

**ALLEN COUNTY COUNCIL
MEETING MINUTES
NOVEMBER 13, 2007
8:30 AM**

The Allen County Council met on Thursday, November 13, 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; Paula S. Hughes, Maye L. Johnson, Darren E. Vogt and Paulette Kite.

Also Attending: Tera Klutz, Chief Deputy; Jackie Scheuman, Finance Manager; Bill Brown, 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:

Darren Vogt made a motion to approve the minutes of October 18, 2007. Roy Buskirk seconded. Motion carried. (Miller absent)

FINANCIAL REPORT:

Jackie Scheuman: The amount currently available for appropriation in the General Fund is \$10,471,136. The amount before you today is \$10,267,444. This includes Auditor recommendations for appropriation and the Rainy Day Fund transfer. Departmental requests are \$2,102,064 for today.

Paul Moss: Are there any questions for Jackie on the financial report?

Darren Vogt: I just have one. Jackie, do you notice any of the taxes that we do collect that look like they may not come in under the estimate for 2007? Some of them are one-time lump sums.

Jackie Scheuman: Other than the riverboat, we have gotten the full amount of that. That came in at 95%. The rest, I believe, we on track.

Darren Vogt: Okay.

Roy Buskirk: For the year, we are over.

Jackie Scheuman: Correct, we are already over 100%. Anything we collect in November and December will be rollover and available in January.

Paul Moss: Councilwoman Hughes, did you have a question?

Paula Hughes: I wanted to point out that one of the conversations that we always have, at budget time, is the funding of items for NIRCC and if you will notice, the percent collected this year exceeds 100%.

Paul Moss: Any other questions?

Darren Vogt: Move for approval of the financial report.

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 (Miller). Economic development, Ashley?

Ashley Steenman: Ashley Steenman, Allen County Department of Planning. Today, we have a public hearing and consideration of a Confirmatory Resolution for Press-Seal Gasket. We were here last month, explaining that we have to go through the whole two-step process as they are located within the City of Fort Wayne. They are located at 2424 West State Boulevard and are investing \$480,000 in new manufacturing and information technology equipment. The company has been doing business since 1954. They manufacture rubber products that are designed to seal underground collection systems and functions to protect our clean water. They employ 97 people right now and will create about five new positions. They are eligible for a five-year abatement for personal property taxes. I have James Skinner and Rob Young here to tell you a little bit more and I can answer any questions that you may have.

Paul Moss: Council, are there any questions on this? I have one, if I may. In looking at the taxes paid, comparing 2005 payable in 2006 and 2006 payable in 2007, it appears that they paid considerably more taxes. Can I assume that this is because of the reassessment?

Ashley Steenman: Do you mean in real property or personal property?

Paul Moss: On the real property, \$77,000 in 2006 and then \$90,000.

Ashley Steenman: It is probably in part of the reassessment and also when their tax statement is rolling down closer to the full amount that they should be paying. That is why they pay more every year.

Paul Moss: So, is it a combination of the two?

Ashley Steenman : Yes, a combination.

Roy Buskirk: This shows of a company that has continued growth in the community and has provided excellent jobs. We appreciate what they are doing.

Paul Moss: Welcome.

James Skinner: Morning, I am James Skinner, President of Press-Seal Gasket.

Rob Young: Rob Young with the Fort Wayne Allen County Development Alliance. Part of the answer to your question, Councilman Moss, is that this would have been the first full year of taxation under the massive improvements that Jim and his team have made to the former Dana Tech Center building. I am sure that you are aware of the property and Jim's operation is in the back. We are also proud to host the U.S. headquarters of a new Centinell Wireless in the front of that building which was facilitated by Jim's acquisition and repositioning that property. It has been a tremendous project from that standpoint let alone Jim's continued reinvestment. There have been some pretty tough times in his industry and some of his competitors are down about 40% because the majority of this product goes into home building developments and we all know that this is in the low cycle right now. Great project and great reinvestment and we, at the Alliance, believe that this abatement is very appropriate.

Paul Moss: I don't argue that. I was just trying to get at if the property hasn't changed, I was curious if you were feeling the pain that everybody else is feeling in that regard.

James Skinner: Basically, we have continued to develop that property and what that is is the first full year of taxation at 2424 West State. There is a substantial investment that we put ourselves and Centennial in with 183,000 square feet that we combined jointly. We have consolidated some operations back to Fort Wayne from other locations. We are aggressively going into new markets and other industries. The markets that we can approach with our existing equipment and some new equipment, will allow us to expand and keep our employment numbers up and also diversify ourselves.

Paul Moss: Your willingness to continue to take risks is greatly appreciated.

Paula Hughes: And to invest in Fort Wayne and Allen County. Move for approval of the Confirmatory Resolution approving the designation of certain real estate in Section 33 of Washington Township as an economic revitalization area for Press-Seal Gasket.

Roy Buskirk: 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 (Miller). Thank you very much. We are going to make one quick adjustment here.

This shouldn't take very long but we are going to move the Sheriff's discussion on the pension plan compliance.

Elaine Beaty: Elaine Beaty from McCready and Keene. We are the actuarial firm that provides services to retirement funding to the Sheriff and the deputies. Thank you for making the adjustment to the schedule for this. Last month, as you recall, Mr. Feighner and I was here to present an amendment to the plan that included some technical changes that were required as a result of some federal and state legislation compliance issues. At that time, the Council's position was to table it for a month and have an opportunity to review the material and ask any questions. We were asked to return this month to ask for your official motion to be made and approval of the amendment. I did forward a letter that summarized the content of the amendment and I hope you received a version of that.

Roy Buskirk: Yes we did.

Elaine Beaty: I did speak with one Councilman about some questions that he had regarding the issues and I am here now to answer any additional questions that you may have.

Paul Moss: I think everybody had an opportunity to review that information and I am comfortable with it. If anybody has any questions, we would be happy to entertain them.

Elaine Beaty: On behalf of the plan and the department, we are asking that it be in a motion to approve it and as a result of that, there are some signatures that are required.

Paul Moss: Do we all sign it or do I sign it?

Elaine Beaty: Just one, you as the Council President, is appropriate. It states that what you are signing has been approved at an official meeting of the Council and you are signing on behalf of the Council.

Paul Moss: Would somebody like to offer a motion?

Roy Buskirk: I make a motion that the Allen County Police Department Pension Plan-Technical Compliance Amendment for the IRS be approved.

Darren Vogt: Second that motion.

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 (Miller). Thank you. We are going to go into the appropriations and the first one is Data Processing.

Ed Steenman: Ed Steenman, County IT Director. Item one has to do with a discussion that I had with you back in March. I described a project that both the City and the County have undertaken to replace old and outdated servers and the old email system with new servers and new email. At that time, I described that the process of migrating each and every user was going to be lengthy and that we would need additional resources to make that migration happen. I have been paying those resources out of my budget and have come up short in one of the line items because of paying those resources. I did that because I didn't know what the exact amount was going to be and didn't want to ask for a fictitious number. I am asking for an additional appropriation of \$67,798 to pay for the remainder of year for those resources.

Paula Hughes: As a reminder, this is the route that we told Mr. Steenman to take. We told him that we were supportive of hiring extra resources to expedite the process and we told him to wait until he knew a more exact amount.

Ed Steenman: We are nearing the end of that migration and fully expect that by shortly into January, we should be complete.

Paul Moss: Are there any other questions from Council?

Darren Vogt: Do we want to do all of them separately?

Paula Hughes: Yes.

Darren Vogt: Move to approve item one, contractual for \$67,798.

Paula Hughes: 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 (Miller).**

Paula Hughes: The next two items were discussed in the April meeting and we earmarked funds for these two projects. We advised Mr. Steenman and the technical staff to move forward with getting bids and proposals for these projects. He has done so on both of these and is now reporting back to us with the request for appropriation.

Ed Steenman: Item two is for the replacement of the current Public Safety server. This server was purchased in 2002 and was upgraded in 2004. The package that I just handed to you has a graph on the front page that shows the load on the current system. The blue line is a distinct portion of the day where you can see that the load exceeds sixty. The yellow line, at one, is the vendor's recommendation. We, almost 100% of the time, are over the vendor's recommendation for the load on the system. The users are sending numerous complaints to the Help Desk about it being slow or

unavailable. This is the server that serves all of the Public Safety agencies throughout the City and the County.

Roy Buskirk: You made reference to the number sixty and the top line on the graph is sixty and it doesn't even go up to that line.

Ed Steenman: This particular set of times didn't reach sixty but it has reached sixty but this timeframe didn't show worse-case scenario.

Paul Moss: Those of us who aren't as computer literate as Roy, what do you mean by load? I assume it refers to people getting into a database or something along that line.

Ed Steenman: The load is a function of how many users are on the system, what they are doing and how much CPU processing is going on. The more users you have on the system, the higher the load. They are accessing the database or the dispatchers are logging calls, officers are checking warrants, all of those processes add to the load. If you look at the chart on the second page, it shows that the overall number of users, at times, reaches almost 600. Back when this server was purchased, that number of users was more in the 200 range. We have grown quite extensively since this server was installed. That is why there was an upgrade in 2004 to try to address that. We have now outgrown that. The server that we are putting in place, with this project, is a server that is much more expandable than any server that IBM has offered in the past. We are putting in a starter system but it has the ability to add additional processors and memory and additional storage space. The new platform allows for greater expansion.

Darren Vogt: That is what my question is. In the future, when we see these tech requests for some potential expansion, it won't be to the extent of cost that this would be. Is that a correct statement?

Ed Steenman: Correct.

Darren Vogt: If you were to take this chart that is on the first page and put it into where we are going forward, I assume we will never get all the way there when there are spikes, where is that yellow line going to move us?

Ed Steenman: The yellow line will remain at one. That is the vendor's recommendation. The anticipation is that the blue line will be reduced dramatically and will, at times, be below one.

Paul Moss: From 12:00 a.m. to 6:00 a.m., if I am reading this correctly, there is still a significant amount of activity. Who is here and what are they doing to create that activity?

Ed Steenman: Those are the officers on the street and dispatchers.

Paul Moss: So that is supported in this?

Ed Steenman: Yes.

Paul Moss: You mean in terms of the laptops in vehicles tap into that?

Ed Steenman: Yes.

Paul Moss: Does this also support the email system?

Ed Steenman: This doesn't have anything to do with that. This is strictly the Public Safety server. We did a significant software upgrade recently and that is what brought this to a head. We saw a more pronounced load on the system after that upgrade. We have been anticipating this for a couple of years and this has been outlined in my strategic plan for the last couple of years.

Roy Buskirk: Is this both the City and County? This is the 911?

Ed Steenman: Yes.

Paula Hughes: What is the history that the County is picking up the tab?

Ed Steenman: The City does pay the County \$255,000 a year for computer resources.

Paul Moss: Are there any other questions on items two and three?

Paula Hughes: No that is just item two. Move for approval of item two, office and computer equipment, in the amount of \$499,728.

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 (Miller).**

Ed Steenman: Thank you. For item three, I brought some friends with me.

Kim Bowman: Good morning, I am Kim Bowman, Executive Director of Planning Services. With me today, as a general background, is a variety of City and County staff and department heads as well as some members from the private building industry. They are here to show their support of this project.

For the record, the following people appeared and introduced themselves:

Dave Fuller, Building Commissioner for Allen County

Mindy Waldron, Administrator for the Department of Health

Clifford Clarke, Chief Information Officer for the City of Fort Wayne

Tony Burrus, Allen County Safety and Environmental
John Caywood, Neighborhood Code Enforcement
Phil Pease, County IT Project Manager
Chad Delagrang, member of the Homebuilders Association
John Urbahns, Director of Community Development for the City
Ed Roussel, Community Development, Land Use Management for the City
Rick Orr, Director of Transportation representing Public Works of Fort
Wayne
Chuck Dehnert, Associated Builders and Contractors

Kim Bowman: Thank you for your time today. We have what we feel is a very exciting project. But first, I would like to start with a riddle. What has over 990 steps and travels over 150 miles a year?

Darren Vogt: The permitting process.

Kim Bowman: Exactly! The permitting process hasn't changed since County Plan started in 1960. It is a totally paper-driven process where on a daily basis I have a staff person, as well as the City, who hand carries permits over to the Building Department. Being a planner and not an efficiency expert, we did figure out that there is a better way to do this. Initially, in discussions with the Building Department, Health Department, Safety and Environmental, we started discussing the possibility of us being linked together. Mindy is going to talk about a favorite project of ours and there really is an overlap of a lot of the County departments. We started working on the project and guess what? We have a lot of overlap with City departments too. Routings will go to some City offices and County offices as well as places outside of this building. We put our heads together and on a very tight timeframe, we developed a committee in support of the Consolidated Enforcement platform. What this is will link City and County, our departments as well as our clients, the home builders, restaurant agents that are looking for permits and the public who might have a complaint about a property. This will provide not only your offices but the City offices and the public, a faster and more efficient manner to communicate, check on projects, to check on permits and to check on complaints. This is a legacy project and you have heard me say this before. This is the beginning of the way Allen County, Fort Wayne and the public will be doing business. With the approval of this \$1.5 million, this will allow us to continue forward with a consultant that we have all selected. We have all worked together in selecting the consultant that can provide all of our needs. A phase pattern so that we are not trying to accomplish the impossible in a very short period of time. I would like to add that we have accomplished a lot since September, to the credit of all of the partners that introduced themselves. Keep in mind that this will change things for decades. With that, I think Dave is going to talk a little bit about his part of this.

Dave Fuller: This is why we need something in the computer instead of this. We have been meeting for about a year and a half among the four County departments that Kim mentioned. It started out of a need to get together to try and figure out a

more efficient way to handle complaints. We were finding that the people in the community were calling us and filing a complaint with the Building Department and then calling the Board of Health and filing a complaint. It would be the same address and the same complaint. Independently, we had all sent someone out to look at it. We started getting together and discussing those and communicating more by email in trying to resolve some of that. That is what prompted looking for some kind of database system to handle complaints. Then we would know what each other was doing. As we got into that, we realized the City departments were also involved. We deal routinely with Neighborhood Code Enforcement at the Building Department. It is not unusual for them to condemn a structure because it is unsound and for us, a week later, to issue a building permit for them to repair something that has been set for demolition. There needs to be a better system with communication. That is kind of what brought us to this point and then we expanded that to City departments also. We felt that was necessary because the Department of Health and the Building Department have been combined for forty years. We are dealing with both equally. It was necessary for us to improve that communication system. This project that Mindy is going to talk about is the first large project after we started meeting and we realized the benefit of communicating and working together. A lot of things that we enforce, the enforcement activity, are spread between different departments and we didn't even know for sure what the ordinances were for the other departments. Part of this has been improved dramatically but it is going to continue to improve with this database. Now Mindy will talk about this particular project.

Mindy Waldron: We thought it would be important to show you an example of how we actually collaborated and what the electronic version of this might be. About a year ago, we started working together monthly on looking at the complaints and how we could work together to eliminate the problem. Usually these are trash issues or large residential problems. This particular instance is the culmination of about 66 hours of us individually going out, working with other departments to see what we could do. Alone, we weren't able to do a whole heck of a lot because our ordinances are very fragmented. When we worked together, probably in a week or so, we had a situation that you can see in these pictures. These are flyovers from 2003 and 2006 of a particular property in northwest Allen County where there were many shanties and a lot of animals. When we went out, by way of getting an inspection warrant, we were working together and within a week, this is what it looks like now. If we would have been able to see that, by way of a complaint coming in to all four departments, we would have been able to go out at the same time and it wouldn't have taken years to clean this up. This is just one example but we meet monthly with similar ones. If we had this database, we would be able to see these and know who to send out. The efficiency would be, if we had a swimming pool type complaint, the Building Department and our department does similar things. We don't both have to go out. We could save that way, as well. This is one example of how we could see it versus getting together and going out. That is kind of the reason for exploring this. Ed and Phil are going to explain what we did once we decided to go further with the City and the County's platform.

Ed Steenman: After the County departments established the requirements of what we needed to do and we saw the need to partner with the City, we gathered the entire group of departments around the table and started discussing this. One of the first outcomes that was made was a memorandum of understanding between the City and the County to move forward with a Consolidated Enforcement platform that met the needs of both City and County. After putting that in place, we published an RFP that went out to anybody that was interested and received four responses. Two of those responses were very high priced. One response was from a software company who really doesn't work in our size of jurisdiction. The fourth response was from the vendor that we have selected. That vendor gave us a demonstration last week and did a very good job. In the packet, you have a signoff from just about all of the department heads who are members of the steering committee. The steering committee consists of City and County department heads. The cost for that platform is \$1,519,538. Also included in that package is the budget estimate for this project. It includes not only the software but also the hardware necessary to run it on. I will answer any questions that you might have.

Paula Hughes: We have talked but you haven't mentioned, in front of the Council, whether we would put the money in an escrow account and pay it out over three years and have five years of the maintenance fees covered. Wasn't that an option?

Ed Steenman: Yes, we do have an option from this company to make use of a purchase agreement that allows us to lock in our maintenance fee for five years. Basically what we do is to put the entire amount into escrow and they draw an annual payment from this escrow. For that investment, we lock in our software maintenance cost. For years four and five, we have no cost at all. I had the Auditor's Office examine this and they were okay with it but wanted legal to review the terms and make sure it is okay. That has not been done yet but it will be Commissioners' approval that would set that in place.

Roy Buskirk: This total amount is to be paid over a three year period?

Paula Hughes: We would pay it up front and they would draw it down over a three-year period. We would put it into an escrow account that is established.

Ed Steenman: They establish an escrow account that they estimate interest to be 4.5% and that interest would be our interest. I don't know the details of this since I am not a financial person. We would gain the cost savings of the interest in addition to the cost savings of the fixed amount for maintenance for five years.

Paul Moss: And there is no additional cost over the first three years, correct?

Paula Hughes: Over the first five years.

Roy Buskirk: We would hold the escrow account?

Ed Steenman: My understanding is that the escrow account is something of their choosing. Is that right, Tera?

Tera Klutz: It is there bank account but it is in our name. Money would only be released upon approval from us.

Darren Vogt: Then we are keeping the interest or they are keeping it to cover the cost of year four and five on the maintenance?

Tera Klutz: We get to keep the interest in the account and we are the name holder on the account. I am not sure what options we have as far as what bank and what type of investment. I was unsure of what kind of interest rate we could get if didn't have control.

Roy Buskirk: So, instead of giving a discounted rate, we would just be receiving the interest on it.

Tera Klutz: Right. With their formula, they are estimating 4.5% would be our interest rate of return. It's not bad but it is not the best.

Darren Vogt: Who is risking the principle, us or them?

Tera Klutz: I don't think it would be a risk.

Darren Vogt: A fixed account.

Tera Klutz: Yes.

Paula Hughes: It is actually a much better situation than a lot of other software vendor agreements that Allen County has entered into. We have a lot of agreements that we have entered into a contract and are obligated to fund projects and whether they come out satisfactorily or not. I know of a couple of pending lawsuits coming because of disagreement between Allen County and vendors of how software is implemented and how vendors perform for us. I think we should talk about the process as a whole because this is just a financing mechanism and is much better than anything we have been offered from the other vendor. It is a definite advantage to us. Other situations would require us to enter into a contract and then make payments throughout time. This would be implemented within a year, right?

Ed Steenman: That is the estimate that the County would be able to implement within the next year.

Paula Hughes: If it were a standard type of contract, we would have to pay out the entire amount in the first year. This gives us more flexibility and interest on the funds.

Darren Vogt: So they are going to install the stuff and then not receive their money for three years?

Paula Hughes: No, they will draw it down over time.

Darren Vogt: If they are going to install it within a year, they will receive those funds once the job is complete, correct?

Ed Steenman: They are going to get one-third at inception, one-third after the first year and one-third after the second year.

Paul Moss: It is like building a new house.

Roy Buskirk: So, they are installing all of the equipment and not receiving payment for it. I think that is what Darren is talking about.

Darren Vogt: Yes. So they are willing to delay payment. What contingencies are in place in the contract that if it doesn't work, what happens?

Ed Steenman: We haven't signed a contract yet. The contract negotiations, we have to put clauses in there to insure that we are safe if they do fail.

Paul Moss: Who will lead those discussions?

Ed Steenman: Phil and I and Bill Fishering.

Darren Vogt: Will you set a functional standard or what parameters will you put in order to hold the funds if it doesn't work?

Ed Steenman: In part of the RFP, we specified from each department, the requirements that the system must meet. They have responded to each of those requirements. The review will be down that same list. If they have met each of those things, they have done well. If they haven't, then they will have to or they fail.

Darren Vogt: Okay, great. That is what I was looking for. Ongoing expense to this, what do you see in the future? Where do you see future expense in this operation?

Ed Steenman: The \$1.5 million that we are asking for today is for implementation in the County. As we have said, the MOU puts in place a collaborative effort with the City. Their purchases of their licenses will be borne by the City. Going forward, as we see the need to bring other County departments on, it will be additional licenses that we will need to purchase. Does that answer your question?

Darren Vogt: Yes, thank you. Licenses are a minor part of the overall cost.

Ed Steenman: A large part of this cost is the company that we are contracting with will come in and analyze and insure that their software is configured to do things the way Allen County and the City of Fort Wayne does business. Also, to look at what processes can be enhanced by the way that their software can bring benefits. That review and analysis is a large part of this project. From talking to references that this company has provided, Indianapolis, Cleveland and Oklahoma City, they have done very well at implementing their system.

Paul Moss: Councilman Buskirk?

Roy Buskirk: The licensing on this is over \$400,000 so it isn't a minor portion. This working between the County and the City, what participation is the City doing? Is the City participating on the hardware? I can see that they would be covering their own licensing fees?

Ed Steenman: They don't have funds earmarked or appropriated for this platform yet. Next year they will be purchasing their licensing. They are not financially participating in the hardware because they don't have funds.

Paula Hughes: The County will own the system. The Board of Health and the Building Department are both joint departments. The way we walked through this reminds me of the Shovel Ready Sites. The County is pioneering the path towards improved efficiency and making the improvements on our side. But we are doing this with full participation from the City departments so that when the City is ready to evolve, they will already have gone through the approval process. When we first started down the path, City and County were both going forward but with different software platforms. This is a chance to have full agreement on what software platform is used. When the City is ready to come on board, they have already have said that they agree with this software platform and will use this one.

Phil Pease: To piggyback on that, in terms of overall hardware platform, keep in mind that this project originally started with the Department of Health, Building Department and several other County departments and really didn't include the City departments. As you look at hardware in terms of physical boxes and servers and those types of things, to increase the capacity to allow the City departments to come on board, is a fairly incremental small amount. The bigger costs are in the software licensing and maintenance costs. A large component of the hardware costs facilitates those four core County departments. To add the City would be to add an additional processor to the box. You are not looking at a very large cost there.

Paula Hughes: This is something that we want to do for the County. At the offset, we decided to do it in a way that would welcome the City when they are ready to join. Correct?

Ed Steenman: Correct. This is a project that was discussed at the Council meeting back in March. That was when it was earmarked from a rollover from last year.

Roy Buskirk: I think that in the ongoing discussions, I was looking for Commissioner Peters, with the combining of the Plan Commission and the counterpart with the City, that the cost would be shared on a joint effort. This is another example of where the County is picking up the bulk of the cost. I realize that once you have the basic platform, to add additional capacity is not as great as getting the original platform. It is something that the County needs to look on. Councilwoman Hughes and I were in a meeting last week in which the funding for the bridges is moved to other government agencies throughout the County and away from the County portion and we are being stuck with the expenses. I just wanted to bring up the point that the City's participation on this cost is just with their licensing.

Paula Hughes: This is all going to be based on the County's GIS system. That was another important consideration for us on the County side, that this be done on the levels of quality and the standards that we have already established with that system. That was important to us as we went through the software decision. Part of the issue for the City departments is that they will have to consider the expenses of data conversion when and if they decide to migrate and partner with the County's iMAP system. This is another step in that direction that they would have to enter into an agreement with the County to use the iMAP system to access this software as well.

Paul Moss: I understand the concern about the cost sharing but we need to look at this as objectively as we can. I think it is a project that certainly needs to be completed. From a process standpoint, it has been handled about as well as it possibly could. It clearly has not been done in a vacuum in terms of any one department or anything along that line. I think it is a worthy project and will have a significant impact.

Ed Steenman: It is worth mentioning how much participation there has been between the department heads. At first, the County department heads getting together and determining where this needed to go and then the City department heads as well. These last few months, as we have discussed it, there has been a great deal of participation from the City department heads as well. I don't think we would be where we are today without the help of all of the department heads sitting around the same table at the same time.

Paul Moss: Are there any other questions from Council?

Patt Kite: Just a comment. This Council has encouraged consolidation for as long as I have been around and probably before that. To me, this seems to be the most logical step in consolidation and our internal efficiencies are going to be improved as the first step. I commend all of you for the work that you have done and thank you for bringing this to us.

Paula Hughes: Move for approval of item three, Consolidated Enforcement, for \$1,519,538.

Patt Kite: 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 (Miller).

Round of applause.

Paul Moss: We are moving on to item four. The Commissioners are requesting \$15,000 for unemployment.

Judy Heck: I am Judy Heck, Financial Coordinator for the Allen County Commissioners Office.

Janette Jacquay: I am Janette Jacquay, Personnel Manager for the County.

Judy Heck: We are here to ask for a \$15,000 additional appropriation for unemployment expenses. This is something that we budgeted \$70,000 for and have already spent \$68,000. Hopefully, \$15,000 will bring us to the end of the year.

Paula Hughes: What has changed? This is normally a fairly static budget line. Janette, can you talk about any differences? Or Tera?

Tera Klutz: That is one of the line items in the Commissioners budget that the Auditor projects every year. Workers Comp, self insurance and unemployment and we do a trending and pick an amount. In the last years we have been right around \$70,000 so we went with that and it was a decrease from prior years. That may be the number this year but with only \$2,000 left for November and December we need to put more money in that line item in case it does go above. If we can't pay the bill, we then incur a late fee. It doesn't pay to hold the bill until 2008.

Paul Moss: How many employees are we talking about here?

Janette Jacquay: The number of employees that do collect does fluctuate. Last year, there were approximately fifty ex-employees that did collect.

Paul Moss: Is this for county-wide?

Janette Jacquay: Yes. I protest all of the unemployment cases other than Superior Court and the Prosecutor's Office. We have decreased the total amount that the County used to incur, by about half.

Judy Heck: Let me clarify one thing. The amount that I am asking for is only for the County General portion. Board of Health pays their own. Coliseum pays their own. Highway pays their own.

Darren Vogt: You said that the Judges and the Prosecutor do their own?

Janette Jacquay: Yes they do their own. Historically, Jerry Noble in Superior Court has protested his claims since before I was in this position. Susan Tate, in the Prosecutor's Office, likes to protest their claims. They do fall under a different handbook than what we fall under.

Paul Moss: Are there any other questions on item four?

Darren Vogt: Move for approval of item four, unemployment, for \$15,000.

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 (Miller). Thank you. Highway Fund 250, items five through seven. Mr. Hartman, how are you?

Bill Hartman: Fine and how are you? Good morning, I am Bill Hartman, Allen County Highway Department. These are transfers out of our cash in MDH. Flutter Road is a federal aid project and is currently estimated to be about a \$6 million project. With the monies that we already have in the line item, \$900,000, it should carry the project through to completion. We get reimbursed 20% on our engineering and right-of-way as we do the project. Currently, we have been reimbursed \$400,000. The money is taken out of the line item and goes back into the cash. What we would like to do is work with the Commissioners and set up a fund so that as we get reimbursed, the cash goes into that fund for this particular project. That way, we don't have to come back and re-appropriate the money over and over for the different processes. This is just the first step in that process.

Paul Moss: Any questions?

Darren Vogt: I want to understand what you just said there. We are basically putting the money back into the same project so that you don't have to come back before us to ask for the money that we already have.

Bill Hartman: As we get reimbursed, the regular way that things are set up, the reimbursement goes back in cash and we have to come back as I am now. Once I get this \$900,000 along with whatever else is in the line item, it should equal the 20% that we need at the end of the project. When we go to construction, we have to send the 20% down to INDOT in Indianapolis and they have to bid out the project. In the meantime, we more or less handle the money back and forth between us and the feds through the engineering and right-of-way process.

Darren Vogt: Okay. So it is only engineering and right-of-way. Once the actual construction goes, that money then officially goes to INDOT. Is that only on those federal projects then?

Bill Hartman: Yes sir. Our local projects have no reimbursement, of course.

Darren Vogt: Okay, thank you.

Paul Moss: Councilman Buskirk?

Roy Buskirk: The one thing that I was going to point out is that the 80/20 is based upon the initial engineering estimate of the project and if the bid exceeds that, the County has to pick up the additional.

Bill Hartman: There is the possibility in a federal-aid project, from beginning to end, that it can take seven years. As we all know with the price of oil and everything else, it adds to the cost of everything. We may have to do this by the time we get to construction but we want to have the majority of the money secured and not go through the process over and over again.

Roy Buskirk: One of the things that you mentioned there is that we get reimbursed 20% but we really get reimbursed 80%.

Bill Hartman: Yes, we get reimbursed 80% on the engineering and the right-of-way. That comes close to being the 20% match sometimes.

Roy Buskirk: On Flutter, Coverdale and Gump, I know we aren't doing numbers six and seven at this time but the one question I have is, are there any agreements?

Bill Hartman: There is on Gump Road. There is an interlocal agreement with Huntertown.

Paul Moss: What is the Gump Road project again? Was that redone recently?

Bill Hartman: Yes, that was from Lima Road to Coldwater Road. It was a three-lane project through the city limits of Huntertown and on the north side of the project will be a multiuse trail.

Paul Moss: When is that expected to be complete?

Bill Hartman: We are in the initial stages of design and are probably three years away.

Darren Vogt: That intersection was already designed for that so you will be going on the other side of the school?

Bill Hartman: Yes sir.

Paul Moss: Are there any other questions?

Roy Buskirk: I make a motion that we approve item number five, Flutter Road, for \$900,000.

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 (Miller).

Roy Buskirk: As far as item six and seven, we can do them together.

Paul Moss: Is that a motion?

Roy Buskirk: I don't know if there are any questions.

Paul Moss: Are there any questions?

Roy Buskirk: Okay, I make a motion for approval of items six and seven, Gump Road and Coverdale Road, in the amount of \$1.1 million.

Darren Vogt: I second that motion.

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 (Miller).

Roy Buskirk: As an afterthought on that, what percentage is Hometown paying on the Gump Road project?

Bill Hartman: Probably about 40%.

Paul Moss: All right, items eight and nine.

Bill Hartman: Here again, in LR & S, these are federal aid projects that are in the off-system. These are a little different in that we don't get reimbursed for engineering and design. We get credits towards 10% of the construction. We need to have 10% of the money at the end of the project so we are appropriating these monies towards the engineering and right-of-way. These are off-system funds and the rules are different. Flutter, Gump and Coverdale are on-system and the rules are a little different.

Paul Moss: I may be the only guy in the room that doesn't know what on-system and off-system means.

Bill Hartman: Outside of the urban area on the 2030 transportation plan. On-system is in the urban area and off-system is outside of the urban area.

Roy Buskirk: One thing that you should bring out here concerns the bridge bond and funds for bridges. If you can, go into that a little bit on how many bridges that we were hoping to cover with the bridge bond.

Bill Hartman: So far, we have completed twenty. We are going to get enough interest back on the bond and with a little residual money we are hoping to build one more, 21 out of 29. It was a three-year bond and some of those projects were designed six or seven years ago and the other aspect of it is that we adopted trails into the transportation system and so we needed to widen out several of the bridges to accommodate the trails. That came up in the middle of the design and bonding.

Paula Hughes: As an add-on to that, Councilman Buskirk and I participated in the meeting that Commissioner Peters called. It included Councilman Shoaff and several City staff members. Talked about was the issue of bridges, not major bridges, but the ones smaller than 200 feet. With the changes in the way that our Highway Department is funded, the majority of the funds, Highway Fund, Local Road & Street and Motor Vehicle, shifting with either miles of road or population, our budget has decreased to the point where we can't continue to fund all of these bridges. I have been on record, numerous times, that I don't think the County should continue to blindly fund these bridges. The funds that we were given to make those repairs are now going to other jurisdictions. We have formally put the City of Fort Wayne and Terry McDonald, the Mayor of New Haven, on notice that we are going to cease the funding for the repairs for those bridges in the near future. We want to work out a plan for transferring that responsibility. The County will still have the responsibility of inspecting those bridges but we want to work out, as civil a manner as possible, how we transfer the responsibility of those repairs. Particularly with the property tax and levy issues that are pending before us. If Circuit Breaker goes through, and these bonds are outside of our levy, they will still impact or could impact our General Fund. We are moving forward in those discussions. Bill Fishing did follow through on determining the legalities and it states very clearly that we are not responsible for funding those bridges if we are not receiving the funds.

Roy Buskirk: One other thing that was brought up in that meeting is that it has been estimated in the next ten years that the cost would be \$30 million.

Paula Hughes: For maintenance.

Bill Hartman: For maintenance and rehabilitation.

Paula Hughes: That does not include the expense to build the Maplecrest Road Bridge which is \$41 million at this point.

Paul Moss: Councilman Vogt?

Darren Vogt: Is it the position of the County that we will no longer fund, repair and maintain those bridges? When you say "put them on notice", when is that future date?

Paula Hughes: That has not been determined. The Commissioners are extremely reluctant to set that date. They do not feel that it would be fair to the municipalities to make a firm cutoff date. I am not in agreement with that. I would have done it last year but that is not our call.

Darren Vogt: What is our call is where we spend the highway dollars. Council, I think we need to be very prudent of that and pay attention to that. I would agree that if we are no longer receiving the funds that we used to use to repair those bridges, the timeframe is now. For them not to go into another budget cycle and not understand that, I think we would be doing ourselves a disservice to not notify those that control the financial purse strings of those municipalities.

Paul Moss: I would tend to agree with that. One thing that you need to keep in mind, as well, is that with the transfer of those funds that certain municipalities are doing substantially better as a result. One could argue that money is being spent somewhat frivolously. I would agree that something that needs to move forward very quickly. One thing that would be interesting to see would be the year-by-year anticipated cost would be.

Paula Hughes: That is broken down and one of the engineers in the Highway Department has a whole booklet on it. It would be good to get a copy of that for the Council members. It is broken down by jurisdiction and by year.

Roy Buskirk: It is also broken down by taxing districts. What Councilwoman Hughes brought up is something that we definitely have to keep in mind and that is the fact that the Governor's proposal as far as property taxes is concerned. The total property tax bill would only be able, in this past year, to increase 3.7%. That includes in the levy and outside the levy. In past years, it was what was in the levy. Bonding issues have been outside of the levy. What he has proposed is that it would be all inclusive. We have to be very careful as far as any increase in bonding. That is where we have the control over these bridges and is the only way possible for the Commissioners to pay for them.

Paul Moss: Any other comments or questions?

Darren Vogt: I have one question. Who is paying the bill to repair these? Are they INDOT projects as well?

Bill Hartman: 80% of the construction will come from INDOT. These are federal-aid projects. They are just funded a little differently. We pay for the engineering and right-of-way up front and they give us credit of up to 10% of construction. Once we have taken care of those two things, we should only have to send 10% of the proposal amount to Indianapolis.

Roy Buskirk: This is not repairs, this is new bridges. Right?

Bill Hartman: Dawkins will be a complete new bridge. Monroeville, we will likely use the substructure of the existing bridge and add to it. That is right in front of Heritage High School and so we will widen and add some lanes for traffic control.

Patt Kite: Where is the bridge on Dawkins?

Bill Hartman: That is right at State Line Road.

Darren Vogt: Move for approval of items eight and nine, Dawkins Road Bridge #187 in the amount of \$80,000 and Monroeville Road Bridge #276 in the amount of \$75,000.

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 (Miller). Item ten is the Bostic Road Bridge.

Bill Hartman: We are proposing building a new bridge next to the old bridge and using federal funds. This is similar funding to Dawkins and Monroeville where we get credit up to 10% on construction of this structure.

Roy Buskirk: Bill, you might go into a little bit more detail about retaining the old bridge.

Bill Hartman: Because of the historic significance.

Roy Buskirk: Right, and there will be a ...

Bill Hartman: It will be rehabilitated for multiuse trail purposes.

Roy Buskirk: That cost will be almost as much as the new bridge. It will be about a million dollars on each one of them.

Darren Vogt: Would it be more cost efficient to add to the old bridge?

Paula Hughes: It is historical.

Bill Hartman: When you use federal funds, you go by their rules. State historic preservation weighs in on that and they don't want us to take that bridge down or change its elevation. The last three flooding events we had, came over the top of that bridge, somewhat. That is what led to the deterioration and closure of that bridge. My feels are that if we rehabilitated it, put a million dollars in it and it washes out, where are we? We had proposed dismantling it and putting it in a park somewhere but that didn't suit their needs so they were adamant that they wanted the bridge to stay there. In order to serve the folks in the area, if we rehabilitated it, it would still

be one lane and would barely carry school buses. It wouldn't carry any agricultural equipment and would have very limited use. It has been quite a process, to put something there, that is usable and yet work with the federal funds.

Darren Vogt: Where is the million dollars coming from that is going to go...

Bill Hartman: At this point, we have a million dollars set up for the job. We are going back in December for an additional appropriation and will know by April if we are going to receive that to put this whole package together.

Darren Vogt: The rest of my question, to make sure you answered it correctly was for the rehabilitation of the bridge.

Bill Hartman: That is also federal money as well, twenty percent ours and 80% theirs.

Darren Vogt: \$200,000 of the taxpayers' money is going to be put into a bridge that could continue to be washed out by the flooding.

Bill Hartman: That is right.

Roy Buskirk: Let me interrupt here for a second. It is 90%, right?

Bill Hartman: Maybe it is 90%.

Roy Buskirk: It is 90/10.

Bill Hartman: We will be putting in \$100,000.

Darren Vogt: Let me rephrase that then. My federal tax dollars and not my local tax dollars, \$900,000 are going to go to a bridge that...

Bill Hartman: Could possibly. A few years ago, just west of town, we had an eight inch rain in four hours. Any structure could be overrun. We design any storm drainage system within parameters that are reasonably economic. If you try to design for any possible disaster, it would be so overbuilt that we couldn't afford it.

Darren Vogt: I agree with that and understand that.

Bill Hartman: They are continuing to do some diking in the south end of the City which will bring the St. Mary's up a little bit more but with some of these events, you just don't know. The new bridge, at this location, will be at a higher elevation.

Paul Moss: I think Councilman Vogt's frustration is with the fact that it is all coming out of our pocket.

Bill Hartman: The folks that live there are very vocal and very organized. They want a bridge very badly. The traffic count is only about 150 cars a day. This is the best solution for providing them a bridge in that location for such a low usage. By going to the federal government, we are going to spend a couple hundred thousands of our money as opposed to a couple million. The cost benefit of using the federal money is still there.

Darren Vogt: Let me clarify my position. I want to make sure that I am not discussing the building of the new bridge. That is not the issue that is in my mind. The issue to me is rehabilitating the bridge to another tune of a million dollars that is functionally at a grade or elevation that can continue to get washed out.

Bill Hartman: It has been there over a hundred years and has not washed out to this point. The water was just inches over the deck.

Darren Vogt: And we are going to put another bridge back in its place. Is any of this \$200,000 for the renovation of that old bridge?

Bill Hartman: Of course.

Paula Hughes: Move for approval of item ten, Bostic Road bridge #268, in the amount of \$200,000.

Roy Buskirk: Second.

Paul Moss: We have a motion and a second. All in favor please signify by saying aye. All opposed same sign. That creates a problem. 3 (Hughes, Buskirk & Johnson) – 3 (Moss, Vogt & Kite) – 1 (Miller absent). I would suggest that between now and the next meeting, we talk about this. **The motion does not pass.** Items eleven through fourteen are appropriations in Youth Services Placement Fund 737.

Chris Dunn: Good morning, Chris Dunn, Youth Services Center. I have a request for four different items. The first item is to connect Yoder House with Kryder House. I don't know why they were not included in the connection of the fiber optics. I have been working on it for a couple of years and decided to come and ask for the money out of the 737 Fund just so that we can get it done. I would like to decrease that request to \$11,500. Part of the large number is to prepare for unexpected costs. They will be going underground through the old Allen County Children's Home and every time we have done that, we run into problems because of the old concrete. The sprinkler inspection has already occurred along with repairs to the current alarm system. This is a system that is outdated and we have difficulty getting parts for it. We are continuing to work and try to get the new proposal for funding but we need to maintain the one we have. The last item on there is the radios that we use to communicate. We had a new employee approved this year and I need to get a radio for that position and I would like another radio for the part-time staff. I went with a less expensive radio. The former director purchased Motorolas but we have some

IKON radios in use and are much less in cost but work just fine and are compatible with the Motorolas.

Paul Moss: Are there any questions from Council?

Patt Kite: Move to approve items eleven, twelve, thirteen and fourteen in the amount of \$13,832.

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 (Miller). Okay, we have some transfers within the General Fund.

Brian Dumford: Good morning, Brian Dumford, Director of Human Resources for Allen County. I have a few transfers that we would like to have take place. The first one is out of our Maintenance Agreement line and into our Furniture & Fixtures line. The transfers are in preparation for our office move to the third floor. The Commissioners are remodeling an area next to the City HR. We will be co-located on the same floor. For ease of communication between the two departments and ease of the public to be able to apply for positions, we will have all of Human Resources on the same floor. One of the things that we are getting is a training room. This will be located adjacent to the City's training center. We are going to put a movable wall so that the City and County can have a much larger room to do joint training projects and workshops. With that, we will be purchasing tables and chairs and audio-visual equipment for our training area that will mirror the City's. There will be two separate training areas but can be opened up into one. That is items fifteen and sixteen.

Paula Hughes: I have a question. I am surprised that there is an extra \$2,000 in your Maintenance Agreement line. Tell me what has changed and you are not maintaining anymore.

Brian Dumford: There was a small savings from the copiers. We did not renew the maintenance on the People Track Software, which was the online job application system. In preparation for the joint project, we have been discussing a joint job application and government jobs portal type of thing. We are not using People Track anymore. That is where the bulk of that money came from.

Paul Moss: Any questions on item fifteen or sixteen? If not, you are welcome to talk about items 17 through 21.

Brian Dumford: We had staff turnover. One of the Human Resources Administrative Assistants is no longer with us. We have hired a young lady that is a good fit for the organization. Because she is coming in at a different step, we had a

few additional dollars left and want to put that into the 400 series to purchase the audio-visual equipment and tables and chairs.

Paul Moss: That training center doesn't have any A-V equipment currently?

Paula Hughes: We don't have a training center.

Brian Dumford: We don't have a training center.

Paul Moss: Maybe I am misunderstanding. I thought you were expanding the City's training center.

Brian Dumford: We are creating a room next to the City's training center. It will be the County's training center. That area was previously just offices and we are expanding that and it will be a stand alone training center that can merge with the City's room. We will have two distinct training areas but be able to join forces when needed.

Paul Moss: So there is no opportunity to just share one room?

Brian Dumford: No.

Darren Vogt: How often do you use a training room?

Brian Dumford: We do training in various different areas. We use the Courtroom monthly. We have Conference Room 1 twice a month and Building Department once a month. We do insurance appointments, orientation and lots of opportunities for use in that room.

Darren Vogt: What I am trying to get, to Councilman Moss' point, is there a way, if you are going to co-locate, to say that you are not using the room 365 days a year? I don't want to spend money if we don't need to spend money. If the City and County could use one room and coordinate schedules, why go to the expense of creating another room?

Brian Dumford: The City's schedule is very robust and they use that room for many different things. The County room is going to be smaller than the City room. It will give us flexibility of different sized events going on and will give us the ability to have two things going on at the same time.

Paul Moss: Well, personally, I am not sold on it. I would prefer some additional information and conversation. I am willing to entertain any motions.

Darren Vogt: One concern that I have is that if every time an employee leaves the company, then we allow those funds to be transferred, we set a precedent for everyone to come in at the end of the year saying that they want to do X, Y and Z.

From the budgeting standpoint, it doesn't hold with how we have done things in the past.

Paul Moss: That is a legitimate point. The bigger concern for me is that I am not comfortable that just because the City has a robust schedule for that room, doesn't mean that it can't be shared. These are the types of things that you want to address on the front end. This is similar to the GIS systems and the fact that the City went in one direction and we went with another platform and now we are at the point where it makes total sense to try and merge those operations. This is minor compared to that but I think co-location is one step down the road towards a total consolidation of Human Resources. With that in mind, constructing another training room doesn't seem to be necessary. I am happy to talk to the Commissioners about it, in more detail, if you would like. I am not going to support the transfer at this point.

Brian Dumford: If I may, from the very beginning of our move to the third floor, we have had discussions to see how we could work together and how we could increase the capacity and flexibility of what we could do together. There is an existing standing wall right now. We have chosen to remove and install the partition wall for the very reason of being able to collaborate and do things together. Right now, the City is limited to a certain amount of space and the County is limited to a certain amount of space. By talking together and cost sharing on the partition wall, I think it is a win-win for everybody.

Paul Moss: Maybe it is a case where I need to go up there with the Commissioners or something and take a look around. I haven't seen it.

Brian Dumford: I would love to give you a tour.

Paul Moss: Has anybody here been up there?

Maye Johnson: I have. Not in relationship to this but there was a move proposed for another agency and we looked at the space. I would have to look at it again in accordance with this request.

Paul Moss: I am not interested in beating a dead horse here so if someone wants to make a motion, have at it. There doesn't seem to be a lot of enthusiasm for that.

Brian Dumford: I will ask that the Commissioners contact you to discuss this further.

Roy Buskirk: Before you leave, I talked with you earlier this morning and were you able to find anything out?

Brian Dumford: No, Beth was going to take care of that. Did she give a note on that?

Roy Buskirk: She gave me a note on what she was looking into.

Brian Dumford: I will go look right now.

Paul Moss: Onto salary ordinances and the Board of Health.

Mindy Waldron: Mindy Waldron, Administrator of the Department of Health. I am before you today for two salary ordinances. Both positions were approved by the Personnel Committee last month. I would be happy to answer any questions on those although I do see that I made an error when I submitted these to Becky. One of these positions is a new position but both will be from our existing budget. The position for the Nurse is from an existing position. What I did when I sent this to Becky is that I was looking at the 2008 grid. The Nurse positions went up one in the reclassification. I we presume to hire that now, we need to use the 2007 classification which would be a PAT 4. Can that amount change back to the current PAT 4 amount? It is my error.

Jackie Scheuman: Are you going to hire someone within the next four weeks?

Mindy Waldron: I hope so.

Jackie Scheuman: December 9th starts the 2008 pay.

Mindy Waldron: Oh, okay.

Jackie Scheuman: If you don't hire someone before December 9th, you are okay.

Mindy Waldron: We can make it after December 9th and we will be good to go.

Tera Klutz: So, you need a 2008 ordinance for the Public Nurse.

Mindy Waldron: Correct.

Tera Klutz: Then you need a 2007 and 2008 for the new Medical Assistant.

Mindy Waldron: Correct. Does that make sense?

Paul Moss: So we are pulling the second one?

Roy Buskirk: No, no.

Jackie Scheuman: Currently, in 2008, that position is not a Nurse. What is it?

Mindy Waldron: Currently, it is an Environmental Health Specialist and a PAT 4. In 2008, the Nurses would move to PAT 5. I had jumped ahead in putting that in there.

Roy Buskirk: Why does December 9th already start in 2008?

Jackie Scheuman: Because we pay two weeks behind.

Roy Buskirk: But nine and two weeks, we are still not into 2008.

Tera Klutz: The ninth is the first day of the two week period and that pay wouldn't be paid until the end of the second week after that pay period. The paycheck for the 23rd would be two weeks after that which would be in 2008.

Roy Buskirk: Okay. That is as bad as the computers.

Darren Vogt: What are these folks doing? What is the difference? What are we doing here?

Mindy Waldron: Both of these positions are to assist with refugees. Both of these positions, in addition to others that we will need and will request down the road, we can absorb them into our current budget. To give you an idea of where we are, normally we would screen 150 to 200 per year. As of last week, we had screened 489 already this year. We are still expecting several hundred by the end of the year. For 2008, they are predicting at least 800. What we did at the special board meeting last week was, and I tried to synopsize and present in an email, go through each task and list whatever we do in regards to refugee care. From the second that we hear they are coming, there is preparation that goes into each patient. There is the actual screening at the Community Health Clinic as well as through the Infectious Disease Clinic two days later. They are screened for a number of communicable diseases as well as parasites and other health screens that go into it. We broke it down in terms of tasks and calculated that in terms of time and I equated that to the finances. We know what we will need to accommodate the 800 next year. We feel comfortable that we can absorb these two positions that are needed immediately. We closed the public clinic for immunizations on Mondays but are still open on Wednesdays and Fridays, as usual. By closing Mondays, it adds four extra days per month for screening. To do that, we are seeing more per day. We used to see 15 to 20 but are now trying to see 30. Then we can catch up with the backlog that we still have of refugees waiting to be seen. These two positions will help with that. Both will be located mainly at the Infectious Disease Clinic but will be cross-trained and shared with Community Health. These positions will be purely for refugee care.

Roy Buskirk: Maye and I was fortunate to attend the meeting that you had and Mindy and her staff need to be commended for what they are doing and are trying all kinds of avenues for funding on this. Currently the federal government, after eight months, their funding stops.

Mindy Waldron: They come in with Medicaid for eight months. After that time, if they are secondary resettled refugees, say they settle in Lansing, Michigan and then come to Fort Wayne, they can move after they are resettled. If they come after the timeframe when they had Medicaid, the Health Department assumes their medical costs. During the time that they are on Medicaid, we can't collect from Medicaid.

What we are trying to do is seek a medical waiver so that we can recapture those funds for the services that we provide.

Darren Vogt: When you say we, I am not sure that is a pronoun that I understand. Who is the “we” that is receiving the money?

Mindy Waldron: The Department of Health is seeking a federal waiver with the assistance of Congressman Souder from CMS which is the federal Medicaid service. Currently, the Health Department cannot seek reimbursement through Medicaid because we would have to bill for all services. We are trying not to do that.

Darren Vogt: Who is receiving that reimbursement? Who is getting it now?

Mindy Waldron: No one. When they come, they have Medicaid and can seek services from those that provide it. If they were to seek medical care at a hospital, the hospital can be reimbursed for that. Money comes in through the federal government to FSSA at the State level, a stipend. We are looking at all avenues. We do the actual care but are receiving no monies for that. We are looking at that stipend as one avenue which is a State avenue. We are also looking to the federal government for the waiver so that we can begin to recapture some of the Medicaid funds. We are also looking at other options such as grant funding, which I am not a fan of for this, but it is something that we have to figure out how we will fund this over the next two years or more. We have to understand that this is a pay me now or pay me later situation. If we don't see them and they slip through the cracks and they get into the workplace or the schools and we have not screened them or adequately provided their services, it is estimated that about 40% of Burma's population is infected with TB. That doesn't mean that they are contagious. If you use that general percentage, when they come here, that is several hundred that may be infected. What we do is screen them and ask. If they are, then we will work through putting them on a preventive treatment. It is estimated that ten to fifteen percent of those that don't go on treatment become active throughout their life. If we miss any of those, we are looking at hundreds of cases, potentially, here locally. That is over a large period of time and we can't predict that. We need to see them, get them on preventative treatment and treat them for all communicable diseases that they may have. Then we can get them safely into the schools and the workplace. We are seeking all types of funding. One is through our budget and as I said in the email, we will probably be coming before you in the next few months for additional funding.

Paul Moss: Councilwoman Johnson?

Maye Johnson: I want to thank you and Dr. McMahan for a very effective presentation and not to appear alarmist, we are looking at a serious health situation if we are not proactive in addressing these needs. With an additional 700 refugees coming in by the end of the year...

Mindy Waldron: Not additional, we will see a total of 700 for this year.

Paul Moss: Councilman Buskirk?

Roy Buskirk: The Health Department has made this a community project. There are a lot of organizations and agencies and there are things such as transportation for getting these people to the right points. One of the things that I found interesting is that a lot of the people are settling in Lansing, Michigan?

Mindy Waldron: There are about five large resettlement sites in the United States of which we are one.

Roy Buskirk: And after they are settled there for a week or so, they can move. They are not prisoners. If they have family or relations in Fort Wayne, then that is where you lose track of them. It is really hard to follow their movement. This evening, we are meeting with State Legislators, the Council and the Commissioners, and we need to bring this up in our discussions with them.

Mindy Waldron: Senator Bayh's office has been cooperative as well, in looking at the State issues. A good point is the community partners that we are working with. We work with the schools and transportation networks to get things done. We don't want the translators being the ones to get the transportation taken care of because we need them at the clinic. We have established, with Commissioner Peters, a Commissioners' task force that looks at each facet as to how these refugees are acculturated or simulated into our community. We try to make sure that everything is done appropriately and efficiently and not just from the health standpoint.

Paul Moss: What is the designation that we have that nobody else seems to have in the State? How did we receive that gift of being a resettlement site?

Mindy Waldron: That, I do not know. The State Department works with areas that have resettlement organizations and I don't know how the designation comes or how often that changes. I just know how the mechanism occurs when the refugees are decided to be placed here but I don't know how we became a resettlement site.

Paul Moss: I hate to sound callous but from a Council perspective and being held responsible for the expenditures of the County, I hope that people are thinking about how much of a welfare state do we want to have? Where do you eventually draw the line on basically an open checkbook for all of these services? I know that is not a question you can answer and it is multifaceted, it is federal, state and local, but it is also extremely frustrating. I don't have anything against these folks but it is kind of an open checkbook and we have issues that we have to deal with from a fiscal standpoint. Councilman Vogt?

Darren Vogt: I want to make sure I understand. These folks are Medicaid eligible.

Mindy Waldron: For eight months.

Darren Vogt: Is most of our screening occurring during that timeframe?

Mindy Waldron: Yes.

Darren Vogt: Is there a way to contract that service to someone who can go after the Medicaid reimbursement?

Mindy Waldron: That is a good question. We explored that as well. But because Indiana code charges the Health Departments for all communicable disease, there is no way to divorce that part of it to another agency.

Darren Vogt: If they go get a TB test at some health clinic, they can't file Medicaid for that?

Mindy Waldron: Yes they can. Other folks but not refugees can go somewhere else for a TB test. That is the extent of what those clinics do. Once it is read and found possibly to be positive, that all comes through the Health Department by Indiana law.

Darren Vogt: Once it is found. So all they do is the screening aspect of it.

Mindy Waldron: That is a minimal part.

Darren Vogt: You made the statement that approximately 40% of Burmese have TB.

Mindy Waldron: Are infected with TB. I want to be clear because we are getting a lot backlash about using those terms. We want to make sure that we are not saying that they are contagious.

Darren Vogt: Right. So what percentage of population that we have tested, of the 700 let's say, are in that same boat?

Mindy Waldron: We are actually seeing forty to fifty percent are infected. It is latent TB which means that at some point, without treatment, they may convert to be contagious.

Roy Buskirk: Isn't it 10%?

Mindy Waldron: That is the actual population that would convert without treatment. If you are exposed to TB and begin to be infected, that means that you will show a positive skin test. It doesn't mean you are contagious and you may very well not show any symptoms. We will do a chest x-ray and that will tell us the level of infection. You will then be counseled on going on preventive treatment to rid your body of that part of the bacteria. It means that it is sitting dormant in your body but could become active at any time. What we do is screen for that. We see that forty to fifty percent of the people have latent TB. We are counseling them, doing the x-rays

and putting them on preventive treatment so that they won't become active when they are out working or living in the community. That is the importance of getting them into our system.

Darren Vogt: What, in your estimation, will not get done because we are switching the focus? What will you not complete because you are going to transfer some funds?

Mindy Waldron: How we have figured out that we are going to do this, at least in the short run, is that the Environmental Health Specialist position was an existing position and was a vacated food inspector position from last year. We began a workforce capacity project with the State and Purdue University to see what we needed to do with two open positions. Coming out of that, we had some hopes of doing some proactive programs within the department. We wanted an outside source to tell us where best to place our resources because we had done what we could internally. We feel now that priority says the open position needs to go to what is needed for refugees. That is really kind of an even exchange. The Medical Assistant is just taking some existing funding that we have and creating a position out of that. The only thing was that we closed immunizations on Mondays. We picked Monday for several reasons. Super Shots, which is a huge partner of our department, have local clinics on that day. We have just diverted those that would come to our clinic to one of theirs. The only thing that is changing is the number that we are seeing. We are not discontinuing any services.

Darren Vogt: I will make one statement and agree with Councilman Moss but we need to be very careful and mindful of the property tax dollars that we collect. I equate this one to a transfer within and allowing them to use the monies as they see fit but when it comes time to ask for additional dollars, I may not be able to support that.

Paul Moss: Getting back to the resettlement designation. Is that something that is simply bestowed upon us by Washington or do we have any interaction with them? Surely there has to be some sort of certification process and what are our options in terms of not having that designation?

Mindy Waldron: I think that when you have an active resettlement organization, in your community, that is willing to accept and has the ability to house them, get clothing and get them into schools...

Paul Moss: Is that Catholic Charities?

Mindy Waldron: Catholic Charities, yes. I don't know how you become a resettlement site. My assumption is that when the decisions are being made from the federal government, they are looking at who can do what in the localities. We can do a lot here and that is why I assume that we are selected.

Paul Moss: Is it an annual recertification?

Mindy Waldron: I don't believe so but I really don't have any idea.

Paul Moss: Are the folks at Catholic Charities aware of burden on the taxpayers of Allen County that this creates?

Mindy Waldron: Yes, it is a burden on them as well.

Paul Moss: But it is a different burden and a burden that they choose. They receive money in a different manner.

Mindy Waldron: I think you would need to ask them though. I don't want to speak for them.

Paul Moss: I understand.

Roy Buskirk: Since it has started, if we weren't a site, they could move here after a week if they wanted to anyhow. And we wouldn't get the benefit of the eight months. Some of the preventive medications and everything that they are given is for longer than eight months.

Mindy Waldron: Right, it depends on their infectivity as to how long they are on treatment. It is a daily dose with sometime three to twelve pills daily. It can go as long as twelve months but depends on their illness.

Darren Vogt: Let me clarify. We aren't receiving any eight month benefit.

Mindy Waldron: Not yet but that is why we are trying to get the waiver so that we can. We can't stop this process. They are coming and we have to do it efficiently, effectively and accurately for the benefit of the entire community. Our goal is to find out how we get those funds to do that. Whether it is from you, from our budget, from federal or state, we are pursuing all options.

Paul Moss: Just to throw a little more cold water on this, as a recipient of substantial Medicaid dollars in the business that I am in, I can assure that that those will not come close to covering your costs.

Mindy Waldron: We actually said that at our meeting.

Paul Moss: Let's not think that if we get Medicaid it is going to be a panacea and cover the costs.

Mindy Waldron: That is why we are pursuing all options.

Patt Kite: Is there any way to measure compliance?

Mindy Waldron: We have two levels of treatment, depending on if they are infected or active. We have directly observed therapy where we go to them every single day and watch them ingest everything to assure that it is done. We have self-administered therapy which is more preventive and we still monitor them. There are significant records kept for every patient. What we want to keep from getting to is doing directly observed therapy for people who convert to being active. That is a person going to their house, school or workplace every single day and monitoring for health symptoms and watching them take the medication. That is extremely costly. We have calculated what that takes. We are trying to do the preventive method and screen them and get them on treatment so we don't have the long-term burden.

Paul Moss: I feel like we beat this pretty good. Are there any other questions or is there a desire to move forward on the salary ordinances?

Roy Buskirk: I make a motion to approve the position for Medical Assistant for 2007 salary ordinance with an annual salary of \$27,477. Do you want me to do more than one salary ordinance?

Paul Moss: Let's do them separately.

Paula Hughes: 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 (Miller).

Roy Buskirk: Move to approve the 2008 salary ordinance for the Medical Assistant with an annual salary of \$29,291.

Paula Hughes: 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 (Miller).

Roy Buskirk: Move for approval of the Public Health Nurse with an annual salary of \$42,617 for 2008.

Paula Hughes: 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 (Miller). Thanks, Mindy. Okay, we have some grants. The Drug Task Force is up first.

Lin Wilson: Lin Wilson, Grant Administrator.

Art Barile: I am Art Barile, Sheriff's department.

Lin Wilson: We are requesting permission to apply for a grant for \$70,000. This is up considerably from last year when we were only allowed to request \$25,000. Some counties have dropped out of the program and some counties were debarred because of misappropriation so now there is more money in the pot. We are asking for \$70,000 this year and I will let Lieutenant Barile how he plans to use the money.

Art Barile: About \$33,000 of the money will go for the building lease. We have an off-site office. \$20,000 is for confidential funds. The other \$20,000 is for training and some equipment.

Paul Moss: Are there any questions from Council?

Paula Hughes: Move for approval of the Drug Task Force request to apply for the Ed Byrne/JAG grant for \$70,000.

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 (Miller). Okay, Superior Court and the Foellinger Grant. That is a large Foellinger Grant.

Megan Kelly: I am Megan Kelly, the coordinator for the Great Kids Make Great Communities project with Allen Superior Court.

Lin Wilson: This is basically a continuation grant that requires no match. I will let Megan explain how the funds are used every year.

Megan Kelly: Allen County Superior Court has been granted, for the last ten to twelve years, the majority of funding primarily for the Conference on Youth. This draws about 700 area youth serving professionals. We bring in professionals from all over the country to speak on relative topics. In addition, it pays for our salary costs on an ongoing program that we run throughout the year and for training.

Paul Moss: Any questions?

Darren Vogt: Move for approval of the Superior Court application for the Foellinger Grant in the amount of \$218,750.

Patt Kite: 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 (Miller). Thank you. Moving right along, I think we have several issues with the Sheriff's Department.

Darren Vogt: Do we want to take Building Maintenance and the Cooling Towers? They are probably a much shorter conversation.

Paul Moss: Is that okay with you? That is a good idea there because they have been waiting a while.

Dan Freck: Good morning, Dan Freck Director of Buildings and Grounds for the Allen County Commissioners.

Craig Scully: Craig Scully, Design Collaborative.

Paul Moss: This is a follow-up from the earlier discussion. I am not sure what gaps we need to fill in here.

Dan Freck: What had happened was last month we came to Council with an estimate price for the project, removal and installation of the new cooling tower. We had two companies bid on that and those quotes came in at \$700,000 and \$799,000. We estimated this project a month ago at approximately \$520,000. We are \$180,830 short. We did not add anything. We had sent a letter outlining that we felt we lacked more information than we should have had to get those numbers closer together. Mr. Scully could probably answer that better than I.

Craig Scully: If you have read the letter, there were basically three areas that we felt we fell short on in the original budgeting process. One of them had to do with the rigging of equipment up on the roof. Our original estimate was just shy of what it will cost. It was our understanding of the project at the time. When we did our estimate, there are complications that occur when the design is finished. Another area was in the control work. There was significantly more control work than we anticipated in the original budget. Those two account for close to \$120,000. We did add some additional work as far as replacing some pumps. The original didn't anticipate it but once the design was done, it was necessary in order to make it function. We do our due diligence as best we can and provide an estimate of what we believe it will cost. When the design is complete, there sometimes has to be adjustments to that.

Paul Moss: Councilman Vogt?

Darren Vogt: Can you explain what controls mean?

Craig Scully: Controls have to do with computers and equipment that actually turns valves on and off. We added some additional equipment such as soft starts that help save energy.

Darren Vogt: Soft starts were originally planned in that.

Craig Scully: Yes, they were originally planned but in dealing with some large piping and other things, we had to add a control valve here and there.

Darren Vogt: We have not advertised any dollar amount to spend on this.

Jackie Scheuman: You still have over \$400,000 in your capital line and you could transfer today.

Roy Buskirk: You were discussing before that the Commissioners are picking up a portion of it.

Jackie Scheuman: The \$520,000 was appropriated in CUM CAP.

Darren Vogt: If we don't do anything today, the project is already going forward. Have you already put it to bid? Have you already ordered equipment?

Dan Freck: No. We have put it to bid but once the bids come over what we had estimated, Mr. Little stopped it right then and there. Mr. Scully and I figured out where the issues were and drafted the letter to County Council. I got with the Auditor right away to get on the agenda. The time is accurate. We wanted to make sure the funding was there to go ahead with the project.

Craig Scully: The contract has not been awarded yet. They are aware that we are going for additional funds. I think I had noted in earlier discussions, Councilman Vogt, about expanding budget years since we are at the end of a budget year. The majority of these funds would not be needed until the beginning of 2008.

Paula Hughes: I think we have the money in our capital line now. We are not making appropriations in December. If we agreed that we support the project, we should support the project.

Darren Vogt: The question is does it come out of our capital line or CUM CAP? What is the balance in CUM CAP?

Tera Klutz: We have enough.

Jackie Scheuman: You can't do anything in CUM CAP today.

Tera Klutz: They have a million dollars left for appropriation.

Darren Vogt: From 2007? That will roll over into 2008?

Tera Klutz: Yes.

Paula Hughes: That doesn't address any projects that are out there.

Darren Vogt: I prefer to tell them we will support it but we will work out the funding after we have had a chance to analyze where we spend the money from.

Tera Klutz: They will probably tell you that they have that million already budgeted into next year.

Paul Moss: We have already appropriated \$550,000?

Tera Klutz: \$520,000.

Roy Buskirk: You have two bids. Since they were coming in high, do we go for a third bid or talk about the possibility of doing that?

Craig Scully: It was advertised for bid for about two weeks for public bidding purposes under construction. There were three contractors that were interested but we only received two bids.

Darren Vogt: And it is not that the bids came in high, there were more things in the design that made the price go up.

Craig Scully: I think the bids, with the fact that they were within 4% of each other, reflects that it accurately portrays the amount of work that needs to be done. I am not so sure that we are getting bad numbers from the bidders. I think we just didn't have all of the information when the budget was put together.

Roy Buskirk: As far as the timing of the project, it is something that you want to do in the winter months, right?

Dan Freck: Correct.

Roy Buskirk: The other thing, of appropriating it out of next year's funds, how is that looking? The DLGF...

Darren Vogt: I forgot about that. We won't have a certified budget until July.

Roy Buskirk: Should we do it now, then?

Darren Vogt: Move for approval of transfer from our capital line item to Building Maintenance, \$180,840.

Patt Kite: 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 (Miller). Thank you. If the Sheriff would kindly join us for the discussion, I would appreciate it.

Ken Fries: Kenny Fries, Sheriff of Allen County.

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

Paul Moss: Just to refresh everybody's memory here, we talked about the salary issue at the last meeting. We talked about the salaries of the sworn officers and it was my personal preference to have a similar adjustment for the dispatchers. That was not successful for a variety of reasons. One of those reasons is that Councilman Miller thought very strongly about the need to incorporate that into a discussion about consolidating the City and the County dispatch areas. That is a very valid discussion to have but I was uncomfortable with tying the two together. A couple of comments that I would like to make are that I would continue to support the application of percentages to the sworn officers and the dispatchers. And also, yesterday there were some comments in the Journal Gazette editorial page in regards to providing these raises in order to get the County dispatchers closer to the City dispatchers in terms of overall compensation. And that this would make it easier for consolidation. I want to go on record indicating that this is not in my thinking at all. That may be an end result in this but I am not going to sit here and say that I believe that the City dispatchers are paid appropriately. I am not going to say that they are paid too much and I am not saying that they are paid too little. What I am saying is that if, at the end of the day there is some consolidation, I would hope that someone objective would give the data of what that combined entity should be paid. I am saying this because I know there will be additional discussions about consolidation of various departments and I think that I have said consistently that one of my concerns with consolidation is that everybody is just going to move right up to the City pay scale. I still believe that the County is substantially more efficient in terms of salaries, wages and benefits than the City is. I think we provide substantially better value to the taxpayers as a result of that. I have said my piece and we can open it up for discussion. If you have some introductory remarks that you would like to make, I know there are some other issues here too in terms of some additional information that has been received relative to the dispatchers' pay.

Ken Fries: I had a conversation with Councilman Vogt about where we are in the consolidation and combining of dispatchers. He thought it was appropriate that I let the rest of Council know. What we have been doing has been kept out of the public eye because I don't want the outside influences, of the Journal Gazette editorial board or the City Council or County Council or County Commissioners saying this needs to be done, because they don't know. They don't know about the nuts and bolts operations of what the County does and what the City does. The two heads of communications, the City and the County with their second in command, have been meeting to decide what do the nuts and bolts of the operations look like. What do we do and what do they do? Can that certain function be combined and should it be combined? What are the roadblocks to each one of them? They would go down through the litany of all of the different functions and see what is compatible and what is not compatible. At the end, we have a very black and white, no emotions, can it, should it and what should it look like? That is rather than a knee-jerk reaction to just combine it. I told the Mayor that this will not be done by the end of the year. This is done by looking at all of the data to see if it will work and how it will work and what it will look like when it is done. That process is going on. Like I said at the start, I took this job to make a difference. In the end, I don't know if it will be

combined but we will look at all of the numbers and the different jobs to see what it will look like. It is an ongoing process and if we can do it without the spotlights of the public and the Councils and the newspapers, it will get done when it gets done.

Darren Vogt: I agree with you that I don't want to see it rushed but at some point, we have to say that we looked at it. In your best estimation, when do you think we will have some resolution? I know you said it won't be by the end of the year but do you see it in six months, nine months, three months, what kind of timeframe?

Ken Fries: I don't know what you mean by resolution.

Darren Vogt: To whether you have analyzed all of the data and here is your recommendation based on X, Y and Z.

Ken Fries: I would hope to get the majority of data in by the end of this year. There are going to be things that are totally incompatible. And that is according to them. This is not something that should take years. It needs to be looked at without the emotions of who is going to be in charge and just what would it look like?

Darren Vogt: I will tell you that I think that is what we have been looking for. What would it look like and what would it cost. And would it be better for the taxpayers and would it provide a better response time for the 911 call? I think that is truly what we are ultimately asking.

Ken Fries: I told the Mayor that my bottom line goal is, does it get a police officer, firefighter or ambulance to my house quicker?

Paula Hughes: And is it less confusing for the citizens that are calling in? We had a conversation two months ago about this and I agree with not rushing through the process. I am delighted that you are putting things in place from an operational standpoint to truly evaluate what would need to happen. My bottom line is not necessarily to save money by this combination. My bottom line is that we provide better service to the taxpayers. I don't think we are providing good service right now with these two separate departments.

Ken Fries: That is our goal and I agree. I have also said that I don't know if it will save money. If it does great but are we providing better service. And is that better service worth the extra money?

Paula Hughes: Or a neutral cost.

Paul Moss: I have been through a few consolidations as we acquired hospitals and things of that nature and if there are duplicative services then that is what is driving everybody to do this. Intuitively, there should be money saved. There should be some efficiencies gained. I hold out hope because otherwise I would question the

need of why should we do it. To move this specific issue along with regards to the dispatchers' pay...

Ken Fries: I think you got an updated graph that shows the 2008 figures. Apparently the Fort Wayne dispatchers got a little bigger pay boost than we thought. I think it is going to be 45 as opposed to 43.

Darren Vogt: Is that the one that went out yesterday?

Paula Hughes: Yes.

Darren Vogt: I don't think I have it.

Vanessa Miller: The one that went out yesterday was the longevity pay.

Darren Vogt: What is the number for Fort Wayne? My grid shows \$43,675.

Vanessa Miller: That is the number that we would have had on the grid but I found out it is \$45,400, I believe.

Ken Fries: What I proposed was a 15% pay increase for the dispatchers to try to get them closer. They are still going to be way behind. The fiscal impact, and I know Darren said he is not concerned about the bottom line is, but since 911 pays for five of the dispatchers and three of the supervisors, the bottom line fiscal impact to the County is \$49,000.

Darren Vogt: Before you say that I am not concerned about the bottom line, the rest of that statement was taken out of context. I think it is more important that we treat them fairly and not worry about the bottom line. The bottom line is secondary is what the rest of that statement was. I agree that I said that but in a different context.

Roy Buskirk: The 911 is paid by all of us that have land lines.

Paul Moss: So, the Sheriff is proposing 15% across the board for the dispatchers. The sworn officers ended up with a total of 9.5%.

Ken Fries: Our dispatchers are starting out substantially lower than the regular officers are starting out. It still leaves them about 28% behind the people on the other side of the glass wall.

Paul Moss: I am not disputing that. I am just restating where we are to keep things moving.

Paula Hughes: One of the points of concern is that if a 15% increase were approved, then starting dispatchers would be paid at a significant higher rate than confinement officers. I wondered if you are comfortable with that?

Ken Fries: Yes. I have worked both places. Historically dispatchers have made more than confinement officers. That changed when they went to the grid. Confinement officers, in 2008, will start at \$31,500. With the 2.5% increase, the dispatchers are at \$29,000. Councilwoman Kite knows because she worked down there.

Patt Kite: Both places.

Ken Fries: When you have an eighteen-year-old girl on the phone because the two-year-old that she is supposed to be watching has drowned, it puts an unbelievable amount of stress on a person. That is why dispatchers always made more than confinement officers. You can only do so much from that end of the telephone. They deal with life and death daily. I have no problem with them making more. Confinement officers' average stay at the jail is two and a half years. Dispatchers are 2.8 years. We are not able to retain them and we spend so much time training them. The job has gotten so technical compared to when I was there. I couldn't go down there and work again without six months training. Back in January, when you asked me who deserved a pay raise the most, I said dispatchers and confinement officers. They deal with life threatening emergencies every day and should be compensated for that.

Paul Moss: We have dealt with the sworn officers and the confinement officers. Now if we can deal with the dispatchers, we will have the Sheriff off our backs for a few months.

Patt Kite: Having experienced working both places, I wholeheartedly concur with the Sheriff. It is a totally different job and I am not sure I could do the job now. If you go down there and spend some time and see all of the technology and different screens and stuff that goes on, it is boggling. It is probably a good year to train someone adequately. The bottom line is public safety and someone's life is in the hands of those people. And not to mention the police officers on the street have their lives in the dispatchers' hands. I think his request for 15% is appropriate.

Paula Hughes: What is before us? Can we approve some sort of increase? We would make a motion to increase the 2008 salary grid for dispatchers by X percent. Then the Auditor's Office would have time to implement that? Just to put it out there, I am going to move for approval of the 15% increase for the Allen County dispatchers.

Tera Klutz: Do you want a total of 15% or 17.5%? This is just so we make sure we get it correct.

Paul Moss: They have already had the 2.5%.

Darren Vogt: These numbers reflect the 2.5%, correct?

Ken Fries: It is a total of 15% but if you want to go to 17.5%, I am okay with it.

Darren Vogt: It is a net 15%.

Paula Hughes: So an additional 12.5%.

Tera Klutz: Yes, for a total of 15%.

Patt Kite: Second.

Paul Moss: **We have a motion and a second.**

Darren Vogt: Sheriff, this will put some dispatchers as higher paid than some of the officers.

Ken Fries: No. A starting officer now is \$41,694. A 15% increase right now, for dispatchers, it would be a ten to fifteen year employee to get the \$41,000.

Darren Vogt: So you don't have any entry level officers at \$41,000. They are going to move up the grid at their three percent or whatever it is.

Ken Fries: Plus the 9% they will get next year.

Paul Moss: So there is a motion for 12.5% and there is a second. We are still in discussion mode and I would like to make one comment. This is related to Councilwoman Kite's comment and it is very valid in terms of the stress level. Just about everyone in the County could say that my job is stressful. People in various departments could argue that. It is always tough, in relative terms, to identify who has the most stressful and difficult position out there. That is a struggle but what I look at is the market data that we have. That is what I think justifies this substantial increase. I look at the turnover issues and I think there is a return on the investment with this and am certainly supportive of it.

Roy Buskirk: As far as comparing to outside data, I talked to St. Joseph County this morning and their starting wages for communication officers is \$27,394. You can get numbers all over the board.

Paul Moss: Sure you can but the most relevant market data, and I go back to when the City unionized its workforce, that is our market. **Seeing no further discussion, all in favor of the 12.5%, please signify by saying aye. All opposed same sign. The motion carries 5-1 (Buskirk) – 1 (Miller).**

Ken Fries: Thank you and the dispatchers will thank you. The public will thank you.

Paul Moss: Sworn officer longevity payment.

Ken Fries: This goes back to the discussion I had with Councilwoman Hughes. This goes to the grid system and when people were paid their grid bump at the next pay

period after their anniversary date. At the time, I think you felt that you had done that for all County employees but it excluded merit employees which are the County Policemen. My anniversary date is in April and I wouldn't get my longevity until the following January. There is a 1996 ordinance from Council that spelled that out. What we have done is prepared a new ordinance to get all of the County employees on that system where the next pay period after your anniversary date is when you get your increase.

Paul Moss: What is the fiscal impact of that?

Jackie Scheuman: The first year that we did that was substantial because we had to do two years, basically. But now it is the same.

Roy Buskirk: So this would make them the same as the rest of the County employees, right?

Darren Vogt: Right but we don't have the financial impact of this.

Paul Moss: You are not saying that it would be revenue neutral? There is an impact.

Jackie Scheuman: The first year is going to cost you more. Everybody who would have gotten it this year would get it in January and then in January, you are going to start with anniversaries. So in essence, 2008 will be doing two years' worth.

Darren Vogt: And they are a 1% bump every year, right? So it is a little different.

Tera Klutz: And it is every three years.

Darren Vogt: If I recall, wasn't the number around \$250,000?

Tera Klutz: Yes it was but that was county-wide.

Ken Fries: We are talking about 124 officers.

Darren Vogt: So it is a much smaller impact than that.

Jackie Scheuman: We have around 200 to 250 people getting steps every year. It is not like everyone gets a step every year.

Paula Hughes: He is saying that only a third of the officers get it.

Roy Buskirk: It is only one percent.

Jackie Scheuman: They get three percent.

Darren Vogt: So there could be a few more in the Sheriff's because it is every three years versus five.

Paula Hughes: We were talking about 1,200 employees before and this is only 10% of that number so we may see a fiscal impact of \$20,000 to \$30,000.

Darren Vogt: It is the right thing to do and whatever the impact is, we make it work.

Paula Hughes: I think so. Move for approval of changing the sworn officers' longevity payment to the first pay period after their anniversary date.

Roy Buskirk: I will second the resolution.

Paul Moss: **There is a motion and a second on the adjustment to the Sheriff's longevity payment system. All in favor please signify by saying aye. All opposed same sign. The motion carries 6-0-1 (Miller).**

Ken Fries: Thank you very much.

Paul Moss: It appears to me, if I am reading correctly here, the Allen County Tax Adjustment Board has been withdrawn.

Darren Vogt: They will be on the agenda for December. John Stafford and several other members of the Tax Adjustment Board will come before us and talk about the resolution that we passed and the reasons behind it.

Paul Moss: Auditor appropriations recommendations. In absence of the Auditor, her highly capable Chief Deputy will walk us through this.

Tera Klutz: In preparing for next year, Lisa started looking ahead and noted that we don't have assessed values for 2008. It will probably be a similar situation, in 2008 as we were in 2007, as far as having a certified budget. Normally we would get the 2008 certified budget in March but we are anticipating one in mid-summer. A certified budget is what we need to formally approve appropriations in 2008. We approve them as part of this body as the initial step and then they go to the Department of Local Government Finance for final approval. One of the formalities is having a certified budget. Lisa thought that if we wanted to move forward with some of the things like GPS on county vehicles, the Sheriff's building and contractual items that we might need in 2008. It may be wise to appropriate at this meeting and encumber the funds into 2008 if we don't need them for the rest of this year. That way, next year, if these items or projects come up, we will have the cash available to spend because it will already be appropriated.

Darren Vogt: And even if it is not for these expenditures, we can use it for other emergency type expenses.

Tera Klutz: Yes.

Paula Hughes: Absolutely.

Darren Vogt: That could be a win-win that we didn't think about last year.

Tera Klutz: And on the same note, part of the request is to transfer almost \$5 million into the Rainy Day Fund. That \$5 million was calculated by using an estimate of the 10% expenditures from the General Fund and the Board of Health Fund.

Paul Moss: Can that number change upwards?

Tera Klutz: Yes, up to \$8.2 million.

Paul Moss: Obviously consolidate permitting and server refresh are moot points. The issue for me is the GPS and \$500,000. I think that is an issue that I think is unresolved. To say the least, I think there is some disagreement between the Council and Commissioners in terms of what direction to go there. I am a little hesitant with that number but I am not sure what the accurate number should be. The other piece is the Sheriff's building. I am not sure what to do there. There are quite a few variables out there and I think most of you are aware of them. I would offer up, for some consideration possibly and if it doesn't create problems down the road, moving that million dollars into the Rainy Day Fund. Do we have the flexibility to do what we need to do on down the road, if we were to move that, or does it matter?

Darren Vogt: Can we just do a contractual amount and make it a blanket dollar amount?

Tera Klutz: Yes. On the money that we are going to transfer to the Rainy Day Fund, that will not be appropriated. You cannot spend that without appropriation in the future. If you wanted to have flexibility to use the million dollars next year, for other projects, I would just transfer that into contractual appropriation today. That is part of that \$7 million but the difference is that it is also the Rainy Day Fund amount. It depends on how much you want to put in contractual and how much you want to put in Rainy Day.

Roy Buskirk: So in essence, what we are doing is taking it out of contractual and putting an amount into Rainy Day. The balance will remain in contractual.

Tera Klutz: If you appropriate that today, yes.

Roy Buskirk: I would rather do it that way because I feel that the Rainy Day Fund is strictly for emergency on the economy going down. Our CREDIT Funds and different funds that are based upon the economy would be less and we would have to make up for them in the Rainy Day Fund. I don't want to see the Rainy Day Fund used by putting money in there for future expenditures.

Paula Hughes: I still want to clarify, are you supportive of transferring the \$4,990,000 to the Rainy Day and the rest to contractual and encumbering for next year? Then we can appropriate from that if needed. That would leave us with a balance of, help me here.

Tera Klutz: \$2,010,000.

Paula Hughes: I am supportive of that. I like the idea of boosting the Rainy Day Fund to the 15% level. Particularly with the couple of years that we have coming as we adjust to the annexations.

Darren Vogt: I would rather take the two \$500,000, the 165 and 250 and add that to the contractual.

Paula Hughes: That is what will happen.

Darren Vogt: No.

Tera Klutz: You would have to add that to the two.

Roy Buskirk: Let him finish.

Darren Vogt: Add those in and then transfer the \$4.9 which would take the \$2 million more to like \$3,500,000. Same concept, just adding those in.

Paula Hughes: I thought it was part of it. I apologize.

Darren Vogt: And I do want to talk about the Rainy Day Fund balance and when do we say that we have enough money in that? I know this might not be the appropriate time for this discussion but at some point we can put too much money in and not be prudent other ways.

Roy Buskirk: I think the maximum amount that we can put in is 15% of what our budget is.

Paula Hughes: No. You can put in up to 10% a year. But a part of the analysis that was provided by the Auditor indicates that their recommendations, from the federal government, that a total reserve of 15% is the appropriate reserve level. Moving this \$4.99 million would get us to the 15% level.

Paul Moss: Doesn't the Grand Wayne have 100%?

Tera Klutz: Yes they do. So do a few of our own Allen County funds. I don't think we should grow it perpetually. Once we hit this year, I don't think we should be growing it at all. It is the taxpayers' money.

Paul Moss: You are correct. I am not comfortable with what percentage that should be right now. I think you need to have some flexibility there depending on economic circumstances and a variety of factors.

Darren Vogt: Since Councilman Miller is not here, I know he is a huge fan, as am I, of reducing our tax levy. As we continue to do our job and be prudent and funds continue to do the way we have, that is where we can cut into our levy and reduce the tax burden. That is something that we really need to start to consider in the future. If things continue to trend this way, we are looking at an area where we can make a substantial impact.

Roy Buskirk: We have a lot of unknown answers as far as the property tax issue is concerned.

Paula Hughes: Yes we do.

Roy Buskirk: I think that is the reason I would be in favor of increasing the rounded off \$5 million figure. Then we can leave it open for further discussion.

Darren Vogt: Let me do some math here.

Paul Moss: While you are doing that, I want to bring up the issue that continues to linger out there. That is in regards to a suggestion that I had made months ago about some CEDIT dollars going towards expansion of the Children's Zoo. I have had quite a few conversations with the Commissioners over the course of the last few months. There continues to be insufficient support for moving in that direction and there is certainly not unanimity on Council to move in the direction for what appears to be any amount for the Zoo's project. I continue to believe it is one of the more glaring examples of not economic development but economic vitality and attractions in this community. It is right at the top of the list. There is a project underway that is substantially more subsidized and doesn't even come close, in relative terms, of the amount I was suggesting and from a risk standpoint, it is infinitely a more risky project. There seems to be substantial support for that. I am intimately involved in the Zoo's finances out there with being on the board. It will be difficult for them to raise the amount of money that they hoped to raise. I am going to take that off the table at this point in time. I wanted to make you aware of that so it is not in the back of our minds and we can move forward.

Darren Vogt: Since you brought that up, I would encourage this Council, it may be too late for this budget cycle, but as we come along, this project will continue on into the 2009 budget cycle. As we continue to look at those dollars and where they are spent, this Council re-looks and steps forward in what we do and how we do it when it comes to CEDIT dollars and make some bold moves in that direction. I am not sure that I am willing to let it alone based on what happens and where that money gets spent. To tie every road project and economic development when I think I

clearly showed to you that it is not the case and not how it is done. With that said, it may be off the table for now but it may resurface again.

Paul Moss: I can assure you that I am not taking, off the table, the expenditure of CEDIT dollars and the prioritization of those dollars. That is absolutely at the top of the list of agenda items going forward.

Darren Vogt: The number that I had, going into contractual, I came up with it by just moving everything under the server refresh and moved all of those numbers into contractual. That amount is \$8,415,380. Of that, \$5 million would be transferred to the Rainy Day Fund.

Paula Hughes: Is that a motion?

Darren Vogt: Yes.

Paula Hughes: Second. Leaving \$3,415,380 in contractual line?

Darren Vogt: Correct.

Roy Buskirk: And we can put the full five in?

Paula Hughes: Yes.

Roy Buskirk: I was going to ask Pam (Finlayson) if the number for the voting machines is still the same. That hasn't changed any?

Pam Finlayson: No.

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 (Miller).** Does that meet your needs, Chief Deputy?

Tera Klutz: I was writing some things down and was there a separate resolution to transfer \$5 million or did you just tie it all into one?

Darren Vogt: I tied it all together.

Tera Klutz: Could you do a separate one for us because we are going to have that one floating around separately.

Darren Vogt: I will make a motion to transfer \$5 million from the General Fund into the Rainy Day Fund.

Paula Hughes: 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 (Miller). We took the Tax Adjustment Board off the agenda but there is a resolution that Councilman Vogt would like to discuss. It is related to the Governor's recent property tax plan.

Darren Vogt: You all should have received a copy of it electronically. The purpose of this was to support the Governor's plan. As we have talked with City Council about looking at property tax owners and what their burden is and how we could go about adjusting it, I looked at the plan and it is generic in nature. That is what I tried to do with this resolution. In supporting the fact that the points, made out by the Governor, were appropriate and that we would support those plans. Obviously, as legislation goes, you may have heard from Pat Bower that they are taking this up in organization and already have debated this plan and this will be on the floor before session ends. They will have hearings in December. With that said, I still believe that it is critical that we look not only at property tax owners but also people who are businesses and pay property taxes. That includes rental properties as well. The Governor's current plan is a 1, 2 and 3 percent cap with one on residential, two on landlord types and three on businesses. I feel that it is important that they look at that and analyze that because I am not sure that we should penalize a business owner, who creates jobs and income for the community, to pay a higher percent and use the same amount of taxes and services that a residential owner is doing. With that said, I would support the one, two and three if that is best compromise that we can get. But I still think that there needs to be more in that. Also, the cost associated with the abused and neglected children is going to be taken over by the State and that would eliminate our cost by increasing the sales tax to 7%. The sales tax going up to 7%, if you look at it from the surrounding area, does not put us in any economic impact disadvantage. That is the resolution that I put before this Council and if you haven't read it, we can delay it. If there is anyone who isn't comfortable or doesn't support it, that's fine but we can move forward in December as well.

Roy Buskirk: I would appreciate it if we could delay the voting on the resolution because there are a lot of details that we might later find it to be advantageous for us to endorse it. The one thing that Councilman Vogt brought up, as a businessman and the elimination of the inventory tax, businesses received a huge advantage a couple of years ago. That was primarily retail and some manufacturing. As a businessman, I am not sure that it should be at 3%. If that is the best solution that we can come up with, I possibly would support it. I think there are a lot of unanswered questions in the proposal for us to endorse it at this time.

Paul Moss: I am going to assume that everybody has had a chance to read this and I applaud Councilman Vogt for taking the initiative to do this. I think we should be vocal and proactive in this regard. To somewhat echo what Roy said, my only concern is that we are endorsing his plan as is. We might want to consider leaving some flexibility in terms of re-wording the sentence to support reform but not necessarily that specific proposal. You know it is going to get reworked and there will probably be some positive changes to it as a part of that process.

Darren Vogt: I have no problem rewording it. There “whereas” means nothing. The “therefore be it resolved” is the issue. Why don’t I rework it and bring it back in December.

Paula Hughes: I would also like it to say that at the last meeting with the Commissioners, and only Councilwoman Johnson, Councilman Buskirk and I were in attendance, we discussed doing a joint resolution with the Commissioners. The Commissioners are interested in pursuing that. I would much see a joint resolution because I believe it is a much stronger message to the State Legislature and that the Council and Commissioners of Allen County are acting cooperatively.

Darren Vogt: From the conversations that I recall, I am not sure that there is consensus amongst Council and Commissioners on the details. That is why I want to be as generic as possible but yet we are supportive of the sales tax concept or capping the property tax. I am trying to keep it to those issues and the detail part will be worked out in legislation.

Paul Moss: I think, to Councilwoman Hughes’ point, we can offer the Commissioners to join us in this. Thanks for bringing this forward. I think it is a good approach. I think that brings us to Recent and/or Upcoming Meetings. Do we have a Personnel Committee meeting scheduled?

Paula Hughes: We don’t have one scheduled. I know there is going to need to be one because of the combination of the Planning Departments comes together. I believe they were hoping to get one scheduled before the end of the month.

Paul Moss: We also have the exec issue that we were working through. I don’t know if he sent that out.

Roy Buskirk: He did to everybody and that is why the ladies have been sitting in the back of the room.

Pam Finlayson: You aren’t going to talk about it, are you?

Roy Buskirk: No. It wasn’t on the agenda. He slipped me a note that he had an 11:30 meeting.

Paul Moss: What we will do is get another Personnel Committee meeting scheduled promptly and make sure that all of you are aware. We need your input on his proposals. I received a note from the Commissioners in regards to the government efficiencies committee which I was appointed to. We are trying to nail down some dates for our first meeting and that will probably occur in a couple of weeks. Are there any other meetings that I am missing?

Paula Hughes: I wanted to update the Council on progress with the Shovel Ready Sites Committee. In the meeting last week, we decided to disband the version of the

committee that has been meeting. Essentially we still have our goals. We had a joint City and County Alliance Committee that developed a point system for Shovel Ready Sites and developed an application. We received the earmarks and the budget lines for site preparedness and for land-banking in the budgets this year. Since Allen County was the only entity that made those budget lines, Fort Wayne and New Haven have not made those allocations, we are going to disband that committee as a whole and hand over part of the responsibility to the Alliance so that there is an ongoing committee. They can meet quarterly or twice a year to talk about how Allen County positions us to the State. We were getting bogged down as we tried to incorporate the processes with the City of Fort Wayne who had not set aside any funds. The County is moving ahead and is developing everything as a template so that any other entities that want to come onboard are welcome to any of our materials.

Paul Moss: Councilman Vogt?

Darren Vogt: I have been in contact with the Sheriff about his contract. We still don't have an agreement on that and I am hoping to have something on that soon. I am meeting with him shortly.

Paul Moss: I think that covers Recent and/or Upcoming Meetings. Any comments from the public?

Paula Hughes: 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 November 13, 2007.

Darren Vogt: 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 (Miller).

Darren Vogt: Motion to adjourn.

Paula Hughes: 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 (Miller). The next meeting will be held on December 20, 2007 at 8:30 am. (Meeting was changed to December 13th)

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 11:45 am.