

**ALLEN COUNTY COUNCIL
MEETING MINUTES
February 21, 2007
9:30 AM**

The Allen County Council met on Wednesday, February 21, 2007 at 9:30 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: Paul G. Moss, President; Roy A. Buskirk, Vice President; Cal S. Miller, Maye L. Johnson, Darren E. Vogt, Paula S. Hughes and Paulette Kite.

Also Attending: Lisa Blosser, Auditor; Tera Klutz, Chief Deputy Auditor; Jackie Scheuman, Finance Manager; Becky Butler, Administrative Assistant; Nelson Peters, Linda Bloom, and Bill Brown, Commissioners.

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 a.m. by President Paul Moss with the Pledge of Allegiance.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Paula Hughes made a motion to approve the minutes of January 18, 2007. Darren Vogt seconded it. Motion passed 7-0.

FINANCIAL REPORT:

Lisa Blosser, Auditor: The amount we have left for appropriation is \$11,587,894. For your consideration today, there are additional appropriations in the amount of \$78,558. These appropriations would not be approved by the Department of Local Government Finance until we receive a certified budget. There has been some good news from the Assessor's Office. Their annual adjustment and ratio study has been approved. At this point, we are still waiting to receive values from them. They are planning on having some of the Form 11's mailed out next week. Those forms will have the trending adjustment and the new assessed values. We are making progress but are still delayed.

Darren Vogt: Does the Form 11 include commercial real estate?

Lisa Blosser: Yes.

Darren Vogt: That is what I thought.

Roy Buskirk: Do you have any idea on what percentage or anything?

Lisa Blosser: No.

Paul Moss: Are there any questions or comments for Auditor Blosser?

Darren Vogt: Motion to approve the financial report?

Roy Buskirk: Second.

Paul Moss: We have a motion and a second. All in favor signify by saying aye. All opposed same sign. The motion carries 7-0. Are we going to do Economic Development or have a discussion about the Sheriff's Department?

Paula Hughes: I thought Economic Development was first and then the Commissioners.

Paul Moss: Okay. Councilwoman Hughes and Economic Development.

Paula Hughes: Miss Steenman is introducing for the Breast Diagnostic Center. If you could, please introduce yourself for the record?

Ashley Steenman: Good morning, Ashley Steenman, Allen County Department of Planning Services. Last month, you approved a statement of benefits for the Breast Diagnostic Center which is located out on the Parkview North Hospital campus. Today, we are asking you to approve an amended statement of benefits that requests an additional piece of equipment that they decided to purchase. This is identical to the one they purchased last month. The additional digital mammographer that was purchased by the BDC will be placed in the mobile coach that will travel around the area and provide services to women who may not be able to make it to the doctor's office. This is the Francine and Friends unit that you see around the area. The unit will be parked at Parkview North and for taxing purposes will be part of Perry Township taxing district. The terms have not changed but the total investment has increased from \$427,000 to about \$852,000. It will remain a seven-year abatement with a contribution of their tax savings back to the county remaining at twenty percent. No new jobs will be created. They will save over \$33,000 over the life of the abatement. I can answer any questions that you may have.

Roy Buskirk: Do you have any questions?

Paula Hughes: Seems pretty straight forward.

Patt Kite: I will move to approve the benefits for Francine's Friends.

Maye Johnson: Second.

Roy Buskirk: All those in favor say aye. Those opposed.

Cal Miller: Abstain.

Roy Buskirk: Motion carries 5-0-2 (Miller abstain, Moss absent)

Paula Hughes: We also have for consideration an ordinance authorizing and providing issuance of multifamily housing revenue bonds for Community Housing Concepts' East Central project. Mr. Harrold?

Scott Harrold: Scott Harrold from the Department of Planning Services. You first heard about this project last September. The project involves buying two different apartment complexes. The bond issue would be a maximum of \$5,000,000. Most of it is to purchase properties and they will spend about \$1,000,000 to make repairs and improvements and \$550,000 at Centennial. We worked with the City Housing Department since this is within the City. They feel it meets their housing plan for this community. They also helped review the financials more thoroughly than we would. I would just note that the County is just acting as a pass-through on these bonds. It is just a process to get them a good interest rate on the financing. This was approved by the Council in September and the City Council gave their blessing on October 24th. We had a public hearing last Thursday, February 15. It is now coming to you for final approval and then it will go to the Commissioners to sign the bond documents. We ask that you waive the second reading today so that we don't have to come back next month for a final approval. I think that has been customary over the years. If you have any questions about the project, Liz Smith is here as well as Tyler Kalachnik and Phil Genetos. With that, I would be happy to answer any questions you may have.

Paul Moss: Councilman Vogt?

Darren Vogt: When this originally came before us, it does go to how many bonds we can issue on an annual basis. Has that conversation been updated with the Commissioners?

Scott Harrold: There is still a question about whether or not the Coliseum is going to issue bonds but that doesn't affect your ability to issue bonds. What it does affect is if you can issue bank quality bonds. I think they have come to the realization that they might not be able to go that route. I will let Phil speak to that.

Phil Genetos: I am Phil Genetos with Ice Miller. We have been talking with Bill Fishering extensively about this. We had not been able to get all of the HUD approvals to make this in 2006 and here we are in 2007. The rule is that when you issue bonds, if you are willing to say that you do not expect to issue more than \$10,000,000 in governmental or 501C3 bonds in the calendar year, then you can designate up to the \$10,000,000. The question that we have been talking to Bill about is that there is the expectation of doing the re-funding of the Coliseum issue. That issue would cause you to issue more than \$10,000,000. We are not expecting you to issue these as bank-qualified bonds because you are not in the position to say that you don't expect to issue the Coliseum bonds. I guess the financial people are hoping that you will issue the Coliseum bonds in order to save money.

Darren Vogt: Okay. Thank you.

Roy Buskirk: It is also my understanding that it is not only the Coliseum bonds but also bridge bonds.

Phil Genetos: Right. The question that Bill and I have been working on is if you didn't issue the Coliseum bonds, your bridge bond and this bond would be collectively under \$10,000,000. I believe he thought that it would be the case. But he said that we were really thinking of doing the Coliseum bond and the bridge bond and that would take you over the \$10,000,000. So you couldn't designate either one. I don't think ours causes any issues in that regard.

Cal Miller: Thank you. Do you think we should hear from a Commissioner?

Paul Moss: There are a couple of them in the other room. It may not be a bad idea.

Cal Miller: Commissioner Peters?

Nelson Peters: Nelson Peters, Allen County Commissioner.

Cal Miller: Mr. Genetos from Ice Miller has outlined discussions that he had been having with Bill Fishering, regarding the issuance of bonds for 2007. We were all concerned, given the last conversation that we had when the issue of the multifamily housing came before us, there was a \$10,000,000 threshold. As far as the Commissioners are concerned, are you in favor of us approving this?

Nelson Peters: Yes we are and there have been discussion that gets us about to our limit when we look at other projects in which bonding might be required. We are comfortable doing that and we are still below our limit.

Roy Buskirk: On the Coliseum bonds, that is refinancing an existing bond.

Nelson Peters: Correct.

Cal Miller: At a savings.

Nelson Peters: Yes. The savings was projected to be between \$900,000 and \$1,000,000.

Cal Miller: So you are satisfied that there will be no adverse financial impact to the County associated with the Council's approval on this.

Nelson Peters: I am. We are comfortable that there will be no adverse affect.

Paul Moss: Councilman Vogt?

Darren Vogt: One point of clarification for me is that before we do any written type of bonding for bridges, we need to be involved in that conversation so we can decide if we want to reinstitute the Cum Bridge Fund. And that may be a better way for a long-term bonding.

Nelson Peters: Would be happy to make you part of the discussions.

Roy Buskirk: Since that was brought up, how is that done? Is that something that has to be done through state legislation?

Paula Hughes: No. It is a local decision.

Roy Buskirk: All right. Thank you.

Paul Moss: Are there any other questions on this issue? Is the Auditor's Office involved in this at all?

Lisa Blosser: No, we haven't been involved in the bonding discussions.

Cal Miller: Move for approval of the consideration of an ordinance authorizing and providing for the issuance of multifamily housing revenue bonds for Community Housing Concepts' East Central project.

Darren Vogt: Second.

Paul Moss: We have a motion and a second. All in favor signify by saying aye. All opposed same sign. The motion carries 7-0.

Paula Hughes: We probably need to include the rest of that.

Cal Miller: I need to include also the Centennial Apartments project.

Roy Buskirk: Second.

Paul Moss: All those in favor. Those opposed same sign. Motion carries 7-0. I believe that we are going to move to the discussion of the Sheriff's building. Commissioner Peter's has an appointment and needs to be out of here at a certain time. Welcome.

Nelson Peters: Nelson Peters, Allen County Commissioner. I appreciate you moving us up on the agenda. What you have before you today is a request to purchase the property at 4807 New Haven Ave. The property, we believe, will do a number of things for the project which is currently underway at 4813 New Haven Ave. that we commonly refer to as the Sheriff's building. Hopefully you received a memo from me yesterday that outlines some of these advantages. We believe the purchase would enhance the value of the building next door by allowing us to control that property. As businesses begin to grow in that area, we think that the purchase of that property will allow us to clean up that corner more than what you see if you paid a visit out there. There could, depending on future needs of the Sheriff's Department, be the necessity to have that land for things like training the dogs. It seems that what we believe we can purchase the property for, although no offer has been made at this point, that it will enhance not only the property that we have purchased but the entire area in that corner of New Haven. I did provide for you yesterday, a memo and a fact sheet that will outline a number of issues that I know have been expressed. This should also provide answers to some of the concerns that this body has had. With that, I would be happy to answer any questions.

Paul Moss: Councilman Buskirk?

Roy Buskirk: There are several things I am concerned with. One is that with the purchase of this additional property, is that going to delay any way the remodeling on the existing building that we purchased some time ago? It seems that it has been delayed considerably waiting on this corner piece. I think most of the Council thought that the remodeling progress was underway and then we find out that basically nothing has been done.

Nelson Peters: With due respect, Councilman, there is a lot that has been done at this particular point. It has in no way, shape or form been contingent on what is happening with this corner lot. When I approached this Council back in August or September of last year, we discussed the possibility of

using the new state design and build concept which came into law July 1, 2005. We felt fairly comfortable in moving ahead in that direction however we wanted to do some investigatory work to ensure that it was indeed the way to go. It took us a little bit of time to get comfortable from that perspective. After that, it was necessary to scope the project and to bring an architect on board to give the Sheriff and us a better understanding of what the building would look like and if there were any better alternatives. Also, what architects might use going ahead with the design build concept. After the scope was done, we put together a technical review committee which is required by law to assist with the process. That committee's responsibility is to provide assistance throughout the entire project as well as serving as a construction manager. They would also help to go through the requests for qualifications and the subsequent requests for proposals. After that group was established, we sent out a request for qualifications in late December but don't hold me to that. The request for qualifications has been responded by four design build teams with the idea that moving forward, one of those teams will be selected. Within the next few days, the technical review committee will go through those RFQ's to evaluate them and then turn them over to the Commissioners to make a recommendation. Then we can send a request for proposal out. It is likely that the request for proposal is likely to go to those who responded to the request for qualification. There is a thirty day period for them to respond and then at that time, an evaluation will be done by the technical review committee based on experience, timing of when the project can be completed and a number of other factors. After the project has begun and we are about thirty days into it, that all concludes at about day 100 of this process. That will be early spring and it is my understanding that we will be able to proceed with what is needed to be done to get us to where we ultimately need to be with the renovation of the inside of the building. So there have been a lot of things going on but because of this new concept, this concept will be fairer to taxpayers, more cost efficient to taxpayers and probably fairer to architects and contractors moving forward. We have delayed, up front, getting to where we might have been had we just used the normal way of doing business.

Roy Buskirk: I can see why we have had delays. The other thing that we have here is the appraised value on this corner piece. It varies from \$50,000 to \$90,000. Why is there such a broad range?

Nelson Peters: Councilman, you can probably answer that better than I can. I am not an appraiser and don't really know how these things work. I do know that one of the appraisers came in at \$50,000 and the other came in at \$90,000. My suspicion is that he probably felt that with the lot that has already been purchased, the other lot would actually become a little bit more valuable.

Roy Buskirk: Has there been any environmental inspections done on the property?

Nelson Peters: I received the environmental report back twenty-six minutes ago. I haven't looked at it but I will be more than happy to share that with you.

Roy Buskirk: Was that taken into consideration since you only received it twenty-six minutes ago?

Nelson Peters: It actually was. There was some work done by both appraisers, down in Indianapolis, to find out a little bit about the history of the property. What the history indicated was that there were some tanks in the ground and they have been in the ground long enough, since before 1967 when IDEM changed some of their regulations, that any cleanup associated with that would be nominal. That is what they told me with the initial findings.

Roy Buskirk: So if the tanks leaked over the time, it doesn't matter what date the tanks were put in, you are still going to have the cost.

Nelson Peters: That is correct but I guess at the time, they had satisfied that everything was good and there was no leakage. They were filled with sand and they were comfortable moving forward. What he told me is that it translated to today's date at very little cost. We will look at the environmental and it may tell us something different.

Paul Moss: I am a little uncomfortable with this portion of the conversation. It feels that we are having a discussion about real estate transactions that may not produce the best results for the taxpayers. I am uncomfortable talking about appraised values on a property that has not had an offer made on it. Did you have any other questions, Councilman Buskirk? I know Councilman Miller has some.

Roy Buskirk: I'll pass for now.

Nelson Peters: Can I answer that for a second?

Paul Moss: Sure.

Nelson Peters: The offer, I suspect, would be somewhere between \$50,000 and \$150,000. There is a \$100,000 window in there. There has not been an offer made at this particular time. I am here, asking today with

Commissioner Brown, to get the okay from you guys to go ahead and begin the negotiations.

Paul Moss: Councilman Miller?

Cal Miller: I would like to turn back the clock to mid-2006 when the Commissioners came before Council to ask for consideration of the actual purchase of the property. At that time, the discussion about the wisdom of a future co-location of the Sheriff's Department and the City of Fort Wayne Police was at the forefront of the discussion. I believe there were some concerns that the purchase of the property in New Haven sounded the death knell of the full embracing of the merits of co-location. I was on the record for saying that by approving of the purchase of the New Haven property, County Council would be losing its voice in the debate about the wisdom of co-location. It is not only the Sheriff's decision, not only the Commissioners' decision. It is part of the natural checks and balances that we have in county government. You are asking to spend funds and as part of the fiscal body, it is our responsibility to analyze those requests. I recall quite vividly, and correct me if I am wrong, but you were not concerned that the future merits of co-location would be lost if the county purchased this property and if the property were turned into a short-term solution. I was comforted by your words that the consideration and analysis would not be lost and you would continue to pursue that. Then Councilman Moss chimed in and made the most compelling argument that we needed to do something on the short-term for the folks in the Kidder Building and a short-term lease would mirror the expense of purchasing this building. Then at the end of the day, if co-location were an alternative, then the county would at least have an asset that the county could then turn around and sell if it made more sense for the taxpayer. So my concern is that while we are adding to the project out there and requesting to purchase additional property we are getting further away from a genuine embracing of the merits of co-location that could do one of three things. Be a better long-term solution for the taxpayers in terms of the financial burden, be a better arrangement for the two forces in terms of sharing information and doing what they do best in keeping the community safe and being a better solution for the folks in Allen County to go to one location to deal with policing issues. Are we in fact, getting further away from that or do you still have a genuine interest in exploring the co-location. How is this additional purchase going to get us further away from that goal and what has occurred with respect to the exploration of co-location?

Nelson Peters: Thanks for the question and I think it is important that you have a level of comfort with that before we move forward. When we purchased the building, there was about 15,700 square feet in it. The Sheriff at the time, and I don't presume to speak for the current Sheriff, indicated

that this wasn't enough space to do the things that needed to be done on either a short-term or a long-term basis. There were some renovations that needed to be done to get him to the point where he could operate on either a short-term or long-term basis. I don't sit here and tell you that this is the long-term approach. On the other hand, I don't know what long-term is in terms of ongoing discussions that do continue with the City of Fort Wayne regarding co-location of public safety or any other offices that might create better efficiencies for the citizens of Fort Wayne and Allen County. Those discussions do continue. We have had those discussions at the end of last year and this year without realizing a solution at this point. We will continue to discuss until we find out that something makes sense or absolutely will not work. I can assure you that the purchase of that property does not take us further away from those discussions. Having said that, if on down the road, there was a solution that included public safety for both Allen County and the City of Fort Wayne, I am not at all uncomfortable that this has been a bad purchase. We have other space needs within Allen County government to the tune of the 21,000 square feet that this building will represent. I think that moving forward, there is use for this building should we find a long-term solution that would involve the co-location of public safety.

Cal Miller: Just in follow up, what is your specific commitment to continuing to embrace the merits of co-location? We are talking generally about this but we have to make a decision. Each additional appropriation that the County Council makes, they continue to lose their voice in this debate. I think it is an important debate for the community. Could you define more specifically your commitments to pursuing this analysis to determine whether it does make more sense?

Bill Brown: Bill Brown, Allen County Commissioner. I would like to get in on this conversation a little bit. As the new Commissioner, I have made a commitment to Commissioner Peters that I would be willing to help with some of my background. I would like to give you a little perspective on this real estate. Setting aside the co-location issue, the real estate was purchased and worth every bit of the money that was paid for it. On the corner property, I believe I bring to the table a little different philosophy. I have a deep belief in the elimination of urban blight. That property on the corner is an incredibly blighted property. A lot of people go past this property. The property in this distressed state isn't worth a whole lot of money. But the property connected to the property we bought is worth a lot of money. We have an appraised value to establish that. Now to delve into that a little further, the building was bought, meaning the credit union, but the corner property was not for sale. It is now being negotiated towards a sale. When you have a buyer who is not a motivated seller, it is harder to purchase the property. There was an issue with the tanks and Nelson expounded on the

environmental study. When you have a property that is leased and this one is currently, now you have an issue of somebody else making it harder to get to the property to do the appraisal and the environmental. This has slowed down the process. Our attorney has told us that we will be able to acquire this property. It may take time. It may take up to six months. I think we need to get to a point of clarity. It is important to me to meet the needs of the taxpayer and meet the needs of the parties making this decision. Also, we need to meet the needs of a very motivated new Sheriff who has started his tenure with us with a lot of really good ideas. I think it is very important that the Sheriff's Department and the patrolmen come out of the Kidder Building and into a location where morale will be high and they will be motivated. I believe they are and they would be. We need to keep that at its highest level. Any new home that is found for them needs to be a location that the Sheriff is motivated to work out of and meets their needs. I want to go back a little to this design build concept that we are working on. Commissioner Peters has done a good job trying to embrace this new construction methodology. Because of the nature of the property that is required to do the build out, it is making the design build process trial a little bit of not the best fit. Nelson will tell you that construction is not his high point. I recognize there is a certain element in the architectural and contracting community that we want to make this a good fit for them also. What we are coming along with here is that we will be getting these RFQ's back but we still don't own the corner. Currently, that corner is an important piece. The project can be redesigned so that we don't need the corner but I would advocate that we get the corner anyway from a community standpoint and an adjacent property standpoint. So, I guess I want to make it clear that since we are in a position where we might not be able to get this property for up to six months, we need to keep that out there in our perspective. Perhaps that time frame is the time to take a look at the merits of co-location.

Cal Miller: You have tangentially circled around to the very end and in the most tangential way that one can, and this is not a criticism, but my question simply was to just lay our cards out on the table.

Bill Brown: That is what I am trying to do.

Cal Miller: So I am perfectly clear with the motivation of my question, my request for the question that I asked is what are your specific commitments? I would include the Sheriff in this as well to considering genuinely embracing the analysis of the merits of co-location. As we know, the City of Fort Wayne Police Department on Creighton Street has a lease that will be expiring and they will be looking for new digs as well. For the reasons that I have stated before, I want to know what your commitment is. Your commitment is going to drive my decision as to whether I would agree to commit to move forward

and purchase this property. If your commitment is that you are not interested in it, that's fine. But my decision and my support will be based on what I believe your commitment to be. At least undertaking a genuine analysis of the merits of co-location so I want to know what your specific commitment is to that so I can make my decision. I can't be clearer about what I am asking.

Bill Brown: That is fine.

Cal Miller: Because the very foundation of the approval of this Council to buy the New Haven property in the first instance was premised upon Commissioner Peters suggesting that we were not boxing ourselves out of an analysis of the co-location. Also that this was not a 100% long-term solution and that there was an out if this debate was ever embraced the way it should be to reverse ourselves in a way so as to make sense for the taxpayers. That is what I am interested in hearing from you.

Bill Brown: I sense your frustration with the process and all I was initially trying to do was lay out what I knew about this real estate purchase and connect it to what I think is the global perspective of how to move forward either co-location or with this New Haven site. To answer your question, it is a two-part scenario. One, we have already entered into a real estate purchase and what part of that was based upon leads to the second question which is really immaterial. What we need to do is make that piece of real estate whole and take it to its highest and best use. To buy that corner and take it to its highest and best use will only add value to that total corner. That is the first piece I would like to talk about. The second piece is, and I think this goes to the heart of your question, do we decide to spend a million dollars plus prior to doing this appropriate study that you were talking about. In my opinion, I don't think it is the best idea. If I was starting over on this process, I think we should have had that study and that look earlier. But from my conversation with the Sheriff, he does not want to co-locate downtown at this point. From his belief and his analysis, there is not a cost savings. He does not feel that it would be better for the county at large. That is all the information I have on that particular topic. You have one out of two parties that maybe are not particularly interested in co-location. Between the Commissioners and the Council people, am I speaking too long?

Cal Miller: Commissioner, what really rubs me wrong about what you said about it being immaterial about what happened before, we are talking about adding a piece of property. I am not offended by that...

Paula Hughes: I am.

Cal Miller: ...but I take great issue because the representations made to this Council permitted it to make the analysis to go forward that this was going to continue in terms of what could be viewed as a co-location analysis. It was fundamental to the decision. To characterize it as immaterial now undermines one of the fundamental keys to having the decision made in the first place and secondly, moving on beyond that, the Sheriff is one of three players in this and that is exactly why our government is set up with checks and balances. That is so that one side is not driving the debate whatsoever. We have an analysis that is done by all sides so that the taxpayers are fairly represented. If the Sheriff is reaching that conclusion on his own without your support or the County Council's support, then he is outnumbered and the checks and balances that we have set up in county government ought to prevail.

Bill Brown: As far as what happened prior and the decision that was made was immaterial in my mind as far as the real estate deal. As far as what the structure was of the purchase, the fact of the matter is that we own a piece of real estate that is setting next to a very distressed piece of real estate. Those properties combined will be worth more and the appraised values show that. I didn't mean to lessen the value of your decision making process prior to the purchase back in the summer. I thought I was clear when I was talking about the Sheriff. That is the Sheriff's opinion and I thought I made it clear that he was one of three parties that could make this decision. I wasn't saying in any way, shape or form that the Sheriff was going to override our authority or your authority.

Paul Moss: You did make that clear. Let's rein this in just a little bit.

Nelson Peters: Can I answer the question that I think Councilman Miller initially asked me?

Paul Moss: Sure, as long as he doesn't have to repeat it.

Nelson Peters: We have had discussions and we will continue to have discussions. Those discussions necessitate an analysis, going forward, of what is the best use and the way to create the greatest efficiencies for the taxpayers of Allen County. And yes, we will continue that.

Bill Brown: Can I chime in here?

Paul Moss: Hold on. Councilman Vogt has been waiting.

Darren Vogt: I want to applaud one thing out of this conversation. The issue for me is the design build side of this thing has a specific timeline and dates.

That is the exact same thing that Councilman Miller said, and I will agree with him on that, is if we can put the design build concept to a conversation around co-location of those facilities and a timeframe of what we need to do. We continue to get to discussions and they are great but if they don't have outcomes and designed game plans as to what their goals are going to do, then they are just discussions. I would like to see us take the design build concept and look at how much space is needed by both facilities, where that facility could be located, what is the use of it and all of those things need to be hashed out. Then you will come to a decision whether it makes sense or not. Then we can put a price tag to it and move forward. But to hear that there is no formal discussion, it is more of a process than a discussion. Who is to lead that discussion? If it is us, then we need to do that. One more point on the design build, the concept behind it is to save taxpayers money. It is to keep from going to overruns. We come up with this is what we need for a space based on the number of employees, number of meeting rooms and all of that. Is that correct or not correct?

Nelson Peters: Yes.

Bill Brown: I will say this. The design build process is a much longer process.

Paul Moss: And one could argue that we now have missed the indoor construction season and had we maybe decided to go with not the design build and bid it out, we would be farther along. But I don't want to get into that now either.

Bill Brown: I just want to make one point of clarity.

Paul Moss: Sure.

Bill Brown: What we have to remember is that we have this whole process going but we don't own the real estate that the thing is designed for.

Paul Moss: And I have some questions about that. Councilwoman Kite?

Patt Kite: I will be brief. I want to throw in my two cents here. I think first we need to look at the environmental report. That may tell us or not whether this is a viable idea. Maybe we are putting the cart before the horse if we haven't even looked at that yet. That could be a huge issue. I think the Commissioners have presented a very valid argument today for the purchase of this extra property. I haven't heard anything today that tells me that co-location is out the window. The Sheriff is maybe not prone to like that concept but that doesn't mean it is gone. The bottom line here is that he needs the space that it is going to take to move the operations from out north.

We already know, as from last summer, the existing building is probably not adequate for what he needs. Commissioner Peters has told us that there are other places that the county could use this building in case of co-location in the future. That is all I have to say.

Paula Hughes: I have several things. I voted to support the purchase of the New Haven property only because we did the analysis that said that a five-year lease would have an equivalent expense. In my mind, we put kind of a time frame on it. I am extremely disappointed and it is a violation of trust from the Commissioners to the Council if you are saying that those decision making factors are immaterial. I know you were not here and were not a part of that but there has to be a trust between the Council and the Commissioners and other parties in our government structure in order to move forward. It just doesn't work to say now we've got it so let's make the best of this one and never mind what we told you. That doesn't work for me. In reference to Councilwoman Kite's comments about not hearing anything in this arena, that you haven't heard anything about those conversations being dead, the deeds that have been acted tells me that the county is certainly not motivated to pursue that conversation. There are words and deeds and here we are six months later. We have requested, repeatedly, that the Council be involved in space use planning discussions. That the Council be at the table in these conversations with the City to move the space claiming and sharing of space and we have been denied that privilege of sitting at the table with the esteemed Commissioners to discuss the future of space use for county government. I am going to ask again that Council be involved in those discussions. I think it is more than appropriate. Commissioners come to us when you need a check or the approval to buy something. I would like to see a little involvement before it gets to that point. I am going to say that I don't necessarily agree that your initial argument of beautification of that corner is not a priority. That is the first time that has been brought into the conversation and I don't find it compelling.

Bill Brown: Then we have a difference of opinion. I think the elimination of blight...

Paula Hughes: There is a viable private sector business operating on that corner. My last point is that I believe that we have been pushed into making these decisions because of the condition of the Kidder Building and I am starting to feel that it is crying wolf. Here we are, another three months into a winter season, and the roof hasn't fallen in and I was lead to believe that it would. That argument, for future reference, does not hold a lot of water with me. With that, I give the floor back.

Paul Moss: I have just a couple of questions. Way back when, when we approved the purchase of this building, we approved three hundred and some thousand dollars. We talked about a number of \$1.8 million to do all the things to make it habitable. That \$1.8 did or did not include that corner? I can't recall.

Nelson Peters: It did.

Paul Moss: Okay, it did include that.

Nelson Peters: \$150,000 set aside for the purchase.

Paul Moss: I thought it did but I wanted to make sure I clarified that. The design that was shared, way back when, has that changed since that time when we approved it?

Nelson Peters: I am not sure you have seen a design.

Paul Moss: I think I saw them in your offices.

Nelson Peters: I think those were for the North American Van Lines building and the Merchant Street building. The only thing you have seen is a scope which is part of what is necessary to move the design build concept ahead. You haven't seen the design because we haven't seen the design.

Paul Moss: I saw a floor plan or site plan or whatever you want to call it. Has that changed dramatically over time?

Nelson Peters: I think what you saw then is what it is now.

Paul Moss: Okay. So my point is are we still talking about being able to complete this project within a few dollars of the \$1.8 million?

Nelson Peters: Yes.

Paul Moss: Okay. So given that fact and I go back to Councilman Miller's comments of what I had brought up previously. I do want to say that co-location is an important issue. What drives me on that is data. What I have used in the past when thinking of co-location is the conversations that have taken place. There have been substantial conversations, at high levels, of co-locating the Sheriff's Department and the City Police Department. My recollection, and feel free to correct me if I am wrong, the price tag for all of that and the many dominoes that would have to fall as a component of that was probably five to ten times higher than the \$1.8 million. I look at that and

think it is a fairly simple equation that co-locating seems fairly expensive. Add to that fact, just from a capital standpoint, my concern is that if you co-locate blue uniforms with brown uniforms, you will see creep in your budget. Your budget is made up primarily of personnel and, I think everybody would agree, the blue uniforms are paid more than the brown uniforms. I am not saying that is right or wrong, it is the case. The reality is that if you co-locate them, you will start to see a sudden shift and an increase in the terms of personnel costs to mirror the blue uniforms. If we are going to be honest about this, it is something that needs to be put out there. In my mind, I felt that this was a fairly easy sell, given that \$1.8 million. The five years was not a magic number for me. I just looked at five years to see what the lease rate would be for that and factoring that into the equation in terms of cost. If they were to move out at some point and everybody agreed that co-locating was the thing to do, then you can look at what you paid as a lease rate over those five years. There is your cost and you have a building or fixed asset that you can sell. It seemed to me, intuitively, to be somewhat of a bargain given some of the other properties that we looked at in the co-location issue at that time. I don't argue with the desire to do that and I am open to that. I tried to look at it from an analytical perspective and I still think that this is a good spot and a reasonable price. Today, we are not talking about changing that \$1.8 million. There have been some comments made that we are adding to that now and we really are not adding to it. This was part of the original plan. I would like to see you move forward. The only thing I think we can all agree on is that the Kidder Building does have some significant issues. It is bad and we have to get people out of there. I would like to see some additional involvement from Council in terms of this particular project going forward and starting to identify and quantify the next steps in a timeline a little beyond this. This is so that we don't have to have these types of discussions again in trying to recall what was said and figuring it out kind of piecemeal. Commissioner Bloom?

Linda Bloom: I am Linda Bloom, County Commissioner. Several years ago, the City and the County got involved in a very in-depth space study. This was to not only make government more efficient but to also satisfy some of our space needs. With the discussions with the City and their dilemmas on their safety space and our dilemmas on safety space, the numbers brought to us have always been so much higher than what we are paying now. With the existing Sheriff and Police Chief, I am not sure how much communication has been going on. Sheriff Fries made it pretty clear, when he was running, that he did need additional space and co-locating was not in the picture right now. When we were discussing other buildings, the cost would have been amazing as far as increased tax dollars to the county. Both sides have to work together and if they can't, it is not going to work. Right?

Cal Miller: You mean if they won't or they can't?

Linda Bloom: Well, either or.

Cal Miller: One is more troubling than the other.

Linda Bloom: Well, I am not being argumentative about this. I am just telling you that before it could come to the Commissioners we were just giving facts and figures on dollars. We haven't even gotten 9-1-1 settled yet. I am a little offended to think that we are esteemed Commissioners in respect of the space study but...

Paul Moss: We think you are esteemed in all respects.

Linda Bloom: Oh, thank you ever so much.

Bill Brown: I want to address the can't and won't thing a little bit.

Linda Bloom: I don't think I was finished.

Bill Brown: I apologize. Sorry about that.

Linda Bloom: In one building in particular downtown, we only needed sixteen to twenty percent of the total building. The total cost was considerably more. We went through so many of these. We are trying to utilize the best we can, the space that we have available. All of the buildings that we're shifting around right now belong to the County. To keep the Council abreast of decisions, it is almost funny because they were changing so often. We are in the process now of co-mingling Purchasing and Human Resources and giving everyone the space that is readily available. We always knew, in this space study, that there was not room for Safety. Co-mingling, as far as co-habiting, I thought it was a dead issue. I cannot see anything progressing.

Cal Miller: At what point? Was it before the Commissioners told us and we made it a fundamental part of our decision to buy the New Haven property?

Linda Bloom: No.

Cal Miller: If you concluded that it was a dead issue after, what did you do after the Council made the decision to purchase, based on the representation that it was still alive, that lead you to it now being a dead issue?

Linda Bloom: Commissioner Peters, Commissioner Irving and I realized we needed space and we needed it as soon as possible. This is taking longer than

all of us would like but we are going through the procedure. Under the circumstances, if we would have had to lease space, we decided that this building was in good condition. Maybe not for the Sheriff's Department as far as remodeling and shifting around space and adding on, but it was certainly a worthy building. It was worth the money we were paying. If co-habiting and co-mingling departments were to occur, we were not throwing money away. We felt this was a really good building to buy. Maybe for future storage. A lot of expensive space in this building is used for storage. A lot of materials could be moved so that we could stay here. We have always wanted a temperature controlled building for storage. We didn't feel that this was the final, final. We did not make false pretenses on that. This was a building that would be amenable for the Sheriff's Department but not forever if conversations were to the point where we could all be in the same building. We always thought this was a good building and a good price. Did we not?

Paul Moss: We need to probably tie a bow on this somehow. The question I would have to address on some of the concerns, and Councilwoman Hughes concerns are valid, in terms of buildings and space needs, is there a willingness on your part to allow someone who volunteers to participate to sit in and listen...

Paula Hughes: I would volunteer for that position.

Paul Moss: ...as you work on space issues? Is there that willingness?

Linda Bloom: Certainly. Actually, it is after the fact now.

Paul Moss: Prospectively there is always going to be issues coming up. So if there is willingness then we have accomplished something.

Nelson Peters: Councilman, let us offer this. If you want to appoint someone to serve as the point person for space issues, then absolutely we would be willing to work with them. Additionally, to address some of Councilman Miller's concerns, if you want to have someone appointed to participate in discussions with the City, we will be more than happy to accept them also.

Paul Moss: I think that is a great thing. I think Councilman Miller would appreciate some additional information and who knows whether that would change your position or not. Until you have that information, it is hard to form a solid opinion. Sheriff Fries has a couple of comments that he wanted to make.

Ken Fries: I promise I will keep it brief. Sheriff Fries, Allen County. Commissioner Brown did misspeak about me being diametrically opposed to

combining with the City. That was about a specific building, yesterday during a phone conversation. I will not waste taxpayers' money to move to a downtown building that has less parking space and will cost us substantially more. I think we are on track with this building. The Kidder Building is in horrible shape and we need to move out of it. I told Commissioner Peters that I am waiting for the key. The 21,000 square feet and how it is configured on the property, doesn't matter to me. So, I am not diametrically opposed to combining with the City. I will genuinely take interest in looking at it. We need to look at the numbers and every number we have gotten from the City has been way out of line and I will not waste taxpayers' money. Period.

Darren Vogt: With that said, I am going to recall a conversation. Since I was the liaison at the time, this corner lot was part of the conversation and our analysis. I am going to make a motion that we move forward with permission for the Commissioners to purchase the property at the corner of New Haven Avenue and Meyer Road.

Patt Kite: Second.

Paul Moss: We have a motion and a second. All in favor signify by saying aye. All opposed same sign. The motion carries 4-3 (Hughes, Miller and Johnson)

Darren Vogt: Sheriff, you might as well stay right there.

Paul Moss: We are now to item 1. Sheriff and Councilwoman Kite in regards to item 1.

Ken Fries: We are asking to appropriate \$30,000 from our Commissary Fund which has already been placed in the General Fund. This is to pay our part-time commissary employees.

Paul Moss: Are there any comments on this?

Cal Miller: Move for approval of item 1.

Roy Buskirk: Second.

Paul Moss: We have a motion and a second. All in favor signify by saying aye. All opposed same sign. The motion carries 7-0.

Ken Fries: Thank you very much.

Paul Moss: Cooperative Extension. Mr. Talbott is not here?

Darren Vogt: No he is not here. I talked to him and told him there was not a need for him to come all the way down here from the Extension Office. If you look at this, it was one where the money was paid out of the wrong account and is just a matter of fixing the budget from 2006 to 2007. That is all we are looking to do. I make a motion that we approve the \$558 for office computer equipment and repair.

Roy Buskirk: Second.

Paul Moss: All in favor signify by saying aye. All opposed same sign. The motion carries 7-0. Youth Services Center is next with Extra Deputy Hire. Again Councilman Vogt.

Darren Vogt: I will go ahead and let Mr. Dunn discuss this. I think he has had an opportunity to talk to most of you.

Chris Dunn: Chris Dunn, Youth Services Center. I have come before Council today to request \$48,000 to be used for hiring three part-time nurses. I met with Personnel Committee last July and discussed this issue to see what the best approach would be. We currently need to hire three part-time nurses who won't get benefits because they are part-time. I am trying to keep our costs as low as possible and yet cover our need to care for the kids we have at the center. This \$48,000 is just to finish out this year. We don't have a set figure for the budget for next year. I have different amounts that I am looking at depending on the experience of the nurses that we hire and the rate that we would pay. Hoping to keep the cost as low as possible.

Darren Vogt: So basically, next year in the budget, our line item will not be \$48,000 but will be about \$77,000. It will depend on how it all plays out. The thing I want to stress is that we have looked and Chris has looked at ways to try and figure out how to make this work with other nurses in the facilities and hauling the kids. It doesn't make sense with the fact that we are dispensing meds and the facility is way north on Lima Road. With Extra Deputy Hire, it does give us some flexibility if something does come up.

Paula Hughes: I had asked for a commitment from Mr. Dunn and this is the first year that he is rolling into this program, you will not ask for a transfer from Extra Deputy Hire to cover additional expenses elsewhere. And I know you will be able to keep that commitment.

Chris Dunn: We have one full-time nurse who works Monday through Friday, 7:30 to 4:00. Our plans are to cover the evening hours and weekends.

Roy Buskirk: Like Councilwoman Hughes, I will support this for now. I will get a name for you because just last week I was in Elkhart County and they do not use nurses to give out meds. It is the way in which they dispense the meds that they feel they cannot be held liable. I will get you some more information on that. I thought it was quite unique in the fact that...

Chris Dunn: What kind of facility, if I may ask?

Roy Buskirk: It is similar to yours and even in the jail. They give the medication and watch the person take the medication out of the bottle instead of taking it out themselves and giving it to the person. Their attorney feels that they are not actually dispensing the medication.

Paul Moss: You can obviously have CMA's pass meds and that nature but unfortunately you can get a dozen attorneys in a room and get a dozen different answers. This is a liability issue that he has explored very well. Councilwoman Kite?

Patt Kite: I asked Mr. Dunn also about the QMA's. Wasn't there an issue with them not being able to take orders from doctors?

Chris Dunn: They can't take orders or call in scripts. Their general knowledge wasn't to the level that we needed.

Patt Kite: That is why you need nurses. A couple of examples that really show what we need are that right now we have a six-year-old who is on six different medications. The majority of them are psychotropic. We have a seventeen-year-old with an IQ of 65 who is diabetic. He struggles to count his carbs to take care of his diabetes. We have to oversee that. To me, I need a nurse who has a better knowledge of how to handle these. I don't know much about CMA's. I know what they are but not what they are capable of doing.

Paul Moss: They wouldn't be able to take physicians' orders.

Cal Miller: I have a couple of questions. Chris, we are talking about liability issues. Are these part-time nurses considered employees of the County?

Chris Dunn: Yes.

Cal Miller: Do they carry their own liability insurance? If there was an accident and someone dispensed the wrong medication, do they have their own insurance policy?

Chris Dunn: The chart nurse has her own insurance. Nurses are encouraged to carry their own insurance. We don't cover that.

Cal Miller: I think we ought to move beyond encouraging and that any nurse you hire... I don't know if any nurse we hire, if they are going to be employees, would the County be liable?

Chris Dunn: our attorney, John Feighner, has already given Personnel a letter. He researched this to find out what the Feds required. He said at our last meeting that we would not be able to avoid being liable for something like that because of who we are.

Paul Moss: As a general rule, nurses do not carry their own liability insurance.

Cal Miller: I represent some that do and was working in a very similar facility.

Paul Moss: They certainly can but at the hospitals they generally do not because the hospitals carry that.

Cal Miller: But here is my point. In Indiana we have the Medical Malpractice Act. If a health care provider, who pays a surcharge, there is a statutory cap on damages that a patient can pursue against that person. Furthermore, the insurance that is needed is a \$250,000 policy and anything over and above that amount is paid by the Patients' Compensation Fund. So if these nurses are employees, perhaps the County ought to be considering whether they should pay a surcharge to afford themselves that cap. Is there a \$300,000 cap under the Tort Claims Act for municipalities if these nurses did something that caused a liability suit? Chris, I think you ought to go back to John Feighner and find out how this would play out. If for some reason there was something unfortunate to happen, is there a way for the County to better insulate themselves from exposure?

Chris Dunn: I will get hold of Feighner and discuss this with him and HR.

Cal Miller: If you want to have him give me a call, I would be happy to discuss it with him.

Chris Dunn: I guess the problem I have right now is that the jail has struggled with nursing staff and the juvenile center has struggled to keep a nursing staff. The Health Department has struggled with finding nurses who will work. The flexibility of the hospitals and the pay is so great. The County really struggles to compete with that. That would be my only concern and

how all of that would play out. If we required them to carry their own insurance that may cause problems for people that are willing to work with us.

Cal Miller: But I want to make sure that if they are employees, and you are talking to Feighner, would the County be afforded the cap under the Indiana Tort Claims Act? I think we should think through the problem so that we can limit that exposure as much as possible.

Paula Hughes: Move for approval of item 3 Extra Deputy Hire in the amount of \$48,000.

Roy Buskirk: Second.

Paul Moss: All in favor signify by saying aye. All opposed same sign. The motion carries 7-0. Okay, on to item 4. If you could, introduce yourself for the record, please.

Lin Wilson: Lin Wilson, Grant Administrator for the County.

Suzanne Lange: Suzanne Lange, Assistant Director of CASA.

Paul Moss: Thank you. As brief as possible, if you could give us an idea of what you are looking for.

Lin Wilson: We have received two grant awards. One from the Indiana Bar Association and they awarded us \$8,000. I wrote that one when we found out that the CAPTA grant wasn't going to cover all of the media blitz that CASA program was going to do to recruit new volunteers. These are two grants that CASA has been awarded and we are asking for appropriation today so that the media blitz campaign can be started. There are going to be three billboard campaigns throughout 2007. That is what this money will be used for.

Darren Vogt: Have the funds been received yet?

Lin Wilson: Yes.

Paul Moss: Are there any questions on these grants?

Darren Vogt: Make a motion for items 4 and 5 in the amount of \$8,000 and \$10,000.

Cal Miller: Second.

Paul Moss: We have a motion and a second. All in favor signify by saying aye. All opposed same sign. The motion carries 7-0. Thank you. Superior Court has been taken off. Is that correct?

Jerry Noble: No, items 7 through 10 have been withdrawn. I am Jerry Noble, Superior Court. We were very fortunate to once again receive a donation from the Christmas Bureau in the amount of \$1,000 for the purpose of our incentive program in the Drug Court. It needs to be appropriated to the promotional line item. We are very grateful to the Christmas Bureau and I think the Quietus form and a copy of the letter are in the packet of information that you received.

Paula Hughes: Move for approval of item 6 for promotional expenses in the amount of \$1,000.

Darren Vogt: Second.

Paul Moss: We have a motion and a second. All in favor signify by saying aye. All opposed same sign. The motion carries 7-0. Thank you. Next up is a transfer in the Board of Health.

Mindy Waldron: Good morning, Mindy Waldron, Department of Health. In 2006, our STD and HIV grant was cut from the State Department of Health mid-year. What we have done for this year is to re-prioritize how we could cover some of those services. One of them is our Quest Services who does some of the STD and HIV testing. To cover the rest of the year, we will need approximately \$1,500. To do that, we thought we could use some of our Donation Fund. So we would like to take some of that and transfer it to Contractual.

Paula Hughes: Move for approval of items 11 through 15.

Cal Miller: Second.

Paul Moss: We have a motion and a second. All in favor signify by saying aye. All opposed same sign. The motion carries 7-0. Okay, back down to grants. Is the lieutenant here?

Lin Wilson: No, he is out of town. He is in Indianapolis for training today. Lin Wilson, Grant Administrator. I am here to request approval for a grant that we are going to submit to the National Association of Drug Diversion Investigators in the amount of \$10,000. This fund is originally funded through Purdue Farmer which is the manufacturer of OxyContin and Vicodin. They started awarding grants back when there was a huge surge in

thefts of OxyContin. Prescription drugs have a very high street value and are in big demand. So NADDI is using this money to help drug task forces recoup some of the costs that they have had to use to prosecute the cases. They are very expensive to prosecute. There is a lot of tracking and a lot of research on pharmaceutical records. The one case we submitted wound up being almost \$9,800 to get this suspect ready for prosecution and then he died before he went to trial. There is all of this outlay of expense and no way to recoup it and this is the way that the Drug Task Force can try to recover some of those expenses. There is no match involved.

Darren Vogt: Move for approval for permission to apply for a grant from the National Association of Drug Diversion Investigators for \$10,000.

Patt Kite: Second.

Paul Moss: We have a motion and a second. All in favor signify by saying aye. All opposed same sign. The motion carries 7-0.

Lin Wilson: I also wanted to point out that there are brown field grants for environmental remediation regarding that corner property.

Paul Moss: Now we have a salary ordinance. Mr. Miller, how are you?

Tim Miller: Tim Miller, Circuit Court. We need to have the salary ordinance adjusted for the part-time Extra Deputy Hire. Back in July, we had a full-time person request to go part-time. After looking at redeploying some of her duties, we decided to go ahead and make it a part-time position. What we didn't realize was that if we take her salary and divide it out to an hourly rate, it was higher than what the part-time rate was. So we had to expand the part-time rate.

Cal Miller: Move for approval of the amended salary ordinance.

Maye Johnson: Second.

Paul Moss: We have a motion and a second. All in favor signify by saying aye. All opposed same sign. The motion carries 7-0. Now on to the discussion and other business section. I am sure that you recall the appointment to the PTABOA Board issue that we discussed at the previous two Council meetings. I have had some conversations with Stacey O'Day, our current Assessor, and she is the individual who recommended Mr. Meyers. I am certainly comfortable with his appointment. Does anybody else have any comments on that?

Paula Hughes: Move for the approval of Dave Meyers' appointment to the PTABOA Board.

Patt Kite: Second.

Paul Moss: We have a motion and a second. All in favor signify by saying aye. All opposed same sign. The motion carries 7-0. Congratulations to Mr. Meyers and thank him for his service. The next item on the agenda is the Tax Adjustment Board. As Council is aware, Councilman Vogt and I have been involved in some discussions in that regard. We met with the City Council about three weeks ago and wanted to make you aware of that. The conversation was interesting with a lot of feedback from them. I would certainly not describe their position as one of universal support. As you are also aware, Councilman Vogt has had some conversations with Senator David Long in regards to possibly making some adjustments to that legislation and specifically as to who serves as the Tax Adjustment Board. My assumption is that there will not be much done in this session but I would be interested in your input on that.

Darren Vogt: There won't be anything to happen this session. As sessions change, there could be. There could be conversations around taxes and property taxes and what they are trying to do. At this point, after talking to City Council, there are some concerns from representatives that I definitely agree with and would prefer to have some more conversations about attempting to change the legislation. As I said before, my only intention was to create awareness that it was an appointed board and there are some differences between people who think an appointed board is better than an elected board. Given the fact that this board would have the power to reduce taxes of other elected officials, I don't think they should be elected. At this point, I am not going to pursue any more legislation until I have some meetings with the City Council and the other members such as the school board.

Paul Moss: What is before us is, are we as a Council, willing to move forward with the Tax Adjustment Board under the current structure that is provided by the State for that? I have heard nothing but positive feedback and support for a Tax Adjustment Board from taxpayers. Then I have heard almost universal opposition to it from folks that are on taxing entities. Philosophically, that makes me lean towards the Tax Adjustment Board. That is really the issue before us. There has obviously been quite a bit of press on this. I am hoping that everybody feels comfortable enough with their level of knowledge about what this board is capable of doing and that we are able to make some sort of decision today. My goal was to not have this linger throughout the year. Having said that, I am hoping someone will make a

motion here so that we can make some sort of decision on the Tax Adjustment Board. The only question or caveat that I have to that is that I am not sure that if a motion is made, does there need to be a resolution created in advance of that motion? Or can we make the motion and suddenly start that process? I think we do need to keep in mind, as Councilman Vogt said, we would need to have the board appointments made by April 15th. We only have one appointment to that board and I have somebody in mind that I would like to suggest if we go forward with this. If anybody else has any thoughts on any individuals, we will give that due consideration. That is all I have to say about the Tax Adjustment Board but I don't know if anybody wants to make any comments or has additional questions.

Maye Johnson: I have a question. I want to be clear that the Tax Adjustment Board would only make recommendations.

Paul Moss: That is not accurate. They can actually reduce budgets.

Cal Miller: And that can be subject to an appeal to the DLGF. I would like to make a few comments. I was able to tune in and watch President Moss and Councilman Vogt get grilled by the City Council. As a bystander, in the comfort of my living room, it is easy to come up with responses that one would have made to Councilman Pape, in particular. I certainly respect Councilman Pape and this thought process. The one thing that resonated with me was when he said that the Tax Adjustment Board wouldn't be the expert on the City Council's budget or the school districts' budgets and who are they to say that they should have any input on any particular budget. The thing I would have liked to respond is that we need to look at the big picture. There is a value and wisdom in having someone overlooking all of these things. A natural checks and balance would give the taxpayers the greatest degree of comfort that any individual budgets are being analyzed. For that, I do believe the Council ought to use its authority to reestablish the Tax Adjustment Board while we continue to work with the State legislator through Councilman Vogt's efforts and whoever else will join him. With that, I make a motion that the Council reinstates the Tax Adjustment Board and have the appointments made in time for it to take affect in 2007.

Paula Hughes: Second.

Paul Moss: We have a motion and a second. Any further discussion?

Darren Vogt: I will make one comment. There were many comments that I had for Councilman Pape that in the interest of time and with respect to the other Council members, I will have a separate side meeting with them. You are right and that was the key thing for me that we don't have a watchdog

looking at the big picture of this community. When you look at each individual taxing unit as a special interest group, they are only looking out for themselves. When you hear some say that their idea is to collect as much revenue from the taxpayer as they can, that is not sound fiscal discipline. Sound fiscal discipline needs to be in place. I wholeheartedly intend to support this motion.

Paul Moss: Councilman Buskirk?

Roy Buskirk: I really feel that we need a tax board. I think it would be better if the appointees would be elected officials because they would understand. I am still learning after all these years because of all the different tax levies, the different taxing units and everything involved with it. I am a little hesitant to support it at this time in the fact that I would like to see the committee made up of different elected officials that would handle that.

Paula Hughes: I would like to suggest an amendment to Councilman Miller's motion to make the language that we would reestablish the board by rescinding the resolution that was adopted June 20, 1985 that abolished the board.

Cal Miller: I will make that my amended motion.

Paula Hughes: Second.

Paul Moss: **So there is an amended motion and second. Any further discussion?** I would like to comment that I understand this is not perfect but I would hate to see another year go by without something like this in place. I think the downside of implementing this is minimal compared to the upside. I certainly agree, in the private sector, you want a fractured market. But on the public side, it becomes very parochial and everyone is looking out for their own budgets and how can they increase their budgets. I think this is the best instrument available depending on our ability to appoint good people on there. As far as elected officials are concerned I waiver a little on that. Part of the reason that we are in this situation is that elected officials don't have the will to make some of the tough decisions that should be made on a fiscal basis. I think it is going to be very important for us to have the appointments because they are key in this. Councilman Miller?

Cal Miller: I wanted to add that if the board is re-enacted, we will be able to see it in action within the current composition and that would give an understanding of how it could be improved. We could talk about, in theory, the current composition and how it works but when we see it work we will have a better idea of what adjustments to make to improve it.

Roy Buskirk: I guess there would always be the opportunity of rescinding it again.

Paul Moss: Absolutely. With all that being said and there being no additional comments, **I ask all those in favor of reinstating the Tax Adjustment Board to signify by saying aye. Those opposed same sign. The motion carries 6-1 (Johnson).** Thank you very much for that. The next item on the agenda here, and I will try to make it as brief as possible. I handed out a bullet point summary and I have a booklet here about IKON. I know we have talked about copiers and printers, ad nauseum, over the years. It appears that there is a somewhat haphazard way for acquiring and refreshing copiers, printers and things of that nature. Just to remind you of what we did. Last summer, we agreed to spend \$4,000 to have IKON Professional Services provide or complete a survey of the County printer and copier needs. They call it a Document Output Strategy Assessment. They have completed that and Councilman Vogt and I met with them a few weeks ago to go over the details. It was about as thorough a study as you could ask for. I would like to go through this if everybody is okay with it. We would go through the key summaries but briefly talk about how they did the study. As you can see here, what they really focused on was equipment acquisition and the service contracts that we have out there. Also, the management and oversight of those contracts, along with the Print and Copy Center that the County maintains and utilizes. And the use or lack of electronic document management systems. Those were really the key components. We were primarily interested in the first three. The EDM, electronic document management is kind of an added on component. The methodology that they used was to conduct a great deal of interviews throughout the County, and there is a list of everybody that they interviewed. They reviewed financial reports and actual invoices and they have sample copies of invoices in there. They got copier, printer and multi-function device values. This was done for one month. They annualized that for this study. They completed a pretty thorough review of the existing processes and the ongoing contract service management.

They give the current County device information, the average device cost of roughly \$6,200, the device life which is about seven years. We have been purchasing almost fourteen devices a year. They use all of these numbers as a part of their equations to identify any potential savings. There is additional detail to each of these components in this booklet. Again, I am just trying to summarize here. Currently, in the industry, there are three primary methods of device acquisition. You can purchase, which the County has traditionally done. You can lease and there are two different types of leases out there. There is the fair market value lease which means you can purchase the product at the end of the lease for fair market value. There is the dollar

purchase option lease which means you can purchase the device for one dollar at the end of the lease. To cut to the chase and based on their analysis, they are recommending that the County consider the one dollar purchase option.

Darren Vogt: That is what the State does also.

Paul Moss: I believe the City of Fort Wayne is also doing that as well. The study is broken down into three different components here. The service contract management kind of lumps quite a few things together. Some interesting information here is that the average cost per impression, which is basically one copy, for the County is .0234. As a note of comparison, the State, the City and some of the larger employers here in town, are paying less than half of that.

Paula Hughes: Do you have that figure?

Paul Moss: Not right this second. The County contracts through all of their service agreements, is about ten million impressions. The actual annual value, after doing their study is about half of that, obviously. Keep in mind that we are paying for ten million impressions. We are only utilizing half of that. That leaves about 4.6 million impressions, on an annual basis, that we are paying for via our contracts that aren't really being paid attention to. If you want to do some simple math, the .0234 times 4.6 million comes up with money that we are throwing out the door.

Cal Miller: So what is that?

Paul Moss: Probably about \$100,000. And that is on an annual basis. They have example after example of invoices that clearly show what is being paid for. I think they were very objective about this and they were very conservative in these numbers. There are certainly larger opportunities than what is shown here.

Darren Vogt: Let me interject one point on that too. This is not any consideration of consolidating units at all. These are just raw numbers of data based on current usage.

Paul Moss: It is pretty straight forward in that regard. One of the things I want to mention is service contract management. One of the things that they point out is that there are essentially caps on the contracts. Generally there is a five percent cap in terms of what those costs can increase. It appears that the vast majority of those are not adhered to. The contract rates are going up dramatically. That was a really substantial number of \$312,000 over seven

years. They used a figure of eight percent instead of the five percent that it should have been.

Darren Vogt: They said the average was 9.7% and some were as high as 15.5%.

Paul Moss: That is just from simple contract management. I think what they identify in here is a fractured system of purchasing copiers and printers and maintaining them and dealing with the contracts. There is no central repository for this and nobody has accountability to keep an eye on these things. That is another substantial amount of savings there. If you look at the bullet points that I have here, the service contract management is \$292,950. That is the result of a variety of factors. One is the annual volume that is not being used. But in their estimation, using the loose term of contract management, there is a potential savings of about \$300,000 through better management practices.

The other component that they looked at is the Print and Copy Center. The potential savings that they have is \$41,000 but there are a lot of ways to look at that. I think it is important to note some of the things related to the Print and Copy Center. We have three full-time employees down there right now. They produce about 250,000 impressions on a monthly basis. The industry standard for one full-time employee is about 693,000 impressions per month. One could, intuitively, say that there might be some staffing issues down there. As an example, at Lutheran Hospital, we have one and a half employees doing 1.2 to 1.3 million impressions a month. There is a substantial issue there of productivity.

The third part of this is the electronic document management. That really is something we need to look at down the road. It is difficult to quantify potential savings. There are three departments that are utilizing scanning and EDM systems currently but they believe there are some opportunities more of that.

Darren Vogt: Let me clarify some of the numbers that you are looking at. The \$292,950 is a number that I am not sure where you got that. In one section, it is about \$166,000 per year based on the impressions if we went to the State contract of the dollar purchase lease. There are some glaring examples in here where we are doing the taxpayers a huge disservice by not managing these contracts. I am going to make the recommendation that when we come into budget time with the Commissioners, that we put a crimp in their budget if they are not willing to force their hands in these kinds of conversations. They are the ones that are going to control this and if they are not going to do it, we will have to do it for them. I would rather enter into

conversations with them and we will start that on Friday. This kind of savings can fund other projects that we need to do on an ongoing basis. It is just poor management on our part as the taxpayers' representatives.

Paul Moss: I certainly would agree with that. I do think that the only way to force this issue is to do it during budget time. I will communicate to the Commissioners on Friday, at the legislative session, that we expect to see movement on this between now and budget time. We want to see some solid movement prior to budget time or we take a look at roughly \$400,000 of their budget and whack it somewhere.

Cal Miller: Can I interject? Are the contracts patrolled or policed by department heads and other elected officials?

Darren Vogt: That is the problem. I think there was no real policing of anything. There are a few elected officials that have people within their departments who may be looking at an invoice but they don't have the contracts. The contracts are in a different spot.

Paul Moss: Policing would not be the proper term. Managing would not be the proper term. Signing off on them yes.

Paula Hughes: But every contract has to be signed by the Commissioners' Office.

Paul Moss: That is correct. They sign the contract but they don't manage it.

Paula Hughes: So the responsibility and liability lies there.

Paul Moss: That's correct.

Cal Miller: I am sure we could delve into this in much greater detail but it occurred to me that one of the things Council could do to get a handle on this is to hold the user of that machine accountable for managing the contract. They have to get the contract and at the end of the year, they are permitted an increase to go above the contractual amount of increase. If they did other things that could have been eliminated it if it had been managed correctly, it could be reduced to a dollar figure and reduced from the budget for the following year. That would incentivize people to manage the contract.

Paul Moss: I think this is a shining example of where centralization needs to occur.

Roy Buskirk: They are in the individual departments' budgets. On my own use, my maintenance contract, you look each year at what you ran the previous year. You do have an allowance and I think that is what you are referring to at the 5% that you can overrun your maintenance contract.

Darren Vogt: I think this is a little different. This is an actual increase in the contract price. The service agreement should be 5% at the maximum. There are examples in here of service agreements going up 7, 8, 10 or 12%.

Roy Buskirk: You were talking here about the number of impressions. The contract is for a certain amount of copies ran that year.

Darren Vogt: Right and we are way underutilizing our contracts.

Roy Buskirk: That is what I am saying in the fact that it is up to the individual department head to know how many and should be involved in setting the number of impressions for that maintenance contract. Then you are allowed to exceed that number, if you are off for some reason...

Paul Moss: You are talking two different things here. We are talking about the per click cost going up beyond what is contractually allowed.

Roy Buskirk: Correct. That is one item. And I am talking about the number of maintenance contracts.

Darren Vogt: I think that is the problem. It is so dysfunctional from who is watching what and who is responsible for what. The way we are set up right now is if you need a 10,000 unit machine, you go to this and this is the contract you get on it. That is the short version of what I understand. If I do 10,000 pieces a month, then it comes with that contract agreement on it and that is how I see it managed. Does that make sense?

Roy Buskirk: But maybe you don't need the 10,000...

Darren Vogt: Exactly right.

Roy Buskirk: copy a month machine.

Paula Hughes: If we could get back to the centralization which I think would be the cure to many of the symptoms of the disease of copying that we have in the County. We talked about centralizing utility bills and I don't know how effectively we did that in the last budget session. I know we have started that process. I suggest that in the budget process for this coming year that we make, as part of the submittal request, any department that is currently

funding one of these contracts, highlight that amount in their budget request. Then we can just group them together under the Commissioners. I think this is the only way we are going to get a handle on what the total expense is and rein in the responsibility for them. While we are talking about centralization, one of the topics in this morning's Data Board, was the talking about centralization of the internet usage. I think that centralization is a topic that may be a bigger part of our budget discussions this year.

Paul Moss: I agree with the exception of having the part under the Commissioners' budget. Why can't it be under ours?

Paula Hughes: That would be fine too except that they have to sign the contracts.

Darren Vogt: If we go to a contract that is a lease, it would be one contract with one vendor or however we do it. It would be different and a lot easier to manage.

Cal Miller: What is the plan moving forward from these very interesting findings and to demonstrate that we do have a reason to be concerned and a reason to take action?

Paul Moss: As I mentioned, we are going to go before the Commissioners on Friday and present this information to them. They have a copy of this and have had ample opportunity to review it. Hopefully we can gain a commitment from them to accept this and then decide to put out an RFP to any and all comers who may have an interest in managing the County's copier and printer needs. Or they could simply say that they want to start discussions with IKON. IKON has the State contract. The City, Fort Wayne Community Schools and we utilize them. I don't care who does this but they happen to be pretty big in terms of government. There is a set rate out there now that the State has in place. You can put this out to bid but you don't have to. What I don't want to see as a third option from them is to say that maybe we can tweak things internally and let's have department heads talk about how they can improve the process. If that is the case, my message is going to be that even though the money is in the departments' budgets, I am going to support taking \$400,000 out of the Commissioners' budget. This is the sort of thing that should drive people crazy. I do want to say that one of my frustrations, and this was at the Personnel Committee, is that the salary survey and the need to make sure that we are paying closer to market. There seems to be a tendency on the part of the Commissioners to say that we just need to pay everybody better. My response to that was that it is a very frustrating and somewhat offensive statement because this Council has a little bit of a different focus. We tend to look at the fiscal side of things and

are not quite so willing to throw money at things. I believe we need to be looking internally for efficiencies just like this. Then we can do those sorts of things in terms of the salary. But I don't feel that the mindset is necessarily shared amongst the Commissioners.

Paula Hughes: \$300,000 funds a one percent increase for the employees. Not that I am saying that this is what we should do. But it is significant.

Roy Buskirk: So the possible savings on the copy machines could give all County employees 1%.

Paula Hughes: Yes. It could go a long way in addressing the issues that come up in the wage and salary discussion.

Paul Moss: There have been other recent examples of inefficiencies within County government and some people have taken real steps to head in the right direction.

Paula Hughes: I would like to commend President Moss and Councilman Vogt on pursuing this. I did not realize and I am glad that you pursued it. I know we spend a lot of time with it.

Darren Vogt: It is not pretty but it does end in results. That is the thing we need to keep in mind. The things that we look at may seem to be trivial but end up finding dollars associated with them and it can go a long way for the greater good. We just need to continue as a Council to focus on these.

Maye Johnson: This was an impressive piece of work.

Paul Moss: I would mention too, I know a lot of people focus on City and County consolidation but the City is currently using IKON. If we were to move in this type of direction, the GIS situation is similar, this would be an opportunity to move in that direction.

Paula Hughes: On that topic, I have the pleasure of being asked to attend a meeting at the Fort Wayne Area Association of Realtors next week to discuss the County's position on distribution of iMAP information. I don't know how many of you are aware but our area association of realtors went forward with developing their own GIS system. So now there is another system floating out there because of the policies that we have put in place regarding the use of iMAP. I think the policies that we have in place regarding how we disseminate our GIS information are going to have to change probably this year. We keep running into situations that are awkward for County government. And it is the opposite of productive. Another example of that is

the Assessor's Office made the move to put all of the property record cards on their own website. They are sending out Form 11's and they wanted to be able to tell people that they can get their property record card at this site. All of that is currently on the iMAP system but it is at a subscriber level so you have to pay to get at it. They wanted people to access the 150,000 records through the internet so that they wouldn't be flooded with calls. They went through the expense of loading it onto their site. We keep running into these examples of why our policies don't work.

Darren Vogt: I will add this. As a user of that and someone who pays for the service, there are other counties that I use that service for and I pay absolutely nothing and get the same information.

Paula Hughes: It was this Council that forced the subscriber status. It wasn't this body but a prior Council that forced that issue. It is within our hands to rectify it.

Darren Vogt: What does it take to do that? I would be willing to make that motion. I see the value because, as the prior liaison to the Assessor's Office, they had to take that step. What do we need to do?

Paula Hughes: The iMAP Board is meeting on Monday and I will bring it up for discussion at that time. Before we make a motion, I want to be cautious and get a recommendation from the iMAP Board. There are a few things that we want made accessible but not be able to manipulate. There are some checks and balances in there and I want to make sure we are doing it right. I would like to table it for a month. The iMAP Board meets at 1:30 on the 26th.

Cal Miller: Are we still on the other business?

Paul Moss: Yes we are.

Cal Miller: I would like to harken back a half hour to Councilman Moss' statement about people having the will to make tough decisions. To open up the Auditor's recommendations for reducing the General Fund tax levy this year based on an assessment of the rollover we had to this year from last year. The Council has already committed to reducing the maximum levy that could be collected by \$100,000 at a prior vote. The Auditor, at the request of Council, analyzed the current financial status of the County and some of the future needs. They recommended that if the Council were inclined to reduce the General Fund tax levy in an amount greater than the \$100,000 that was committed to, the Auditor's office has a comfort level that it could be reduced by another million dollars with some caveats. Go ahead and talk about that.

Lisa Blosser: Sure with one note of caution. There is proposed legislation that if we do lower our levy now, we could forever lose it. That had been in statute in the past and was rescinded and it is out there again. It is a gamble if we lower the levy before the legislative session is over this year.

Cal Miller: In looking at the first paragraph of your recommendations, to avoid the use it or lose it, the million dollars could be cut from what we had allocated for the Boys and Girls institutional expenses because the Psych Fund provided over a million dollars to pay that debt last year. To avoid the use it or lose it scenario, could the Psych Fund be reduced and not jeopardize the County's ability to extend if it needs to in the future? Then the County could bump up its tax levy and still be under the max levy.

Lisa Blosser: We use the recommendations from Family and Children Services. There is a formula that we use after the fact to determine what is left then to pay them.

Cal Miller: If people are following me here, we don't run into the risk of use it or lose it but at the same time, the overall tax burden to Allen County decreases by \$1,100,000. If you recall our earlier discussion and final vote, we are passing a budget that does not max out the levy. We can make a more significant in-road to that based on the recommendation of the Auditor of \$1,100,000. This is certainly not an insignificant amount in a \$70,000,000 budget.

Darren Vogt: Do you know what that House or Senate bill is?

Lisa Blosser: It is part of the budget bill.

Darren Vogt: Thank you.

Roy Buskirk: They are talking about taking the Children's Psych Fund and turning it over to the State and the State would pay that.

Tera Klutz: That is also the same bill, I believe, the Family and Children's levies after 2005. But it is all pending.

Roy Buskirk: Right, exactly.

Cal Miller: If the Psych Fund went to the State and the County Council reduced that Psych Fund down to zero, we would still have all of the funds necessary to pay the Boys and Girls because we haven't taken it out of our own General Fund. Wouldn't that be the safest route to go?

Tera Klutz: I think we can definitely reduce that levy but it is going to take conversations with them. Their budget also gets approved through the Family and Children's Services. Another point is that I believe they could operate. I am not even sure they are raising a million dollars. They have been slowly reducing their levy every year because they haven't had the expenses that they thought they would. That is why they have left over money for us to use.

Darren Vogt: They bring on programs that don't work and they stop them.

Roy Buskirk: But they have been the ones that pretty much set that tax levy.

Tera Klutz: You technically do set it and you have been backed up by the State.

Roy Buskirk: We do set it but it is on their recommendation.

Cal Miller: How about approaching it this way. To provide the taxpayers with the most benefit, in the reduction of the levy and to insulate County Council, if we were interested in embracing the recommendation of the Auditor, pass a tax levy that is \$1.1 million dollars less than the maximum amount. That we do a hybrid scenario and agree that the taxpayer will be set, we are going to collect \$1.1 million dollars less, a combination of a reduction of the Psych Fund or the money that was allocated for the institutional expenses.

Tera Klutz: Would you like for us to look at that further? We still have time.

Paul Moss: What is the timeline for that? When do we have to make a decision on this?

Tera Klutz: Since we don't have assessed values yet, we still have at least a month.

Cal Miller: Would you mind taking that up so that we can make the most informed decision that takes into account the use it or lose it legislation?

Lisa Blosser: Absolutely.

Paul Moss: Councilman Buskirk?

Roy Buskirk: I think we need to be very careful on reducing that because of the fact and one of the items listed on here is the Cum Bridge Repair which I would rather see that put on the tax levy. I know the Commissioners are going to come before us for ask for approximately an \$8 million bond. I don't

like to borrow money and pay the interest. That would put an additional cost on the taxpayer of having to pay interest. I know there is a need for bridge repair but to me it is wrong to constantly have to do a bond issue on it.

Darren Vogt: Can you do some analysis on that as well as adding that fund back in?

Lisa Blosser: We had looked into it. There would have been \$4.5 million in the Cum Bridge fund if it hadn't been rescinded.

Paula Hughes: But maybe the annual impact?

Darren Vogt: That's what I was looking for. The annual impact of what that does if we reinstate that. We check the dollar amount to it, right? So we can set it at whatever amount of money we want.

Tera Klutz: It is kind of complicated. Yes but no because it is rate fund but it is tied to your max levy.

Roy Buskirk: Yes it is but the other thing is that it's not going to generate all of the funds necessary for bridge repair. You are still going to have to do some bonding. But it wouldn't be near as much as what we have done in the past.

Paula Hughes: We are playing catch up for a little while.

Roy Buskirk: Exactly.

Paula Hughes: That is not as sexy as decreasing the levy.

Darren Vogt: Good fiscal sound decision making.

Paul Moss: This is a big issue for us. Would anybody have an objection to some sort of subcommittee meeting or something like that? Then we wouldn't have to have this bantering back and forth at the next Council meeting. Let's formulate a plan that people could live with on some of these issues. Everybody is invited. Those that can show up will. We can do that, right?

Darren Vogt: Yes as long as we publicize it.

Paul Moss: That would be my suggestion just to move this along.

Paula Hughes: I would be willing to chair that subcommittee and will set up the meeting.

Paul Moss: That would be much appreciated. The next item on the agenda is recent and/or upcoming meetings. As I mentioned previously, there was a Personnel Committee meeting in which Ray Temple was in attendance. He talked about the salary study that is being done and I think that right now, the ball is in the Human Resources court.

Paula Hughes: There are two meetings tied to that. I am meeting with Brian Dumford, the Human Resources Director, at 1:30 on Tuesday, the 27th to talk about his preliminary recommendation. We have a meeting of the County Human Resources Committee at 2:00 on March 7th. Mr. Dumford has committed that he will disseminate his findings out to everyone by March 1st. We should be getting a lot more information on that.

Paul Moss: That March 7th meeting, I will be down at the Statehouse all day.

Paula Hughes: Okay.

Paul Moss: There are no other recent or upcoming meetings that I can think of. Does anyone from Council have anything to bring up?

Roy Buskirk: Two things. One of them is that I would like to see about rescheduling the June 21st Council meeting to June 14th. I have an opportunity to go on a mission trip.

Paul Moss: You say move it to the 14th?

Roy Buskirk: Right. We have budget hearings the first week.

Paul Moss: It is fine with me but I don't know about anybody else.

Cal Miller: I wanted to add that I know Councilwoman Hughes talked to you, President Moss, about having a presentation on the Harrison Square project.

Paul Moss: Yes.

Cal Miller: I am certainly in favor of hearing about that. I think it would be important for the Council members to be involved in that important debate in the county.

Paula Hughes: I will clear that date with Mark Becker from the Mayor's office.

Paul Moss: That would be at our next meeting?

Paula Hughes: Yes, March 15th. I told him to come at 10:00 a.m. because I thought that would be a good point given the run of the Council meetings.

Maye Johnson: The Deputy Mayor is giving a presentation?

Paula Hughes: Yes.

Paul Moss: Councilman Vogt?

Darren Vogt: I have a meeting with the State in my unenviable quest to deal with them and the juvenile debt. I had a meeting set and it was one of the days that we had the snow and so I am meeting with them again on March 1st. I spoke with Tom Hardin, the attorney that we contracted with, to dive into some of those issues and he said he should have some preliminary information for me before that meeting. I am trying to get them to understand our position and their position and we found some ways to clarify those numbers. I will probably spend the entire day at the State so if anybody wants to go along, let me know. That leads me to our legislative person. Has anybody else had any updates?

Paula Hughes: Nothing.

Darren Vogt: Okay.

Paul Moss: I will bring that up with the Commissioners. We haven't been updated and we are in the middle of the session.

Darren Vogt: We are getting updates from the Auditor about legislation but we haven't heard anything on the 2% cap or anything like that. There are a lot of things out there that are affecting us but we haven't seen any kind of update.

Paula Hughes: The Commissioners office just made us aware that this room is not available on June 14th.

Paul Moss: So, Becky, will you work on alternative dates to accommodate Councilman Buskirk?

Becky Butler: Yes.

Roy Buskirk: There is one other thing before you go on. The legislative liaison did have a death in her family. The other thing is that the Chamber of Commerce has legislation this Saturday starting at 10:30.

Paul Moss: That is the Third House and I would encourage everybody to attend. The intent of this agenda item, the upcoming and recent meetings, is so we can share what we all have been doing. I want to make everybody aware of what I am doing and would like to hear what you are doing also. Are there any comments from the public?

Paula Hughes: I didn't realize we were talking about all of the meetings that Council members have been going to. I have been participating in a committee composed of Commissioner Bloom, myself, Deputy Mayor Mark Becker, Walt Branson from IPFW, Randy Brown and Al Moll from City Parks Department. We are going forward in a formal review of potential other uses of Memorial Stadium. IPFW has a serious interest. They see a need for it in their future plans. They have partnered with us in the expense to hire consultants to facilitate community discussions about what those uses would be. The timeline for that is fairly quick. We should have results back within a month to six weeks.

Darren Vogt: Would it make sense to have the Harrison Square proposal at the same time that we have that information? It is a County facility that is really impacted by that. If we are going to be asked to make decisions to support or not support something, I don't want to make it without all of the information.

Paula Hughes: I don't think that the information that is being pulled together will impact that significantly. I think we should go ahead and have it. There is enough going on with Harrison Square that we should have an update in March and another one in April.

Paul Moss: At the March meeting, we are not being asked to support Harrison Square.

Cal Miller: I would just like to hear about it and I think it is important for County Council have a voice in it. At some point, whatever your comfort level is with this should be made known to the public.

Paul Moss: I would agree with that but my concern is that there is so much information that is yet to be known.

Darren Vogt: I make a motion to waive any second reading for today's County Council meeting of February 21, 2007 where it deemed necessary.

Patt Kite: Second.

Paul Moss: We have a motion and a second. All in favor signify by saying aye. All opposed same sign. The motion carries 7-0.

Roy Buskirk: I have passed out some information on the expenses of the justice system and our revenue. Deputy Auditor Klutz has been working with me and thought there was a lot of information. The first sheet shows the last fifteen years that the cost has gone up 213%. The second sheet shows the expenses that we have had and the percentage of what it is towards our budget. It shows the miscellaneous revenue and I need to apologize to our courts because I have been saying that their expenses exceed our property taxes but in the last couple of years, it has not. There are a lot of good numbers there to study. The last sheet shows how the juveniles are not being sent to the State but being held here in the County. Our expenses have gone up tremendously since we are keeping them here. It has gone up almost \$8 million this coming year.

Paula Hughes: That budget has increased over 300% since 1999.

Roy Buskirk: And that is basically for housing them here.

Paula Hughes: But at the same time, for the 2007 budget, we have a \$4.4 million budget for the State school and \$2 million of that is repaying the debt?

Tera Klutz: It is like \$3.8 million. It is \$1.9 million each year. You encumbered it so that is the budget now.

Darren Vogt: Keep in mind the public defender reimbursements are positives and not negatives? Oh those are revenues, I am sorry.

Paula Hughes: On the bright side, Superior Court's budget has decreased by \$1.2 million because they have partnered with the Council and are relying on their own funds.

Tera Klutz: And a lot of their expenses moved up to Wood Youth.

Cal Miller: Motion to adjourn.

Darren Vogt: Second.

Paul Moss: We have a motion and a second. All in favor signify by saying aye. All opposed same sign. The motion carries 7-0. The next meeting will be held on March 15, 2007 at 8:30 am. There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 12:10 pm.