ALLEN COUNTY COUNCIL
MEETING MINUTES
MAY 15, 2008
8:30 AM

The Allen County Council met on Thursday, May 15, 2008 at 8:30 am in the City Council Chambers. 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, Calvert S. Miller and Paulette Kite.

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

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Paula Hughes: Move approval of the minutes of April 17, 2008.

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 7-0.

FINANCIAL REPORT:

Lisa Blosser: Miscellaneous revenue collections are at 35.8% at the end of April. As you can see on the financial report the actual cash balance is $2.1 million. I will be coming before you to request a temporary loan from the Rainy Day Fund in June. This is because of the delay in the property tax collections. We are now looking at tax bills going out sometime in July with collections in August.

Paul Moss: Are there any questions for Auditor Blosser?

Darren Vogt: Make a motion to approve the financial report.

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 7-0. Councilman Buskirk, would you like to update us on the most recent Personnel Committee?

Roy Buskirk: I think everybody received a copy of the minutes. Is that correct? Basically, we voted on two things. On the Adult Probation, we approved a Supervisor position. The County Assessor was there about some reorganization and we will have a report later on in this meeting. That is about it.

Paul Moss: Thank you. One thing that I would like to mention is that I received a letter from the Commissioners a while back in regards to a couple of appointments to the Redevelopment Commission. It appears that we have two appointments, one of which is effective in July and would serve the remainder of Mr. Ed Neufer's term. The other would begin in January, 2009. We do not need to vote on this today but would like to have a vote on it at the next Council meeting. I have a name that I would like to submit and I believe there is another individual that is interested, as well. If any of you have any individuals that would be interested in participating on that Commission, I would appreciate hearing about that. Just be aware that I hope we will be able to discuss and vote on it at the next meeting. We are going to have a presentation and this is an addendum to the agenda. The presentation and discussion is with the Department of Child Services. We are going to put them up first, so if you would like to come up we can have a discussion about the issues.

Michelle Savieo: Good morning. We just wanted to come before you and let you know the status of our budget. We had talked, when we were here to present the budget, about how I would like to keep you updated on where we were. When we finished 2007, we actually had an appropriation balance of $1.1 million and had a cash balance of $2,099,999. The reason that we had this cash balance, as well as the appropriation balance, is because at the end of September, we ran out of money to pay our institutions. We had to carry over three months of bills. October and November billings because December didn't come in until January, so we carried over two months of billing. We did that because the cost of our October billing, for residential care, was over $1.8 million. We did not have the appropriation balance to pay those bills since our appropriation balance was left at $1.1 million. This happened when our budget was reduced earlier that year, by the Department of Local Government Finance. We went into the year with a cash balance but we were unable to spend it. We came in last year and asked for a budget of $37,640,000 and that was not approved. What we were approved at was a budget of $29,735,494. As of the end of April we have spent 50% of that budget. Based on the rate of spending, I anticipate that we are going to be out of money at the end of August. We have projected out what we estimate that we will need to get through the year. We are looking at $38,058,970. What we had asked for, when we came last year, was $37,640,000. Based on that, we anticipate that we will be short approximately $418,970. We will need to come back and ask for the additional appropriations or we could ask for them now, based on what the Council would prefer us to do to increase our budget back to the original projection of $37,640,000. Based on that, we anticipate that we can work on cutting costs and probably would be very close to getting through the entire year. We will not get through the year at the $29 million. We also know that we will need additional money. What we anticipate that we will need is $7,904,506. When we talked last year, we talked that we would either need to take out a loan or there was a mention that maybe Council could come up with that additional money for us. We know that we will need that. The State will be taking over our budget as of January. That was through House Bill 1001. We will only need the money, from Council, to get through the remainder of the year. I come to you to ask how you would like us to do that. Would you like us to come back in June or July and talk about those appropriations and going forth to request the loan or should we have that discussion today? We are at 50% of our spending and it is 33% of the year.

Paul Moss: I am open to suggestions. I think that one of the things that we need to keep in mind is that we have a discussion in the first week of June in regards to the budget and this is obviously something that would need to be incorporated into that as well. Councilman Vogt?

Darren Vogt: Michelle, I am a little confused. Your original number that you said you were short, was $418,000. What timeframe is that short for?

Michelle Savieo: Our original projection and based on what we anticipate on our rate of spending this year.

Darren Vogt: But then you said you were short $7 million. I am a little confused. The State is taking over your expenses as of January, 2009 and so when do you need this $7 million?

Paula Hughes: In August.

Michelle Savieo: Right.

Paula Hughes: But the difference is in the amount that she requested and the amount we approved. If we had given the amount that she requested, in the last budget session, then she would have been $418,000 short. Since we did not give her the amount that she requested, she is actually short $7.9 million. Is that correct?

Michelle Savieo: Yes.

Roy Buskirk: Actually the $7.9 million and the $418,000.

Paula Hughes: No.

Paul Moss: In my opinion, it would be helpful to have something documented so that we could take a look at it. It is difficult for me to try to write all of these numbers down and then I would have to subtract it. I don’t know about anybody else but I am not sure that we can have this discussion today in any sort of substantive manner. Councilman Miller?

Cal Miller: I agree that we can not make a $7 million decision based on a thirty second presentation. Ms. Savieo, I am sure you can appreciate that. When you do set forth, in great detail and in writing, what the needs are and what the budget numbers are, I would also like to know if the increase you requested was about 30% over the budget of the previous year, wasn't it? As part of the request for the additional dollars, I would like to know, first of all, what happened to the appeal to the DLGF?

Lisa Blosser: The hearing is in June. We haven't had the hearing yet. There hasn't been a decision reached yet.

Cal Miller: Also, what has the department done in the anticipation of not being granted the 48% increase in the budget? What have you done to curb spending so that you don't find yourself in the predicament of being $8 million short? I don't think that you can come to this Council with the foregone conclusion that this is going to be appropriated based on the decision made last year to not grant a 48% increase. I am just one of seven members of this Council.

Michelle Savieo: I can tell you that I will be happy to do that. This was more of an informational discussion. Some of the things that we have done are look at the placement costs although they continue to rise. We have required the case managers to justify any placement requests that are over $200 a day. When children don't get through placement in nine months, as the State contracts, they have to provide justification as to why they need more than nine months.

Cal Miller: For those sorts of maneuvers that were made in your department, if you could tell us in writing and what the savings were resulted were from the adjustments you made…

Michelle Savieo: It is difficult to tell you what type of savings we had because our placement costs are actually higher than anticipated. The number of children that we place is also higher. We have over 1,300 wards on our caseload. The needs that we are seeing in children of today's society are much greater than we have ever seen. We are seeing many children who are a danger to themselves and others. We are seeing so many more children that need to go into residential placement that we were able to place in foster care. We are also working very hard to try to keep children in their own home. One of the things that we are doing in order to do that is that we have an expense of anywhere from $500 to $1,000 because we need to help families pay back due utilities or rent so that they are not evicted. If we pay $1,000 up front and don't have to place those children in care, in foster care it is anywhere from $25 a day to over $100 a day. If we can pay the $1,000 up front and keep a child from being placed in foster care for a month, in tow months, we have recouped our savings. It is difficult to see that when placement costs have gone up and cost of services have gone up because the budget just continues to rise.

Cal Miller: That is part of the concern that this Council expressed in not approving a 48% increase. As I recall the discussion was a very detailed discussion that Council had last year was where does this end. At what time do these increases stop? Forty-eight percent is a staggering figure and if we are asked to appropriate what this department was asking for, that it decided not to do, wouldn't we be undoing that decision? Furthermore, would that just make the question before the DLGF moot? I understood that your department was appealing to the DLGF to have the full budget reinstated. Procedurally, maybe the Auditor's Office could help us out if that meeting is in June.

Lisa Blosser: By law, I had to appeal. June 11th, the meeting will be at 9:00.

Cal Miller: From a timing standpoint, my preference would be that we let that hearing occur and we see what they say. We can then be guided appropriately based on what the DLGF decides.

Tera Klutz: When, and if, they would approve their budget, we would still need to discuss if we would take out a loan for them to operate. Family and Children is part of the County and if we are going to take a loan for the General Fund next month, I think August, when she runs out of cash, we, as a County, would need to deal with how Family and Children will operate within their approved budget. It is a fund of the County, just like the General Fund. We really have two issues but I think we will be addressing the cash flow, regardless.

Paul Moss: Councilwoman Hughes?

Paula Hughes: I want to remind Council that we had this discussion almost a year ago but I really believe that the local division of Family and Children Services, and I know that is not the right acronym anymore, is between a rock and a hard place. You are mandated by the State and by the State agency that you are a part of, as to how you provide the service but at the same time, you are under the burden of local units of government to seek your funding. We were compelling in our argument to the State legislature this last year that is was not an appropriate funding stream to have State control over a locally funded agency. I certainly don't want anyone in the audience to think that this is something that is a surprise to any of us. We knew this was coming. I don't know if I was the lone voice in this but there are a lot of things that you can not control in your budget. I would be happy to work with you on the presentation for County Council in the upcoming months.

Paul Moss: Councilwoman Johnson?

Maye Johnson: I would agree with Councilwoman Hughes in the compelling case that you made to Council months ago. You don't have control over the escalating costs but at the same time, I didn't realize that you were absorbing so many of the emergency costs for services. Could you document that as well? I agree that we can't make a decision until after the hearing.

Paul Moss: Councilman Vogt?

Darren Vogt: When you are preparing for the next meeting, I would like to see what the other divisions around the State are doing and what their increases are and compare them to what we have here and if we are out of pattern with everyone else.

Paul Moss: Councilman Miller?

Cal Miller: Procedurally, what happens here, if the DLGF overturns the County Council's decision not to approve a 48% in a budget for this department? If they overturn that, what occurs? If they support the decision and do not increase their budget, what occurs?

Lisa Blosser: At the hearing, because of the way the law is written, there is a pretty good chance that the appeal will be approved. It will just be added on to the tax bills. The tax cycle timing has been so delayed this year it is probably the reason why the hearing is so late. If they decide to deny it, we, as the County, will have to find the funds to pay those expenses. If we don't receive the revenue from the property tax levy, we will have to fund the expenses from the Rainy Day Fund. It is our responsibility.

Paul Moss: Councilman Buskirk?

Roy Buskirk: Michelle, you said that the $29 million was the budget that was approved by the DLGF?

Michelle Savieo: That is what was approved for us when we were here in July, with County Council.

Roy Buskirk: Okay. I thought that you said earlier that it was approved by the DLGF.

Michelle Savieo: We have not had our budget approved for this year by the DLGF. Back in 2007, the DLGF approved our budget at $30,295,832.

Roy Buskirk: Did we approve the entire budget? I have $18 million stuck in my head.

Lisa Blosser: The whole budget is not on the property tax roll, just a portion of it.

Roy Buskirk: Okay. Part of the budget on the property tax roll, on the County property tax roll, is 23.6% of the property taxes collected by the County is for your budget. That is one of the reasons why we were supporting the legislation to have that go through the State. I thought it was amazing that Senator Bob Meeks said that he didn't know if the State could afford it because there is no control of your budget. I realize that our society is not very well as far as the treatment of children.

Paul Moss: One could argue that our society does pretty well in treating children when you are spending this type of money. I think that I have said in the past, there are other agencies, and I have served on the board of SCAN and their budget is $7 million a year or something along that line that obviously it should be thrown into the pot in terms of what we do for kids in this community. I share Councilman Miller's concern. It is kind of like a black hole and when does it end? Is $100 million or $200 million that is appropriate? And that is without taking a look at the root cause of these kinds of issues. I think that is just a frustration that everybody at this table shares but we understand that you have limited ability to address those issues. I think, from a procedural standpoint, I think we could possibly have a conversation at our June meeting and allocate a specific amount of time to that and you could provide us some documented information that would help all of us digest and understand what we are talking about. Then we can move forward from there. We have to keep in mind that we have the June 11th meeting with the DLGF and that will obviously help us form an opinion. Does that seem like an appropriate approach? Michelle, are you okay with that?

Michelle Savieo: Yes. I can tell you that our department is making sweeping reform within our department, to address some of the concerns that you have. The budget keeps growing, the number of children that we serve keeps growing and we are implementing many new practices within our office. We call them child and family team meetings but the whole intent is wrap the services around the family and identify both formal and informal supports that will help them get through our system faster and help them to not come back. As long as we keep seeing the same people come through our doors, the budget continues to increase because their needs continue to get greater. As we work through this process and learn more about it, the hope and intent is that we won't continue to have this revolving door. I will be happy to give Council a presentation. I know it will take a little time and I don't want to bring it to a meeting unless you would like me to do so. Maybe there is another avenue that I could share the information. We really are looking at how we can impact the cost and move more cost into prevention. If we can get them up front, we might not have these high placement costs at a later date. That really is our goal but it is going to take time and effort because we have families that have great needs. I would be happy to share the reform and new practices that we are going through if that is something Council would like me to do.

Paul Moss: I think you should anticipate a half-hour to forty-five minutes on June 4th, right?

Roy Buskirk: No, no, the next Council meeting.

Paul Moss: I was talking about having her at the budget discussion.

Paula Hughes: I suggest that we delay it until after the June 11th DLGF meeting.

Darren Vogt: If they approve it, our conversation would be moot at that point.

Paul Moss: I am fine with that.

Michelle Savieo: Would that be in July?

Roy Buskirk: No, June 19th.

Paul Moss: How many children do you serve?

Michelle Savieo: Our currently monthly average is 1,244 children. Right now we are at a high of over 1,300.

Paul Moss: When you say 1,300 children, is that 1,300 different children each month?

Michelle Savieo: No.

Paul Moss: So what number would you take, let's assume $38.5 million, what would the number be to divide that $38.5 million to see how much is being spent on each child that is served? We just went through, last month, a discussion of a grant for $100,000, a federal grant so it is not our money, but it was going to serve about fifteen kids. I think it was a legitimate issue in terms of our position to be fiscally showing some restraint, so I am curious what that equation should be.

Michelle Savieo: Five hundred of those children are in placement. Approximately three hundred are in foster care. Our department has over 120 children in any residential placement at any one time. Probation also has 120 children in residential placement. Almost half of the children in placement, that we serve, are CHINS in foster care and half are in institutions. The children in institutions cost the most. Children in their own home, we can try to figure out what their cost of placement is but it is relatively low.

Paul Moss: What I am looking for is just an average. It is roughly $30,000 a year, according to the numbers that you provided. Do you think that that is pretty accurate?

Michelle Savieo: Probably, however, some of those children we pay $250,000 a year because of the institutional costs.

Paul Moss: Sure, we are just looking at an average. It is not a criticism. I think people just need to understand. That is a way to quantify it easily.

Cal Miller: $38 million for 1,300 children?

Paula Hughes: It is not only 1,300. That is a rolling average each month. The way to look at it is $2,500 per child per month average.

Michelle Savieo: We do an average of 250 investigations a year and those are new families coming into the system. Not all of those families are taken into court to become Children in Need of Services. Some of those families just need the service up front and then the case can be closed without going into court. Some require the court intervention. We take approximately 25 new children into court each month. The children that go into court, there are 1,300 that require court intervention and are involved in the court system on a long-term basis.

Cal Miller: Has there ever been any attempt at calculating the actual cost of the 1,300? The court costs aren't included in the $38 million budget, are they?

Michelle Savieo: No.

Cal Miller: And the probation isn't included in the $38 million, is it?

Michelle Savieo: The cost of services and placement are.

Cal Miller: What is not included in that budget that is auxiliary costs that are being incurred by the community?

Michelle Savieo: Court costs, Medicaid costs, many families receive counseling and many times, social service agencies get funding from not only us but also from other sources. The social service agencies also serve our children. Their funding comes from many sources.

Cal Miller: Are you aware of any studies or analysis that attempts to put a price tag on all of the services?

Michelle Savieo: I am not but I can do some research and see if the Child Welfare League of America has ever done anything on that.

Cal Miller: I would appreciate that.

Paul Moss: Well, to wrap up this broad-ranging discussion, I think we have agreed that we are going to have you come back at the June Council meeting and we will have a little more detailed discussion. You will be able to provide us some documents to review, prior to that.

Michelle Savieo: I will and we will be through half the year, no we won't, we will just have an additional month to add on.

Paul Moss: That will be great. I appreciate the update.

Michelle Savieo: Okay, thank you.

Paul Moss: An additional agenda item here is a discussion with the Assessor. This is something that was discussed at our Personnel Committee meeting. This is in regards to reorganization that the Assessor would like to move forward with. The Personnel Committee was supportive of this but I don't think we need to go too long into the details but if you want to summarize it for everybody.

Stacey O'Day: Thank you Councilman Moss. I know you have a busy agenda today and I will try to be brief. As you know, legislation did away with four of the township assessors that we have in Allen County. This means that the County Assessor's Office would be absorbing twenty employees. What we have come up with is a plan that takes place on July 1 to take care of those four townships. Very briefly, what we have done is kind of taken the team concept that we did last year with the Commercial and Industrial properties and tried to streamline the same methodology with the other departments that we have in the County Assessor's Office. We created the Commercial and Industrial team, last year, which took one employee from each office. The do all of the commercial and industrial properties throughout the County and that is to produce uniformity. That is what the Governor's message truly was. The other team that we created is the Personal Property Team. It is really not territorial but the job is the same no matter where you go in the County. All of the members of all of the townships will be coming down to create a Personal Property Team. The other thing that we created is the Sales Team. It is very important to know out markets and go over our sales disclosures and make sure that the sales we are using are indicative of the sales in the market. It is crucial to our ratio studies. The other thing that we have done is created a Commercial & Ag Team. Basically, that is very territorial. We have broken down personal accounts per staff to make sure that we are covering the field and tracking the market to make sure that the sales are indicative of the assessed values. Do you have any other questions for me?

Paula Hughes: I would like to make one comment, if I could. I spent yesterday in Johnson County, which is just south of Indianapolis and in that county the County Assessor quit rather than deal with this situation. I want to commend our Assessor for stepping up and wading through this. I know it has not been easy. There has been a lot of time and effort put into it and I have met with Assessor O'Day repeatedly throughout the last couple of months. I am please with the plan that she has put together. I asked her to come and we could look at this so that if any Council members have any questions about this, please get them to the Assessor within the next month because our next Council meeting is only eleven days before this has to go into place.

Paul Moss: Are you willing to commit, publicly, that you will remain in the job?

Stacey O'Day: I have been here for eighteen years and I plan to continue on.

Paul Moss: We appreciate that. Councilman Vogt?

Darren Vogt: In this plan, does this address the assessors that will not be doing the functions at all?

Stacey O'Day: We have a plan that would take place should the referendum lose the three other township assessors that we have. We have Plan A and Plan B. It is really difficult to try and place these people when we have two different times that this is going to take place. We are prepared with a Plan B to encompass those folks. It is very much the same as this but is just making sure we are allocating staff where it is necessary. The residential will remain very territorial so it is very important to know your market base. Certain staff members will know and will be assigned to certain neighborhoods so that they know, exactly, what the market is. The market between Aboite Township and Wayne Township are just different. The staff has got to know their territory. The plan is just more of the same of that should the other three be brought into the County Assessor's line items.

Darren Vogt: What about the assessors that are currently doing the duties but the jobs will go to your office on July 1?

Stacey O'Day: That is what we talked about in the Personnel Committee meeting. We created a team leader that will be leading these teams.

Darren Vogt: And that will be those folks?

Stacey O'Day: Actually the statute says that I have to interview the township assessors and the staff and will place the staff where they are necessary. We will go through a formal interview process with all of the staff that would be technically losing their jobs.

Darren Vogt: Will all of the responsibility of assessing then fall under yours and there would be nothing left for those elected officials to do within those teams.

Stacey O'Day: The statute says that their job is to assist me between July and January.

Darren Vogt: Council, the reason I ask these questions is because we have our budget considerations coming up. I wanted to make sure that we were clear on what direction they were going.

Roy Buskirk: Have you seen the Attorney General's ruling on that as far as the wages?

Darren Vogt: Correct and we set those wages.

Roy Buskirk: I mean that they are continued at the same wages until the end of the year?

Stacey O'Day: Yes.

Paul Moss: Probably important to keep in mind that this will vary from county to county but there may not be a whole lot of efficiencies gained here. Many of the initiatives are meant to streamline and create efficiencies but this may be one of those cases where it is not necessarily more efficient but it is more consistent. Hopefully there might be something that comes out from an efficiency standpoint.

Stacey O'Day: Yes. What I did not mention is that the township trustees also fall under that umbrella of less than 15,000 parcels. The staff that we currently have, we anticipate just absorbing the work of the personal property and the field work.

Roy Buskirk: I was going to ask that question. The fact is that all of the current employees in the township assessors are being retained but are taking on additional work because of the township trustee/assessors.

Stacey O'Day: I am not asking for additional staff. We have a huge job to do but we are absorbing the work of those township trustees.

Paul Moss: We appreciate the update and information. Are there any further questions? Thank you.

Stacey O'Day: Thank you.

Paul Moss: Okay, we will move right in to the appropriations. The first one is from Countywide Compensation for $21,515 to Building Maintenance.

Cal Miller: I don't have anything to add to that.

Paula Hughes: As a reminder to Council, this is reorganization of the Building Maintenance Department and went to the Personnel Committee last month.

Cal Miller: Move for approval of items one through fifteen.

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 7-0. Okay, item 16 and 17 is contractual. Councilman Vogt?

Darren Vogt: What we have is a situation where the Public Defender's office has not been charged rent and the Commissioners are going to start charging rent to them. It is going to be money in and money out of ours and then be reimbursed from the Public Defender Fund. It will be about 40%. Mr. Leonard, we have a number on our agenda that says $50,000. That is the annual rent, is that correct?

Chuck Leonard: That has been adjusted by the Commissioners.

Darren Vogt: And what is that?

Chuck Leonard: $23,000.

Darren Vogt: Thank you. Make a motion to approve items 16 and 17 in the amount of $23,000.

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 7-0. Appropriation of $291,563 in Drug Free Communities Fund.

Jerri Lerch: Good morning, thanks for allowing me to be here. I am Jerri Lerch, the Executive Director of the Drug and Alcohol Consortium in Allen County. We have completed our annual grant cycle where we solicit for grants according to our State approved plan. We have been through the funding process with the funding committee and our board. We have reviewed with the County Commissioners and I am here to request the appropriation. That way, we can put prevention dollars out in the community. I have provided for you a couple of things. You should have received the report that lists the grantees. I also sent electronically, a brief overview of the Drug and Alcohol Consortium. Today, I brought an example of a significant amount of work that we have completed within the last year for a State project. It documents the scope of drug and alcohol issues here in Allen County. We use this data driven approach to guide us in how we set goals and how we plan across multiple community organizations. I am happy to answer any questions.

Paul Moss: Councilman Vogt?

Darren Vogt: If you could tell us where these funds come from and how they are generated?

Jerri Lerch: Certainly. These funds are generated out of the Drug Free Indiana statute. It is overseen by the Indiana Criminal Justice Institute’s commission for Drug Free Indiana. That is where we have to submit a plan that documents our community plan and working together. Once that plan is approved, we are eligible for $200 per OWI arrest and fine. That is put in a designated fund for these purposes. By statute, we are required to spend those proportionately on prevention, justice and intervention or treatment.

Darren Vogt: Thank you.

Paul Moss: Council, are there any other questions or comments on this request?

Patt Kite: Move to approve item 18 in the amount of $291,563.

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 7-0.

Jerri Lerch: Thank you.

Paul Moss: Items nineteen through twenty-six is Youth Services.

Chris Dunn: Good morning, Chris Dunn with Youth Services Center. First I want to say that I put in your mailboxes our year-end statistical report. The number of kids we serviced last year set an all-time record high. The last time that we were close to that was 1994. I come before you today wanting to use some of the 737 Fund. The $500 is for criminal background checks that we are required to run on every one of the people that we employee. The State sets those standards, I have no say in that. The cost of running those has gone up over the last two years. It is about $50 per person. The treatment, item 19, is regarding a program that I brought before you last fall. The grants that we were hoping for did not come through. We are hoping to fund this program ourselves through the 737 account. We feel that it is very important for those kids that are coming into our center to receive some therapy. They have not been receiving any therapy while they were with us. We are talking about something in the form of a group session to give them some skills to work with the issues that they are dealing with. The other issues are regarding two positions that I went in front of the Personnel Committee for and they did approve. They approved the increase to OSS 2 and 3. Are there any questions?

Paul Moss: The one question I have is on the treatment. You are currently not designating and funds for treatment, per se. Is that an accurate statement?

Chris Dunn: Correct. We had started a pilot program last fall and the grants did not come through and the program had to come to an end. We feel it is important and would like to fund it totally out of the 737. At our last childcare board meeting, we discussed this and it was decided that I come to you. We are not giving up on going for grants to fund this. We wanted to be able to provide these services whether we get the grants or not. We are going to continue looking for grants but I need to report back to the childcare board prior to spending any of this money and about any success that we have had in securing those grants. We wanted to have the money available to bargain with getting that agreement set up.

Paul Moss: Is it safe to assume that you are working with Ms. Wilson on those grants?

Chris Dunn: Yes.

Lin Wilson: I didn't write that grant. Somebody else was to be writing it and they dropped the ball. This time, I will be helping him.

Darren Vogt: Let me interject since I sit on the board. One of the other things that we talked about was outcomes to make sure that the kids receiving the services were actually thinking that they are benefiting from it. When we originally funded it, it was $6,000 for a three-month trial. The group that was going to do it was part of the contact that was going to go out and find the grants. We didn't circumvent our grant writer but that was part of the deal that they would do it themselves. The childcare board realized that the services are valuable and that the kids would be getting some benefit out of it. We told him to come before Council for the money but still work to get the grants.

Chris Dunn: Darren asked that we put in the measure and we will try to come up with a measure for the groups. We will try to get a measure on the front end when the kids are coming into the groups and then when they are leaving us. We will try to measure when the kids are coming into the groups and then when they are leaving us.

Patt Kite: I have a question. On the background checks, who does that work for you and what is the depth?

Chris Dunn: It is required or mandated by the State. We have to go through FBI fingerprint checks and we have to use the agency that the State is set up with. Pride Rock is located in Airport North. I have to send the staff down there in the last step of the hiring process. They submit the fingerprints to the FBI but I still have to run local checks because not all small, local agencies turn everything in to the FBI. The third thing they do is to check those names against the database for Department of Family and Children to see if they have ever had their children removed from their care. I don't have access to that because it is a new process.

Patt Kite: Isn't that a function that the Sheriff's Department could do? I recall doing background checks on all kinds of applicants.

Chris Dunn: It was supposed to go through the State Police. This is all part of the new department that Mitch Daniels and Judge Payne started and this is one of their requirements. It is not up to us to go through the Sheriff's Department. We have to go through Pride Rock.

Patt Kite: You have to?

Chris Dunn: Yes. It is not our choice.

Patt Kite: It makes more sense to do it in-house.

Chris Dunn: They are not allowed to do triple-I for us.

Patt Kite: Who, the Sheriff's Department?

Chris Dunn: Yes, about four years ago, they are not allowed to do triple-I for us and that is what we need.

Patt Kite: And that is because?

Chris Dunn: State rules, I guess. As far as who has access to triple-I background checks and who they can run them on.

Patt Kite: I am going to defer to the Sheriff back there.

Ken Fries: We would be capable to do it and happy to do it and save $500 as long as the State didn't mandate that them going somewhere else.

Paul Moss: That sounds like the wisdom of the State.

Patt Kite: Doesn't the Sheriff still do triple-I inquiries?

Ken Fries: Yes ma'am.

Patt Kite: They do them for me in my investigative capacity.

Chris Dunn: They used to do them for us.

Patt Kite: Maybe you can work that out.

Roy Buskirk: They might think that there is collusion if a local person is doing it.

Paul Moss: Well, on that note, are there any further questions on this appropriation request?

Paula Hughes: Move for approval of items 19 through 26 for $67,436.

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 7-0.

Darren Vogt: We have a salary ordinance. Consideration of a salary ordinance amending the pay for employees within the budget of the Youth Services Center; Assistant OSS 2/5 to OSS 3/5 in the amount of $32,663 and Assistant Office Manager OSS 2/2 to OSS 4/2 in the amount of $31,243.

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 7-0 for both salary ordinances. We are now at the Circuit Court salary ordinance, Tim Miller.

Tim Miller: Good morning, Tim Miller, Allen Circuit Court Administrator. We went to the Personnel Committee and this was in our 2008 budget to do some reorganization within the Probation Department. We have identified the candidate for the Supervisor position and we are asking for the salary ordinance to take care of that. I did want to point out that I miscalculated and we were off by $250.

Darren Vogt: What is that new number?

Tim Miller: It would be $50,603.70.

Roy Buskirk: With the number of probation officers that we have, this is another mandate from the State.

Tim Miller: Correct. We have twenty-one probation officers now and basically the UPROB grid, the State allows us to name a Supervisor. We have a Deputy Assistant Chief and we are now instituting a Supervisor. They will split those twenty-one officers for supervision and monitoring and things of that nature.

Paul Moss: Any further discussion or questions on this salary ordinance?

Darren Vogt: Move for approval of a salary ordinance setting the pay for the employee within the budget of Circuit Court, Adult Probation Supervisor UPROB 6 in the amount of $50,604.

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 7-0.

Tim Miller: Would it be all right if I stayed for the next agenda items, the grants?

Paul Moss: Sure. This is the Court Reform Grant?

Tim Miller: Yes. The Indiana Supreme Court has made some money available to the Indiana Courts for Court Reform. In working with Jerry Noble from Superior Court, we have decided to take advantage of applying for one of these grants. Initially we thought the deadline was May 1st but we just have to have the letter of intent. We have put it on the calendar but have not applied for the grant yet. The deadline has been extended to July 1st. We decided to take advantage of the opportunity to look into the possibility of adopting the court tools. It is a set of ten court measurements that the National Center for State Courts has made available across the country. It is a set of measurements that we can collect data, analyze the data and then compare ourselves against the operations of courts nationwide. That is essentially what our request is.

Paul Moss: Are there any questions from Council on this?

Jerry Noble: I might add too that Tim and I have been talking about this for several months and even before the grant opportunity became available. We thought it was a good idea to adopt some performance measures. We think this dovetails quite nicely with the strategic planning. This will be a major part of our strategic plan within the context of the County's overall plan.

Darren Vogt: Move for approval for Circuit and Superior Court to apply for the Court Reform grant in the amount of $20,896.

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 7-0. I would like to note for those in the audience that we have a couple of other grants to get to here and then we will take a brief recess to set up the PowerPoint presentation. ACJC, how are you?

Joe Brita: I am Joe Brita with the Allen County Juvenile Center and this is Chandra Reichert, our Finance Administrator.

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

Joe Brita: We are here to ask for approval to apply for two separate grants from the Drug and Alcohol Consortium. Chandra or Lin can explain it to you.

Chandra Reichert: I believe you already have the list of those that have been approved. Unfortunately we had some timing issues and were not able to get on the last agenda to ask for your permission to apply. The deadline has passed and we did apply. We are now just waiting to hear back from Jerri Lerch.

Paul Moss: Ms. Wilson, do you have any comments that you want to add?

Lin Wilson: No just that the DAC grants will only have spring funding this year. They are not going to do a fall round. I am pretty sure that most of the people who submitted applications are going to get funding or partial funding.

Paul Moss: Are there any questions from Council?

Roy Buskirk: And what would happen if we voted this down?

Lin Wilson: You would have to take that up with Jerri Lerch.

Cal Miller: Didn't we just approve the DAC budget, so they are already in there. Let us be the first to give you the good news.

Joe Brita: It is actually kind of sad that we have to open up two new assays but it is a trend that is going on with the kids that we serve, anyway. Drugs seem to be going from the street to the medicine cabinet. This is what it is all about. You get some minor surgery anymore and you get some pretty potent pain medication. Kids are just finding it a lot easier to move into the homes and get it right out of the medicine cabinet.

Darren Vogt: Move for approval of the ACJC grant from the Drug and Alcohol Consortium in the amount of $26,656.80 and an additional grant in the amount of $414.34.

Lin Wilson: Excuse me Darren that is a typo. It is $23,000 instead of $26,000.

Darren Vogt: Amend that motion to $23,656.80.

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 7-0.

Ken Fries: Good morning, Council. Kenny Fries, Sheriff of Allen County requesting permission to apply for the Advanced Criminal Enforcement grant through ICJI. There are no matching funds and it is primarily for enforcement drug interdiction along I-69 corridor.

Lin Wilson: It is a three month blitz, June, July and August. They have to do at least six stops or interdictions per month. This is surplus money from the JAG grant. It is federal money passed through. There is no match required. The officer will be responsible for his uniforms, car and all of that stuff. It is strictly for overtime for the blitz in June, July and August along the I-69 corridor.

Paula Hughes: The Sheriff's Department talked to me about this and I am supportive of the application.

Patt Kite: Will this work be accomplished by the new interdiction officers?

Ken Fries: No. We are going to use other officers and we had to send them a list of the names of the people who have been through the interdiction training that will be working the blitz.

Lin Wilson: There will be K-9 officers involved; a couple of Corporals, six different officers have been identified. Seven officers plus three K-9's.

Paul Moss: Are there any further questions on this grant request?

Tera Klutz: Thanks for letting us know when not to go on I69.

Ken Fries: I didn't want anybody to say too much about it.

Lin Wilson: Well, as Mayor Helmke said that if you know that you are not dealing drugs or using drugs and you get along with your family, you are not going to have a crime problem.

Paul Moss: Well, that is words of wisdom.

Roy Buskirk: I make a motion that we approve this grant application.

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 7-0.

Roy Buskirk: I had a lady call me last week and ask if you would be interested in some old Smithsonian magazines that you could use in the jail for reading material?

Ken Fries: I would have to say no.

Lin Wilson: I will take them. I will find a home for them.

Roy Buskirk: Do you ever take reading material?

Ken Fries: Yes. The chaplain service actually provides all of the reading material in the jail. If you want, they can contact them but I am betting that they would say no.

Paul Moss: Are these all of your old Playboys or something?

Roy Buskirk: No, no, no, no.

Paula Hughes: Council, something that I have been thinking about with these grant applications is that it seems fairly cumbersome that we have to go through this process each time and deadlines are missed. I was wondering if we could develop a consensus form. We could make a subcommittee of Council and have the Auditor's Office involved. If there are certain things like it is a direct grant, there is no matching and if it is not increasing employees, things that we could check off and they would automatically have approval.

Paul Moss: I am all for that. I mentioned the desire for a consent agenda a long time ago. I would be happy to try to move that forward here.

Paula Hughes: All right, I will work on that over the next month.

Paul Moss: Okay. Do we need to take a break to set up? All right, we will take a couple of minutes to let people set up for the Maplecrest Extension.

Short break.

Paul Moss: I think we are about ready to get started. Darren? Paula? I think we are ready to get going with the presentation. I would like to make a couple of quick comments before we view the PowerPoint presentation. This is obviously an issue that has been discussed at the Council table for a few months now. There has been a significant amount of information that has been provided. We now have had the feasibility study and I hope that everyone has had an opportunity to review that. I am not sure who is going to be making the presentation but I would suggest that you hit the highlights so that there is ample opportunity for discussion and questions afterward. I would also like to say that this is being characterized in the media as a bit of a battle between Council and the Commissioners on this issue. I certainly do not feel that this is the case. I think there have been some legitimate questions raised and it is important to note that this Council has a fiduciary responsibility to make sure that this project is appropriately scrutinized. I will also ask that it appears there are some folks that may want to have some comments. There will be an opportunity if folks have a desire to make some comments either for or against and we will make sure that that occurs. Having said that, Linda, are you going to make the presentation?

Linda Bloom: I am it. Good morning. How are you? Long day already. I am Commissioner Linda Bloom, President of the Board of Commissioners. I want to begin by thanking you for giving us this opportunity to discuss this and answer your questions about one of the most important and certainly most talked about road construction project in recent history. Here with me today are Cynthia Bowen, Director of Planning and Urban Design with RW Armstrong; Bill Sheldrake, President and Jason O'Neill, Staff Consultant with Policy Analytics and Brian Colton, Manager with Umbaugh. He will talk about the feasibility study for this project. Rob Young, President of the Alliance will briefly speak about the economic impact from a local perspective. Dan Avery, Director of NIRCC and County Highway Director Bill Hartman will review the transportation efficiencies and planning of the project. Also, of course, my fellow Commissioners, Commissioner Brown and Commissioner Peters, will have their own remarks. At the end of the presentation, we would be happy to answer any of your questions. Also, showing support for the Maplecrest Road Extension is Dan Starr, the legal counsel for Do-It-Best and representatives from the Fort Wayne Chamber. We hope, that at the end of this presentation, you will take a formal vote to allow us to proceed with bond counsel with what we believe is a vital project that will improve accessibility and safety along this corridor and generate significant benefits for the County. With that, I will begin with Cynthia, Bill, Jason and Brian for the presentation.

Paul Moss: Commissioner, I do have one quick question.

Linda Bloom: Yes.

Paul Moss: You mentioned that you would like to see a vote to move forward with bond counsel.

Linda Bloom: Yes.

Paul Moss: What would the amount of that bond be? If you look at the estimated project, the sheet is indicating $50,800,000. Is that accurate and is the bond still at $25 million?

Linda Bloom: Both numbers are correct.

Paul Moss: Okay.

Cynthia Bowen: Good morning. Thank you for having us. My name is Cynthia Bowen and I am the Director of Planning for RW Armstrong. Let me talk briefly about what we are going to cover in our portion of the presentation. We are going to talk about the purpose and the study area to give you some background of context of what we looked at. We will talk through the development analysis, economic analysis and revenue analysis and TIF feasibility. I have four folks with me to talk today. Three of us will be doing the majority of the speaking. I represent RW Armstrong and we are a planning and engineering firm and have been in business since 1961. We have been doing transportation, civil engineering and planning projects. I graduated from Ball State University with a degree in planning and regional development. I have completed over eighty comprehensive plans, land use studies and such for multiple clients in the Midwest. Also with me is Bill Sheldrake. He is the President of Policy Analytics. He is the former State Budget Director and Chief Forecaster for the State of Indiana. He has a masters in finance from Purdue University. Finally speaking will be Brian Colton, the Manager of Umbaugh who specializes in economic development and TIF analysis. He graduated from Indiana University with a masters in public affairs. He is also a certified, independent public finance advisor. The way that we broke this up is that our team was asked to complete this feasibility study for Maplecrest. We worked jointly together to do this with RW Armstrong looking at the land use component. Policy Analytics was looking at the economic impact derived from that land use. Finally Brian and Umbaugh's firm looking at the TIF feasibility based on the numbers that RW Armstrong and Policy Analytics prepared. The purpose of why we were asked to undertake this study was to really look at and project what the future development pattern is based on the current trends and land use policy. Right now, the City of New Haven, Fort Wayne and Allen County have comprehensive plans in place. They are very broad brush strokes of what can happen in terms of land use development over the next twenty years. What is common in many communities is that a very detailed sub-area plan is created to understand how a county or city needs to map out its land use and what that policy direction should be. So what we were doing, besides creating a feasibility study to understand the impacts of Maplecrest, we were also doing a much more detailed land use analysis and projecting what these trends are. We also needed to identify and evaluate that potential new development, address the economic impact based on that land use plan and what we foresee the land use being over the next twenty years. Also, determining the financial viability of that and so all of that is contained in this report. First, I want to give you some context. We have to set a study area boundary to determine what the land use is for the future. We went roughly a mile off the corridor and that is the shaded area that you see here. This is what we used as our study area. The other thing that is here is you also see the TIF boundaries; the New Haven TIF boundary, the Fort Wayne TIF boundary, the Allen Adams TIF as well as the Allen Marion TIF. The red line here is the City of Fort Wayne. The blue line is the City of New Haven. Everything else is Allen County. That is what we looked at in terms of this study. To get into a little bit about the development analysis and how we go about projecting land use for the future. First, we have to step back and look at what is the existing land use policy in the City of New Haven, in Allen County and in Fort Wayne? We went back and looked at your adopted policy and the comprehensive plans and the zoning ordinance which tells how parcels are going to be developed out. We looked at the TIF establishment documents. When you put the TIF documents together and establish that TIF district, you have to state some of the direction for that development. We looked at all of those different things. We also talked to the various planning directors for each of the jurisdictions to understand and insure that the direction that was set forth in this comprehensive plan and what the zoning ordinance said is still consistent policy of how the County and the cities are implementing them to this date. We also had to acquire existing data. We had to get the mapping for the area and we looked at all of the comprehensive plans to determine what the projected growth rates were. We also looked at the zoning to determine average lot size so then we could get into the financial feasibility and the economic impacts. Again, because this is a study looking at a twenty year period, we did a full build out scenario for this area. Understanding that the policy is going to put in place, and if it stays in place not withstanding any type of political changes or economic climate changes, we developed a full build out scenario of what could potentially happen over the next twenty years given the zoning and the current comprehensive plans. Anytime you do a land use study, you always have to put some assumptions in place. As I have told people, if I had a crystal ball to know exactly what the land use was going to be, first of all, people would not need to hire me to determine that. Secondly, I would probably be a millionaire because I would know exactly what was going to go on the ground. We have to make some assumptions in undertaking this study. First of all, we have to understand that the land use trends are pretty much put in place and have existed for a long period of time. It is going to take a lot of change, policy change, economic change and other change that is outside of anyone's control, to change those land use patterns. A lot of our assumptions are based upon the existing adopted land use policy in the comprehensive plans. We also use the existing zoning, for each area, to specify how the lots are going to build out. Given the understanding that zoning can change, it was a basis for where we needed to start at this point in time. We also utilized the growth rates. The County and Fort Wayne underwent an extensive comprehensive plan process that tested these growth rates and established what the growth rates were and what the needs were for the County. So, instead of reinventing the wheel, we went ahead and used those approved growth rates from that comprehensive plan to apply to the growth of this area to begin to rationalize it out over the twenty year period. Finally, when we are doing a land use study, in order to get an accurate estimate of the economic impacts, we had to subtract out any existing development or known development that we knew was going to be happening in the next couple of years. Those are some of the assumptions that we utilized in preparing this study. The next part of this process is the team sat down and went through and discussed what this land use pattern is going to be. What you see here, the red signifies commercial areas. The purple signifies industrial areas. The blue is going to signify more private or public areas. In this case it is the landfill and the Sheriff's training facility that is proposed. In most cases, you are not getting tax dollars for that. The yellow is residential. Again, we looked at the development patterns. Another thing I should note too is the hashed areas that are right here, are already existing developed areas. When we sat down to look at this land use analysis, we determined what is going to be the highest and best use of all of these different areas. One of the things that we looked at is where, specifically, is commercial and industrial going to go. That is going to provide the greatest economic impact and benefit to the County and to the cities. Based upon the trends, we show and think it is realistic, that this area here is going to develop out with industrial type uses, distribution, light manufacturing and warehousing, similar uses that have already been developed. This area is going to be more regional commercial in nature. We all know that Walmart is looking at going in right here and typically what follows Walmart are other support type commercial uses that serve the community. One of the things that folks sometimes worry about, when you are designating more commercial in an area is how is that going to impact other areas within the community. One of the things that we know is that on the other side of the river, there is a commercial area located there. But the difference is here in this area, you are developing a Walmart. As far as I know and can tell, there is not a Walmart located in a close proximity or distance. You can look at the draw area as being roughly a fifteen to twenty minute drive from this Walmart area. That is where you are going to pull the population from, to serve this. The other item is that as this residential develops out over the next twenty to thirty years, those folks in the southwest quadrant are also going to service this area. The other thing that we looked at is this is one of the last interchanges, around 469, in order to develop out. It is only natural that it would develop out in a commercial fashion, typically with gas stations, restaurants and hotels. It is also close proximity to the airport. The other thing that can happen over time, and it will take some time for this to happen, is that you can also get a regional bent to this area. You start to develop out with such things as Target, Best Buy or Home Depot and those types of uses. That is going to be driven by the amount of residential that develops out in the area. The only reason why we had put residential to show on this map is that residential is not counted in the economic impact. Residential is also not counted in TIF because it doesn't apply to that. The reason that we show the residential on this map is that was the natural growth area pattern and we needed to be sure that not of that area would build out or develop out in an industrial or commercial manner. It would not be realistic for us to bring the industrial down any further or bring the commercial up and further along Marion Center Road. With that, I am going to turn it over to Bill who is going to talk about the economic analysis.

Bill Sheldrake: Thank you, Cynthia. Thanks for allowing us to work on this. My name is Bill Sheldrake and I am the President of Policy Analytics. We had an opportunity to work on this feasibility study. Let me talk a little bit about our methodology. We had consistent assumptions across all three groups here. Our economic assumptions come from the uses of the various parcels of land on this map. What we did was assumed was that in each of those areas would build out would occur and there would be, over a period of time, development and construction and jobs that come from that. How we do that kind of economic impact, there are three areas that affect an economy. The first is direct impact or direct investment that comes from a building or construction period. In this case, the first affect is the build out of the bridges and the road project. There is about $48 million of hard costs built into that and that is the direct impact of that project. The indirect impact is the suppliers and all of the other costs that come into that project. The induced affect is the affect of the wages that are paid and the profits that come from the direct impact and how it flows through the economy. We used some software that was developed a number of years ago by the University of Minnesota and is called IMPLAN. It is used, around the country, for this kind of estimating of inter-industry linkages between geographies. The geography that we are talking about here is the entire County. The direct investment is going into those areas that Cynthia identified and we talked about on the map. The impacts that take place as those induced affects work their way through the economy will take place through Allen County. There were three areas that we measured, economic output, employee compensation and full-time jobs. There are other things that we could talk about but those are the primary impacts and those are talked about in the report. This summarizes the impact and you can see the initial project, the total economic output, the indirect, the direct and induced, is about $85 million over the period. Employee compensation is about $30 million. Full-time employment, and this is throughout the entire County, would be 930. That breaks out, in terms of the capital investment and the non-capital investment about $41 million of direct, $7 million of non-capital for a total of about $48 million. Let me talk a little about the build out period. The economic impact of the construction project doesn’t end when the road project is done. There will be development and there will be construction and there will be jobs and there will be permanent development that occurs in those regions. That is development that is split between industrial and commercial. It moves forward after the construction period and that is why you see that build out period beginning to ramp up. Just a note here, we did some analysis of the intermodal facility that is being proposed for that one parcel and for residential. Those numbers were not built into the TIF. Those are add-on numbers that we tried to take a look at if the intermodal facility took place. We realize that this is just a proposed idea or concept. Those are not built into the tax revenue numbers. I think the residential development over the eleven year period gives me about 900 parcels. The employee compensation works out to about $112 million over the twenty year period. The total economic output is approximately $300 million over the twenty year period. At this point, I am going to turn it over to Brian Colton of Umbaugh to talk about the TIF or revenue analysis.

Brian Colton: Good morning, my name is Brian Colton and I am with Umbaugh. We work with a couple hundred TIF areas in the State of Indiana. We have done a number of projects like this. I don't know if you are familiar with Hanson in Boone County. It is a 1,700 acre mixed-use development project and still in its infancy. We did a project in Noblesville which is also in its infancy but it has really picked up steam over the last couple of years. It is kind of where you put infrastructure, you build it and they will come. Noblesville is a true success story. A common theme with our methodology is that the group of us works together. RW Armstrong started the process by looking at the land use and then we got together with Bill Sheldrake with Policy Analytics and developed the timing and how that would get built out. To help develop the TIF revenue, we looked at comparable properties within Allen County. We tried to look at properties in Marion and Adams townships first and then if there were not properties in those townships we then looked countywide. For example, what is the square foot cost on a Walmart or a hotel or a restaurant? That does vary from county to county. Theoretically we are supposed to be getting towards a market value system. We are not there and so we don't use comps from somewhere else. It takes a fair amount of work to look at different properties. We also took a look at the impact of the recently enacted 1001 legislation. We will talk about that a little more in a couple of slides. This first slide summarizes where we ended up as far as with the tax increment. We have supporting slides after this that shows the composition. As you can see, we don't really have the TIF revenue starting to come on line until 2014. That takes into account the construction period for the project. We also built in some delay in the fact that you want to build in some variance there for build up to start. Also, we would rather be conservative and come back in five years to see that there is some development rather in 2012 than come back and it being 2014. Our firm's methodology is to be on the conservative side. The earliest growth occurs basically in the commercial sections. I will hit on those high points here in a second ending with the industrial development further on. That mainly has to do with where the commercial properties are anticipated to be located. Ones up by 930 have already been discussed with the Walmart property. Another piece is down by the interchange. At an interchange, those can develop more quickly than if you are in between those two locations. If the TIF comes in as estimated, based on our current assumptions, you would see that it would reach full revenue in 2022 at about $2.5 million. These schedules are based upon the assumptions that there are not additional abatements added and we can discuss that as we go on. You can do abatements in a TIF area but it would delay that revenue coming on line because the taxes would come in on a slower pace. Some additional assumptions that we included in looking at the properties, for example the Walmart facility, we did an estimate on what that would bring in. It is important to note that the Walmart was not included in the revenue numbers that you see. That has already been committed by the City of New Haven for that specific site. We built that in when we were doing our estimates however when I show you assessed values and revenues, it is not included in that. The commercial retail piece would be hotels, gas stations, restaurants, strip retail and things like that. We used $60 a square foot which I think is on the conservative side. If you were to look at what the square foot cost for a restaurant is, that is in excess of $100. Strip retail developments can vary widely. We don't know what the quality is going to be in this area so we used $60 a square foot for those types of properties. Industrial and distribution is about $35 a square foot. That number is pretty consistent statewide. We also looked at the density of development for those parcels. What that represents is that for commercial big-box development, that at a twenty acre site about twenty-five percent would be covered. Other retail and industrial is about fifteen percent. A lot of that is based on the guidelines of zoning and some of the comparable properties that we looked at. It is also important to note that we only captured real property in this analysis. Any additional assessed valuation that would occur because of personal property has not been included in these numbers. It is an option for certain types of property that you could decide on a case-by-case basis the designated taxpayer or personal property. On this model, we did not rely on any revenue from that. Finally, we did adjust the 2007 tax rates to account for 1001. This is kind of a big picture adjustment. We looked at the abstract, the budget levy numbers and we made estimates based upon adjusting the deductions and exemptions for residential properties. That is a significant impact on your assessed valuation and how that is going to change the tax base. On the flip side of that, we took out those different funds that are going to be absorbed by the State. The school General Fund, the Special Ed Fund, some of the pension funds, different placement levy and the Welfare Funds were taken out as well to come up with an estimate on the tax rates. We have four different slides that break out the four different sections of the TIF area. The first two have to do with the County TIF area. This is Adams Township which is estimated to be industrial use. It is kind of in the middle portion of the TIF area. There is already a facility out there that was recently developed. We have this beginning in 2017. This would be the last piece of four different pieces that we have built into our model for development. That is mainly because of location and commercial on the ends. This would be development that would occur over an estimated six year period. By the end of development in 2022, it would generate about $38 million of assessed valuation for real property. The Marion Township portion of the Allen County TIF area is anticipated to be commercial on the southern end. That is anticipated to start in 2014. One other item I should note is that on Bill's schedule, you saw things coming on line in 2012. We built in a two year lag from when the property would be developed and taxes would come on line. Wherever Bill's numbers are, ours are going to be two years after that. This would reach about $30 million by the end of its development period in 2021. The Fort Wayne industrial portion, as you can see, is a much smaller piece. There is about 140 acres of developable land out there, according to the plan that was prepared for the establishment of the TIF area. We have set aside fifteen acres of that for the intermodal facility that Bill touched on. This only represents growth that would occur on twenty-four acres of property. We set aside the funds for the intermodal because that may be necessary to bring that company in. We didn't want to have that in these numbers and then have that in a different report, later on, for the intermodal. If for some reason, that development did not occur as an intermodal facility, then it would generate additional revenues in the Fort Wayne TIF area. Finally, the New Haven slide, it shows a combination of commercial and industrial. It is mostly commercial and I want to note, one more time, that this does not include Walmart. The final slide shows that if we look at a comparison of the tax increment with the estimated debt service, the schedule also shows on the Major Bridge revenues. The Major Bridge revenues are anticipated to fund the debt service to the extent that TIF is not available. As you can see, it would fund the bulk of the debt service in the early years out to 2013 or 2014. At that point in time when the TIF would start to come on line and by 2019, if this came to fruition, the entire amount of Major Bridge revenues would be freed up for other uses. That is based on this schedule and the $25 million amortization schedule that the County had prepared. Under this scenario, you would also have additional TIF revenues for other purposes in the areas beginning in 2019. That is all that I have and I believe that Rob Young is here to talk at this time.

Darren Vogt: Is everybody going to come up before us and then we will ask questions?

Paul Moss: Ideally, we could have gone through and interrupted them and asked questions. I think that would have taken a great deal of time. Is Mr. Young going to be the last presenter here?

Linda Bloom: No.

Paul Moss: You prefer to go through the whole list of people?

Cal Miller: I would prefer not to. I think that the presentation and the analysis of the numbers have been made. I have questions that are on my mind…

Paul Moss: that would be lost eventually.

Cal Miller: …and the additional presentation doesn't directly go to the numbers and how they were formulated. My preference would be to go to…

Paul Moss: I would tend to agree with that. I think we could focus on some of these numbers for a little bit if you are comfortable with that. Hopefully, we won't be too redundant in our questions. I know we have quite a few. Councilman Vogt, would you like to start with your questions?

Darren Vogt: One of the key points, and I will start with Cindy, you said that there is a fifteen to twenty minute driving area is the population that it is going to serve. Is that correct?

Cynthia Bowen: Yes.

Darren Vogt: To clarify for you, there is a Walmart, K-Mart and Super Target within that fifteen minute drive. That is out there.

Cynthia Bowen: Okay.

Darren Vogt: How does that impact that analysis that they are going to pull from that population base? Where do you see that drawing, is it going to pull those people from the other retailers, how does that impact the study?

Cynthia Bowen: Typically, what we look at from a marketing perspective is that you can roughly assume that forty percent of the people within that fifteen to twenty minute drive time are going to service that commercial area. One of the other phenomenons that you will see, especially regarding Walmarts, is that they will locate within a ten to fifteen minute drive time and it really doesn't have a strong bearing or impact of pulling from either store. I am not privy to their market information but it becomes a common occurrence and neither seems to hurt performance.

Darren Vogt: Then, the analysis part of this, this is built out of all of that industrial and commercial? Is that correct? When everything is all said and done, is it 100% build out?

Cynthia Bowen: Let me go ahead and answer that. While we say and show that entire area as industrial, it is not 100% built out at the physical ground. It is roughly fifteen to twenty percent of a lot. That will then limit the size of what that facility could be.

Darren Vogt: Let me rephrase that question then. Available space, it is 100% of the available space used up in the analysis? If I need to locate my widget manufacturing facility and I needed twenty acres, you included that as twenty acres and that would be the analysis. That would take up twenty acres even though my facility is only so big.

Brian Colton: Correct. For commercial, I think we did 100% but for industrial, we did not. There is a large portion of the area down in Marion Township and it shows as residential. That land could be rezoned in the future to industrial.

Darren Vogt: I understand that but what you showed on the colored slide, those were all built out to 100% capacity in the analysis, as residential, as commercial and as industrial.

Brian Colton: No, we cut the residential significantly back. It is about 1,800 acres for the County TIF area. We cut that back significantly for the residential as well as the industrial. We took a block of residential that was south of the Fort Wayne TIF area and used that. There is additional land that we didn't even include in the analysis.

Cynthia Bowen: Let me answer it this way, for example, we developed the land use acreages. In your example, you say twenty acres of industrial. Given what I know about the development standards for the County, I know that building won't take up the whole twenty acres. It will only take up twenty percent of that. The numbers that these two guys worked with was the twenty percent that was available to build upon and not the whole twenty acres.

Darren Vogt: Correct, which in theory is building out the whole, entire parcel. I think we are saying the same thing. It is 100% build out but only what is available to be built on.

Cynthia Bowen: Correct and that is what they used for the basis of their numbers.

Darren Vogt: Great, thank you. I will yield the floor to someone else for questions before I take everyone else's questions.

Paul Moss: Councilman Miller?

Cal Miller: If I could, I would like to start with Mr. Colton. I would like to get back to your analysis of the TIF district. You indicated that the potential for tax abatements was not considered in the projection you made for TIF revenues. Is that right?

Brian Colton: Correct.

Cal Miller: Okay. Would you agree that the likelihood of getting tax abatements, in a climate where you are trying to encourage economic development, is rather high? Is that a reasonable assumption to make?

Brian Colton: It really varies from area to area. Certain areas, like Plainfield for example down by Indianapolis, they abate everything. North of Indianapolis, they don't abate anything.

Cal Miller: What do they do in Allen County?

Brian Colton: They do have a fair number of abatements.

Cal Miller: Did any representative of Allen County ask you specifically to not consider the current trend of tax abating in Allen County to come up with your projection of TIF revenues?

Brian Colton: At our initial meeting, I asked if I should include abatements and I was told no.

Cal Miller: I am not being critical of you for not doing that, I just want to understand why it wasn't. Now, have you undertaken any analysis, whether it made it to the final report or not, of the impact of the current environment in Allen County to grant tax abatements on your TIF projections?

Brian Colton: No, we ran one model of this. We were told this morning that someone had asked a question about that.

Cal Miller: Did the Commissioners ask you to not put the TIF, excuse me, the tax abatement potential into your model?

Brian Colton: When we had our organizational meeting, I just asked the questions that we ask when we do a project and one was do you want us to include tax abatements?

Cal Miller: Just a minute, I am still working with Mr. Colton, if you don't mind. Despite the fact that tax abatements have not been considered in the model, do you, from your experience with Umbaugh, can you project with some reasonable certainty what the impact of the liberal tax abatement process that Allen County has, on the TIF projections that you have made for the study?

Brian Colton: If you look at a full build out or full TIF revenue stream comes in line; if everything got, what do you want like a ten-year abatement? That would push it out from 2022 to 2032 to reach full revenue. In the meantime, you have revenue coming on line throughout that period. By the fifth year of an abatement year of about 50% of revenue coming in from a project but to give a specific number, year by year, I can't do that while I am standing here. Not everything comes in on year one.

Cal Miller: The issue of tax abatement, in your experience as managing the Umbaugh organization, is there a relationship between tax abatement and economic growth in an area?

Brian Colton: Sometimes we see economic development where they will seed the area with abatement. As that area starts to take hold, the abatements will go away or they will reduce the abatement. In some situations, yes, but in other places, people want to be in that location.

Cal Miller: I have my tax abatement questions on TIF and I have some questions that I could yield to the floor as well, if you want. I do have some questions of Mr. Sheldrake and his projections. I understand your TIF projections and thank you for undertaking that. I understand that Umbaugh is typically conservative in their projections and that it good news to me in terms of my consideration of your analysis. With respect to the TIF projections that were made by Umbaugh as part of the feasibility study, did it factor in the impact, one way or the other, of whether the tax abatements would be given liberally or not given at all in projecting its TIF revenues?

Bill Sheldrake: Not when we did this report. We may have asked the question but we went the directive we were given.

Cal Miller: But you see, my question is a little finer than that. These TIF revenues that you are projecting, did they factor in, if there is a relationship between economic development and the generation TIF did your numbers factor in, one way or the other, an equation about the tax abatement willingness or unwillingness to give tax abatements? If that is part of the economic incentive, how did your analysis include the unknown about whether there will be tax abatements or no tax abatements and how did that factor into your projection?

Paul Moss: You essentially tied our hands, if we go along with your line of thinking, we would not be able to grant abatements in order to have these TIF revenue numbers to be what you predict. I have to say that it was very presumptuous, not from you but whoever gave you the direction, it was a very presumptuous thing to do, in my opinion.

Cal Miller: So, if you don't mind, Mr. Sheldrake, if we could hear, are these numbers going to be altered if tax abatements are granted?

Paul Moss: Absolutely, how could they not? I'm sorry, I don't mean to answer your question but it seems pretty intuitive.

Bill Sheldrake: I believe that your question about abatements being factored in or not went to the issue of demand for that build out. In other words, how rapidly does it occur or does it occur more slowly if abatements are not given versus if abatements are given. If abatements are seeding, do seed development, is that not your question, sir?

Cal Miller: Yes, right. That is my question. How is it going to impact these projections if they are not given?

Bill Sheldrake: I think the issue is, in trying to estimate demand which is where you are really getting to, how much demand is there to build into this area? I think that our analysis would indicate there is a good deal of demand here for some, in discussing this with other people. If abatements are not granted, excuse me, if abatements were granted, we were asked not to factor those in, but if they were granted, we might see development occur more rapidly. That would affect two things, I will let Mr. Colton speak to this as well, the timing of the build out which would occur sooner and would also affect the revenues and I think that is what the Council President was referring to. It would reduce the revenues in the early years because you would not see the TIF revenue. Do you want to speak to that, Brian?

Brian Colton: It does kind of go both ways. If the development does come in sooner because you offer the incentives, then where we have no numbers showing, you would see a trickling in of the revenues. While the revenue stream would look different, sitting here today, would it be faster, would it be slower? It is hard to tell that, but if it does accelerate then you would have revenues coming on line sooner. But it would be different, you're right.

Cal Miller: Well, I will turn it over because I do want to go back to some other numbers. With respect to the TIF and tax abatement issue, based on the information that is available historically here in Allen County, is it possible to plug in a reasonable analysis of the liberal history of giving tax abatements to encourage economic development, into your equation of what the impact on the forecasted revenues for TIF would be so that we could be guided with a better number as to what those revenues would be?

Brian Colton: Yes, that would be additional scoping but it is a project that could happen.

Cal Miller: And you think that, based on your analysis, the information that you have analyzed, if that information is available and to work into your projections in a way to give us some useful information about what the impact tax abatements would have on TIF revenues…

Brian Colton: We would have to talk to the Auditor's Office and others about the historical trends and what that would be. But that would also impact Bill's model as far as assumptions made and as far as would that encourage development sooner. It would be multiple phases in that.

Cal Miller: This Council and future Councils will need to make a decision now about whether they are going to tax abating. We are concerned about the revenue projections and this particular corridor has been outlined so well and going to take the position that there will be no tax abatements. At some point, someone is going to have to figure out what the impact of tax abatements will be so that we can have some idea of whether there is going to be a shortage of funds is going to require an increase in taxes through the Major Bridge Fund. I think that information, up front, is going to be more beneficial that it would if you consider the project and the development that it holds. Again, it is not a criticism of what you were asked to do.

Brian Colton: It is definitely possible to do the calculations and factor in abatements.

Cal Miller: I yield the floor.

Paul Moss: Councilman Buskirk?

Roy Buskirk: While we are talking on the subject of TIF, I would like to have an explanation. It is my understanding, and correct me if I am wrong, that the TIF is no new money. Sometimes it is being referenced to as generating funds and everything. TIF, because of House Bill 1001 and the Circuit Breaker puts the limit at one percent, is actually coming from other tax levies such as school corporations, library, airport, County General and City or whatever. So, it is a reduction on the revenue that they would be receiving. That is where this TIF money is coming from.

Brian Colton: I don't believe so. The Circuit Breaker is a parcel by parcel basis.

Roy Buskirk: Correct.

Brian Colton: So you look at each parcel. Take a Walmart, for example. You would look at the Walmart parcel and say what is the gross assessed valuation of that times a three percent Circuit Breaker for the Walmart? You would compare that to what the actual tax bill would be. The tax rate estimates that we have looked at, none of the tax rates are above three dollars. There's a couple that's close but they are not at three dollars. So, if they are still below three dollars, then that parcel is generating the full amount of the revenue that that one parcel can generate. Residential, you would get into a situation where it could start hitting the one percent Circuit Breaker. As far as the commercial properties and the industrial properties, they would be limited to the three percent Circuit Breaker. That is not revenue coming from someone else. That is Walmart paying part of it to the base and part to the increment. Parcel by parcel is how you have to look at that.

Roy Buskirk: When you are saying three dollars on commercial, are we saying a three percent Circuit Breaker and also that the tax rate not exceed three percent?

Brian Colton: If you look at a property that doesn't have abatements. If there are no abatements on a property, then you can look at the tax rate and simply take that. If it is under three, it doesn't hit the three percent circuit breaker, if a parcel has abatements, you go through more calculations.

Roy Buskirk: On page seventeen you have a tax rate district, Adams-Marion, Fort Wayne-Adams, New Haven-Adams, current rate, is that…

Brian Colton: That is 2007.

Roy Buskirk: Pay 2007?

Brian Colton: Yes.

Roy Buskirk: And then you deduct, your revised rate is the deduction of the welfare fund and the school general?

Brian Colton: We actually went through and recalculated the rates. From the abstract, you can find out what portion of the property is homestead. The better analysis would be parcel by parcel but this is a $30,000 fee analysis to look at. Trying to figure out how much of AV is reduced in each of the different taxing districts. On the AV side, we reduced the assessed valuation by the additional homestead deductions, $45,000 or 60% of the assessed value. On top of that, an additional 35%

and on top of that 25% if it is over a certain assessed valuation. So, we pulled down the assessed valuation. Also, the Property Tax Replacement Credits go away. There is no longer a net rate. It goes from a net rate to a gross rate. This tax rate is the net rate, the current rate of the net rate. Then the revised rate is a gross rate. It is really apples to apples because of the way that it works. We went through and pulled out all of the different welfare levies, the school General Fund, the education fund, the TIF replacement levy and the pension funds.

Roy Buskirk: And you actually anticipate the rate going up then.

Brian Colton: Correct. That is based upon this estimate. This is based on 2007. When we see 2008, that is going to change it and then when you go into 2009. If you just looked at 2007 and said what if 2007 was under the new rules, this is where we would be.

Roy Buskirk: Correct. Thank you.

Paul Moss: Along the lines of the TIF discussion, before we move onto something else, I am not sure of the best way to pose this question but the numbers you have here of $41 million and total TIF revenue, if you total up the County, it is about 17.6, Fort Wayne about 4.4, New Haven is about 19.3, is that all considered incremental TIF revenue?

Brian Colton: Yes, it is all incremental.

Paul Moss: It is all incremental?

Brian Colton: It would have backed out of that calculation as the assessed values associated with a TIF parcel.

Paul Moss: So, you are not taking any existing property and the property taxes that are generated and shifting them. I will use as example, and it might seem analogous, Jefferson Pointe for Harrison Square. That is a property that was in place and they created a TIF district to shift some of those funds. Is that occurring here or is this considered all incremental?

Brian Colton: It is increment because the base that is there is frozen. When the area is established, if the base is $3 million of assessed value, look at AV not revenue. If all of the parcels add up to $3 million of assessed value, that $3 million goes to the base. That goes to the schools, the County and the City. It is anything above that magic number that goes into the increment.

Paul Moss: Councilman Miller?

Cal Miller: When the parameters for the study were set up, and I know there was some discussion as to whether to include or exclude tax abatements and its impact on the projections, are there any other parameters since you are the expert team that undertook the analysis at the request of Allen County, that weren't included and typically would be included that would drive your numbers to a less prosperous economic projection?

Cynthia Bowen: As we are debating back and forth, there is nothing else that we can think of amongst ourselves that we would either take out. Under the scenario that we did, we were asked to do a full build out scenario for this study. The questions that we talked about were whether we include the intermodal facility or whether we include Walmart. It was determined that we should take both of those out.

Cal Miller: No other factors that you all can think of, that you recommended or asked if they should be included, and ultimately the decision was made to not include them for whatever reason?

Cynthia Bowen: We didn't include any of the public uses that you saw listed on the land use. The Sheriff's facility and the landfill, none of that was included. We didn't include any of the residential in the TIF portion. It was only the commercial and the industrial. We didn't include tax abatement.

Cal Miller: While we are talking about general questions, when I look at these projections, it certainly appears to me, you all know much better than I to be favorable projections from an economic standpoint. In your formulation of this analysis, were there other less favorable conclusions that you reached and then you made a change to some key variables, I am not talking about in any sinister way, but as you decided what information to include and exclude and that would drive the numbers in terms of the numbers in the projections up or down, are there any other key variables that… Let me ask it another way, what are the vulnerabilities, what are the key vulnerabilities of your projections not being met? Of them falling flat on their face or falling short in a manner that would be substantial or significant to the revenue stream needed to retire the debt service for this very expensive project.

Cynthia Bowen: As we stated in our report, those would be the unforeseen circumstances that we can't account for. For example, from a land use and economic development standpoint, if this Council, if the County Commissioners and if the Plan Commission changed, and you had folks in there that wanted a differing policy regarding economic development, regarding tax abatements, regarding zoning, that is going to change the entire development pattern and could change the numbers that we presented here today. In undertaking a study like this, we have to go with what we know about tax rates, what we know about the different economic generators currently in place right now and project for that.

Cal Miller: Setting aside the unknown and unforeseen that you refer to in the report, what are the variables that are more foreseen and can drive the success or failure of these projections?

Bill Sheldrake: I will try to answer the question. I would say that we were asked to do one scenario. We weren't asked to do a prolonged U.S. or Midwest recession for instance that could affect this. The economic assumptions that are in this are what I would consider normal business cycle patterns. There's no significant acts of God kind of situations, earthquakes or significant kinds of disasters that might occur in a portion or all of Allen County which could affect the economy and have a significant detriment on that.

Cal Miller: I understand that the study was limited. It was a $30,000 study and not a $150,000 study. In what you do for a living, in analyzing this information, do you on occasion look at a conservative projection and here is a mid projection and here is an optimistic projection? Is that something that you do and are able to do and if so how, if you had done that in this project, what variables would be dictating a more conservative, setting aside natural disaster, a more conservative projection, a more midline projection and a more optimistic projection? That is really what I am getting at. What are the variables that can take us from a very conservative, less optimistic to a more optimistic and what are those variables and where is this study in that spectrum?

Bill Sheldrake: Councilman Miller, I will try to address that from the economic assumptions perspective and then I will turn it over to Cynthia and Brian to talk about it from the land use and tax revenue perspective. When we do these kinds of studies, we are doing work for the Northwest Indiana Regional Development Authority in Lake and Porter Counties. Sometimes we are asked to do conservative or pessimistic scenarios, mid-range scenarios or optimistic scenarios. I guess the thing that we would look at is some kind of more significant jarring of the regional economy, a prolonged recession or something that affected the transportation industry that might cause the build out that was expected, for instance down at I-469, that would substantially change the commuter patterns. We built this on $4-a-gallon gasoline and so that won't affect the economic assumptions here. Those are the kinds of things, generally speaking, when we do a pessimistic scenario. We will look at what kind of job impacts and what kinds of economic employment compensation and personal income and what kinds of things happen when you have a prolonged recessionary period and those kinds of impacts hit a region. On the other side, there are some things that we didn't build in that could be more optimistic. As Cynthia will talk about in a second, we looked at the land use patterns that were in your comprehensive plan. We did not build in any kind of real focus from economic development planners on incentives and other things that could bring investment into this region more rapidly and more intensively. The more infrastructure that might be laid that would cause additional investment to occur. I think it would be fair and truthful to say that this is a mid-range scenario. In other words, we left out the optimistic assumptions and we left out the more conservative, pessimistic economic assumptions. I will turn it over to Cynthia.

Cynthia Bowen: Thanks, Bill. Councilman Miller, when we look at land use planning and land use projections, there are usually three scenarios that we can look at. We look at what we would call the current or existing scenario. If you were to continue on in your planning and land use development and in what you are doing right now, what would that area look like in twenty years? For most communities, that is a very low growth rate. It doesn't show a lot of growth to an area. When they come to us to ask us to do a land use plan, they want to change that land use pattern. The second focus is usually a middle of the line focus, such as what we did here. Given some of the patterns and trends that are in place, given some of the policies that you are going to undertake, where can that drive economic development and what seems to be realistic for the corridor? The final phase is really an aggressive growth build out, which is a lot of times what we will do for our clients. This is where we begin to say if we change some of the policy, we focus on the area and put some incentives in place to accelerate the growth and say that this is going to be the targeted hub for economic development, then how can we maximize that area? We do that scenario and land use projection. Then typically what we will do is to sit down with our clients and go through the pros and cons of each of those scenarios. As I always like to say in planning, from a land use planning side, it is always best to plan for the most aggressive scenario because then you make sure that you have your transportation improvement, your police, your water and sewer and fire all in place. If that growth does explode around that area, you are not going back saying that you weren't planning for this or prepared for this. There are some communities that say that they don't want to grow that fast. We don't want to have that type of growth. Then we have to come back and put in place, policies to make sure that that growth is slow and steady or in some cases, maybe no growth. From a land use perspective, there are various levels to growth and various policies that you put in place to manage how that growth occurs.

Paul Moss: Councilman Vogt?

Darren Vogt: I will go back to the same questions as growth rate. What growth rate did you use for Adams Township? Did you look at our current Adams Township, Marion Township and that corridor of residential housing? The reason that I ask that is that I look at the number of build outs and the number of homes and that relates to jobs and as a person who wants to create jobs, I think that is important. But when I look at what rate you put in there, that is a lot of houses in Adams Township and Marion Township that I don't see happening currently. And you are going to put them next to industrial. As a person who would never want to live next to industrial, I am not sure that is the best land use plan for that area. What rate did you do that in? Is it the current with the trends of today?

Cynthia Bowen: The rate that we utilized and looked at was the one that was stated in the comprehensive plan. Within the Fort Wayne-Allen County comprehensive plan, you had specified between 2000 and 2025, how many houses that you needed and how many square feet of industrial and commercial that you needed. Based on that, we created a generalized growth rate based on what your comprehensive plan said you needed for that area.

Darren Vogt: Let me interrupt, for that area or for the entire County?

Cynthia Bowen: It was the growth rate for the entire County and we applied it for that area.

Darren Vogt: For that area, okay.

Cynthia Bowen: There was not enough time for us to go in and do a detailed analysis. That is not what we were scoped for on a feasibility study, to sit down and figure out currently what the absorption rate is specifically for this corridor. We had to make some judgments and understanding that there is a defined need for a specific number of housing units, we pulled that out of the comprehensive plan and then applied it.

Darren Vogt: The reason that is important from my perspective is because I am one that lives in the community and realizes and sees that. I have to be the one responsible for making that decision along these numbers and making sure the economic impact is there and viable. When we look at Major Bridge funding, all of those revenues are going to come in line to make sure we repay bonds.

Bill Sheldrake: I want to clarify one thing. The economic analysis is not of jobs and economic output is not dependent on residential. I want to be clear about it. The growth is based on the industrial and commercial build out and that residential housing does not have to occur in the corridor. We are talking about 900 homes over and eleven year period. That is reduced back from the initial assumption about residential growth. Let me be clear about this. There is not interdependency between the commercial and the industrial jobs and economic output and the residential. We were asked to put the residential in there just because it is part of the land use plan. Our economic model is not using the residential investment to drive those commercial and industrial jobs. I just wanted to be clear about that. So, in no way is the residential investment driving the TIF revenue.

Darren Vogt: I would agree with that. I didn’t make those assumptions.

Bill Sheldrake: If it is slower, it is not going to make an impact.

Darren Vogt: I have two more questions, Council. RW Armstrong has been in business since 1961 or 1962, can you give me examples where you have done these studies fifteen or twenty years ago and your revenue projections have either hit the mark or not hit the mark and where are those types of growth patterns happening?

Bill Sheldrake: I don’t know that I can say that we have done an economic impact study fifteen years ago and come back and looked at the construction period. Having spent about ten years of my life in State government as the Chief Forecaster where errors of less than two percent are considered to be good on one hand and be politically devastating on the other. Two percent of a $15 billion revenue stream is a lot of money. From my perspective, there is a lot of experience on this team and we have a good experience of seeing our forecast come true over a period of time. As an experienced forecaster, and in going back to what Councilman Miller said earlier, this is a mid-range scenario. We have not built into this a lot of optimistic assumptions that could cause this to fall apart. Are there some things that could cause it to fall apart? Yes but we have not built those kinds of assumptions into this forecast.

Darren Vogt: My last question is infrastructure. Cindy, you mentioned that infrastructure is critical. How critical is it for industrial, commercial and residential to have four-year forecasts to move forward. Do those utilities need to be in place?

Cynthia Bowen: Whenever we do land use planning, density does play into determining how much of the land is going to be built out. When we talk to the planners, specifically for Allen County and this residential area, we were told we could go three to four dwelling units per acre based on what zoning has in place. We felt that was a little optimistic and so we backed that off. Right now, that area doesn't have water and sewer. You could feasibly, but it wouldn't be my recommendation, you can put a house on a half acre of land with septic and well. That is not a land use policy that I preach. It is known to be done. Most communities go larger than that. In one of the things that we looked at, especially up north, we knew that utilities were in place. We know that in order for the commercial to develop down at 469, there are two things. You can still develop some commercial on septic and well. Your parcels have to be much larger in order to do that because you have to have certain separation distances between that. We anticipate that by the time that commercial comes on line, there will be utilities. That was one of the assumptions in that there would be utilities there so it could grow. Residential will probably not come on line at this depth until you get the utilities there. This is looking out twenty years from now and assuming that improvements, you want to highlight this as an economic development corridor and that one of the things you would want to do with targeting this is that you would want to make the improvements. Typically, when communities are going under construction, if they are going in and making upgrades to a road, it is more economically feasible for them to also put in sewer and water at the same time when the road is already torn up. We made the assumption that some utilities would be to that area.

Darren Vogt: In your model, what timeframe would you say that those utilities need to be in there?

Cynthia Bowen: I do not have my projection in front of me but I believe that we said there is a five or six year lag before the commercial started in that area. Let me see if I can find it here. We were beginning to look at about 2014. Because we say that ten acres could occur in 2014, depending on what type of commercial use went in there, that is a large enough area that you could still only have septic and well and have development. We are not looking until 2014 for the commercial in that are to start to begin to develop.

Darren Vogt: Is that on the south end?

Cynthia Bowen: Yes, around 469 and Marion Center Road.

Paul Moss: Councilman Buskirk?

Roy Buskirk: You, earlier, made a statement about this intersection being close to the airport. The first interchange that we have is the Bluffton Road and 469 and it has sewer and water available and also railroad. Then you have Winchester which does not have any utilities. U.S. 27 is the next one and Allen County Sewer District is in that area. Then you have the Marion Center one. It just amazes me that you can foresee that being commercial development in the next twenty years.

Cynthia Bowen: The way that we look at it and the way that we view it, you look at some of these other interchanges, there is a mix that goes into what drives development. The thing that we have to look at is the proximity to existing uses. We have to look at existing development there. One thing that's going to drive for this area is the fact that you have New Haven and Fort Wayne right there with development already established in industrial parks and in a commercial area. You already have utilities to the area and if you make this road improvement, it becomes much more feasible, from an overall transportation system and analysis that trucks can and commercial goods and services can get to the area. We didn't do a market study to determine feasibility and over the other interchanges. You have the right components in place for this area to develop out quicker than some of the other interchanges. You went around this way. You didn't come down from…

Roy Buskirk: You go around the other way and you have U.S 30 which has ample space for future development with utilities.

Paul Moss: I think that what Roy is getting at is that there are other areas available for development. You have made an assumption without evaluating those other areas. Is that an accurate statement or did you evaluate those other areas?

Cynthia Bowen: No we didn't. What we also have to look at is that the policy that we are hearing from the County or what we are being told is that this is an economic development corridor. Therefore, your economic development and your Chamber of Commerce are going to be more focused to drive development to this area versus these other interchanges.

Roy Buskirk: Even with the other areas having utilities?

Paul Moss: We have Shovel Ready sites and I am having a tough time understanding how this is prioritized but that may be a discussion that we have with other representatives. Did you have any other questions?

Roy Buskirk: Yes I did. Did you consider the growth that we had on the recently completed Ardmore Avenue-Hillegas corridor and also the fact that you talk about the routing of trucks and everything is this taking into consideration of Maplecrest being made a truck route?

Cynthia Bowen: We did not take that into account. Again, what we were looking at in the terms of development out of industrial is that a portion of this road could handle some of it. But if you want more truck routes and you want more trucks, you are going to have to upgrade the road facility to be able to handle that capacity. There is an inherent link between transportation and land use. If you don't plan for either, you are going to come up with issues. When you make improvements to this road, you are going to help drive that land use in that area. You get more industrial and you get more commercial because you have a thoroughfare and a road that can handle the capacity and quickly move goods and services north and south through this area that may not be available in other areas within the County.

Roy Buskirk: Okay, that answers the truck route question. Now, as far as Ardmore, did you study Ardmore and the impact that it has had in that area?

Cynthia Bowen: No we didn't.

Roy Buskirk: I am assuming that you are aware that it is the west side north and south corridor.

Cynthia Bowen: Right. We had a very defined and narrow area that we were to study in terms of the feasibility and to look at the land use. To go and study another corridor and study the impacts of another corridor, that is a different type of study. It is a growth study to undertake and occur. We were asked to determine the feasibility and what would be the growth trends for this corridor.

Roy Buskirk: How can you do a feasibility without studying the other areas in the same community?

Cynthia Bowen: We looked at it from comparables from a tax increment financing but what happens in one corridor and the pattern of the way it develops out is not necessarily directly linked to what happens in another corridor. That is because of utility changes, policy changes, soils and a whole host of things that you look at. Our scope was to look at it from a sub-area perspective and not an overall community growth plan.

Paul Moss: To kind of follow up to Councilman Buskirk's comment, I do think we need to take a more overall view. There is a corridor that isn't all the way over to Ardmore. There is Coliseum, at least I think it could be considered a corridor, there is some interesting dynamics there and some interesting changes taking place there that aren't necessarily positive. There are businesses leaving and a pretty constant state of turnover of those businesses along there. I think that should have been incorporated into this somehow to take a look at that as an option. I understand you were given a very narrow focus and you have done a great job with that focus. I do, at least personally, think that there are options to this that may have been less expensive and need to be considered as well. That was more of a statement and not a question. The question that I have is that you talk about direct affect and that is, if I understand you correctly, primarily driven by a job works project, the construction that is being funded by this and the employment that would be derived from that. Is it assumed that that would be local employment or is it assumed that it would be a mixture of local and other employment? I personally assume that a project this size would probably have some outside, non-local entities providing those services. And as such, does that play into your numbers any way in terms of the economic impact and if it has, can you explain how it has or has not? That would be helpful.

Bill Sheldrake: Direct affect, in this kind of modeling, is direct investment. That is what occurs, in this case, with the construction project. There may be folks that come in from another company. We do have to be a little humble. The joke is that economists use decimal points to show that they have a sense of humor. This is a forecast. Exactly how many people are going to be drawn in the estimate of how many jobs are created in a direct affect is really on the basis of, in a normal construction process like that, how many folks would be employed in this kind of investment. To say that such and such a company comes in and bring thirty workers from outside, is something that we can't tell. That is a level of fineness to the forecast that we can't answer.

Paul Moss: And I understand that and you have provided an estimate of the number of employees around 930 as a direct employment as a result of this. My point is and my assumption is that you have that 930 employees and a certain amount of compensation related to that and then based on that, you extrapolate out some additional economic benefits as a result of that. Is that correct?

Bill Sheldrake: Yes.

Paul Moss: Those economic benefits are different if half of those employees are here living in a hotel as opposed to living here in a home and paying property taxes and things of that nature. That could have a substantial impact on the numbers here, is my point. I am not asking you to be able to predict how many employees there are. My personal experience, on the hospital side, we have a $500 million project that is going to occur to the north of the County. This is not my project but I have been in other projects where we hire hospital contractors from outside of the community to come in and supplement it. As a general rule, it can be 50% of those dollars go to outside contractors. A project of this nature, I don't know, maybe the Highway Department can answer this question. I would suspect there is going to be a substantial amount of folks coming in. I think I have made my point but that…

Bill Sheldrake: I would like to make one clarification. That construction period for that direct investment is a relatively short period. It is a couple of years. That is 930 jobs not just directly but it is overall. Some of those are from capital investment and another way to put it is from direct affects, indirect affects and induced. If you look at page eight, it talks about 930 overall. When we did this, we used a model that tries to draw a boundary around the County. Understanding that, those folks would probably be employed, particularly the ones that are from direct affect would be employed here for a while. Some may be brought in for a short period of time and from outside. The induced affect and indirect affect would likely be from Allen County because that is the way the model is specified.

Paul Moss: The other question that I have is with regard to Walmart. It appears as though, based on the conversations and the study here, you are assuming that Walmart is going to be the anchor on the commercial side. Is that an accurate statement?

Cynthia Bowen: Yes.

Paul Moss: I have not seen anything but I have heard there is going to be a Walmart built there. Is there some sort of written commitment from Walmart to build there if this is done and if so, who might have that? What sort of specific conditions have been placed on that, if there are any? The other comment with regards to Walmart, someone had mentioned the potential affect on businesses or at least the ability of people within the fifteen to twenty minute range to go to other businesses. Have you looked at the affect on businesses in Georgetown? That is very close by there and many are locally owned. Personally, I am not so sure that another Walmart is something to really celebrate in this town but that is just an opinion of mine. So, if you could address the issue of the impact not only on the Georgetown area and over on Coliseum Boulevard, kind of spreading out a little bit farther beyond what you have on your map.

Cynthia Bowen: First of all, I can't really speak to any dealings or conversations with Walmart.

Paul Moss: Has that been shared with you? Has anybody shared that there is a specific commitment?

Cynthia Bowen: No. The only thing that we know is that Walmart is interested in that property and that they own the property. That is all we have been told and that is what we used for the basis of our analysis.

Paul Moss: How would your analysis be affected if, for some reason, they chose not to build on there? What affect would that have on the commercial development out there?

Cynthia Bowen: We still would have indicated that. 930 is a strong commercial corridor and we still would have recommended as was recommended in the comprehensive plan for the City of New Haven, that it would be commercial. Again, it has to go with the City of New Haven as how they want to manage their land use. In talking with the Mayor and talking with the Planning Director, Brian Yoh, the projections that were made for that comprehensive plan are still being followed today. There was no reason for us to think that anything would be changed. The difference from the economic standpoint is that we did not include it in the TIF. We revised the numbers with something else going in there and taking that place. I guess in terms of your question regarding the market impact and the market analysis, I can only generalize because RW Armstrong has not undertaken a market feasibility study. It is only information and knowledge that I have and know of from working in other areas where Walmarts have been established and how Walmart has been used to spur on economic development. Whenever we are looking at a market analysis, we always look at the impact area to be about a fifteen to twenty minute drive. It is based upon an industry standard set by the Urban Land Institute. That is going to tell us the basic service area for that commercial corridor at 930 and Adams Center Road. Beyond that, another industry standard is that 40% of the population, located in that concentric circle, is going to go and utilize the services that may be there. Whenever a commercial industry enters into an area, they always do a market analysis to understand what the market will bear, the competition and what is going to be feasible there. What we also know, as planners, is that whenever something like a Walmart, Target or Home Depot go in, it is a pretty standardized case where within one year, spin-off development occurs. In terms of understand the impact that this development will have on the Georgetown area, I can not speak to that because I am only providing general rationalizations or realizations based upon standard industry markers. I can’t tell you what that total impact is going to be.

Paul Moss: Right and you are correct that they may, whether it is Walmart or whatever big box store it is, spur some economic development in the immediate area. That has been shown but there are also plenty of studies out there, I suspect, that show that there are other areas where there ends up being lots of empty storefronts. Generally, those are locally owned. That is more of a philosophical issue. I guess my last question is, was there any opportunity for you to give us a feel for what these numbers would look like and how that area would grow and develop if this was not built? In other words, you have some numbers here but is it possible that you would have a number that you would subtract out of there is this was not done so that we could see the impact from that perspective?

Cynthia Bowen: It is possible for us to do this but what it would require, the thing probably goes back to a philosophical discussion of what I would have to say, is look at the land uses right now and the rate of growth that is occurring. I would generalize and say that that rate of growth right now is very slow. Without putting some investment into that area, you are not going to speed up that rate of growth. It goes back to when we talked about the three land use scenarios. This would be your current policy, as is, and if we were to carry it out over the next thirty years, what would that land use pattern be? Right now, you have a slow rate of growth so you are not going to have a tremendous amount more of growth occurs in this area versus if you build this road and create access. Right now, where we are projecting the majority of the growth, there are already utilities established in the area. Once folks see the investment occur, philosophically then and what is a typical trend, is that land use growth accelerates because improvements and investments are being shown in the area. What I would gather right now, and again not knowing what the growth rate is, you are going to have the slow and steady growth.

Paul Moss: I think your numbers say that the total impact is around $750 million but it is important to note that there is going to be growth there whether this is done or not. It may be slower without this investment but I don't want people to think that if we don't do this, that number can fluctuate down obviously as a result, there is still going to be some growth out there.

Cynthia Bowen: I feel very confident to say that you will not see the growth pattern, as we presented here, within twenty years, based on the current rate of growth that you have now.

Paul Moss: Councilman Miller?

Cal Miller: A few follow up areas of questions. I appreciate that we have now gotten that this is not a pessimistic or optimistic study based upon what you have said and analyzed this data. I was wondering if there has been any effort to determine what percent of your economic impact projections, in particular which affect the debt service, has to be reached to hit a break even point and the ability to retire the debt utilizing TIF and before there is a need to raise the tax in the Major Bridge Fund. Has there been an effort to analyze what percent of your projections must be met so that that does not occur?

Brian Colton: No, we didn't do that calculation but I can take a look at it.

Cal Miller: Well, based on the information that you have, is it a calculation that can be done with some ease to find out where the break even point or what percentage of your projections must be reached before this project starts operating in the red and will require a property tax increase?

Brian Colton: At full build out, we have $2.6 million in TIF. The debt service is $1.8 million so that is 70%?

Cal Miller: We know that Major Bridge Fund…

Brian Colton: is going to fill that in.

Cal Miller: We also know that it has other needs while the TIF catches up.

Brian Colton: Correct.

Cal Miller: After the TIF catches up, the Major Bridge Fund is going to have some other…

Brian Colton: In the interim period? We did not take a look at that.

Cal Miller: I am really asking that question to set up the next question. Before this Council decides or has a discussion of what the importance of including or asking you to go back and include the analysis of tax abatement on the projections that you have reached, I have heard you, Mr. Colton, say that that analysis would impact the TIF revenues but by virtue of that it would also impact the analysis in the projections that were undertaken by Mr. Sheldrake. I would like to hear from you all as to whether you think it is a worthwhile endeavor and a useful piece of information to have or make a decision that has been up front at $54 million and when you include the overall interest costs over $100 million of the taxpayers dollars to interject into this equation the impact of abatement. As I said before, personally, I would like to have that information up front so that these Councils know that this is going to be an area that is not going to be available and furthermore, what impact of a policy of having those tax abatements is going to have on the overall economic development climate of that corridor. So, just generally speaking, do you think that is a worthwhile piece of information to have in making a decision like this?

Cynthia Bowen: To try to answer your question, it really is going to depend though on your future policy regarding this area. As a Council, you are going to have to go back and determine, as an economic development incentive, whether you really want to utilize tax abatement to help spur economic growth and development or if you are going to remain consistent with the policies that you have. Given the fact that we have shown you, that if you don't do tax abatements, this is what you are going to garner in terms of tax increments and revenues and how it is going to impact the bridge fund. You, as a County or as a body, have to make the determination and the impact of whether it is going to be in your best interest to help spur economic development or whether you want to do abatements.

Cal Miller: Let me ask you a question about that statement then. Are you suggesting and you colleagues agree with you, that the current projections are made based on consideration that there will be no tax abating?

Cynthia Bowen: When I put together the land use plan, or when RW Armstrong put together the land use plan, I did not take into account a tax abatement policy. I took into account, what types of land uses are already there, what the policy of growth was in terms of how that pattern was developing out, what the potential growth rate would be.

Cal Miller: That is really not my question. There has been a concession here, an understanding I think, that tax abatements have a relationship between economic development and one's willingness to develop in an area if they are offered abatements. The question is a little more specific than that. I understand that the tax abatement issue wasn't used to try to calculate TIF. Are you saying that these projections have taken into consideration a policy that there will be no tax abatements to encourage economic development and therefore, these are what the projections that we think will flow from a policy decision not to give a single solitary tax abatement in this area? That is the question. I don't know if you are the one to answer that but these guys, in terms of the dollars and economic impact might be in a better position.

Bill Sheldrake: Councilman Miller, I will try to answer your question. I was not present at any of the discussions directly with the Commissioners. I think it is fair to say that, let me step back for a second. Tax abatement is part of a general economic development strategy. It is used in some cases but is not the only incentive to be used to encourage development in an area. Staff time, focus, objectives and all kinds of things can be used to encourage economic development within a particular area. I think that it is fair to say that we were told that to not include tax abatement in the TIF projections. I think it is also fair to say that we were given to understand that there would be some economic development focus. In other words, there would be some incentivization that would occur in this area. How that would take place and what it would consist of, we were not told and frankly we didn't have the time or the instructions about anything more specific than that. If I could very briefly address the question that you mentioned earlier which was, would it be valuable to look at abatement and how that might change the development. I would answer that this way, I think it would be valuable as long as that was not just focused on abatement but focused on the entire economic development strategy for this entire corridor. If you are going to ask that question, if you would have asked somebody that question, I think you should broaden it to say how might the economic development incentives be applied in this corridor? How might the development roll out? Would you use abatement or would you not use abatement? How would those incentives affect development in the corridor?

Cal Miller: Again, you have done a fabulous job of making a much better question out of my question. My question to you then is, how was it considered by you in reaching the economic impact? That is what I want to know. Did you factor that in? What strategy did you employ to suggest that we are going to end up with this projection if we invest the dollars that are being appropriated?

Paul Moss: I have to interject here that I believe that the question has been answered and the answer is no. Abatements were not factored into these calculations.

Bill Sheldrake: Abatements were not factored in.

Paul Moss: Thank you.

Cal Miller: Here is the question though. The policy and overall strategy for economic growth, was that policy that there would be no abatement factored into the projections? I think it is a very different question.

Paul Moss: It appears clear to me that you were directed not factor in tax abatements. Is that correct?

Cal Miller: That is not the question.

Cynthia Bowen: From a policy standpoint, when we look at and determine economic development for a corridor, we have an assumption that a series of economic development tools, which may or may not be, tax abatement is going to be used to help this. The only assumption that we can go in is that you are going to put focus on this corridor to make economic development happen. Fort Wayne, New Haven and Allen County, you are all going to focus on this corridor. What those particular steps and what those particular actions that you are going to do are not feasible for this type of study for us to tell you what those steps need to be in order to make that land use plan a realization.

Cal Miller: I did not ask what those steps ought to be. I want to make sure that your projections aren't based on any policies one way or the other. Let me ask you this, based on the data that was used, you suggest that there was an overriding thought that there would be an economic strategy utilized throughout this area, where in your data that you used to formulate the projections is your insertion of the statement that there would be an overall strategy to incentivize development of this area?

Cynthia Bowen: You mean a statement in the report?

Cal Miller: These are all number driven. At the end of the day, you have numbers and you have projections. So which of these numbers, that you are utilizing, form the basis of the insertion into the equation of these projections that we would be using several tools of the economic incentive to develop this area? What numbers are you using that actually put some flesh on the statement that that was considered, that we would be using economic incentive tools to drive this area and to form the basis of your projection?

Paula Hughes: Councilman Miller, are you trying to prove that their economic projections are flawed because they presumed that we would use tax abatements when the two sides don't balance?

Cal Miller: I am not trying to prove anything. I still don't know the answer to the question that President Moss has gotten. That is not my question. My question is, with respect to the tax abatement issue, I know that the tax abatements haven't been included but the policy of no abatement has that been included in your projection? You have said that this study assumed that there would be a number of economic incentive tools used to develop the area. I am asking you where, what numbers did you utilize or what information did you utilize to formulate those projections? What incentives do we have to use to reach your marks?

Paul Moss: What other alternatives, other than abatements, did you utilize and how did they affect the numbers?

Bill Sheldrake: I will try to answer the question. I don't think I talked about incentives. I said that you can focus on an area, in terms of economic development, and use other things besides abatements. One of the things is simply the staff marketing a particular area and focusing on that area. I guess that the numbers that we used are the numbers of the speed at which things will develop in terms of the build out. Speed with respect to the Walmart, speed with respect to the industrial area around or not including an intermodal facility. That wasn't part of the TIF but there are a number of discussions that folks have had that talk about how rapidly things are built out and this is a mid-range estimate or forecast. If that focus was not there, then there would be a slower build out.

Cal Miller: And if you put it in the context, what is missing for me is my concern is that this project doesn't pay for itself. We are going to have to raise taxes in the Major Bridge Fund if your projections fall short. What concerns me is that the tax abatement issue, given the fact that historically they have been liberally given, has not been entered into this equation. I want to know if what we want to do is try to avoid raising a tax is to make the most accurate projection based on the information that we have. Should we go back and factor in the historical willingness of giving tax abatements into this equation and see what your projections say and see whether there is still a comfort level with this Council to go forward with this project?

Cynthia Bowen: Well, again, we could go back and do that and it would be another model or projection that we would have to make for the corridor different from the scenario that we created under the set of assumptions.

Cal Miller: I am just at a loss and it is not a shortcoming because you didn't set the parameters but it is a reality of what we have. If we make a policy that we are not going to abate a single property, I can live with that. But if we are going to, as history has shown us, I want to know what the economic impact of that is to assure myself, as one member representing the taxpayers of this County, that his project has a good deal of certainty to pay for itself out of TIF revenues, that the abatements are directly related to the economic analysis. It is that combination of factors that I have a big question mark about. That is a piece of the puzzle that I don't feel comfortable even going forward without understanding what the impact of that factor on the ability to retire this debt without having to raise taxes.

Paul Moss: I think we can address the issue of the abatements. You have made it clear a couple times now, I believe. You can go back and take a look at what the impact of abatements would be on the sheet that you have here with the TIF numbers and all of that. That is one piece of that, I believe. Would you agree with that, Councilman Miller?

Cal Miller: Yes.

Paul Moss: The other component, I am not sure that they can answer. It is almost a philosophical question in terms of…

Cal Miller: I would almost rather focus on the TIF.

Paul Moss: do we want to use abatements as a tool out there and if we don't, what impact will that have on the growth et cetera, et cetera. Let's move to Councilman Vogt. You're done? Okay. Councilman Buskirk?

Roy Buskirk: One other comment. On tax abatements, you did your calculations without any tax abatements and it took a longer period of time. With tax abatements, it would be done quicker.

Paula Hughes: No.

Roy Buskirk: Did I misunderstand that?

Paul Moss: It was a shift in the dollars.

Darren Vogt: The development would happen more rapidly.

Cynthia Bowen: Yes.

Roy Buskirk: Under abatements?

Paula Hughes: That is my understanding.

Roy Buskirk: So it would almost be a tradeoff.

Paul Moss: We are going to have you all take a much needed break and have a seat. We will ask Mr. Young to come up here, if he would. If he really wants to come up here, that is.

Rob Young: President Moss and members of the Council, thank you for letting me be here. I am Rob Young and I am the President of the Fort Wayne-Allen County Economic Development Alliance. I have served in that capacity since the fourth quarter of 2000. Our offices are located at 111 W. Wayne Street in downtown Fort Wayne. There are a couple of things that I want to share and I will be brief. I will be happy to answer any questions that you have of me. On April 10th of this year, our Alliance board of directors met and they passed a resolution in support of the Maplecrest Extension Project. I want to be very clear about that. We had sixteen voting directors and the vote was thirteen in favor, one opposed and two abstentions. Those abstentions were Councilman Vogt and City Councilman Mitch Harper because obviously this is an issue before you with this stage and we certainly understood those abstentions. The no vote was from a voting director who did not want to vote pending the outcome of the economic analysis report. That was the only basis for the no vote. It was not reflective of the project itself, necessarily, but was a timing issue of the report. The support of the project is reflective of the entire discussion today including what really hasn't been covered yet. Those are issues of accessibility, mobility and safety. We fully understand, as an organization, the magnitude of the issue before you today. That is not lost on any of us. The hardcopy of the report, more than the presentation today, covers the significant aspects of accessibility, mobility and safety. The economic impact has been the majority of the discussion. Going back a little bit, the Alliance staff with conjunction of input from both Dan Avery of the Northeast Indiana Regional Coordinating Council as well as John Stafford at the Community Research Institute at IPFW, did prepare two documents for the County through this whole process. I believe some or all of you have those documents and they have been shared with the media and others. We prepared a February 20th letter to Commissioner Bloom as well as a May 7th update memo. Those two documents reflect the Alliance's best input into this discussion. First of all to find the area of focus for those documents. We talked about the existing base jobs in the area and we talked about the projected future jobs in the area. This is largely based on information that Dan supplied through John. We also talked about existing and potential development projects like the proposed, and I underscore proposed, intermodel project and some of the other activity that we have been involved in. The County then appropriately turned to its consulting team to put together the analysis that we have spent the majority of our time together today looking through. That includes independently generated TIF projections and other pertinent information. Our organization does remain in support of this project, fully recognizing the magnitude of the decision before you. A couple of questions and perhaps they have been touched on today is would the additional development happen without the extension? I think it is safe to say probably. Perhaps the better question is do we have the potential to accelerate that development and perhaps go beyond what we would otherwise realize? We believe that to be the case. There is one important aspect that I don't believe has been covered or covered to any extent. That is the impact on existing base employers in this area. You have one, in particular, well represented here today and that is the Do-It-Best Corporation. As you know, they maintain their world headquarters on Nelson Road and would be directly impacted by this project and in fact, its parking lot would be significantly impacted. Do-It-Best has been tracking this issue and is well represented here, this afternoon. Provided that he is still here, Dan Starr, the General Counsel, does have a few comments from the company. Perhaps it is appropriate for Dan to share those comments and then I will be happy to address any questions.

Paul Moss: Sure that is fine. Come on up.

Dan Starr: I am Dan Starr and I am the General Counsel for Do-It-Best Corp. I am also the Vice President of HR. That is really the capacity or the hat that I am wearing as I wanted to address a couple of points to you. As Rob mentioned, we have been tracking and following this issue for some time. It is one of particular interest to us and he highlights an excellent point, I think. That is economic development and the impact that you have been focusing on so far is a tremendously important issue.

Don't want to minimize that or suggest otherwise. At the same time, it is going to be very important for other members of the community, right now, what your decision is. For us, Rob also mentioned the notion of accessibility and safety. Those are critical considerations that we have. What we've officiated about the project, as proposed, is that it hits some key issues. If you are unfamiliar with the area, if you drive around it, just so you know, we have over 400 people that daily make the commute to the heart of this area that you are talking about. That access to where we are involves potentially four different ways of getting to our building, each of which involves one or more railroad tracks that you must cross. Three of them have guardrails that come down when a train is crossing. One doesn't. It is a spur that comes across one major access point. That is a concern to me. Another concern that I have is just the ability to access emergency response. Those issues of safety and security are very well known to me because I communicate regularly with all of the people who work there. That is what I want to highlight and that is one of the primary reasons why as just an existing member of the community, we are very much in support of the project as proposed. I appreciate your time and I appreciate your consideration of all of these issues. They are very critical but I just want to highlight that one from our perspective. It is important, not just to us but for every member of the existing community that you take that into consideration. Thank you very much for your time. I am happy to answer any questions. I didn't have anything to do with the economic model.

Paul Moss: Is it safe to characterize their concern is primarily related to access and convenience, being able to get there a little more easily or a little more quickly. Is that the primary issue? The public safety issue has been brought up in the past but if you look at the booklet that we were provided, it was noted in there as a response to my question about providing some specific instances where you have issues with response times and there was nothing to site.

Dan Starr: Fortunately, we haven't had any catastrophic events at our facility lately but I can tell you that safety is critically important.

Paul Moss: I agree but it is also helpful to have some historical information.

Roy Buskirk: Sir, can you come back up to the microphone?

Paul Moss: There is no question that it is important but it is helpful to understand from a historical basis, some examples.

Dan Starr: You are right. I don't have an example that I can point to. When we conduct fire drills and things like that, response time is certainly something that we measure. I believe there has been a significant increase in train traffic in that area, within the last year or two. We communicate when we are having our drills so that we can measure response time. I can't point to an instance where we can say that there was damage done to our facility or to people as a result of a train sitting on the tracks. I can only tell you what our experience is right now in non-emergency situations where there are frequent delays because of train traffic. That is what gives rise to the concern. It could easily happen in the event of an emergency.

Paul Moss: But primarily it is an employee access issue. Would you agree?

Dan Starr: No, I wouldn't agree. I would not agree with that.

Paul Moss: Okay.

Dan Starr: That is a consideration and a significant one but safety is more important to me.

Rob Young: Dan, I don't want to put words in your mouth but we spend about 80% of our time on retention and expansion of base employers in our County. You are in an area that has been challenged and this is an opportunity to improve the area. You are bringing in clients, vendors and potential members. The quality of area within which they do their business does matter. When you look at the potential for the improvement of this corridor from an accessibility and safety standpoint, I think that has to factor into the discussion as well. This would conceivably improve the area for one of our headquartered companies.

Paul Moss: Councilman Buskirk?

Roy Buskirk: Mr. Starr, do you receive any product at that facility? Is that warehousing there?

Dan Starr: We have some product but for the most part, the purpose behind that is just for view of product by some of the folks that make decisions about sourcing. We have distribution centers located across the United States but we don't operate, in Fort Wayne, as a distribution center. It is our world headquarters.

Paul Moss: Any other questions for Mr. Young or Mr. Starr? Okay, thank you. Is Mr. Avery still here?

Dan Avery: Can we swap out computers? We can take a two minute break.

Paul Moss: I am afraid if we do that, we will prolong this even further.

Bill Hartman: Good afternoon, I am Bill Hartman, Director of the Allen County Highway Department.

Paul Moss: I want to let everybody know that we are getting to the point where we are going to be crunched for time. It appears that there is a conflict with the Planning Commission.

Cal Miller: What time?

Paula Hughes: We have to be done by five till one. Is that correct?

Becky Butler: They need to have time to unhook and move the equipment.

Paula Hughes: Quarter till one?

Becky Butler: Quarter till at the very latest.

Paula Hughes: We have half an hour.

Bill Hartman: We have a handout for this presentation. This is a rendering of a project in the vicinity of Do-It-Best. It goes over the railroad crossings and the parking lot. It shows that we are eliminating two crossings on Estella and we have a down ramp from the main line of the project onto Nelson Road. Coordination with other municipalities, we know we have interlocal agreements with City of Fort Wayne and the City of New Haven to help share in the cost of the project. Total length is 1.5 miles, four-lane roadway and the construction of four bridges. A bicycle and pedestrian path will be placed on the east side of the project which will interconnect with the River Greenway.

Dan Avery: Is it afternoon yet? My name is Dan Avery and I am the Executive Director of the Northeast Indiana Regional Coordinating Council. I promise to go through this very quickly. I have met with a number of you and I have presented some of these benefits but I think they are very important and I think it speaks quite loudly to some of the impacts to the County as a whole. The four primary benefits that we wanted to discuss today, safety, mobility and accessibility, the transportation system and community development. We have touched on the safety. The access and mobility, I think it is important to note that it is not while the access into the area that is trapped in between the rail lines and the river is very important but in addition it provides another corridor for emergency responders to utilize within the region. We have some disconnects in that area and we do a lot of meandering when we drive through that area ourselves. So not just the response time to that area that gets trapped but on a more regional basis it provides for a better mobility of emergency response in the area. As Bill mentioned, there is the elimination of two rail crossings. From a transportation standpoint, mobility and accessibility are very important. It does provide a continuous north-south corridor and an additional river crossing. As the urban development continues to occur and is anticipated to move into that area, you need the proximity of your river crossings should be closer. You see in the urban core and as you move out, just to ensure that you have good accessibility and good mobility within the area, you want to make sure that you don't have wide gaps crossing the physical features like the river. It also provides a very direct route that lends to a number of efficiencies. If anyone has tried to access New Haven recently from Landin Road, while the railroad crossing has been under construction, you quickly find out that you are very limited to the number of routes you can take to New Haven. You end up backtracking to Coliseum Boulevard or going to 469. They are not easy to get to and take a considerable amount of time.

When there is construction or other incidents that occur on those parallel facilities, it is very beneficial to have another corridor and have that direct route. From transportation efficiency, we measure how well a system works based on vehicle miles of travel, vehicle hours of travel, impacts to the environment and another one of the benefits is that this relieves capacity on other corridors and that becomes very important. I am going to hit the others a little more heavily but we are very limited in the number of corridors that we can improve on in this area. Just as the Ardmore-Hillegas corridor freed up capacity on parallel facilities, we anticipate that this corridor will do exactly the same thing. Our transportation system is a radial system with the downtown urban core being the hub of that. Virtually everything comes into the urban core and goes back out. That creates a lot of undue travel and putting trips in the downtown that we don't need. Corridors like this keep the trips where they are more desired and frees up additional capacity on locations where we will never be able to expand the system. In the downtown corridors like Anthony, the buildings are too close and it would be too expensive to try to make any kind of improvement to those corridors. We need to look at the areas where we have the ability to make those improvements and can facilitate efficient traffic flow. Considering that this project is set to open in 2012, we estimate 14,000 miles per day, in vehicle miles, of savings. That is a reduction just of this project alone. By 2036, it will be up to 28,500 miles saved. That is using an operating cost of 15.1 cents per mile. That is essentially for your gas and oil. It doesn't include insurance, depreciation and those things. That value would be more at 50 cents per mile value. That is about $23,870,000 savings and is money in the pocketbooks of the Allen County taxpayers. On hours of travel, this is the amount of time that we spend in our cars. In 2012, 1,200 hours in one day and in 2036 it is 5,400 hours additional, in the car that we can save. We used a Texas Institute of Transportation value of $14.60 per hour. That is not assuming any commercial for the first numbers there. A 25-year savings of over $322 million to the taxpayers of Allen County. If we assume a five percent commercial utilization of that corridor, commercial is about 77 and some odd cents per hour.

Cal Miller: Mr. Avery, can I just interject for a second? Are we really concluding this meeting in twenty minutes? If so, is this the best use of our twenty minutes?

Paul Moss: I am open to suggestions. We can try to get through this or we can skip it and ask questions of Mr. Avery if anybody has any questions.

Cal Miller: I have had the benefit of seeing this slide presentation but if we have some discussing to do, is this issue going to come up for a vote today? Is there going to be some discussion about waiting until the law goes into affect and requires a referendum even if we passed it? Are we going to discuss whether this study needs to be reevaluated with respect to the impact of the tax abatement issue? If so, we have precious little time.

Paul Moss: I can't predict if there is going to be a motion made with regard to the $25 million bond today. I would be happy to provide my personal opinion that there doesn't seem to be a particular sense of urgency to have that vote today. I would be interested in hearing if the Commissioners have a particular sense of urgency and if it relates to the referendum issue. As far as these slides are concerned, I can live without them. I had a couple of questions that I wanted to ask Mr. Avery that don't really relate to this.

Cal Miller: I propose that we move on past the slide presentation.

Paul Moss: In the interest of time, I am fine with that.

Paula Hughes: I think this is a crucial slide and Mr. Avery hasn't gone into this. The vehicle emissions are maybe the most pertinent out of this entire presentation. We know that this community kind of flutters in and out of compliance with vehicle emissions. That is a concern for economic development because if we are out of compliance, then we are hampered in the companies that we can lure to our area. It would impact economic development which would impact all of projections made as far as the presentation. One of my questions to the vehicle emissions numbers is, what are the numbers, how does that rank in the volume that we are allowed to have and the volume that we have? Do you know what I am asking?

Dan Avery: These are pretty significant numbers.

Paula Hughes: Real quickly. How are vehicle emissions measured? What is that measure, when we get above it, I don't have it off the top of my head. I was going to look it up and forgot.

Dan Avery: I don't know that off the top of my head either. VMT is the standard. Increase in VMT will always generate the higher emissions. That is the critical value that we look at and how much that increases. Any kind of project where we have a reduction in VMT, there is a net benefit.

Roy Buskirk: Dan, how much are we allowed? We are right at the level of being in compliance or not and if you could give that number then show what this deduction is…

Dan Avery: This is calculated at tons per year. If you back it down to a daily that is what we have a budget for. Carbon monoxide is not a compliance issue for us right now. When the climate change starts to come in, we have new regulations on the climate regulation that then becomes a very important number for us. Right now, the VOC's and nitrous oxides, the VOC's is three-hundredths of a ton per day and for nitrous oxide it is about one-hundredth of a ton. It keeps us under the margin but it is not the decisive factor if that is what you are after.

Rob Young: Councilwoman Hughes, if I understand your question, I believe you are referring to the eight hour ozone standards from the EPA and that we were in non-attainment status attaining the clean air standards. We are now back in attainment but with changing federal regulations, we may be put back into non-attainment.

Eliminating this kind of pollution would kind of help stay out of non-attainment status or helps us get back into attainment status that much faster.

Paula Hughes: Right. That is kind of what I was getting at but also to quantify it, the VOC's and nitrous oxides are the compelling numbers. Is 9.4 tons per year, does the County put out 500 tons per year right now or is it 100 tons per year? What percentage is the overall production?

Dan Avery: I would have to run that calculation.

Paula Hughes: Okay.

Dan Avery: As Rob indicated, with the new standards and designations pending in 2010, if those designations were made today, we would be back in non-attainment status. And we are just barely over so even subtle changes in our air quality will make that difference in whether we will stay in or we don't.

Paula Hughes: Okay, thank you.

Paul Moss: Just to be a devil's advocate, there are other alternatives to reducing fuel consumption. One of my personal pet peeves is the lack of synchronization in our signaling system. There are many instances where you come up to a stop light and there is nobody coming on the crossroad and you wind up sitting. That is a huge consumption of fuel there. There are communities out there, very progressive communities that utilize systems that help avoid that so the traffic flows better which reduces fuel consumption. That is one alternative to this. We are talking about spending $55 million to $60 million dollars and I, personally, would like to see some other efforts in that regard. At this point, what we probably need to do is decide whether we are going to adjourn briefly and possibly move upstairs which is an option. Is that correct?

Becky Butler: We would have to do it without video because I don't think Larry would have time to set it up.

Paul Moss: Okay.

Becky Butler: Or we could stay here and finish without the recording.

Paul Moss: Okay. The room does not matter, it is the video.

Becky Butler: We won't have the recording.

Paul Moss: This is obviously an important issue and it would be rather unfortunate for the public to not be able see this.

Cal Miller: We won't get them to see it either upstairs or here, correct?

Paula Hughes: Correct.

Paul Moss: That is correct.

Tera Klutz: We would just have to take notes for the minutes.

Cal Miller: Doesn't the video have audio and doesn't it record what we are saying?

Paula Hughes: They are saying that they can still record the audio.

Paul Moss: But people aren't going to see it on television. That is a very popular way of getting information. I guess what I would ask is to see what the Commissioners' pleasure is and if it is your strong desire to have a vote today that will influence what we do. If somebody wants to provide some collective wisdom on what your desire is.

Nelson Peters: It is obviously unfortunate that we couldn't follow the agenda that we put together because I think we could have probably had the time and you would have had the time to get questions answered. To push this thing today, we have lost a number of the people that wanted to speak on behalf and that there were a number of people to speak against that also left too. I don't know that there is a lot of utility in pushing through today. It is important that the best information get on the table to you so that the appropriate decision can be made. I agree that without cameras, the public is going to be left in the dark and it is an important public issue that people have the opportunity to weigh in on.

Paul Moss: I am not sure what agenda you are referring to.

Nelson Peters: Unfortunately, the folks from RW Armstrong were asked a number of questions that they couldn't begin to answer. If we had been able to go through the agenda, you would have found that you would have gotten the answers and we could have gotten a lot further along.

Paul Moss: I take incredible offense to that. I think they were appropriate questions but…

Nelson Peters: They were appropriate questions but they were being asked of the wrong people.

Darren Vogt: Who did the study?

Roy Buskirk: Oh, Nelson.

Paul Moss: Let's not get into an argument here. It appears as though we can keep the camera if we take a little break here and come back into this room. We just need to give Larry a little bit of time. What I would suggest is that we adjourn if we can keep people here for a little longer. We could come back at a quarter till or ten till one. Is that okay?

Cal Miller: Before we do that, part of the Commissioners' presentation, and they put it together, and if you don't have people here that you think are important to the presentation, for the overall decision, for or against, is there any reason to go forward?

Paul Moss: Can you identify people who need to be here and aren't here?

Nelson Peters: There are some Chamber people that left and there were some representatives of Georgetown who wanted to address the issue as it was being asked regarding what might happen to their location. Obviously their input is helpful.

Paul Moss: We know the Chamber's position. I asked the question about the affect on Georgetown and nobody was available to answer that. Unless you are able to answer that, I think we can get beyond those two issues.

Bill Brown: Bill Brown, Allen County Commissioner. One of the things I think it is important to go forward is what we are asking for today, a vote to hire bond counsel. We understand from our legal advisor, the County Attorney, and Gretchen Gutman from the State, that whether we go before referendum or not will be decided by bond counsel. To move the project forward, that is what we need to understand.

Cal Miller: What does that mean?

Paul Moss: Yes, help me understand…

Cal Miller: Bond counsel is going to decide whether this gets put on the ballot for referendum?

Bill Brown: The way our legal opinion from Bill Fishering, the legislation was written with a double negative and it can't be stated specifically unless someone knows something that I don't, at this point, whether this is going to go before referendum.

Paul Moss: Let's clarify this, Bill, because this is an important point. Is it the date that the bond counsel is hired, is that some sort of a trigger for a referendum or lack of referendum? Or are you saying that the bond attorney makes the decision as to whether this goes to referendum or not?

Cal Miller: Irrespective of when the vote is cast.

Paul Moss: Right, that could be.

Bill Brown: I believe we could ask that question specifically unless there has been some new information found during the break.

Paul Moss: I can't imagine that that is the intent of the legislation to have a bond attorney decide if it goes to public referendum or not.

Bill Brown: The way that I understand it, it is going to have to go to the DLGF and through the State, it will be decided.

Cal Miller: If you have a letter, in written form, from the County Attorney, would you be willing to share that with Council?

Bill Brown: Oh, absolutely. We have a verbal, at this point, but I would propose that we break and continue and get some clarity on that point.

Paula Hughes: If I could suggest, the information that we had from Ms. Gutman and her presentation, regardless of the timeframe, every bond that has gone before the DLGF has been sent to referendum. They are not approving anything. Timing doesn't matter. The question is whether or not a bond from Major Bridge has to go through referendum.

Bill Brown: Correct.

Paula Hughes: That is not time sensitive. Is that correct?

Linda Bloom: Yes.

Paul Moss: That makes more sense.

Linda Bloom: A revenue bond was the issue. Any new taxpayer bond will have to.

Paula Hughes: I can explain that. The point is that this would not be a new property tax. This would be funded by existing property tax revenues. There is no intention, anywhere in this funding proposal, that new property taxes be generated to fund this project. It is not clear whether or not if it would have to go to a referendum process. The referendum process is very clear about new property tax funds. It is not about using existing property tax revenues. We are going to raise these Major Bridge funds whether or not we do this project. It is not clear if it would have to go to referendum. It could be considered a revenue bond. Correct?

Bill Brown: Yes. We can get more clarity on that. There is a second point that I think is important to discuss. The reason that property tax abatement was not factored in, we got this information to you guys by email last Friday and the booklets were produced earlier in the week for you to read through, and as this evolves we are finding questions as we go. I appreciate the questions that have come back from Council. We made a conference call yesterday and had some other conference calls this week with Umbaugh and RW Armstrong and realizing today that the property tax abatement analysis, Council feels that it is important and it is a piece of information that I think would be good to factor in. Two things, one is understanding the referendum piece and getting approval to acquire bond counsel and look at that and two, perhaps after a break we could discuss a little further, on why the property tax abatement piece wasn't factored in.

Paula Hughes: I would suggest that we not readjourn. I will have difficulty if we go past 1:00. I have another appointment.

Cal Miller: I would not vote to support this project today without looking at the tax abatement issue and factoring that in and understanding better the timing of the referendum and if there is timing involved and this passed before a referendum, I would not support it. I am not going to this decision, start a new law that has some merit and furthermore, I want to know once the abatement is factored in, what the break even for this project would be. What percentage of the projections needs to be reached before there would be a need to look outside the funding mechanism to try to retire the debt? Those three things for me need to be satisfied before I even consider supporting this project.

Bill Brown: Just a quick point to that. I can make this clear and I can speak for the other two Commissioners. There is absolutely no intent to skirt the referendum if, in fact, it applies to this, absolutely no intent. The reason for moving this project forward with somewhat of a sense of urgency was towards last summer and before the legislation was written. Our interest is to take advantage of the availability of the construction market. While construction costs are going up, we do have availability of contractors et cetera and we feel, as compared to Fort to Port, that project came in significantly below engineers' estimates and we think we have an opportunity to get that done with a bid date in early 2009.

Paul Moss: Do you believe that opportunity is going to be lost in a month?

Bill Brown: No, that is the next point that I was going to make. A month, as far as I am concerned, is not going to be a major issue. It is not about skirting the referendum.

Cal Miller: If the referendum is required, it is not going to be a month.

Bill Brown: It won't matter and that is where we need to… the last conversation that I had with our County Attorney, is that it wouldn't be decided until we hired bond counsel.

Cal Miller: If the referendum is needed, that is my point, this project doesn't even get started until that vote occurs. This thing isn't going to get going in a month irrespective…

Darren Vogt: Although from a timing standpoint, it may be on the ballot for the general election in November. I am not sure what the timeframe is but there is some urgency, from our perspective to make a decision. If we vote no, on the project as a whole, it's dead. But we still have to vote yes to move the project forward.

Cal Miller: I couldn't agree more that we need to position this that if it is going to get past this Council, we need to position it for the next available referendum vote, if it is required.

Roy Buskirk: I think August is the deadline to put it on the fall ballot.

Cal Miller: Can someone help us out and clarify that date?

Paul Moss: So, this takes us full circle, to deciding if we want to readjourn or if we want to postpone this. I have questions that are unanswered as well and I am not supportive of moving forward at this time without having some of those questions addressed.

Bill Brown: I would offer this, because of this process and it is a public process, I appreciate the opportunity for us to share all of this information. Discovering today the relevance of the tax abatement question, I think we need to do some homework on that. Would there be an opportunity, if need be, to have a special meeting in a couple of weeks? I don't know if that will be necessary.

Paul Moss: We can. That is always an opportunity as opposed to having other agenda items, we can certainly just devote it to this issue. I am comfortable with that.

Bill Brown: We want to give this a thorough vetting. We all believe in open government and we don't want to leave a stone unturned.

Paul Moss: We appreciate that and we are sorry that we asked so many questions and dragged it out.

Bill Brown: I think that is part of the process.

Darren Vogt: The question is, have we vetted out all of our questions? I still have a couple of questions for Mr. Avery. If we don't get all of our immediate questions answered now, we are going to…

Paul Moss: I think the intent is to have a special meeting soon, to have those folks who did not have an opportunity to speak or have questions asked of them, then we could have an up or down vote. That is my thinking.

Bill Brown: Just one point of clarity to the public, the reason that we had it in this room is to use the Powerpoint. We knew Planning Commission was going to be in the other room but we didn't realize the recording equipment was an issue.

Paul Moss: Councilman Buskirk?

Roy Buskirk: Can I ask Brian a question real quick?

Paul Moss: Yes, very quickly and then we can end.

Roy Buskirk: In your calculations on the Major Bridge revenue, there was no adjustment for 2010 when the step basis comes in and I was wondering why.

Brian Colton: I just flat-lined that. We can take a look and see what the relationship is with Major Bridge and the overall revenue. I know the rate is less than one percent for the different districts so it is a portion of somebody getting hit. We can take a look at the relationship.

Roy Buskirk: My scientific wild guess is probably around a five percent reduction. Two-thirds of our assessed valuation is within the City of Fort Wayne and they are against the one percent.

Brian Colton: Is that just looking at the residential piece?

Paula Hughes: Yes.

Paul Moss: If we can get another meeting scheduled in a couple of weeks, I understand that this is not the biggest project that you have ever done, you have costs associated with travel et cetera. It would certainly be appreciated if we could figure out a way to get one or two of you up here again in case there are some additional questions. I would ask your consideration of that and work with you.

Cal Miller: Are you talking financial arrangements? I think we can make some arrangements to get you back that isn't to your financial detriment.

Cynthia Bowen: That would be appreciated.

Darren Vogt: Move to waive the second reading on any matter approved today for which it may be deemed necessary for the County Council meeting of April 17, 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 7-0.

Paula Hughes: Move to adjourn.

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 7-0. The next meeting will be held on June 19, 2008 at 8:30 am.

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 12:45 p.m.