

**ALLEN COUNTY COUNCIL
MEETING MINUTES
OCTOBER 18, 2007
8:30 AM**

The Allen County Council met on Thursday, October 18, 2007 at 8:30 am in the County Council/Commissioners Courtroom. The purpose of the meeting was for additional appropriations, transfer of funds in excess of the current budget, 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 and Paulette Kite.

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

The meeting was called to order at 8:30 a.m. by President Paul Moss with the Pledge of Allegiance.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Cal Miller made a motion to approve the minutes of August 16, 2007 and September 20, 2007. Roy Buskirk seconded. Motion carried. (Hughes absent)

FINANCIAL REPORT:

Lisa Blosser, Auditor: The amount left for appropriation today in the County General Fund is \$460,406. For your consideration today, there are additional requests in the amount of \$189,934. In the County Council capital line budget, you have a balance of \$446,249. Miscellaneous revenue collection is at 89.31% for the year.

Darren Vogt: One question that I have is in the capital line expense. The Building Department cars are at \$68,200. Is that inclusive or exclusive of the request today for \$71,216?

Lisa Blosser: Exclusive, the cars were not added to this. These are requests that have already been approved.

Darren Vogt: Okay. So that would be an additional?

Roy Buskirk: Additional to the Building Department?

Cal Miller: Isn't the \$68,200 what we were holding to pay for the cars that he is going to be asking for today?

Jackie Scheuman: No, I believe you already looked at it.

Tera Klutz: Is this for 2008?

Cal Miller: No, they are for now. We asked him to come back in 2007 and we can ask him when he comes up.

Darren Vogt: We will just clarify that later.

Paul Moss: Are there any other questions in regards to the Auditor's report?

Cal Miller: Move for approval of the financial report.

Darren Vogt: Second.

Paul Moss: We have a motion and a second, all in favor please signify by saying aye. All opposed same sign. The motion carries 6-0-1 (Hughes). We are going to have a couple of adjustments to the agenda here. We are going to move Mr. Dumford and the discussion for the request for a salary ordinance to the front end here due to some issues that Mr. Dumford needs to deal with.

Brian Dumford: Thank you very much. I am Brian Dumford, Director of Human Resources. I am here before you today more as a department head than as the Human Resources Director. I am putting on my department head hat for this request. I am requesting an adjustment to a salary ordinance for the position currently titled Personnel Manager being re-titled HR Manager/Employee Relations Specialist. This is a position that is very vital to my office and in the job evaluation project, I am adding duties to that including supervising the two administrative assistants. This is slated to have a classification adjustment up to PAT 6. The reason I am here today is to correct an inequity that was caused earlier this summer when the County Council approved the Sheriff's personnel position to a PAT 5. That elevated that position over this position. This position counsels the Sheriff's Department position and has duties far sweeping across the entire county. That is why I am here today requesting that the salary ordinance be adjusted.

Paul Moss: Would those then be equivalent positions?

Brian Dumford: No, this position of HR Manager/Employee Relations Specialist would be one step higher than the Sheriff's Department position.

Paul Moss: This position was included in the internal inequity analysis project and would be addressed as a part of that which we approved and would not occur until January.

Brian Dumford: Correct.

Paul Moss: What you want to do is move that forward a few months and make it effective immediately.

Brian Dumford: Yes. Based on the current situation, we are below people that we are counseling.

Paul Moss: I understand the desire to advocate but I also am concerned about being in a different department and had people on that list, I question the fairness of picking one individual and having this apply to them.

Brian Dumford: I do understand your concern and that is what prompted my comments about putting on the department head hat. Commissioner Peters was going to ride second chair on this however he is in Indianapolis. I believe you received an email from him and hopefully had time to review it. He is supporting this and asking for approval as well.

Cal Miller: If you had your HR Director hat on and understand the comments made by President Moss about the message that this sends to the other people, while we are waiting on the internal inequity piece to be implemented January 1, 2008, what would you be telling the Council?

Brian Dumford: If I had my HR Director hat on, I would be telling Council that you would still want to look at this due to the approval of the Sheriff's Department position outside of the study.

Cal Miller: How do you reconcile that with the hundreds of other people that are going to be impacted the same way when we address the internal equity piece?

Brian Dumford: I would reconcile that to say that we shouldn't have approved the Sheriff's Department position.

Cal Miller: So we correct one wrong and then two wrongs make a right?

Paul Moss: Was it disclosed at the time, and I am having trouble remembering, of the committee meeting where the Sheriff's issue was addressed, was it disclosed or discussed at that time that we would be creating this issue?

Brian Dumford: At the time, it was not solved because the position was under appeal. The HR position was under appeal.

Paul Moss: So help me recall, why we went ahead with the Sheriff's adjustment and not this one at that time.

Brian Dumford: Because the Sheriff came to you and appealed the classification that we were doing in that study. He brought it to the Personnel Committee and pushed to have it done immediately due to increased duties that he was giving that person.

Cal Miller: I want to go back to the fundamental question of, if we have these other people waiting in the wings until January 1, why would addressing this to correct one inequity as opposed to several dozens of others be the appropriate thing to do?

Brian Dumford: You put me in a very awkward position and I appreciate that. It does create a conflict as a department head fighting for an employee as I would hope any other department head would do.

Paul Moss: Honestly, it probably should not have been on the agenda. That is my opinion and I take responsibility for that.

Brian Dumford: I am sorry but I need to get this call.

Paul Moss: Go right ahead. We will go ahead and finish this conversation.

Darren Vogt: As we move forward on this, I think that we will have everybody in here, in the November meeting, asking for the same thing. I think we have to just stick with what we have done. We have gotten this far and why throw another monkey wrench into it. I am not sure when the duties were added to the HR person, whether it was before or after the process was going on but I would just as soon let it implement on January 1 as it was planned.

Roy Buskirk: I am not sure I understand that. If we do nothing, this will automatically occur on January 1?

Darren Vogt: Right.

Roy Buskirk: I don't recall it being moved to a PAT 6.

Paul Moss: That is part of it and I am taking his comments at face value that as a part of the internal inequity study, that was a result of that. It would occur along with all of the others in January.

Roy Buskirk: Since he is back, if we do nothing today, January 1st, this will take place.

Cal Miller: Can we call for the question?

Darren Vogt: We don't have a motion.

Cal Miller: Okay, then can we say it dies for lack of a motion?

Darren Vogt: Is anyone willing to make a motion?

Paul Moss: I think you have your answer.

Brian Dumford: Thank you for moving me up. Everything is fine with my wife.

Paul Moss: We are going to move on to Economic Development and the only other adjustment is the request by the Commissioners to have the appointment to the Allen County Bridge Task Force moved up.

Ashley Steenman: Good morning, Ashley Steenman, Allen County Department of Planning. This morning, we have Press-Seal Gasket which is in the City limits but I will get to that in a second. They are seeking abatement for their \$480,000 investment in new manufacturing equipment and information technology equipment. The company has been doing business since 1954 manufacturing rubber products that are designed to seal underground water systems. Press-Seal currently employs 97 people and they intend to hire an additional five. With this expansion, these five salaries will range from \$45,000 to \$70,000 which is substantial because we always want to see an increase in the average wage in Allen County. Considering all of the information that was included in their application, they are eligible for a five-year abatement for personal property. Back to them being in the City, the City and County, in 2004, entered into an interlocal agreement to transfer jurisdiction to the County so that Press-Seal could relocate some equipment that they had received an abatement on when they were in the County in 2002. There is some wording in a State law that says they can't move it from one place to another as long as there is an abatement. This was to take care of that. The agreement is supposed to last five years, until 2009. Because they are not located in the unincorporated part of Allen County, we have to go through the two-step process of naming it a county privatization area. If you remember before 2004, that is how the process went. Now all of unincorporated Allen County is now an economic revitalization area. Pending your approval today, we will be back at the meeting next month to get the resolution approved and the Statement of Benefits that they submitted. I can answer any questions.

Paul Moss: Councilman Vogt?

Darren Vogt: How many abatements have we given them? I know they have been before us before. They have been continually expanding and business is growing for them.

Ashley Steenman: Right. They moved into an old Dana building in 2004 and before that, they received an abatement from the County in 2002 for some equipment. In 2004, it was for real and personal property. There are at least two on the record right now.

Paul Moss: With those abatements, do you know what their property tax payable was in 2006?

Ashley Steenman: I don't have that information in front of me. I looked at their compliance forms and they have been in compliance with the amount that they invested and the number of employees and salaries that they committed to.

Darren Vogt: So, they have been substantially in compliance.

Ashley Steenman: Correct.

Roy Buskirk: I think this just shows a company, with assistance, continues to grow and be a good company in the community. I make a motion that we approve the request.

Patt Kite: Second.

Paul Moss: We have a motion and a second. The only other question I would have is do you have any idea, in terms of how their assessment changed in their overall taxes due?

Ashley Steenman: I don't know and I don't have that information in front of me.

Paul Moss: I would find that, in the future, to be useful information as part of the packet, if at all possible.

Ashley Steenman: Okay.

Roy Buskirk: The abatement is for additional assets and doesn't reduce any current assessed valuation.

Paul Moss: I understand that. I just think it would be nice to see especially for those entities that we have had prior abatements for.

Ashley Steenman: I will provide that in the next packet.

Paul Moss: We have a motion and a second, any further discussion? All in favor please signify by saying aye. All opposed same sign. The motion carries 6-0-1 (Hughes). Thank you. We are going to talk about the appointment to the Allen County Bridge Fund Task Force. Then we will get back into the appropriations.

Chris Cloud: I am Chris Cloud, Allen County Commissioners' Office. Commissioner Peters is looking to form a task force with a group from City Council, City of New Haven, unincorporated Allen County and the County Council to look at bridge funding in Allen County. In particular, look at the CUM Bridge fund and see if what we are doing is the best way or if there are other possibilities. I don't think

he has any particular agenda in place for this group but wanted to get the stakeholders together and see what their thoughts were. He has requested that you make an appointment to that board.

Paul Moss: Do we draw short straws or what?

Cal Miller: I was thinking Paula Hughes.

Paul Moss: Will you put that in the form of a motion?

Cal Miller: This is a subject that is of interest to Paula. Move to appoint Councilwoman Paula Hughes.

Maye Johnson: Second.

Paul Moss: We have a motion and a second. All in favor please signify by saying aye. All opposed same sign. The motion carries 6-0-1 (Hughes). That was quick and an excellent suggestion Councilman Miller. Moving right into the appropriations, item one.

Therese Brown: Good morning, President Moss and County Council. How is everyone this morning? I am Therese Brown, Clerk of the Allen County Circuit and Superior Courts. I have on the agenda for you today, what I believe I had mentioned in a previous meeting. That was that I would be coming back for an additional appropriation for postage expense. I think I made you aware at that time that circumstances beyond the control of this office, certified mail is now a required process. I want to make sure that you are aware that we continue to receive revenue coming into the General Fund and, to date we have added \$1.2 million back. In the current year, we have brought approximately \$500,000 to \$700,000.

Paul Moss: Councilman Vogt?

Darren Vogt: Originally, for the 2007 budget, you had assumed that postage would be lower based on some savings and some other stuff. Talk a little bit about that because now we are increasing and I want people to understand. Originally this was going to be lower and you had moved some money out of this line item and now, because of what has changed you need an increase.

Therese Brown: Not a problem. In 2006, we started a process called signature mail. It is a process like if FedEx or UPS comes to you, they electronically sign for the document they are receiving via the US mail. That allows us \$1.53 savings in the overall cost of a one ounce piece of mail. Based on prior postal rates, we were able to reduce the appropriation we had requested for 2007 to \$220,000. Unfortunately with the increase in the different things going on and the dynamic of the reality and all the increased requirements, it has increased that expense. Next year, I have about \$430,000 that we have increased our postage line and supply line. There are mail

pieces that you have to use to meet those requirements. Some of you have probably seen the one with the little Styrofoam block in it. We have to purchase those types of envelopes to receive the savings. Until those changes, we were able to reduce our appropriation.

Paul Moss: Councilman Buskirk?

Roy Buskirk: The last postage increase rate that we had, it now also makes a difference on the size of the envelope. I want to point out that you mailed five sheets of paper to me in this large, huge envelope. The cost was 97 cents. If you would have put it in a business envelope, it would have been one ounce and would have gone 41 cents in regular mail. This morning, I checked with the Purchasing Department and in using our mail service, it would have been 37.7 cents.

Therese Brown: We do use first class bulk rate. I do want you to know that.

Roy Buskirk: Okay, but I am suggesting...

Therese Brown: You are correct.

Roy Buskirk: Penny pinching me, I would have preferred a business envelope than this huge envelope. In my personal business, we are constantly running into this too. It can easily be folded and it would have cost less than half of what the postage ran for you.

Paul Moss: Are there any other questions?

Patt Kite: I move to approve item one in the amount of \$78,000.

Roy Buskirk: Second.

Paul Moss: We have a motion and a second. All in favor please signify by saying aye. All opposed same sign. The motion carries 6-0-1 (Hughes).

Therese Brown: Thank you very much. I do have one request. I have a comment that I would like to make relative to a discussion item that is on the agenda for later today.

Paul Moss: I am okay with that.

Therese Brown: I would like to first and foremost thank Council for taking the aggressive approach on the internal inequities for the employees of Allen County. One thing that was an unfortunate was that twenty-one employees were red-lined, seven of which were in my department. I am not discounting that those were the decisions that were made and did not necessarily have any problem with those adjustments. When I discussed these issues with the seven staff members, I did

indicate to them what I perceive the position that you have placed out there for the 1,500 to 1,600 County employees, excluding what you have on the agenda today with the Sheriff's Department. Not to discount or disparage in any way, shape or form the opportunities that those individuals deserve, we are trying to get this explanation across and the sticker shock that these individuals will have in 2009, I am hoping that you will take to heart the opportunity out there to deal with the external inequities before 2009. There are a lot of individuals out there that support this entity and it is not just run on one department. More than one department keeps this operation functional. I just wanted to make my personal opinion know and we will continue to do the best job we possibly can, based on the dollars that you give us. I felt it was important that you keep in mind that there are other individuals and the disparity may continue to grow.

Paul Moss: My response to that would be that there is general unanimity in the desire to address the external issues which one of them will be talked about today. Going into 2008, it continues to be an agenda item that we will deal with. There is an infinite desire and request and a finite budget and it is just a matter of balancing the two. The only other comment I would make is that the reason people are red-lined is because it was deemed, as a part of this study, they are basically at the top. We have to cap that and not leave it open-ended. Otherwise, you would continue to create additional inequities.

Therese Brown: I totally understand the position that Council took. Unfortunately, when you translate that in a face-to-face conversation with an individual who is getting reviews every six months and meeting their obligation, it doesn't equate easily. It is an issue that you have to address and is something that you have put on the table and there are individuals out there that are hoping that the other shoe drops and that they at least break even.

Paul Moss: It is very complex and there is no easy answer. Building Department and item two for \$71,216.

Dave Fuller: Good morning, Dave Fuller, Building Commissioner. I have a couple of items on the agenda under this line item. First is vehicles and when we came to you for budget hearings, you asked us to come back and seek those cars rather than have them in the budget for 2008. When we originally investigated that, we were looking at buying cars that were comparable to what we had gotten last year, Chevrolet Malibus. That would cost us about \$71,000 based on last year's cost. They are no longer making the same style of Malibu and are upgrading it to a larger style and much more expensive. It was going to be too expensive for us to consider. We have since changed directions and what we are proposing is to buy five Ford Ranger pickup trucks. We have not had pickup trucks before and don't need them for our work but the cost was very attractive. The cost of maintenance issues that we had previously with the cars, primarily transmission damage from driving on the job site, will hopefully be resolved with using the Rangers. Three quotes were obtained. Two were from local dealerships and the third was the dealer who has the contract with

the State. That dealer actually reduced the price below the State price because he wanted to keep the business. Bloomington Ford is the one that we wanted to get the vehicles from. Five trucks came to \$64,796. We felt that was a very good price. The second item was computer mounts. We had not anticipated getting those until next year. The current computer mounts were gotten about six years ago when we first got the computer system. The previous administration had those mounts made specifically for Gateway Computers. They are non-adjustable mounts. Through the refresh program, we started replacing computers and found out they didn't fit the mounts. We had the mounts modified but it eliminated the locking mechanism so the computers can no longer be locked in the mounts. We are proposing purchasing all new mounts. The bases are still usable and the mounts will slide right on the existing base. These mounts will not only adjust width, depth and height, they also have an arm that supports the screen when it is open. One of the routine maintenance issues that we routinely had with computers is the hinges. If they drive with them open, they bounce back and forth and they are not made to be closed a dozen times a day. We routinely had to get the hinges replaced. The computers are no longer made and so we can't get hinges. We are proposing spending another \$6,400 to replace all of those mounts. It is a one-time expense because those mounts, short of an accident, should last indefinitely. This will allow us to lock the computers in the cars.

Paul Moss: Any questions from Council?

Roy Buskirk: Yes. On those mounts, and I realize that as computers are replaced, are they flexible to be adjusted for different styles of computers?

Dave Fuller: The new mounts are. They are infinitely adjustable for any size of laptop computer.

Roy Buskirk: Another question on the bid sheet. I notice that the radio is an AM/FM with a CD player.

Dave Fuller: That is a standard radio that comes with the truck.

Paul Moss: Councilman Vogt?

Darren Vogt: Did we get the dollars figured out on the \$68,000 that we have set in our financial statement? I want to make sure I get what we are doing with it.

Dave Fuller: The \$68,000 was spent in January on five cars. If you recall, we always ran our cars through the Commissioners sale of county owned property account. We had planned on doing that last fall and just before we came to Council to have the money appropriated through that account, the Council and Commissioners worked it out that the account would go away. In December, we couldn't get an appropriation and so we waited until January to get last year's cars. That is why that

money was there. These are actually cars that we would have requested for 2008 but to be purchased now.

Cal Miller: So what is that money going to be used for that is in the County Council's line item that is earmarked for you?

Lisa Blosser: That is what you have spent already. We report to you what you have spent already.

Cal Miller: Okay, thank you.

Darren Vogt: That is where I was confused also. In this year, you are making up last year's cars and next year's cars.

Dave Fuller: Correct.

Darren Vogt: In 2008, you won't come before us for any additional vehicles?

Dave Fuller: No unless you ask us to come back in 2008 for 2009 cars.

Cal Miller: I would move for approval of item two in the amount of \$71,216.

Maye Johnson: Second.

Paul Moss: We have a motion and a second.

Roy Buskirk: I have one quick question. Normally, some of your units have been held back and gone into the County pool. I noticed that all five of these have been marked to be sold. The question is that always before, they have been cars and now you are having pickups. Will the same hold true with the pickups? Can those be used and put into the pool? What I am leading up to is the fact is there a desire to have them in the pool?

Dave Fuller: The process has changed over the last few years. It used to be that we switched out cars every 60,000 miles. It was done so that, once the warranties ran out, we wouldn't have the expenses and we gave the cars to another department. The last few years, we started driving the cars until they wore out. Now the only cars that we don't get rid of are the ones that we keep as a spare to get rid of the old spare.

Roy Buskirk: Inter-department.

Dave Fuller: All of our cars have been going to auction.

Darren Vogt: Keep in mind that these are light-duty trucks.

Dave Fuller: Since they are all six cylinders, I would like to think that we would be able to get more than 100,000 miles out of them.

Roy Buskirk: I can see where they will be better utilized because of you being on construction sites. The mileage will be very similar too.

Paul Moss: We have a motion and a second. All in favor please signify by saying aye. All opposed same sign. The motion carries 6-0-1 (Hughes). Item three is Parks and Recreation and more vehicles.

Maye Johnson: Mr. Baxter, would you reintroduce yourself?

Jeff Baxter: Jeff Baxter, Superintendent of Parks.

Maye Johnson: As I understand it, you have reduced your request from last month?

Jeff Baxter: Yes, last month we didn't come with the right information. I think there was a misunderstanding and didn't realize we needed firm quotes for that. Since the September meeting, we have withdrawn a request for a passenger vehicle. I feel we will still need the passenger vehicle eventually but the maintenance equipment is a greater need for us now. We got three quotes from three local vendors. The 30hp tractor is \$15,934 which is the low quote on that. The utility vehicle is \$9,500. The utility vehicle is something that we can take back on the trails. Almost on a daily basis, we have a lot of fallen trees and limbs that need to be cleared away. Metea has a lot of topography changes and the four-wheel drive vehicle appears to be the best option. The tractor and Gator that we have out at Fox Island both serve the purpose at Fox Island but Metea is a totally different park. The terrain at Metea is a lot harder on a vehicle than the terrain at Fox Island. Right now, we have to trailer the vehicles to Metea whenever we need them and that is a forty minute drive each way along with loading and unloading times. I have one employee in a non-productive mode while he is driving both ways and loading and unloading. When it is at Metea, I can pretty much not do any work at Fox Island and vice versa. We have made due to this point. I believe Roger requested it in the 2008 budget and I believe we were requested to come back this year for the appropriation.

Paul Moss: How often are you having to transport?

Jeff Baxter: We could do that on a weekly basis and leave it up there for two or three days but then we have two or three days that we would not be working at Fox Island.

Darren Vogt: Do you have enough employees to work both places at the same time?

Jeff Baxter: Yes, we have reassigned, in the last year, one of the maintenance workers to Metea. We have that much work, at Metea, that needed to be done and we were going back and forth.

Darren Vogt: So they are fully up there and there won't be a transport at all.

Jeff Baxter: We have assigned them there on a regular basis. If there is a major project, we will still go back and forth.

Darren Vogt: This maintenance is for routine maintenance such as grass cutting and stuff like that.

Jeff Baxter: Construction of trails and maintenance of trails, which is done regularly.

Darren Vogt: User fee funds, have you looked at that to see if any of this could or should come out of those funds?

Jeff Baxter: The attorney is looking into the ordinance to see if those kinds of expenses can be paid out of there. We do understand that the operation and maintenance will come out of that fund in the future.

Darren Vogt: Okay, thank you.

Roy Buskirk: Question about Metea, is there storage available for keeping these up there?

Jeff Baxter: Yes. We have a barn that doesn't have concrete flooring.

Roy Buskirk: You mentioned that Fox Island is rougher on the equipment?

Jeff Baxter: No, Fox Island has been more developed and for a longer time and we don't have as many topography changes. Fox Island is a little easier on the equipment.

Roy Buskirk: Do you have the same operator on the equipment?

Jeff Baxter: Tom may be the operator after he hauls it up there but Dina is assigned to Metea. If it was left there for a few days, Dina would be the operator.

Roy Buskirk: I thought maybe some of the usage was the operator being harder on the equipment.

Jeff Baxter: No, they pretty much operate the same way.

Cal Miller: Move for approval of item three in the amount of \$25,434.

Maye Johnson: Second.

Paul Moss: We have a motion and a second. I do have one additional question. I am going assume that you have looked at your 2008 budget. One of the things that we have talked about over the last couple of years, since this park has opened, from a philosophical standpoint, is the need or lack thereof, have this get to the point of being a full-service park. Do you believe that your 2008 budget puts you in a position to have this park where it needs to be in the terms of services or opportunities or things of that nature?

Jeff Baxter: I am comfortable enough that we can be open the same amount of hours that we are at Fox Island. We are very tight on being able to do that but I believe we can do it. That is certainly what we are going to strive for. It is open for the same hours as Fox Island is right now.

Paul Moss: There is a motion and a second and if there is no further discussion, all in favor please signify by saying aye. All opposed same sign. The motion carries 6-0-1 (Hughes). Thank you. Okay, items four, five and six in the Adult Probation User Fund.

Tim Miller: Good morning, Tim Miller with the Allen Circuit Court. Basically, the State Adult Probation pay grid allows for a five percent increase when an officer obtains a degree and Officer Mike Manuel did that. We have prorated it for the last three months of the year and that is what is on the request for today.

Cal Miller: Move for approval of items four through six in the amount of \$670 and congratulations to the officer.

Patt Kite: Second.

Paul Moss: We have a motion and a second, any further discussion? All in favor please signify by saying aye. All opposed same sign. The motion carries 6-0-1 (Hughes). Items seven, eight and nine, I believe Mindy is here.

Mindy Waldron: Good morning, Mindy Waldron, Administrator for the Department of Health. What we have on the agenda today is a request to transfer some money from our Immunization Donation Fund to some specific line items. What we had happen about three months ago was, early in the morning, our large two-door refrigerator went into alarm. It went into defrost cycle and never made it out. It is hooked to the alarm system in the building and we were able to save the vaccine which at any given time is about \$38,000 to \$40,000 dollars in stock. The unit is not able to be repaired. We checked with two different companies, through Dan Freck and his staff, and they were not able to repair it to the specs of the temperatures that it must hold. We donated that to the cafeteria and we purchased two units so that we have a refrigerator and a freezer. We are hoping to transfer some funds from our Donation Fund to cover the cost of that as well as the alarm and the 24/7 service agreement. I will be happy to answer any questions.

Darren Vogt: Move for approval of items seven, eight and nine in the amount of \$10,000.

Cal Miller: Second.

Paul Moss: We have a motion and a second. All in favor please signify by saying aye. All opposed same sign. The motion carries 6-0-1 (Hughes). I will mention, just to forewarn you, but as you have seen in the paper, there has been a lot of discussion in regards to the refugee population. I think you will probably see in November that we are going to have a fairly significant discussion, from a financial standpoint and a philosophical standpoint, because we are tasked with a substantial amount of cost in providing services for the refugees. So just be aware of that. Are there any comments that you would like to make related to that?

Mindy Waldron: I just want to make sure that all of you received my email that had information that Councilman Miller requested last meeting. It will give you an idea of the process and how things occur. It also talks about the responsibilities and the things that are out of our hands. I have offered my time to you to discuss that and as Councilman Moss said, we have some personnel issues that we will be bringing before you in the Personnel Committee in November. We will have a special board meeting real soon to discuss the issues from both standpoints so that we can figure out how to tackle this issue. There needs to be a complete understanding of what our responsibility is, where that lies and what are the timeframes under which we must respond and what will this look like for the next year? All of those issues will be discussed at that point. If you would like to talk to me at any time, please call and I will meet with you at any time. It will give you a better understanding of what we do.

Darren Vogt: Do you know when that meeting is?

Mindy Waldron: Not yet. It will be in early November. I need to make sure we have a quorum and then I will announce the date.

Paul Moss: I think one of the things that would be helpful to understand, at that meeting, would be what our responsibility would be and why it is our responsibility and who is mandating that so that we can address that in a different forum. Also, what the Board of Health is trying to do in terms of trying to get some of those costs covered via Medicaid or whatever.

Mindy Waldron: We will be prepared.

Paul Moss: Thank you. Moving right along to item ten, the Technology Fund.

Ed Steenman: Good morning, I am Ed Steenman, County IT Director. At the July Council meeting, Commissioner Peters and I discussed with you that we had notified ACS that the current contract would be terminated at the end of 2008. In preparation

for the contract termination, we would be evaluating our go-forward situation as far as technology support. In the process, we will be retaining a consultant to help us through that process. We have retained the consultant and have been working with them and the cost of that consultant is being shared with the City. This is a City and County effort and the total cost of that consultant work is estimated to be about \$88,000. The County's half is about \$44,000. The agenda shows a request for \$44,500. That is actually the cost but it is not what we are asking for. What we are asking for is \$33,700 because that is what we estimated the balance to be in the Technology Fund.

Tera Klutz: The balance is higher than \$44,000.

Ed Steenman: It is?

Tera Klutz: Yes. What do you need?

Ed Steenman: We had estimated that there was \$33,700 in the fund and so Judy (Heck) was going to use some other funds to make up the difference.

Tera Klutz: She called me and I told her that the balance was more than that in the Technology Fund and could handle the full cost for this.

Ed Steenman: She didn't relate that to me.

Tera Klutz: I told her that after you calculate the interest on the earnings, there would be ample cost to pay for the technology project.

Cal Miller: So what is the cost, \$44,000 or \$44,500?

Ed Steenman: \$44,500 is the County's portion of the cost. That is an estimate because in that cost are travel expenses that they charge us for on an actual basis. We don't have a fixed cost because of those travel expenses.

Roy Buskirk: I guess this is one of the few times that we will allow you to have round-off numbers.

Cal Miller: What is the contract amount, setting aside the travel expenses?

Ed Steenman: They had estimated about \$5,000 for travel expenses. So, about \$85,000 is the contract.

Cal Miller: Move for approval of item ten.

Roy Buskirk: Second.

Paul Moss: We have a motion and a second. I do have a couple of questions. My recollection of the prior discussion about ACS may be incorrect. I don't recall being informed that you were actually providing termination notice for that. I just want to make sure that you did do that.

Ed Steenman: Yes.

Paul Moss: You have done that.

Ed Steenman: The stipulation, in the current contract, requires us to notify them by June 30, 2007 of any termination prior to the actual contract termination.

Paul Moss: So, you have the notification window and that makes sense. As a part of the consultant's work, are they looking at coming up with an internal solution? Are they looking at that or potentially remaining with ACS? Is that an option as well?

Ed Steenman: We have worked with them and said that our acceptable solution would be anything from total outsourcing that we have today to total in-sourcing that we discussed in other venues and a combination thereof. That is what they are working toward and they are expecting to have their final report to us next week.

Paul Moss: Even from a decision standpoint, when that consultant report comes in, how is it structured such that the City and County are going to take the same approach?

Ed Steenman: From one aspect, the steering committee that has been involved, is City and County based.

Paul Moss: Who is on the steering committee?

Ed Steenman: The steering committee consists of Commissioner Peters, Councilwoman Hughes, Tim Miller, Bill Fishering, Clifford Clarke and me.

Paul Moss: So the County outweighs the City significantly.

Ed Steenman: Yes it does.

Paul Moss: But you are comfortable that we are going to be going in the same direction, whatever that direction is.

Ed Steenman: Yes.

Paul Moss: That would be very frustrating to suddenly see a split.

Ed Steenman: Exactly and we made that quite clear to the consultants that this is a joint effort.

Darren Vogt: What I would like to see is you keeping us in the loop on this. If it does go towards total in-sourcing, you will ask for employees and those kinds of things and we may need to look at the long-term affect of that versus the short-term. So, please keep us in the loop.

Paul Moss: Particularly in paying attention to the offset in the current contractual of what we are reimbursing them for. Any other questions or comments? **If I recall correctly, there is a motion and a second, all in favor please signify by saying aye. All opposed same sign. The motion carries 6-0-1 (Hughes).** Thank you. Items eleven through twenty-one, appropriations in Youth Services Placement Fund 737.

Chris Dunn: Good morning, Chris Dunn, Youth Services Center. Several of the items come off of the strategic plan. I started going through that list to see what I listed as needing done in 2007. I am requesting funds from the 737 Fund to cover those expenses. Some of the other expenses are just expenses to replace some items that we have here. Do you have my letter outlining the specifics?

Roy Buskirk: Yes.

Chris Dunn: I will answer any questions about anything. The first thing I would like to let you know is that the defibrillator, the quote that is on there is from the Red Cross and that is who we work with. All of our staff is required to have training through the Red Cross. I took their quote but after receiving it, I started looking around and I can get two for the same price. I would still cut \$600 off it. That is what I would like to do instead. The Red Cross provides our staff with First Aid/CPR and will be doing defibrillator training. That is why I originally went with them but then I went on the internet and went to the same company that the Red Cross purchases theirs from, I thought I could get two defibrillators and two sets of infant/child pads and still be \$600 below their bid.

Cal Miller: So what is the total request then?

Chris Dunn: I would be reducing item eleven to \$2,968.

Cal Miller: So the total request of \$25,657 is being reduced by \$600.

Chris Dunn: Roughly, yes. The new defibrillator cost would be \$2,698.

Darren Vogt: Are we going to take it line item by line item?

Patt Kite: Chris, who would provide the training if you purchase these?

Chris Dunn: Our nurse is already certified through the Red Cross for First Aid/CPR and does that on a regular basis for all of the staff. She also has helped out other departments in the past. She is certified in training our staff.

Darren Vogt: I am assuming that one defibrillator would be in one house and one in the other house.

Chris Dunn: We would like to put one in the main building and in the school.

Darren Vogt: You still have two on campus, so to speak.

Chris Dunn: I may come back and request one for the other building later on.

Paul Moss: Have you given any thought to Parkview has a tendency to provide defibrillators to a variety of entities? They have a grant process to go through to request those and I didn't know if you had given thought to getting free ones.

Chris Dunn: I approached Lin Wilson about a grant and she said we had missed the cycle for it but since I am going to want others, I can still try to get some through the grant process.

Cal Miller: Move for approval of items eleven through twenty-one with the exception of the adjustment of item eleven to \$2,968.

Darren Vogt: Second.

Paul Moss: **We have a motion and a second, any further discussion? All in favor please signify by saying aye. All opposed same sign. The motion carries 6-0-1 (Hughes.)**

Chris Dunn: Thank you.

Paul Moss: Thank you. Appropriation in Drug Free Community Fund.

Jerri Lerch: Jerri Lerch with the Allen County Drug and Alcohol Consortium. I am here to request the appropriation of the remainder of the funds for this year in the amount of \$67,994. Those come from the fees from the previous year. We have run a second fall grant cycle to award those funds in the areas of treatment, justice and prevention. I will be happy to answer any questions. Our process has been the same. We have a variety of citizens and leaders in different areas who help us with the granting process and we advertise and solicit for grants across the community. We evaluate those and make the awards appropriate to the county-wide plan.

Paul Moss: Councilman Vogt?

Darren Vogt: Can you just briefly explain where your funds actually come from?

Jerri Lerch: I believe so. Through statute of Drug Free Indiana, a portion of the OWI fines are allocated to the Drug Free Indiana Fund. Indiana is the only state in

the country that tries to mobilize each county. Each county then has a local coordinating council. We apply to the State through a comprehensive plan that is submitted annually and a strategic plan on how we are going to address issues. The State approves those and that is what gives us access to that fund. It is a percentage of the OWI fund.

Darren Vogt: Council, at some point and this is not the appropriate place for this, I would like to have a philosophical discussion on whether or not this is one of those self-fulfilling prophecies as the State grants for OWI's and enforcement and we turn around a create a big cycle of bureaucracy at some point. I am not sure where I am going with that comment but I am trying to figure out if we are just continuing to perpetuate by collecting and not seeing results. Are the numbers coming down as a result of these programs and grants that the State gives us to enforce these, shouldn't we see some results? When do we say we are seeing results just like we do in any other aspect of what we do? I just want to see that OWI's are going down.

Jerri Lerch: We track on that regularly. In 2007, those rates have come down. The question is, is it a matter of less public drinking and driving or a matter of law enforcement efforts? You can't always attribute exactly what the causality is. This is one fund that we have and there are other State and Federal grants. We were recently granted to do an indepth study on why Allen County ranked fourth, on alcohol problematic issues, in the State and with that we are doing a major statistical study to identify that. We have a separate funding pot that we are taking a hard look at. Councilwoman Hughes sits on our board but we welcome and create community forums and other participation. We are happy to include you in those discussions.

Darren Vogt: That would be great to see the results of why we have a problem in Allen County.

Paul Moss: Councilman Buskirk?

Roy Buskirk: I would appreciate an explanation on this because it looks to me that some of the math doesn't jive.

Jerri Lerch: Okay. With the local coordinating council status with the access to this funding, we are required, by State law, that twenty-five percent of funds goes towards treatment or intervention. That would include halfway houses and anyone that is doing anything to intervene with an already identified problem. A quarter of it needs to go to justice or law enforcement and has to be related to criminal or felon activity. It can not be related to the good prevention efforts, which is a lot of what the police departments are doing. Another quarter goes to prevention efforts. We are required to divide our allocation into quarters. We seek grants from a variety of community organizations who will meet the goals of our comprehensive plan. We entertain those grants and how sophisticated they are in their programs and writing grants and carrying those out. Depending on what they put in their grants, our funding committee looks at that and decides what percentage should be granted and what

should not. You will see some differences in what was requested and what was approved. For example, the Fort Wayne Women's Bureau wanted to buy some materials. In that particular one, they additionally wanted to run a celebration dinner. In their budget, they had put about \$500 in this grant to help support the celebration. Is that a fund-raising purpose or what did that go for? When the committee reviewed it, they decided not to allocate the \$500 this time. They go through a very similar examination process that you might do. Does that answer what you asked?

Roy Buskirk: The recommended amount column, even the totals, you have funds available of 67 and I don't see where you are spending the whole \$67,994.

Jerri Lerch: We currently approved the \$34,085 and that leaves \$33,900 and the funding committee has specific plans for that. We need the funds before the end of the year. The Commissioners approved the entire allocation for us to continue granting in the same way that we have been.

Roy Buskirk: Okay, so then what you are saying over here in the Available to Grant column is that this is how much funds are available?

Jerri Lerch: If you look at the requested part, at the bottom, it says total requested, total allocated, we had \$75,000 in requests. We have \$67,994 left in the fund for this year. That is what those two numbers mean. The committee did recommend that \$34,085 be granted in review of the grants that they had received for the fall cycle. For this calendar year, it leaves \$33,900 yet to be allocated to particular programs.

Cal Miller: So you are asking us to allocate funds that have not yet been determined to be granted to different organizations.

Jerri Lerch: That is the pattern that we had done last year. We do it in the same manner in the spring and the fall.

Darren Vogt: I guess that I don't recall that. So we have appropriated funds even though we don't know where the grants are going? We have done that in the past?

Paul Moss: It was a couple hundred thousand, wasn't it?

Jerri Lerch: No, it has always been a small remainder amount. All together, in 2006, the total Drug Free Indiana Fund for this county was in excess of \$300,000. In the spring, we allocated \$200,000 and some. We try to only do this once a year. It depends on how the community needs and the timing.

Cal Miller: Can you let us know, to the extent that this is approved, where the remaining \$33,908 went?

Jerri Lerch: We did that last year. We definitely gave you the follow-up information.

Cal Miller: Move for approval of item twenty-two in the amount of \$67,994.

Patt Kite: Second.

Paul Moss: We have a motion and a second, any further discussion? All in favor please signify by saying aye. All opposed same sign. The motion carries 6-0-1 (Hughes). Thank you. That takes us through all of the appropriation requests. Now we are going to get to the Other Business to come before Council. The first on that list is the discussion that we had previously as part of the budget process. This is in regards to an additional adjustment to the sworn officers pay for 2008. If I recall correctly, there was a great amount of discussion at that time and there was some information presented and there was some request for follow-up. I believe there were some meetings amongst individual Council members with representatives of the Sheriff's Department who are joining us at the table.

Cal Miller: Can I interrupt for a second? We have one other Sheriff's Department item that is going to be a lot less brief than this discussion. May I recommend that we take Mr. Feighner and his colleague first?

Paul Moss: Oh, yes, I'm sorry. If that is all right with you two, we will do that because the other could be a lengthy discussion.

John Feighner: I am John Feighner, Assistant Allen County Attorney. I have the responsibility and privilege of representing the Sheriff's Department. Elaine Beaty, from McCready Keene, is with me today because we have a proposal that we would like to have approved by the Allen County Council. The Sheriff's pension is established by State statute. By State statute and procedure, the Allen County Sheriff's Merit Board is the plan administrator. The plan provides and is managed in a proper fiduciary responsibility. Toward the end of Sheriff Herman's administration, the investment advisory firm, that invests the money as well as the actuarial company, did an evaluation and McCready Keene was hired. They undertook a comprehensive review of the plan documents and there were some technical and timing issues in terms of amendments to comply with the Uruguay Convention and some of the other laws. In looking at the documents, they are actually as part of some Uruguay Convention that Congress added to the pension laws. The point is that there are amendments that we need to go back and retroactively approve so that we meet the technical requirements for Internal Revenue code. This was discussed with the Merit Board last year and this year, we completed the work. The proposed amendment has been submitted to the Merit Board and unanimously adopted at the October meeting. Under State law, we are required and always do come to Council because Council has the oversight to make sure that if there is going to be any fiscal impact, you would be requested to approve that. If we were here asking for an additional appropriation, we would notify you. This is something that is not going to have an adverse impact. I can tell you, if you are interested, what the actual costs have been for the last couple of years. If you approve this amendment, it will bring

the plan into compliance with all of the technical requirements, which is very important. It is a matter of philosophy that McCready Keene thinks it should meet all IRS requirements. I think Sheriff Fries and Sheriff Herman support that. In other county Merit Boards and Sheriffs that use McCready Keene, have gone through this process. Historically, this issue is whether or not a governmental plan has to meet all of these requirements. It is kind of a belts and suspenders thought. It is better to meet the requirements so that there is no question. The plan has never been audited and is not currently being audited. The point is that this amendment has been approved by the Merit Board and if Council approves it, we will submit it to Ice Miller, a law firm in Indianapolis that does pension work throughout the country. They will submit it to the IRS and we anticipate that everything will be fine and we will have an acceptance letter sometime next year. Elaine is here to go over more detail, if you want to, of some of the reasons why we are doing this. I would like to present this to you and if it meets with your approval, then we would ask the representative from Council to approve it and Elaine can take it back to Indianapolis and they will complete all of the filings and services.

Cal Miller: Is there any timing aspect of this? Council takes all of these things seriously and would like to take the opportunity to digest the document that you have handed us. If we were to approve this at the next meeting, assuming that we have had a chance to look at it and review it, would there be a problem with the timing?

John Feighner: What we need to do is finish the documentation in the next month or two so that it is ready to go. I think Ice Miller, if you want to review it for the next meeting, wouldn't be an issue. Do you think so, Elaine?

Elaine Beaty: I don't think it is an issue. We would like to have copies made as what has been handed to you is six identical versions as originals. What we like to maintain is that they have already been signed by the Merit Board and we don't want to lose these. The reason that we prepare so many of the same thing is that once they are fully executed, every body that does the approval will be able to keep an original.

Cal Miller: The only reason I say that is that we are being asked, as a body, to approve something that you take very seriously and we would like the opportunity to digest that. If there is not going to be any adverse impact to the timing that you are going to be faced with, I just as soon be given a copy and then have the discussion next month. I don't know if that is going to require you to come back or not. I don't want to do that if you don't have to. How does the rest of the Council want to proceed?

Paul Moss: If it is not going to create an issue for you that would be my preference as well.

John Feighner: I will slip down the hall and make copies for all of the Council members.

Paul Moss: Councilman Vogt?

Darren Vogt: I have one quick question. As a registered securities person, I may have to abstain on the vote for this. Will that create a problem for you on this?

Elaine Beaty: Not that I am aware of.

Darren Vogt: I will check with my principals to make sure.

Cal Miller: Is there a way we can do this where you outline what you need to and we can let the Auditor's Office know if we have any additional questions before we approve it and Mr. Feighner can come back next month and save you a trip back up here?

Paul Moss: What are the fundamental changes that might be outlined?

Elaine Beaty: As Mr. Feighner said, this is really in order to receive a qualification from the IRS as a qualified plan. That is really just a stamp of approval saying that there are no discrimination issues and that everybody is in order. Also, there is no fiscal impact here. Many of the requirements that the Federal government puts in place for private industry plans, have fiscal impacts. But they have also written that they are exempt for most of those things. Some of these things are being put into place just to be purely put into place. They will have no effect. An example would be on the compensation definition. The Federal government places maximums on the amount of annual earnings for compensation that can be used to determine pension benefits under a qualified plan. It is a pretty high ceiling at an excess of \$200,000 per year. Whether or not government employees may achieve that level of earnings is beside the point. For the County Police retirement plans there is a restriction, in Indiana law, the places the restrictions much lower. It is at the rate of the full-time Prosecuting Attorney at the time that a member separates from employment. There is the Federal limit in excess of \$200,000 and Indiana limit is at \$110,000. The Federal law says that you have to write our limits in there. They want to know that their limits are going to be recognized. They don't care if the Indiana limits are more restrictive. This is the type of thing that we are putting in. The other benefits wording that needs to be included in this plan to receive the IRS approval is that benefits will start being paid to members no later than the age of 70½. Under private industry, where people often do continue their employment well into their later years, it is less likely that it is going to happen where you have deputies working to that age. Minimum distribution laws say that if they continue their employment, they must start receiving a portion of their benefits. It doesn't cost the County or the plan anything. It is just following the rules. That is what all of this language is about and I understand your desire to have this and review it.

Cal Miller: That is essentially what we have tried to do in the last few years. I propose that you provide Lisa Blosser a copy so that she could email it to us and then we can let her know, well in advance, if we have any questions.

John Feighner: That sounds great.

Paul Moss: Now we will move back to the Sheriff's Department pay issue. As I mentioned, there were some follow-up discussions with representatives of the Sheriff's Department and I think the intent of those discussions was to drill down into the information that was provided. There is some additional information related to the comparisons between the City and the County's pay structure for the officers. I believe there are a few Council members that met with them and/or reviewed the information. I think the best approach to take here would be for you to summarize some of the additional information. What we need to do is come up with as close a figure as possible in terms of true differential between the City pay structure and the County's pay structure.

Vanessa Miller: I am Vanessa Miller, HR Manager for the Allen County Sheriff's Department.

Jill Werling: I am Jill Werling, Comptroller.

Vanessa Miller: One of the items requested by Council was to have a comparison of low, medium and high between the City and the County. Jill prepared that for us.

Jill Werling: The figures came from all of the officers in the Allen County Sheriff's Department. I did a spreadsheet with each officer, their position and it includes their longevity. I then compared it to the information that I received from the Fort Wayne Police Department at the same point in their career. I didn't have the whole Fort Wayne Police Department payroll but I could compare with what they told me their rates were. This is from probationary officer up to the Sheriff.

Vanessa Miller: Another thing that I think you requested was additional information on tech pay which was submitted to you. The previous comparison that I gave you what Allen County made as far as tech pay, Fort Wayne and the difference. The one that I sent you most recently was actually prepared by the Sheriff and was broken down by per pay, per person and the cost of the entire tech pay.

Darren Vogt: Let me say that this was at my suggestion when we were looking at them. Our original tech pay was only two lines, canine and SWAT. Those were the only two discrepancies that we had. I said that if we were going to address and consider all of the options, what would you recommend for technical pay and education pay for your officers? As I look at it, we need to encourage our officers to be trained and encourage them to learn different variations and aspects of job just as we would anyone else. On the agenda earlier, we had a probation officer who had gotten an advance degree in their line of work. I would consider these advance

degrees. That is where this conversation came from. It wasn't one of the original requests but was something that I thought would be very useful for us.

Vanessa Miller: The canine and the SWAT are in the 2008 budget and the rest of them were not and we would like them to be considered for additional pay. It does take training to go through all of that. We also included the SORT team which is like the SWAT team for the jail. If there is a riot at the jail, they are all on call and have to be there ASAP. We included them in here even though it is not a sworn officer.

Cal Miller: What are we doing today, so that we have a framework for our discussion, for the overall percentage increase for sworn officers? Is there a second category that Vanessa is talking about, as well? Are we approving or considering approving these other categories of specialized training? Is that what we are talking about?

Darren Vogt: Yes.

Cal Miller: Okay. With respect to the specialized training, may I have a copy of that? Is that what you emailed last night?

Vanessa Miller: No, yesterday was the vacation structure between Allen County employees, Allen County sworn officers and comparing it to Fort Wayne.

Paul Moss: In an attempt to answer your question, Councilman Miller, in what we hope to accomplish today is that based on the lengthy conversation a month ago, to have folks interact with the Sheriff's Department and get the additional information that we wanted. We would digest it as much as possible and have the Sheriff's Department come to us and talk through it and summarize it so that everyone here understands it. Then clarify a few issues, for instance, we never came to a conclusion as to the 2.5% that was already provided and agreed to by the Council. Then at the Personnel Committee meeting, there was a recommendation for an additional 6%. It was never clarified if the 6% was in addition to the 2.5% or not. There may be some disagreement on Personnel Committee. I did not vote for the 6% because I wanted to see a more comprehensive approach taken. I don't feel comfortable making the call in terms of whether it was in addition to or not. We could be looking at where we are currently at being 6% or 8.5% and possibly expanding that. That is a question as well.

Cal Miller: Can't we just eliminate that question? We have a full Council decision that we have the 2.5% already granted and today's decision will be what additional percentage increase will there be for sworn officers? What, if any, additional accommodations will be made in the special categories? The third thing I would like to interject is what, if any, adjustments will be made to the policy of one dollar per year health insurance for sworn officers? If we are going to make an adjustment across the board that is going to be a substantial increase, this Council should use this opportunity to put the sworn officers on the same playing field with respect to

the health insurance costs. At the same time, recognizing the percent increase that the Council agrees to today, that it is to be factored in. I see three topics for discussion which will come down to decisions about what percent increase over 2.5%, if any, does that include health insurance and one other special categories of compensation. Does the Council want to acknowledge the Sheriff's request to permit him to continue to reward the officers who are achieving other certifications to distinguish themselves from the other officers in the ranks?

Darren Vogt: I think we need to add that we should also consider the dispatchers in this same conversation. The information has been provided the same exact way. It hasn't been the focus of our conversations but it is the same basic comparison that we are looking at for the sworn officers. I have looked at this and am comfortable with including them, if we so choose.

Patt Kite: I would agree that we need to look at them. They are a very critical part of public safety.

Paul Moss: Councilman Buskirk?

Roy Buskirk: In answering the question, as far as the Personnel Committee, and the vote on the 6%, I made the motion for that. It was my intent that it was in addition to the 2.5%. Councilwoman Hughes understood that it included the 2.5%.

Cal Miller: My point is that it is moot at this point.

Paul Moss: It is moot but it was a recommendation by Personnel Committee to the full Council. We are essentially starting from scratch. We are starting with the 2.5% and moving up with that and I am comfortable with that. What I am uncomfortable with is that we are looking at a total compensation package and making substantial changes. I am a little concerned to be able to accomplish that in this forum. What I would like to suggest is either some subcommittee getting together, hashing this out and coming back with a recommendation or having it go through the Personnel Committee with the expectation that this Council is comfortable with that and is going to in support of that recommendation. Given the different facets that we have to deal with here, I can see us going back and forth and back and forth and not coming up with an answer.

Cal Miller: It is early yet in the day and I would like to see us roll up our sleeves and see what we can accomplish as a full Council. Since this is the last item on the agenda and we have gotten a great deal of information, let's have a discussion about these items. I don't think we should include, at this point, but I think we should take on the dispatchers. Are they sworn officers?

Darren Vogt: No.

Cal Miller: This is something that I think needs to involve the Sheriff, as well. Sitting in this seat isn't one of the Council members, intent on discussing the control issue. If we are going to make equal pay, then where are we in terms of the control issue and having one person or body having control overseeing the dispatching? I don't want to lose that leverage by making a decision here with respect to dispatchers pay that doesn't involve this body pushing forward what ought to have been done a long time ago.

Paul Moss: I am not sure how the two are connected.

Cal Miller: They are connected, Councilman Moss, in the fact is it leverage that this Council has if it has the desire in seeing having that department combined. The one leverage we have to continue to push the idea is withholding the decision with respect to equaling the pay of the City. They are directly connected, in my mind, if the Council wants to use this opportunity to continue to have a voice in a project that has been discussed for a long time.

Paul Moss: I have not suggested that we would necessarily move them to equal pay as the City. The hope was to move in that direction and eliminate some of the inequity and flow of people that we have trained, being hired by the City. Councilman Vogt?

Darren Vogt: There is discussion, although I have not been privy to it, about creating a one-dispatch unit and this is how it is. When I started this conversation, with then Sheriff Herman and Chief Deputy Al Moll that was the original intent. Design a dispatch center around what you would need to dispatch folks for the County of Allen, regardless of any geographical jurisdiction. Let's put a cost factor associated with that, evaluate the work that needs to be done and evaluate the pay structure for that person. As that is supposedly moving forward, I am okay with using that as trying to get something else done. I am okay with putting the dispatchers on hold.

Cal Miller: So you are okay with putting that as a separate issue? I agree that it needs to be addressed but I don't want to lose an opportunity to be a more significant part of that discussion. That has been a project of County Council for a number of years. I remember distinctly having the Sheriff sitting next to the Deputy Mayor when we had a joint meeting and asking them if the county was going to be experiencing an influx of 24,000 people merely because the City was annexing Aboite. The answer was, well of course not. I asked them if they believed that the current number of dispatchers could adequately serve the County. Of course, then why are they anticipating five or six additional dispatchers merely because the City is annexing Aboite? There was something about that logic that I found very troubling. That brings me back to the issue of should this be one department serving the needs of the County and not the City versus the County? I think this is our opportunity to press for the full unification of that department and can serve all of the citizens of the County in the most efficient way.

Paul Moss: I understand that but we also need to keep in mind how long this has been going on and there are people who there with a very clear inequity. Like it or not, we are going to have a new City administration and who knows what the viewpoint is going to be? Who knows who the new police chief is going to be? My point is that it could drag it out further. The County's position is fairly clear and there is going to be consistency there because the Sheriff is early into his term and what ends up happening is that the individuals working down there are used as pawns in this game. That frustrates me. I have never said that we should pay them the same as what the City pays their employees. What I would ultimately like to see is a part of that combination, of those two entities, in an appropriate pay structure based on external market data. I don't know if the City employees are overpaid or underpaid. What I do know is that the external market data we have for the County side is that they are clearly underpaid. I understand where you are coming from but the question is when we say we are going to separate it out, is that going to be done in this discussion or are we going to carve it out let it sit so we can keep that arrow in the quiver as part of the potential leverage down the road?

Cal Miller: I think we should sit it out of this discussion but continue to address it. I don't think we should sit on it for the reasons that you have said but I don't believe it is something that we can resolve today. We are here to talk about sworn officers and their pay vis-à-vis sworn officer pay in other counties vis-à-vis the City of Fort Wayne and what adjustment County Council is going to make based on the information as requested. I think we have ample time to discuss that with the full Council today and make some headway and arrive at the decision if there is going to be an addition to the 2.5% and whether the health insurance benefits will be applied.

Patt Kite: Can we put a timeframe on this dispatcher issue? It has been on the burner for as long as I can remember and we have qualified, trained dispatchers walking out the door everyday. I see that as a hazard to our public safety.

Cal Miller: I would be happy to discuss that at the next meeting.

Patt Kite: We need to move on it, we really do.

Cal Miller: This is my suggestion today so that we can try to accomplish as much as we can.

Paul Moss: Councilman Vogt?

Darren Vogt: I want to clarify that when I say combine the dispatching services, I am not saying to combine the protocols that the City uses and what the County uses. They are two, completely separate issues. We are talking about functionality only and not the way the dispatching is done. There is a distinct difference in who sends cars to what and they are two different animals. That is not something that we are looking at changing.

Maye Johnson: I am for tabling the dispatcher issue with an established timeline. We need to set a time and resolve the whole issue of the sworn officer pay.

Paul Moss: Councilwoman Kite, did you have something else to add?

Patt Kite: I didn't mean that we had to discuss it today. I am just saying that we have had this on the burner for so long and in the meantime, we have people who are walking away. We need to finalize it very soon.

Cal Miller: I agree and if everybody is okay with it, let's tackle that at the next meeting.

Paul Moss: What exactly are we going to tackle at the next meeting?

Cal Miller: Whether there is going to be an adjustment in the pay scale for the dispatchers.

Paul Moss: How does that tie to your argument that we retain that leverage? If we wait until November and make an adjustment, do we lose that leverage?

Cal Miller: I would argue that we do.

Paul Moss: So what is different about doing that then as opposed to now?

Cal Miller: I may be the only person here who feels that way. But if the will of the Council isn't as concerned as I am about maintaining a leverage about something that should have been done years ago, then the will of the Council prevails. I think we should be able to put ourselves in the position to make the decision next month with respect to adjusting the pay scale for the reasons that you've stated. If it doesn't prevail, then we know we have more work to do with respect to the aspect that concerns me.

Roy Buskirk: Let's go ahead and discuss the sworn officers and we will see how the motion comes out. We need five of six to approve any adjustment to a salary ordinance. After that is made, then there could possibly be one made for the dispatchers.

Paul Moss: We will do that but I am going to reiterate that I have a sneaky feeling that we are going to be in a bidding war back and forth. But, hey, have at it. Start throwing numbers out. I would prefer to engage some folks from the Sheriff's Department to go through this and look at it in a more comprehensive basis.

Roy Buskirk: I think we have pretty well had the Sheriff Department numbers provided to us and most of us have had the opportunity to review it. I appreciate

them being here for any clarification but I think the discussion will be primarily amongst the Council members.

Paul Moss: Well then, start throwing out numbers.

Patt Kite: I do also have someone else in the audience who would like to speak about the Sheriff's pay, a former Merit Board member and retired City Police Officer.

Paul Moss: I would be happy to have him come up.

Ron Burkhardt: My name is Ron Burkhardt. I have been a Merit Board member for twelve years. Before that, my law enforcement career began in Allen County in 1968. Bob Bender was the Sheriff of Allen County. I have always worn the blue through Fort Wayne and now out at IPFW. I have been there for ten years as a patrolman on third shift. My heart is with the guys who have supported me for the last twelve years as their rep with the Sheriff's Department. This is my first time that I have been before the Council. I am here to speak for the 125 guys that voted me for the last twelve years. First of all, being on third trick, I do get to talk to a lot of the officers. One of the problems that I have noticed in the last four, five or six years is that we have had more officers lateral to Fort Wayne. I get discouraged when I see a man on the Sheriff's Department, with an outstanding record, give up his ten years of seniority to transfer to the City. I have seen other officers do the same. I have had numerous officers, with five or six years, that we have trained and put money into, lateral to Fort Wayne. In any profession that you people are involved in, if you can make \$12,000 more a year, you are going to take that opportunity. I have seen that happen and it is going to continue to happen. We have a good department but in the hiring process, that I have been involved in for the last few years, I have seen that pool of people shrink. When you can make that kind of money across the street, you are going to take you college education and your knowledge and you are going to go across the street. I get discouraged when I see this pool shrink. The qualified people that are 24, 25 or 26 years old and have a family to support and house payments to make, are going to take the money. I encourage the County Council to consider that. We need to keep the quality of officers that come into the Sheriff's Department, at a high level. My own experience in the last twelve years, we are losing that quality. I talked to a young officer last night and got this information off the internet. He is my partner out at IPFW. He has a bachelor's degree in education but he loves law enforcement. He was hired at IPFW. From the internet, we pulled these figures. After one year on the Sheriff's Department, he would make \$40,364. As a Fort Wayne Police Officer, with his college benefit and his night bonus, he would make \$52,719. That is a difference of \$12,354. You take a young man and that is a lot of money and if he had his drothers, that is where he would apply. I have enjoyed my twelve years of representing the officers. I have worked with Squadrito, Herman and now Kenny. It has been a real privilege for me and I have worked with a lot of different people. If you have any questions, I would be more than happy to answer them. I would like you to keep this in mind. They make the same runs. Those guys

in brown are taking the same family fights, armed robberies and rape investigations that the City does. It is discouraging for them to go out and do the same job and make \$12,000 less a year.

Paul Moss: I certainly appreciate the comments. Does anybody have any questions?

Patt Kite: I think we have another Merit Board member who would like to speak.

Win Rood: I am Win Rood, President of the Sheriff's Merit Board. I am not going to repeat everything that Ron said because I agree with all of it. The thing that I want to talk about is the pool of applicants. I have been on this board for almost thirty years. In the old days, when we were interviewing new candidates, we would go through two or three days interviewing them. And that would be thirty to thirty-five potential candidates that had been approved. We would eliminate one or two out of that whole group. I have seen that decline over the thirty years until the group that we had a few weeks ago. We had eight people and the Sheriff said to look at these carefully because they are not as good of candidates as what you have had in the past. Of the eight, we rejected three. I have never seen that happen before. I have to think that the salary had something to do with that. The other thing in the thirty years, when I was first involved, we would get laterals from other police departments. I can remember people coming from as far as Texas because we had a good reputation. That never happens anymore. That is really all I have to say except that I endorse what Ron had to say. If there are any questions, I would be happy to answer them.

Paul Moss: I have one question. There is a belief out there that relative to other counties in the State of Indiana, at the current pay structure, it is at the top level.

Win Rood: I have not seen a recent survey.

Paul Moss: But my point is, if that is true, I think you would be seeing people making the lateral move over here from other counties. Are you seeing that?

Win Rood: Absolutely not. We have not had anyone requesting a lateral move from anywhere.

Darren Vogt: You say that the numbers of applicants are down, so how many are you seeing per cycle and is it up and down or is it declining?

Vanessa Miller: It is declining. Each year is declining by about 100 applications. The one that was just before the Merit Board had 299 applicants. The group before that had 400. The group before that had 500. The application process that started two and a half weeks ago and ends on October 31st, I have received about 110 applications. It will go down again.

Win Rood: We understand that the City has substantially more applications than they are able to accept. The Chief made a comment to the Sheriff that they have some extras if the Sheriff doesn't have enough applications.

Darren Vogt: Let me ask another quantifiable numbers. What is the number of lateral moves to the Fort Wayne Police Department?

Vanessa Miller: I have been in the department for a year and a half and I haven't lateralled anyone. My predecessor lateralled two.

Win Rood: I would say that we are averaging two or three a year.

Vanessa Miller: I think it depends on where they are at.

Win Rood: The problem is that we are not losing rookie officers. The last one I was aware of was probably our best drug officer. We had a lot of money invested in his training and all of a sudden, Fort Wayne picked him up.

Darren Vogt: I just want to make sure that is clear that losing one or two officers a year is normal. If you told me you were losing fifteen or twenty, then it would be considered a problem. I can lose one or two of my staff to another insurance company just because that is the way it goes.

Win Rood: Your point is well taken except you are missing one thing. That is our experienced officers. We also lose officers who come into the department and only work six months to a year.

Darren Vogt: That is the number I am asking for, the total number.

Win Rood: They can get you the number but we have still invested in the fourteen weeks of training at the Indiana Law Enforcement Academy.

Paul Moss: Were you including that when you said you don't recall any...

Vanessa Miller: I haven't lateralled anybody. I have lost people for other reasons.

Roy Buskirk: You have lost two.

Vanessa Miller: I have lost two. It was brought up that part of it is the caliber of people that we bring in. A couple of people that we lost were lost during the probationary period. That is finding out if we are a good fit or not. That is our tool to make sure that they are going to be an officer that we want to keep or if they want to be with us. We lost two in a year's period of time.

Cal Miller: To Councilman Vogt's point, what does that mean in the grand scheme of things? How does that compare to any Sheriff's Department across the State of

Indiana? Is that a number that should be of concern and is that number out of the ordinary? That is why it is difficult for us to focus on your personal experience without knowing whether that is to be expected in any Sheriff's Department across the State of Indiana. Without that background to consider your loss experience, then how in the world can we assess that is significant in any way?

Vanessa Miller: We put in a lot of money. When you go into law enforcement, then that is your career. We put a lot of money into that person on the first day that he starts. To waste all of that money and let someone go later, that is what we are trying to explain. If we are paying them more, we are not going to lose them. It is expensive to train these people.

Roy Buskirk: Everybody has training costs. When you actually look at the numbers, in 2006 you had two that resigned. That is 1.3%. You had two that were fired and they were trained too. When you compare with the DLGF figures, the Sheriff's wages in the surrounding counties, they are below what Allen County starts at. There is no way that Allen County is going to be able to compete with what the Fort Wayne Police Department is paid. That is something that we just have to accept. We have many other personnel in the County employment that in the City gets paid more. Our leader here has said that the County budget is a lot more efficient than what City government is. When you look at all of the figures, I agree that there needs to be some adjustment so that it is closer. That is why I proposed the 6% added to the 2.5%. This is one reason why I was behind the confinement officers getting a tremendous increase this year. When you look at the numbers in the confinement, you had 14.8% turnover. There was an area that had a problem and I think the Personnel Committee and the Council has addressed that. Also, you have a one year probation period for confinement officers before they can become a sworn officer.

Patt Kite: That has nothing to do with it.

Win Rood: Confinement officers are a separate entity. We have a one year probationary period once we hire an active duty officer and he has been through the academy.

Roy Buskirk: Aren't most of the people required to be a confinement officer before they can be an officer?

Win Rood: That used to be more the case than it is now. There are some sworn officers in the jail but the bulk of the confinement officers are civilians.

Vanessa Miller: The confinement officer is not the first step into becoming a police officer. It is totally separate. We do assign police officers to the jail and that is normally in the very beginning stages.

Roy Buskirk: On the tech pay, there are many people in the County who have special training for their job and to my knowledge, are there other departments that get pay for other than education?

Lisa Blosser: The assessors.

Jackie Scheuman: The assessors and the probation officers. The probation officers get paid for a master's degree.

Roy Buskirk: Right.

Lisa Blosser: For the assessors, it is a certification.

Roy Buskirk: I think the tech pay issue can be outside of this but I make a motion that we give the sworn officers a 6% pay increase in addition to the 2.5% that the countywide employees are receiving.

Win Rood: I am going to leave now but I can tell you that in the thirty years, I have seen a lot of changes.

Roy Buskirk: The other thing is too that more and more youth are having records than what there were thirty years ago. That is one of the other requirements that you don't have a record when you apply. There can be a lot of things.

Paul Moss: We have a motion on the floor. I want to make the comment that this is a good conversation and there are a lot of variables to this. One of the variables that I would like to interject again is that I feel like former Mayor Lebamoff did a real disservice to the City when he signed some executive orders, on his last day, for collective bargaining for the City. I think that history shows that the cost as a result of that has gone up dramatically over the years. I may have a different perspective on this because of the industry that I am in and the challenges that we face but I think this is an issue that needs to be addressed. I think that the 2.5% plus 6% is not sufficient enough and would like to see that move up. There is a motion of the floor and I haven't heard a second as of yet.

Cal Miller: Let me interject that I will not support any motion for any increase until there is a discussion about the health benefit component of the pay. I want to have that discussion before we have any motion.

Patt Kite: Something that may throw a monkey wrench into that is that open enrollment has occurred.

Cal Miller: November 2nd is the deadline.

Patt Kite: Yes, but the plans have already been presented to the officers.

Paul Moss: It would be difficult, knowing how benefit plans work, to make an adjustment now. Next year could be a possibility.

Patt Kite: For next year, I can see it but for now, no.

Cal Miller: I am just saying that until we have the discussion, I am not supporting motions for increases.

Roy Buskirk: You can go ahead and ask for a second.

Paul Moss: Let's hold on. Councilwoman Johnson has something to say.

Maye Johnson: I am inclined to second the motion. I think the 6% in connection with the 2.5% is fair. I have heard the arguments with bringing this into alignment with the City. That same argument could be made for various other departments within the County as well. We have limited funds and they are talking about increasing efficiencies. I think people leave for a variety of reasons. I heard Sheriff Fries talk about his reasons for staying and he made a convincing argument. There are people that want to work for the County instead of the City and I am comfortable with the 6%. I am concerned about the health benefits also.

Paul Moss: Councilman Vogt?

Darren Vogt: I would prefer to let this motion die for a lack of a second.

Maye Johnson: I just seconded it.

Darren Vogt: Okay. I will not support this right now but will support a potential motion after we have the discussion about the benefits. I think there are options that we could do with the same scenario that we did with red-lining. To the point that Councilwoman Kite made, the benefits are out there and we are going to impact them so let's give them a year to do that. I won't support it until we have the discussion though.

Paul Moss: **We have a motion and a second, any further discussion? All in favor please signify by saying aye (Buskirk & Johnson). All opposed same sign Moss, Vogt, Miller & Kite). That motion does not carry.** What additional discussion would you like to have, Councilman Miller, about the health benefits?

Cal Miller: I think this is the appropriate time to discuss and consider whether the sworn officers' health insurance benefits, while we are making upward adjustments in pay, should be equalized or the same as the other County employees. If we do increase the pay, I think in all fairness to the officers, if we take the insurance benefits out now, there should be some accommodation for doing so as a part of the percentage increase that we would consider for them. I am not suggesting that we strip it from them without replacing it with a percentage point that would carry

forward and pay it into the future. I believe that as health care costs get more expensive, that benefit becomes more valuable and makes it more difficult for the Council to make a comparison. To be fairer to the other employees in the County, if we are going to consider having them pay like the other employees, this would be the time to do it. At the same time, we would acknowledge that the 6% increase wouldn't be a 6% increase because they would be paying for benefits. I am in favor of getting the sworn officers on the same health insurance program as the rest of the County but I do want to fund that by virtue of an additional percentage point increase. I am in favor of a 7% increase across the board on top of the 2.5%. That additional percent increase funds the health insurance to a large extent.

Paul Moss: A couple of comments on that. As a point of clarification, I am not sure we have much control over their benefit plan.

Jackie Scheuman: The plans are not different, just the cost is.

Paul Moss: My point is, can we as the Council, make adjustments to the employee contribution? It would seem to me that it would be a Commissioners responsibility but I could be way off base.

Cal Miller: My response to that is that I believe since we wrote the salary ordinances, I believe we can make that decision.

Paul Moss: I am willing to make the assumption that this is correct. The other issue that I am concerned about is that I don't know what the actual offset would be. I don't know if one percent across the board increase will offset the benefit associated with the plan that you are talking about.

Cal Miller: Let's break this down a little further then. What is interesting about this is that one of the reasons why the sworn officers have the one dollar for health insurance benefits is because it was in lieu of a pay increase and because they are putting their butts out there like no one else is in this County. That is why I want part of the increase to fund that. With respect to them putting their butts out there, when you look at the choices of options for insurance, I don't know if it can be addressed individually. For some, that additional one percent is probably going to be more money than they need to offset and for others, it may not be enough to cover. I don't know how to address that other than just to add an additional percentage point.

Paul Moss: Councilman Vogt?

Darren Vogt: One of the things that you just hit on was putting people's lives on the line of fire. Councilman Buskirk mentioned the tech pay and how other County employees do or do not get that. I clearly see the need to encourage someone who is willing to go in and deal with a bomb, for example, and attempt to diffuse this. I will support the 7% and the benefits but I also want to put in there that the technical pay will be an additional increase on top of that. This is for people who are going above

and beyond the call of being an officer. They are at a level where they are going to be doing something a little more technical and more involved than they really have to do. This is their way of getting more money just as a department has someone moving within the department to get more money. If they can do that training, they need to be rewarded for it because it is a jeopardy to them. I agree with the concept of the 7% and let's include the tech pay and get this issue over and done with.

Roy Buskirk: The reason I said about going to the tech pay is that some of them, such as being trained to give a breathalyzer test, puts the officer in any more danger. That is what I was thinking as far as training.

Darren Vogt: I asked that same question. It is not that simple. When it comes to the breathalyzer, there is more explanation to that and I will leave it at that. It has to do with standing up in court and being able to operate the machine and getting the right tests. Then, if we get someone in jail, we are not being sued for false arrest.

Roy Buskirk: I understand about the calibration and all of that, but to me it is just part of the training.

Darren Vogt: If you look at the number of officers, not every officer has that.

Roy Buskirk: I was surprised by that.

Paul Moss: There have been several points made here and I am still conflicted about the health insurance piece and how much of an offset that is. I am not sure how to get my arms around it.

Cal Miller: Here are some numbers that the Auditor put together.

Paul Moss: Does the Chief have anything that he would like to say?

Dave Gladieux: Dave Gladieux, Chief Deputy of the Sheriff's Department. Councilman Miller brought up a good point about how all of this came about. The only thing that was talked about was that we got the dollar a year for insurance. You didn't talk about the raise. You want to make it up by giving a percentage. That isn't going to make it up. If you do the math, throughout the years, the savings to the County had by not giving a raise, far outweighs one percent.

Cal Miller: This Council, for sake of argument, would otherwise give a 6% raise. I am saying that we should make it 7% and reduce the one dollar a year health insurance. How is it different to you at all?

Dave Gladieux: You are saying that we should give up the discounted insurance rate and go with the same as the other County employees, correct?

Cal Miller: Yes. For sake of argument, the sworn deputies are going to get 6% and this Council says let's do 7%. That is if we put the sworn deputies on the same health insurance as the rest of the County. All of the officers that choose healthcare plan one and two, the one percent pays for it all. Those that choose three, that one percent probably pays for 75% of it. Okay?

Dave Gladioux: Okay.

Cal Miller: So maybe this Council needs to address how we make the folks that choose three more whole. I really don't understand your point.

Roy Buskirk: We have some officers that don't even have the County health insurance.

Darren Vogt: There is no clear way to do it other than to do it. We have to set a point and say that we are going to do it. We have to make a decision on the here and the now and what is the best decision to go forward with.

Cal Miller: I do want to understand your point. What is the difference between 6% with or 7% without?

Dave Gladioux: Let me step out of that for a second. I look at the big scheme of things and how far the County has gone with this big savings. You go year after year and that dollar amount just gets bigger and bigger. The difference between the City and the County pay is expanding every year, throughout those years.

Cal Miller: So are you advocating for a higher percentage? Your argument has nothing to do with healthcare.

Dave Gladioux: What I see is if you did away with the dollar a year, which I have no problem with, it would be nice to be just a little more than one percent.

Cal Miller: Okay now we are on the same page. My first acknowledgement was that this is going to cover everybody and perhaps Council ought to rethink what the percentage should be. You are just talking about a higher percentage and not talking about taking it away. You don't mind it being taken away as long as it is replaced with some form of percentage.

Roy Buskirk: The one thing also is that there was really no savings to the County. The County is self-insured and was still paying for the medical claims.

Dave Gladioux: I was talking about the percentage in pay that was given up years ago.

Darren Vogt: That is why I said we have to make a decision here and going forward. If we include the tech pay, a lot of the officers are going to get tech pay.

Jackie Scheuman: 2.9% to 3% is the for the largest amount.

Vanessa Miller: If you take someone in the dollar category and they are doing the self plus one, they are paying a dollar but the benefit is \$41.66 per pay. So \$41.66 per pay over 24 pays, it would be about 2.9% to make up for that.

Darren Vogt: What pay did you figure that on?

Vanessa Miller: Just the base probationary officer pay.

Roy Buskirk: That is not right. You're cheating.

Darren Vogt: But an officer that is earning \$50,000, the one percent is more.

Cal Miller: Let me add another factor to your analysis. If this Council were to approve a 7% increase and eliminate the healthcare benefits, we would now find ourselves almost identically situated with the City of Fort Wayne given the difference in pay that you outlined here. Those new officers looking at the City will find that the health insurance options are the same. What we have done, if you want to take those people in mind, is equalize the playing field completely with the probationary officer and first year officer. They both have to pay and they are getting equal pay. The higher pay corresponds to the higher rank. The one percent that would be given to accommodate for healthcare cost is getting applied to a much higher figure than in the first year.

Vanessa Miller: Okay.

Darren Vogt: Council, at this point, I would be willing to make a motion for the 7% in addition to the 2.5%, the removal of the current healthcare benefit they receive to be effective January 1, 2009 and include the technical pay that is outlined by the Sheriff's Office.

Patt Kite: I will second that.

Paul Moss: So essentially it is 9.5% with no change for this year and gives people time to adjust.

Darren Vogt: It is the same thing that we did when we red-lined the folks and gave them until January 1, 2009 to adjust.

Paul Moss: **We have a motion and a second, any further discussion?** Councilman Buskirk?

Roy Buskirk: I think that the problem is going to be in the math and I would have preferred that it would have been worded that it was a 6% pay increase and the

additional one percent would be given at the time the insurance was adjusted, either this year or next year.

Paul Moss: Number one, it can't be done this year and number two, I won't support that. I say do the 7% plus the 2.5% now and deal with the insurance piece in 2009. There is a motion on the floor and you are trying to amend the motion.

Roy Buskirk: Then they would lose one percent in 2009 because they would have to pay for their insurance.

Darren Vogt: In theory.

Paul Moss: We have a motion and a second. Does everyone understand the motion? The motion was the 2.5% was already approved and an additional 7% for sworn officers and the one dollar insurance benefit will be eliminated on January 1, 2009.

Cal Miller: And the tech pay.

Paul Moss: And there is the tech pay as requested by the Sheriff's Department. All in favor please signify by saying aye. All opposed same sign. The motion carries 6-0-1 (Hughes).

Jackie Scheuman: I have a clarification question. Do you want to fund this from the \$900,000 that is left in the Council's salary?

Paul Moss: No, the discussion was within their budget, this should be something that they will deal with.

Jackie Scheuman: So you are not funding the 7% or the tech pay.

Tera Klutz: Does the tech pay include the educational bonus?

Paul Moss: In my mind, it did.

Roy Buskirk: In everybody's mind, it was included.

Vanessa Miller: There is one other issue I needed to bring up. When the step increase changed, that it happens on their anniversary date, that excluded the sworn officers because they are full-time Merit employees. We are still operating under the resolution of May 23, 1996 where officers get their step increase or longevity pay on January 1st following their anniversary date. We would like to get that changed and in alignment with regular County employees.

Darren Vogt: This was not their doing whatsoever. I stuck my nose in it and I told them to bring this to us.

Lisa Blosser: The Sheriff's Department receives a step increase every three years. They receive the increase more often, but with the change they would be the same as the rest of the County.

Cal Miller: That is fine with me.

Paul Moss: So what do we need to do to address that?

Darren Vogt: Let's do that at the next Council meeting because there could be some money connected with that. Let's get with the Auditor's Office and figure that out.

Jackie Scheuman: It was a resolution by Council in 1996.

Vanessa Miller: I will email it to you.

Darren Vogt: We need the dollars and cents connected to it.

Vanessa Miller: On behalf of the confinement officers, they thank you very much for their pay raises. They are very happy.

Paul Moss: That is good. They are much deserved. Recent and upcoming meetings, there is a Personnel meeting coming up on the 29th at 3:00. I don't have any recent meetings that I have to report on.

Darren Vogt: The Tax Adjustment Board has been meeting and we are meeting next week, Monday and Tuesday, and if anyone is so inclined to come and listen, please do so.

Paul Moss: I am sure that will be riveting.

Roy Buskirk: There is one other meeting that I would like to mention. This evening there is a Fort-to-Port meeting at Woodlan High School. Originally the road was designed with interchanges at four different sites and then it was eliminated because of cost. The Feds asked the State to take a second review and the State has come up with a bridge, at one site, that will accommodate buggies. That is so the Amish will be able to cross the four-lane highway on a bridge that can also accommodate wagons. It will not be wide enough to accommodate cars.

Darren Vogt: I move to approve to waive the second reading on any matter approved today for which it may be deemed necessary for the County Council meeting of October 18, 2007.

Roy Buskirk: Second.

Paul Moss: We have a motion and a second. Is there any further discussion? All in favor signify by saying aye. All opposed same sign. The motion carries 6-0-1 (Hughes).

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 6-0-1 (Hughes). The next meeting will be held on November 13, 2007 at 8:30 am.

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 11:20 am.