thank you.

President Lloyd: Mr. Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: I think, for some of the upper management that did not get pay raises they kind of followed the direction of all of the county departments as well, because two years ago no elected officials received pay increase.

Doug Joest: Right, well, there was some non like, I will just say people below me didn't get raises. That's who I'm mainly addressing.

Councilmember Goebel: Well, I'm not sure of each specific case, but that was the general theme, and then last year zero increase, this year 1.5 on a county level. So, I think, what we've tried to do is ask everyone to kind of follow that lead.

Doug Joest: Okay, we'll take that under advisement.

Councilmember Shetler: I make a motion that we go to a one and a half percent increase along the personnel, as opposed to the three percent that's in here.

President Lloyd: Okay.

Councilmember Shetler: Then, the steps and all the other things would figure accordingly, but that, our baseline would be the one and a half percent, rather than the three percent.

President Lloyd: Okay, that's a motion, Mr. Shetler. Is there a second?

Councilmember Raben: Should they mirror more the city than the county? No?

Councilmember Shetler: I was going to take the lesser.

Councilmember Kiefer: I second.

President Lloyd: Well, they're a county, they're a taxing district county-wide.

Councilmember Kiefer: So, there's a first and a second.

President Lloyd: Okay, that would be not including steps which are either union contract or automatic based on longevity. The general wage increase 1.5 percent.

Councilmember Shetler: Correct.

President Lloyd: Okay, that's another motion. Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Abstain.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes.

(Motion carried 6-0/Abstention by Councilmember Bassemier)

President Lloyd: Motion passes six/zero. I think that's probably a prudent move based on just the difficult economic environment where the airport—

Doug Joest: I appreciate that comment. This was prepared not knowing what the—

President Lloyd: Right.

Doug Joest: —environment was going to be.

President Lloyd: Okay. Well, I guess, I look at the airport monthly reports, and I know including depreciation, but anyway the airport is operating at a deficit at this time.

Doug Joest: By design.

President Lloyd: Right.

Doug Joest: That's how the model works with the airline industry.

President Lloyd: Okay.

Doug Joest: Just a quick comment.

President Lloyd: Uh-huh.

Doug Joest: Our 2010 budget, we will probably spend about \$580,000 less than what was budgeted, so again, we just spend what we have to spend as we go along.

President Lloyd: So you've made a lot of cuts, and that's a good thing.

Doug Joest: Yeah.

President Lloyd: I mean, in this environment.

Doug Joest: Basically run it like a business. We do what we can.

President Lloyd: Okay, other questions? Mr. Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: I do have one on the revenue stream.

Doug Joest: Okay.

Councilmember Shetler: The rental cars that are located out there, I know they pay a rental for the space that they occupy.

Doug Joest: Correct.

Councilmember Shetler: Do they also, as part of that contract, do they get, do you get, the airport, do you get a fee for each car that's rented from there?

Doug Joest: Yes, we get a percentage of the rental car contracts.

Councilmember Shetler: Okay, and is that—

Doug Joest: Not only do they pay rent for the counter space, they pay rent for the parking lot area where they build their ready buildings, where they clean up the cars and such, but we also get, I believe, ten percent on the rental contracts.

Councilmember Shetler: Right.

Doug Joest: The rent (Inaudible).

Councilmember Shetler: And, I assume that is down, compared to—

Doug Joest: Yes, that's all driven by our enplanements, which I'll just give you a brief update on that. In 2009 we had about a 25 percent decrease in enplanements. That's basically the number of people getting on the airplanes. So that was a historic low in many, many years. This year we're, year-to-date, up through August, we're up ten percent over last year. So it's not where we want it, but it's in the right direction. Also obviously, the shrinkage in the airline industry, you know, ten years ago we probably had six or seven airlines here. We're down to two. It's not that, we didn't lose these airlines, they just don't exist anymore. So we're kind of fighting that battle, which is kind of why we're now on the general fund tax rate, that's going to drive that. We can't just go to the airlines and keep jacking up the rates because A: they're cutting back, and B: there's fewer of them.

Councilmember Shetler: Well, and as we have more competition, more airlines that also, for the taxpayers helps reduce our cost of buying a ticket out there, because you've got airlines competing for seats. So yeah, I, myself, I would rather see us not jack up the rates and discourage people.

Doug Joest: No, we don't. In fact—

Councilmember Shetler: So, I mean, that's what you're saying, right?

Doug Joest: From 2009 to 2010, I did not increase the airline rates.

Councilmember Shetler: Right.

Doug Joest: We're still negotiating for next year.

Councilmember Shetler: The other side of that is, that the more competition we have, the more planes you have coming in, and it helps businesses get their people in and out. The number one complaint that I hear from business activity as far as economic development is concerned is, you know, the air service, and not your fault, but the fact that, you know, if Evansville had a larger airport or if we had more airlines servicing it, have more times on the board and stuff, they could get their employees in and out in a day or two rather than three or four days.

Doug Joest: Correct.

Councilmember Shetler: It saves them money. So, it, an airport is vital to our community when it comes to economic development. There's no question about that.

Doug Joest: I appreciate that.

President Lloyd: Other questions for the airport? Any other closing comment?

Doug Joest: No, just appreciate the support, and, obviously, we have, to your point on the revenues, we are constantly trying to increase our non-aeronautical revenues through real estate activities and development. It's not a big piece of the pie, but it's another piece so we're not (Inaudible). It's a diversity of our portfolio if you will, of income streams. So, we're doing that, and we're aggressively trying to recruit additional air service in here. I mean, there's not an airline that we haven't talked to, to try and get service here, but they're all kind of in a holding pattern. Just to give you an example, Continental and United are not going to do anything until they get their merger done. That's just one example. So we continually try to do that. One thing in our capital budget for next year, we're going to try to get some loading bridges in here so people don't have to walk out on the ramp to get on the airplane. That's one of the things that I want to try to get done. Any other questions?

President Lloyd: Other questions? Mr. Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Just along those lines, I was wondering if, since the number of carriers are decreasing, I know there's another merger I read about just this week, is there any opportunity for a charter type, specialized services out of the Evansville area?

Doug Joest: That's a function of demand. As a point of fact, Allegiant runs a charter in and out of here at least once a month, maybe every other month to one of their casino destinations. Certainly, that's more of the charter companies to promote, but we can handle, obviously, those types of flights. Those are typically bigger airplanes. I mean, we've handled up to DC10's and Lockheed L1011's as far as aircraft size here.

Councilmember Goebel: I was just wondering what the market is on something like that. Is it growing? Are they starting to flounder as well?

Doug Joest: That, at least the activity here has been steady. Its not been huge, but its not dropped off. Again, it's just one flight every month or so.

Councilmember Goebel: Thank you.

Doug Joest: Sure.

President Lloyd: On, I guess, one minor question on miscellaneous. The Thunderbolt Pass Golf Course, that contract, did the airport make any money on that?

Doug Joest: No, we didn't make any money on it.

President Lloyd: Okay.

Doug Joest: We do have a professional company operating that. We're fulfilling our obligation to the county when we took it over.

President Lloyd: Right. Well, and that's a protective buffer. I know in talking to the golf community that there's quite a bit of play out there, and I've received positive reviews on what you've done.

Doug Joest: Well, thank you. We're trying to spruce it up a little bit. It's a work in progress, obviously.

President Lloyd: Right, and there was some drainage issues that--

Doug Joest: Which we've corrected in the last month. We're going to work on some cart paths through the summer, we'll continue to work on that.

President Lloyd: Was the management company, was that a multi-year contract?

Doug Joest: Yeah, it's a five year contract (Inaudible). In January will be the second year of that, the ending of the third. The second year will be finished into that five year contract. We're real happy with them.

President Lloyd: Yeah.

Doug Joest: They're real go getters. I mean, they have a passion for golf, plus the business of golf.

President Lloyd: I mean, and that serves a real need in this community, so appreciate that. Any other questions?

Councilmember Bassemier: I've got a comment.

President Lloyd: Mr. Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: I would just like to say, not just because Mr. Joest is my boss, I've been out there eight years, he's got a lot on his plate right now, and he's doing an outstanding job. He's looking out for our best interests and the taxpayers' best interest. I can attest to that.

Doug Joest: Thanks, Ed.

Councilmember Bassemier: You're welcome, sir.

President Lloyd: Then, what we're going to have, I would ask a motion to approve the airport budget pending, I guess, the motion including the changes, the two motions that were changes that were brought in by Mr. Shetler.

Councilmember Raben: So moved.

Councilmember Shetler: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Raben, second Mr. Shetler. Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Abstain.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes.

(Motion carried 6-0/Abstention by Councilmember Bassemier)

President Lloyd: Then that recommendation to the state will include eliminating the position of Assistant Chief and a general wage increase of 1.5 percent. Everything else will be the same.

Doug Joest: Alright, thank you.

President Lloyd: Alright, thank you very much, Doug.

Doug Joest: You're welcome.

SOLID WASTE DISTRICT

President Lloyd: Let's go to item 4D, Solid Waste District.

Joe Ballard: Thank you.

President Lloyd: Good morning.

Joe Ballard: Good morning. I'm Joe Ballard, Director for the Solid Waste District. With me is Susan Jeffries, she's the administrator of the Solid Waste District. I was here last month for the public hearing on this. Just briefly, and I can take any questions if you would like, even though the money that's coming into us, and, again, we're not tax funded, we're funded by waste that goes into the landfill. So, you can figure that one out. But, anyway, even though the money that's coming into the landfill, or to us, is better in the last few months, because of more waste going in there, we still have decided to hold the line on the budget. It's still not what it used to be at one time. So, this year we have our budget, this year we've cut our budget again. It's cut by 8.7 percent, or \$37,000. We now have a very frugal budget, I would say, of \$392,304. Last year, as you may remember, I guess, the first year we came here, we cut it 16 percent, because we had some real problems then. The economy was very slow and not much money going into the landfill. So, again, we've cut this year 8.7 percent or \$37,000. So, if there are any questions, I can take them.

President Lloyd: Questions by Councilmembers? Mr. Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: I move we approve.

President Lloyd: Is there a second?

Councilmember Terry: Second.

President Lloyd: I would just like to echo, I serve on that board, and the recession has hit the trash business hard. I mean, no question about it. So, you think about all of the construction activity that's been diminished, all those materials are not going into the landfill. But, it looks like, I mean, this is an extremely frugal budget, and, hopefully, those fees are on the rebound.

Joe Ballard: I was going to say, I think you've seen, we pass that out every month, the landfill totals, and they have gone up the last several months. So, hopefully, that means the economy is going up and we'll do even better.

President Lloyd: Right, last year, hopefully, is the bottom, and now things are coming up. Mr. Raben?

Councilmember Raben: (Inaudible. Microphone not on.)

Joe Ballard: They've told me for the last seven or eight years they have about 15 years left. So, they're into, they don't have any more space there. Well, I shouldn't say that, on this footprint or whatever, they have some additional areas to go in, but they don't have any additional out there. The landfills are into compaction, so, they like compacting what they've got, and, of course, they're building up too. So, I've been told 15 years. I think, of course, this is what I think, once that fills up, I don't foresee them being in Vanderburgh County after that. I mean, their service will be, I don't see the landfill being there anymore. I don't know if there's anymore space frankly. Land is too expensive here.

President Lloyd: I guess you'll be here 15 years from now and you can worry about it. We have a motion and a second. Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

President Lloyd: Thank you, Joe, for coming in. Thank you, Susan.

Joe Ballard: Thank you.

President Lloyd: Okay, that's it on Solid Waste. That will be submitted with no changes to the state.

CITY OF EVANSVILLE

President Lloyd: Now we move on to 4E, City of Evansville.

Jenny Collins: Hi, Jenny Collins, City Controller. As you may have heard through, you know, the past couple months we've been working on the budget, the city has been able to obtain a lot of savings in our budget by making some very tough decisions. You know, one thing that we've done is we were able to save \$1.3 million by eliminating the ambulance service and putting that back on the users that actually use it instead of the taxpayers. We continue to see savings with the Cooperative Purchasing Organization that we took on last year. We were able to save tens of thousands of dollars through the copier initiative that the city took on where we eliminated printers. We no longer have desktop printers. We've all went to the multi-function devices. So, we're seeing some savings there, even on paper. We were able to eliminate several fax phone lines due to the multi-use facilities. We've also, this year we have brought water, the Water and Sewer Utility back in-house, and that is estimated to save \$14 million over the next five years. We refinanced the Parks District bonds to take advantage of the lower interest rates, which is a savings of \$425,000. So, the city continues to look for ways of savings. As far as the budget goes, we had, we are recommending a two percent increase for city employees. It has been two years since the city has seen any type of increase. The city is different from, I believe, the county has a step increase program. The city does not have that. I mean, we do have our union bargaining negotiations, which we do that, but we do not have any sort of step increase program. There are no changes to the employee's health care costs for 2011. We did not put anything back on to the employee's for their health care. We did open up access for bargaining units to use the health care clinic. We are seeing good participation there, and we think that that will also allow us better options for our employees, and, hopefully, able to save them some money and get ahead of chronic diseases by having this health care clinic. With that, I'll take any questions that you may have.

President Lloyd: Mr. Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Jenny, just maybe you can rattle it off the top of your head, but with your copier services that you've changed, can you give an idea to us of what the city is saving by going to this new program?

Jenny Collins: The estimated savings, I haven't seen the real number data, but the estimate when we did the pilot study was tens of thousands of dollars. I mean, you're looking at savings from, you know, utility costs, paper costs, you know, I mean, if people have to physically get up and go get their documents they tend not to print as much. You save on the ink cartridges. We've done the program with Xerox where they come out, and that was part of the cost, they, we don't pay the cost for any more ink cartridges. So, I don't have exact dollars, but, I see a significant change in my office alone.

Councilmember Goebel: Okay, and I think we are entertaining, perhaps, that idea on the county level, I hope.

Councilmember Raben: It's a lot of steps in the right direction.

Jenny Collins: Yeah, the phone lines alone, I mean, I know for our fax line in the City Controllers office, we paid, oh, I want to think it was one of the old Centrex lines, and it was \$35 a month. So, I was able to cut that line out, and we did that through several city offices. So, that was a substantial savings.

President Lloyd: Questions from Council? Looking at the summary sheet, you have a debt service that's rolling off, I guess, it's this sheet here.

Jenny Collins: Uh-huh.

President Lloyd: Fund number 0180, and then you've got a new debt service, so—

Jenny Collins: The new debt service is, last year we, basically, it's replacing some debt that has rolled off. With the savings in the Park Bond it will allow us to keep the tax rate neutral. We're requesting a two million dollar bond for the downtown—

President Lloyd: The arena?

Jenny Collins: No, no, no. No, not the arena. The Front Door Pride, I'm sorry, and the parking garage improvements. We did a bond last year through the Evansville Bond Bank, and then this would be replacing that.

President Lloyd: Okay, so, on here, there were, you would not show anything for the arena, because that's going to be lease revenue, not supported by property tax?

Jenny Collins: Correct.

President Lloyd: Okay. I, your local income tax, you show it going up slightly ,or, is that, am I looking in the wrong place?

Jenny Collins: That could be due to, it's not just, there's other revenue sources that flow through there. It could be from METS, we receive grant monies and sometimes we'll throw that, we'll flow that money through the County Option Income Tax Fund. We did budget for a decrease, and that will be one change that I take to City Council. I just got the final numbers recently, and I'm having to decrease it by \$80,000 anticipated revenue.

President Lloyd: The, just the COIT line, I know the county we saw over three million, I mean, is that what you guys are looking at?

Jenny Collins: Yeah, it was like a 17.5 percent decrease is what I put in the budget. Like I said, I'm going to have to go back to Council and reduce that figure just slightly, because it was a little bit over that.

President Lloyd: Then, the, on the Water and Sewer being brought in-house, is that effective now, or was that January?

Jenny Collins: No, it's effective now.

President Lloyd: Was that September?

Jenny Collins: Well, we did two phases. We brought sewer in first, and then water in second. I think, June or July was the last round to bringing employees on.

President Lloyd: How is that working out with the ambulance?

Jenny Collins: So far, so good. We, you know, we still have some work on our side from, you know, previous users of the ambulance. So I have some on-going billing that goes on in my office, where people have used the, that we've billed. So other than that, I think the Fire Department has done a great job and stepped up, under the new agreement, and I haven't heard any real issues with changing the services with the ambulance.

President Lloyd: So somebody that can afford to pay, that bill will not come to the city?

Jenny Collins: Correct.

President Lloyd: Okay, I know, when I was Mayor, that was a large cost item, and that was a big chunk of the budget. I mean, it was a hard thing to deal with.

Jenny Collins: It is. It's hard to put that back on the taxpayers.

President Lloyd: Right. Any other questions for the City of Evansville? Is there a motion to approve as submitted?

Councilmember Raben: So moved.

President Lloyd: Is there a second?

Councilmember Goebel: Second.

President Lloyd: Motion Mr. Raben, second was Mr. Goebel. Okay, roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Abstain.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes.

(Motion carried 6-0/Abstention by Councilmember Terry)

President Lloyd: So, from the County Council's view that's six/zero, approved as submitted. Thank you.

Jenny Collins: Thank you.

LEEVE AUTHORITY

President Lloyd: Item 4F, Levee Authority.

Jenny Collins: I'll be here to represent the Levee Authority also.

President Lloyd: Okay.

Jenny Collins: Not much changes in the Levee Authority. I'm sure you all know we've been really working hard with the Corps of Engineers to get our levee certified, which has put a little bit of cost on to the levee that we weren't used to, but that process is going very well. I believe we've got our certification now. I don't know if we've got the official certificate, but things are going well and we were able to make some improvements to the levee that the Corps recommended. I think we're still waiting on maybe the FEMA recommendation of approval, but we've got the Corps. They also are following the city with the two percent increase.

President Lloyd: Okay. Any questions on Levee Authority?

Councilmember Raben: Move approval.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion to approve. Is there a second?

Councilmember Shetler: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion and a second to approve the Levee Authority as submitted. Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

President Lloyd: Levee Authority approved as submitted, seven/zero.

PORT AUTHORITY

President Lloyd: The last one is 4G, Port Authority.

Jenny Collins: The Port Authority is, there's no salaries associated with the Port Authority. It's just maintaining the dock where the LST is. We are currently funding this through our Parks Fund. We fund it with a transfer, so there's no actual tax for the Port Authority. We're just using park revenues to fund this operation. There is no change in the budget. It is the same as last year.

President Lloyd: That's basically a board that meets, I guess, and deals with issues related—

Jenny Collins: Correct.

President Lloyd: —the downtown port?

Jenny Collins: They are doing that through the Parks Department, Dan Schall is heading up that.

President Lloyd: Any questions? Mr. Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: You said this is primarily for the LST?

Jenny Collins: Yes.

Councilmember Goebel: And they just had a great, great run, I understand. So we're very fortunate to have that piece of our history still here. Thank you.

President Lloyd: Mr. Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: Is there any revenue that offsets this?

Jenny Collins: No, not at this time. The only funding is a transfer that is done through the Parks Department.

Councilmember Shetler: Okay so, basically, the \$123,700 and change, that is placed solely on the backs of the taxpayers then?

Jenny Collins: Correct, at this time.

Councilmember Shetler: Right, okay, thank you.

President Lloyd: Is there a motion to approve Port Authority?

Councilmember Raben: So moved.

President Lloyd: Is there a second?

Councilmember Bassemier: Second.

Councilmember Goebel: Second.

President Lloyd: Motion Mr. Raben, second Mr. Bassemier and Mr. Goebel. Any other discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

President Lloyd: Port Authority approved as submitted, seven/zero. Thank you very much, Jenny.

Jenny Collins: Thank you so much.

President Lloyd: Anything else to come before Council? Any member of the public that would wish to speak? If not, I will, this is the first civil taxing unit group. Next week, October 6th we will have civil tax unit hearings on the townships. They had a conference this week. They were unable to attend. So, we broke this into two. So, we'll have the townships next week after the regular Council meeting. Any other discussion? If not, I'll entertain a motion to adjourn.

Councilmember Shetler: So moved.

President Lloyd: Is there a second?

Councilmember Raben: Second.

President Lloyd: All in favor signify by saying aye.

All Councilmembers: Aye.

President Lloyd: We are adjourned. Thank you.

(There being no further business to come before the Council, the meeting was adjourned at 10:14 a.m.)

VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL

President Russell Lloyd, Jr.

Vice President James Raben

Councilmember Joe Kiefer

Councilmember Mike Goebel

Councilmember Tom Shetler, Jr.

Councilmember Ed Bassemier

Councilmember Stephanie Terry

**VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL
OCTOBER 6, 2010**

The Vanderburgh County Council met in session this 6th day of October in room 301 of the Civic Center Complex. The meeting was called to order at 8:32 a.m. by County Council President Russell Lloyd, Jr.

President Lloyd: I'll go ahead and start the Vanderburgh County Council meeting October 6, 2010. Could we have the attendance roll call please?

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

President Lloyd: For the Pledge of Allegiance, I would ask Councilman Kiefer to lead us. Please stand.

(Pledge of Allegiance was given)

APPROVAL OF MINUTES SEPTEMBER 1, 2010
--

President Lloyd: You have minutes from the budget hearings but you just got those this morning so we haven't had a chance to review them. You did receive in the mail minutes from the September 1st regular meeting. Is there a motion to approve those?

Councilmember Kiefer: So moved.

President Lloyd: Is there second?

Councilmember Terry: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, any discussion? All in favor signify by saying aye.

(All Councilmembers voted aye)

President Lloyd: Any opposed?

(No opposing votes were cast)

President Lloyd: Okay, six/zero.

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

APPROPRIATION ORDINANCE

President Lloyd: Item five, appropriation ordinance. I'll turn that over to the Finance Chair, Mr. Shetler.

ELECTION OFFICE

Councilmember Shetler: The first item on the Election Office, it's for an appropriation of \$15,000, that was to extend the early voting. We had transferred some money in there earlier, this is to appropriate the money now into that account to make that account whole. So any questions?

President Lloyd: We had the Clerk in last week to explain it. Mr. Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: I just wondered if we could reiterate exactly the locations for early voting and the date. I know Susie is not here.

Councilmember Shetler: I don't have the locations.

President Lloyd: Well, as of right now, the only early voting is the Civic Center. What is it, room 214, in the Election Office. Then next week, October 11th, it starts in the public libraries, and I believe it's five locations in the libraries: Red Bank, Main, Oaklyn, and I'm not sure which the other ones are.

Councilmember Goebel: I would imagine something would come out in a media release.

President Lloyd: Right. I mean, it's the same ones that there were in 2008, the same library locations.

Councilmember Goebel: Thank you. I think it's a great idea.

President Lloyd: Okay.

Councilmember Shetler: Alright, so I put that in the form of a motion to approve.

President Lloyd: Is there a second?

Councilmember Goebel: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Shetler, second Mr. Goebel. Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. Motion passes 6-0.

ELECTION OFFICE		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1210-1170	Election Judge	15,000.00	15,000.00
Total		15,000.00	15,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION

President Lloyd: Cooperative Extension.

Councilmember Shetler: The next item, and I move for approval on Cooperative Extension, that is a routine request every year, that’s basically from a grant, and I think it’s from St. Mary’s Hospital into that. And it’s for the line item 1900 for FICA for \$462 and line item 1990 for Extra Help \$6,038, total of \$6,500 for the request. So I would make a motion to approve that.

President Lloyd: Is there a second?

Councilmember Terry: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Shetler, second Ms. Terry. Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. Motion passes 6-0.

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1230-1900	FICA	462.00	462.00
1230-1990	Extra Help	6,038.00	6,038.00
Total		6,500.00	6,500.00

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

SUPERINTENDENT OF COUNTY BUILDINGS

President Lloyd: Superintendent of County Buildings.

Councilmember Shetler: That was a request, basically, at the old Courthouse, the utilities are running short in the at account, that line item, of about \$50,000. They're hoping that that's going to take care of them for the rest of the year and I move approval for it.

President Lloyd: Is there a second?

Councilmember Bassemier: Second.

President Lloyd: Motion Mr. Shetler, second Mr. Bassemier. Any discussion? And we had, I guess, Commissioner Tornatta came in and said he thought that would last them the rest of the year. If not, roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. Motion passes 6-0.

SUPERINTENDENT OF COUNTY BUILDINGS		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1310-3200	Utilities	50,000.00	50,000.00
Total		50,000.00	50,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

THE CENTRE

President Lloyd: The Centre.

Councilmember Shetler: The Centre is for Union Overtime, the total is \$5,355, that breaks down the line item 1850 Union Overtime, \$4,500, the FICA related to that of \$360, that’s line item 1900, line item 1910, which is the PERF associated with the \$4,500 payout, \$495, total of \$5,355. And I move for approval.

President Lloyd: Is there a second?

Councilmember Goebel: Second.

President Lloyd: Motion Mr. Shetler, second Mr. Goebel. Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. Motion passes 6-0.

THE CENTRE		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1440-1850	Union Overtime	4,500.00	4,500.00
1440-1900	FICA	360.00	360.00
1440-1910	PERF	495.00	495.00
Total		5,355.00	5,355.00

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

JAIL BOND

President Lloyd: That’s it for general fund, we’ll go to Jail Bond fund appropriation.

Councilmember Shetler: I move approval on this, it’s \$2,100, in the line item 3993.

Councilmember Terry: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Shetler, second Ms. Terry. I guess we had talked about it last week, that the state wants counties to designate this as a separate line item, so that’s why they’re doing it that way. Other discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. Motion passes 6-0.

JAIL BOND		REQUESTED	APPROVED
3661-3993	Jail Bond	2,100.00	2,100.00
Total		2,100.00	2,100.00

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

TRANSFER REQUESTS

President Lloyd: We’ll move on to item number six, transfers. Mr. Shetler.

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION	AREA PLAN
COMMISSIONERS	WEIGHTS & MEASURES
COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS	DRUG & ALCOHOL DEFERRAL
LEGAL AID	CUMULATIVE BRIDGE
REASSESSMENT/COUNTY ASSESSOR	REASSESSMENT/PTABOA
COOPERATIVE EXTENSION (LATE)	SUPERIOR COURT (LATE)

Councilmember Shetler: I have a request from Cooperative Extension of \$1,600 to

move from the 4-H Assistants part-time to Extra Help, that's line item 1990, to the tune of \$1,600. Area Plan Commission, line item 3410 Printing \$250 moving to Garage & Motor for \$250, that's line item 2230. The Commissioners, from line item 3000, that's Bond & Insurance of \$64,000, to Unemployment \$20,000, that's line item 1930, line item 3142 Televised Meetings \$4,000, that's why we're kind of running a little quicker if you noticed today, to kind of cut that cost. Line item 3610 Legal Services \$40,000. Weights & Measures, request to take from Miscellaneous Equipment \$300, line item 4250, to line item 3141, which is Communications for \$300. Community Corrections, from line item 1410 Confinement Officer \$10,000 and a Confinement Officer 1400 \$4,400, to the following line items: 1850 Union Overtime \$10,000, 1530 which is Shift Differential \$1,700, and line item 1300 Case Manager of \$2,700. Drug & Alcohol Deferral Service from line item 3770 Treatment Cost \$520, to line item 4210 Office Furniture of \$520. Legal Aid, from line item 3010 in the amount of \$182, line item 3450 \$300, line item 3600 \$182, line item 3680 \$237, line item 3700 \$18, line item 3730 \$200, all to line item 3140 of \$205, line item 3250 of \$300, line item 3540 to \$182, line item 3990 for \$237, line item 2600 \$195. Cumulative Bridge fund, line item 4417, which is the Baseline Road Bridge of \$160,000, going to University Parkway line item 4422 in the same amount of \$160,000. Reassessment/County Assessor, from line item 1090-3540 Maintenance Contract of \$8,000, going to line item 3130 Travel/Mileage of \$5,000, and line item 2600 Office Supplies for \$3,000. Reassessment/PTABOA from line item 1180 of \$3,000, to line item 2600 Office Supplies of \$3,000. We have a late transfer request which is Cooperative Extension...another one from Cooperative Extension from line item 4220 \$493, to line item 3200 of \$493. Superior Court 3903 in the amount of \$3,000, to line items 3250 of \$2,000 and line item 3947 of \$1,000. I put that in the form of a motion to approve all transfers as read into the –

President Lloyd: Is there a second?

Councilmember Goebel: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Shetler, second Mr. Goebel. We just have a lot of transfers at the end of the year, officeholders are looking to change budget items where appropriate, so any other questions or discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. All transfers pass 6-0.

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1230-1200-1230	4-H Assistants (PT)	1,600.00	1,600.00
To: 1230-1990	Extra Help	1,600.00	1,600.00

AREA PLAN COMMISSION		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1240-3410	Printing	250.00	250.00
To: 1240-2230	Garage & Motor	250.00	250.00

COMMISSIONERS		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1300-3000	Bond & Insurance	64,000.00	64,000.00
To: 1300-1930	Unemployment	20,000.00	20,000.00
1300-3142	Televised Meetings	4,000.00	4,000.00
1300-3610	Legal Services	40,000.00	40,000.00

WEIGHTS & MEASURES		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1302-4250	Miscellaneous Equipment	300.00	300.00
To: 1302-3141	Communications	300.00	300.00

COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1361-1410-1361	Confinement Officer	10,000.00	10,000.00
1361-1400-1361	Confinement Officer	4,400.00	4,400.00
To: 1361-1850	Union Overtime	10,000.00	10,000.00
1361-1530	Shift Differential	1,700.00	1,700.00
1361-1300-1361	Case Manager	2,700.00	2,700.00

DRUG & ALCOHOL DEFERRAL SERVICE		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1371-3770	Treatment Cost	520.00	520.00
To: 1371-4210	Office Furniture	520.00	520.00

LEGAL AID		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1460-3010	Other Insurance	182.00	182.00
1460-3450	Yellow Pages	300.00	300.00
1460-3600	Rent	182.00	182.00
1460-3680	Malpractice Insurance	237.00	237.00
1460-3700	Dues & Subscriptions	18.00	18.00
1460-3730	Continuing Education	200.00	200.00
To: 1460-3140	Telephone	205.00	205.00
1460-3250	Law Books	300.00	300.00
1460-3540	Maintenance Contract	182.00	182.00
1460-3990	Miscellaneous	237.00	237.00
1460-2600	Office Supplies	195.00	195.00

CUMULATIVE BRIDGE		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 2030-4417	Baseline Road Bridge	160,000.00	160,000.00
To: 2030-4422	University Parkway	160,000.00	160,000.00

REASSESSMENT/CO. ASSESSOR		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 2490-1090-3540	Maintenance Contract	8,000.00	8,000.00
To: 2490-1090-3130	Travel/Mileage	5,000.00	5,000.00
2490-1090-2600	Office Supplies	3,000.00	3,000.00

REASSESSMENT/PTABOA		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 2490-1091-1180	PTABOA Member	3,000.00	3,000.00
To: 2490-1091-2600	Office Supplies	3,000.00	3,000.00

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1230-4220	Office Machines	493.00	493.00
To: 1230-3200	Utilities	493.00	493.00

SUPERIOR COURT		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1370-3903	Petit Jurors	3,000.00	3,000.00
To: 1370-3250	Law Books	2,000.00	2,000.00
1370-3947	Pauper Transcripts	1,000.00	1,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

<p align="center">SUPERIOR COURT DRUG COURT REQUEST TO HIRE GRANT EMPLOYEE</p>

President Lloyd: Okay, we'll move on to, there's nothing for item seven, nothing item eight. Item nine, new business, we had item nine A, Commission on Homelessness gave their report last week, so we'll go to item nine B, Superior Court/Drug Court, request to hire grant employee.

Robert Pigman: Good morning. I'm here in my Wayne Trockman disguise this morning standing in for the judge, who is unavailable. I think he sent you a written explanation for what he wants. There is a couple of grants available that will enable him to hire an additional case manager for the Drug Court. This would not require any expenditures out of the local county budget. One is a state grant from the Bureau of Justice and Assistance, and the other is from the Department of Corrections and Judge Trockman has the Department of Corrections commitment to fund this position, if it's necessary, beyond the three years that it's funded from the Bureau of Justice Assistance, if it comes to that. So no additional outlay from the county's budget for this request.

President Lloyd: Okay, any questions for Judge Pigman on behalf of Judge Trockman?

Councilmember Bassemier: Make a motion to approve.

President Lloyd: Okay, is there a second?

Councilmember Goebel: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Bassemier, second Mr. Goebel. Any other discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. That's approved 6-0.

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

<p style="text-align: center;">SUPERIOR COURT REQUEST TO FILL VACANCY</p>
--

Brett Niemeier: Good morning.

President Lloyd: We have your letter, probation officer position.

Brett Niemeier: Yes, and I was here just last month having to fill a position, that unfortunately, someone had resigned and now I am still short another probation officer, and I'd like that to be filled.

President Lloyd: Any questions for Judge Niemeier?

Councilmember Shetler: Judge, and I've spoken with a couple of the other judges about this, but, I guess, kind of to get it more public and on record, but do we have anyone right now in the probation area that is qualified as a psychologist that's on-staff or on board?

Brett Niemeier: No, we do not have a psychologist. We do have a part-time master's level social worker, very part-time.

Councilmember Shetler: Okay. As I understand it, in conversations with some others in law enforcement or connected perhaps with the jail, other judges and stuff, a great deal of the people who come before you guys for doing kind of bad things in our society might be people who might have other kinds of issues that they're dealing with, but that might be a way of really getting to the heart of the problem if we were able to bring in other people. Is that something that you guys have discussed or talked about at all that people who might be trained in that to be able to help facilitate, get people into the right direction so that they get that necessary help?

Brett Niemeier: Any juvenile that's locked up in Vanderburgh County starts out being locked up at the Youth Care Center. The Youth Care Center has implemented a new program where they do an evaluation and assessment. It basically, it's not done by a psychiatrist or a psychologist, but you do have to be trained in giving that assessment. If that assessment determines that there is need for a full evaluation, then that's brought to the court's attention and then the court would order that. Now that's only for kids that are locked up. Kids that are not locked up, they're just coming through normal process, then it's the probation officer's responsibility to determine, based upon the (inaudible) with the parents and the child and looked at the prior history, the mental health history, looking at school documents, for instance, to see whether or not they should be referred out to maybe to Southwest Behavioral

or another agency in town to do that assessment.

Councilmember Shetler: Alright, thank you.

President Lloyd: Other questions? Is there a motion to approve?

Councilmember Shetler: So moved.

President Lloyd: Is there a second?

Councilmember Bassemier: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Shetler, second, was that Ed? Mr. Bassemier? Okay. Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. Motion passes 6-0.

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

<p>SUPERIOR COURT JUVENILE DIVISION REQUEST TO UPGRADE TWO POSITIONS</p>

President Lloyd: Item D, Superior Court Juvenile Division, request to upgrade two positions recommended by Personnel Administration Committee. And that's still you.

Brett Niemeier: Still me, yeah.

Councilmember Bassemier: Motion to approve.

President Lloyd: Okay, is there a second?

Councilmember Terry: Second.

President Lloyd: And this was the Salary Administration Committee meeting September 30th, I believe, and it was to reconfigure positions in your office based on a long-time employee passing. Any other questions on that or...roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes, that's approved 6-0. Thank you, Judge.

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

COUNTY CLERK TRAVEL REQUEST

President Lloyd: Item nine E, Travel Requests, County Clerk, I guess we'll take the Finance Chair, Mr. Shetler, on this.

Councilmember Shetler: On the travel requests? I'm sorry. I think the first one is for the County Clerk, I don't see Susie here. I know she's requesting two people.

President Lloyd: It's a state called meeting.

Councilmember Shetler: Yeah, it's in the middle of December in Indianapolis and it's a state called meeting. Let's see, what was the amount? \$961, yeah, was the total amount. And I'm going to have to presume it's in the budget.

Councilmember Kiefer: It looks like they're sharing the travel arrangements, you know, with one vehicle, so I'll make a motion that we approve.

President Lloyd: Is there a second?

Councilmember Shetler: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Kiefer, second Mr. Shetler. Any discussion? Roll

call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. Travel request for the County Clerk passes 6-0.

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

COUNTY ASSESSOR TRAVEL REQUESTS
--

President Lloyd: County Assessor.

Councilmember Shetler: We have two requests for a state sponsored event for the County Assessor, and it's in the amount of, I think it's \$1,100 total. Six hundred for one and five hundred for the other, is that correct?

President Lloyd: Going to Greensburg, Indiana.

Councilmember Shetler: Is that correct on that, six hundred for one and five hundred for the other?

Jonathan Weaver: Yeah.

Councilmember Shetler: That's the way I was understanding it.

Councilmember Kiefer: What's the difference? I mean, I think the mileage is \$164, so it seems like the one would be 164 minus 600, so I guess I'm confused why it's 500.

Jonathan Weaver: Good morning, Jonathan Weaver, Vanderburgh County Assessor. We can get back to you on that answer. I don't know off the top of my head.

Councilmember Kiefer: Yeah, it looks like one should be 600 and the other should

be like, 436 or, whatever minus.

Jonathan Weaver: Maybe it was rounded, I don't know.

President Lloyd: Maybe they're going to have an extra couple meals or something.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay, well, I'll just make a motion to adjust it to 600 and then the second one being 436.

President Lloyd: Okay, is there a second? Okay, so the motion is to approve.

Jonathan Weaver: The mileage is estimated so, which is why it's rounded to 1,100. So I'd appreciate, since it comes out of the Reassessment fund, that it stay.

President Lloyd: Okay, well, right now we've got a motion and a second for 600 and 436, which would be \$1,036 instead of \$1,100. Either of you want to withdraw your motion or we'll just vote on this and...

Councilmember Kiefer: I guess I'll withdraw my motion then.

President Lloyd: Withdraw the second?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

President Lloyd: Then we need a motion for the original figure.

Councilmember Bassemier: Make a motion to approve.

President Lloyd: Okay, so that will be for the original \$1,100. Is there a second?

Councilmember Terry: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Bassemier, second Ms. Terry. Any other discussion?

Councilmember Shetler: Let me clarify this. Since we're not asking for, necessarily specific isn't nailed down, then are we saying up to six hundred and up to 500? In the motion?

President Lloyd: Yeah. And if they don't spend that it just stays in that budget.

Councilmember Shetler: Okay, thank you.

President Lloyd: Any other discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. Passes 6-0.

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

HEALTH DEPARTMENT TRAVEL REQUESTS
--

President Lloyd: The next is Health Department.

Councilmember Shetler: Alright, the Health Department has several requests: one for \$150 to an annual conference. Another one and it is not state sponsored or state called, another is to one that is, and it's \$1,600, there's three people going to that. Another is a request for \$80, and another one is not requesting any additional amount on it, so a total of \$1,830 total for the Health department.

President Lloyd: Any questions on Health Department?

Councilmember Bassemier: Is that a motion to approve?

Councilmember Shetler: Yeah, that would be a motion then to approve that.

Councilmember Kiefer: Second.

President Lloyd: The breast feeding is like six days long.

Gary Heck: I need to see which one we're talking about on the breast feeding one.

President Lloyd: Well, you've got three people going.

Gary Heck: I don't know that I have a copy of it here in front of me. Is that the one that's in Kentucky?

President Lloyd: No, Jasper, Indiana, Memorial Hospital.

Gary Heck: And is it six days, all at the same time? I'm sorry, I don't have that one in front of me.

President Lloyd: October 19th, 20th, 21st, and November 16th, 17th, and 18th.

Gary Heck: Right, I think they are two different months, three days apart, that's correct. And there are peer breast counselors, they are independent contractors and there is a separate grant fund that covers all of those costs.

President Lloyd: Okay, any other questions on Health Department? Is there a

motion to approve? Or you made it, is there a second?

Councilmember Kiefer: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Shetler, second Mr. Kiefer, roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes, motion passes 6-0.

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

Gary Heck: There is an adult flu clinic tomorrow at the Health Department if anybody is interested. It will be nine dollars, cash or check only. We won't be doing any of the Medicare reimbursements on this particular one since we're also doing school immunizations and we're also doing extended hours on Tuesdays for the Tuesdays in October and November the 9th and the 16th. We won't be doing them on election night. But we'll be open from 3 to 7 for all of the school age folks that need their immunizations caught up so they can continue to go to school and not be excluded. We just wanted to make sure you all were aware of that, and we have extended hours for that. And I appreciate it. Thank you.

President Lloyd: And we know there's quite a few that need that. Mr. Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Gary, the flu shot, this vaccine this year, that includes H1N1?

Gary Heck: Yes, sir, it does.

Councilmember Goebel: So we don't have to go through the drama.

Gary Heck: It won't be a special one this year. I mean, when you get your seasonal flu, it will include the H1N1 as one of the three that's in there.

Councilmember Goebel: Thank you.

Gary Heck: You're welcome.

President Lloyd: Okay, that takes care of travel requests.

CENTRAL DISPATCH REQUEST FOR 911 FUNDS

President Lloyd: Nine F, Central Dispatch request for 911 funds.

Jo Anne Smith: Good morning. In May, I came before this Council to request \$50,586. It was later determined that we were unable to use 911 funds for a high efficiency heat pump or an upgrade to our admin telephone system. What I would like to do with those funds, which is \$12,438, I'm requesting an additional \$1,699 so that we can purchase computers for Central Dispatch with these funds.

Councilmember Bassemier: Make a motion to approve.

President Lloyd: Okay, is there a second?

Councilmember Kiefer: Second.

President Lloyd: Now, this, your request, that's for the county's portion?

Jo Anne Smith: My request is for out of the special capital account.

President Lloyd: Right, out of the 911 account.

Jo Anne Smith: Right.

President Lloyd: And if you look at the letter, the balance in that account in April, \$761,000 approximately.

Jo Anne Smith: Yeah, and then 785 in July.

President Lloyd: Okay. Any questions about Central Dispatch request? So it's just an additional on what we had approved earlier in the year. Mr. Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: Not, a question, really, not even about this per se, but a comment, yesterday, listening to the Mayor of Louisville, Mayor Abramson, he pointed out that one of the most difficult challenges of trying to unify the city and county governments was the fact of centralized dispatch, something that we had done a generation ago. So this community is way ahead of it's time as far as unifying and consolidating many essential services and it's been a real benefit, I think to public safety in our community for a long time, and you've been spear heading that for a long time and so that's a great credit to what you've done. So thank you.

President Lloyd: And I would echo that. Any other questions on the Central Dispatch? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. The motion passes 6-0. Thank you, Ms. Smith.

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

Councilmember Shetler: By the way, on that, I think he mentioned that he spent 75 million dollars in new equipment to try to get that thing updated to bring it into line with what needs to be done today. Just to kind of give you an example of really what we are saving.

Jo Anne Smith: And that's a small chunk.

President Lloyd: That's pretty amazing.

<p>COUNTY ASSESSOR REQUEST FOR AN INCREASE IN PART-TIME PAY</p>
--

President Lloyd: Item nine G, County Assessor, part-time salaries, request for an increase in part-time pay. Any questions on this?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yeah, Mr. President. I noticed you laid on our desks, it looks like something from Marion County, perhaps, had a list of salaries.

Jonathan Weaver: Yeah, what we did, you'll see, what we gave you, and I thank you for your time, we're asking for a part-time pay increase for our part-timers from \$8.50 an hour to \$10.50 an hour. We have a comparison here of what they do in counties, some counties across the state, and then if you look at Marion County, it says see salary ordinance provided, so that's what their salary ordinance is. So I'll take any questions. We're having a hard time retaining talent. You know, the economy is bad, people do take the job at \$8.50 an hour but then once we get them trained, you know, then they find another job that pays more, so I'm just asking for your cooperation then to bump it up \$2.00 an hour, then I think that would be more attractive in keeping the talent. By the time you train them on the assessing software and get their knowledge up, thus far, we've had three people basically, since, May or June, leave.

Councilmember Shetler: The comparison chart, you know, this shows, this is interesting because it shows other salaries from other departments, and it looks like you know, if you look at what Indianapolis pays, you know, they pay up to \$154,000

in some areas like in, you know, obviously this is probably not a good comparison because their salary ranges are so much higher in every category.

Jonathan Weaver: You'll see the other counties where we're looking at comparable counties like Elkhart County, and also Porter County. Elkhart starts at \$14 an hour and Porter County starts at \$10, and then up to \$20 an hour. So we feel we're kind of low, that's why I'm asking for your assistance with that, it's going to come out of Reassessment fund, to retain and attract talent.

Councilmember Kiefer: But the only concern I have is that then we're going to get a flood, the flood gates are going to open up and every department is going to come because like, I could see the County Clerk, you know, everything she does is critically important because, you know, she's dealing with the courts, and then I could see the Treasurer saying well, you know, hey we have to get the tax bills out, so on and so forth, so I guess my main concern would be, you know, if we do this for your department then it somewhat opens the flood gates for every department to come in. But I'm open to hear what other Councilmembers say.

Jonathan Weaver: I understand your concerns and being that we're in the middle of this Reassessment, when we reach out to people and they're saying well, there are two unemployed people and they're saying their unemployment benefits are more than \$8.50 an hour and they've done field work in the past, that kind of hurts us. But I'm open for suggestions.

Councilmember Bassemier: And that is coming out of the Reassessment Fund?

Jonathan Weaver: That would be, yes.

Councilmember Bassemier: And the other departments would not be coming out of Reassessment funds that you're talking about, Mr. Kiefer.

Councilmember Kiefer: No, I agree with that, but I mean, I can see them come to us and say, hey look, you're paying \$10.50 for part-time because you felt like it was critical, well, I could hear the County Clerk saying hey, everything we do is critical. You know, when we're dealing with courts trying to get things out, you know, then I think what's to happen is we're probably going to be adjusting everybody to \$10.50, but that's just my opinion.

Councilmember Bassemier: Mr. Weaver, how long will this go on, the Reassessment?

Jonathan Weaver: The Reassessment ends March 1st of 2012. So if that's a concern of yours, Mr. Kiefer, then maybe –

Councilmember Kiefer: I think the main concern is just setting a precedent for, you know, every other department when we're really, you know, we're scrutinizing every new employee, we're scrutinizing whether or not people can re-hire after somebody quits, I mean, so this somewhat would go, you know, we give a one and a half percent pay raise because we're concerned, so to me, this somewhat conflicts with what we're trying to accomplish. And I agree with you times are tough and you may be struggling to find necessary help, but I've got to think with this economy there would be people out there willing to work for the current pay rate.

President Lloyd: Mr. Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: I understand Mr. Kiefer's argument and somewhat I agree. However, you're in a different situation, I think with the level of expertise these people must have to input the information. And if you have that information go into reassessment, you're going to have to pay a lot more money in salaries just to try to undo mistakes. I think maybe, I think you're shooting a little bit high, but I do think since it comes out of Reassessment, it's not coming out of the general fund, the money is there already, and that's what the money is there for, then if you're having trouble retaining for \$8.50 an hour, people make more on unemployment, we're kind of shooting ourselves in the foot. So I'm kind of inclined to think, with the number of staff members cut, that's he's working not to fill full-time jobs, but to add part-time, that we might want to consider this.

Jonathan Weaver: And we ceased the contract this year with a vendor, so that saved \$98,000 out of the Reassessment fund, and we're not contracting out the Reassessment, which is costing some counties seven figures. So I'm saving you a lot and the taxpayers a lot in the long run. So I'm just asking for your assistance to get some bodies in there because the down time between those that resigned and move on and hiring and finding someone to come in, you know, hurts us, too, that couple weeks.

Councilmember Kiefer: Have you calculated, what would be the total additional expense to the reassessment fund, about two dollars an hour increase?

Jonathan Weaver: Uh, I can get details for you.

President Lloyd: I'm looking at Exhibit H in the salary ordinance and you've got County Clerk part time \$8.50; other ones, part time \$8.00; Auditor part time \$8.50; Recorder part time \$8.50. Now you do have some that are higher, the Sheriff, you've got some at \$9.00 and \$9.50. Coroner, if you recall, we raised some of hers because, but that's a little bit more specialized, \$8.75. And I think we raised her to –

Councilmember Kiefer: \$8.75.

President Lloyd: I think we raised them to ten at the Coroner, but that's in, you know, dealing with some specialized areas. Mr. Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: Yeah, could you maybe just spell out specifically what responsibilities and duties that they would be, what they're going to be charged with?

Jonathan Weaver: A lot of data – Glen, you want to fill them in?

Glen Koob: Glen Koob, supervisor real estate. Reassessment is, you hire field people to go out in the field, data collect anything that is new, hasn't been picked up. The state orders this, it's a state law. We don't do this by choice. We still have to continue to do our work that we do for 2011 pay '12 that the new houses that are built, that's a different year that we have to put in before we put in the Reassessment, so we're basically running two data bases. Then, whenever they go out in the field, they data collect, they come back in. We have people, right now we're on a Monday, Wednesday and Friday that they go out in the field and Tuesday and Thursday, the people that go out, they are data entering, but they can't get it all done. The other day we had two go out in the field and they picked up 73 houses that day. So, that's pretty good. That's two people going out, that's clicking it off pretty well.

Councilmember Shetler: Okay, so basically, the skill sets are someone that can hold the one end of the tape measure, and someone who reads it off and says how much the length of that house is?

Glen Koob: Yes, the skill set, that's demeaning, a little bit, the job. The skill set is that you measure the house, one person can go around and measure the house at times unless they have angles. And if you notice these big mansions that they have, that takes them about an hour to measure. We measured one the other day and it took them eight hours to put that thing in, it was over 7,000 square feet. The other, while the one person can measure by their selves, at times, it all depends on if it's a ranch house, a rectangular house, the other person, in the meantime, is talking to the owner of the residence, if they're at home, and in the area they are now, there are a lot of people that are home. So, yeah, they're going out, they're measuring, they're talking with the owner, they're asking about the inside, they're asking about any kind of additions they've made and that information, they ask about everything on the property record card.

Councilmember Shetler: Let me just point out something for the other Councilmembers is that the Reassessment fund is paid by the taxpayers. I mean, it is not a pot of money that is put up by the Henderson County people and we can just pop off of it and take whatever we want. Our taxpayers right here in Vanderburgh County are the ones who are supplying that fund, and so it is tax dollars that's going into it. The second concern that I have, though, is somewhat along the lines of Mr. Kiefer, and that is, as I'm looking at some of the other positions, I know some of the part-time we have in the legal, whether it be in the Prosecutor's office or in the judiciary, many of those people are paid \$10 or less, and we're asking for skill sets here that are fairly basic as far as measuring and data entry and data taking. I mean, it's not really complex, you know, intricate type of stuff that we're dealing with here. I would think that in a bad economy when people, 12 - 13% unemployment and here it's much lower than that, thank goodness, people are looking for jobs, though, that would make it easier to fill as opposed to more difficult to fill. To me, it's just, it is probably, because of the economy, the wrong time to really look at increasing this, particularly a 25% increase, which is what we're dealing with here, and I think that's excessive.

Glen Koob: We do have professionals that call us and we do have Realtors that call us, we do have tax home owners that call us and ask us about our information, to interpret it on the website. The other thing is that when we go out to measure, I forgot what I was going to tell you now besides that, I think that, yes, the taxpayers also would like to have their property correct. I think they would like to have that property – Mr. Bassemier knows that, he's talked with us before – they would like to have their property correctly assessed. And you tell me what the difference is and this may seem silly to you, but it's not to a taxpayer. What's the difference between a concrete pad and a canopy, and what's the difference between a concrete pad and a roof extension. I can tell you, it's about \$300 difference now in assessment. There is other things that are bigger. What's the difference between a hot tub and a spa? What's the difference between just a hot tub sitting outside with no plumbing connected that you fill up or however, that's not connected to plumbing? You know? You have to know those things and we have this manual that we have to read, and those data collectors have to know. If they ask me something in the office, the people that are data entering, I say, is your manual on your desk? Have you read it?

Councilmember Shetler: Let me ask you this. You're sending them out in groups of two –

Glen Koob: Yes.

Councilmember Shetler: Both of those are new, rookie-type people that are going out?

Glen Koob: No, they're not. No, we do not –

Councilmember Shetler: So one of them is an experienced, skilled person that's full-time?

Glen Koob: And they usually are the ones that are talking to the home owner.

Councilmember Shetler: Okay, --

Glen Koob: Because homeowners do –

Councilmember Shetler: So the other person, that's the one you're requesting a 25% increase for?

Glen Koob: Yes.

Councilmember Shetler: And they're not the one that's actually in charge of that team –

Glen Koob: No, they're getting a salary, the ones that are in charge, but the person that's with them, they're the ones that are quitting because they're only making \$8.50 an hour and they are out there with that person that's in charge, doing the same things except sometimes they don't have to talk to the taxpayer.

Councilmember Shetler: But they're not the ones that have to do the calculations or anything else. They're the ones that are just basically assisting and helping out, so their skill sets are not even the same as the full-time –

Glen Koob: What those people do when they come back into the office, we call it pre-picking, which means we go into Pictometry, we look at a property and we see if it's assessed correctly so that they go out there, they can look. They do that, they also do sales disclosures, they also, – by sales disclosures, we look at the sales disclosures to see what the house sold for, we do the cost, which is the measuring, we also, if there is an apartment in there, we do the income. There's three approaches to value that we have to look at every time we do a property. Not all three on every property, but there's three approaches that are have to use according to state law.

Councilmember Shetler: But you have your full-time person that's on that team that's able to do that.

Glen Koob: Yeah, but while that full-time person is out in the field, they can't data enter and they can't do anything, they're doing the field work. These people are doing double jobs. They're out in the field data collecting, they come in on Monday, Wednesdays, and Fridays, they come in on Tuesdays and Thursdays, they stay in the office and they do their data entry work. And the person that's out in the field, their assistant, we are giving them other jobs to do. One girl today is, we're doing Center Township right now, she's in there and she's going through Pictometry and looking at the style of the house to see if anything has been torn down or added. That's how they can tell, sometimes people don't get permits, you know, so that's

how they can tell the field people to make it go faster for them, okay, this is what this house has. Yes, it still has this, according to the 2009 Pictometry. When you go out in the field, you walk around that house, is that still there or have they added a new thing? Have they added a new shed, have they added a new garage? You know, it's not as simple as what you're trying to make it. It is very detailed work. And for us to train somebody, this is what the bad part is, for us to have to keep retraining and taking our time to retrain these people every time, you know, because they're not making enough money and they find a new job or a better paying job, that's what's doing, it's just wasting our time. We would like to retain some people and it's not like we're going to pay them that forever. You know, and I know the people, you know. If we didn't do our job to do the assessing or the data collecting or that, then look at the permits, whatever, I guess we could shut down the whole county because if we don't do our job, we're the ones that initiate the assessment, initiate the money in the county, right? So if we don't do our job, then nobody gets paid. That's the way I look at it.

Councilmember Kiefer: Can I interrupt? Glen, I have a question or maybe this is for Jonathan. How did you come up with, was it like you had employees tell you, hey, I'm leaving because if I was making 10.50 an hour I would stay or I mean, how did you come up with the 10.50, I guess? I mean, would \$9.00 do it or, I mean, it's hard for us as, you know, to go back as being the fiduciary body to go back to our constituents and say, yeah, we gave them a 25% increase. I need to know whether that was an arbitrary number you just kind of plucked out and said, you know, if we made it high enough we could attract them. I mean, how did you come up with 10.50, I guess, and what is the turnover rate? Is it 90% of the people you hire, they leave within a month or is it 10%? I mean, what's the turnover rate?

Jonathan Weaver: It's been, as I said, we've had three people leave since May or June. If you look at the spreadsheet I gave you and look at LaPorte County, you know, we have 81,000 parcels in Vanderburgh County. LaPorte, they're at 70,000 parcels, starts at \$10 an hour. Tippecanoe County with 67,000 parcels starts at \$10 an hour, and then we have a, let's see, Porter County, there, at 78,000 parcels \$10 an hour. So we're just trying to be competitive.

Councilmember Kiefer: I guess my question is, I mean, how do you know \$10 is the number versus \$9? I mean, have you talked, I mean, have you done surveys with exit interviews with your employees as they're leaving and the reason they say we're quitting is it because a) they got the dream job. They went to college, they got their degree, and they finally got that job. Or are they quitting because, hey, if I made a dollar more an hour, I would have stayed?

Jonathan Weaver: We're seeing people leave for two and three dollars more an hour. So.

Councilmember Kiefer: Into full-time jobs or into part-time jobs?

Jonathan Weaver: Into other part-time jobs.

President Lloyd: Are some of those Work One employees?

Jonathan Weaver: None of these that we have on part-time right now, no. Are you talking about Welfare to Work or Work One?

President Lloyd: Welfare to Work.

Jonathan Weaver: Welfare to Work, nobody right now that we've hired at this second.

President Lloyd: But you had one of your employees say, I can make more money on unemployment?

Jonathan Weaver: Oh yeah.

President Lloyd: If you –

Jonathan Weaver: They weren't an employee, they were a prospective employee.

President Lloyd: You know, I'm still looking at Exhibit H here, Prosecutor IV-D \$8.50 an hour, these are all part-time. Election Office \$8.50 an hour. Coop Extension is \$7.25. County Commissioners part-time \$8.00 an hour. Superintendent of County Buildings part-time \$8 an hour. Circuit Court interns, typists \$8 an hour. Community Corrections part time, \$7.25 an hour. Community Corrections 136Y \$8.50 an hour. I mean, it goes on and on. County Highway, part-time summer \$7.25. County Engineer, one intern \$8 an hour. And some of them are higher, like Health Department, you've got some that are lead clerk, \$10.28 an hour, well, that's specialized. Prosecutor, legal intern is \$10 an hour, but those are law school students. I'm just concerned that, like Councilman Kiefer indicated, we're going to have a flood, especially people that are paid part-time at \$7.25. And I guess I would alert Council on your motion, you could either make a motion for \$10.50 an hour or less depending upon what you want to do.

Councilmember Bassemier: Mr. Kiefer, what would you suggest? You're kind of torn here.

Councilmember Kiefer: Well, I would like for them to go back and re-evaluate what is something a little bit more reasonable. I don't want to arbitrarily just say, hey, let's pay them \$9 or \$8.75, I'd like for them to go back and maybe examine this a little bit closer and see, you know, I just don't want to do 25%, I know that's too much for me.

Councilmember Bassemier: He's in need of part-time help right away, aren't you, Mr. Weaver? You need it right away.

Jonathan Weaver: You got rid of two people yesterday. The average on that spreadsheet I gave you, the range is \$9.95 an hour to \$16.02 an hour on that spreadsheet I gave you of the counties scattered throughout the state.

Councilmember Bassemier: Would a dollar more on the hour right now pacify you or help you out to make up your mind today? I know I'm in favor of –

Councilmember Kiefer: Well, one thing is, I think he could hire, if he feels comfortable with these people, hire them at the \$8.50, let's examine, you know, I'd like to look at this a little bit closer, you know, maybe come back at the next meeting and then if we need to bump it up at that point, you know, I'd be willing to –

Councilmember Bassemier: That's thirty days away and they're on a time frame here. Can we give them what we approved the Coroner's office for, \$9.50 an hour, would you, I mean, I'm not negotiating here for the Assessor's office, but he needs some help. He can't keep any help.

Councilmember Shetler: There's a couple of things, I think, at play. First of all, when

you're looking at labor rates, you're looking in your specific market area, you're not, I mean, to look at 300 miles away, Porter County, that's on the border of Michigan where you're dealing with a whole lot higher industrial rates and stuff than what we're dealing with here, I mean, to me, that's not anything under our consideration. The other thing is, the skill sets that are required at a given job. I'm not seeing those skill sets versus what we're getting in other departments and other areas being significantly higher or more necessary than what we're seeing in other areas. I have real difficulty trying to justify anything at this point in time unless we can see a little bit clearer cut skill sets involved here. And if we're dealing with two people on a line when in many instances in the past, we used to have one man teams, but we're having two man teams now and we've got a lot of innovation and stuff –

Jonathan Weaver: (Inaudible)

Councilmember Shetler: Excuse me, a lot of innovation that we've paid a lot of good money for, the Pictometry, to aid and assist these people and then we have a full-time person going out there that's supposed to have the skill sets and the other person there is kind of an aid, as an assistant. It doesn't require the same sets of skills that you need for that lead person. I'm having a real difficult time understanding and to lose two or three, I don't know, school started back up, other things came, I don't know specifically the reasons on it, but, and I don't know how many total people you're talking about, 20 or so?

Jonathan Weaver: Well, we're looking, one of them, for example, that just left, when you're paying \$8.50 an hour, 39 hours a week, and they're making less than \$800 a month, and this is a college grad with real estate experience, you know, we're looking for real estate experience. Another woman in the office has her real estate license and she's looking to move on, too. They can't live on less than \$800 a month if they're devoting 39 hours a week to the county and to my office.

Councilmember Shetler: I understand that, but perhaps we don't need for that second person, and that's the point, perhaps we don't need a college educated person. Perhaps we don't need a licensed real estate person to actually be doing that at this – I mean, it doesn't sound to me that the skill sets require that. It sounds like perhaps one of the people on that lead time may need that, but you're telling me you have a full time qualified person that's leading that up and then you're putting a part-time with that full-time person. If that's the case, we don't need two well educated people to be out measuring a house and doing the same kind of things.

Glen Koob: Councilman Shetler, where the skill set comes in is when they come back into the office and we have to teach them how to data enter it into ProVal. Yes, you're right, and you know what, you're welcome to come out and just view them for a half a day, if you'd like, to see what they do, and then when they come back into the office on Tuesdays – and we do have other people helping them because they can't be out in the field for three days and for two days come back and get that all data entered, you know, but we would be glad for you to come out and just see what they do, you know, to see how they go out into that field and go out into a neighborhood when it's dogs chasing them, whether it's taxpayers telling them to get off their property. They go through a lot of stuff out there and I –

Councilmember Shetler: I don't deny that they endure an awful lot in their job. I'm not denying that. The point is, the skill sets that are required for the specific part-time position that we're talking about, and I'm sorry, I don't mean this in any kind of a rude way or anything, but so far, I'm just not convinced that we need to have all the part-time people college educated. I'm just not convinced that the skill sets require

that at this point in time.

Glen Koob: I don't think they all need to be probably educated, but I think they need to be able to feed their selves and get a roof over their head. For \$8.50 an hour, I couldn't do it.

Councilmember Shetler: But that isn't the question.

Glen Koob: Yeah, it is, you just said.

Councilmember Shetler: No, it really isn't.

Councilmember Kiefer: I think like in our job study, you know, when we review full-time jobs, we don't look at personalities, whether or not it's enough money to keep food on the table, we look at the skill sets and what the qualifications are for that job and then we determine what the market rate is based upon, you know, guidance from Tim Deisher, you know, but this is part-time so we're, obviously, don't look at this in the Job Study. But, you know, right now I'd like to move off the subject, you know, unless there's a motion for it to pass.

President Lloyd: Ms. Terry hadn't had a chance to talk yet.

Councilmember Terry: Just had a question. What are the qualifications, the minimum qualifications for this position?

Jonathan Weaver: Well, you'll be amazed how many people don't have computer skills so we need someone that's very proficient and can learn quickly and get into that assessing software and get into Excel, get into Access, and a lot of that comes from fresh college grads, that have that knowledge and can pick it up quickly.

President Lloyd: Mr. Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Well, I think that we're not making much progress here. I do think that there, Jonathan may have some merit for a pay raise. I don't believe it should be as much as it is, at least higher than any other part timers, so I think maybe we should revisit that and maybe get a better idea of how many part timers you actually have that would be affected and how much that would affect the Reassessment budget. I do want to say that his office has been cut from 52 full-time with the consolidation to 39, and he's not asking for full time, full benefits, if I'm not mistaken. Is that the right amount from 2006? But we have made some technologically advanced moves with the new programs and things you've implemented. I don't think \$10.50 is a go, though.

President Lloyd: You know, you had, I almost hate to ask this, but you had an employee that was arrested for transporting drugs. Was that person a part-timer?

Jonathan Weaver: Yes.

President Lloyd: Okay, so now was that one of the ones you lost or is she still on the payroll?

Jonathan Weaver: We lost her, yes. And this is the Welfare to Work program is a great program and this doesn't put a mark on that program, we're still interviewing candidates and bringing them in, which, you know, that's not costing you guys any money out of the general fund or the reassessment fund.

Councilmember Kiefer: Jonathan, I'm not opposed to reviewing this, I just don't feel comfortable voting today, but I'd be glad to, you know, let's take a look at this, go back, re-evaluate, you know, like Councilman Goebel said, you know, we don't want this to be, obviously, the highest paying part-time job in the county, either, you know, but we'd be open to hearing it back at another meeting in the future, but I'm not prepared to vote on anything today.

President Lloyd: Okay, is there anybody that wants to make a motion to raise the part time salaries?

Councilmember Bassemier: I'll make a motion just to get it on the floor and see what happens. I think it's going to be three/three and it's going to be, since we don't have seven –

President Lloyd: Okay, how much?

Councilmember Bassemier: Uh, I'd like to make it \$9.50 an hour, anyway, and that's getting a starting point.

President Lloyd: Okay, so your motion is to raise the County Assessor part-time to \$9.50 an hour?

Councilmember Bassemier: \$9.50 an hour.

President Lloyd: Is there a second? Okay, motion dies for lack of a second. Thank you.

Jonathan Weaver: Thanks.

AMENDMENTS TO SALARY ORDINANCE

President Lloyd: Item ten, Amendments to Salary Ordinance, Mr. Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: They're being passed out as we speak. I will read...first of all for the Centre, amend Salary Ordinance line 1440-1850 Union Overtime as we approved. Community Corrections, amend Salary Ordinance line 1361-1850 Union Overtime as transfer approved. Amend the Salary Ordinance line 1361-1530 Shift Differential as transfer approved. Amend the Salary Ordinance line 1361-1300 Case Manager as transfer approved. Current employee is a Union PAT IV-Step V with an annual salary of 41,000 and that was not correct in the budget book because it did not include the salary step. The Drug & Alcohol Deferral Service, the corrected job title for 1371-1150, that's to be amended to Secretary/Bookkeeper. This change, we recommended that in 1997 and it was upgraded in '98. Superior Court Drug Court, amend the Salary Ordinance for Superior Court Drug Court to allow hiring a counselor. That is a PAT V with a starting salary of \$37,205. That is fully funded by a grant position. Superior Court Juvenile, amend the Salary Ordinance line 1370-1402 to approve replacing a Probation Officer and that is a PAT V starting at \$37,205. After six months, that salary does go to \$38,993. Superior Court Juvenile Division, amend the Salary Ordinance line 1370-1390 to permanently change the position title to Probation Officer with a PAT V classification, and that was recommended by the Personnel Administration Committee. Superior Court Juvenile Division, amend Salary Ordinance line 1370-1500 to reclassify position title to Administrative Supervisor PAT VI, the current employee is a PAT VI with a Step 7, and an annual salary of \$62,178. That will be effective October 18, 2010. And Superior Court Juvenile Division, amend salary ordinance line 1370-1490 to

reclassify the position to Supervisor of Intake and Dispositional Staff PAT VI. That will be with a Step 7 and an annual salary of \$62,178. I put that in the form of a motion.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion on the Salary Ordinance changes. Is there a second?

Councilmember Kiefer: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Shetler, second Mr. Kiefer, any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. The Salary Ordinance amendments pass 6-0.

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

PUBLIC COMMENT

President Lloyd: Public Comment. Is there anybody from the public that wants to speak about the Council meeting? We're going to have another meeting on the township budgets, but if you want to speak on the Council business. Any takers?

Councilmember Bassemier: Mr. President, can I say something?

President Lloyd: Yes, Mr. Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Just a point of interest, I'm looking at the Salary Ordinance amendments, and the first one on there, Cooperative Extension is \$9.50 per hour for part-time help, it's just –

Councilmember Kiefer: I think that's grant money, though.

Councilmember Bassemier: That's still taxpayers' dollars.

Councilmember Kiefer: No, no, --

Councilmember Bassemier: In a way, it is.

Councilmember Shetler: No, it comes from St. Mary's Hospital. It's an annual grant that they give every year.

Councilmember Bassemier: Okay.

Councilmember Shetler: We've done this for several years, Ed.

Councilmember Bassemier: I stand corrected. But anyway, it's \$9.50 an hour, that's just what we turned down. So just a point of interest.

President Lloyd: Anyone from the public? Is there a motion to adjourn?

Councilmember Shetler: So moved.

President Lloyd: Is there a second?

Councilmember Kiefer: Second.

President Lloyd: All in favor, signify by saying aye.

(All Councilmembers voted aye)

President Lloyd: We are adjourned. Five minutes, and then we'll start the townships.

(There being no further business to come before the Council, the meeting was adjourned at 9:35 a.m.)

VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL

President Russell Lloyd, Jr.

Vice President James Raben

Councilmember Joe Kiefer

Councilmember Mike Goebel

Councilmember Tom Shetler, Jr.

Councilmember Ed Bassemier

Councilmember Stephanie Terry

**VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL
TAXING UNIT
BUDGET REVIEW
OCTOBER 6 , 2010**

The Vanderburgh County Council met in session this 6th day of October, 2010 in room 301 of the Civic Center Complex. The meeting was called to order at 9:45 a.m. by County Council President Russell Lloyd, Jr.

President Lloyd: I would like to call to order the meeting of the Vanderburgh County Council review of civil taxing unit budgets, October 6, 2010, and this will be the township budgets. Attendance roll call please.

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

President Lloyd: For the Pledge of Allegiance I would like to ask Councilwoman Terry to lead us. Please stand.

(The Pledge of Allegiance was given.)

President Lloyd: Thank you. We'll move on to our agenda to item number four, consideration of civil taxing unit budgets. This is somewhat of a new procedure, although we've done it for several years now, but the state legislature asked County Councils to review township budgets. The townships are an entity of the state and they report their budgets to the state. Their, obviously, their meetings are public meetings, but the feeling was, for greater transparency in government, that the townships could come to the County Council. The County Council reviews the budget, can make a recommendation to accept it as submitted, or recommend a change, but what we do is not binding, and that just goes to the Department of Local Government Finance and then they will make the final determination. Does that sound right? Our attorney is Ryan Schulz, does that sound right, Mr. Schulz?

Ryan Schulz: That sounds right.

President Lloyd: Great, thank you. Okay, first up would be 4A, Armstrong Township Trustee.

ARMSTRONG TOWNSHIP TRUSTEE

President Lloyd: Please state your name and any highlights of your budget.

Joyce Kron: I'm Joyce Kron. I'm the deputy of Armstrong Township. Really there's not much change in my budget. We put in a one and a half percent pay increase, which comes for the Trustee, the deputy and the three advisory board members.

It's a total of \$127. We put in an increase of \$24 in our repairs and maintenance, and the additional increase is in our fire service. Those are our only changes. Any questions?

President Lloyd: Mr. Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes, thank you for mentioning your pay increase recommendation. Maybe each of the township trustees can preface their statements with if there is a pay increase and at what percentage it is, because that is important to us. Other than that, it looks real good.

President Lloyd: Other questions for Ms. Kron? I just have a couple. What was your township cash balances as of January 1?

Joyce Kron: Well, hang on, I've got to find that paper.

President Lloyd: Okay.

Joyce Kron: For the township fund?

President Lloyd: Just total.

Joyce Kron: Oh, okay, I don't have a total, I'm sorry.

President Lloyd: Or you can go through the funds if you would like.

Joyce Kron: Okay, on our, oh, shoot, I have, okay, alright, the Township Assistance Fund at June 30th has \$11,700.

President Lloyd: Okay.

Joyce Kron: My Fire Fund had \$10,000, I'm sorry, \$110,719, but I, that did not include our payment to the fire department at the first of July. So right now, it probably has about \$50,000, roughly. I just noticed, as I pulled my papers, I have two of my township assistance funds copied here and not my actual township fund.

President Lloyd: General?

Joyce Kron: That is probably, off the top of my head, I probably have \$40,000 in it.

President Lloyd: Okay, and I think some of the state newspapers did a survey of townships, and there was a feeling that some townships were sitting on large amounts of cash reserves while still levying tax rates on their citizens. The feeling was those tax rates could be lowered if they used some of that excess cash. But anyway, it doesn't sound like you have that situation.

Joyce Kron: Well, we haven't, for several years, had a township rate, because we're trying to work down that money. We have only had a fire rate in the past several years.

President Lloyd: Well, that's good news for Armstrong Township citizens. Any questions on this? Mr. Fluty?

Bill Fluty: I've just got a statement on cash balances. All townships and even county government would actually, we settle on June 30th or a day before June 30th, or settled on the last days of December, so their cash balances would be inflated as of January 1 or as of July 1st. Now, immediately after they receive their tax settlement checks, they're actually paying down to everybody that they owe. That's just a reminder that those, at that particular time that will be the highest time you'll see their cash balances.

Joyce Kron: June 30th balances can be deceiving.

Bill Fluty: Yes.

President Lloyd: Then, how many employees do you have for the township?

Joyce Kron: The trustee, the clerk, which is myself, and then three advisory board members. That's all.

President Lloyd: Okay.

Joyce Kron: We have no additional employees.

President Lloyd: Then, I guess, what I would ask Council to do, if you have any changes, we would vote on any recommended change. Otherwise, we would vote on accepting their budget as submitted. So is there a motion for that? Mr. Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: One question real quick. Did I see that, for what, relief, \$6,100, is that right? Did I see that? Yeah, Poor Relief.

Joyce Kron: Oh, our township assistance? Yes.

Councilmember Shetler: Is there a standard or a criteria that you go by that you can give so much to an individual? Is it based on income? Is there any kind of rules?

Joyce Kron: There are rules. Each township has their own. We have guidelines from the state that we have to follow, but then, within your own township, you can fine tune those. Actually, I'm probably not the best one to ask that, because we are so small—

Councilmember Shetler: Right.

Joyce Kron: —and I have very little township assistance. One of your larger townships could probably address that better.

Councilmember Shetler: Okay, thank you.

Joyce Kron: Okay.

President Lloyd: Okay, is there a motion to approve the Armstrong Township budget?

Councilmember Shetler: So moved.

President Lloyd: Is there a second?

Councilmember Goebel: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Shetler, second Mr. Goebel. Any discussion?
Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes.

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

President Lloyd: It will be submitted to the state as submitted by you. Appreciate your patience. Sorry we ran long.

Joyce Kron: No problem.

CENTER TOWNSHIP TRUSTEE

President Lloyd: Next township would be Center Township Trustee and their representative.

James Ritter: I'm Tiger Ritter, I'm the Township Trustee, and Barbara Isaac, she's my chief investigator. I thought there might be some questions she might answer.

President Lloyd: Okay, thank you for coming, Mr. Ritter. Any questions from Council of the Center Township budget? Mr. Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: Let me go ahead and ask that question to you as well, Mr. Ritter. That is, on the, what kind of criteria do you all use on the poor relief?

James Ritter: What kind of criteria?

Councilmember Shetler: Right, I mean, is it income, based on their income? Is it based on the size of the family? What kind of guide-

James Ritter: I'm going to ask Barbara to answer that. It's her department.

Barbara Isaac: Yes, the county has guidelines that we use for income, and it's based on how many people is in the household. We help them a certain amount of time each year, but it is based on income at first. Like, for one person in the household, it starts out, if they make over \$800 an hour, then they would be over income. Then it goes up based on how many people—

President Lloyd: Do you mean \$800 a week?

Barbara Isaac: A month.

President Lloyd: Oh, a month? I'm sorry.

Barbara Isaac: Yes.

Councilmember Shetler: Okay, \$800 a month. Then, it's kind of, then it's pro-rated?

Barbara Isaac: Yeah, then it goes up, like another \$50 for each additional person in the household.

Councilmember Shetler: Okay.

James Ritter: Also, they have to be on food stamps before we help them.

Councilmember Shetler: Is that a criteria you've established, or is that kind of universal policy?

Barbara Isaac: Universal.

Councilmember Shetler: Okay.

Barbara Isaac: We all have income (Inaudible).

Councilmember Shetler: That's statute by state, that they have to be on food stamps?

Barbara Isaac: Yes.

Councilmember Shetler: Okay, alright, thank you.

President Lloyd: Other questions for Center Township? Mr. Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Did you offer a pay increase to the employees of Center Township? Pay increase, is there any percentage increase?

James Ritter: Well, last time we did that, the one we've got in there now was the one we put in a year ago that we refused. You all recommended we not have it. We sent it in to the Department of Local Government Finance and they approved it.

Councilmember Goebel: We're aware of that. We got that information back.

James Ritter: We all voted not to take it, it was 100 percent.

President Lloyd: Okay.

Councilmember Goebel: So there is no pay increase?

James Ritter: No, this will be the same one that we did—

Councilmember Goebel: Last year?

James Ritter: Yeah.

Councilmember Goebel: Okay.

President Lloyd: Well, we appreciate that. That's very thoughtful. Other questions for Center Township? I guess, one question I would have, are you seeing quite a bit of additional people looking for assistance?

James Ritter: Absolutely.

President Lloyd: And that budget looks like that has gone up.

James Ritter: Yeah, I think we had the biggest last month that we've ever had.

Barbara Isaac: If I might say something.

President Lloyd: Yes.

Barbara Isaac: Just in Vectren alone, and I know Pigeon does a lot more than Center, but just in Vectren alone, we did \$15,000 in one month to help these people to stay on and to get turned back on. Our assistance with rent and everything else is up a lot more than in years past.

President Lloyd: Okay. Then, I guess, I asked the other townships, what was your cash balance as of June 30th? Roughly what were your cash balances in your accounts?

James Ritter: Do you mean the different accounts?

President Lloyd: Or, if you can give me the total, that's fine.

James Ritter: Well, I think I checked that, about \$260,000.

President Lloyd: Okay. Then, did your tax rate go up or down?

James Ritter: Did we go up or down?

President Lloyd: Yeah, the tax rate.

James Ritter: It would go up.

President Lloyd: Okay, any other questions? Any recommendations on any changes for Center Township?

Councilmember Terry: I just have a question.

President Lloyd: Ms. Terry?

Councilmember Terry: On the assistance, how often can they come back for assistance?

Barbara Isaac: Well, we have, a lot of our families come back once a month, and that's for a non-food voucher, where they can get laundry detergent, shampoo, toothpaste, that sort of thing. But with Vectren or rent, they can get help three times a year.

Councilmember Terry: Okay.

Barbara Isaac: There's a guideline that we go by for that.

Councilmember Terry: Okay, thank you.

President Lloyd: Other questions? Mr. Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Maybe you spelled it out, but you do show a sizeable increase in Fire?

James Ritter: Yes, that's the, in the regular fire, you mean? Yes, that's for the hiring of more regulars, instead of volunteers. Volunteers are very hard to get, they tell me. I'm not involved in that real closely, but that's what...I have a meeting with them before I do the budget. That was one place where they said they need two more people, and that's about \$50,000 a year for each one when you include everything.

President Lloyd: For fire protection, do you guys contract with Scott, or do you have your own?

James Ritter: No, we have our own.

President Lloyd: Oh, that's right.

James Ritter: Oh, yeah, McCutchanville Fire Department.

President Lloyd: Oh, that's right, McCutchanville, I'm sorry. Okay. Any other questions?

Councilmember Shetler: Do they have two houses? Is that right? They have two—

James Ritter: Two fire departments?

Councilmember Shetler: Two fire stations?

James Ritter: Yes, one on St. Joe and then the one in McCutchanville.

Councilmember Shetler: Right.

President Lloyd: My mistake. I'm sorry. Any other questions? Is there a motion to approve Center Township as submitted?

Councilmember Shetler: So moved.

President Lloyd: Is there a second?

Councilmember Bassemier: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Shetler, second Mr. Bassemier. Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes.

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

President Lloyd: Thank you, Tiger, for coming in. Thank you, Barbara.

James Ritter: Okay, thank you.

President Lloyd: It will be sent, the Council approved as submitted.

GERMAN TOWNSHIP TRUSTEE

President Lloyd: Item number 4C, German Township Trustee.

Fred Happe: I'm Fred Happe, German Township Trustee.

President Lloyd: Any highlights on your budget?

Fred Happe: Except we're in a big hole with the fire department and EMS to the tune of about \$80,000 short on our, which we're trying to put through an extra appropriation in. I do have an outstanding loan with the bank. Hopefully, we'll dig out of this hole. The rest of the accounts, the general fund, you know, we have about \$33,000, June balances, township assistance is well off and cumulative fire is well off, pretty well.

President Lloyd: It looks like you don't have a lot of township assistance.

Fred Happe: That's true.

President Lloyd: Has that gone up?

Fred Happe: It's going up some now, because we have, not to point a finger, but like Whirlpool employees and their families are going to be, in our area we have quite a few of them in our area.

President Lloyd: Was that fire deficit done over time, or is that just recent?

Fred Happe: Well, what they tell me, it's not, our tax rate increase hasn't kept up with the budget we've been supplying for fire protection and the EMS.

President Lloyd: Okay. Any other questions for German? Then, did you, how many employees do you guys have?

Fred Happe: Well, there's three, advisory board, my wife is clerk, and I'm Trustee. There's five total.

President Lloyd: Okay, and did you guys receive a pay increase?

Fred Happe: Well, they put a pay increase in it, but as of right now they're going to not accept it.

President Lloyd: Okay, so you're going to accept zero at this time?

Fred Happe: Accept zero on the increase.

President Lloyd: Oh, okay.

Fred Happe: I mean, my salary. I'm sorry.

President Lloyd: Oh, okay. Okay, any other questions for German? Mr. Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Well, Mr. Happe, you offered not to accept your pay increase? Do we amend this at all, or put a little tag on it? Or will you send in something different?

Fred Happe: Well, what will probably happen, which we do, if they do put it in, we'll transfer the funds to the Rainy Day Fund, and then that will help make up part of my shortfall on my fire. So we'll leave it in as is, but I'll amend it in my minutes that I won't accept the pay increase.

Councilmember Goebel: Okay, sounds good to me.

President Lloyd: Other questions? So is there a motion to approve German Township as submitted?

Councilmember Shetler: So moved.

President Lloyd: Is there a second?

Councilmember Goebel: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Shetler, second Mr. Goebel. Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes.

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

President Lloyd: We'll submit as submitted by you, six/zero, that was approved. Thanks, Fred.

Fred Happe: Thank you.

President Lloyd: Okay.

KNIGHT TOWNSHIP TRUSTEE

President Lloyd: Item 4D is Knight Township Trustee.

Kathryn Martin: Good morning.

President Lloyd: Good morning.

Kathryn Martin: Kathryn Martin, Knight Township Trustee. Paula Hurt, my chief deputy. I have chose to decrease our budget by \$200,000. I have also done away with one of the positions in my office and that person made \$25,000 a year. So no pay raises.

President Lloyd: How many employees are you down to?

Kathryn Martin: It will be four.

President Lloyd: Okay, so you and chief deputy and two case workers?

Kathryn Martin: Yes.

President Lloyd: Okay. Questions for Knight Township? I'll throw one out there, I guess. What's the status on the tax warrant, the loan from the Evansville Bond Bank?

Kathryn Martin: We should be getting it on the 18th.

President Lloyd: Okay, so that was like published and there's a waiting period of a number of days?

Kathryn Martin: Correct.

President Lloyd: So that would be October 18th?

Kathryn Martin: Correct.

President Lloyd: Okay, and the office can survive until then?

Kathryn Martin: Yes.

President Lloyd: Okay. Mr. Goebel first.

Councilmember Goebel: Kathryn, we all know you came into a pretty volatile situation. Concerning expenditures, not just your township, but all townships, you have an advisory board, how closely does that board scrutinize? Do they look over all of the papers, and how often do they meet, just in general?

Kathryn Martin: Well, I would prefer if we met once a month. We decided yesterday that we would do that. At the end of the month I will show them, you know, the

month end report, and let them know and be a part of everything so they know what's going on.

Councilmember Goebel: That is their purpose, is it not?

Kathryn Martin: Yeah.

Councilmember Goebel: Thank you.

President Lloyd: Mr. Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: At those monthly meetings, is the attorney required to be there?

Kathryn Martin: No. These are just between my advisory board and myself.

Councilmember Shetler: Underneath professional services, legal services, it says \$10,000, is that what the attorney is being paid?

Kathryn Martin: That's correct. In light of what had gone on before I got there. We still—

Councilmember Shetler: The attorney that's there—

Kathryn Martin: Can I finish?

Councilmember Shetler: Yeah, please.

Kathryn Martin: The attorney, because we are still fighting the unemployment, we are still fighting all of these other legal battles, and I am not going to sell my township short and put us in a position to where we could fall into something because we can't pay our attorney.

Councilmember Shetler: Okay, and that attorney, is that the same attorney that represented—

Kathryn Martin: Yes.

Councilmember Shetler: —before, Knight Township, and then represented her personally?

Kathryn Martin: Yes.

President Lloyd: For the record, represented Linda Durham.

Councilmember Shetler: Right.

President Lloyd: The former Trustee, now under arrest.

Councilmember Shetler: And that same attorney is the one that represented her to retain her job—

Kathryn Martin: Correct, we are fulfilling a contract between the township and that attorney right now. There will have to be a new contract made at a later date.

Councilmember Shetler: Okay. Just kind of thumbing through this, on other budgets and stuff, I'm not seeing any place, and I might be incorrect on this, where an attorney for a township is being paid quite so much.

Kathryn Martin: Well, I don't believe that any other township has gone through the struggles that we have, and we're defending the money that we're trying to keep, and also, going forward, we're fighting unemployment, we're fighting possible more litigation with Ms. Durham. Like I said, I don't want to say that we're not going to be able to have enough money to defend ourselves. It makes no sense. If anything, that's, to me, really important.

Councilmember Shetler: Well, I don't disagree that it's critical, I'm just questioning whether or not the guy that kept her there, that created the problem—

Kathryn Martin: As I said—

Councilmember Shetler: —and he's the highest paid attorney out of all of the townships in this county.

Kathryn Martin: We are fulfilling a contract that was written prior to me getting there. We will sign a contract at the beginning of next year. It may be less than this, but I'm not going to sell my township short.

Councilmember Shetler: This is for the budget for next year?

Kathryn Martin: Correct.

Paula Hurt: He has a retainer fee, but he also gets paid hourly for anything extra he does.

Councilmember Shetler: Okay.

Councilmember Terry: So have there been other bids? I'm sorry, have there been other bids for a new contract?

Kathryn Martin: Not yet. We are going to implement it though, that's kind of what I'm trying to say.

Councilmember Bassemier: Mr. President?

President Lloyd: Mr. Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Then, Ms. Martin, your attorney does not see this as a conflict of interest since he represented the other side before you took office?

Kathryn Martin: No.

Councilmember Bassemier: He does not see any conflict at all?

Kathryn Martin: No.

Councilmember Shetler: Let me just give you an example. Center Township has legal representation, \$2,000 a year. Center Township, I mean, Knight Township we're talking \$10,000, five times, 500 percent increase. Again, the question that I have is, that this is the very person who personally represented her so that she could have that seat to begin with, and then we got into some serious problems, so it was his actions that helped create the fiasco that we're in. Then, we're retaining him further—

Kathryn Martin: Because I have a contract with him.

Councilmember Shetler: I understand, but—

Kathryn Martin: (Inaudible) obligated to keep him until the contract is up. Once that contract is up, it is open to other people to come in and be able to offer their services. But because of everything that's gone on in Knight Township, I don't feel comfortable putting \$500 in there, or \$1,000 or \$2,000.

President Lloyd: Mr. Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Maybe Mr. Schulz could shed a little light. Would this be considered a conflict, from a legal standpoint? I'm not talking about the contract right now. I'm talking about down the road.

President Lloyd: He represented her personally to become Knight Township Trustee in a lawsuit, but then he became Township Trustee attorney.

Ryan Schulz: That would be something that we would review and then get back to you on. Certainly, it sounds interesting. So we'll review that and get back to you.

Kathryn Martin: I definitely agree with you. That's why I'm stressing, I am finishing my contract with him.

Councilmember Goebel: You are open then, in the future?

Kathryn Martin: Yes.

Councilmember Goebel: Thank you.

President Lloyd: Mr. Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Kathryn, thank you for doing the work of, you know, it looks like you're streamlining, you know, cut out employees and things like that, and I appreciate that. Perhaps, as a suggestion, you know, maybe you can review that contract. There might be some loophole in the contract that allows you some flexibility. Also, you know, I know some of the big things that you've been confronted with has been past actions of, you know, the previous Trustee, maybe you might want to shed some light on some of the safeguards you've put in place since you've taken office. I know some of the other townships expressed how they give poor relief and how there's a formula there and a system, maybe you might want to just shed some light on that, too.

Kathryn Martin: Well, basically, because of where we stand, and we are so far in the hole, we go by our guidelines. We are very strict with it. Unfortunately, unless there is an extenuating circumstance and somebody is over income, we have to deny them. If somebody loses everything in a fire, and the Red Cross comes in and helps and they still need a little bit of help, that to me is an extenuating circumstance. That's why my office exists. So I will not turn somebody down in that situation. But before, and I think a lot of the other townships do, you know, a one time if they're a little over or something, we just can't. We can't. We've dropped our poor relief down half of what it was, and that's the purpose of doing away with one of the positions.

Councilmember Kiefer: Can you give a brief update, I know it's been in the headlines about the fire department—

Kathryn Martin: Yes.

Councilmember Kiefer: —can you give a brief update on what the status is with all of that work?

Kathryn Martin: We will be contracting with Evansville Fire. With the annexation in the wings and everything else, it's the right thing to do. So the Knight Township Fire Department will be closing. We'll be contracting with Evansville.

Councilmember Kiefer: What will happen to their facility and their equipment and supplies and all of that stuff? Is that something the—

Kathryn Martin: We do not own it, so that will be something that they take care of on their own.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay. Alrighty. Thank you.

Councilmember Goebel: Can we surplus? Can we surplus some of those engines and things to the other townships?

Kathryn Martin: They're not mine.

Councilmember Goebel: I know. I'm just kidding.

President Lloyd: I think they're like a non-profit corporation of their own. So I guess, they're going to liquidate, which is a pretty sad thing really. They've even contacted a realtor about selling their property. Mr. Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: Yeah, I'm kind of thinking about that new building they put out there on, what, Pollack?

Kathryn Martin: The south building—

Councilmember Shetler: Right.

Kathryn Martin: —uh-huh.

Councilmember Shetler: Because, I know the County Commissioners were involved with some grant money that came through on that, state grant money and stuff, and there may be some more strings attached to it. You know, I don't know that the township necessarily would be.

Kathryn Martin: The township is not involved in that. We have been to the meetings and I am fully aware of what's going on. I'll leave it to Chief Wathen and Chief Jarboe to enlighten everybody on what the plan is.

Councilmember Shetler: I guess, the question that I have, I know that you guys have, and you have been placed in a very difficult situation and a real challenge that faces you personally as well as the township in general, the, were you successful in borrowing the money from the Bond Bank?

Kathryn Martin: Yes.

Councilmember Shetler: To get you through. I'm assuming that money is going to have to be paid back, and I know that you'll be getting your tax receipts in in December and be able to pay that back temporarily, but then you're going to be in the same boat, I would think. What kind of financial plan do you have to get that \$200,000, is it roughly \$200,000?

Kathryn Martin: It's about \$172,000.

Councilmember Shetler: To get that paid back—

Kathryn Martin: It's 80 percent of what our tax draw will be in December.

Councilmember Shetler: So next year, will that, I mean, next, you're going to get into some kind of a problem again next May, June, I would think.

Kathryn Martin: Right, and I have a plan for that if I'm still here. I've spoke with my opponent, and, of course, I'm not going to lock him into anything should I not be here.

Councilmember Shetler: I guess, the question, in your plan then—

Kathryn Martin: Uh-huh.

Councilmember Shetler: — how long do you think until you would be back on sound footing—

Kathryn Martin: About two years.

Councilmember Shetler: — through the township?

Kathryn Martin: About two years.

Councilmember Shetler: About two years? Okay, thank you.

President Lloyd: You know, one thing I was going to ask some of the other townships, would it be beneficial to have State Board of Accounts come in and audit

every year instead of every two years? For townships? Had you ever thought about that?

Kathryn Martin: Why don't we just think about getting people in that are honest and trustworthy, instead of spending more money to make sure people aren't?

President Lloyd: Okay. We've got another township official here.

Kathryn Martin: Mary.

Mary Hart: Mary Hart, Pigeon Township. No, it would not be beneficial. First of all, the State Board of Accounts does not have the staff to audit township government every year. They audit every two years, and the recommendations are, any changes are made every two years. So first of all, they don't have the staff to audit us every year.

President Lloyd: How much do they charge you? Roughly.

Mary Hart: Well, my township is \$340 every time they audit. So I don't know what the other townships pay, but it's rather expensive.

Kathryn Martin: Mine was around \$4,000.

President Lloyd: Well, compared to a private CPA firm that's an extreme bargain. I think a private CPA firm, you're talking about \$8,000 on up. But they don't, they do what the governmental audit requires.

Mary Hart: But the \$340 that they just charged, the last one was just a partial audit, they didn't do a full audit. Doing a full audit, an audit can cost me up to \$1,000.

President Lloyd: Well, that's still a bargain for what you're getting. Other questions for Knight? One more question I had, and we had talked a little bit about township assistance, and that was where Ms. Durham really took the township, I guess, down the wrong track by overspending that account.

Kathryn Martin: Correct.

President Lloyd: Did you have to increase your requirements to, I guess, not give as many people assistance because those funds are depleted?

Kathryn Martin: Well, I did, one thing I didn't mention is, I did away with the non-food program for next year as well. I ended it, this August was the end, and we have, usually we would pay upwards of \$100 on a Vectren bill, now we pay \$50. We are scrutinizing a lot more. I was just in for an appeal the other day. So we're buckling down because we don't have a choice.

President Lloyd: Right, and it's tough because these times are not easy.

Kathryn Martin: Right.

President Lloyd: So there's a lot of requests, and you're having to scale that back.

Kathryn Martin: Uh-huh.

President Lloyd: Okay. Mr. Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Kathryn, was there any success of getting any monies from the bonding companies?

Kathryn Martin: The Attorney General right now is going after the bond company. There's no reason why we should not receive that back. I did request from the Evansville Bond Bank \$172,000, because I didn't want to sell the township short, counting on the \$60,000 from the bonds from Linda.

Councilmember Kiefer: Sure.

Kathryn Martin: So hopefully, that's something we are counting on is getting the \$60,000.

Councilmember Kiefer: When do you think you might hear back?

Kathryn Martin: We don't know.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay.

Kathryn Martin: I've made contact with the Attorney General's office, and they're in litigation with the bond company right now.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay, thank you.

President Lloyd: There's more litigation over this township. It's unbelievable.

Kathryn Martin: I'm telling ya'.

President Lloyd: Mr. Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: I would like, at this time, to make a motion for, a recommendation much like we did last week on a couple of the other ones that I made motions on. In light of the fact that we do have other people around who are willing to aid and assist in the legal issues and problems, I would recommend that since we're talking, particularly for next year, 2011, and not the current year, that the legal services line item be reduced from \$10,000 down to \$4,000. That's twice what we are paying, that any other township is paying out in their legal funds that I can see.

Councilmember Kiefer: Tom, I would like to—

Councilmember Shetler: I haven't gotten to Pigeon Township yet, so maybe I'm incorrect on that.

Mary Hart: You are incorrect. My township, I have a \$5,000 attorney retainer fee.

Councilmember Shetler: Okay, I'll make that five. We'll make it \$5,000 then on that.

Councilmember Kiefer: I would like to explore that a little bit further, if you don't mind. Now, go ahead and just reiterate to me again why you had \$10,000.

Kathryn Martin: Well, I didn't put that in the budget, but now I'm thankful it was there because of everything that's gone on.

Councilmember Kiefer: So you're thinking there is going to be continuing litigation next year—

Kathryn Martin: There may be.

Councilmember Kiefer: — that would result in the need for that fund?

Kathryn Martin: Correct.

Councilmember Shetler: Are you, did I understand that in the 2010 budget there was \$10,000 in it?

Kathryn Martin: Yes.

Councilmember Shetler: So before any legal problems came up, he was being paid \$10,000? Okay, I mean, so obviously, we had some problems here that dealt with someone's bad behavior and someone's ineptness of paying, perhaps, out too much on poor relief, but we also were overspending in some other areas, like legal services, for example, may be a perfect example, and I'm not sure Pigeon is a good one to give an example with Knight. Knight and Center are more of the same kind of size, same kind of demographics, in terms of legal issue. I'm not sure, I would have to go back three, four, five years, but I'm thinking that the retainer that they had for legal services back then was around \$2,000 at Knight Township. Suddenly, its jumped up to \$10,000, and, again, my motion is that we would cap that at \$5,000 for legal services next year.

Mary Hart: What happened with her attorney fees though, there was two years in a row, they didn't have \$10,000 in and in '08 and there was some legal issues there that, with the fire contract and additional things, that they ran over their \$5,000 retainer because they started charging \$275 an hour for the remainder of the hourly that they were doing, over and above that \$5,000 retainer. So that's the reason \$10,000 was put in to cover the excess that was being used at the hourly rate.

Councilmember Shetler: \$275 an hour?

Kathryn Martin: I'm with ya'.

Councilmember Shetler: That's lucrative. Okay, thank you. I make a motion for \$5,000, a recommendation to cap—

Councilmember Goebel: Kathryn, can you live with the \$5,000?

Kathryn Martin: Yes.

Councilmember Shetler: Thank you.

President Lloyd: Okay, there's a motion to change an amendment to the Knight Township budget recommendation by County Council, \$5,000 for legal services. Is there a second?

Councilmember Kiefer: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, I guess, one point of information, what you called bad behavior, I would call alleged criminal behavior and mismanagement.

Councilmember Shetler: I was sugar coating it there a little bit.

President Lloyd: Yeah.

Councilmember Shetler: But \$275 an hour, I will tell you that that is the rate that high level partners, managing partners get paid in Evansville, and we're talking a couple of years ago. I mean, that's a lot of darn money for legal services. I think you're going to be hard pressed to find very many in Evansville getting paid that kind of money.

Councilmember Kiefer: I mean, Russ, in, like the city, isn't it a negotiated rate of like \$125-\$150 an hour or something like that?

President Lloyd: I believe so.

Councilmember Kiefer: Yeah.

President Lloyd: I'm not going to defend this, but I suspect that attorney had to do more work that he wasn't paid for in this, when you talk about the mountain of legal problems for this township. Anyway, there's a motion and a second. Any other discussion? Let's vote on this motion. Mr. Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: I would just like to say, Ms. Martin, I think your board, your township board ought to check in with the attorney and see if that's a conflict of interest. I feel that it is since he represented her before you got there. So that would be my recommendation.

President Lloyd: I think Mr. Schulz said that he would look into it, if we asked him to.

Councilmember Bassemier: Okay.

President Lloyd: Okay. Any other discussion? We're voting on this motion to amend Knight Township budget, recommendation \$5,000 professional services. Any other discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes.

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

President Lloyd: Any other questions for Knight Township? I guess, my only other question would be, did the tax rate go up or down?

Kathryn Martin: The tax rate?

President Lloyd: The property tax rate. It went up a little bit?

Kathryn Martin: Yes.

President Lloyd: Okay. Other than the amendment that we just voted on, is there a motion to approve Knight Township as submitted?

Councilmember Terry: So moved.

President Lloyd: Is there a second?

Councilmember Bassemier: Second.

President Lloyd: Motion Ms. Terry, second Mr. Bassemier. Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes.

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

President Lloyd: It will be approved as submitted, six/zero, except for the change in professional services. If, after the townships are finished, if there's any public comments we'll accept those after all of the townships. Thank you.

PERRY TOWNSHIP TRUSTEE

President Lloyd: Go to 4E, Perry Township Trustee.

David Mosby: Good afternoon. David Mosby, Perry Township Trustee. Trying to think of all of the questions you asked. No, we don't have a pay raise in our budget. Yes, we do have some balances, around \$325,000 at the end of June, so we'll be paying out some of that. Yes, we do have guidelines that we follow, and they are based on income, based on the amount of the household, and then sometimes on circumstances that might occur that you go back and look at, too.

Councilmember Shetler: What about your legal?

David Mosby: My legal is \$2,000 for the whole year. We keep John Hamilton on retainer.

President Lloyd: Are you having any problem with the fire funds, as far as running a deficit?

David Mosby: No, my fire department pretty much knows what we have and what we can get, and they are very good about that. We have an excellent fire department. Nobody's paid, they're all volunteers. So and a great chief and some good people.

President Lloyd: Other questions for Mr. Mosby? Mr. Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Your fire department is all volunteer?

David Mosby: Uh-huh.

Councilmember Goebel: Interesting. Thank you.

President Lloyd: Any other questions? Township assistance, obviously, are you seeing an increase in requests?

David Mosby: Very much so.

President Lloyd: Yeah.

David Mosby: That's what me and the chief deputy who's with me, Darlene Schweikhart, were talking about, and there's a good chance that we'll be next out of funds by the first of December or so, but we're working on that.

President Lloyd: Did you have to raise requirements?

David Mosby: No, we haven't raised the requirements yet. You know, hopefully, there will be some areas that we can scale back here and maybe transfer out of prescriptions or something like that to carry over to. It's more in non-food and utilities, is the big thing.

President Lloyd: Okay, other questions for Mr. Mosby?

Councilmember Bassemier: Motion to approve.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion to approve as submitted, with no change by Mr. Bassemier.

Councilmember Shetler: Second.

President Lloyd: Second, Mr. Shetler. Any other discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes.

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

President Lloyd: I would also like to say, David, thank you for all of your service.

David Mosby: You're welcome.

President Lloyd: Appreciate it.

David Mosby: Thank you all.

PIGEON TOWNSHIP TRUSTEE

President Lloyd: We'll move on to 4F, Pigeon Township Trustee.

Mary Hart: Good morning, Mary Hart--

President Lloyd: Good morning.

Mary Hart: --Pigeon Township Trustee. Yes, there is a two percent pay increase in my budget. Fire department was decreased from \$20,000 to \$12,000. That was because of the annexation into the city, and my city contract was lowered because of the annexation.

President Lloyd: You guys contract with the City of Evansville, because Pigeon is totally within the city, other than that one piece?

Mary Hart: There's several areas that's outside of the city limits, but the biggest majority of it, down around Marina Pointe, was annexed in, but there's still some areas outside the city limits, and that's the reason that contract was lowered.

President Lloyd: Okay, and you listed here, number of employees, it looks like, eight, or seven, plus you?

Mary Hart: Seven employees, and myself makes eight.

President Lloyd: Okay. Then, did you guys have a pay increase last year?

Mary Hart: No.

President Lloyd: Okay, so you're following the city guideline, two percent?

Mary Hart: Two percent pay increase.

President Lloyd: Okay.

Mary Hart: That's the only changes in my budget.

President Lloyd: Okay. Any other questions for Ms. Hart? Then, also, you're, are you president of the township association?

Mary Hart: Yes.

President Lloyd: Okay, Indiana Township Association?

Mary Hart: Yes, and our guidelines are based on poverty guidelines. There are extenuating circumstances, but the cases are reviewed case by case to determine

eligibility, not just by guidelines, but by the situation that the family is in. They may be a little over our income guidelines, but they've had a major catastrophe. They may still qualify for our services for Vectren, or rental assistance, or medications. It just depends on the situation that our families are in.

President Lloyd: Do you guys give food assistance?

Mary Hart: Yes.

President Lloyd: Okay. Mr. Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Mary, maybe you could, since you are an expert, give a little light as far as the volunteer fire departments. Do most of them come up with actual volunteers? Or do we have a lot that are paid? Or is it apples to oranges based on the location of the township?

Mary Hart: It really depends on the location of the township. Across the State of Indiana you have some in the rural areas that are all total volunteers. In the larger, urban areas they have volunteer fire departments that have paid staff. So it just depends on the area that they're in.

Councilmember Goebel: Thank you.

President Lloyd: Other questions for Ms. Hart? Mr. Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: Yeah, let me just go ahead and ask you a little bit on the legal, and, again, noticing on a couple of the others they either have really very little or nothing in their legal, or else it might be \$2,000. Yours being \$5,000, what's, I mean, do you guys, do you have to occasionally file suits or get involved with folks?

Mary Hart: We do. My attorney is David Shaw and he's on a retainer, and we have, in the last couple of years, caught fraud in the assistance that we have given and we have asked him to prosecute to retrieve the money. So we do have to have him a little more frequently than the others, because our case load is so much higher than the other townships.

Councilmember Shetler: Would that, and, again, I'm just asking the question, not, would that be a service that would be generally provided by the Prosecutor's office then, if it's a criminal fraud?

Mary Hart: No. He would have to file the charges, because it's actually welfare fraud. He would have to file the charges, the Prosecutor wouldn't pick them up.

Councilmember Shetler: So then it's a civil—

Mary Hart: Yes.

Councilmember Shetler: —as opposed to being a criminal?

Mary Hart: Right.

Councilmember Shetler: Alright, thank you.

President Lloyd: Well, and you're not talking about huge amounts of dollars, but it's, I mean, you probably have several of these types every once in a while.

Mary Hart: Yes.

President Lloyd: Okay. Other questions for Ms. Hart? I mean, I've asked the other ones, but obviously, you've seen, over the last two years, a large increase in requests for assistance?

Mary Hart: Yes. Much worse this year than it has been in the past.

President Lloyd: Okay. Has your tax rate gone up?

Mary Hart: No.

President Lloyd: About the same? Okay, well, that's good news for property tax payers. Any other questions for Ms. Hart? Does anyone make a motion to approve?

Councilmember Bassemier: Motion to approve.

Councilmember Shetler: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion to approve Pigeon Township budget as submitted, Mr. Bassemier, second Mr. Shetler. Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes.

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

President Lloyd: Passes six/zero. Will be approved as submitted. Thank you, Ms. Hart.

SCOTT TOWNSHIP TRUSTEE

President Lloyd: Item 4G, Scott Township Trustee.

Bob Harris: Bob Harris, Scott Township Trustee.

President Lloyd: Good morning.

Bob Harris: Hi.

President Lloyd: Any highlights of your budget?

Bob Harris: When I prepared this budget, I put a three percent raise in for the wages. That amounts to a total of \$1,080. I will reduce that if it's the pleasure of the Council. Everything else is about the same. We're talking about fire departments, Scott Township is the only township in Vanderburgh County where the township owns all of the equipment, owns all of the buildings. I just contract with the fire department for their services. They use the township equipment.

President Lloyd: How many employees?

Bob Harris: In the township?

President Lloyd: Yeah.

Bob Harris: Five, myself, a clerk, and three board members.

President Lloyd: Okay. Any questions for Scott? Mr. Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: So Bob, you will amend back to 1.5 percent?

Bob Harris: I will amend it to 1.5 percent.

Councilmember Goebel: That's great. I don't know if there's any across the board situation, like you own the fire equipment, others we lease, or rent, I think that would be generally a good thing if we had a uniform policy on those, on the fire departments.

Bob Harris: I think you'll find that's the way Indiana State code says it should be.

Councilmember Goebel: Thank you, Bob.

President Lloyd: Well, and you have other, some of these other townships, or the fire departments somehow became these separate non-profits. Then, they have borrowing authority.

Bob Harris: If they put themselves at risk for the loans, when I buy the equipment, you know, it's paid for by tax monies. When that loan is paid off, it drops off the tax rate.

President Lloyd: Well, and you also have ambulance service.

Bob Harris: We run the only ambulance service outside of Evansville. We take care of Armstrong and Scott Township. We run a 24/7 paramedic unit.

President Lloyd: Mr. Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Has the Baseline Road overpass—

Bob Harris: It's helped tremendously.

Councilmember Goebel: So it has been something you needed?

Bob Harris: Oh, for years.

Councilmember Goebel: Thank you.

President Lloyd: No, that's a good thing that the county did. Other questions for Mr. Harris?

Councilmember Shetler: Move approval.

President Lloyd: Okay, move approval as submitted by Mr. Shetler. Is there a second?

Councilmember Goebel: How do we work the amending back to 1.5?

President Lloyd: Oh, we need to do an amendment on the pay.

Councilmember Shetler: Move approval with the amendment of one and a half percent cap on the salaries.

President Lloyd: Is there a second?

Councilmember Goebel: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Shetler, second Mr. Goebel.

Councilmember Shetler: I was incorporating in my motion.

President Lloyd: Right, the motion is the budget as submitted, other than a pay increase for township employees 1.5 percent, instead of three. Is there any other discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes.

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

President Lloyd: It will be, with that one change on the pay, approved as submitted.

Bob Harris: Thank you.

President Lloyd: Thank you, Mr. Harris. Thank you, Barbara Harris as well, and thank you for your work on the reorganization committee.

Barbara Harris: You're welcome.

UNION TOWNSHIP TRUSTEE

President Lloyd: Item 4H, Union Township Trustee. The letter U is last.

Joe Steinkamp: Saved the best for last. Joe Steinkamp, Union Township Trustee. There's myself as Trustee, my wife the deputy, and three advisory board members. There was no pay raise. I didn't even bring the account balances with me. I figured you all had those. My wife brought 12 copies up here and didn't leave me one. We contract out our fire service from Perry Township. A couple of years ago I got approval from the state, built a fire garage in our township above the '37 flood level, and that's bumped up the tax rate a little bit in our township, but we have the guy that stored the truck for the last 15 years decided that he didn't want to store the truck anymore. So we have a fire garage, a dandy little building. That's about all there is interesting to know. We haven't really seen an increase. We run about the same amount of assistance. We have guidelines, we follow them, and that's about it.

President Lloyd: What's the population of Union Township?

Joe Steinkamp: I don't know what the population is. The census just got done, so maybe we'll find out.

President Lloyd: Right.

Joe Steinkamp: But there was 162 people who voted the last time, when I was first elected.

President Lloyd: And not all of them vote, so there's a few others.

Joe Steinkamp: There's less than a thousand.

President Lloyd: Right, you've got some children as well. Questions for Union Township? So did the fire garage, is that land that the township purchased?

Joe Steinkamp: Yeah, the previous Trustee had bought it back in the early 90's and built the mound, and put rip rap on it, because it's in a flood plain, and then that sat there—

President Lloyd: Okay.

Joe Steinkamp: —for the last, sometime in the last four years.

President Lloyd: Right, so it was good planning. Okay. Questions? Mr. Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: This is totally, I think your budget proposal is great, but totally off this subject, does Union Township still own section 16?

Joe Steinkamp: Yeah, one of the, for the benefit of the board, section 16 in every township in the State of Indiana was set up for the benefit of education. Our, Union Township, I think Orange County has a township that has their section 16 yet, but Union Township is one of the only townships in the State of Indiana that still owns section 16 for the benefit of education. It's all farmland in a flood plain, and we only, a section of land is 640 acres, and we only have about 300 tillable, because the rest of ours has fell in the river, because of it's on the outside of Old Henderson Road. So part of my job as Trustee is to administer the funds of that land, and so the students of the township get a small stipend to help pay for books and supplies, and as children go to college they get a small stipend from that. Then, at the same time, a certain portion of the funds, long before my time, but when EVSC became, took over all of the township schools, part of the negotiated rate was "x" amount of the annual rent goes back to the county to reduce the tax rate for the benefit of all of the taxpayers in the township.

Councilmember Goebel: Well, I bring that up because I think it's really interesting. Historically, this township situation was by the land ordinance of 1785 that section 16 would be set aside. Long before we even had our Constitution, and we're still living that history. I think it's really interesting, and good.

President Lloyd: That's, I learned some things today. That's pretty interesting. Any other questions for Union Township? If not, we'll ask for a motion to approve as submitted.

Councilmember Goebel: So moved.

President Lloyd: Is there a second?

Councilmember Shetler: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Goebel, second Mr. Shetler. Any other discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes.

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

President Lloyd: Thank you for coming in, Mr. Steinkamp.

PUBLIC COMMENT

President Lloyd: Okay, before we adjourn, any public comments on the township budgets?

Bob Harris: May I say one more thing?

President Lloyd: Sure.

Bob Harris: The poor relief guidelines are filed with the Commissioners every year. So if anybody would like to review the township poor relief guidelines, they can go to the Commissioners office, and they're on file there.

President Lloyd: On the state, or the county? The County Commissioners?

Bob Harris: Each township—

President Lloyd: Oh.

Bob Harris: –all of their guidelines are filed in the Commissioners office.

President Lloyd: The County Commissioners?

Bob Harris: The County Commissioners.

Councilmember Kiefer: Question.

President Lloyd: Mr. Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Are, does each township have, is it possible that they all have different guidelines? Or, is it a standardized–

Bob Harris: My last time I reviewed, we will review our guidelines yearly–

President Lloyd: Yeah.

Bob Harris: –and I try to check with the other townships, and they’re pretty much the same.

Councilmember Kiefer: Pretty much, but they don’t have to be, but they’re pretty close?

Mary Hart: Can I answer that?

President Lloyd: Go ahead.

Councilmember Kiefer: Sure, thanks.

Mary Hart: Our actual guidelines have to be at poverty level. Now, as far as the assistance that we issue, it may vary a little bit township to township as far as the dollar amount for Vectren that we assist with may vary from township to township, rental assistance will vary dollar amount township to township, but the actual guidelines are based on federal poverty levels.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay, thank you.

President Lloyd: Well, and the Commissioners, we know they get a lot of paper.

Mary Hart: They all have them.

President Lloyd: I’ve not heard from a Commissioner that they receive these, but I’m sure they do. Any other public comments on the township budgets? Is there a motion to adjourn?

Councilmember Shetler: So moved.

President Lloyd: Is there a second?

Councilmember Goebel: Second.

President Lloyd: All in favor signify by saying aye.

(All Councilmembers voted aye)

President Lloyd: We are adjourned. Thank you.

(There being no further business to come before the Council, the meeting was adjourned at 10:42 a.m.)

VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL

President Russell Lloyd, Jr.

Vice President James Raben

Councilmember Joe Kiefer

Councilmember Mike Goebel

Councilmember Tom Shetler, Jr.

Councilmember Ed Bassemier

Councilmember Stephanie Terry

**VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL
NOVEMBER 3, 2010**

The Vanderburgh County Council met in session this 3rd day of November in room 301 of the Civic Center Complex. The meeting was called to order at 8:35 a.m. by County Council President Russell Lloyd, Jr.

President Lloyd: I'd like to call to order the Vanderburgh County Council November 3rd, 2010 meeting. Attendance roll call please.

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

President Lloyd: For the Pledge of Allegiance, I'd like Councilman Raben to lead us. Please stand.

(Pledge of Allegiance was given)

<p style="text-align: center;">APPROVAL OF MINUTES AUGUST 17 & 18, 2010 BUDGET MINUTES SEPTEMBER 1, 2010 BUDGET HEARING SEPTEMBER 8, 2010 SPECIAL MEETING SEPTEMBER 8, 2010 FINAL BUDGET MEETING</p>

President Lloyd: Okay, we have minutes from the August 17th & 18th budget hearings, September 1, 2010 budget hearing, September 8, 2010 special meeting, and September 8, 2010 final budget. Is there a motion to approve all those?

Councilmember Raben: So moved.

President Lloyd: Is there a second?

Councilmember Kiefer: Second.

President Lloyd: Motion Mr. Raben, second Mr. Kiefer. All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

(All Councilmembers voted aye)

President Lloyd: Any opposed?

(No opposing votes were cast)

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

President Lloyd: Before we go to item five, just briefly, we had a general election yesterday and on this Council, we had all the incumbents returned, so Councilman Raben, Councilman Terry, Councilman Shetler, congratulations. I think what that says is the people were satisfied with the government on the County Council. We are going to see some new faces in county government. Some experienced, some new, so hopefully, they'll learn the ropes quickly and look forward to working with all them. And once again, the importance of voting. We had the Knight Township Trustee margin of 12 votes. I mean, that's someone's extended family, like the Shetlers, I mean, it's very tight, and then we've got a couple state rep races that we don't even know yet, including Councilman Goebel.

Councilmember Goebel: And my family, unfortunately, doesn't live in my district.

President Lloyd: You lost out some votes there. But, once again, the voters gave us some surprises and it's always interesting and anyway, appreciate the work everybody did and now that the election is out of the way, we've got important business to attend to. We'll move on to item number five, appropriation ordinance, and I'll turn that over to the Finance Chair, Mr. Shetler.

APPROPRIATION ORDINANCE

CORONER

Councilmember Shetler: Well, I will try to get through this. My throat is a little bit under the weather here. While brevity may be the soul of wit, it's also a necessity for me today. So, first is the Coroner and the request is for \$18,000. It's for funding the autopsies, not much we can do about that, more of an act of God, but if we can change anything there. But anyway, Annie Groves is here to answer any questions.

Councilmember Raben: I'll move approval.

President Lloyd: Motion Mr. Raben.

Councilmember Shetler: So I second.

President Lloyd: Second Mr. Shetler. Any questions for the Coroner? I think she went over this pretty well last week. Okay, if no questions, roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. Motion passes 7-0.

Annie Groves: Thank you.

CORONER		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1070-3650	Autopsies	18,000.00	18,000.00
Total		18,000.00	18,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION

President Lloyd: Next, Cooperative Extension.

Councilmember Shetler: I move for approval on the appropriation of \$1,450, that's for \$1,000 for Utilities and \$450 for Equipment Repair. If there is any questions, and I think they're here.

President Lloyd: Okay, I think they were here last week.

Councilmember Raben: I'll move approval.

President Lloyd: Is there a second?

Councilmember Terry: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Raben, second Ms. Terry. Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. The motion passes 7-0.

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1230-3200	Utilities	1,000.00	1,000.00
1230-3520	Equipment Repair	450.00	450.00
Total		1,450.00	1,450.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

DRAINAGE BOARD

President Lloyd: Drainage Board.

Councilmember Shetler: Again, I'll move for approval on this particular item, it's on Drainage Board for \$15. It was a mathematical error or omission in the PERF account for \$15, so I move for approval.

President Lloyd: Is there a second?

Councilmember Goebel: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, \$15, one of the smallest we'll ever see on this body. Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. Motion passes 7-0.

DRAINAGE BOARD		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1260-1910	PERF	15.00	15.00
Total		15.00	15.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

PUBLIC DEFENDER

President Lloyd: Public Defender. The Public Defender, this is actually upon our request concerning the 2011 budget. We took that out of the 2011 budget and put it in the 2010 expenditures and this will be carried over for use for next year, it was a way of keeping our books straight and cash flow reasons. So it's for \$250,000 for the Death Penalty and I move for approval.

President Lloyd: Is there a second?

Councilmember Raben: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Shetler, second Mr. Raben. And this was money that, as you had indicated, in 2011, the Public Defender had asked for this and we wanted to pay it out of 2010 to save our budget for next year. And we have the cash balance on hand. Any other questions from Council? Okay, roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. Motion passes 7-0.

PUBLIC DEFENDER		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1303-3948	Death Penalty	250,000.00	250,000.00
Total		250,000.00	250,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

BURDETTE PARK

President Lloyd: Burdette Park.

Councilmember Shetler: The request is for a total of \$4,000, \$2,000 for Tires & Tubes, and \$2,000 for Repairs to Buildings & Grounds, and I'll move for approval.

President Lloyd: Is there a second?

Councilmember Raben: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, tie Mr. Bassemier and Mr. Raben, second. Motion Mr. Shetler. Any discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. Motion passes 7-0.

BURDETTE PARK		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1450-2220	Tires & Tubes	2,000.00	2,000.00
1450-3550	Repairs to Bldgs & Grounds	2,000.00	2,000.00
Total		4,000.00	4,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

CONVENTION & VISITORS BUREAU

President Lloyd: Convention & Visitors Bureau.

Councilmember Shetler: This is a request for \$15,000 for Legal Services. The explanation was essentially because of a suit that's been brought before them, additional legal services that they may need for the remainder of this year. I don't think they were at the meeting last week to answer any questions. I know they're here today and perhaps could answer questions for us if anyone has any.

President Lloyd: I believe it was related to the termination of the previous director.

Councilmember Shetler: It was. I guess the one question that I have myself is that can we expect more of this, is this going to take care of that suit, it's entirety or can we expect more to come for next year?

President Lloyd: We're fortunate to have Executive Director and the Attorney.

Krista Lockyear: Krista Lockyear, representing the CVB. I think I can answer that. The insurance company has assumed the responsibility at least at this date, so we're hopeful that insurance will cover all the rest of the legal services related to this lawsuit. The bill that you have was preparatory up until the point where the insurance company accepted coverage.

Councilmember Shetler: Okay, thank you. Do you know, what is that coverage, by the way, for the insurance?

Krista Lockyear: For the lawsuit itself?

Councilmember Shetler: Yeah, how much money are they willing to put up?

Krista Lockyear: I don't believe there is a limit on that at this point. We've just received engagement, or they've accepted coverage and engaged our law firm to continue with the lawsuit, but I don't think they've put any legal limits on the coverage.

Councilmember Shetler: Alright, thank you.

President Lloyd: Do you know what the plaintiff was requesting? In dollars or...

Krista Lockyear: No sir. There's not a...there is an amount in the agreement that they are claiming that the Convention & Visitors Bureau should honor, however, there are additional damages that they're claiming that are not set forth in detail.

President Lloyd: Okay, but you don't have a dollar figure?

Krista Lockyear: No.

Councilmember Shetler: Your insurance, is there a cap on that legal –

Krista Lockyear: Councilman Shetler, I'm not sure. We can get the policy and provide that, but I don't have that number off the top of my head.

Councilmember Shetler: Alright. Do you feel like it's sufficient to cover it or you're not sure?

Krista Lockyear: At this point, I mean, we're in the very early stages of this lawsuit. We've actually just gotten through, whether it would be in federal court or state court, and at this point they haven't even started to address the substantive issues, so it's kind of hard to speculate how long this lawsuit could last.

Councilmember Shetler: Alright, thank you.

President Lloyd: Any other questions from Councilmembers?

Councilmember Shetler: So, I'll move for approval on the \$15,000.

President Lloyd: Is there a second?

Councilmember Terry: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Shetler, second Ms. Terry. Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. Motion passes 6-0.

CONVENTION & VISITORS BUREAU		REQUESTED	APPROVED
3570-3610	Legal Services	15,000.00	15,000.00
Total		15,000.00	15,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0. Councilmember Goebel was out of the room during this vote.)

TRANSFER REQUESTS

President Lloyd: We'll move on to transfers, item six. The first one is the Sheriff.

SHERIFF	SUPERIOR COURT (THREE)
JAIL (TWO, INCLUDING ONE LATE)	CUMULATIVE BRIDGE (TWO)
CORONER	SUPERIOR CT. SUPPLEMENTAL

Councilmember Shetler: If you don't mind, I think what I'll do is go through all of the transfers and do it in one motion. The Sheriff department is requesting a transfer of \$3,000 from line item 1050-1130-0024 to line item 1050-1210 that's going into the College Incentive program. The Jail is requesting a transfer from a Confinement Officer line which is 0306 \$2,200 going into line items 1051 Shift Differential \$2,000 and line 1531 Civilian Shift Differential of \$200. The Coroner is requesting a transfer from line items 2210 in the amount of \$2,000, 2710 Color Film in the amount of \$1,000, line item 3200 Utilities \$1,000, going to line item 3530 for Contractual Services of \$4,000. Superior Court is requesting a transfer from 1370, which is Chief Probation Officer \$1,698 going to two Probation Officers, the line item is 1500-1370 and 1490-1370 each of \$849. Further, on Superior Court, transfer request from line item 3949 Adoption/Home Study \$15,000, line item 3980 Transportation Child & Miscellaneous, \$5,000, to line item 3050 Patient/Inmate Care \$20,000 total. Another by Superior Court from line item 3620 Copy Machine Lease \$750 going to 4210 Office Furniture \$750. I might have a question on that one in a second here, Judge Dietsch, the office furniture. Let me finish the rest of them and then we'll get back to that one. Cumulative Bridge, from 4425 Fickas Road Culvert \$15,000, from 4427 Neu Road Culvert \$11,000, line item 4743 Broadway Avenue Bridge \$40,000 all going to line item 3930 Other Contractual Services \$66,000. Again, in Cumulative Bridge, request to take from line item 2000 Materials \$30,000, take from line item 4250 Miscellaneous Equipment \$16,500, all going to line item 2530 which is Bituminous Materials \$30,000, and also going to 4230 Motor Vehicles of \$16,500. Superior Court Supplemental Adult Probation going from 2620 – I'm sorry, 1100-2620 Chief Probation Officer \$580, going to 1210 Probation Officer, which is line item 1100-2620 in the amount of \$290, and line item 1200-2620 Probation Officer in the amount of \$290. We also have a late transfer going to the Jail, which is going to help feed the prisoners, we have been at max for most of the year, and so they're running short on the food, that's coming out of line 0306 Confinement Officer \$11,000, 0313 Confinement Officer \$16,000, 0332 Confinement Officer \$16,000, 0349 Confinement Officer \$16,000, line item 0358 Confinement Officer \$15,000, that will all go to line item 2260 which is the Food, and that's a total of \$74,000. I would put all of those in a motion for approval and after I get a second I have a question.

Councilmember Kiefer: Mr. President? Just out of curiosity, on the Coroner's, it says Color Film, I don't know if she's here still. Annie, I was just curious, I mean, do you guys still use color film, you don't use digital? I mean, obviously, you're taking money out of that account but I was just curious why there was any money –

Annie Groves: Annie Groves. We actually do both.

Councilmember Kiefer: You do both?

Annie Groves: Uh-huh. It depends on the case.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay, I was just curious because I –

Annie Groves: It's for court.

Councilmember Kiefer: Oh, okay, because I would have thought digital would have just been the primary...

Annie Groves: Well, for court, we have to have some color film, too, because they don't want it altered.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay, alright. Thank you.

President Lloyd: Photoshopping.

Annie Groves: Right.

Councilmember Shetler: Okay, and I –

President Lloyd: You made a motion on all the transfers as requested. Is there a second?

Councilmember Kiefer: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Shetler, second Mr. Kiefer. And I will say that I did approve the late transfer on the Sheriff Jail, Food, and he said that they would not go without food but the vendor would go without pay. But in this case because of the capacity of the Jail, we needed to round up additional money for food.

Councilmember Shetler: I do have a question for Judge Dietsch, I assume you are the one, Judge, on that, and the question is on the office furniture, what specifically is that for?

Terry Dietsch: Well, we were using chairs from the jury room that the jurors use in the offices, the chairs were that bad. And we looked downstairs to see if there was some replacements and there were not. There are a couple of other items that have to be replaced. Quite frankly, Mr. Shetler, right now, I don't know specifically what those items were.

Councilmember Shetler: Okay, well, you answered my follow up question, that you went downstairs, so thank you. Appreciate that.

Terry Dietsch: Any other questions?

Councilmember Shetler: Alright, thank you.

President Lloyd: Any other questions from Council on the transfer? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. All the transfers pass 7-0.

SHERIFF		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1050-1130-0024	Sergeant	3,000.00	3,000.00
To: 1050-1210	College Incentive	3,000.00	3,000.00

JAIL		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1051-1130-0306	Confinement Officer	2,200.00	2,200.00
To: 1051-1530-1051	Shift Differential	2,000.00	2,000.00
1051-1531	Civilian Shift Diff.	200.00	200.00

CORONER		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1070-2210	Gas & Oil	2,000.00	2,000.00
1070-2710	Color Film	1,000.00	1,000.00
1070-3200	Utilities	1,000.00	1,000.00
To: 1070-3530	Contractual Services	4,000.00	4,000.00

SUPERIOR COURT		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1370-1390-1370	Chief Probation Officer	1,698.00	1,698.00
To: 1370-1500-1370	Probation Officer	849.00	849.00
1370-1490-1370	Probation Officer	849.00	849.00

SUPERIOR COURT **REQUESTED** **APPROVED**

From: 1370-3949	Adoption/Home Study	15,000.00	15,000.00
1370-3980	Trans. Child & Misc.	5,000.00	5,000.00
To: 1370-3050	Patient/Inmate Care	20,000.00	20,000.00

SUPERIOR COURT **REQUESTED** **APPROVED**

From: 1370-3620	Copy Machine Lease	750.00	750.00
To: 1370-4210	Office Furniture	750.00	750.00

CUMULATIVE BRIDGE **REQUESTED** **APPROVED**

From: 2030-4425	Fickas Road Culvert	15,000.00	15,000.00
2030-4427	Neu Road Culvert	11,000.00	11,000.00
2030-4743	Broadway Ave. Bridge	40,000.00	40,000.00
To: 2030-3930	Other Contractual	66,000.00	66,000.00

CUMULATIVE BRIDGE **REQUESTED** **APPROVED**

From: 2030-2000	Materials	30,000.00	30,000.00
2030-4250	Misc. Equipment	16,500.00	16,500.00
To: 2030-2530	Bituminous Materials	30,000.00	30,000.00
2030-4230	Motor Vehicles	16,500.00	16,500.00

SUPERIOR COURT
SUPPLEMENTAL ADULT PROBATION **REQUESTED** **APPROVED**

From: 2620-1100-2620	Chief Probation Officer	580.00	580.00
To: 2620-1210-2620	Probation Officer	290.00	290.00
2620-1200-2620	Probation Officer	290.00	290.00

JAIL **REQUESTED** **APPROVED**

From: 1051-1130-0306	Confinement Officer	11,000.00	11,000.00
1051-1130-0313	Confinement Officer	16,000.00	16,000.00

(Table continued next page)

1051-1130-0332	Confinement Officer	16,000.00	16,000.00
1051-1130-0349	Confinement Officer	16,000.00	16,000.00
1051-1130-0358	Confinement Officer	15,000.00	15,000.00
To: 1051-2260	Food	74,000.00	74,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

<p style="text-align: center;">CONVENTION & VISITORS BUREAU PROPOSED BASEBALL/SOFTBALL COMPLEX</p>

President Lloyd: Okay, no item seven. Item number eight, Old Business, Convention & Visitors Bureau proposed baseball/softball complex. Before we start, I want to let everybody know there is going to be no vote taken today. What I had talked to Mr. Dunn about was, we would allow them to make the presentation. This weekend, the Council received the financial budget and some of the bond projections for the project if it would move forward. So we need a little bit of time to digest that and I'm sure Councilmembers will have a number of questions but I'd like to limit it here and what we can do is call a special meeting for the Council questions and the vote on the project. So I know, Mr. Dunn, I think, and the people here representing Convention & Visitors Bureau, you had some presentation, so we would allow that and there may be, we'll allow some limited public comments, but there will be no vote taken on this today. So, did you guys want to come forward?

Councilmember Raben: If we could, Mr. President, let's cover, you know, there was schedules and what have you under different categories, Build America Bonds, COIT, Build America Bonds, let's take those items separate, you know, --

President Lloyd: You mean the time table or the different types of bonds?

Councilmember Raben: Each type of bond has a different schedule. Rather than do an overall, let's take them one at a time and whatever order, I don't care, but so everybody has got a clear understanding.

President Lloyd: Okay, why don't you go ahead with your presentation and we'll go from there.

David Dunn: Good morning, Mr. President, and members of the Council. On behalf of the board of the Convention & Visitors Bureau, members of the Destination Evansville Committee, we want to thank you for the opportunity to present to you an update of this project that we've been working on for some time. We, too, want to offer our congratulations to those of you re-elected as well as to Mr. Goebel in his endeavors to pursue state representative position.

Councilmember Goebel: It's called limbo.

David Dunn: This morning what I'd like to do is to update you on the design of our project, we will review the development budget, the operating budget, our financing plan, and the economic impact of this particular project. As you know, the mission of the Convention & Visitors Bureau is to promote and encourage tourism in Vanderburgh County. The project that we propose accomplishes this mission better than any other project that we've been able to identify. As you also know, that our funding for the CVB and all of our operations associated with the Convention &

Visitors Bureau comes from the Innkeepers Tax primarily. We do receive a subsidy from the Riverboat which amounts to \$212,000 a year, but primarily our funding comes from an 8% tax that is levied against the gross revenues of all rooms that are rented in Vanderburgh County. As you can see from this slide, our tax is broken up into three different areas. We have our general operations where staff and marketing and advertising is coming out of, we have the Tourism Capital Development account, which funds brick and mortar projects in our community, and then we have a 2% subsidy to the Centre operations. Why this project? It may be one of the most often asked questions that we receive, why this project, and as you may remember from prior presentations that we've delivered to you, we've been working on this project now for over six years. If you recall, it began during a board retreat where we were developing a five year strategic plan. What we determined was that Vanderburgh County needed more attractions that cause people to select our community. It didn't start off as softball/baseball. We studied hundreds of ideas including a river walk down main street, a giant Ferris Wheel and a NASCAR track, just to name some of those that we spent time looking into. We hired a consultant that helped us identify sports as a primary attraction that we should focus on, eventually leading us to softball and baseball. We've studied softball and baseball now for several years. We have visited countless complexes throughout the Midwest and, again, we have found no other project that meets or exceeds what this project can deliver. What's interesting through our research along the way is that we've uncovered an unbelievable opportunity as it relates to this particular project and I will share that with you throughout this presentation. Probably the most often asked question is why this location? And I think I can sum it up with two words: convenience and uniqueness. As you can see from this slide, Evansville is ideally geographically located between four major metros, five if you include Cincinnati. It provides us with an unbelievable market to draw from. It also creates an opportunity for teams to meet in the middle who might be representing one of these four communities and choose not to make the journey all the way to the competitive site. It's just an ideal location for so many reasons. Most sports complexes of this magnitude are located miles away from conveniences and amenities and that's primarily due to the amount of space that's required to develop. For a complex like ours, we need somewhere between 60 and 75 acres to do it adequately. And generally, that space is not found readily available inside of the city limits. At this location in the heart of our community, our visiting guest will only be five minutes away from all the services that they come to expect, services such as hotels, restaurants, shopping, retail, and family activities. As you can see from this slide, the new complex that we're proposing to develop is so centrally located as it relates to the hotels that service our community. Right now we have over 4,000 hotel rooms in Vanderburgh County. And again, as you can see from this image, this site is convenient to all of those hotels. Likewise, you can see that within five minutes or so, we offer a multitude of food and beverage outlets. And what's interesting about food and beverage is, as it relates to tourism, food and beverage is the largest benefactor of every tourism dollar that is brought into our community. The second largest benefactor of tourism is retail, and combined, food and beverage and retail represent 55 cents on every dollar that is spent in our community. What this does is it also illustrates what visitors are looking for whenever they're coming into your community, and again, why this location? It certainly depicts the convenience of those services that our visitors are looking for. The primary market that we are pursuing with this particular development is going to be families. Families offer the greatest return on our investment simply because they travel in such large numbers, so when you understand that this is our primary market, what we wanted to do was to create a unique experience for them while they're in our community and this location does that. That's the second part of why this location, it's uniqueness. I suspect that each of you, at some point, have traveled with your children, perhaps

your grandchildren, for some sporting event and if you think back on those travels, think back on the ones that are the most memorable to you, and what made them memorable. When we look at the opportunity that we have in front of us by developing at this location, we feel confident that we're going to be able to develop an experience that is so unique to those families that are traveling to our community. When you think about the amenities that are currently in place at Wesselman's, what you have is an opportunity for families to enjoy much more than just softball/baseball. You can see those other amenities that are presently there. As I said, we've been working on this for quite some time and it's been an arduous process going through the approvals process. It's been very complicated at times as we've had to navigate through seven different governmental agencies that are asked to weigh in and support and endorse our project. Currently we have approvals from the Convention & Visitors Bureau board as well as the Parks Department. You can see the endorsements that we've also received from some prominent organizations within the community. But what's pending are those groups that are in the far right hand column of this slide. Obviously, the Vanderburgh County Council must approve the project before it can proceed and actually there are only two governmental agencies that could stop the project in its tracks: the Parks Department as well as the County Council are the only two that could actually stop the project. All the other governmental agencies that we're seeking approvals from come from the method by which we're proposing to finance. We will present to the County Commission, the County Redevelopment Authority, Area Plan Commission, as well as come back to County Council and then the city must also approve the lease agreement that the Parks Department has approved. I mentioned earlier in my remarks that along this journey, what we have uncovered is an opportunity that we didn't anticipate, and that opportunity is a vision that we have, a vision that the Convention & Visitors Bureau has, for something grander than just softball and baseball. And as you can see from this slide, I've shown you this slide before, the vertical line is Lloyd Expressway, the horizontal line at the bottom is Boeke Road, just to give you a bearing, but what we envision is being able to create a world class nature and recreation area by combining the assets to the south, which are commonly known as the state hospital grounds as well as combining the assets to the north that reach all the way to Morgan Avenue with McDonald's Golf Course. We see the ability to do that through a series of connectors and I think we're all excited about the announcement that the city made recently when they received the grant for the ability to develop the pedestrian walkway over the Lloyd Expressway. That is a wonderful first step in our ability to see these two campuses joined together. In addition to this major connector, what we see is trails that connect to existing trails as well as trails that we see developed that actually connect all of these assets together ultimately creating this world class nature and recreation area. In the end, if, in fact, this is developed, you'll have miles and miles of hiking, jogging, riding, and walking paths throughout both campuses. We feel that our project is really just the catalyst for accomplishing the grander vision of creating the park, but I would like to take a moment just to bring you up to speed on some of the changes that we've made since our last presentation to you. We held a public design meeting where the public was allowed to participate in the design of this project and we really did receive a number of quality ideas that were built into our redesign of this project. What we heard from the Wesselman Nature Society was a concern about the impact of our project to the 245 acre preserve. We conducted an environmental assessment, and from a scientific point of view, were able to demonstrate that our project does not have any negative potential impact on the preserve and they accepted that report and were thankful for it. But in addition to that, what they asked us to do was to design and build a larger buffer between our activity and the point where our projects come together and that's what we've done right here is we redesigned our site to create this larger buffer, which I think they asked for and

appreciated. Another item that had been brought our attention was the impact of the basketball. There are several services, current amenities that are located in this area of development that are going to be displaced and relocated, basketball is one of them. Our original thought was to relocate basketball in this open area here, but a concern was brought to our attention about the potential impact of that to the Good Samaritan Home. What we've now done, is we've located the basketball in this area and it is as far away from the Good Samaritan Home as can be and, likewise, it is as far away from the nature preserve as possible. Another concern that was brought to us in our design meeting was the potential impact along Boeke Road to the residents here. As cars pull into these parking stalls, there was concern that the headlights might impact the residents along there, so what we've done as part of our design is to design berms and heavy landscaping so to block the headlights as they point westward. Another concern that was brought to our attention during design was, there's a stand of mature trees along Boeke here and we were asked to do what we had to do to ensure that we did not affect those. So what we've done in our redesign is, is we've pushed this pod as far east up to the Par 3 property line as possible and by doing so, we have been able to preserve those mature trees along Boeke. Another idea that was brought to our attention was the need for easy access through our development site and connectors to existing trails that are there and that's what we've done, we've made sure that folks can access through this site in an unobstructed manner and it does tie into existing trails. And then finally, we were asked to consider additional warmup and practice areas for the teams and that's what we've done here. What we did is, we took this pod and we pushed it south somewhat and we opened up the space between the two wheels and we've created an area here that's convenient to both sites as well as created additional warm up and practice areas along the way. So those are some of the changes that we feel are significant and they came from the public design workshop. There were original concerns that were brought to our attention from the beginning and we feel like we've addressed those as well. As I mentioned, we did the environmental assessment, which addressed all the potential impacts to the preserve, we've demonstrated that light pollution is actually going to be reduced with this project. Traffic was a concern originally and that's why from design, we've ensured that there's no direct vehicular access from our complex onto the Wesselman Park site. The environmental assessment also demonstrated that our project will actually have less traffic on Boeke Road than what currently exists today and noise was a concern, the environmental assessment illustrated that noise was essentially net neutral to what's there now. We're not reducing noise with this development, but we're not increasing noise either. I'm not sure when the last time any of you have been to Wesselman Park, but the images that I will share with you are the current conditions that are there, that exist today. These are not random images that we have selected throughout the community, they're not random images that we've even selected from Wesselman Park. In fact, these are images of the current conditions of the area that we are proposing to develop. I'm certainly not suggesting that it's the responsibility of this Council to address these. What I am suggesting, though, is that it is a community responsibility and what I can tell you is that if we are allowed to develop this project at this site, that our community will never see these images with these conditions at this site ever again. This is a list of the users that we anticipate utilizing this facility, but the one I want to point out is the fact that it's our community that is going to be the primary benefactor. It's the community that will utilize this park, utilize these fields, more than any other. Obviously, the revenue generating side of this proposal is from the out of town teams, but what is nice about this proposal is the fact that it's a great blend of activity where the adult leagues will use the park through the week and then our out of town guests will use it on the weekend. So we're able to do that in a complimentary coordinating fashion. The only time that we anticipate that there may be a conflict is if we are awarded a major national which

would be a ten day event. Those are done two years in advance, which gives us ample time to work with Chris Renn in the Park's Department on a scheduling issue and Chris has indicated his support for our project and certainly his willingness to work with us on those schedules. As we go through the development project, you'll see that all of these areas are, in fact, included. It's important that I point out the fact that there are current amenities that exist within the site that we planned to develop that are going to be disrupted, but it's important for you to know that we are committed to relocating them, actually building them new. Those include the basketball that I mentioned, the sand volley ball and the handball courts. In addition to our plan, you'll see that our proposal is to raze Roberts Stadium and the 28 acres of asphalt that's currently there. The information that, and really, for the sake of time, this morning we have given you, as President Lloyd has indicated in advance, copies of our development budget, our operations budget, and so I'm going to highlight some of the components of our budget. I'll save questions from you at the appropriate time. As you can see, the construction of this site is roughly 12.8 million dollars. It's important to note that these fields at this time are planned to be developed as natural turf fields. There has been discussion from our group about the value of developing synthetic fields. What we find is at this time, we do not have the budget to support that 2.5 million dollar premium between the difference of natural and synthetic. Not to say that we're going to give up on that yet, but at this time, the numbers that you have in front of you depict a natural turf development, therefore, an expense that we have to plan for is the necessary equipment to maintain natural turf and that's what this line item is for. Also built into our budget would be the razing of Roberts Stadium and that 28 acres of asphalt that I had mentioned. In addition, there are some enhancements that will be made to the park depending on, as it relates to the current infrastructure that's in place, that does represent approximately 2.4 million. There's 1.8 million dollars worth of soft costs that include design engineering, project management, and costs associated with putting the bond together. As you can see, it's a 17.5 million dollar project that we are proposing. With regards to the financing, presently, there are two stimulus bonds that are available that we are considering: one is the Recovery Zone bond and the other is the Build America bond. The reason why we are considering utilizing one of these two bonds is because there is a rebate that is available to us for the life of the bond. The Recovery Zone bond offers a 45% rebate on the interest of that bond. The Build America bond offers a 35% interest on that bond. There is a sense of urgency on both of those bonds because presently they are to expire at the end of this year and if they do expire, then so would our ability to enjoy the rebate from either of those two. Between the two, Build America is the most likely bond that we will pursue and it's primarily because the Recovery Zone bond has a limited allocation to Vanderburgh County. Presently, the allocation is 2.7 million dollars. The state has realized that there are a number of counties throughout the state that were also allocated Recovery Zone dollars that did not put them to good use and they are in the process of pulling those back and reallocating them to projects like ours, so there is a chance that we could use the Recovery Zone bond to finance this entire project. We won't know that for maybe another week or two, so in the interim, we're probably zeroing in on the Build America bond. Likewise, there is a tax free bond that we could utilize, but again, what we sacrifice by considering that would be that the rebate, and as you can see from the illustrations, it's roughly 4.8 million dollars over that 25 year span as it relates to the Build America bond, it's close to 200,000 dollars a year that would come back to us that we would utilize to reinvest back into this project. Likewise, we've presented to you our operating budget, our revenue and expense forecast. I'll probably just skip through this, entertain your questions at the appropriate time. I would like to point out to you, though, that as you can see from our forecast, we do forecast an operating deficit for the first two years on a straight operating performance basis.

By year three we are forecasting that the project can cash flow, but what's interesting about this forecast is the impact that the rebate has on our financial plan. If, in fact, we're utilizing the Build America bond and receiving roughly 200,000 dollars a year, it ensures the financial success of the project. This is probably the slide that I'd like to draw most of your attention to, --

Councilmember Raben: David, since we were -- do you have time for a question?

David Dunn: I'm here at your pleasure, sir.

Councilmember Raben: We were at the -- you just hit on the revenue projections and it looks to me as if, like 2013, we're taking both rebates?

David Dunn: No, 2013, would have a carryover rebate during our development years.

Councilmember Raben: Okay...

President Lloyd: So that \$455,000 is a carryover from what '11 and '12?

Councilmember Raben: Well, that's Recovery Zone rebate. There it says Build America, but on the sheet that was provided to me, it says Recovery Zone rebate.

David Dunn: Okay, it could be, Councilman Raben that we've made some adjustments to our presentation slide versus what we had submitted to you, but this is the most current information that we have so it's really, we're not really focusing on Recovery at this time because of its limited capacity to fund so we're --

Councilmember Raben: I understand, but on my sheet it says that we're --

David Dunn: I apologize for that, it should say --

Councilmember Raben: -- as an assumption that we're getting that as well as the Build America.

David Dunn: Yeah, that's a --

Councilmember Kiefer: So, Dave, it's not both, you don't get both, it's either/or?

David Dunn: It's either/or, yes.

Councilmember Kiefer: Yeah, so there's not an opportunity for both of those. That's why there was multiple amortization schedules. I was confused by that at first because I didn't know if you were just getting one or the other, but --

David Dunn: Technically, we can pursue both but it's too costly to do that and so what we will wind up doing is pursuing one or the other. We would prefer to pursue Recovery because of the greater rebate back to us, but at this stage, it seems unlikely that we can fully fund the project using Recovery, so instead, our numbers as it relates to our rebate forecast are based on the 35% rebate that is anticipated from the Build America, and I apologize for the typo --

Councilmember Kiefer: And as the amortization schedule shows, this is not one big chunk of money you get up front, it's spread out over the course of the life of the bond.

David Dunn: Actually, that's true, but I think what you'll see is that it's going to be more front loaded where the rebate is going to be heavier on the front end because we're paying a larger percent of the interest on the front than we do towards the end of the project. But we don't get a 4.7 or a –

Councilmember Kiefer: Right, that's what I was getting at. And then up here in these numbers here, you're showing 299,455, that's with the assumption that you're getting COIT backup on COIT, the use of the COIT fund.

David Dunn: That is correct.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay, thanks. I just wanted to clarify that, thank you.

President Lloyd: Got a couple of slides to go?

David Dunn: Yep. This is a busy slide and if I may, I'll just explain it to you, if I can. The far left hand column identifies the number of weekends that we're forecasting to host events. You can see that in year 2013, which is the year, the first year that we feel that we're going to be able to have this development up and running. We're forecasting 16 teams, the second year 22 teams and the third year 26 teams. The next column identifies the number of teams that would be anticipated for those. You can see that early on, we're anticipating hosting smaller qualifiers, smaller events but by year three, we do anticipate being in a position to pursue the larger events. As I stated earlier, the large events are granted to a community two years in advance and so we leave next week for Shreveport to pursue large events from the ASA convention. The next column is just a multiplier of teams and weekends and mixed with that on the right hand side of that third column is a reduction of those teams because we know that there will be local teams that will also be participating in our events so we wanted to reduce the number of teams that would anticipate staying over, and that's what that column represents. The fourth column represents the number of rooms nights that are going to be associated with that. The hotel revenue that is forecast, and the multiplier on the hotel calculation is using \$76.75 as an average daily rate which is consistent with what our market is producing today. The direct spend is also using industry averages on a conservative basis at \$220 per night is the average spend that an individual makes into our community. The economic impact is taking a 1.38 multiplier as that money then is reinvested in the community and then the final column is an interesting column because what it's doing is, is it's showing a true return on investment as it relates to the tourism capital development account that we're using to fund this project. If we're allowed to develop this particular project, this project will help to perpetuate the same fund that's financing it and you can see by our third year, we'll be adding over \$150,000 back into the Tourism Capital Development account that can then be used for future projects.

Councilmember Shetler: David, before you leave that slide, what's the season for travel softball?

David Dunn: March through October is the general season which represents roughly 32 weekends that we can pursue depending on the climate that we have, we can entertain groups outside of March through October, but you can see that by year three, we're trying to be as aggressive as we can utilizing the park as often as we can but still not implying that every weekend will be filled.

Councilmember Shetler: And that's my question, really, do you think that's really realistic, you know, half, for six months, we'll be pretty well tying up that complex with

fairly major events? I mean, given rain in the spring and all the other, you know, climate things we deal with. We haven't seen rain in a long time but spring time, we hopefully will.

David Dunn: Well, again, rain is the primary reason why we were attracted to synthetic turf and so we still want to consider that because it has the least amount of effect on our ability to host but, clearly, rain is the worst challenge that we have to overcome as it relates to it. As I stated, we've been researching softball/baseball now for over three years and we have enlisted numerous industry experts who have helped us to make these forecasts and projections and do feel that they are realistic.

Councilmember Bassemier: What are you planning on charging per team to participate?

David Dunn: Three hundred dollars is the general average that we see as the entry fee per team.

Councilmember Bassemier: So you're going to have a tournament every weekend?

David Dunn: Every weekend? We hope to, yes. And remember, this is softball and baseball, this is not just softball, but we do want to have activity at the park as often as we can.

Councilmember Bassemier: Thank you.

President Lloyd: The number of tournaments each year, so are you anticipating every weekend, basically, or –

David Dunn: Not every weekend.

President Lloyd: Right, because, like –

David Dunn: By year three, though, we're confident that we can ramp this thing up and have activity 26 of 32 weekends that we see has realistic potential.

President Lloyd: So the revenue slide, which was a couple slides back, but you had roughly 535,000 in '13, do you know how many tournaments that would be, like for each one of those years, roughly?

David Dunn: Well, it's using this same model.

President Lloyd: So when you say 25 teams, --

David Dunn: Twenty-five teams would come to an – for example, in our first year, we anticipate eight tournaments that would accommodate 25 teams a piece. We also see four tournaments that would be a little bit larger of about 30 teams a piece. And then we also see four events that would be even larger yet at 50 teams a piece. Now a major national would be those that are 150 teams or more. We're not looking to be awarded one of that size, but we are going to pursue large, large tournaments that would accommodate 100 teams or more.

President Lloyd: The largest tournaments, you wouldn't have enough fields, would you?

David Dunn: Yes. What happens, there is, instead of it being over a weekend, it

would be over a ten-day period and again, that's where we would know with plenty of time in advance to work out that conflicting schedule with the adult league play.

President Lloyd: So what does one team get charged to go to a tournament, roughly?

David Dunn: Three hundred dollars.

President Lloyd: Other questions?

Councilmember Shetler: So does that mean that where it's going to go over two weekends, should this be like 29 instead of 26? I mean, you've got three 100's –

David Dunn: No, it's built into our averages. It's all built into our averages.

Councilmember Shetler: Well, the math doesn't appear that the 100 teams is weighted heavier than the other – you follow me? Mathematically, you've got that straight-lined at 26 weekends and if a hundred team is going to take more than one weekend, it should reflect in that number 26, shouldn't it?

David Dunn: Well, again, --

Councilmember Shetler: I mean, it's not weighted, it seems like that – so we may be exhausting in – I guess the other question I had was, because of, you know, there's not a whole lot of spare time there, you know, 26 out of 32 projected, the spring time, if there is rain or, thank God if there would be some rain in the summertime, and something would be rained out for the weekend, are they refunded?

David Dunn: Yes.

Councilmember Shetler: So you would have a certain amount of –

David Dunn: It may not be refunded, all of it, there may be some –

Councilmember Shetler: Make allowance, to keep good will.

David Dunn: Yeah.

Councilmember Shetler: And that's not reflected in these numbers?

David Dunn: No.

Councilmember Shetler: Alright.

President Lloyd: Let's see, we're getting to the end of this. Do you want to keep going?

David Dunn: Sure. This is an important slide, I think, because, once again, what it's doing is it's demonstrating the impact to the tax itself that's being utilized to fund the project. And what we've done is we've just illustrated the impact of the revenue stream as it relates to just this project and the additional incremental revenues that will be associated with it, so that you can see that by year '13, what we're able to do with this project alone is we're going to add \$77,000 worth of revenue to our general operations account, we're going to forecast \$150,000 of incremental revenue into the Tourism Capital Development account and likewise, there's roughly \$62,000 that's

going to be added to the subsidy that we currently provide to the Centre if we're allowed to develop this particular project. The total contribution is close to \$300,000 by year three based on these forecasts. I'm going to summarize the project like this and perhaps I'm too close to this project because I can't understand what's not to like about it, quite honestly. You know, this is a project that's fully funded using the Innkeepers Tax that does not use any property tax whatsoever, either in the development of the project or the ongoing operational project or the future capital needs of this project. It's a project that's an affordable project that does not deplete all of the revenue stream from the Tourism Capital Development account. If we're allowed to develop this project and we can add the additional revenue into Tourism Capital Development, what we're going to have is roughly 4 to \$500,000 a year in surplus that is presently unallocated or uncommitted. This is a project that does not further burden the Parks Department, this is a project that addresses and cures the current conditions that we've just illustrated that exist today at the park. It's a project that actually expands the park by over 40 acres. We're really not developing softball and baseball. What we're doing is we're expanding our park and we're developing eight multi-purpose softball/baseball fields inside this expanded area. It's a project that is unanimously endorsed and supported by the hotel community, the same industry that is funding and creating the revenue source for this project to be developed. It's a project that's viewed as an investment rather than an expense, a project that offers a significant return on investment. It's a project that has been developed to operate in an efficient manner. It's a project that has a sensible finance plan that provides a revenue stream to ensure the profitability, not only of the immediate short-term operations needs, but also provides for that long-term capital need. It's a project that promotes healthy lifestyle in our community. It's a project that improves the quality of life to the citizens of our community. It's a project that's been transparent from the very beginning. We've been open-minded, we've been willing to change and we've overcome every single objection that's been presented to us along this design phase. We feel it's a project that this community deserves and if we can't support this project, which one should we support? I mean, if a project that offers all of these qualities and all of these elements and all this value is not one that this community can support, which one should we be focused on? I thank you for your time this morning and certainly would entertain additional questions if you have some.

President Lloyd: Okay, let me kind of lay out the ground rules here. We're talking about the financial plan –

(TAPE CHANGED)

– bonds. We will allow public comment after the Council questions, but we're going to kind of keep this limited because we do anticipate another meeting for the final approval. Let me start with one question, preliminary timetable and checklist: Barnes & Thornburg, is that still in effect, because we did have the Commissioners throw a monkey wrench in there and not approve the Recovery Zone, so are you still abiding by this and it may be an attorney question. But this timetable calls for the Council to vote on the final approval, I guess, December 1. So is there a need for Council to act prior to December 1, the County Council?

David Dunn: Actually, that is a timetable that illustrates the absolute drop-dead schedule in order for us to be able to consider the Build America or the Recovery Zone bonds being able to have the time necessary to have bond counsel prepare and get those to market. Obviously, with the change in schedule from last week, we have to re-evaluate that timetable. It is an aggressive schedule as had been illustrated before. Our window of opportunity continues to shrink with each passing

day which creates an even greater sense of urgency.

President Lloyd: Okay, well, are you going to present the resolution adopting the contract to the Evansville Common Council, the City Council, Monday, November 8th?

David Dunn: I would have to reconfirm that we are able to abide by that schedule. I can't confirm that today.

President Lloyd: Okay, same with November 11th, Thursday, Vanderburgh County Area Plan Commission, are you going to propose a resolution to them? I'm just seeing if you're following this time table or not.

Krista Lockyear: Mr. President, yes. Krista Lockyear. In some discussions that we're not proceeding to City Council, it's a contract that is not financially based and the mayor has indicated and his Council is comfortable with the contract. So the City Council does not need to approve that contract. It's a redevelopment contract lettering the county pursue the city's redevelopment authority.

President Lloyd: Okay, so that's just executive authority, and City Council does not have to vote on it, is what you're saying?

Krista Lockyear: Exactly. With regard to Area Plan Commission, the anticipation and hope right now between the County Commissioners and their attorney is that we can still do that. We are submitting that to Plan Commission to be on their agenda. It will take some action from the County Redevelopment Commission prior to Plan Commission for that to be in place for them to vote, but we are proceeding under that schedule.

President Lloyd: Right, and it's got that they would meet next week prior to Area Plan and then Vanderburgh County Board of Commissioners meet November 12th, Friday or...

Krista Lockyear: And those are all scheduled on call, they're not pre-determined dates, so they can be scheduled as needed.

President Lloyd: Okay. So then, and I don't know if you have the answer, but do you need Vanderburgh County Council to adopt this or to vote on it prior to December 1?

Krista Lockyear: December 1 will work, but it puts us down to the last day. Any days that we can get in advance of December 1 would be helpful for bond counsel to put together that package to show the investors what's available.

President Lloyd: And I guess if we go December 1, the bond attorney is going to be working 24 hours a day.

Krista Lockyear: You got it.

President Lloyd: Okay.

Councilmember Shetler: So we're having Thanksgiving here.

President Lloyd: Okay, I mean, I just had some questions related to this timetable, so we'll entertain other questions from Councilmembers. Mr. Raben?

Councilmember Raben: I'm still very confused on the operational side budget. And we're back to the rebates, and I understand that what I show as the Recovery Zone rebate is a typo, that's meant to say Build America. But there is also a footnote at the bottom that that's a carryover from 2011 - 2012 during the construction phase, that we've got figured in our operational budget. But if you go to your debt service schedule, you're calculating that rebate as part of your debt schedule and carrying it into your operational budget. That 455 is part of your 2011 - 2012 debt service.

President Lloyd: What's the title of the sheet you're looking at?

Councilmember Raben: I am looking at Build America bonds COIT.

President Lloyd: One of the Hilliard Lyons?

Councilmember Kiefer: The amortization schedule.

President Lloyd: Yeah, okay, the Hilliard Lyons sheets?

Councilmember Raben: Uh-huh. And if you look at your fifth column, that's your 35% rebate. As part of that debt schedule is the 152,852 and 303,114.86 or 303,115, that number together is this 455,967 that we're also applying towards our operational costs. So, to me, it still looks to me as if we're spending that money twice.

David Dunn: I guess I didn't –

Councilmember Raben: Well, I've got it right here.

President Lloyd: This is, Hilliard Lyons ran four schedules for bond debt principal and interest and this is the one Build America bonds COIT.

Councilmember Raben: You can go back to your screen if you'd like, or I've got it here.

President Lloyd: Are you saying they're double counting that credit?

Councilmember Raben: Well, again, I'm confused. To me, it appears as if it's that way, but there might be a reasonable explanation as to why I'm wrong.

Councilmember Shetler: Councilman Raben, what you're indicating is that it's both on the debt service and also then captured on the operational?

Councilmember Raben: Right, which would appear to me as if we're counting that twice.

Councilmember Shetler: Because you reduced the debt service on the one side to make it a –

Councilmember Raben: – reduce your operational –

Councilmember Shetler: – and then we put it over here in the operational.

President Lloyd: I guess that'd be like getting a mortgage credit on your mortgage payment and then turning around and get a check that you can just spend, and you can't do it twice.

David Dunn: I see your point and we'll have to re-evaluate our operating budget to ensure that we're not overlooking or anticipating something that's not going to be realized for us.

President Lloyd: Other questions?

Councilmember Bassemier: I got one. The two bonds you mentioned today, we're going to have to use County Option Income Tax for collateral, is that correct?

David Dunn: We're asking that you do that, yes.

Councilmember Bassemier: Okay, and you say we have nothing to lose? I mean, if –

David Dunn: We don't see any downside to it because we never, ever see a time when that COIT fund would be called upon to retire debt. We have more than ample revenue stream today. Our P & I on this note is roughly one million dollars. It calls for a 1.2 million dollar debt ratio, which gets us to 1.2. Our current revenue stream is 1.5, so that's throwing off about a \$300,000 a year cushion.

Councilmember Bassemier: Now, this debt service will be for 30 years, right?

David Dunn: Twenty-five.

Councilmember Bassemier: I'm sorry, twenty-five, and will there be anything if we approve this, left over to do any other projects?

David Dunn: There would be. As I mentioned, there is \$300,000 a year, that is the difference between the debt service requirement and our current cash flow. Our current revenue stream has been increasing at a rate of three to five percent annually. In addition to that, the revenues that we would add back into the Tourism Capital Development account would be roughly \$150,000 a year, and would be added to that current cushion. So we see the ability for that amount to grow by 450 to \$500,000 a year for future projects that could be funded.

Councilmember Bassemier: Last question, who is going to manage the park? Have you decided who is going to manage this park ?

David Dunn: We haven't selected the manager yet, but our intention is to hire a third party management company that specializes in sports development, sports complexes. The CVB is not going to be the manager, we'll be responsible for it, but we're not going to be the manager.

Councilmember Bassemier: Will this have any affect with your bureau as far as any of your employees or anything?

David Dunn: No. I don't see that. Well, the affect would be perhaps direction of their activities. With this kind of investment, we're going to – our bureau is going to refocus sales efforts as it relates to helping to ensure the success of this, but it's not going to affect, we're not going to lose people or anything like that.

Councilmember Bassemier: Okay, thank you, sir.

President Lloyd: Mr. Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: Is bond counsel giving you any indication of how much you might be saving in finance cost by using COIT as collateral?

David Dunn: Yes, it's over a million dollars.

Councilmember Shetler: For the life of the bond?

David Dunn: No, and let me see if I have that schedule as well.

President Lloyd: While you look for that, I could make a comment. I mean, I was looking at the coupon rates. You've got Recovery Zone Economic Development bonds and then you've got Recovery Zone Economic Development with COIT, and that's about .25 percent difference on the coupon rate; 3.15 versus 3.37, and then on the Build America bonds, I guess you could call them naked versus Build America bonds COIT, 3.74 versus 4.01, so once again, about .25 percent.

Councilmember Shetler: And I suppose that the reason why bond counsel is recommending that is that they feel that the difference of the income coming in versus the debt service going out is too thin for a bond to sell at a reasonable –

David Dunn: They've not indicated that to us, they've just indicated that by having the COIT as a backup, the rate, the interest rate that we pay will be lower and that the rating will be better and it will just be an easier bond to sell. But if I may answer your original question, bond counsel is indicating that there's a \$901,000 original issue discount that will have to be recognized if COIT is not utilized as the backup. So it will cost us over \$900,000 more to use the Build America or the Recovery Zone bond without COIT backup. The rate that they are identifying also changes. The rate that they are recognizing today on the Build America bond without COIT backup is 4.59, 3.96 on the Recovery Zone versus 3.83 for Build America and 3.26 on Recovery, so there's a difference of almost a point in both cases with and without COIT as the backup.

Councilmember Shetler: You and I spoke one time before about the possibility of maybe COIT being on there for a brief period of time, say for the first five years. Have you explored that possibility?

David Dunn: We have. It's certainly not bond counsel's preference. They don't know that that's sellable, but we are still asking them to explore the impact of that if that happens to be Council's demand or preference. What will happen is that a reserve will have to be established to replace that backup which will also have an effect on our ability to fund future projects because we'll have to fund some type of reserve, is what bond counsel is indicating to us.

Councilmember Shetler: And what kind of reserve would that be? One annual payment or in excess of that?

David Dunn: No, it would be in excess of one annual payment.

Councilmember Shetler: Alright, thank you.

President Lloyd: Other questions from Council? Mr. Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Good morning, David. Concerning the COIT backup for the bonds, obviously, this group, and I don't think anyone is interested in actually extending any COIT monies, but this is pretty standard procedure in cases like this

to back the bonds with COIT?

David Dunn: Right.

Councilmember Goebel: Do you know of any time in our past history where the COIT has actually been taken out to finance because of a shortfall?

David Dunn: I have no knowledge of that, sir. I couldn't answer that. I'm not aware of any, but I don't mean to imply that it's never been utilized.

Councilmember Goebel: Okay. Maybe I'll open that question, I don't know if it's ever happened before, but if it brings down the rate and the amount we have to pay back, it seems to make a bit of sense if it's pretty standard procedure and we're safe.

David Dunn: Bond counsel has indicated that, and I don't know how far back they looked, but they could find no case of COIT actually being called upon to assist with debt service for Vanderburgh County. And the comment was, that it's a very conservative county, as it relates to their financing projects and that the revenue stream that is identified has been adequate to cover debt service, and that COIT has not been called upon. But I don't want to say that it's never been.

Councilmember Goebel: Okay, Bill?

Bill Fluty: I can answer that. We've had bond issues in the past where we actually used COIT as a backup, and for those particular bonds we did not ever have to use that to make payments. Actually, the coverage is always geared in a certain way that's very unlikely, but any time you co-sign, and that's what you're doing on this note, there is risk, weighing that risk between the benefit and the savings of this particular project is what he's asking. We have used COIT monies to fund the USI overpass, but that was actually to retire the debt. It wasn't as a backup, it was along with surtax and wheel tax.

Councilmember Goebel: So this is a fairly standard procedure and it will lower the actual cost over time with lower interest rates?

Bill Fluty: I believe we've used COIT on different projects for at least two or three different bonds in our history.

Councilmember Goebel: Okay.

David Dunn: And I will tell you that a schedule that I just received yesterday from bond counsel illustrates that they are going to require a 1.2 million dollar debt service reserve in addition to the COIT backup. I mean, so perhaps offering additional assurance to you that plan is in place to ensure that COIT would never be called upon.

Bill Fluty: And in simple terms, he has revenues of over a million dollars which over and above what actually has to be paid every year, then again, if he would fall short, he would be asking for some smaller amount from COIT, not a full payment, so the risk is minimal and then he has his debt service which would be the first, which you take from before you take the COIT, is that correct?

David Dunn: Correct.

Bill Fluty: So he's putting money, the debt service money, behind there and then he

has his actual revenue he has coming in to pay the debt, and then the third thing you would go to is the COIT.

David Dunn: Right.

Bill Fluty: In that sequence.

Councilmember Goebel: And we have not hit that third thing prior –

Bill Fluty: Oh, I can't sit here – maybe with two months left I can say different things, but anything could happen, but it would be unlikely that his revenues would fall so short and you still have a million and a half in your debt service to get you at least a two year, probably you could get two years of payments along with your revenues before you would actually go to the COIT. But with anything, there's always risk, and you're co-signing a note and you're actually, if these revenues, this debt service is actually used and his revenues fall short, you will be using COIT dollars to pay that debt.

Councilmember Goebel: And the risk is very minimal.

Bill Fluty: It seems to be minimal in this climate.

President Lloyd: One quick note, and this was kind of a just preliminary with the Auditor's Office, the county only has one bond that's backed by COIT at this time and it was the Azteca bonds. So, and I may be wrong on that.

Bill Fluty: Azteca was a little bit different because it was geared with TIF, and it was backed and we actually used COIT to pay some of the debt early on until the TIF dollars, because it had a tax abatement on Azteca, and it was a loan company, so it took a while for those years to fall off on that tax abatement for that revenue to come up. So it was always anticipated to use COIT dollars until that tax abatement years passed, until those TIF dollars actually paid the payment. So it worked out very well and is continued to have an excess in that now.

President Lloyd: But the Vanderburgh County, like Convention Centre lease, there's no COIT on that and also the Burkhardt Road TIF, Green River Road TIF, there's no COIT on either one of those.

Bill Fluty: I believe the coverage on the Burkhardt TIF was well above that where it wasn't needed, and I don't believe the others were. But I think it's been used on the Industrial Park also, and has the same, similar circumstances as Azteca. But it has been used in the past, basically for the benefits you speak, to save some money up front.

Councilmember Raben: I think the Centre was backed by Food & Beverage.

Bill Fluty: That's correct. I'm sorry, so it was different.

President Lloyd: Other questions from Council? I think we're winding this up here and we'll allow some public comment, but we will be taking this up at a future meeting.

Councilmember Kiefer: I've got a couple of questions. Dave, I just wanted to make sure I understand this correctly, but I'm looking at the park operations budget, 2013 to 2015 summary of revenues and expenses, the total operations fund carry forward

line item, so what you're stating here is, those are excess funds that you have available that you're going to carry forward every year in case there is maybe a shortfall in operations revenues?

David Dunn: Well, I think this is to Mr. Raben's point where perhaps we –

Councilmember Raben: Got a \$450,000 error there, I believe.

Councilmember Kiefer: Potentially, I guess what I'm getting is, I didn't see anything in here allocated for capital improvement projects in the future like capital reserve, for example, you need to replace or repair stands or building repair or potholes through out the parking lot area, so I didn't know if that was the intent of that operations fund carried forward was for –

David Dunn: That was the intent, yes.

Councilmember Kiefer: – those type of projects or if it was the intent to cover shortfalls, say you don't hit that million in operating revenue, you would then dip into that. I wasn't for sure.

David Dunn: Yeah. The plan would be to utilize that carry forward for both, should there be an operating shortfall from one year to the next we would have the sufficient funds to utilize as well as creating revenues in the future for capital development means. But that was the source for it. Obviously, we're going to have to re-evaluate that.

Councilmember Kiefer: Alright, thanks.

President Lloyd: Mr. Ahlers has a question.

Jeff Ahlers: One of the things, Mr. Dunn, I had called last week, bond counsel, and he was on his way to a meeting and was going to get back with me. I hadn't heard back yet but I was going to, on some of these questions to try to get some of the legal procedures down and the type of documents that may have to come before Council. Obviously, I know we've talked about an ordinance in terms of dedicating a portion of the Innkeepers tax, I guess one of the other things that comes to mind in this discussion over using COIT as a backup as well as the excess fund that the Convention Bureau will be putting together to make sure, I guess, that there is some sort of documentation that the cash fund that you would be putting together and set aside would be utilized first, if there was any shortfall. To the extent perhaps that any COIT revenues would ever be drawn down upon, you know, having some sort of documentation that the county would be able to recover that back from future revenues from the Convention Bureau because obviously, that would create a shortfall in other areas that we're using COIT revenue for, so as I listen to this and I'll talk to him about it, but I guess it's whether there's maybe some things that are a little more complicated than just a single ordinance. And to stay ahead of the curve and, and I've spoken with, you know, Ms. Lockyear as well because we're on a short timetable. I guess I want to make sure we ferret these things out, so I don't know if you want to pass that along to bond counsel or have them contact me, because I just want to make sure we're not a document short along the way and that somehow that creates a problem in terms of timing.

David Dunn: I appreciate your comments and would defer to President Lloyd for direction of what would be necessary to obtain prior to our next presentation that would answer questions and provide enough information and data that would allow

you to make a decision at our next meeting.

President Lloyd: Well, and what he's, I guess in plain English, the orders of payment so that the COIT would be like the third on the list, and that would protect the county in a better way. I guess one other thing, one final thing, I know, the budget you've given us, the total cost, approximately 17.5 million for the construction, we had had conversations where I had asked if there was any way you could reduce that. And this is kind of the detail of where that comes from so I guess from your point of view or from the Convention & Visitors point of view, you don't see any way to reduce it based on the project you have put forward at this time?

David Dunn: To reduce the overall development cost comes at the expense of some quality element that we feel is necessary with our project. We've researched, it's consistent with the cost of developing projects of this magnitude. Columbus, as an example, is in the midst of developing a four-plex at roughly 9.5 million dollars to do a four-plex themselves. So in relevant dollars, it's consistent with costs, and they're not taking 1.5 million to raze a building and removing 28 acres of asphalt, and so on.

President Lloyd: Are they using Build America Bonds or do we know?

David Dunn: I'm not sure how they're financing their project.

President Lloyd: Mr. Shetler, another question?

Councilmember Shetler: The two and a half million dollars that you're using to improve Wesselman Park, how much of that is actually to improve the park and how much of it is because you are taking out some existing stuff and moving it to another location?

President Lloyd: Well, 1.5 is to tear down Roberts Stadium.

David Dunn: Roughly, \$200,000 of it is – actually, that's not true, there is \$200,000 in that 2.4 million that is an improvement to electrical systems within the park. There is another amount less than that, that is also designed to improve water service to the Par Three. The balance of those monies are identified because of current infrastructure that is being affected as well as the monies necessary to raze Roberts and the lot. So I'm not sure it's a black and white answer to your question, but it would be roughly \$400,000 or less that is in direct improvements versus affected infrastructure.

Councilmember Shetler: Alright, thank you.

President Lloyd: Any other questions from Council? Alright, thank you very much, Mr. Dunn, and your contingent here. And, once again, this is the financial part of the project. The budget of the project, if the public has any comments, we'll be happy to entertain that regarding this. Otherwise, we've got more things on the Council agenda to move forward. Anybody from the public? Come on up.

Jim Vincent: My name is Jim Vincent. I'm here with Evansville Community Tennis Association representing Terry Clements, the president, couldn't be here today because of work issues. We are located in the park and would like to make a comment that we have been under a lease agreement with the Park's department for the last five years. I think it has been extremely successful. We've grown 18% just in the last year in terms of activity at the tennis facility. We're in about the last mile of a master plan of our own that would end up with the largest facility of its type

in the state of Indiana. And just to kind of put this in context, last year, Evansville was not able to host a tournament that Jasper was given by the USTA out of Indiana because of our inability to have 18 courts in one facility. That being said, we are in support of this project for a number of reasons: one, because of the location and the proximity for athletics and sports to be centered in our community, and we believe that the way tourism works, and just to put this in maybe a personal perspective, I own a restaurant here in Evansville and our three largest days are Mother's Day, Father's Day and Frog Follies. And I don't know if they can put this into numbers, but from what I've seen from looking at their projects, they are projecting several weeks out of the year in Evansville where we're going to see activities going on in our community that would be similar in volume to that one week event that we enjoy. So, you know, they should be commended, I think, for identifying something that fits into the Midwest and to our region and can draw lots of people to our community. We look at this as a business proposition from a couple perspectives. One, the Build America fund, which would be guaranteed because we have the capacity to support it brings in roughly 300,000 a year. That money alone would probably be adequate to help us in our capital request to expand the tennis facility at some point in the future, assuming that they're successful moving forward. Because remember, from a business standpoint, as the numbers flow from the amount of activity, organizations like our restaurant will pay into the fund and will expand that when you look at those revenue projects. If there's skepticism about the projections of activity, I would go back and look at somewhere between the highest point and the lowest point, and look at that number and then factor in if we meet the dates by December 1st or earlier possibility to get the Build America fund approved, that's \$300,000 that comes to our community from the federal government for the next 25 years, to our park. So, anyway, I just want to tell you that we think that this is a very well thought out plan, even though it doesn't directly address tennis today, we see it indirectly addressing our ability to move forward with our own project, and be able to host collegiate level, junior level, adult level tournaments here. So, as a result of this, what will happen is we'll probably bring an additional 496 juniors from the age of 12 to 18 to the park every year for tournament activity, and that's just a direct output from the economic benefit that they're creating. Thanks for your time.

President Lloyd: Any questions for Mr. Vincent? Thank you. Is there a Mr. Ball that wanted to speak? I had a note that he wanted to speak. Come on up. Name and address, please.

Jordan Baer: My name is Jordan Baer, and I'm at 221 South Barker. I run the blog, saverobertsstadium.blogspot.com and Evansville Moving Forward. And I also am starting an activist group, Tri-State Tomorrow. So I don't know if you guys have been to the site, but I like David Dunn's proposal, I really do. I want to commend him for starting this project because it takes a lot of guts to get something going. But there's only two things I disagree with him on this project, and that is the uniqueness and the location. And the reason why I say location is because we've got the third oldest active ballpark in all of the U.S. The only two the ones are Wrigley and Fenway, which are landlocked and they're not even close to being able to do what we can do. We also have this in Garvin Park which is very similar to Wesselman Woods. And luckily, on top of that, we have if I can get it out here –

President Lloyd: You're referring to Bosse Field?

Jordan Baer: Yes, I am. We have right across from Pigeon Creek, we have Kley Meyer Park, which is such a good location for baseball that there's already three fields there like Wesselman's. Now the important thing to remember about this project is that this is a once in a generation life-time. I really doubt we'll be able to

do this again, so once we do it, we've got to make sure it's in just the right location, and the right time. Unfortunately, the only thing about Wesselman, is that it's landlocked. There's only one business within the immediate range that can reap the benefits off this. My plan would work for First Avenue, and it would also be a stimulus project, I believe, for Diamond Avenue, which the infrastructure has just been repaired but the businesses like Kuesters and the Sunshine Café have all disappeared, so we need to improve that area as well as Main Street, which would be right down the way, it is in dire need of repair. There's a lot of abandoned warehouses I'd like to eventually, I think the city should consider a master plan to fix that as well, but nonetheless, if you put it by Kleymeyer Park, and you go down Main Street, you're going to be at the new hotel that will be put in with the arena. And you're going to be in the shops and stuff that this arena down here will feed off it. So we'll really be able to kill two birds with one stone. Also, he pointed out that that that was in range of Eastland Mall. Well, to get to Eastland Mall from Wesselman, you would just go from Boeke or from Covert to the Lloyd. From here, you would just go from Main Street to the Lloyd, so it shouldn't be too big out of the realm to think the tourists wouldn't go there, as well. Lastly, if we do it at Kleymeyer Park, we could set up vintage fields, which are, now these six I've got, they are the polo grounds, Fenway, Wrigley, Yankee Stadium. Now the important thing to remember is this is just cosmetic architecture. Like, for example, if you built a Fenway replica, the only thing you would really alter to these fields is you would just put a Green Monster out in the wall or Yankee, you would just put the freeze. And this has been done in two cities, actually. Well, the first one is Johnny Rosenblatt Stadium, which is where the college world series is played, very historic, in Omaha. They are going to convert theirs to a little league field. Now as you can see, this is nothing special. All this is, is just cosmetic architecture. There's nothing, it's not really that far out of the budget, it's not a whole field like many would believe. And also, Memorial Stadium, where the Oriole's played before they went to Camden Yards is now a little league field. And, as you can see, there's not much, I mean, this is not like it's going to be like several million dollars. This is well within the same budget so, and the only thing I propose, I don't propose scrapping this project. What I propose is, just like the new arena, the new arena was originally supposed to be in the D-Patrick lot, they simply moved it. All I'm asking is to simply move it, it would probably take a week or two to redesign it and let's go from there because, not only would it be better at attracting tourists due to its uniqueness, but it would also be much more well received in the community. I've even pitched this idea with Marsha Abell, who is the chief opponent of this project, and she said it was a great idea because not only is this area in dire need of, you know, the recovery zone type of stuff that we're going after, but also the Jacobsville site has been given a clean bill of health, so that whole area is good to go. Okay, and then lastly, as the creator of saverobertsstadium, I believe it would be a tragedy to knock down 54 years of basketball history. And I'll keep this quick because I know you guys have got other people, but I've got a blog if you guys want to visit it, saverobertsstadium.blogspot.com. It lists seven proposals, I'm getting ready to put my eighth one on there, which is a botanical garden. I think putting a botanical garden, if we did something like, we could work with USI as far as like research because they have in New Harmony, they're wanting to do research similar to that. But anyway, what we should do is, we should give Roberts Stadium, we've got about a year until its up, we should give it a good faith effort to try and do something with it. Then, I mean, if worse comes to worst, and you can't find nothing and you've still got the 1.5 million to knock it down. So, I mean, so I think, you know, I like this proposal, I just don't like it on the Wesselman Park lot.

President Lloyd: If we, if Roberts Stadium doesn't get torn down, it may become a natural botanical garden with weeds. So, anyway, appreciate your time. Does anybody have any questions for Mr. Baer? Okay, thank you very much for coming

in. Any other comments or questions on the Convention & Visitors Bureau proposed baseball/softball complex? Yes? Last one? Mr. Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: I was wondering, if there is a change in plan at this point, does that knock down all of the search we're having for the special rates, Build America and things like that? Does that eliminate, if there is a change, if it would be from Roberts to a different site? Build America ends this year, correct?

David Dunn: Yes. At this time, Build America as well as Recovery Zone are scheduled to retire. Obviously, Congress could extend Build America if they chose to do so, but there's no guarantee that that can happen. So –

Councilmember Goebel: Doesn't look like it's going to happen.

David Dunn: It doesn't look like it's going to happen, no.

President Lloyd: Alright, thank you. One more. Come on up.

Martha Crosley: Well, I'm kind of the third part of the discussion here. I, very bluntly, think it's too much money.

President Lloyd: Name and address, please.

Martha Crosley: Oh, I beg your pardon. Martha Crosley, 5511 Stringtown Road. I, very bluntly, think it's too much money. I think it's an elaborate plan. I think it's a beautiful plan. I think it's in the wrong location. And the gentleman who just spoke about the tennis courts kind of made that point: you've got the tennis courts enlarging, you've got the baseball complex going in, what's going to be left of Wesselman Park? Where is the park? The park board, I think, made the determination to go with this baseball complex because it looked like it solved some problems because they didn't have to upkeep those baseball fields right there. And also, because they recognize there are two issues going on here. It's not just the baseball complex. It is the baseball complex and tearing down Roberts Stadium for the city. And I've said that all along and people are finally beginning to see that this is a big issue here. The city, apparently, doesn't want to spend the 1.5 or the two million dollars or whatever it costs to tear the thing down, to tear out the asphalt, which would be the right thing to do, but instead, it wants to pawn it off on somebody else. The second thing that really bothers me is the fact that I've read, and Mr. Ahlers, you can probably help me with this, I have read Indiana Code relating to Vanderburgh County CVB, and also to the Innkeepers Tax, and I don't get from reading that, and I'm not an attorney, so you can help me here, but I don't get from reading that, that it says that the CVB can run a business. And this is a business. They're talking about after the third year we can project cash flow. We're talking about after the third year we'll get profits of yada yada. And I see that the CVB's role as described by that law as being to promote, to support that kind of thing, projects that will improve conventions, visitors to the area, travel, that kind of thing. And I don't see it as saying it can go out here and run a little business. Now granted, the profit of this little business is not great compared to the 18 million they're spending for it. I say 17.5, but that is technically 18 million if you round it off. If you get \$150,000 profit after you're in it for three years, and you're spending 18 million on it, and you're still – you're still not making sufficient for the investment that you're doing. You're not making sufficient to pay off the million dollar payment a year, so it's not a sound business. I don't understand why it's being sold as being a wonderful opportunity. It's a wonderful opportunity if you cut the expenses. It's a wonderful opportunity if you put it elsewhere. One of the things that has been talked

about all along and I don't know if I've promoted it or not because I don't know enough about it, I'm not business smart on this area yet, but if you place this up by Goebel Soccer Fields, you combine the two as one promotional entity, the CVB could then support the Parks Department, not run the business itself, but support the Parks Department, the Parks Department could then use the money to run that business to maybe even use that money for other things to help the community with. Then you are helping the community, you are supporting tourism, and you're not running a business if you're the CVB. There is just too many questions here, people, there's too many questions and not enough answers and the reason this is being pushed through so rapidly, we all know, is because of the Recovery Zone Bonds and the Build America Bonds running out. And that money will help support running this field. Okay, well, if you can't run it without those extra rebates, which are unusual, they are not normal things in time. If I go out next week and I want to buy a business and I'm very business savvy about that particular operation, somebody is not going to come up to me and say, well, you know what, I've got this special deal for ya. I'll give you 45% rebate on your interest because you're marvelous and you're going to do wonderful things. That's not the norm, it doesn't happen, so they're trying to take advantage of this stuff and that's fine, that's what you've got to do. But that's also pushing us into something that maybe we don't understand. We're also pushing to get something that we shouldn't rush on. And I certainly hope you don't rush on it. There were a couple of other things that were stated, and it has to do with...not being able to read my notes, is what it has to do with. There was a question about the location in the first place and one of the environmental studies that was done was on noise, and one of those environmental studies that was done had to do with questioning the level of noise, and the type of study that was chosen to be done did not reflect the need of the study. In other words, there are two types of studies: one takes the average sound, another one takes the sounds that occur, especially the high impact sounds. And a gentleman from the Audubon Society stood right here in this room and talked about the fact that you can't use averages when you're dealing with animals or when you're dealing with people because if you do something like **(Ms. Crosley bumped podium)**, that's a pop in sound. And that's different than the average of sound. Another man said, you know, if Bill Gates walked into a bar, the average income of everybody in that place would go up \$2 million dollars, but that doesn't mean that the average gives you correct information. And some of this, I'm a little bit leery about, just like the noise studies. I'm not sure that we're getting the best information. Lastly, I have spoken with the Sycamore Land Trust, they are based in Bloomington, I don't know if you're familiar with them or not, but they have some interest, if Roberts is torn down, they have interest in coming in and rehabilitating the area, native plants and putting it back to where it should be, which would alleviate the great cost. They would do this with philanthropic money and I would hope that you do not get so wound up in just looking at the bonds that we forget there are other ways to go. So what I'm asking you to do is pull back, don't spend this kind of money on something that doesn't reap that much benefit. If you have 100,000 people coming in to Evansville, and there's supposedly like 1,500 going to a tournament because that's what they're allowing parking space for, for families of that many people. You divide that 1,500 into the 100,000, you get about 66, which means you've got to have 66 tournaments to get that 100,000 people unless they are huge tournaments and then you're still spreading them out and you're taking more days. The math doesn't make any sense there, either. Please pull back. Please think about it. Please don't risk COIT. Please stop. It's not too late to do this ball complex even at Wesselman. It is not too late to do it elsewhere. But the only reason we're pushing right now is not a good reason to push. Thank you.

President Lloyd: Any questions for Ms. Crosley? Okay, thank you very much. Any

other comments from the public? Okay, thank you, and this matter to be continued.

<p>RESOLUTION FOR EVANSVILLE VANDERBURGH PUBLIC LIBRARY GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND</p>
--

President Lloyd: We'll go to item number nine, new business, and I'm going to take something out of order here. We're going to go to item E, Ordinance for Evansville Vanderburgh Public Library, general obligation bond. And this is an ordinance we'd had discussions on at the Personnel & Finance. The library is here, Marcia Au, the executive director is here. And I'm going to let Mr. Ahlers comment on this. I want to apologize to her, I'd meant to bring her up prior to this Convention & Visitors Bureau ballfield complex, so my apologies in that regard. But hopefully you've heard some informative information there. Mr. Ahlers, do you want to comment on this ordinance?

Jeff Ahlers: Yeah, after the meeting last week, I was in contact with the library board's bond counsel, and it was determined after our conversation that we needed something different than I guess what was originally submitted. We have that before you, I emailed it to everybody, the resolution, and it's now before you on your desk. And essentially, what's occurring here, unlike a lot of times when we're involved with a bonding process, actually this one is much more ancillary, we're not really directly involved, it's just because of all the new statutes over the past couple of years and our oversight of various boards and such, that it just requires our approval to let them go forward. We're not actually involved or don't have any obligation on the bonds, so it was determined that all that we needed was a resolution allowing and approving the library board to move forward with their refinancing to hopefully save the citizens of Vanderburgh County some money and we put in the ordinance that, you know, that this doesn't obligate County Council so that that's a matter of record, too. So the rest of it, I think, is fairly self explanatory unless any of the Councilmen or Ms. Au or anyone has any questions of me.

President Lloyd: When you say obligate, that means that it's the library, public library authority that is the payer of the bonds?

Jeff Ahlers: That's correct. In other words, unlike maybe what we talked about before with some of these other items, we're not pledging any of the funds or monies that the County Council has or we don't have any obligation to pay if the library board doesn't. We're merely giving them the authority because of our oversight authority by statute, that's necessary to proceed with refinancing the current bond. They're not taking on really any new indebtedness, it's just a refinancing at a lower interest rate.

President Lloyd: Any questions from Councilmembers? Mrs. Au, did you have anything to add or...

Marcia Au: No, I just appreciate, the board and I appreciate the opportunity to bring this to you and look forward to a positive outcome.

President Lloyd: Well, and this will give us the opportunity, it could save the taxpayers quite a bit of money, would assist the library in your operations, and you're just refunding existing bonds outstanding, you're not adding new principal or –

Marcia Au: No, sir.

President Lloyd: Right. Okay. Any questions from Council?

Councilmember Raben: That's 75,000 in annual savings or over the life of the debt service?

Marcia Au: I'm sorry?

Councilmember Raben: The 75,000 that's quoted here, is that over the life of the debt service or is that annually?

Marcia Au: Are you speaking about the wording in the board's resolution?

Councilmember Raben: It says, in order to accomplish net savings of at least 75,000.

Marcia Au: That number was just suggested, recommended to us by our financial advisor as the lowest amount that it would make any sense to refinance. We're actually anticipating, given today's rate, a savings of \$560,000 over the life of the bonds. That would be an average net savings, and that average net savings is because it's an incremental range on the bonds. Currently, we're paying 4.40 to 5.25 percent, and that could go as low as .6 percent to 3.25, so that's where that \$560,000 comes in.

Councilmember Raben: So, when do these terminate? I don't see that information here. How far out do we go on these?

Marcia Au: Just one second. I believe that's 2021. We have ten years, I believe. Ten or eleven.

Councilmember Raben: Well, that's about 56,000 a year in savings.

Marcia Au: They're saying 53, but that's –

Councilmember Raben: And that's after you pay bond counsel and what have you?

Marcia Au: That's correct.

Councilmember Raben: Okay. You know, I think it's a good thing. I'd like to see them reduce their budget annually by 56,000. I mean, it's only a good savings if we don't spend it. I mean, if you spend an extra \$56,000 a year at all, it was a waste, so I'd like to figure out how you could utilize that as a true savings.

Marcia Au: We're working on that. And we brought you a much smaller budget this year than we have in the past.

Councilmember Raben: And as we'll look for next year, and thank you.

President Lloyd: And we appreciate that. Other questions for the library? Is there a motion to approve the ordinance?

Councilmember Shetler: So moved.

President Lloyd: Is there a second?

Councilmember Goebel: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Shetler, second Mr. Bassemier and Mr. Goebel.

Any other discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes, and we appreciate the efforts the library does. You're a real resource for our community. Thank you, and hope you can move forward to save some money on this.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

Marcia Au: We intend to.

Councilmember Raben: And thanks for your help this year with the elections.

Marcia Au: You're welcome, and we appreciate the Council funding the opportunity to have those at the library. I believe we voted in excess of 10,000 people.

President Lloyd: Right, and I heard very positive comments on that, the library voting, so we thought it might not be as many people this year, but apparently, people like to take advantage of that.

Marcia Au: They do. Thank you so much.

President Lloyd: Thank you.

<p>CONVENTION & VISITORS BUREAU EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SALARY</p>
--

President Lloyd: I'm going to go to 9F, let's just stay out of order here, Convention & Visitors Bureau, Executive Director, since those folks are here, maybe you had

some information on that.

Stacey McNeill: Thank you. Stacey McNeill, I'm representing the Convention & Visitors Bureau as the chair for the search committee for a new executive director. And we're here today to ask for help. We're ongoing through our process to find and identify a new director for our bureau. And during our process and research, we have discovered that the line item budget that was previously approved by this committee is not sufficient to secure the person that we're looking for, for the community to lead our efforts. So, in essence, we're asking for up to a \$10,000 increase over that budget or up to 98,000, to be approved today so that we can secure the right person for the position moving forward. We have done research in other like-size markets and budgets for CVB's in other communities, and if you would like, I could read some of those to you to show that the research supports the increase. Actually, the research supports going above 100,000, but for our community, we feel that up to 98,000 for that position is sufficient.

President Lloyd: Well, I think all the Councilmembers would like to see that if we could get copies made.

Stacey McNeill: Sure, I can actually submit that at a later date when it's professionally prepared. And, for starters, do you want me to read through some of those before submitting it or –

President Lloyd: You can go ahead and read through some of them.

Stacey McNeill: Sure, the first city, Ft. Wayne, Indiana, there's an estimated population there of 391,000 people, a little larger than our community. The budget, 1.2 million, and the salary for their executive director, just under 107,000. The second, Erie, Pennsylvania, estimated population 103,000, a little smaller than our community, the budget 840,000, a little smaller than our budget for our CVB. The salary for that position, 100,000. Kalamazoo, Missouri, estimated population 77,000, much smaller than our community, the budget, 1.3 million, and the salary for that position, 100,000. Roanoke, Virginia, estimated population 95,000, budget 1.4 million and the salary for that position, 97,000. Schaumburg, Illinois estimated population 75,000, budget 1.2 million, and salary 110,000. And for those of you that aren't familiar, our Evansville, Indiana estimated population, 120,000, our budget 1.2 million, and our current salary that was submitted and approved in the budget, 88,000. What we're asking to do is to increase that up to 98,000.

President Lloyd: What do we have? The current line item for that is how much?

Stacey McNeill: It's right at 88,000, I think it's 87,937, something like that.

President Lloyd: Okay, I may defer to Mr. Raben on this. We don't have a formal request. This is a request from the floor to allow what, up to 10,000 additional, annual on that salary. We'll still have to go through the formal process with the salary ordinance.

Sandie Deig: It needs to be done in January.

President Lloyd: Right, I mean, I guess we could vote on it at a later date. What do Councilmembers think about this?

Councilmember Raben: I mean, you can give an unofficial yea or nay. I don't even know if we can do that, but we don't have to follow our standard salary ordinance

because they're not part of it.

Bill Fluty: Just a comment. We have a budget for 2011 of the 88,000, which at this point in time we aren't able to adjust. So asking for that right now is kind of – just a sequence kind of thing, so –

Councilmember Raben: I was trying to think, we can't even accept – can we do a transfer – I don't know that we've ever done a transfer within their budget, have we?

President Lloyd: Well, this would be, you could advertise it for the December meeting but we're getting a heads up here, that they want to request additional monies for this position.

Stacey McNeill: Right, we've been unable to secure anyone for the position at the salary that's there now.

Bill Fluty: I think what they're asking for, would you be in favor of doing this next year so they can present this, the 98,000 to some of your candidates, I guess, is what you're talking about.

Stacey McNeill: Yeah, in order for us to proceed with the search and to identify a candidate, we're going to have to have the okay from this committee to offer an amount of money that's greater than we have now. We do have salary allocations in our budget and I can't speak to those numbers, four positions that are open today and someone over here mentioned a transfer, that are not filled and potentially will not be filled through the entire year of 2011.

Councilmember Raben: We still – don't we still look at their salary lines as one lump within our budget?

President Lloyd: Mrs.Deig?

Sandie Deig: You do, but the money has to be in place (inaudible) January, so you couldn't approve an appropriation for additional money until January.

President Lloyd: Okay, I think what we want to do is, there's been a request for additional funding for the director of, up to \$10,000, which would raise the current salary from say 87,937, to 97,937. We can either say a yea or nay or abstain or need more information, but I guess what we'd like to do is, which Councilmembers would be in favor of moving forward on this? And it's not a vote, it's just maybe an expression, and then we would go through the formal mechanism of bringing this higher. And I think what Ms. McNeill is saying is, based on a national search, ours comes in low versus other communities, even smaller communities for this position.

Stacey McNeill: Right, and one thing that I didn't mention that I can point out is that we have a remaining \$40,000 in the salary for that position for the abandoned position this year, if that helps.

President Lloyd: Right, with a lawsuit pending.

Stacey McNeill: Exactly.

Councilmember Bassemier: I've got a question. You've advertised this throughout the nation and also here locally?

Stacey McNeill: Uh-huh.

Councilmember Bassemier: And it's kind of hard to believe you can't get anybody at \$88,000, and I always like to see somebody hired here locally, they've lived here for years, they've paid their taxes here, their family is being raised here, and seem like we always go out of town looking for somebody.

Stacey McNeill: Well, we actually started our search locally and abroad and the search committee has put in a lot of hours to interview candidates to make sure that we find and identify the best candidate for this position and in our opinion, there was no one from the local market who applied that fit those qualifications. We would like to see that ourselves.

Councilmember Bassemier: Okay, if you're asking me, I would like to think about it.

President Lloyd: Okay. I'm going to say I would approve that request just based on what we're looking for in this position. It's a critical position. I think we've had good representation over the years in this position from the directors. But I guess we would just go around the room and just see, would you approve the \$10,000 increase for that position? Would you not approve, or would you defer? So we'll throw it to Mrs. Terry and kind of go around the –

Councilmember Raben: I don't know that legally we can even do that.

President Lloyd: You can express your opinion.

Councilmember Raben: Okay.

President Lloyd: So, Mrs. Terry, and we'll go around the room.

Councilmember Terry: I'll defer, but I do have a question. In that 98,000, does that factor in any new relocation dollars that will be needed?

Stacey McNeill: No, this will be the baseline salary.

Councilmember Terry: Okay, so the other dollars, I guess, where in your budget will you factor that in?

Stacey McNeill: For relocation –

Councilmember Terry: You're only asking for 10,000, will you initially need more than that?

Stacey McNeill: Right. We have an operating budget that would have sufficient funds for those type of negotiated items that have yet to be determined.

Councilmember Terry: Okay. Thank you.

President Lloyd: You said you'd defer?

Councilmember Terry: Uh-huh.

President Lloyd: Okay, Mr. Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: I'd like to think about it.

President Lloyd: You defer? Mr. Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: I, too, have some questions and a little bit of reservations in our economic climate today. I know it's a fairly specific job and tasks that's asked of that position, and I don't know what skill sets you're looking for per se, but without having enough – sufficient information today I'd be a little reluctant to give a blanket endorsement of increasing the salary up another \$10,000.

President Lloyd: You defer?

Councilmember Shetler: Yes.

President Lloyd: Mr. Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Defer.

President Lloyd: Mr. Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Well, it sounds like that's the direction it's going. I do think that there is at least one qualified local candidate that's been a part of that bureau and the functions within for a long time that, you know, I think is – I haven't heard it directly, but I think would be willing and able, quite able, that would be my first recommendation and if we've exercised or if we've ran that gamut and it's, you know, there is no other alternative, you know, I might consider it, but I'd have to see, you know, all the details and the proposal in writing.

President Lloyd: Do you defer?

Councilmember Raben: I defer.

President Lloyd: Mr. Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Well, if we need 98,000 to hire the highest quality individual, I don't have a problem with supporting somebody to pay that amount of money to get the right individual. But again, you know, I want to echo everybody else's viewpoint, too, I mean, I don't know that, I don't want to say there's nobody locally that isn't a quality individual that can do the job, but I'm not going to stand in the way of paying 98,000 to get the best quality candidate. I don't want to do, I guess, what the city has done, you know, with some of their positions. I'd rather, I appreciate the fact that you're coming here and being straightforward and asking for the money. You know, I think that's the best approach.

President Lloyd: Okay, so you're okay with that and I'll say I'm okay with that, so that's two tentative approvals with more information forthcoming, and five that would defer and like to see more information.

Stacey McNeill: Alright. And could you define, outside of the market research for the salaries and budget types for CVB's, what else could we prepare that would satisfy some of the hesitations or reservations from the room?

President Lloyd: We probably have the job description, maybe we could see the updated one and –

Stacey McNeill: Absolutely.

Councilmember Raben: And I do stand corrected after looking at their budget. There are individual line items, they're not lumped together like the airport is, as an example, is lumped together. This one, at one time was, but it, a few years back, was broken back out. So they are individual lines.

Stacey McNeill: Okay, we'll submit the requested items later today.

President Lloyd: Great, thank you.

TRAVEL REQUESTS

President Lloyd: Okay, we'll go back to item 9A, travel requests. Mr. Shetler, you have your travel requests with you?

Councilmember Shetler: I do. Let's see, County Commissioners are requesting \$1,500 total for each of the three, 500 a piece to go to the, it's the conference on roads and streets, I believe, is what it is. That is not a state called meeting. Legal Aid is asking for a little under \$300 to come out of the United Way account. It's the Indiana Pro Bono Commission. You would think that would be free.

President Lloyd: That's cute.

Councilmember Shetler: Health Department, several requests there. Gary Heck going to a state health planning meeting, \$150, that is state called. And a couple of people going to Indiana Enviro Association meeting, and it's not state called but they're not requesting any money. David Gries for Food Safety and that is state called, that's \$100. A couple of people going to ISDH Onsite System Training, that is state called, it's \$50. Ron Norvell, let's see, going to Lead-Safe and Healthy Homes Conference, that is not – the request there is for \$400. Let's see, I know Dr. Nicholson is here in case anyone has any questions. Another one going to a WIC Coordinators meeting, and that is state called. That's \$80. And then a person going to something on public health, law policy and advocacy. It's not state called, but the request is for \$30. We also have a request for Local Roads & Streets from a couple individuals going to a pavement workshop, which is requesting \$400 lump sum for both, that is not state called. We have requests –

Councilmember Raben: One more Health Department.

Councilmember Shetler: Okay, I'm sorry, one other Health Department, two individuals going to a state called meeting, which is for \$75. And then a travel request from – well, that was in there. Sorry.

President Lloyd: Is there a motion to approve?

Councilmember Shetler: So moved.

President Lloyd: Is there a second?

Councilmember Kiefer: I've got a question. I was just looking at the County Commissioner request and as we have done with other people that made requests, we always ask that they try to ride together and I guess I can't make sense out of what they're asking. It says means of travel, personal vehicles, if they're riding together or they're not riding together.

President Lloyd: It says on here, \$145 a person for registration. And its an

overnight, three night, two night.

Councilmember Kiefer: I mean, we just, we require that of everybody else. I mean, I don't know why we wouldn't ask them to, you know, they're going to the same location, unless they've got –

(Inaudible – microphone not turned on)

Councilmember Kiefer: – can't have three Commissioners together. Okay. Good point.

Councilmember Shetler: You can't even have two.

President Lloyd: Right. That's a violation of –

Councilmember Raben: As long as they don't talk.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay, good point and never mind.

President Lloyd: Other questions? There was a motion by Mr. Shetler. Is there a second for the travel requests as submitted?

Councilmember Bassemier: Second.

President Lloyd: Second Mr. Bassemier. Thank you. All in favor signify by saying aye.

(All Councilmembers voted aye)

President Lloyd: Any opposed?

(No opposing votes were cast)

President Lloyd: It passes 7-0.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

<p style="text-align: center;">COUNTY HIGHWAY REQUEST TO FILL VACANCY</p>
--

President Lloyd: Item 9B, County Highway request to fill vacancy. And we have Chris Walsh here. There is a letter in your packet. This is the mechanic's position?

Chris Walsh: Chris Walsh, Vanderburgh County Highway Department. Yeah, that's correct.

President Lloyd: How long has this been vacant?

Chris Walsh: When the hiring freeze was put in place, we had that position open, so it got frozen at that time and I'm going to say, roughly, fourteen months.

President Lloyd: Fourteen months. And, I mean, had consideration been given to bring this forward prior to now?

Chris Walsh: We have tried, and we tried to honor the hiring freeze and save the taxpayers all the money that we were possibly able to, but we delayed putting this before this body until this time. But we're hitting winter and we're hitting certain maintenance considerations that I just feel like public safety is starting to become an issue. I have 125 pieces of equipment in the fleet, and I really need this position.

President Lloyd: How many mechanics do we have now?

Chris Walsh: We have two. With seniority and vacation time, there's quite a bit of down time with the other two mechanics, which I rotate up people, but they're not quite qualified to be a lead mechanic or be a mechanic. I just have them assist the mechanics that I have at the time. With winter coming on and the age of our equipment and that, I'm really kind of concerned.

President Lloyd: So we have two currently, and this would be the third? And it was in the budget, and it's just been vacant for over a year?

Chris Walsh: Correct.

(Inaudible)

President Lloyd: Mr. Bassemier first.

Councilmember Bassemier: I've talked with Chris and he told me that if he could get this mechanic it would really save. He's contracting vehicles out now –

Chris Walsh: That's the other part of the equation is, that in the long term, it would save the county money by doing more in-house, where we're reaching a point where more is going to have to go out of house and it will rapidly eat up the line item that would have been in place for the mechanic.

President Lloyd: And also he had talked to the (inaudible) out there now that does a lot of the work, and he says it's hard for him to keep up. And he's, of course, he has to go out a lot of times away from the shop, he can't do work in the shop, so my personal feeling is, I really believe it's overdue for them to get this mechanic.

Councilmember Shetler: I think we have a little bit of an issue. Because of it being vacant for so long, this year, when we approved the budget, we eliminated that line item.

Chris Walsh: Which we were not aware of.

Councilmember Shetler: So that is not funded for next year. So we would be looking towards doing something to appropriate new money for next year, probably to the tune of \$40,000 plus counting –

Chris Walsh: That sounds about right. I don't have the figure right here in front of me.

President Lloyd: I mean, we can do it. It can be done.

Councilmember Raben: As would be with any vacancy you fill that you had during the last budget session, but I do see and understand this one, you know, particularly going into winter, and I know what dialogue I've had. You know, 14 months was a pretty damn good effort to go without.

Chris Walsh: And we tried to respect the intent of the hiring freeze to save the tax payers money as long as we could conceivably do it.

Councilmember Raben: Unfortunately, you know, when you're doing snow or ditch work or grading or stuff like that, you do that during normal business hours but snow, you don't have that luxury and, you know, when two or three snowplow trucks are broke and if you've got one person on vacation, and you know, I think, according to your policy, you have to have two people, so I know last year, I think you ran into a few instances where it was problematic for you, so I would say this one definitely deserves the opportunity to be refilled.

President Lloyd: Mr. Fluty has a point here.

Bill Fluty: Just a financial picture of where the Highway is now and just a look at that. Many of you know that we actually fund Highway with gasoline tax. And as those decreased over the years and the County Highway's budget increased, no longer could we do that. We've been supplementing with COIT dollars and surtax/wheel tax money, to the tune of about \$700,000 this year. Their projected unappropriated balance for next year is just around \$25,000 right now, so there's not much, I would have to say there's hardly any wiggle room in the budget as its been submitted and passed for 2011. Not that some shifting couldn't occur in that budget to make that happen, but you'll have to look at that budget or actually using some other dollars to supplement that, so just the financial picture of the Highway.

President Lloyd: Okay, so part of what you're saying is, there was a deficit in the Highway because of less gas tax money, and when the Council prepared this budget, we saw that vacancy and said well, this will help with that deficit.

Bill Fluty: Well, actually, I think that's what your plan was, there hadn't been a request and there hasn't been anybody in that position for 14 months, so actually, to make that budget work, I guess you zeroed that out.

President Lloyd: And we're going to, if we would add this position back, then we're going to amend the salary ordinance, and add the position. Mr. Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: With regards to vacations, you're able to manage the time that they take, when they take their vacations, etcetera?

Chris Walsh: To a certain degree. They have to take the time by the end of the year on vacations and that sort of thing. I mean, it is constrictive and we've gotten by, but we do have a couple of our mechanics that have a lot of tenure with the county, so they do have quite a bit of vacation time, so that's kind of been part of the equation to keep things filled.

Councilmember Shetler: And you have two lead mechanics and –

Chris Walsh: We have two mechanics. We normally keep three mechanics in-house. We have 125 pieces of equipment in our –

Councilmember Shetler: Well, you said you bring some people up sometimes. What did you mean?

Chris Walsh: Occasionally, if they're on a project in-house that I have not sent out in order to save money, I'll keep someone, pay them up to a mechanics level to assist the mechanic, but they're nowhere near at the level of a mechanic.

Councilmember Shetler: But you do, you have different levels of mechanics.

Chris Walsh: Yeah, we're trying, and that's just –

Councilmember Shetler: How many –

Chris Walsh: – and that's just the way we got by to this point.

Councilmember Shetler: Okay, how many assistant mechanics do you have, then?

Chris Walsh: None. I just, every once in a while I'll, depending on what the project is, I will upgrade one of my laborers to just assist, and it's more just a hands on kind of thing. It's not so much that they understand the pneumatics or whatever of the piece of equipment. Its more just assist the mechanic so I don't have to send it out.

Councilmember Shetler: Do you have someone in mind for this position that –

Chris Walsh: We have not posted it in-house because of the hiring freeze, and that will be the first step in this procedure, would be if it's okay, then we would post it in-house to see if one of the rank and file wanted to fill it, was able to fill it, qualified to fill it.

Councilmember Shetler: So, if we would give you approval today on this, how long would it take before you could actually get somebody working in the job?

Chris Walsh: Probably less than a month. I'd have to run it through the bidding process first before it went out to the street, if it did go out to the street, and that would probably be less than 30 days.

President Lloyd: And they'd have to have certain certifications as a mechanic to be able to apply for the position?

Chris Walsh: Correct.

President Lloyd: Okay, so if Council would approve this, then we're going to have to go through the mechanics of putting it back in the budget for next year and amending the Salary Ordinance to that effect. Any other questions for Council?

Bill Fluty: I think you'd have to do, if you're going to fill it before the end of the year, is there money available in that line item now?

(Inaudible)

Bill Fluty: Right now, so you're okay for that. But then again, you'll have to, for the beginning of the year, you know you don't have a certified budget at the very beginning, so a lot of the actions that you take at the beginning of the year, the money isn't in place. So you're waiting for that certified budget before the actual money gets there, so hiring quickly into January and February, you don't have the certified budget. So, not that you can't act on it, but he can't physically be there, because it's not at that point. You may be able to transfer some money into that, which is quicker, doing that early January, there's the mechanics of just trying to put that in. I just want to make you aware of that and the Council aware of that.

President Lloyd: When do we get our certified budget back or have we already got it back?

Bill Fluty: We don't, but we're supposed to have it by February 15th.

President Lloyd: And so what we'd be doing is making a change to the certified budget that we've already submitted to the state.

Bill Fluty: That's correct, in January.

President Lloyd: Right. Question, Mr. Shetler.

Councilmember Shetler: Would this create a problem where the individual would be working if we hired him say, now, or in a month or so, and he's working this year because there's money there but then it's not appropriated, we haven't taken action until '11, that he wouldn't get paid for a couple of weeks? You have to be working?

Bill Fluty: No, you could still make sure – surely, if you hire somebody this year you have a commitment to them to continue their pay in January and you would do a transfer at the beginning of the year.

Councilmember Shetler: Okay, so there wouldn't be any – there's no repercussions to the employee?

Bill Fluty: Not as long as you act, all that paperwork is filed and you act affirmatively, provided everybody says yes.

Councilmember Shetler: Okay, thank you.

President Lloyd: Other questions from Council? To add the position back, I mean, the position has got money now, but to allow them to advertise and fill the position is what we're voting on and then we'll have to do whatever is necessary to put it in the budget for next year. Roll call vote please. Oh, we need a motion and a second.

Councilmember Bassemier: Motion to approve.

President Lloyd: Okay, Mr. Bassemier, motion to approve. Is there a second?

Councilmember Raben: I'll second.

President Lloyd: Second Mr. Raben. Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Raben: He stepped out briefly, once again.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Lloyd?

President Lloyd: I'll go ahead and vote yes, so that's 6-0. So you can advertise and fill the position. Thank you, Chris.

Chris Walsh: Thank you very much.

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

PROSECUTOR REQUEST TO FILL PART-TIME VACANCY

President Lloyd: Item 9C, Prosecutor request to fill part-time vacancy. You should have a letter there. Yes, name please.

Regene Newman: Regene Newman, Prosecutor's office.

President Lloyd: Okay, and it's a position, the letter is from – I'm looking at my letter from the County Clerk – I've got the wrong letter here. Mr. Levco. It says Child Support Division part-time \$10.00 an hour, and it's being paid from incentive. Anything you want to add to that?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yeah, is that what the rate was prior to when that position was filled, were they paying \$10 an hour or what was the previous rate?

Regene Newman: The lady that was in it before that, we came to you in March of last year and asked that it be increased from \$8 an hour to \$12 an hour and we'd like to pay this lady \$10 an hour.

Councilmember Kiefer: Oh, so she was – it was making \$12 per hour?

Regene Newman: The lady that was in it prior was only making \$10 an hour, but we had permission to pay up to \$12 an hour. That was my understanding.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay, thank you.

President Lloyd: Other questions for Ms. Newman?

Councilmember Raben: I'll move approval.

President Lloyd: Is there a second?

Councilmember Terry: Second.

President Lloyd: Motion Mr. Raben, second Ms. Terry. Any other discussion? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. We approve that 6-0. Thank you for staying.

Regene Newman: Thank you

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

COUNTY CLERK REQUEST TO FILL VACANCY

President Lloyd: Item D, Clerk, request to fill vacancy, and she's here. And we have a letter from the County Clerk. Vacancy in small claims, and you have more information on that.

Susan Kirk: Well, first, this is Ryan Schultheis, and he's kind of shadowing me today and he just won an award over at the Centre -- is that where you had your, or where did you have your, -- the Holiday Inn, okay. The Optimists, this is Youth Appreciation Week and anyway, he's won an award and so I wanted him just to come up see what's going on here in the Council. So anyway, it's always nice to see our youth actively involved and he's a student at Memorial, actually.

President Lloyd: Welcome to County Council.

Ryan Schultheis: Thank you.

Susan Kirk: This is the same position that I asked for the last time I was here. The employee that we hired, it didn't work out, so we're just replacing that particular position. So I would like to think at least, the votes would be the same as far as streamlining anything.

Councilmember Raben: I'll move approval.

Susan Kirk: My staff is really -- good.

Councilmember Terry: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay motion Mr. Raben, second Ms. Terry. Any other questions

for Ms. Kirk? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: Well, to be consistent, I was opposed before because we've got the hiring freeze on and I feel like we need to hold the line where we can and if we don't we're going to be getting into some problems here with our reserves shortly. So I'll remain consistent in that and have to vote no.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: I'm going to stay consistent, too, sorry. No.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. Motion is approved 5-2. Thank you.

(Motion carried 5-2/Councilmembers Shetler & Goebel opposed)

Susan Kirk: There is one thing I want you to think about now. I emailed each one of you about the late fees that we collect, and other things. It was, like, over \$300,000. And I think you need to stop and think, we can't even begin to do any more late fees because of the time that it takes for us to field phone calls and process paperwork for collecting that \$300,000. You need to decide now, is it worth it to hire a part-time person for, say, \$18,000 to collect \$300,000. Thank you.

President Lloyd: And, Susie, I just wanted to say, commend you on the work you did yesterday on the election. Great work done there and everything –

Susan Kirk: And congratulations. We have all winners. How about that.

President Lloyd: Right. Everything went smoothly that I could tell.

Councilmember Goebel: Speaking a little bit quickly there.

President Lloyd: Yeah, we aren't sure on his.

Councilmember Goebel: We are sure. This chair is going to remain very comfortable.

President Lloyd: Are you kidding me?

Councilmember Goebel: I'll be remaining here.

President Lloyd: How many votes?

Councilmember Goebel: I think it was 165.

President Lloyd: Wow, that's a surprise.

Councilmember Goebel: But this is a good spot to be in, and I can't complain, and I wish Ron Bacon good luck. Thank you.

President Lloyd: Mr. Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: I just wanted to point out to Mr. Schultheis, I hear a lot of stories about Ryan Schultheis. My daughter is in his class at Memorial High School. He is a very fine young man and I know he's at the top of his class at Memorial High School, and congratulate him for his efforts and everything he's done. And wish him the best of luck in his future endeavors.

Ryan Schultheis: Thank you.

President Lloyd: What year are you?

Ryan Schultheis: I'm a senior.

President Lloyd: Did you have anything else you wanted to address to the Council? Are you going to be with her all day?

Ryan Schultheis: Yes.

President Lloyd: Okay, you have my sympathy. No, I'm kidding. I'm kidding.

Susan Kirk: Councilman Goebel, you may feel that it's a loss, but it's still a win that we get to keep you here, okay?

Councilmember Goebel: It was a win-win situation, thank you.

President Lloyd: Thank you.

Councilmember Goebel: Even after that vote today?

Susan Kirk: (Inaudible – comments not made from the microphone)

FILING DEADLINE FOR DECEMBER AND JANUARY COUNCIL MEETINGS
--

President Lloyd: Item 9G, for county officeholders and department heads, we need your submissions for requests by November 12, due to the holiday. For January, we're going to need your submissions, because of the holidays, by December 3rd.

SALARY ORDINANCE AMENDMENTS

President Lloyd: Okay, we'll go to item 10, Amendments to the Salary Ordinance.

I'll turn that over to the finance chair, Mr. Shetler.

Councilmember Shetler: Motion to approve the amendments to the Salary Ordinance that you all have been handed. That includes the Jail, Superior Court, Superior Court Supplemental Adult Probation, and County Highway, Prosecutor, County Clerk. Do you need me to do more on that?

President Lloyd: You want to make that in the form of a motion?

Councilmember Shetler: That is in the form of a motion, yes.

Teri Lukeman: And make this a part of the record?

Councilmember Shetler: And make this a part of the record, yes.

President Lloyd: Okay, is there a second?

Councilmember Bassemier: Second.

President Lloyd: Second, Mr. Bassemier, thank you. Any other questions about the salary ordinance? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. The amendments to the Salary Ordinance are approved 6-0.

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

PUBLIC COMMENT

President Lloyd: Item 11, public comment. Any member of the public that wants to address the County Council? Okay, we've had quite a bit of that. I don't see any others.

Councilmember Terry: President Lloyd? Can you just repeat items G & H for me?

I must have missed that.

President Lloyd: What we're asking there, is because of the holidays, we have a shortened time schedule, like if someone has a request for appropriation for the December 1 meeting, County Council office needs it by November 12th, and then the same with December, December 3rd, that's really for January, right?

Sandie Deig: December 3rd for the January meeting.

President Lloyd: For the January meeting, we need that by December 3rd. So it's really more for the officeholders that have changes and if they want to do a transfer, we need it by those dates. A couple of other items real quick. I want to congratulate Sheriff Eric Williams on his re-election, and we have him there, and he sat through this whole meeting. Thank you, Sheriff, and appreciate the job you do. And then one more item, Bill Fluty, eight years as County Auditor, eight years as Chief Deputy, he's been here a long time servicing County Council. I know all the Councilmembers that have worked with him, we appreciate the work you've done for us and you've certainly been very helpful to whoever sat in this chair as president. You're moving to another office, and we wish you the best and we look forward to working with Joe Gries, your Chief Deputy. Any other closing comments from Council? Is there a motion to adjourn?

Councilmember Kiefer: So moved.

President Lloyd: Is there a second?

Councilmember Shetler: Second.

President Lloyd: All in favor, signify by saying aye.

(All Councilmembers voted aye)

President Lloyd: We are adjourned.

(There being no further business to come before the Council, the meeting was adjourned at 11:09 a.m.)

VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL

President Russell Lloyd, Jr.

Vice President James Raben

Councilmember Joe Kiefer

Councilmember Mike Goebel

Councilmember Tom Shetler, Jr.

Councilmember Ed Bassemier

Councilmember Stephanie Terry

Recorded and transcribed by Teri Lukeman.

**VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL
DECEMBER 1, 2010**

The Vanderburgh County Council met in session this 1st day of December in room 301 of the Civic Center Complex. The meeting was called to order at 8:32 a.m. by County Council President Russell Lloyd, Jr.

President Lloyd: I'd like to call to order the meeting of the Vanderburgh County Council, December 1st, 2010. Could we have the attendance roll call please?

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

*Councilmember Kiefer arrived shortly after roll called.

President Lloyd: I'd like everybody to stand for the Pledge of Allegiance. Could Councilman Shetler lead us, please?

(Pledge of Allegiance was given)

President Lloyd: Jeff Ahlers is our County Council Attorney today. Bill Fluty is our County Auditor; Teri Lukeman, the Recording Secretary; Sandie Deig, Executive Assistant. Thank you all for helping us out.

<div>APPROVAL OF MINUTES OCTOBER 6, 2010 NOVEMBER 3, 2010</div>

President Lloyd: Item number four, approval of minutes, October 6, 2010 and November 3, 2010. Have the Councilmembers had an opportunity to review those minutes?

Councilmember Shetler: I have. So moved.

President Lloyd: Motion to approve. Is there a second?

Councilmember Bassemier: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Shelter, second Mr. Bassemier. All in favor signify by saying aye.

(All Councilmembers voted aye)

President Lloyd: Opposed, same sign.

(No opposing votes were cast)

President Lloyd: That is approved 6-0.

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

APPROPRIATION ORDINANCE

JAIL

President Lloyd: Item number five, appropriation ordinance, I'll turn that over to Councilman Shetler.

Councilmember Shetler: The first item is the Jail, and again, we have another situation where we're running out of food or running out of money to pay for the food, I think we have food, because of over population there. The Sheriff is here if anybody has any further questions, but this \$ 90,000 that we need to appropriate, is set to get us completed throughout the rest of the year. So I move for approval.

Councilmember Raben: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Shetler, second Mr. Raben. Any discussion? And the Sheriff was here last week to go over that as well. Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Raben?

Councilmember Raben: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: President Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. Motion passes 6-0.

JAIL		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1051-2260	Food	90,000.00	90,000.00
Total		90,000.00	90,000.00

(Motion unanimously approved 6-0)

COUNTY COUNCIL

Councilmember Shetler: This is, again, an item we took up last week and it really, the amount of money, the \$125,147, that amount of money that's being requested is basically to be placed into an account for some employees that are leaving service of county government who have accrued overtime and vacation time and sick days etcetera, and again, it's in the amount of \$125,147, and I move for approval.

President Lloyd: Is there a second?

Councilmember Bassemier: Second.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Shetler, second Mr. Bassemier. Any discussion?

Councilmember Shetler: Well, now that I've done that, I think there was a little bit of a question hanging last time that dealt with breaking that down between some individuals and I don't know if we –

Sandie Deig: You have it broken down, but I've not given out figures.

Councilmember Shetler: Okay. Yeah, that's appropriate, I don't think it ought to be done by name. So we do have that information. Because of privacy laws it's probably best at this point not to publically tell how much money is going to certain people but it is broken down if anybody is interested in that.

Councilmember Goebel: How many individuals?

Sandie Deig: Eleven right now.

Councilmember Goebel: Thank you.

Councilmember Shetler: And that 125, is that going to cover...

Sandie Deig: I hope.

Councilmember Shetler: Alright, any other questions then?

President Lloyd: I mean, I think if any Councilmember wanted to see that list, that's available to them. Any other questions on that? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. Motion passes 7-0.

COUNTY COUNCIL		REQUESTED	APPROVED
1480-1971	Accrued Payments	108,445.00	108,445.00
1480-1900	FICA	8,297.00	8,297.00
1480-1910	PERF	8,405.00	8,405.00
Total		125,147.00	125,147.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

TRANSFER REQUESTS

- CLERK**
COOPERATIVE EXTENSION (TWO)
SUPERIOR COURT
JAIL (LATE)
SUPERIOR COURT (LATE)
HEALTH DEPARTMENT (LATE)
- JAIL**
CIRCUIT COURT
LEGAL AID
ELECTION OFFICE (LATE)
CUMULATIVE BRIDGE (LATE)

President Lloyd: Move on to item number six, transfers. Mr. Shetler.

Councilmember Shetler: I'd like to make a motion that we approve all transfers as requested and I'll read through those, unless there is an objection to separating those out.

President Lloyd: I see no objection.

Councilmember Shetler: So I move that we approve all the transfers and I'll read those. I need a second, probably, I guess, before I...the motion would include transferring, in the Clerk's office line item 1610 \$450 to line item 1310. In Jail, from line item 0325 to 0401, that's in the amount of \$120. Request to transfer in Cooperative Extension line item 1990 to line item 1200 for \$1,600. In Cooperative Extension line item 3200 Utilities \$493 going to line item 4220 Office Machines of \$493. Circuit Court, from line item 3902 Grand Jurors \$680 going to line item 3723 Psychological Evaluations of \$680. Superior Court from line item 3941 Guardian Ad-Litem, \$7,000 going to line items 3050 Patient/Inmate Care \$5,000 and to line item 3980 Transfer Child & Miscellaneous \$2,000. Legal Aid from line item 3450 Yellow Pages \$144 and also from line item 3990 Miscellaneous \$237 going to 3250 which is Law Books \$155 and line item 3540 which is Maintenance Contract \$226. Late transfer requests from the Jail from two Confinement Officers, one is line item 0315, the other is 0337, \$2,460 and \$3,800, and also from line item 0338 Jail Receptionist \$2,100, from line item 0354 Confinement Officer \$2,800 and line item 1750 which

is Clothing Allowance \$2,854 all going to two different accounts which is line item 1751 Civilian Uniform Allowance 3,813 and Union Overtime which is line item 1850 in the amount of \$10,201. Election Office, from line item 3410 which is Printing, \$580 going to line item 3530 Contractual Services \$580. Superior Court going from line item 3903 in the amount of \$2,000 going to line item 3250 in the amount of \$2,000. Cumulative Bridge from line item 2000 in the amount of \$30,000 going to line item 2530 \$30,000. In the Health Department, going from line item 1430-2130 Deputy Registrar \$1,300 going to line item 1990 which is Extra Help for \$1,300.

Councilmember Kiefer: Question?

President Lloyd: Is that a motion?

Councilmember Shetler: That was a motion.

President Lloyd: Is there a second?

Councilmember Kiefer: I'll second it but I'd like to ask a question.

President Lloyd: Okay, go ahead.

Councilmember Kiefer: Regarding the Law Books, I see there is a couple of different places where we're getting Law Books in Legal Aid and then also in Superior Court, are those hard copies, physical copies or is that something on-line, Internet based?

Unidentified: Both.

Councilmember Kiefer: Both? And they're used, the law books, those are used frequently?

Unidentified: Yes.

Councilmember Kiefer: Okay. Well, I just didn't know. I thought all that had moved to on-line services. I didn't realize they still used physical copies like that. Thank you.

Councilmember Shetler: Some of that is like subscriptions to the various ongoing type of expenses that we have, I believe.

President Lloyd: Other questions from Council? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. That passes 7-0 and due to the volume, it's a lot of end of the year kind of transferring money around for each county department.

CLERK		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1010-1610-1010	Admin. Sec./ Court Archivist	450.00	450.00
To: 1010-1310-1010	MT/Calendar Clerk	450.00	450.00

JAIL		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1051-1130-0325	Confinement Officer	120.00	120.00
To: 1051-1130-0401	Emergency Med Tech	120.00	120.00

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1230-1990	Extra Help	1,600.00	1,600.00
To: 1230-1200-1230	4-H Summer Assistants (PT)	1,600.00	1,600.00

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1230-3200	Utilities	493.00	493.00
To: 1230-4220	Office Machines	493.00	493.00

CIRCUIT COURT		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1360-3902	Grand Jurors	680.00	680.00
To: 1360-3723	Psychological Eval.	680.00	680.00

SUPERIOR COURT		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1370-3941	Guardian Ad-Litem	7,000.00	7,000.00
To: 1370-3050	Patient/Inmate Care	5,000.00	5,000.00
1370-3980	Trans Child & Misc.	2,000.00	2,000.00

LEGAL AID		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1460-3450	Yellow Pages	144.00	144.00
1460-3990	Miscellaneous	237.00	237.00
To: 1460-3250	Law Books	155.00	155.00
1460-3540	Maint. Contract	226.00	226.00

JAIL		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1051-1130-0315	Confinement Officer	2,460.00	2,460.00
1051-1130-0337	Confinement Officer	3,800.00	3,800.00
1051-1130-0338	Jail Receptionist	2,100.00	2,100.00
1051-1130-0354	Confinement Officer	2,800.00	2,800.00
1051-1750	Clothing Allowance	2,854.00	2,854.00
To: 1051-1751	Civilian Uniform Allowance	3,813.00	3,813.00
1051-1850	Union Overtime	10,201.00	10,201.00

ELECTION OFFICE		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1210-3410	Printing	580.00	580.00
To: 1210-3530	Contractual Services	580.00	580.00

SUPERIOR COURT		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 1370-3903	Petit Jurors	2,000.00	2,000.00
To: 1370-3250	Law Books	2,000.00	2,000.00

CUMULATIVE BRIDGE		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 2030-2000	Materials	30,000.00	30,000.00
To: 2030-2530	Bituminous Materials	30,000.00	30,000.00

HEALTH		REQUESTED	APPROVED
From: 2130-1430-2130	Deputy Registrar	1,300.00	1,300.00
To: 2130-1990	Extra Help	1,300.00	1,300.00

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

PROPOSED BASEBALL & SOFTBALL COMPLEX

President Lloyd: Item number seven, repeal, we have none. Item number eight, old business, Convention & Visitors Bureau proposed baseball/softball complex, that was withdrawn by the Convention & Visitors Bureau. One point of information, the original time table that was proposed on those bonds, I think December 1st was the last day for 2010 to allow them to access Build America bonds, so that’s one of the reasons that was on the agenda to give them a chance to come up with that, and they were unsuccessful and withdrew that. Any other comments on that? Council? Mr. Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Yeah, that’s just, this whole project has been a good example of public input, I think when people feel like in the public that they don’t have a say, I think this is an obvious example where a lot of input was taken from the public and they had an effect on what the end result was or may be.

President Lloyd: I mean, I would agree with that and you had a proposal by an appointed board, and then the elected board had to look at it and make their own conclusions, so anyway, we’ll see what happens in the future on that. Any other comments from Council?

Councilmember Goebel: I still think if we go back in history when they decided, they did a survey as to what would be most beneficial, as far as an investment for this community, utilizing the Innkeepers Tax, that’s why it was raised, to develop, and this was the number one project, period, as far as the greatest return to bring wholesome quality of life activities here. Families would come for youth baseball and youth softball, and right now, we travel to other places and if anyone has been involved in that, you know a whole lot of stay cations happen; people go to different venues, they stay, they spend their money and it’s pretty clean as far as the economic input into communities. And I think if we can’t find a way to do it at this location, then we definitely should stay open to doing this in the future, regardless, because the money is there, it’s not going to cost Vanderburgh County taxpayers directly. Thank you.

President Lloyd: Other comments? Okay. And we’ve had numerous opportunities for public discussion on this as well.

VETERANS SERVICES REQUEST TO FILL VACANCY

President Lloyd: We’ll move on to item number nine, new business, item A, Veterans Services, I’ve given you a letter, a copy of a letter that Commissioner Melcher sent regarding the assistant Veterans Services officer position, and he is requesting, I guess, a movement of personnel there. I would like to further look at that and maybe have us defer this at this time. I don’t know if any other Councilmembers, if you had a chance to look at the letter. One other point on item

number eight, the new congress in the United States Capitol, there's a possibility they may renew those Build America bonds, we don't know that yet, but as of right now, they were supposed to expire December 31st, so we'll see what happens. Back to item number 9A, is there any Councilmember questions? Mr. Kiefer?

Councilmember Kiefer: Not a question, but a comment: Commissioner Melcher had contacted me about this and feels pretty strongly that there's a need there to do this and I'd like to maybe go over there and visit with them at their office and see if I can discern more about what they're trying to accomplish with the move, but they may have a legitimate concern.

President Lloyd: Are you the liaison to the Veterans?

Councilmember Goebel: I am.

Councilmember Kiefer: Oh, I'm sorry, Mike.

Councilmember Goebel: No, that's alright, but I think with the Job Study and that, I think it would be good if both of us went.

Councilmember Kiefer: Sure, that would be great.

President Lloyd: I'm not opposed to what he's proposing here, I just think we might want to make sure that's the Council's will to do that.

Councilmember Goebel: That position, if it becomes open has to be filled by a veteran, correct?

President Lloyd: Right. And that's something I think maybe Mr. Ahlers could clarify that, is that a county ordinance?

Jeff Ahlers: Well, as far as the actual employee, I don't know, I'll just have to look into it and I can email everybody on that. I don't know, and I can talk to – who is the head of that now? It used to be Acker, who is that now?

President Lloyd: Jay Ball.

Jeff Ahlers: Okay.

President Lloyd: But I think that's correct, that it may be a county ordinance that it always, that the head of that department has to be veteran, and it's been that way for many, many years. But the other positions, I don't think there's any requirements of.

TRAVEL REQUESTS

President Lloyd: We'll move on to item B, travel, and I'll turn that over to the finance chair, Mr. Shetler.

Councilmember Shetler: Okay, I know we have requests from the County Clerk for \$126 for two people to go to a child support training meeting, and it is a state called meeting. We have a request from Voters Registration for two people, it's a state called meeting, and it's \$650 for each. The County Commissioners, we have two members, that is not a state called meeting, to a conference, \$500 each. Legal Aid has withdrawn their request. County Engineer, three people, it is not a state called

meeting, it's a total of \$800 for the three to go to a County Bridge Conference. The Health department has requests for four different people, three of the four are state called, one is a state health plan meeting for \$150 for one individual; the same individual going to another state health planning meeting in January, and that is \$150 as well. Another individual going to a WIC meeting and that is state called, it's for \$50. And then a fourth one, which is not a state called meeting, but it is a license refresher training meeting to the tune of \$550. I don't know if I can answer any questions or if anybody is here to answer them. I know the Health Department people are, but as far as some of the others, I don't know, but –

President Lloyd: I can answer one. On the County Engineer, Mr. Stoll did send me an email and kind of laid out that they typically go every year to that county bridge conference and it's put on by the Purdue Road School, and they usually receive beneficial information on that. And he had a doctors appointment, otherwise he'd be here, but I told him I thought his explanation was sufficient. Any other questions on the travel? Is there a motion to approve?

Councilmember Shetler: That would be a motion to approve.

President Lloyd: Is there a second?

Councilmember Goebel: Second.

President Lloyd: And then that, so Legal Aid has withdrawn, so take the 298.58 out, right?

Councilmember Shetler: Yes.

President Lloyd: Okay, so all the others would be approved as submitted. All in favor signify by saying aye.

(All Councilmembers voted aye)

President Lloyd: Any opposed? Same sign.

(No opposing votes were cast)

President Lloyd: These pass 7-0.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

MBE/WBE UTILIZATION BOARD PRESENTATION

President Lloyd: We'll move on to item C, MBE/WBE Utilization Board presentation and we have a representative of that board here. State your name please.

Eric Cake: Good morning. My name is Eric Cake, and I'm the County Council representative to the MBE/WBE Utilization Board, that's Minority Business Enterprise and Women Business Enterprise. I've come before you today just to bring up the importance of including an MBE and WBE in all bidding and purchasing processes. We hope by doing this we can bring new people in to the table and hopefully lower costs and increase quality. We also would like, if there are problems with an MBE or a WBE to be referred to, have him referred to us so that we can try to find someone to help mentor them. You know, any time you enter into a new

business, there's growing pains that you have to learn and we're also here to assist department heads and purchasing departments in connecting with contractors and vendors. We've had some meetings between different groups and trying to help bring them into that. Our current rate for WBE's is 7 percent, while our MBE's is 12%. We have already had a meeting with the city department heads and the Mayor and managed to introduce some MBE's and WBE's to those department heads. So we just wanted to, I don't know when the last time anybody has addressed you on these issues, but we like to keep in the forefront and be more of an assisting group than kind of a watchful eye, I guess you could say. Are there any questions?

President Lloyd: Who is the chair of that board, is that Maura Robinson?

Eric Cake: Maura Robinson, yes.

President Lloyd: And then, are you going to make this presentation to the Commissioners?

Eric Cake: We intend to once, at the beginning of the year, once they change hands. We felt it redundant to do it now and then go ahead and do it again, being that two of the people would stay the same. Like I said, we have already talked to the city and the department heads in the city, and then hopefully the Commissioners after the year starts.

President Lloyd: Yeah, this board, there's nobody changing hands, so I guess the public is happy with what Council is doing.

Eric Cake: Well, like I say, too, our board is a lot like you guys in that we're bi-partisan, and that we do work well together. And that's something that, I think mirrors you guys pretty well.

President Lloyd: This form you attached, is that something that's been given to all the departments?

Eric Cake: If it hasn't, it will be. It's just our way of tracking to see who is using MBE's and WBE's, and if we find out that they haven't, that maybe the problem is that they just don't have anybody, an MBE or WBE that does that service and then in which case we can go out and look for that or maybe that the WBE's and MBE's aren't competitive. And again, we can help them hook up with a mentor to try to get them in line with everybody else.

President Lloyd: So, I mean, part of the role of the board is educational?

Eric Cake: Oh yeah. Educational, and again, introducing one party to the other. Like I said, we're not just there to come down on people, we're there to help more than anything.

President Lloyd: And I think in a lot of public works projects that we've seen, minority business and women business have gotten some of those contracts, so its been really beneficial.

Eric Cake: And the stadium has been real good on that.

President Lloyd: Right. Any questions from Councilmembers on MBE/WBE? And we've got a list of those board people, we don't have it with us, but, I mean, we've seen that before.

Eric Cake: And, like I said, I like to come before you at least once a year just to update you on what we're doing and how things are going and, like I said, if you have any questions, feel free to give me a call.

President Lloyd: When are your meetings?

Eric Cake: I'm drawing a blank right now. I believe it's the second Tuesday of the month.

President Lloyd: In this room or...

Eric Cake: Down at –

President Lloyd: 307? The old Commissioner's?

Eric Cake: Down at the other end of the hall, 311 maybe?

President Lloyd: 318? Okay. But those are open to the public?

Eric Cake: Oh yes, and they're posted in the newspaper also.

President Lloyd: The second Tuesday at what time?

Eric Cake: I believe it's 10:00. The second Thursday,

President Lloyd: The second Thursday?

Eric Cake: I believe that's what it is. I'm drawing a blank right now, sorry.

President Lloyd: Okay, any questions from Councilmembers?

Councilmember Terry: I have one. How old is this ordinance? How long has it been in place?

Eric Cake: Its been in place for a while, it's just been reworked. I've only been on the board for a year, so some of the other board members have been working at it a lot longer than I have. We're just trying to fine tune it and strengthen it a little bit. The new ordinance, I believe, goes to be certified, I believe, now you have to go through the state instead of a local, so it's strengthened, and there's a lot to that certification that someone like myself, when I first got in I had no idea. I thought, you know, if you're a minority or if you're a woman, you automatically, but there's a lot of background checking that gets involved, so it's a hard thing to get.

Councilmember Terry: Do you feel like, I guess, in Vanderburgh County our trend is growing or –

Eric Cake: I think we still have some work to do. I mean, we're getting better and that's why we try to bring that up in front of everybody to, just to keep it in everybody's mind that when you do that, (inaudible), bring some of those groups in, too, and to the table.

Councilmember Terry: Alright, thank you.

President Lloyd: I think, a little bit of history, I don't remember if Mayor MacDonald

had some kind of structure in place, but we revised it when I was Mayor, so it's been going at least seven or eight years. And they've continued and maybe restructured a little bit.

Eric Cake: Yeah, we're just trying to fine tune it, direct it in ways that benefit everyone.

President Lloyd: So the next Thursday will be January the 13th?

Eric Cake: I believe that's the next one. I'd have to double check that –

President Lloyd: For the public, anybody that wants to come, 318. Any other questions from Council? Great, Eric. Thanks for coming in. Appreciate it.

Eric Cake: Thank you very much.

President Lloyd: Item D, we took at the Personnel & Finance, Growth Alliance of Evansville.

PETITION TO APPEAL FOR AN INCREASE TO THE MAXIMUM LEVY

President Lloyd: Item number 8, petition to appeal for an increase in the maximum levy. You should have a copy of that form and if there's any questions, maybe our County Auditor can answer it, but basically, this is a petition to the Department of Local Government Finance to allow the county to capture property tax monies that, due to a shortfall of appeals, and we've had numerous appeals for multi-millions of dollars. So this would allow the county to get back to 100% of the property tax that's been billed. And I don't know if our County Auditor can elaborate on that.

Councilmember Raben: We basically do this every year, --

Bill Fluty: That's correct.

Councilmember Raben: So I'll move approval.

President Lloyd: Okay, is there a second?

Councilmember Shetler: Second.

President Lloyd: Motion Mr. Raben, second Mr. Shetler. Any questions or discussion? And this is something that's been done every year. I guess my one question, Mr. Fluty, did the DLGF grant this last year?

Bill Fluty: Yes, they did.

President Lloyd: Okay, alright. But if you didn't do this, your property tax at 100% would be less all your appeals, you may only collect 94%, so it just allows you to make up that difference. If there's not any other questions, roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. That passes 7-0. And we'll need Councilmembers to sign that, so don't leave too quickly.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

<p>AUDITOR REQUEST TO RELEASE COUNTY COUNCIL MINUTES ON MICROFILM TO CENTRAL LIBRARY</p>

President Lloyd: Item F, Auditor request, release a set of microfilm to archive County Council minutes to Central Library. I'll ask our Auditor to explain that.

Bill Fluty: I believe, it's been a couple of years, but I have been doing our records of our Commissioners, and our County Council's have deteriorated, but we've been scanning those, the handwritten ones, and we have microfilm here in our office and we have it on CD ROM, but we, since it is your minutes, we're requesting to move that on to the library so they can be viewed there. And we've had that okayed before by the Commissioners, and we're just asking to do the same with the Council records.

Councilmember Raben: I'll move approval.

President Lloyd: Okay, is there a second?

Councilmember Shetler: Second.

President Lloyd: Motion Mr. Raben, second Mr. Shetler. Is there any cost to us for that?

Bill Fluty: No, there's not other than the initial cost to do the work, which you've funded in the past, and we've done it for the Commissioners and now for the Council.

President Lloyd: All in favor, signify by saying aye.

(All Councilmembers voted aye)

President Lloyd: Any opposed, same sign.

(No opposing votes were cast)

President Lloyd: Okay, 7-0, that's approved.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

Councilmember Shetler: Would that be an appropriate place to take some of those Recorder Fees from to get this paid for?

Bill Fluty: I don't believe so.

Councilmember Shetler: Okay, thanks.

President Lloyd: Okay, good try.

SALARY ORDINANCE AMENDMENTS

President Lloyd: Item number ten, amendments to salary ordinance. I'll turn that over to Mr. Shetler.

Councilmember Shetler: I move that we approve the amendments to the salary ordinance as its been submitted. I think each one of you received this just a moment ago on your desks, that we passed earlier.

Councilmember Raben: I'll second.

President Lloyd: Okay, motion Mr. Shetler, second Mr. Raben.

Councilmember Shetler: According to your agenda, I do want to point out that that does not include the Veterans Services, because we did defer that action. So it's on this latest copy, that has it.

President Lloyd: Right, there's two for the Jail, Clerk, Cooperative Extension and County Council.

Councilmember Shetler: Correct.

President Lloyd: Okay, any other questions on that? Roll call vote please.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Terry?

Councilmember Terry: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Bassemier?

Councilmember Bassemier: Yes.

Teri Lukeman: Councilmember Shetler?

Councilmember Shetler: 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 Lloyd?

President Lloyd: Yes. Amendments to salary ordinance pass 7-0.

(Motion unanimously approved 7-0)

PUBLIC COMMENT

President Lloyd: Item eleven, public comment, anybody from the public want to comment to Council? Yes, come on up, Sir. State your name and address please.

Wayne Fehd: I'm Wayne Fehd, Vanderburgh County resident. I'm here representing the Vanderburgh County Soil & Water Conservation District and I want to thank you for your support and your financial support in the past and for this year. And I look forward to working with you again in the new year. Appreciate your help financially with our office workers and I'm an elected board supervisor, and we go in January to the training conference and we appreciate your help whenever we, on our expenses to go up there for training, and that's for the office workers and the supervisor, and the delegate and the alternates in the past.

President Lloyd: How many people is that, approximately?

Wayne Fehd: Well, I'm not for sure, Bonnie and Norma, and I'll be going, Dave Ellison will be going, Darrell Rice might be going, too, our district conservationist.

President Lloyd: I mean, I see the reports and I think all the Council gets the reports from the Soil & Water Conservation, and that's important work you do. Any Councilmember have any questions for Mr. Fehd? Okay, well, --

Wayne Fehd: I sure thank you.

President Lloyd: Okay, appreciate it. Thank you. Any other public comment? Any other Council comment? This will be our last official meeting for 2010. We'll have our Personnel & Finance. Did we set a date for that? Is that the 15th? Sandie, is that the 15th for our Personnel & Finance?

Sandie Deig: Yes.

President Lloyd: Okay. Any other questions? Mr. Goebel?

Councilmember Goebel: What would be the date of the last meeting after that?

Sandie Deig: That's it.

Councilmember Goebel: The 15th will cover both? Thank you.

President Lloyd: Well, and then we'll just have our organizational meeting in January. So, okay, is there a motion to adjourn?

Councilmember Raben: So moved.

President Lloyd: Is there a second?

Councilmember Shetler: Second.

President Lloyd: All in favor, signify by saying aye.

(All Councilmembers voted aye)

President Lloyd: County Council is adjourned. Thank you.

(There being no further business to come before the Council, the meeting was adjourned at 9:02 a.m.)

VANDERBURGH COUNTY COUNCIL

President Russell Lloyd, Jr.

Vice President James Raben

Councilmember Joe Kiefer

Councilmember Mike Goebel

Councilmember Tom Shetler, Jr.

Councilmember Ed Bassemier

Councilmember Stephanie Terry

Recorded and transcribed by Teri Lukeman.