

**ALLEN COUNTY COUNCIL
MEETING MINUTES
May 18, 2006
8:30 AM**

The Allen County Council met on Thursday, May 18, 2006 at 8:30 am in the County Council/Commissioners Courtroom. The purpose of the meeting was for additional appropriations and transfer of funds in excess of the current budget. Also, grants and any other business to come before Council.

Attending: Paula S. Hughes, President; Paul G. Moss, Vice President; Michael W. Cunegin II, Darren E. Vogt, Calvert S. Miller, Roy Buskirk, and Paulette L. Kite.

Also Attending: Lisa Blosser, Auditor; Tera Klutz, Chief Deputy Auditor; Jackie Scheuman, Finance Manager; and Commissioner Nelson Peters.

The meeting was called to order at 8:30 am by President Paula Hughes with the Pledge of Allegiance.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Mike Cunegin made a motion to approve the minutes of April 20, 2006. Cal Miller seconded it. Motion passed 7-0.

FINANCIAL REPORT:

Lisa Blosser, Auditor: The amount you have left for appropriation in the County General fund is \$481,149. For your consideration today there are additional appropriations in the amount of \$1,596; this will leave you with a balance of \$479,553 for the remainder of the year.

Paula Hughes: Are there any questions about the General Fund or other funds?

Mike Cunegin made a motion to accept the financial report as presented. Cal Miller seconded it.

Paula Hughes: We have a motion and a second, are there any questions? All in favor signify by saying aye. All opposed same sign. The motion has passed 7-0. We are going to skip around the agenda a bit because we have some non-County guests with us. We will start with item 2, the Drug Free Communities Fund. If you could introduce yourself for the record?

Jerri Lerch: I am Jerri Lerch with the Drug and Alcohol Consortium of Allen County. I appreciate being here. I am here to request an appropriation of a portion of the Drug Free Communities Fund. As you know, through our court fees we are earmarked to spend on justice prevention and intervention. We are to spend those proportionately. We have gone through a granting process. In response to this we are requesting \$260,214 be allocated in the funding process. That is not the total allotment. We did not receive enough grant request in the area of prevention and intervention. We will be conducting a second cycle in September and October to complete that process so that we have a balance request. I would be happy to answer any questions you have.

Mike Cunegin: I have no questions but a comment. Council members I am part of the board locally and on the state commission. She fits into the guidelines perfectly on what the state wants to do and works very hard with all the board members there.

Paula Hughes: Councilman Vogt?

Darren Vogt: One quick question. After the grants are awarded, what kind of follow-up is done to ensure that these dollars are spent in the areas that they are to be spent?

Jerri Lerch: Excellent question. A couple ways with one being that with the grantees themselves, regarding compliance, we require a six-month and twelve-month written report and additionally we perform a site visit for most of the grants. But one of the most important features is the comprehensive plan for Indiana. Those plans are approved by the state and they mandate we do broad-base planning which includes problem identification and to set goals to move the needle in this community. These grantees work with them to measure their outcomes with the desired goals.

Darren Vogt: Thank you.

Paula Hughes: Councilman Buskirk?

Roy Buskirk: Was there any applications from any new programs or were these funded in the past?

Jerri Lerch: Some were in the past and some are new. I don't have the exact list from last year's budget but there is a mix of both.

Paula Hughes: Councilman Miller?

Cal Miller: The decision making process, could you describe how the dollars are allocated to what entities?

Jerri Lerch: Certainly. The first requirement by the state is that we split our pot into quarters. There is an extensive written grant application that they fill out. Financial and mission data, description of the program, a specific project budget and which particular outcomes they are planning to address. The grants are announced in early March. The applicants have about six weeks to turn those in. We have a funding committee and a chair from each of our areas of prevention and intervention. They help describe the content or industry around that specific grant. The committee makes recommendation on the funding and look at the grass roots and other sources of funding. We also look at sustainability and how they plan to go on. We earmark a portion for grass roots efforts to help new startups and pilots and on-going programs.

Cal Miller: Mrs. Lerch, I appreciate that explanation and it sounds like there is a great deal of scrutiny. On the DAC allocation of \$90,822 is that for administrative costs and what is the breakdown?

Jerri Lerch: A couple of things about that is that about 70% of that is administrative overhead and 30% is programmatic which goes back into training, scholarships and other programs. Last year, that budget was a little over \$105,000 dollars and we were able to reduce that for a couple of reasons. It is primarily for my salary, a part-time assistant and rent. Last year, we were able to garner a \$500,000 federal grant for a five-year period of time. We also garnered a one-year \$25,000 grant. The federal grant is assumed to be renewable for another five years. We are able to reduce some of the administrative and central expenses by the \$15,000 in part from subsidies and part from cost reduction.

Cal Miller: Are the salaries then approved by the committee? Is there an over-sight as to who is getting that?

Jerri Lerch: Absolutely. Also, as of January 1, 2005, we became a 501C3. So the board of directors approves the grant requests and the salaries and budget for the organization.

Cal Miller: Thank you.

Paula Hughes: Any further questions? If not, I look for a motion.

Cal Miller: Move to approve the appropriation in Drug Free Communities Fund for \$329,000.

Darren Vogt: Second.

Paula Hughes: We have a motion and a second, are there any questions? All in favor signify by saying aye. All opposed same sign. The motion has passed 7-0. Thank you. We are now going to jump to a discussion item, the Stormwater Program presentation and I believe we have a Power Point presentation for this. If council will move out into the audience, please.

Al Frisinger: I would like to take the opportunity to introduce the two people from Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis, Center for Urban Policy and the Environment, Dr. Greg Lindsey and his assistant, Jamie Palmer. Thank you for the opportunity to be moved up in the agenda. As you recall we have talked about the activity in the Clean Water Act, Phase 2. We commissioned Dr. Lindsey to do a study and how it will impact our Phase 2 operations. I think he has a good presentation that will answer any questions and may raise a few more. With that, we will move right along.

Dr. Lindsey: Thank you so much. I appreciate the opportunity to be here and to work on this project. What we are going to do is follow-up with some background information, to help think through some of the issues you face, as you work towards designing a program to address storm water quality in Allen County. I would like to give a little background as to how we got here. We are going to talk about clean water and how we achieve clean water. We had some issues with clean water a few years ago and if you remember, the Cuyahoga River caught on fire. That prompted the Clean Water Act in 1972. We have made significant progress in cleaning up the waterways. In 1987, Congress said we were doing a very good job of cleaning up sewage from municipalities and controlling industry but we haven't achieved water quality standards. There was a recent report about the state that said there were a number of streams and rivers that don't meet the standards. Congress decided that there are pollutants that run off the farms and fields and urban streets. Any oils from cars are just flushed into rivers. In 1987, Congress said to EPA to figure out a way to deal with this. Five years later, EPA issued regulations that set in place some new programs at the state level. It was called MS4 (Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System). Initially, they went to the larger municipalities of more than 100,000 people that were associated with these separate storm sewer systems. They began implementing these programs in the mid 1990's. Then Phase 2 was initiated in Indiana in 2003. That is the program that is really driving what we are talking about today. The urban areas need to begin to think about how to deal with the urban run-off and clean up the pollutants. We don't want water standing and so we have to think of ways to get that water moving along. Now we are trying to figure out how to clean it up too. The county decided to hire Christopher B. Burke Engineering to complete the planning and permit documents. The permit was

submitted for a single unified area. The permit involves potentially substantial cost to clean up. What we have done is to work with municipalities to understand how to pay for these programs. The thing we know is that the need exceeds the availability.

We work with municipalities and get them to think through the problems and ways to address it. We work with the financial area for years. We try to estimate the total demand for money to address the drinking water and septic water problems for the state. We have provided this general assistance to a number of places. We were asked to find out how much money is being spent to move the storm water and in managing storm water. This also includes activities to deal with clean water. We were asked to estimate what the demand for additional money would be to try to address this problem. We try to get some sense of what people would be willing to pay. Anytime you make a decision to fund a public program it makes sense to involve the constituents. The idea is to provide information so that the leaders here, who are responsible, have better information.

Jamie worked with the staff in each of the jurisdictions to come up with an estimate of what was being spent on all activities related to storm water. When we manage our roads, we also think about the ditch and the ditch also handles the storm water. Depending on how we design the ditches, we can do a better job of moving it along. We take a broad view which is what the programs require us to do. Street sweeping is another way to look at an expenditure that is related to storm water because we pick up the pollutants here too. Current expenditures for the county are a three-year average of two point one million dollars, annually. What the staff did was to look at what are traditional activities such as moving water quality. About a quarter of it counts towards compliance. We want to address water quality in ways that have never been done before.

I would like to explain the difference between a storm water program and a pollution control program. When you think of pollution control efforts of the past they contained a single source. Storm water doesn't work like that. When you think about runoff and every ditch that runs off into a river, there is no single project that will solve the problem. We need to think about ways to reduce the pollution and the runoff and at other locations would try to intercept it. When we talk about compliance we talk about educating people to pick up after their pets and to design regional retention ponds that capture storm water. Burke Engineers employees a number of specialists in designing these programs and facilities. As you can see, the amount in the urban areas exceeds one point one million dollars. If we implement all of these activities, we are looking at increasing the expenditures for storm water by about fifty percent.

Burke Engineering has worked with this many times and it was not up to us to review these cost estimates but to look at how to take care of this. This gives you an idea for additional funding for clean water. There are lots of different ways we can fund. In some cases, there may be twenty-five funding sources that can be implemented and used in particular instances. What needs to be considered is what is a firm, stable and preferred source of revenue? There are a couple of ways that this can be done. Property taxes and other general revenues but nobody wants to raise taxes. So what people have done is to think of another strategy. What they have come up with is storm water charges. People pay a fee based on the concrete or impervious area they have. All single family homes are going to have about the same amount of concrete or impervious area. There would be a standard charge for those and then for non-residential, we would look at multiples of that. And it would be on a square foot charge. Everybody pays proportionately. They establish a rate base which is different than using property taxes. This gives a stable base of funding for the long term. Storm water is never going away so we have to look at programs that can endure over a long period of time.

In Indiana code, there are different legislations that enable counties to set up user charge systems like we are talking about. One can be set up for storm water and one for sewage. There has been legislation recently, at the county level, about storm water districts being extended. The important idea is that if we are going to make a commitment to achieve clean water and bite the bullet and spend money to do it, then there are options. If we choose options such as charges, there are options within that also. You just need to see what makes most sense for the people you serve.

According to our study, the storm water charge ranges from \$1.25 in Indianapolis to \$7.20 a month in Leo-Cedarville. The typical fee is about \$3.50 a month for residential. The average home, with impervious area, is about 2,800 square feet. The non-residential, businesses, hospitals, etc. would all be measured for the impervious areas.

Many leaders revisit these charges periodically. They look at how much we need and what can we afford. Our staff also talked to a number of people in the community about how they thought a charge system on the impervious area would be perceived. Opinions varied. This was a focus group and not a random survey. People seemed to understand that there was a need for this but wanted it to be emphasized that this would be needed for clean water.

Another thing we looked at was how much revenue would be generated if the fee was put into place. At three dollars per equivalent residential unit (ERU), we estimate that it would be one point four to two point six million dollars in

the unincorporated area. If it was increased to five dollars per ERU, it would be two point three to four point four million dollars. These are ballpark figures.

The bottom line is that storm water charges may be a viable alternative. And if the range is three dollars per household, it would generate the revenues that could cover the magnitude of costs that would be necessary.

The permit only applies to the most urbanized areas of the county. Do the charges only apply to the urbanized areas or is it to be charged to the entire county? There are real needs, there are options and they are workable. We have tried to give you background information. There are administrative and engineering decisions to be made such as how to set up a billing system. If you use the property tax, the billing system is in place. But if you want to bill a property owner, you need to integrate the data systems. There are decisions about how you want to engage the public. Sometimes, the best time to propose this is right after a storm when the storm is still fresh in their minds. There is official legislative action that can be required, a number of technical decisions to be made, there would be decisions about how to engage the public and this would be planned over time.

I will stop here. What I tried to do was give the overview. Jamie did a lot of the technical work and she can answer those questions. In broader issues then we will have Burke Engineers help to answer those.

Cal Miller: Is the one point four million dollars a recurring cost to remain compliant?

Dr. Lindsey: The regulations are set up with minimum control measures. So there are recurring types of expenditures.

Cal Miller: Isn't there some infrastructure costs associated with location in phase two? Where are those funds coming from?

Dr. Lindsey: The breakdown of capital and programmatic costs are averaged out.

Cal Miller: One other question...the one point four looked like it was on top and is that the dollars that are being spent now?

Dr. Lindsey: Yes. It is important to think about these together. If they redesign a ditch, rather than paving they should use a grass swale. It is rethinking the design so we do a better job of trying to reduce the pollutants that go into the streams.

Dona Sapp: Most of this is on the shoulders of the developers. This program is really for the county. This is the most reasonable place to activate it.

Roy Buskirk: In Allen County, the mandated area is not the entire county. Have you worked in an area that was similar to Allen County and how was the fee structure set up?

Jamie Palmer: No county in Indiana has done this yet. We don't know yet. Other counties are considering the option of doing just the urban area or also including the rest of the county.

Roy Buskirk: But in this county it does include some of the unincorporated area.

Dona Sapp: Overall, I think what Jamie was trying to get at is that we have no other counties yet. The portion that is received from the urban areas will be larger than that in the rural areas.

Dr. Lindsey: The experience, in Indiana, is not as great as it is in other places. The rules are three years old and nobody has gone into it. When we look at other places, many have gone to charging entire counties. Some jurisdictions have differentiated the fees by geography within the territory and according to the level of service required. That sounds complicated but with different watershed and different streams but they may require different improvements to claim clean water objectives. When you try to be more specific geographically, you tend to increase complexity.

Roy Buskirk: The complexity is great because in soil and water conservation districts, you have strips on the open streams. This presentation is one that the commissioners should hear because they are the ones that set fees.

Paula Hughes: I believe the commissioners have been involved in this conversation.

Cal Miller: Have you also provided them with a hand-out of the presentation?

Dr. Lindsey: Yes we did.

Al Frisinger: As clarification, the commissioners were handed the edict for compliance for the Phase 2 program and brought it back through the Surveyor's office. They act as the permittee on the drainage side and as the legislative entity that will enact anything to bring fees together.

Darren Vogt: This may be a technical question but you are talking about assessing concrete. Do you determine that if you are over 2,500 square feet that you are paying more and who determines that?

Dr. Lindsey: Usually what happens now is that with the advancement of aerial photography and geographic information. The amount on all non-residential institutions is measured. We use the GIS to do the measuring. The residential is a set number no matter what. The way that is set is that you may take a sample of 500 homes and measure on those and you have competence areas around those to come up with the average. Sometimes people put in those retention ponds and they get rebates for it.

Alex Wernher: I just wanted to mention to Councilman Vogt that, with the infrared photography that we are getting, we can automate that calculation across the entire county.

Dr. Lindsey: So what has happened is that we have become more efficient. One of the challenges is where do you get the capital before you have a revenue stream? Some take general revenues in order to get it running. Others loan money which is paid back. There is another question back here.

Paul Moss: You emphasized a couple of times unincorporated Allen County. What is the City of Fort Wayne doing? I believe they have a storm water fee already in place.

Dr. Lindsey: They moved ahead because they were covered earlier on. There is potential for collaboration across jurisdictional lines on these because some of the activities are education of the populace. Water doesn't stop at a jurisdictional line so there could be some strong collaboration.

Al Frisinger: Councilman Moss, we do have a collaborative effort with the City of Fort Wayne. It is called the Partnership for Water Quality and is with Fort Wayne and New Haven. We do employ an educational person. We do planning with the other entities.

Paul Moss: The City of Fort Wayne is charging a little different from the way you are proposing. They are doing it on the utility bills.

Dr. Lindsey: I don't want to overstate a particular approach. The most common one is based on concrete.

Paul Moss: It seems to be the most reasonable one, in my opinion.

Dr. Lindsey: Some people will try to make it more fair but will make it more complex. In a planning session, we could look at the details a little more and see which approach makes sense.

Paul Moss: The other question I have is will there be a spreadsheet about education and something that breaks down the dollars and how they are going to be spent?

Al Frisinger: That would be the line item expenditure that I gave you last year that went through five-year expenditures through each minimum control measures.

Paul Moss: So that hasn't changed.

Al Frisinger: Not at all.

Dr. Lindsey: There is a little bit of breakdown on the expenditures in which correspond to the six categories of pollution control measures.

Paul Moss: The last question I have is...how do you measure for the clean water? Do you test the river periodically and is it on-going?

Dona Sapp: There have been discussions to get the testing done and to prove that we have done these things. We know that the best practices do benefit. We know that doing these things do work.

Paul Moss: It is just a little frustrating to spend millions of dollars to be compliant as opposed to measurable outcomes.

Dona Sapp: Some of those measurements are done.

Dr. Lindsey: I think you are asking one of the most important questions and again for efficiency reasons are, that if we put the burden on every jurisdiction to measure that outcome, we will be spending a whole lot more money on monitoring that outcome. If we can control inputs in enough places then we should see the right output. It is partly dictated because of the complexity of the system. Trying to control the cost of assessment as opposed to trying to get the cost of something.

Paul Moss: Whether it is a part of the property taxes or not it is still a substantial amount of money and if there isn't someone voluntarily paying that money then in essence, it is a tax.

Dr. Lindsey: I know I have taken a lot of your time.

Paula Hughes: I appreciate your inclusion of Council in this information. It was a big presentation. I would say to keep the on-going conversation with the commissioners and the developers. Thank you. Moving on to the agenda, we are back on item 1. Mr. Zartman, if you could join us, please. First of all, introduce yourself, for the record.

Ron Zartman: I am Ron Zartman, Superintendent of Allen County Parks.

Paula Hughes: I was going to ask how the water level is.

Ron Zartman: I didn't get a chance to look at it but I am going to get on the water tonight. Anybody who is interested to go on the trip, we should touch base later on.

Darren Vogt: I can tell you, as someone who passes by there every day, it is extremely high.

Paula Hughes: All right then.

Ron Zartman: I am here today to make a request for some additional funds for part-time gate staffing as a result of Daylight Savings Time. The park users have an extra hour of daylight beyond what the park hours were designed to handle so by extending one hour, it will give them extra time during the weekdays to come to the parks. It will definitely benefit our users and also the administration of the parks. We gate two of the parks and during the summer hours we have staff that is responsible for closing the parks. They have found it increasingly difficult to encourage people to leave the park and are finding people remaining in the park. I close Fox Island weekdays and have had to spend time getting people to leave the park. Last night it was 9:50 before I left the park. Those are some of the problems for us.

Paula Hughes: Are the parks opened by the administrative staff when you come in or how is that handled?

Ron Zartman: We open in the morning by the reception staff and on the weekends, we have gate staff.

Paula Hughes: Discussion, Council?

Paul Moss: It would be hard to argue that you could have expected this given the contentious nature of the Daylight Savings Time issue.

Mike Cunegin: Madam President, I would like a motion for extra deputy hire for item one in the amount of \$1,596.

Paul Moss: Second.

Paula Hughes: We have a motion and a second, are there any questions? All in favor signify by saying aye. All opposed same sign. The motion has passed 7-0.

Roy Buskirk: Referring back to last month's discussion, I noticed that in reading the minutes, you mentioned the fact for needing additional transportation was for moving pond dip nets, bins and display boards for educational sessions. Would it be possible to have these items at both locations instead of transporting them?

Ron Zartman: Many of those items are duplicated for just that reason. And often they are needed at two locations. We are still trying to build our equipment. The real issue of transportation is at off-sites such as schools and churches.

Roy Buskirk: Thank you.

Paula Hughes: Next, moving on to item three, the Coroner and Mobile Command. Good morning. Please introduce yourself for the record.

Dick Alfeld: Dick Alfeld, Chief Investigator for the Allen County Coroner.

Paula Hughes: Tell us a little about the request you have in front of you.

Dick Alfeld: This is a recurring fund that needs re-appropriating every year to keep maintenance up on the bus. There are several items that currently need repaired and it is sitting there waiting for approval. I would like to have the County Garage complete the repairs.

Paula Hughes: If you could remind us how the Mobile Command Unit Fund is generated.

Dick Alfeld: It was generated by donations mostly in memory of Dr. O'Shaughnessy. There are no tax dollars.

Mike Cunegin: Madam President, I have talked with the Coroner on this and as he stated this is something that comes every year. I would like to make a motion to approve the \$11,933.

Paul Moss: Second.

Paula Hughes: We have a motion and a second, are there any questions? All in favor signify by saying aye. All opposed same sign. The motion has passed 6-0-1 (Patt Kite abstained) I completely missed the Economic Development Department. I apologize. I was totally in awe of the Stormwater presentation.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT:

Ashley Steenman: Ashley Steenman of the Department of Planning Services. I met with most of you in the past week to discuss the Compliance with a Statement of Benefits forms that we have been receiving. And I also have an updated list of the companies that have filed. Today, you have, for your consideration, a blanket resolution to approve all CF-1's stating that they are in substantial compliance. The companies that are shaded in gray are the ones that I hadn't received anything from but should have submitted. I will have a full up to date list once I get with the Auditor's office to make sure who should be submitting their compliance forms. I also gave you the compliance form that shows the steps. The first step is to prepare the jobs routine and jobs created that were promised on the SB-1 to what was stated in the CF-1 and they must fill 75% of the jobs that were promised. If there are discrepancies, we move on to looking at the amount of the investment that was promised and what the amount was in the end. We also look for an explanation as to why the company was not in compliance. Some projects weren't completed and some companies haven't received their form 11. Also, there were some bankruptcies and financial problems so they weren't able to meet all of their promises. Next month, we will go over the ones who hadn't responded in any form. They will be contacted so that we will know what action to take. If you have any questions, I can answer them.

Paula Hughes: So the resolution before us today is for the companies that have supplied us with the information. Councilman Miller?

Cal Miller: There are some companies that have not met the criteria, right?

Ashley Steenman: There are some that have reasons for not complying. If there are logical reasons...

Cal Miller: So is it that the Department of Planning Services' analysis of all of these that those who have responded are in substantial compliance because of the policy set by the council. And has this policy been applied to those responders and the percentages who are not above 75% would fit into a criteria permitting approval of the CF-1 despite them falling short?

Ashley Steenman: Right.

Cal Miller: The application of the analysis, you were following the policy and all of those that fell short did so because of a justifiable reason.

Ashley Steenman: That is correct.

Cal Miller: So you are making a recommendation to us, based on your analysis of all the CF-1's that have responded, that we should continue the abatement.

Ashley Steenman: That is correct.

Roy Buskirk: There are some in which there was an abatement for three buildings and they have built one. Just recently, after being on the market for two or three years, have leased it and now will take the next step to build the second building. But they have been approved on all three buildings. They are not receiving abatements on the buildings that have not been built.

Cal Miller: Understand. But apparently, by applying the policy, that would allow them to fall into a category of being substantially compliant and could continue the abatement.

Mark Royse: Mark Royse, Deputy Director of Planning Services, there are two things. Your policy and state law which provides what the plan actually is. Part of that compliance for the applicant, if they did not meet what they submitted on their statement of benefits, it was usually due to factors beyond their control.

Cal Miller: So in either scenario, they can continue the abatement because they meet the criteria or some exception under state law.

Mark Royse: Yes

Paula Hughes: Any other questions, Council?

Cal Miller: Based on the analysis and recommendation of the Department of Planning Services, I make a motion to approve all of the CF-1's on this list that is not highlighted. Is that what the resolution is?

Ashley Steenman: There is an attachment to the resolution, exhibit A, that lists all of the companies.

Cal Miller: I withdraw the motion and go with the resolution.

Roy Buskirk: And real quick, the one thing that we should bring up, after they submit their forms, they have forty-five days to get Council approval. And they don't have to have the forms in until May 15th. Some of the forty-five days will run out before the rest of them have theirs turned in.

Paula Hughes: That is something that we will need to have addressed at the state level on the wording of the approval process. It is currently forty-five days from the date it is returned rather than forty-five days from the deadline. It causes some confusion with the early submitters.

Cal Miller: With the analysis and recommendation of the Department of Planning Services, I move to approve the resolution of 2006 real and personal compliance with statement of benefits as listed in exhibit A.

Roy Buskirk: Second

Paula Hughes: We have a motion and a second, are there any questions? All in favor signify by saying aye. All opposed same sign. The motion has passed 7-0. Thank you. Moving on, we are now at Ms. Hudson, Serious and Violent Offender ReEntry program.

Mike Cunegin: Madam President, I did have an opportunity to talk with Ms. Hudson and the dollars have been here since July of 2005. And she is here to appropriate these to the tune of \$16,432.

Sheila Hudson: I am Sheila Hudson and the Director of Allen County Community Corrections and I'm here to request that Council appropriate the last amount of money that we have received from the federal government. It is for the hiring of a mental health counselor and for forensic mental health tools. This is for purposes of evaluating those that are coming out of prison.

Paula Hughes: Council, any questions?

Darren Vogt: Was this in the '06 budget or not?

Sheila Hudson: There have been so many extensions over the last three years I really don't have the answer to that. This is not part of the Community Corrections grant. It is a separate grant.

Cal Miller: Move to approve the Serious and Violent Offender ReEntry program in the amount of \$16,432.

Patt Kite: Second.

Paula Hughes: We have a motion and a second, are there any questions? All in favor signify by saying aye. All opposed same sign. The motion has passed 7-0. We will move on to the salary ordinances for some of these positions. Is this related to the last request?

Sheila Hudson: No, this is not related. What I am asking for, over the last year, because of new statutes we have 100 more offenders under electronic monitoring and ReEntry supervision. We are dealing with much more violent and difficult offenders to supervise. What I am asking for in the salary ordinances is that there is no additional money out of the County General for this. I have also spoken with the Personnel Committee and agreed that this should be brought before Council. The first position is for a Security Officer that I would like to convert to a Home Detention/Special Deputy Officer.

Paula Hughes: You can run through all three and then we will take them as a whole.

Sheila Hudson: The second is a Community Service supervisor position that I would like to convert into a Case Manager position. And the last one is a Case Manager position into a Case Manager Section Chief position in charge of intake.

Paula Hughes: And all of these have been approved by the Personnel Committee?

Darren Vogt: Yes. This is more of a restructuring of her staff.

Roy Buskirk: And none of the funding is out of the General Fund.

Paula Hughes: Councilman Cunegin?

Mike Cunegin: The only comment I have is that if you haven't had a chance to go over to her office, please do. They are extremely busy and I commend her and her staff for thinking futuristic about what coming down starting in July.

Cal Miller: That said, move for approval of amended salary ordinance for three positions, Home Detention Officer with salary of \$34,919, Case Manager with salary of \$31,689 and Case Manager Chief with salary of \$40,889.

Mike Cunegin: Second.

Paula Hughes: We have a motion and a second, are there any questions? All in favor signify by saying aye. All opposed same sign. The motion has passed 7-0. Thank you, Ms. Hudson. Okay, if Commander Stevens could come forward.

Commander Stevens: Good morning.

Paula Hughes: If you could introduce yourself for the record please?

Commander Stevens: Commander Stevens, Allen County Jail. I am here to ask for a letter of support for the Allen County Justice and Mental Health Collaboration program. This is a grant that has been offered and Community Corrections has taken the lead to put together a large group of individuals so that we can share information and streamline the process and expedite early intervention to assist individuals inside and outside.

Sheila Hudson: This is part of a justice grant. There are two parts. One needs to be a fiscal agent which will be the justice agency of Fort Wayne. ARC will be the mental health involved. What we are trying to do is intervene with people who are mentally ill, early in the system. We are going to be looking at a community-wide effort on education. With my experience, I never truly understood how difficult it is to treat the mentally ill once they get into the confinement facilities. What I am asking for is your approval and support. There is no money involved. All we would like is your letter of approval to include in the grant application.

Paula Hughes: Council, any discussion?

Patt Kite: Do we have confinement officers who are CIT certified?

Commander Stevens: We are first in the nation to request to participate in that program and we will be the model to show that this is the appropriate place to have those individuals.

Patt Kite: Thanks. I wanted you all to hear that.

Darren Vogt: So we need a motion to grant or just for a letter of support?

Paula Hughes: A letter of support.

Darren Vogt: I make a motion to draft a letter of support for Commander Stevens and the Health Collaboration program.

Mike Cunegin: Second.

Paula Hughes: We have a motion and a second, are there any questions? All in favor signify by saying aye. All opposed same sign. The motion has passed 7-0. Please work with me through the Auditor's office to get that letter. Council, we will now go to the top part of the amended agenda, the transfer within funds for the Auditor's office.

Lisa Blosser: I am requesting a transfer within my budget from the Administrative Assistant line to the Furniture and Fixtures and Office and Computer Equipment. I have money in this line because the Administrative Assistant retired. Just last Thursday, my newest fax machine broke down so I had not anticipated this in my budget.

Mike Cunegin: Thank you for not saying copier.

Cal Miller: Move for approval of transfer within the Auditor's office funds in the amount of \$900.

Paul Moss: Second.

Paula Hughes: We have a motion and a second, are there any questions? All in favor signify by saying aye. All opposed same sign. The motion has passed 7-0. Moving back on the regular agenda we have the budget presentation.

Lisa Blosser: We have packets of information to pass out here. I sent an email with this information but we have copies. If you would, turn to page one, please. This is the 2007 Revenue Projection Summary. The General Fund Projected Revenue is determined by adding the property tax revenue to the miscellaneous revenue for a total of \$79,113,862. The 2006 Adjusted Allocations have been adjusted for a one-time capital expenses and county-wide expenses. This leaves us with a four point six million increase over current budget allocations.

On page two. We have over forty revenue sources for the General Fund. For your information, I have included a brief explanation as to how this revenue is generated.

On page four, these are the current General Fund Adjusted Budget Allocations and their percentage of the budget.

Cal Miller: Some of them are zero, I noticed.

Paula Hughes: It is just not carried out far enough in the percentage points. And we will have a revised version of this for the pre-allocation meetings at the end of the month.

Lisa Blosser: On page five, we have a summary of the 2005 Encumbrance Analysis. The 2007 Pre-Allocation Questionnaire asks for an explanation of the 2005 encumbrances. This is a summary by department of all rolled purchase orders.

Page six is another discussion item. In 2002, the County Council, along with the Commissioners, chose to reduce the Cum Bridge tax rate to zero for 2003, to allow for more property tax revenue to flow to the remaining three funds tied to the maximum levy limitations. If you did decide to reinstate the Cum Bridge tax rate, in the past, the Commissioners still had to bond for bridges. In 1996, they made the bond for five point two million and 1990 for three point seven. We have outlined procedures that you would have to go through to reinstate the Bridge Fund and if it is re-established, any property tax allocated to the Cum Bridge will reduce the amount available for the other maximum levy funds.

Page seven; we have, for the last three years, been closely watching the COIT and CEDIT Revenue Projections. The Aboite annexation to the City of Fort Wayne most significantly impacted the County Shares Income Tax Revenue. In 2008, CEDIT revenues will be decreasing by 26.6% and COIT revenues by approximately 5%.

On page eight; these are some of the 2007 General Fund Allocation Considerations. We tried to provide you with a framework to begin these budget discussions. I think the number one priority will be the reclassification project that has been on-going. We have not received any final numbers yet from Ray Temple. The number I have used for this is two point one million and anything above that you would have to phase it in. Something to compare it with is if we went with step increases and a three percent raise. That would be about one point six million. Another consideration is that the GIS can no longer be maintained outside of the General Fund. The additional funding for that would be about \$505,000. The expense could be paid from CEDIT or Cum Cap. Funding for the Tax Accounting System will be needed next year. That is a state mandate and the state has already started holding property tax replacement credits from other counties.

Paula Hughes: And for clarification, this is a very rough estimate.

Lisa Blosser: Very rough. And that is on the Tax Accounting System.

Darren Vogt: Do we know when we will have any numbers on that?

Lisa Blosser: The rule is supposed to be adopted by July 1st.

Darren Vogt: So it potentially will not hit us in the 2007 budget?

Lisa Blosser: It will.

Darren Vogt: So we are going to have to put in an arbitrary number because we won't have much knowledge or understanding of what the dollar amount is going to be.

Paula Hughes: Part of this is the extensive data conversion. Isn't almost half of this the data conversion?

Tera Klutz: Yes.

Lisa Blosser: And that would leave the amount for allocation appeals at \$20,601.

Paula Hughes: For allocation appeals or increased budgets, since we are before the allocation process.

Cal Miller: Or decreasing the property tax levy.

Lisa Blosser: Yes.

Roy Buskirk: And if we decrease the property tax levy that would have an effect on the miscellaneous revenue.

Tera Klutz: Correct.

Cal Miller: We will have to explore all of those issues and more at the end of May and early June.

Paula Hughes: Any questions for the Auditor? Thank you for the presentation and we don't say it enough but thank you for the work you put into this information for us. I feel well prepared going into our budget discussions.

Cal Miller: When will we have all of the submittals for the pre-allocation requests?

Lisa Blosser: They are due May 24th and we will work on a summary for the first day of the budget allocation hearings.

Cal Miller: They are due May 24th. Will they be available to us then?

Tera Klutz: You can have them there just will not be a summary with them.

Cal Miller: So we can stop by the office on Thursday?

Tera Klutz: Let's hope that they all have them turned in by then. They will be in a binder for you.

Paula Hughes: Anyone who wants to have funding in the budget year 2007 should have theirs turned in on time.

Roy Buskirk: And the instructions said to have a copy for each one of us?

Lisa Blosser: Yes.

Roy Buskirk: And it is just a week away.

Paula Hughes: And that coincides with the date that the Strategic Improvement Plans are due.

Tera Klutz: They are both due and both are being summarized and will be available for you on the 31st.

Paula Hughes: They are to be turned in with duplicates so there should be copies for all council members. Councilman Moss?

Paul Moss: I think it is important to note on page eight, those numbers could move dramatically, especially on the job evaluation. I applaud the Auditor's passion for employee raises but if you recall the discussion a while back, we did give raises and I think there will have to be a pretty significant discussion about again providing a blanket three percent raise. With having the market evaluation for two point one which would put the employees where they need to be relative to the market. And then to apply an additional three percent, I have some concerns.

Lisa Blosser: This is an OR...

Paul Moss: I understand that but I want to make sure everyone is clear on that going forward. There seems to be a tendency to jump in for the raises pretty quickly.

Cal Miller: I have no doubt that this will be a lively discussion.

Paul Moss: Are we confident that we are going to have those numbers from Temple?

Paula Hughes: That was my question for the Personnel Committee.

Roy Buskirk: Paul, since you're on it, can you answer that question?

Paul Moss: I can't right at this moment.

Lisa Blosser: I would hope that by the beginning of June, we would have them. We were promised that we would have them at the end of April so hoping that a month later, we would have them.

Darren Vogt: In the defense of Mr. Temple, there were a lot of complications for getting things done.

Paula Hughes: Two weeks from yesterday is when we are meeting, right?

Darren Vogt: The 31st.

Paula Hughes: Okay. Moving along in our agenda, the Assessor's office has asked that we table the discussion of the reassessment fund. The lead person from that office unfortunately had a loss in her family last night.

Lisa Blosser: They have decided that they are going to go ahead and make a presentation. They feel they need to move ahead to meet the deadlines.

Paula Hughes: Then if the representatives from the Assessor's office could come forward.

Lisa Blosser: Weren't you going to move to the other room?

Cal Miller: Oh, we are going to have a presentation today?

Tera Klutz: Are we moving them to the end of the agenda?

Paula Hughes: Why don't you call them and we will continue on with the rest of the agenda.

Darren Vogt: Are we moving them into the Omni Room?

Lisa Blosser: Right.

Linda Bloom: Why would it not be better to stay in this room?

Darren Vogt: Because of the number of assessors, it would be a challenge to have them sitting in rows.

Linda Bloom: But this room is bigger than Conference Room One.

Paula Hughes: We are talking about going to the Omni Room not Conference Room One. Jackie, could you or somebody see if another room is available? I am not opposed to moving to a room that is more conducive to a round table discussion. Is that what Tera went to do? So, let's move along. As a reminder, Council members, you should have met with all of you departments and discussed the Strategic Improvement Plan and want to make sure that it has happened. Any big picture questions or anything that we should discuss before...

Cal Miller: I have met with Therese Brown on that issue and she has some great reports but I haven't met with all of mine yet.

Paula Hughes: If we could let this serve as a reminder that the deadline for returning the form is next Wednesday.

Patt Kite: I have reminded my folks of that.

Darren Vogt: I have had a conversation with the Sheriff and he has some plans put together and one of his is the building we have been discussing. We have a blueprint drawn up and need to get some numbers associated with it.

Paula Hughes: We will move on. Councilman Vogt suggested that we discuss the resolution that the City Council or Common Council with the City of Fort Wayne sent to the Allen County Commissioners. You have received a copy of the resolution. I would like, in a brief way, because the County Council is not represented in the process. The resolution provides an avenue for our involvement. I thought I would give this body an opportunity, through limited comments and in a round table manner discuss some of the pertinent points. As I see it, the specific points are that the public question would be conducted without a rejection threshold. The county-wide approval percentage would be fifty plus one. The committee would consist of fifteen members with five appointed by the Common Council with the City of Fort Wayne, five appointed by the Allen County Commissioners, two appointed by the Mayor of the City of Fort Wayne and two appointed by the Allen County Council. Those fourteen members would then elect a fifteenth member. The committee would be ratified by a majority of seventy-five percent plus one of

the bodies who made the appointments. It is pretty straight forward. I will start by saying that I admire and applaud the City Council's effort to include County Council because there is no requirement for them to do that. This process needs to be inclusive instead of exclusive but this is a good step in the right direction. I am supportive of going through the process without a rejection threshold. And I do believe that a fifty plus one vote is appropriate for a county-wide vote approval percentage. That is my thought on the subject. Are there any other Council members who would like to speak to the topic?

Darren Vogt: I too want to say thank you for including County Council. I think the fiscal body should have some representation. The thing I think is important to note is that this is a bi-partisan effort. This is not a political issue but a community issue that needs to be discussed in an open and fair debate as to if there is a better way to do things. I support the resolution and agree that the fifty percent plus one is the way to move forward.

Cal Miller: I also support the resolution without any recommended change.

Patt Kite: I am also supportive of the resolution as it stands.

Paula Hughes: Councilman Moss?

Paul Moss: I support moving forward as quickly as possible. I would hope that with the ball in Commissioners' court that they will give it due consideration and hope that the process would move quickly. It could get bogged down if it is talked to death. Having said that, I am a little concerned with the resolution that the beginning makes some assumptions about where we should be at the end of the process. I support this but my concerns are significant about how we leapfrog to a conclusion given the intent. I think the key component is to study the current government structure. We just went through the budget presentation and if you look at it and we were asked to discuss with the departments about the possibility of consolidation, there are not a whole lot of areas of duplication. I think we need to look at this objectively and we need to be identifying any area where we can consolidate and be shown that we are going to save money. I think one of the key components of this effort is developing a committee with people representing the appropriate constituencies. We need to go into this without an identifying outcome. But beyond that, this is great and I am pleased with the City Council and what they have done.

Paula Hughes: Any further comments? Councilman Cunegin?

Mike Cunegin: I applaud City Council for putting together the resolution. I am still cautious and am waiting to see how the County Commissioners move forward on their presentation. I am a little concerned about the number fifteen but I don't want to bog it down like Evansville that had twenty-seven or twenty-nine. If you look at the diversity of our community and the Amish population, that we get this fifteen-member committee as diverse and open as possible. We have a vast group of knowledgeable people. I think it is important that everyone open the book and get an understanding of how consolidation can help. I am for any efficiencies that would save the taxpayers money. I am concerned with the fifty plus one but I can live and work with that. There is a concern here that has not been mentioned. This body, and several before, has made tax abatements. If this moves forward, how would this affect a large employer? We really don't know and is something that needs to be studied. As long as the correct information gets out to all bodies, that is important.

Paula Hughes: Councilman Miller?

Cal Miller: I would like to respond to part of Councilman Moss and what he said. When you go to a department, the tally itself isn't all that impressive. But when you look at one in particular, the Executive of the City of Fort Wayne and the three Executives of Allen County, and ask in a new structure, do you need four executives leading the county? If you step outside on the focus of a tally, that becomes a more fruitful analysis of whether if we were led by one county-wide executive, would we be going in the same direction as opposed to a potential four directions? This is about economic opportunity or economic crisis. While I agree that the tally marks don't put us over the top we could look at the two councils and the executives and we could make a great deal of progress.

Paul Moss: I think that then turns more to a philosophical question in terms of the structure. There are philosophical and economic questions. I am more interested in any potential advantages, from a tax dollar standpoint, and saving some money. I am not opposed to where you are going or to that structure. The frustration of the people can still occur with one county-wide executive. If you elect someone who doesn't do a very good job, you still have the same problems. You just have one of them instead of whatever number that may be.

Cal Miller: I think that both should be pursued at the same time. Obviously, we don't want to create a scenario that is more costly. But you can create one that is revenue neutral to promote economic growth.

Paul Moss: I agree but I have been through a lot of mergers and we have merged a lot of operations from the ground level up and it is not always easy. It is more difficult that the City pay structure is higher than the County for similar work. I question whether anyone has the political will to merge that entity and have a savings. The place for the savings is the pay. I can see where there could be a merger and all of the county employees have moved over to the City payroll. That would increase costs. I am willing to talk about these but we are going to have to have the will to make the tough decisions. I accept this as is because it needs to move forward. I have questions but am not going to bog this down.

Paula Hughes: Councilman Vogt?

Darren Vogt: I think one of the hardest things will be to measure the intangibles of economic development and the speed and reaction time. You can quickly analyze the fiscal side. The response time to businesses willing to come here is a hard thing to do. The other thing about the pay, evaluate the job to meet the pay and then meet the pay. City or County pay should not be the factor. It should be the job and duties that they do.

Mike Cunegin: The only other thing to add is that when you are looking at a savings. Don't rely too heavily on technology. Technology is wonderful but keeping up with it is hard from time to time.

Paula Hughes: Councilman Buskirk?

Roy Buskirk: I would also like to thank the City Council for inviting the County Council into their resolution. I am not sure what the magic number is. Possibly a few more might be better but the county is quite diversified. We all need to keep open minds about the different issues that come up. One thing that Councilman Crawford has brought up about smoking is that there are different ordinances for the City and for the unincorporated areas of the county. Many issues would have to be worked out and I pray that everyone comes in with an open mind and there has to be some give and take. I hope that a program will be put together that would find more support from the voters of this county for more than a fifty plus one.

Paula Hughes: Thank you Council. One of the reasons I am supportive of this resolution that we are delving deeper into the understanding of City and County government and how we are alike and how we are different. We have one more item on the addendum before we adjourn to the Omni Room for the discussion with the assessors. We have two more items. First we will go to Copy Man, Councilman Moss.

Paul Moss: That hurts. We have talked about this on quite a few occasions about copy machines and fax machines. It has always been frustrating for me to get bogged down in that type of a detail conversation about model numbers and how many copies it makes and things of that nature. As we have had those conversations, I have thought that we could have a better comprehensive approach to how we purchase or lease copiers countywide. I am not aware of too many large businesses that don't have a comprehensive approach to this. This is not to criticize the Purchasing Department because they have done very well under the current structure. But the structure needs to be created, structured and implemented by the Commissioners. That is their responsibility. I would like for us to get an objective review of our copier needs countywide and an objective analysis to us as to whether it is better to stay on the current path or looking at an entity that goes in and works with companies to lease copiers. Hopefully we could stabilize the costs on a go forward basis. There are two large companies that do this, IKON and XEROX. I have had some conversations with IKON and they are willing to come in and do some analysis. But I am not saying that we need to do business with IKON. I am just saying that they are one of them that I talked to. They have done a lot of government work and have worked with the State of Indiana. They can come in and give us an objective report as to what are our options. What I am asking for today is for you to agree to spend up to \$4,000 for the analysis. I have talked to Commissioner Peters about this and they have agreed to participate in this. I would like to figure out a way to spend \$4,000 out of one of our funds or splitting that with the Commissioners. Once they get here, we would have the report in four to five weeks after that.

Paula Hughes: I will say that I talked to Councilman Moss about that and I do think it is appropriate to pursue better information and less time in our meetings talking about this. I think it is crucial that we have a strong partnership with the Commissioners and I am supportive of splitting this expense. We have an attorney line that we have not used this year and don't anticipate using it. I ask that the Commissioners match us fifty-fifty in the expense.

Darren Vogt: I agree that I would like to have their cooperation but if we don't have it, I think we should go ahead and take it from our funds. I would find it hard to believe that they wouldn't have it in their funds but we need to get this done. But I do agree that I would rather have them share.

Patt Kite: I agree with Councilman Vogt. Is this something that we have to advertise though?

Paula Hughes: No, when we have money in a line item, it is not an additional appropriation.

Paul Moss: We would have to advertise it if we were to put something out (inaudible)

Roy Buskirk: I make a motion that we have a study completed, on the copiers in the county, as far as leasing or purchasing, in the amount of \$4,000.

Cal Miller: Second.

Paula Hughes: We have a motion and a second, are there any questions? All in favor signify by saying aye. All opposed same sign. The motion has passed 7-0. Now we will move on to Councilman Vogt.

Darren Vogt: You gave me a great segue when you said that we had not had any attorney fees. I have a letter drafted to the Commissioners about attorney fees. I am not putting Councilman Moss on the spot but as the liaison, have you heard anything? We have the budget meetings coming up and thought that this was an area that we thought we could save some money.

Paul Moss: No, I have not had a response but I will be happy to talk to them. The fault is equally mine for not initiating that discussion.

Darren Vogt: But we gave them a direct letter that stated the options and had not heard back. Commissioners, do you have any idea on a time line?

Nelson Peters: I would be happy to discuss that, briefly.

Paula Hughes: Could you introduce yourself for the record?

Nelson Peters: Nelson Peters, County Commissioner. The request has not been ignored but the request involved putting together a lot of numbers and looking at different scenarios. The letter is in the process of being drafted as we speak. I hope in the next week that you will have the letter in your possession.

Cal Miller: By an attorney?

Nelson Peters: Yes. We thought an attorney answering an attorney's letter might be appropriate.

Cal Miller: Is there any potential of re-doing so we get someone in-house to stave off some of the costs?

Nelson Peters: I think that we are not opposed to looking at different ways to do things to create efficiencies within our own office. That is about as far as I am willing to say here.

Roy Buskirk: Commissioner Bloom, do you have any additional comments?

Linda Bloom: No, I certainly don't.

Paula Hughes: Thank you Commissioner Peters. Councilman Buskirk?

Roy Buskirk: Councilman Vogt. Your email, back in the beginning of May, about the housing of juveniles, have you had any response to that?

Darren Vogt: I have had a conversation with Tony Armstrong and they are considering our request. I am to follow-up sometime in July.

Roy Buskirk: In summary, so that others know what we are talking about, the first three months, the state charges us \$60 a day for housing our juvenile delinquents at state facilities. We only thought it was appropriate that the state reimburse us \$800,000 for the housing of the juveniles.

Paula Hughes: I applaud your efforts and diligence in pursuing this. Let's do a little housekeeping before we adjourn to the other room.

Darren Vogt: I make a motion to approve the waiving of the second reading on any matter approved today for which it may be deemed necessary for the County Council meeting May 18, 2006.

Mike Cunegin: Second

Paula Hughes: We have a motion and a second, are there any questions? All in favor signify by saying aye. All opposed same sign. The motion has passed 7-0. The pre-allocation meetings will start on May 31st. They will be May 31st, June 1st and June 2nd. They will adjourn at 4:30 each day. We will now adjourn to the Omni Room. Please take no longer than five minutes.

Cal Miller: Move to adjourn.

Darren Vogt: Second.

Paula Hughes: All those in favor. Alright have a good afternoon.

ALLEN COUNTY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES 4/20/06

The next meeting will be held on June 15, 2006 at 8:30 am.

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 11:02 am.