# ALLEN COUNTY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OCTOBER 16, 2008 8:30 AM

The Allen County Council met on Thursday, October 16, 2008 at 8:40 am in the County Council/Commissioners Courtroom. The purpose of the meeting was for additional appropriations, transfer of funds in excess of the current budget, grants and any other business to come before Council.

Attending: Paul G. Moss, President; Roy A. Buskirk, Vice President; Paula S. Hughes, Maye L. Johnson, Patt Kite and Darren E. Vogt.

Also Attending: Lisa Blosser, Auditor; Tera Klutz, Chief Deputy; Nelson Peters, 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 September 18, 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 6-0 (Miller absent).

### **FINANCIAL REPORT:**

**Lisa Blosser:** The amount left for appropriation in the General Fund is \$2,104,905. For your consideration today, there are additional appropriation requests in the amount of \$71,442. Miscellaneous revenue collections are at 94.21% at the end of September.

**Darren Vogt**: Move for approval of 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 6-0 (Miller absent). One of the agenda adjustments that we are going to have here is that Mr. Fishering has a bit of a time constraint and so we are going to have him join us briefly.

**Roy Buskirk**: What this actually is, I asked the Highway Department because a couple of weeks ago I discovered that when we have a road project that has State and

Federal funding, we have to send the County's share to the State, for their holding, just after the bid. Then it is disbursed to the contractor, on a draw, as the project is completed, which in many cases is a year or two. The County does not receive any interest or anything while the State is holding that money. I wanted to see if there was some possibility that we could earn some interest on that money.

**Bill Fishering**: Ladies and gentlemen, generally in bond issues and major projects like this, we don't generally have Federal funds directly involved but in this particular case, we have an \$11 million grant from the Federal government.

Bill Hartman: We are talking about the Maplecrest Road bridge.

**Bill Fishering**: Because there is a State and Federal grant and the State is involved in this particular project and all of their various rules, those of you that have dealt with County bridges and other matters of county contracting, the general County rules, under Title 36, we have to have all funds appropriated before we can award contracts. There is a similar provision for cities and towns so that general rule has been applicable to us for years. There does not appear to be a similar State statute. The State is required to comply with various Title 8 and Title 4 requirements as well as all of the Federal requirements. At least, from a logic standpoint, the State's position appears to be similar to what we would require for any of our projects. Unfortunately in the very short time that we've had to deal with this very good question, because it does seem unfair in a project that is structured with financing like this that the State would acquire the interest, we have been unable to get a straight answer from the State about exactly where that arises. I will tell you that in my dealings with the State, they follow their rules very precisely and very rarely change them. We have been negotiating for three years, on a contract for the detour, on interstate highways you have seen those signs and there is a big contract there that says we allow them to do that under our local road systems. We have been dealing with the Attorney General and the State Highway Department for three years to try to get that straightened out. We have been dealing with the State Highway Department and the Attorney General, for three years, on Zubrick Road because they had federal funding and we were unable to modify any of their particular procedures. With all of that said, I will tell you that the suggestion that Councilman Buskirk made is a very good suggestion. We are going to approach the State about escrowing the funds instead of depositing directly with them so we may be able to earn the interest which would help us with our bond costs but I do not have a lot of hope that they will modify there rules to accommodate us. They have not done that, typically, in the past.

**Roy Buskirk**: The one reason why I wanted this is because there is an urgency here because the State Legislature can change their rules.

**Bill Fishering**: Yes, that is absolutely true.

**Roy Buskirk**: It is not just Maplecrest. It is almost like Aboite Center Road which is over a million dollars today. All of these projects, the funds that are being sent down there would amount to a considerable amount of interest and would help on the road costs in the county.

**Bill Fishering**: I don't disagree with that one bit. I would point out that we have, and through the Council's auspices, we have dealt with the State on things like funding for juvenile care and it is a long and slow process to get them to recognize where sometimes they don't treat local units as fairly as they might and sometimes it takes major change in State legislation to get them to do it.

**Roy Buskirk**: That's what I wanted in here because if you find out that it isn't possible today, we want to know so that we can start working with the state legislators and have it changed so that all of the counties in the State can get this too.

**Bill Fishering**: That is a very good suggestion and I would recommend that you go to the State Legislature with that because I do not believe that either the State Budget Agency that disburses the state money or the State Highway Department would make any change along those lines that would deprive them of the interest without a specific mandate from the Legislature. They do somewhat like you do on some of your funds and strip the interest off most funds and put it in their General Fund to make their balances work. I think it is an extremely good suggestion because it does deprive us of a fairly good amount of money over projects that normally run one to three years.

**Darren Vogt**: How many projects would you say, Bill, last a length of time like that? Is it typically most of them?

**Bill Hartman**: No. Generally we get a project done in a year's time. Maplecrest Road and Hillegas Road and the Airport Expressway and the larger projects will take possibly two seasons. Normally things take one season.

**Darren Vogt**: How many of those do you typically see a year, just one big one a year?

**Bill Hartman**: The way that they are spread out, they average one year.

**Darren Vogt**: It is an ongoing, continual thing.

Bill Hartman: Yes.

Paul Moss: Any additional questions from Council?

**Paula Hughes**: Thank you for bringing it our attention, Councilman Buskirk.

**Bill Fishering**: Thank you again for taking this early.

**Paul Moss**: No problem. We know that you are on the clock. We are going to take a look at some additional review of proposed budgets and property tax levies. On the agenda are Scipio Township, the City of Fort Wayne and Leo-Cedarville. One question that I have about this, the ones that we have reviewed this far, the majority of those have been through their internal process, is that correct? Then they come to us in a somewhat final form?

**Lisa Blosser**: The DLGF is recommending that you make your recommendations before their final budget approval. The goal is for the tax unit to receive the recommendation before they give their final approval.

**Paul Moss**: Let me rephrase that then. Let me use the City of Fort Wayne as an example. The Council is right in the middle of looking through the budget but all of the others have gone through that particular internal process.

**Lisa Blosser**: Not necessarily. It is a timing issue and we are just trying to get all of the units scheduled in. Some of them have and some of them haven't...

**Paul Moss**: My point is that obviously this is a process that needs to be tweaked as we move forward. I will also point out that all of you have probably had some interaction with the DLGF and that is a positive thing. While this is just a bit of an exercise and we only have the power to recommend changes, it is pretty clear that they are taking our comments into consideration. It at least feels that way at this point.

**Roy Buskirk**: When is the deadline, as far as our actions on these budgets?

**Lisa Blosser**: The State extended the deadline to December 1<sup>st</sup>. The problem is that the tax units are all adopting at different times. What I think would be ideal is to have all of the budgets, at the same time, for you to review but that just isn't happening with the staggered adoption dates.

**Paula Hughes**: I thought that was part of the intention of the Legislature, before the DLGF extended the deadline that the County Council did as the Tax Adjustment Board did last year and looked at the budgets as a whole to see how the pieces of the pie broke out. That would be a lot more useful.

Lisa Blosser: I agree.

**Roy Buskirk**: In one way, it is kind of nice that we don't get all of them at the same time. I talked to a couple of the City Council members last night and they are in the process of looking the budget over and so, for me, it is a little premature that we are looking at their budget because these are not the final figures.

**Paul Moss**: I would agree, so I think some of our comments would be global, in nature and for lack of a better term.

Tera Klutz: May I say something?

Paul Moss: Yes.

**Tera Klutz**: I want to take a moment to remind you that all of the recommendations have been global but don't take this as anything different. You can definitely make you recommendations as to what you would like to see what a final product would look like. I know that on the other ones, you recommended no more than 4% and that was a global recommendation and you didn't get into detail on any of the other budgets. I would say that this is still a good opportunity, before they actually dig in and work, to give them your recommendation. Then instead of them being through all of the work, you make the recommendation and they go forward. Maybe this could be a good thing.

**Paul Moss**: So avoid detailed recommendations such as cutting the City Council members' salaries or something like that.

**Lisa Blosser**: Yes but you want to treat the units of government the same. It has always been your goal, to be fair.

**Paul Moss**: Having said all of that, it appears that you have Scipio first and is there anybody here from Scipio?

Tera Klutz: No.

**Paul Moss**: Okay, I assume that everyone has had an opportunity to take a look at this. Are there any particular comments with regards to this?

**Darren Vogt**: They were direct and to the point.

**Paula Hughes**: I think we are getting the same thing here that we have gotten from other townships in that they have submitted a budget that exceeds the 4% above the levy. I think that is from when they did the numbers on the budget and they believe that the final approval will be at the 4%.

Lisa Blosser: Correct.

**Paula Hughes**: Is that more of the same?

Lisa Blosser: Yes.

**Paul Moss**: So, are you suggesting that they stay within that 4%?

Paula Hughes: I am.

**Darren Vogt**: Second that.

**Paul Moss**: That has been consistent with what we have done. Is there any additional discussion on that recommendation? **All in favor please signify by saying aye. All opposed same sign. The motion carries 6-0 (Miller absent).** The City of Fort Wayne has some folks here. As we mentioned, the City is in the midst of their budget review process and what is out there, publicly, is some significant discussion on various components of your budget. Again, this is a little premature but it could be fun. Welcome and introduce yourselves for the record. I don't know how you would like to proceed. Maybe give us an overview on anything that is unusual.

Pat Roller: Pat Roller, City Controller.

**Tom Smith**: Tom Smith, City Councilman and Chairman of the Finance Committee.

**Pat Roller**: I think the most significant piece to the budget this year is that we were able to bring it in basically balanced. Property tax is \$134 million. We were able to find \$4.2 million to keep it flat. I wanted to let you know that in Column H, the 2009 proposal is what we are proposing. I think we are going through a rigorous process with Council. We are working together to see what else we can do in order to deal with the issues relating to House Bill 1001.

Paul Moss: Councilman Smith, would you like to add anything?

Tom Smith: I really appreciate that the City brought, to us, a flat budget. While City Council is taking a look at it, we think it is a responsible budget but we think it could even be more responsible. We are looking at some cuts in the budget and that is because we know we have some pretty big shortfalls coming up. That is probably a \$33 million shortfall and we would like to look at some cuts now rather than having to do a bunch of them all at once. We will see how that goes. Personally speaking, my big concern is something that is so new that it is hard to imagine what is going on in the economy. I hope for the best but I sense that it might not happen. There could be less income tax coming in and property tax dollars coming in. They could be lower than the projections that we already have. Any shortfalls that we might have next year, say \$9 million, it could be a million more already. It is my opinion and some of the other Council members that we continue to take a look at this budget and try to cut it down, if we can.

**Paul Moss**: Is there any consensus at all, yet, on a percentage of what you guys are hoping...

**Tom Smith**: To cut out of the budget?

Paul Moss: Yes

**Tom Smith**: We sent a letter to the administration asking for a 3% reduction in the budget. I don't believe that has been accepted yet but that would cut out about \$4.5 million. The reason that number was picked is because there is a \$9 million shortfall coming up in 2010 and we looked at making half of those cuts now. It would be too drastic to do all of those cuts in 2010. I would like to build up and see what happens. If we try to make all of those cuts at once, then there would be almost unbearable pressure to raise the Local Option Income Tax. I don't want to have to do that. I would rather see us try to work up to it. If we raise the Local Option Income Tax, where you could replace dollar for dollar, you lose a dollar in property tax and replace that dollar with income tax. If you can do that and know that you have that ability, then it seems to me that there is no pressure to cut the budget. If we get to the point of raising the Local Option Income Tax, we want to raise it as little as possible. I think we can get to that position if we kind of build up to it and see what happens with some of the cuts. Maybe it won't be as bad as we thought. Those are just some of my thoughts. I would like to add one other thing and it is just for Council's consideration. One of the questions is "Has your unit experienced unique financial issues positive or negative that may potentially affect your future property tax levy?" One of the things that could be a real wildcard for the City is that we could be looking at a lot of money for bridge repairs. That is something that has been put before us. How it is going to be resolved, I don't know. That could have a very major impact on our budget. I realize that it all has to be worked out.

**Darren Vogt:** And you realize that we have given you the way out of that situation but it has not been receptive by City Council. I am not saying that I support that idea but the solution has been given.

**Tom Smith**: I believe that is a decision that only you can make.

**Paul Moss**: No, you are correct that statutorily, we are responsible for making that decision. There was the intent that there would be some agreement amongst the municipalities as to where that cash would flow.

**Tom Smith**: That is a discussion that we have to have about raising taxes on people.

**Paul Moss**: I do like the look on the Controller's face.

**Tom Smith**: It is going to come down as to whether we increase the Wheel Tax/Surtax or go to the State Legislature or it could end up in the courts, I have no idea.

**Roy Buskirk**: We want to make one point on that, Tom. It is not an unfunded mandate. There is a funding source that is available. I have a couple of questions. One of them is that when you mentioned the Local Option Income Tax, it is supposed to be a dollar for dollar reduction on property taxes but many of your constituents in the City would not receive that benefit because of the amount excess of the one percent maximum. They would see an increase in their income tax and no

benefit on their property taxes. I have a question, in looking at the budget, I see that the Fire Pension and the Police Pension has been removed. That is with the House Bill 1001, correct?

Pat Roller: Yes.

**Roy Buskirk**: But the \$4 million that has been taken out of your budget because of that, in essence, half of that has been added into the Fire line. That is an increase from \$30 million to \$32 million.

**Pat Roller**: The elimination of the responsibility of the Fire and Police Pension has been taken out of the property tax, as you may know. Of the \$16 million, approximately half of that came from the State. The other \$8 million was paid by property taxes. We had to reduce our levy for that amount.

**Roy Buskirk**: But then, why was the Fire increased?

**Paul Moss**: That is the question. Why was there such an increase in the Fire line item? I assume that is to fund operations.

**Lisa Blosser**: It is a 4% increase which is the growth factor.

**Roy Buskirk**: One other thing that I was going to mention is the fact that the City, as far as the growth factor for future budgets, especially after 2010 and most of your residents are at the one percent max, your growth factor is going to be less than what the State's recommended growth factor is. It is going to depend upon the assessed valuation of the property. The growth factor is going to be the assessed valuation.

**Pat Roller**: That has always been the difficulty in these budgets is the timing of the information and the compiling of the budgets. I know everyone in the County and the assessors and the Auditor's Office has worked diligently to get as much information to us as possible. I have always appreciated the working relationship that we have had with the Auditor's Office. We do the best we can with the best estimates that we have available. Of the three questions that were asked, we don't plan to go over the 4%. We don't have any capital projects planned.

**Roy Buskirk**: You have no capital projects?

**Pat Roller**: We have no capital projects that will be funded with property taxes.

**Roy Buskirk**: I thought that the Police headquarters...

**Pat Roller**: The Police headquarters was put in the capital budget in the out years and then we would move it forward. The G.O. bond is something that I should have changed but didn't. We have to figure out how we are going to fund that but it would not be through property taxes.

Paul Moss: Councilman Vogt?

**Darren Vogt**: When you do the expenses, what we have done is make sure that the department heads figure actual expenses and not add fluff. Then we can get to the real numbers. Do you guys do that with your department heads? In government, there has always been the shell game of "You're going to cut my budget so I am going to inflate it." We have tried to catch rollovers and things like that. How do you handle that?

Pat Roller: What we do, on the front end of our budget process is that we give some guidelines. The guidelines that we have given this year are zero increases and keep the budgets at 2008 levels. There is some back and forth iterations obviously because there are a couple of exceptions and we do the best we can and then we get to a number that we feel comfortable with. We go through the budgets with the division heads. They are, in my opinion, the best people to make decisions on what expenses are to be incurred. Fort Wayne has this tremendous history of financial responsibility. Going back to Senate Bill 1 that was adopted in December 2003, where we lost (inaudible). Our Council cut the levy in 2006, by \$1.2 million. As we all know, the Council cut the levy last year by \$2.7 million. Through many Councils and many administrations, the City of Fort Wayne has a history of keeping the budgets as low as possible.

**Darren Vogt**: We got to 78% of our expected shortfall, based on 1001. Are you guys trying to get there?

Paula Hughes: It is a good way to build up a Rainy Day fund.

**Paul Moss**: I just want to clarify a couple of things. You mentioned that the Council sent a letter to the administration. Was that just a straight 3%?

Tom Smith: Yes.

**Paul Moss**: The reason that I bring that up is because we have to come up with some sort of recommendation for this. The timing is poor and I think we all agree with that. It would be difficult for us to look at particular areas or specific areas that we would suggest you adjust. I have a question about the Metro increase. Was there a pretty significant increase requested on the Metro budget?

**Pat Roller**: There was an increase on the Metro budget and it is being reviewed by the City Council.

**Paul Moss:** Was that the biggest increase requested, of the various departments?

Paula Hughes: Percentage-wise or dollar-wise?

Paul Moss: Percentage-wise.

Paula Hughes: No, that would be Police Merit.

**Roy Buskirk**: That is the Urban League Commissioners, correct?

**Paul Moss**: No, it is the Metro Board.

Roy Buskirk: Being from the County, when you said Commissioners, I thought...

**Paul Moss**: What was the reasoning behind that?

**Pat Roller**: The Metro Commission has various grants and I don't like to speak for the Commissioners but they put forth the budget that they thought need to operate.

Maye Johnson: Councilman Moss, as a member of that Commission, I would be more than happy to address any questions that you might have. There were reasons for submitting the budget as it was and that has to do with the uncertainty of how much the agency is going to receive in property tax dollars. There are some issues that you probably read about that have lead to some confusion and mystery on the part of the Board of Commissioners in terms of how we are going to support this agency with the threat of losing federal dollars related to our federal contracts. I don't particularly want to get into all of that this morning but I would be more than happy to have a discussion with you following this. We could go on and on about why the budget was submitted as it was. It was explained at the Council table two weeks ago. There is a reason for it and it has to do with a situation that we have now with the federal government and stopping the flow of federal funds to the agency.

**Paul Moss**: I appreciate that. I generally only view the Council meetings if I am having trouble sleeping and so I didn't see that one. I appreciate that explanation. The reason that I bring it up is that this is one of the more significant outliers as far as the budget is concerned and as we go through our process, we have to be objective about this in spite of some of the strong feelings in some parts of the community for that entity and I don't argue with that at all. We have to look at it with blinders on and do what we are charged to do. That seems to stick out a little bit and so I think those are legitimate questions. Now, whether we incorporate anything into our recommendations, with regards to that, is a decision by this body. What I am trying to do as well, particularly with regards to Mr. Smith's comment about the letter that was sent to the administration, is help us identify a recommendation. If you guys want to sit here and try to go through specific areas of their budget and make recommendations, we can do that. I think that is a substantial task that they are currently trying to undertake. I think the suggestion might be to support City Council and say that we agree with this 3% reduction. That is a very circular way of saying that but it's a thought. Councilman Buskirk?

**Roy Buskirk**: Two things and then I will make a motion. One thing, being the Chairman of the Budget Committee for City Council, and one thing that has always

puzzled me and people that know me know that I look for saving nickels and dimes, if the City had their elections when the other elections were going on, it would save the City over \$400,000. It would save the County over \$100,000 by moving one year on the election to having it during the national off-year elections. I am not sure if that can just be decided or if there has to be new State legislation. That would also enhance a better voter turnout. I understand that about thirty years ago, this was attempted and the towns and cities were very upset because they didn't want to do it and have to share the newspaper headlines with the other officers running at that time. I think it is time that we get over our childishness and get down to the bottom lines and if there is an opportunity of doing something of this that does not change the services that are being provided to the general public and citizens of this county, I think we ought to take advantage of that opportunity. That is one area that might help, not this year because there is no city election this year but in future years it might help to get to the 3% reduction. I make a motion that we recommend to the City that they reduce their budget by 3% as has been recommended by the City Council to obtain the foreseen reductions for 2010.

**Paul Moss**: There is a motion and a second. Wait, there is no second yet. Does anyone care to make a second?

Patt Kite: I will second it.

**Darren Vogt**: A little discussion. In doing so, although I don't disagree with that, it will not be consistent with what we have told every other unit. We didn't tell every other unit to do that, at least from my perspective. Since I was not at the special meeting, I don't believe that it was a discussion then. I think they should be thinking that through and I agree. It is not the full Council and how many members are on the Finance Committee, three?

Tom Smith: Two.

**Darren Vogt**: There are two that sent that letter.

**Tom Smith**: No, there are three Council members, the President of City Council and one other Democrat so that we had some balance.

**Darren Vogt**: So let me ask, how was the consensus of the rest of Council?

**Tom Smith**: The consensus of the rest of Council was to send that letter.

**Paul Moss**: That is what I asked and was under the impression that it was the full Council.

**Tom Smith**: The full Council didn't sign the letter. It was discussed, at the table, that the letter be sent.

**Pat Roller**: The way that I presented it was that it was additional information for the Council to look at options that they may have.

**Paul Moss**: It is probably important from a timing perspective, but are we going to have an opportunity to look at this again or is it that when we make these recommendations, that is basically it.

Lisa Blosser: This is it.

**Paul Moss**: It is really kind of frustrating and I do believe, I am not picking on Metro but it is one that just sticks out, I would like to be able to have an understanding of what sort of areas the Council ends up cutting or adjusting one way or another. It would certainly be easier for us to do our job. If you are suggesting that the percentage just needs to be higher.

**Darren Vogt**: I just wanted us to be aware that we are not consistent. If the full Council sent that out, they are coming to us saying that we are trying to get to a different place, no one else was doing that. To go along with it, I am going to support the motion because we are getting encouragement from them that this is what they are going to do. It is a little bit different scenario when they are coming to us.

**Paula Hughes:** There are a lot of reasons why the City of Fort Wayne's budget is radically different from many of the other budgets that we have been reviewing. It is the only budget in the County that is comparable to the County's own budget. You look at the number of revenue streams that are coming in to fund all of the pieces of the budget and that compels me to support City Council in their effort to reduce the budget. The numbers are misleading in the form that we have been given. It is an overly simplified form and it has to be in order for us to get through the number of budgets that we have to get through. If you look at the bottom line, and Councilman Buskirk alluded to this, when you look at Column G, the Certified Budget for 2008, that includes the Police and Fire Pension amounts. If you remove those two amounts, which is almost \$4.5 million, then really the City's budget is increasing by 4.33%. If you remove those two from consideration of the 2008 levy, their 2009 proposed levy is an increase of 4.33%. I am very supportive of the City Council's effort to reduce the budget by 3%. I applaud them for taking that effort. I have been watching City Council for a lot of years and you haven't delved into the budget as deeply in the past, maybe because you haven't had to. It is hard work and this is what County Council does. We dig into the numbers and I applaud your effort to move forward in that way. I would be supportive of City Council's effort to reduce the budget. I can not let go, and this is the only opportunity I have to comment, that the forms that were submitted to us shows a \$32 million G.O. bond. I know you said that you shouldn't have put it in that column but for heaven's sake this is a public document. What column were you going to put it in? Any guesses? I sat through meetings through the summer and the fall working with City administration members and County administration members trying to get through a mutual program of co-location of two departments and less than a week later, the City is

announcing via a document, that you are going to bond \$32 million to do a police building but you couldn't come to an agreement with the County. I am just disappointed with how the process has gone.

**Pat Roller**: We moved it over, from year to year, it showed up in 2009 and it is a normal process that we have done for many, many years. I should have looked at it and changed the numbers and I didn't. We are working diligently, as many people around in this room. Something had to be done with the Police Department; we put a number out there so that everyone could keep an eye on that ball. We have a \$42 million number in there for next year for communications. We are going to have the same difficulty with that and whoever sits in this chair next year will treat that differently.

**Paula Hughes**: Part of it is that I understand the nature of wanting to earmark something. We do that in our processes but to me, what was most ingenuous is that there was no reference to that during the meetings of the co-location discussions. There was no mention of the City has been earmarking or trying to keep in mind the \$32.6 million amount. We have it as a GEO bond and that isn't going to work but this is how much we think we are going to have to spend on that. Instead we ground to a halt because you stated that the City couldn't come up with anything near that amount of money.

**Tom Smith**: I did ask that question of Police Chief Rusty York, at City Council on Tuesday night, and he said that no, we did not bring that up during the discussions. That was unfortunate. I have to tell you that when I looked at that amount, I thought it said \$320,000. I could not believe that I was looking at \$32 million. It was really shocking when I realized what the amount was. That has got to change. That is probably dead on arrival given the current financial situation. There has to be other options out there that we can look at and are a lot less expensive.

**Paula Hughes**: This is my formal attempt to express my frustration with how that entire process has gone. I am so disappointed that we put so much time and energy into it and it didn't work out. Getting this in the mail makes me think that the City never wanted to partner with us in the first place.

**Pat Roller**: If it was nothing else, it was an oversight. As I said, we should have moved those dollars over. I should have looked at. This has nothing to do with cooperation or lack of cooperation. It was an oversight in the Controller's Office, which is all it was.

Paul Moss: We do have a motion and a second. Are there any additional comments or questions? Hearing none, all in favor please signify by saying aye. All opposed same sign. The motion carries 6-0 (Miller absent). Our recommendation is going to be in support of the City Council's request for a 3% decrease in the budget. Thank you very much. We appreciate your time. Okay, moving right along, we have Leo-Cedarville.

**Pam Spannuth**: I am Pam Spannuth, Clerk Treasurer from Leo-Cedarville.

**Paul Moss**: Are there any particular comments that you would like to make about this form and the responses that you provided?

Paula Hughes: No hidden G.O. bonds?

**Pam Spannuth**: The only comment is the significant increase in the proposed levy. It is truly there for the sake of advertising in making sure that we reach our levy and our funds. All of the budgets in the funds were planned assuming strictly a 4% increase in the levy. Just for the sake of advertising, we increased that a little bit. The excess is showing in our operating balances, 4A and 4B. Once I planned the budget, I realized that the levies going into the Cum Fund will likely decrease with the uncertainty of our final assessed valuation for next year. I made up for those decreases in the other funds to ensure that we reach our maximum levy. That is the explanation for any overage that shows on our proposed levy for 2009.

**Paul Moss**: Council, are there any questions?

**Paula Hughes**: If we make our 4% recommendation, it is not going to adversely affect your plans?

Pam Spannuth: No.

**Darren Vogt**: Since we are on the discussion of getting to the 2010, do you know what your dollar amount reduction is for 2010? Have you been thinking about that at all?

**Pam Spannuth:** No. We have several Councilmen who would like to shave some more money off the budget but we are at the beginning of the process of reviewing the budget and finalizing it. We have not had our public hearing or adoption yet. We are trying to reduce our budget figures overall.

**Roy Buskirk**: Actually, you might not have any impact because of not having anyone going up against the maximum Circuit Breaker.

Pam Spannuth: Right.

**Roy Buskirk**: You will probably not see a reduction.

**Pam Spannuth**: Earlier worksheets don't show much of an impact to us.

**Paul Moss**: Does anyone care to offer a motion?

**Darren Vogt**: Move for the amount of increase for their levy to be at 4%.

Roy Buskirk: Second.

Paul Moss: We have a motion and a second. All in favor please signify by saying aye. All opposed same sign. The motion carries 6-0 (Miller absent). Thank you. We are going to have to move one thing fairly quickly. We are going to move the Economic Development piece with Indiana Tech up. She has to leave. This should be brief, right?

Ashley Steenman: I am Ashley Steenman from the Department of Planning Services and with me is Judy Roy, Vice President of Financing, with Indiana Tech. Indiana Technology, also known as Indiana Tech, has decided that because of their continued growth they will need to construct another residence hall to house about sixty students. As you may recall, earlier this year we did an identical project. They are coming to you to ask in assisting them in financing by lending the County's tax status to get better rates on the bond to finance the project. They are asking, this time, in the amount of \$2,475,000. This has no impact on taxpayers, you are just lending them our status. The Allen County Economic Development Commission met on Tuesday the 14<sup>th</sup> and approved an inducement resolution to get this process started. It comes to you guys and then we have to see the City Council to get their consent since we are operating within their jurisdiction. The Economic Development Commission will then hold a public hearing and then we will be back to you at the November meeting to approve the ordinance for this. I can answer any questions that you have.

**Paul Moss**: I assume that everyone has had the opportunity to look at that. It was mailed out a while ago. Councilwoman Hughes?

**Paula Hughes**: I believe it was just last year that we had another one of these and the question that we asked was would this impact the County's ability to bond but I am not aware of any pending bonds.

**Ashley Steenman**: It is a different type of bond and there is no financial burden on the County whatsoever.

Paula Hughes: Okay, thank you.

**Roy Buskirk**: Is this the same size and same architectural design of the other one?

**Judy Roy**: Yes. It is a mirror residence hall and will be right across the patio and be the same as the one that we just built.

**Roy Buskirk**: I appreciate using the same design. Then you don't have additional fees for that. I am just curious, you don't have a bid on it yet, right?

**Judy Roy**: We don't have a bid on it yet. It should be about the same but there will be some additional sewer work that we have to do to make a combined sewer. We will be doing some work on the baseball diamond that is adjacent to it as well.

**Roy Buskirk**: I was just curious to see the cost compare.

**Darren Vogt**: Move for approval of consideration of an inducement resolution for an economic development revenue bond for Indiana Institute of Technology.

Paula Hughes: Second.

**Paul Moss:** We have a motion and a second. All in favor please signify by saying aye. All opposed same sign. The motion carries 6-0 (Miller absent). Thank you. I am sorry but I can't remember how to pronounce your name but if you would like to come up here and join us. We appreciate your patience. State your name for the record, please.

**Joe Tocci**: My name is Joe Tocci and I am Chairman of the SMD Fund.

**Paul Moss**: Mr. Tocci, okay. The intent here is that after the Airport Authority had their budget presentation, there was some email activity and the desire of Mr. Tocci to come before Council to offer some additional insight, from his perspective, into the Airport Authority's budget and some concerns that he would like to share with us. We are affording him that opportunity, at this time. I do want to reiterate that we need to keep this germane to the issue at hand which is the Airport Authority budget. I don't want to get off on a whole lot of different tangents or anything like that. Do you have some handouts that you would like to give us?

**Joe Tocci**: Yes sir. In the interest of the agenda, this might be a good time to hand out. Instead of reading this presentation, I was going to give a 55-second presentation and I assumed that this was going to be in 126 downstairs and that it would be a simple thing to do to connect my pc.

**Paul Moss**: We can all commit to looking at that, on line, if you provide us with the information.

**Joe Tocci**: I will be happy to send you the link so that you will not have to hunt and peck with the long string of the URL.

**Paul Moss**: Let me ask a quick question first. I have read your letters, with interest. The SMD Fund indicates that you are Chairman of that fund. Can you describe that entity a little bit? Who else is involved in that, do you have a board and can you give us a little help here?

**Joe Tocci**: We formed SMD Fund in January of 2003, some seven months after the Airport Authority decided to close Smith Field. Our mission was to convince the

Airport Authority that it was a mistake to do that and it would injure the community. There was a dramatic change in the ruling made by the Indiana Supreme Court that changed our mission profoundly. We then had a constitutional basis on which to object to the Airport Authority's formation in the way that it is today. That resulted in a lawsuit the following month, when we learned about this change. We then pursued that lawsuit for about two years and it went all the way the United States Supreme Court. The ruling by the Indiana Supreme Court was that we had taken too long to complain and so we were not permitted to make our case and there was no adjudication on our complaint. Since then, we have been rather quiescent, and I would like to say, that I am thoroughly impressed by Mr. Richardson's performance at Smith Field. The remarks that are in my presentation speak to that. He has done a stellar job. He has resuscitated the field and brought it up to a modern standard consistent with the kind of conditions that the people of the United States, and I presume the people of Allen County, expect what our airports are going to operate like. It has been proven consistently that it is an asset and has a lot of potential to throw up new income for the Airport Authority's budget. My interest in speaking to you on this case is that they are actually proceeding with the plan to increase the levy. I believe that they have all of the resources they need in the way of real estate and operations to fund whatever their needs are going forward. It is my intention to try to figure out what is exactly going on beyond that. I could be wrong but if all I have to examine, as a citizen, is the budget, I don't have very much to find out about the details. So, to answer your question, we formed in 2003. We have a board of three and had hoped to grow to seven but for dynamic reasons, we have never been able to grow the board past three. The SMD Fund is an IRS 501C4. recognized as not for profit. Many of the activities that we were involved in have pretty much gone to sleep until now.

**Paul Moss**: I want to make sure I understand what your mission is. Is it to preserve and enhance Smith Field area or is it to test the constitutionality of the Airport Authority?

**Joe Tocci**: That is no longer available to us. We made that case and were unsuccessful in getting into court. My objective today, and has been, in the scope of their authority covers the entire county. We are not just interested in the SMD Fund. We are interested in aviation for the entire county. We are really interested in what the priorities are of the Airport Authority. We want to find that out and can't without looking at the current financials.

**Paul Moss**: I believe that those current financials are readily available. They are public documents. There are certain processes to go through and I know that they have had a variety of meetings and all have been public noticed. I am not sure what, if any, effort on your part has been made to get that information prior to right now. In order to kind of move this along, let's set Smith Field aside which is a whole different subject that we have no control over. Our responsibility is to look at the Airport Authority's budget, which we did. They made a strong case with regards to the issues that are affecting their budget and the loss of Kitty Hawk and how that

impacts their ability to repay the bond. I think we took a pretty good look at their budget. What I am most interested in, at this point, are your thoughts and suggestions on how that should occur differently. That is a specific question wanting a fairly specific answer.

**Joe Tocci**: I am not sure that we can do that in a setting like this.

**Paul Moss**: What setting would you require?

**Joe Tocci**: I think it calls for an ad hoc committee to examine the financials. These are technical questions.

**Paul Moss**: We have examined the financials and I think everyone is in agreement...

**Joe Tocci**: Have you examined anything beyond the documents that were presented and that I have seen?

**Paul Moss**: What documents would you specifically require that goes beyond the budget that they have presented. Do you believe there are additional funds that are being squirreled away?

**Joe Tocci**: Nothing as nefarious as that. We are looking at a budget that is a Performa that tells us what they are promising to do the next fiscal year.

**Paul Moss**: That is what all budgets are.

**Joe Tocci**: Of course. I am interested in knowing how we got into the condition in which we are now left with a \$30 million debt to the people, directly, and was promised to come out of operations for the balance of this bond. It seems to me that if they have done this, they have essentially defaulted and there is no expectation that they are going to return this thing to operation and recover the funds, not from the bond but from taxes. I'm sorry, not from operations but from taxes. The people have a right to know just exactly how we got into this condition. Why is it that we have this project that resulted in this failure twice?

Paul Moss: I think, and I was not intimately involved in that, but I do believe and I am sure that you understand that there certainly is a risk involved. We deal with this on a fairly routine basis and economic development activities by the granting of tax abatements and the letting of bonds and things of that nature. You have to take, at some face value, the information that is provided to you at the time. I wasn't on Council at the time that this happened with Kitty Hawk but I believe that the intent was economic development driven. The belief was that Kitty Hawk certainly would remain there. There are market forces at play that can create circumstances with an employer that they are not able to meet their obligations and go bankrupt. I am not sure what controls can be put in place in a situation like that. So, setting all of that aside because we can't do anything about the past. We can't slap anybody's hand for

what may or may not have been a good decision. I think it was probably, looking at it today and looking at the numbers and looking at the property that we now own out there and the opportunities for possibly leasing that to another entity, it seems that the current situation that we are in, this is about the best approach we can take. Nobody at this table, in my opinion, is excited about the fact that we have to put that bond on the backs of the taxpayers. A somewhat analogous situation is the Maplecrest Road project. One of the things that we did, as a Council, and we did appropriately with the help of the Planning Department, was look at that bond repayment and have a variety of scenarios of the potential high side and the very low side for the potential for development. Development is going to enable repayment of the bond or keep repayment of the bond off the taxpayers' rolls. We obviously were convinced that the low end development was enough to repay the bond so we wouldn't have a situation like this. There have been some lessons learned, obviously, but I can't go back and change history. We are faced with the situation where we were going to look at their budget and were provided with the information required to do a fairly thorough review of the budget. If there is something specific that you can provide in a suggestion or information that you require, I am open for it. We are always open for public comment and public discussion. I need to have, instead of a broad allegation of incompetence, some specific information from you that is going to help us make a different decision than we've already made. I am not sure that an ad hoc committee is going to help with that. Honestly, Let's call us an ad hoc committee.

**Joe Tocci**: I am talking about the fact that the State is extending the due date, for these budgets to get approval by the State, until December 1. It gives us nominally six weeks to examine, in deep detail, what the financials look like. The financials that I am talking about are described in the letter that I sent to Tory. You have a copy in the handout. Those are specifics. There is a large lease that is unique to airports, and for that matter, (inaudible) listed airport authorities. These are details that are characteristic of review by bond rating agencies because they understand airport authorities that enjoy capital investment by the United States government and have to operate under certain standards. This kind of information is routine in the operations of this Airport Authority. I expect that they will be readily available. In our examination, we will be able to ascertain why, for example, there's \$600,000 in the capital fund for land acquisition for this next year. What possible reason would this Airport Authority have for acquiring land that will not be 95% purchased by the FAA? All the land that the FAA is concerned about is the runway protection zones and the runway safety areas. Almost all of the runway safety area consists only of the contiguous property of these airports. The runway protection zone extends beyond and the FAA routinely acquires that land on behalf of the Airport Authority and on behalf of the people of the United States.

**Paul Moss**: We are going to ask them to come up here and I want to have some specific questions to ask. You believe the \$600,000 that they have in their budget, for land acquisition, could be used to repay these bonds. Is that what you are getting at?

**Joe Tocci**: Yes it is. I say that because no one has told me what that \$600,000 is for and this is a summary budget that is required by the State.

**Paul Moss**: If you stick around, you are going to be told here, very shortly. We want to know as well. What other specific areas of their budget that you have seen, that you might see as used for bond payment?

**Joe Tocci**: To make it straightaway, the letter that I originally sent on the 25<sup>th</sup> of September to Ms. Blosser, enumerates the five major questions. I am speaking about land acquisition but also about Brookwood Golf Course that was acquired. That is the perfect example of acquired ground that is paid for by the FAA in the AIP program. In the presentation, when the Authority made its case, Tory spoke to the AIP but it wasn't clear, from his remarks, that the AIP isn't his program but a federal program. Those funds include not just capital improvements to the runway operations, communications, navigation and pavement. It also includes protecting safety and security for those runway operations and that would include runway protection zones. That is the approaches to these runways. The Airport Authority, in 2006, made a case that they want to make an approach on runway 2-3. That runway has been there since 1940. There has never been a warrant to the FAA to be approved or that there is any need for this kind of runway protection. We have been flying heavy freighters and military aircraft and that has never been an issue. The Airport Authority spent the people's money to acquire a golf course. If that wasn't surprising enough, knowing that the FAA would have bought that for them, they proceeded to give the seller a \$500,000 stipend to run it for them. If that golf course represents a net expense to the Airport Authority, it's inappropriate. If it represents an income stream, as all of the leasing properties do, then it is exactly appropriate. Golf courses are like no other land or facilities that the Airport Authority might use to develop its income independent of the tax base. But in this case, it appears to be an expense. It is possible that it is not going to show in the budget but that parties involved may actually appear elsewhere in the budget. There was a dramatic change in the concessionaires for the parking lot, at the airport. I want to know, in detail, what happened there. You can't know that by the budget because it doesn't say. I have five questions, for Ms. Blosser, that I enumerated. I am hoping to see them explained authoritatively and in formal proceedings. Beyond that, I sent a list of particulars that I was interested in seeing, directly to Mr. Richardson. He has been gracious enough to respond and he has identified the contact at the Authority. My purpose today wasn't so much to get into those details because that is an expensive use of your time. This is the first time that I have been before Council and I have to say that I am amazed that you find the time to do this as you do. Without being patronizing, I really thank you for your service in this regards. I know my father did not run through the plains of Belgium and Germany to do what he did in World War II so that I could come back here and have to have disagreements with my officials. You guys do thankless work.

Paul Moss: Councilwoman Hughes?

**Paula Hughes**: Mr. Tocci, I have read through a couple of letters, one to Auditor Blosser and one to Mr. Richardson. In my mind, I am going to summarize my impression and you tell me whether or not I understand you correctly. It seems to me that the majority interest in this is that you disagree with the Airport's ascertaition that they should continue to operate business as usual with additional levy to cover the amount to pay the Kitty Hawk bond.

Joe Tocci: Precisely.

**Paula Hughes**: Okay. And Council, when we heard from the Airport Authority in the budget hearings and then voted on it last month, we fairly explicitly said that we agreed that they should continue to run operations as usual and we will support you applying for the extra money for a levy to cover those bonds. So, you believe that they shouldn't have excess levy to pay that and they should find it within their budget. That is the biggest part of your argument?

**Joe Tocci**: I wouldn't say absolutely. It may very well be that there is not enough in their operations to make up the difference. But I am not convinced, at all, that carrying on as usual is the way to do this. There is a lot more money in their operations that could backfill this \$2.8 million a year. One of the questions that I asked, in the first letter, if there operation produced more revenue than they predicted in any given year, does that automatically cut back the levy for the next tax year. If that is the case, then this thing can automatically move but it can not improve unless we examine what the real priorities are by seeing what the financials are. In such questions, as those, that I have already enumerated in both of these letters. So, not absolutely.

Paula Hughes: But close?

**Joe Tocci**: I am not convinced that the full amount has to be had. I am convinced that some significant percentage of this levy can be dramatically removed from the burden of the people who are getting ready to take the toughest ride that this county has seen, and the whole country has seen, since 1946.

Paula Hughes: So your investigation into the Airport's budget is prompted more by the financial concerns of the country right now. Presumably, your argument would hold true for last year and the years before and that you believed that the Airport Authority was not spending its budget wisely. If they could find the money within their budget this year to fund the bond payment, they could have found a way to make do with that much less money in past years as well. You think that their budget has been bloated for several years? Do you see the line of logic that I am trying to proof through? Is your concern this year, one because they are applying for an excess levy and two because you think the economy will not allow property taxes to sustain that excess levy?

Joe Tocci: I will tell you that, frankly, I have always been suspicious that there has always been more money in their operations than they were spending on things that would be useful, in my judgment, as a homeowner in this City. But that is not my prompt. The prompt isn't even what is going on nationally. To be honest, the prompt was the acquisition of Brookwood. This is way outside of reasonable. I want to see the records that can assure me that it was legitimate. I don't think it was. It was a \$3.75 million capital outlay that would be beneficial in this fiscal right now. And, insult to injury, is what was approved by the Airport Authority was an up to \$500,000 a year management fee. This is just stunning. I would probably still be quiescent on the Airport Authority today, had that not taken place.

**Paula Hughes**: Okay. I knew that there had to be something that prompted you, at this point. I was trying to get to what that was and thank you. I think those are reasonable questions to ask.

Joe Tocci: That alone was offensive. When they then turned around and tried to make up for what failed at the Air Trade Center, by simply going ahead and putting the burden on the taxpayers, that is too much to stand by and witness. The Indiana Supreme Court chastised SMD Fund for waiting for seventeen years before complaining about this constitutional problem. I don't think it is appropriate for me to wait seventeen days after they proposed to take out a new bond. This is an equity matter in law and so the chance of resolving this thing, by lawsuit in Indiana courts, is pretty slim. I don't shoot twice at the wrong target.

Paula Hughes: Thank you.

Paul Moss: Councilman Buskirk?

**Roy Buskirk**: Hopefully we won't have to go near that far. I think that part of the Council's problem is that the budgets that we have been reviewing, the revenue stream have been property taxes only. In this particular budget, we do not know all of the revenue streams. We know the property tax side but we don't know the leases and their operation income. I think that you brought up some good points that the Council should have more responsibility in looking at the actual operating budget, the profit and loss statement and asking for some of those documents to review.

**Joe Tocci**: Thank you Councilman. There are details here that you don't normally take a look at. They are unique to Airport Authorities or other Port Authorities. I think that the examination of those things is going to provide a lot of opportunities for us to improve the situation there. If I may, I won't read this today, could you go to page two?

**Paul Moss**: We are going to have to make this very succinct and to the point here.

**Joe Tocci**: This is what SMD Fund is looking for. On page two you will see, "Did you know?" that is the link and reference the footnote. I will send you the email

address so that it is easy enough to get to it and watch the four minute and fifty-five second video. I lays out a context about all of America's economy is about to get whipsawed and that we are going to have to endure this for at least two years. Reasonable expectation is that we have been on a slide since 1946, since demobilization, in Indiana, of the Department of Defense. I make remarks, to that affect, in these letters. After you see this, you can see that everything I say beyond that fits into a context to answer Ms. Hughes' question. I think that all this means, things that we have been talking about now and especially the condition that the country finds itself in now, is that our community needs to wake up to forces that will whipsaw us like never before. We have to set a new standard as to how our limited tax resources will be approved. I am making a case that County Council move to conventional budgetary examinations of all its unelected boards. I am talking about current financials and not just budgets. It is the only way to gain authoritative understanding of those boards' priorities. By this new legislative mandate, Indianapolis has made your statutory responsibility to assure the taxpayers that these priorities are aligned with the voters' priorities. I want us to begin this year with the Fort Wayne-Allen County Airport Authority. I will be happy to answer any further questions.

Paul Moss: I think you answered most of the questions and let me just state that we do appreciate you bringing these things to the forefront. We are going to ask Mr. Richardson and anybody else that he would like to have join him to respond. We don't want to get into a situation where we are going back and forth here but I am going to ask him to respond to budget issue question that you brought up about the \$600,000 for land acquisition. I think you also expressed some concerns about the Brookwood Golf Course and so I think it would be wise for them to talk a little about that. Many of the things that you brought up are simply out of the realm of County Council's ability and empowerment to have any oversight on. This is a fluid process and you will find, as time goes on, we will have more oversight and control of different taxing entities. Hopefully that will provide you with some comfort. Again, we appreciate your time and you are welcome to stay and hear these responses and then communicate with us as you have prior to this. Make sure you provide us with the web link that you wanted to have us look at.

**Paula Hughes**: Mr. Tocci, I just read through your description on the presentation and I want to thank you for your work with the EAA as well. I was in Oshkosh this summer and I appreciate that.

**Joe Tocci**: If I don't go at least once a year, I get cranky.

**Paul Moss**: If Mr. Richardson and anybody that he would like to have come up, please do.

**Tory Richardson**: I am Tory Richardson, Executive Director of the Fort Wayne-Allen County Airport Authority. I am here representing both Fort Wayne International and Smith Field. I appreciate the opportunity to respond to some of the

questions that need clarification that is most certainly needed in this case. What I gathered from you, Mr. President, is the \$600,000 on land acquisition and Brookwood. I will try to address those points in just a minute. I also encourage Mr. Tocci to get involved in this process. As you mentioned, we have gone through this for at least sixty days, through identifying all of these issues and laying this stuff out. I'd also say that dating back to 2006, all of this was done in a public meeting and it was explained, in the public meeting, what we were doing and why we were doing it. I am not sure how Mr. Tocci got a \$500,000 stipend in there. Actually that is a revenue stream for us. They pay us \$500,000 a year as revenue so I am not sure where he is coming up with the expense side of it. That needs to be clarified because there is no stipend involved. In terms of the budget issue, obviously it is an open book. I would encourage any of the Council members and Mr. Tocci to sit down and look at some of that stuff. I would be happy to do that. Again, I would rather be part of the solution and not part of the problem after the fact. The \$600,000 land acquisition question that we have, Mr. Tocci is correct in saying that in most cases that can be federally eligible but not always. The FAA does not purchase that land for people. It is money that goes into the Airport Improvement Program and comes back to airports for eligible development on their property or to acquire property. It is not to say that the FAA is going to buy that and it is only available based on funds. We may have \$600,000 in there as a land acquisition but there may not be any funding, from the FAA, available to pay for that which is the case that we've got right now. I don't want to publicly state names of people that we're negotiating with. in terms of the land acquisition. I don't think that is fair to them. I can assure you that we are working with people around the airport. Primarily, the types of acquisitions that we do are for compatible land uses to make sure that we have adequate storm water runoff so that we are not flooding people's places. That we are protecting for hazard issues, much like we did with the golf course. While some of that land may be eligible for federal funding, you have to have federal funds available if you are going to do it that way. We have not had those funds available to us nor did we have those funds available to us at the time that we acquired Brookwood. Brookwood was a hazard issue. If you recall, back in 2006, there was a natural transition of ownership. The current owners wanted to sell it. Our concern was that if it changed hands, it could also change use. They could erect structures out there that could essentially render our runway or portions of it useless. We needed to acquire it for protection of the airspace. The reason that we do not use federal funds on that particular one is because, at some point, we may want to sell it and it is extremely difficult when you purchase land with federal funds and then go through the process to get it released. I don't know if you remember this but I worked with the City and County on the straightening of the Indianapolis and Ferguson Roads area. That took us five years to get that approved from the federal process to release that land. We went ahead and did the project and completed it but it took us five years to release it and just going through the paperwork process. It is a very tedious process to do. In many cases, especially in the case with Brookwood, there is the potential that we could sell off some or that entire parcel in the future fully protecting some of the RPZ and light lane issues that we would have to have. It would be more flexible for us to

keep that off the ALP so that we could turn around and sell that property in the future. I would be happy to take any questions or other comments from you.

**Paul Moss**: Does anyone know what RPZ stands for?

Tory Richardson: Runway protection zone.

Paul Moss: Councilman Buskirk?

Roy Buskirk: You mentioned, like with Brookwood, that you acquired that because they could build a tower. It so happens that on my father's farm, when we went to sell it, at Smith and Ferguson Roads, we were shocked to find out that we had height restrictions of thirty-five feet at the corner of the farm. I know you are aware that the property had been in my family since 1848. The FFA attorney in Chicago told me that my family should have sued and fought against the location of the airport when they placed it there. I told him that we would have been tarred and feathered and ran out of town. There are restrictions all around the airport on the current property of air restrictions on height. That rubs me a little bit the wrong way when you say that they could build a tower. Another question is the fact that if there is a safety issue, as far as the end of the runway, isn't there participation of federal funding on any property that is being acquired because of the safety issue?

**Tory Richardson**: Not necessarily. It depends on how you structure it and whether you are running it as an AIP project. We have a number of capital projects that go on every year and most of the capital projects, in fact on the budget that we submitted is almost entirely AIP eligible and being funded through the AIP program but there has to be money available to it. It depends on if the whole thing is eligible or if only portions are eligible. The other issue, with respect to the heights is kind of a difficult situation. In the current zoning, you can go up as high as thirty-five feet but if you do it right there, at that parcel which would be completely legal for someone to do, that would render much of that runway useless. We actually have a height problem right now and had to disclose that threshold just from the train tracks that are there. There are some places that penetrate what is allowable for an imaginary surface out beyond that runway. When they look at train tracks, they say seventeen feet above that is the requirement that you have to make. You go right across the corner of that property and you put something in there, they are not going to tell you that you can't do that from a tower perspective. They are going to tell us is that now that the tower is there, you now have to change the use of your airspace which means that you can not use that much of the runway. You now have a different slope to your runway and it's going to start further down the runway. They won't stop the development. They have no teeth to stop the development. It becomes basically when the City accepted grants for this airport way back when it was transferred from the DOD, they started accepting grants and with that is the requirement to protect those surfaces. It is incumbent for us to protect those surfaces. The FAA will either go back and say it is a hazard or it is not a hazard or it is a hazard that can be mitigated with lighting or painting or something like that. They can't stop it. Their jurisdiction is how the

airspace is used as a result of that development. Our best case and for the best protection is to acquire that land if we need to and then we can impose some certain requirements on that and turn around and sell it.

Paul Moss: Councilman Vogt?

**Darren Vogt**: So that I understand it, your revenue from the acquisition of Brookwood is \$500,000 a year. There is no management fee, at this point in time, to anyone managing that. We are taking revenue off that after everything is said and done.

**Tory Richardson**: Correct, there is a \$500,000 payment and in addition to that, if they exceed some performance with their revenues, we get a percentage of that.

**Darren Vogt**: Okay, so there is potential for additional. We paid \$3.5 million for that facility.

**Tory Richardson**: It was about \$3.2 million.

**Darren Vogt**: And we are in the second year of that?

**Tory Richardson**: Actually, what we are doing is repaying ourselves back with some of that \$600,000 that was for land acquisition and paying ourselves back for that parcel. We also have a number of parcels that are identified as priorities to acquire in the future. We just don't have the funds available to purchase them right now. Each year, we make progress on those priorities and acquire those properties in accordance with that.

**Darren Vogt:** Okay, I guess my point was that this is a six-year payback. If we keep the golf course, you don't sell it off or don't do what you need to do with it, right now it is a six-year or seven-year payback. Is that a fair statement to say?

**Tory Richardson**: I would probably go a little bit longer than that because we will probably partner with them on some capital improvements and stuff that is needed over there. Essentially, when we looked at the deal, we wanted to make sure that a payback was reasonable and a business could continue to operate over there. At the end of the day, we only control the land and can do whatever we need to do with it.

**Darren Vogt**: That is what I was trying to get at. Sometimes, as we do with land banking as economic development from the County perspective, the Airport Authority has to do the same kind of scenario.

**Paul Moss**: Council, are there any other questions or comments? We appreciate your time as well and we are going to consider this closed for today. I assume you all will have continued interaction with Mr. Tocci. We appreciate both of you and your willingness to do that.

**Darren Vogt**: Are we just now getting to item one?

**Paula Hughes**: No there is Personnel Committee.

**Darren Vogt**: Do we want to do the minutes first?

**Paul Moss**: Mr. Buskirk will give us a Personnel Committee update.

**Roy Buskirk**: Do you want to do that now or wait until the salary ordinances?

**Paula Hughes**: Move for approval of the minutes of September 18, 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 6-0 (Miller absent). So you want to hold off on the Personnel Committee? Let's wait because Brian isn't here and we are going to do the payband thing. It appears that the Sheriff is here. Would you like to join us?

**Ken Fries**: Certainly, thank you. Good morning, Kenny Fries, Sheriff of Allen County. I am here to ask for an additional appropriation for \$9,000 for overtime to put into a separate account for a trial that is beginning on Monday. The money will be used to pay officers for the sequestered jury. We anticipate it to be only a week and we are going to use our reserve officers as much as possible. Anything that we don't use from the \$9,000 will come back immediately and the rest will be billed to Lake County. We anticipate that they will not give us the revenue until after the first of the year.

**Paula Hughes**: This is similar to the approach that we had from Superior Court last month.

**Darren Vogt**: Move for approval of item one in the amount of \$9,000 for overtime.

Patt Kite: Second.

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

**Roy Buskirk**: Isn't there a salary ordinance or something?

**Tera Klutz**: Yes, we are going to take care of that.

**Roy Buskirk**: I want to talk to the Sheriff about something. I sat for 32 minutes and 15 seconds on the Adams Center Road for a train the other night. What is their limitation?

**Ken Fries**: Ten minutes. Do you want me to make you a special deputy and you can go up and arrest the engineer? And that has been the issue in the past, who do you cite?

**Paul Moss**: We can actually be made special deputies? Does it help with traffic tickets?

**Roy Buskirk**: I mean, here we are putting in the Maplecrest Extension into the Adams Center Road, which is supposed to develop that area, and here is a train which was sitting there when I pulled up. I was about the fifteenth one and I was able to use my time wisely by calling Paul and discussing some of the Council business. There were all kinds of cars turning around behind me, there were three semis in the line...

Paula Hughes: How long did you sit there, Councilman Buskirk?

Roy Buskirk: Thirty-two minutes and fifteen seconds.

**Ken Fries**: Ten minutes is the maximum and technically they need to clear the tracks or break the train, at that point. They have, in the past, been cited but the problem is trying to get anyone to pay the ticket and who do you write the ticket to. Believe me, people around New Haven have dealt with this for years and it is horribly frustrating. When we get a chance, we go and tell them to break the train and they usually move it.

Paul Moss: Okay, thank you.

**Patt Kite**: Is the inmate for trial, is he in your custody?

**Ken Fries**: He will be back this weekend.

**Paul Moss**: Moving right along, item two is the Surveyor.

**Roy Buskirk**: Also, on that, I don't know why they were split but items 28 through 34 are part of this item two.

Al Frisinger: Good morning, it is still morning, Al Frisinger, Allen County Surveyor. Before you, you have a request for additional funds for some capital equipment along with the items for transferring of some funds. This is to accomplish the purchase of some various items. I have included, in your packet, a listing of the things that we are looking to purchase. Along with those are various mobile positioning equipment, field equipment for replacement, a base station to be mounted on the roof of the City County Building that will give an accuracy level for not only my department but also for use by the Highway Department and the Board of Health. This will give an accuracy range of sub-centimeters without setting up an additional base station. I know that probably doesn't mean a lot to anybody here but

what it means to the community is the ability to, like crime scene investigation, when you see a survey piece of equipment set up at a wreck or whatever and they are taking shots, what this does is give them the ability look at tread marks, impact zones and those sorts of things. It interacts with several base stations that are already in place in Dekalb County, Whitley County and Wells County. We would be upgrading our equipment to interact with those base stations. Our equipment is about ten years old and as with all computer equipment, it has served its purpose well but it has gotten to the point of needing replacement. There is a replacement value along with a bid to trade in most of the equipment. That brings the price down a little bit. In addition to that, we are looking at a vehicle purchase. The vehicle that we use is a Suburban for our survey crew. It is a 1999 with 165,000 plus miles on it. It is at the point where we should look at upgrading to a newer vehicle. I have looked at doing the community the right thing by getting a Silverado. It is built here, in Allen County, and we would keep the money locally. Right now we have a bid package from the City of Fort Wayne which is the most accommodating. The State bid was not as good. It is my understanding that the City is revamping those and receiving new ones here shortly and they are going to be very aggressive bids. I feel real good about that piece of equipment. In addition to that, we are looking at some monitor upgrades in the office. Upgrades in the conference room in my office. We currently have a folding table and some chairs that I got from Planning when they put their new chairs in. To highlight what we do with that conference room might help. We have had Drainage Board in there and we have other meetings with staff and outside consultants and it is used very widely. I think it serves the County well to have that as a good meeting area to facilitate efficient and timely meetings.

Paul Moss: Councilman Buskirk, I assume you have had a conversation about this?

Roy Buskirk: A couple.

**Paul Moss**: What is your position?

**Roy Buskirk**: One thing I would like to point out is that Stellar bid for six of those

things.

**Al Frisinger**: That is the handheld GPS.

**Roy Buskirk**: He only needs four of them.

Al Frisinger: Right.

**Roy Buskirk**: He is working with the Planning Department because they need two of them. So the bid is to facilitate both the Planning Department and the Surveyor's Department. The Planning Department already has the funding for those two.

Al Frisinger: Yes.

**Roy Buskirk**: I think that is tremendous that you were able to work that out. Also, I saw the four which was higher per unit than what it was for six. It just shows why we need to use the Purchasing Department. Since Paula and Paul were both there when we were talking to the new Purchasing Agent, at the Personnel Committee meeting, it is over fifty percent of the purchases of this county do not go through the Purchasing Department.

Paula Hughes: I think the figure was closer to eighty percent.

Roy Buskirk: I think it was 86%.

**Paul Moss**: That is over fifty.

**Paula Hughes**: Councilman Buskirk, how long have you had copies of these bids? I have some lump sum numbers here, I have a single sheet of paper that says GPS...

**Roy Buskirk**: You should have a whole package.

Paula Hughes: No.

**Darren Vogt**: This morning.

**Roy Buskirk**: This is why, if you will bear with me a little bit more, I recommend that this all be tabled and that this be turned in to our Purchasing Department and see if there are other departments that are looking for handhelds or that we get specific numbers for the vehicle. Have you talked to the Purchasing Department about getting a GM vehicle because every time I see a gentleman from GM, he tells me to have the County come out and see him because he can do a better deal? I am sure the Commissioners have passed on that information. We need exact numbers. We can't have \$25,000 and not know what it is for.

**Al Frisinger**: I think I gave you exact numbers.

**Roy Buskirk**: No, you gave me a thing that was in the handout this morning, a City bid that you think that they are having redone.

**Darren Vogt**: Was that a motion?

Paula Hughes: Move to table.

Darren Vogt: Second.

**Paul Moss**: The only question that I have is will this be a take-home vehicle?

**Al Frisinger**: No, this is one that we carry the equipment in. At some level, it should be a take-home vehicle. We had an incident this last summer where we had it parked

in the lot that we always had it and someone took a crowbar and smashed in the back door trying to get to the equipment. Fortunately they didn't get it but we incurred somewhere between \$1,500 and \$2,000 damage.

**Darren Vogt**: Then does that make sense to buy a truck if you are trying to lock up equipment?

**Al Frisinger**: There is specific equipment placement type of apparatus that you put in the bed of the truck. It is an aluminum bed with a lockable surface. It keeps it out of sight and out of mind.

Darren Vogt: Okay.

**Paula Hughes**: I want to clarify my motion to table items two and twenty-eight through thirty-four.

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

**Roy Buskirk**: Before we go on to the next one, I know several other Council members have expressed their frustration of receiving exhibits and stuff this morning and haven't had an opportunity to review them. I would recommend, and this is not a motion just something for discussion, that unless we receive handout materials at least 48 hours prior to the meeting, that the item be removed from the agenda.

Paula Hughes: I echo that.

Maye Johnson: I would agree.

**Darren Vogt**: I would say not even that. If we have a deadline, what is it Becky?

**Lisa Blosser**: We try to give the book to you the Thursday before the Council meeting.

**Darren Vogt**: If you know you are coming to Council, you should know that you should have this stuff to us at the published deadline. That way we are not getting this stuff at the last minute.

**Paula Hughes**: I think there are going to be exceptions to that rule but I generally agree with that rule.

**Darren Vogt**: Additions, yes, but not all of the stuff.

**Paula Hughes**: I didn't realize it was in the middle of the packet. I didn't realize that we had the level of detail that we had.

**Lisa Blosser**: It was additional information and we just put it in there yesterday.

**Darren Vogt**: It was still additional that gave us information behind.

Tera Klutz: We agree.

**Roy Buskirk**: It was a little confusing that it was items 28 through 34 also. It is not just the Surveyor's Office, it is all offices that expect us to be prudent with the taxpayers' money and here we are having stuff thrown in front of us when we are expected to make a decision. A lot of times it brings up issues needing further review.

**Paul Moss**: So we are basically all in agreement that we are going to do a better job of adhering to the previously imposed deadlines and if it shows up late, we will table it. Thank you. Item three is the County Extension.

**Mike Talbott**: Mike Talbott, Purdue Extension Office. The sheet that I passed out is simply to supplement what I have already given you. What we are looking for approval to purchase from County General a folding machine. This price has been procured through the Purchasing Department. It would be to replace a folding machine that we have had for many years and has had an increased amount of activity in terms of servicing.

Paul Moss: Councilman Vogt?

**Darren Vogt**: What is this potentially for?

**Mike Talbott**: It is for the mailings that we do and we are talking about 8½ by 11 or 11 by 17. You gave me the approval last spring and we are running our newsletter on the 11 by 17 which the cost of that sheet of paper is less. This new machine has the capability of folding the 11 by 17 sheets.

**Darren Vogt**: Is it fair to say, you say that it has been breaking down but then you give us the sheet of paper with the breakdowns and there are no breakdowns for 2008. Is that accurate or not accurate? Then I look at the cost associated with it and there was \$100 one time and \$105 another time.

**Mike Talbott**: Actually, this customer service report was done for the May budget approval and there was one more service since then.

**Darren Vogt**: What did it go in for?

**Mike Talbott**: The belts and pulleys needed to be adjusted. We took it in to Office Concepts and it was about \$160 that we took out of our general budget.

**Patt Kite**: Mr. Talbott has there been any indication from the folks in services that they are not going to be able to find parts for it?

**Mike Talbott**: No, there has not been.

Roy Buskirk: The new one, is it from the same company?

**Mike Talbott**: I am not sure where the Purchasing Department has located this one.

Roy Buskirk: Do you know if there is any trade-in value on it?

Mike Talbott: I don't believe there is.

**Darren Vogt**: How are you folding the new mailings now?

**Mike Talbott**: They are being done primarily by hand because it won't do the 11 by 17.

**Darren Vogt:** How many mailings do you send out?

**Mike Talbott**: The 4H newsletter has around 800 and the Home Ec has around 700. The horticulture newsletter has around 500.

**Paul Moss**: Once again, another riveting conversation about folders and printers and all of that. Would anybody like to make a motion?

**Darren Vogt**: This was a request that was in the 2009 budget that we cut out specifically for him to come back here for capital items. If they are folding these things by hand, it is not very efficient. So I will move for approval.

Maye Johnson: Second.

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

**Mike Talbott**: I will offer that our machine is available for other departments to use.

**Tim Miller**: Good morning, Tim Miller, Circuit Court Administrator. Item four is a request that we put in our 2009 budget for a copy machine. We have had some problems with it over the last eight weeks and it is significant and an impairment to the one individual in that office. I contacted Councilman Vogt to see if there would be any problem doing it in the 2008 budget.

**Paula Hughes**: I have a question about this and I want to involve our Purchasing Director in the conversation. A year ago, I had a conversation with our Technology Department about whether or not the County could more efficiently use fax machines by having an internet based fax service for the County. I felt that the conversation got nowhere. Did that come up in Data Board?

**Tim Miller:** There has been a fax server discussion going on for some time. I think primarily because the change in vendor and the expense and everything else, it was on hold.

**Paula Hughes**: So it got pushed back with the switch of the IT vendor. I hate to see us buying more fax machines. These are significant expenditures when something like that would eliminate the need for them and it would save the County a lot of money. We could eliminate, I can't remember, the number of phone lines that are dedicated to fax lines.

**Darren Vogt**: That was the advantage of having someone like IKON come in and manage all of those types of services. They can handle web processes and how you do it and what equipment to use.

**Paula Hughes**: I would like to take this opportunity to resurrect the discussion. I would like to involve our Purchasing Department in it because people should be coming to you to ask about buying fax machines and I think that something of that efficiency should involve your department and the IT Department.

**Bill Greer**: I have been talking with a couple of different vendors just getting discussions on multipurpose machines and the addition of the fax-scan data board. In a lot of cases, that is all we need to do, is add a board to the existing printer that we have. The price is very comparable and I had a conversation with somebody yesterday about how much money we are spending for desktop printers when we could be using a central printer instead.

**Tim Miller:** This particular model would have the capability of being a printer, copier and fax, if necessary.

**Paula Hughes**: So it would work with a new system if we went to that.

Tim Miller: Right.

**Paul Moss**: Are there any other questions?

**Roy Buskirk**: I think that is something that any other machines that are being purchased should have the flexibility of being adapted.

**Bill Greer**: I have a list of the copiers that are network capable. If I remember, it is about half of them and all we would need to do is to upgrade and put the board in there. One of the concerns that IT had previously was that there was a way to get into the memory that is on the board. That is no longer possible because all we have to do is put a scrambler on there. That was another \$95 or something like that. Ed and I have talked about that and the issue of concern about getting into a copier because of the confidential information is no longer a concern. Some people were

concerned that if they sent it to a network printer, someone else will go there and get my confidential information. But the fact is, when we do it right, you have your own code and so when you send it to that printer, it doesn't print until you enter your code. It will then send you your document only. There is a lot of technology that we simply haven't used.

**Paula Hughes**: Thank you. I am happy to talk to somebody who knows more about the topic than I do.

**Darren Vogt**: Move for approval of item number four in the amount of \$5,500.

Roy Buskirk: Second.

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

**Tim Miller**: With the new IT processes that are going in place and the new vendor, we will be in a much better position to implement some of those things. Item five and six are Adult Probation User Fees that we are requesting to get us through the year for those two line items.

**Darren Vogt**: Can you give us a brief reason as to why you ran short on these?

**Tim Miller**: We have turned over four officers this year, between March and August, and so we extended some of our interns in addition the volume of the pre-sentencing investigations. We still have a couple of positions that are open. That is where the Extra Deputy Hire is coming from.

**Darren Vogt**: Should it be a transfer then from the other line items.

**Tim Miller**: No, unfortunately when those people leave the employment of the County, those benefits get paid out of those line items.

Darren Vogt: Okay.

**Roy Buskirk**: Unemployment?

**Tim Miller**: Vacation time, personal time and sick time. That is not from a separate bucket, it comes out of their line item.

**Roy Buskirk**: Exactly but is that equal to what they were receiving?

**Tim Miller**: Not necessarily equal to but we have to replace those positions with new probation officers.

**Roy Buskirk**: Oh, replaced. I thought you said they were still vacant.

**Tim Miller**: There are a couple that we are in the process of filling.

Paul Moss: Are there any additional questions regarding items five and six?

**Darren Vogt**: Move for approval of items five and six in the amount of \$39,348.

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 5-1(Buskirk)-0 (Miller absent).

**Roy Buskirk**: The reason is, Tim, is that there has to be some funds in those accounts that can be transferred.

Paul Moss: Okay, item seven.

**Darren Vogt**: I'll take this one. If you read through this one, they received more CASA money and they are going to buy an additional computer in the amount of \$986. I didn't think it was worth him sitting here for two hours and forty-five minutes to get to this. We have kind of talked about consent agenda and we still haven't gotten there yet. If anyone has any questions on this, I would be happy to try to answer them.

**Paula Hughes**: Move for approval of item seven for \$986.

Patt Kite: Second.

Paul Moss: We have a motion and a second. All in favor please signify by saying aye. All opposed same sign. The motion carries 6-0 (Miller absent). Items eight through fourteen, Mindy Waldron can't be here and she asked me to carry the water. I will try to carry it the best I can given that I left my cheat sheet out in the car. I believe that you have all seen the explanation. I am perfectly comfortable with each of these items. If you have specific questions, I will do my best to try to answer them.

**Darren Vogt**: I had an additional conversation with her as well and I move for approval of items eight through fourteen.

Roy Buskirk: Second.

Paul Moss: We have a motion and a second. All in favor please signify by saying aye. All opposed same sign. The motion carries 6-0 (Miller absent). Thank you. Appropriation in Youth Services Per Diem Fund.

**Darren Vogt**: That is Mr. Dunn and I did not ask him to come and sit before us especially since he is out on Lima Road. The situation is that they have more kids

and food costs have continued to go up and they pay for that out of their Youth Services Per Diem Fund 737. He is requesting to keep that line item flush until the end of the year and needs about \$17,000.

Roy Buskirk: And there is adequate balance in that, right?

**Darren Vogt**: Yes. I will move for approval of item fifteen in the amount of \$17,000.

Roy Buskirk: Second.

Paul Moss: We have a motion and a second. All in favor please signify by saying aye. All opposed same sign. The motion carries 6-0 (Miller absent). Appropriate in Local Road and Street. I believe Mr. Hartman is here and we are going to deal with items sixteen through twenty-seven.

Bill Hartman: Good morning, Bill Hartman, Allen County Highway Department.

**Martha Starnes**: Martha Starnes.

**Bill Hartman**: We have had to do some additional roads this year. Branstrator Road had to be replaned. Ernst Road between Aboite Center and Homestead, we had to re-chip and seal. We hadn't counted on those this year. The stone is maintenance stone that gets us through the fall and winter and this year there are 200 miles of gravel road that we still maintain. Some of these roads deteriorated and we didn't expect that. We have depleted the funds in this line item and this is the figure that my maintenance manager told me that we would need to acquire about thirteen tons of stone.

**Darren Vogt**: Let me ask one quick question before you go off of that. Are the gravel roads maintained every year?

**Bill Hartman**: This year was particularly bad because when it gets dry and you don't have moisture on the road, they get wash boarded and there is almost no way to get that out of there. That was a chronic problem on a lot of our gravel roads.

**Darren Vogt**: If you could make sure, we had a constituent call and was concerned about Puff Road. Do you know if that is on the list or has anyone called about this? I drove the road because it is in my district and it is passable but it has gotten wash boarded.

**Bill Hartman**: Yes, we have addressed it and we have worked with those folks. They have collected about 90% of the money to stabilize that road and eliminate the dust on the road.

Darren Vogt: Okay, great.

**Paula Hughes**: I have a question about the budget encumbrances. I am looking at the financial report for Local Road and Street and the annual LRS distributions expected for 2008 were just over \$1.8 million. There was \$1.769 million in encumbrances. Where are you at in terms of burning through those encumbrances? Are you expecting to see a volume of encumbrances from 2008 into 2009? Do you have any idea where the cash sits for that? It appears that there is a pretty high cash balance there.

**Martha Starnes**: What carries over are the projects that are ongoing. LR&S is used mainly for engineering. Those projects go on for quite a long time.

Paula Hughes: Okay.

**Bill Hartman**: The average length of time for a federal aid project is seven or eight years and a local project can go four to five. When we get the money appropriated into a project, it will carry over several times.

**Paula Hughes**: So you expect that you will typically have one year in arrears encumbered?

Bill Hartman: Yes.

**Darren Vogt**: Have we gone to where we are breaking it out by road?

**Martha Starnes**: The larger projects are.

**Darren Vogt**: We may need to do that from an encumbrance standpoint. That may help us understand what that money is rolling over.

Paula Hughes: Right now it is just big dollar figures.

**Bill Hartman**: If we have the contract for engineering and right-of-way and we have to back up that contract.

**Roy Buskirk**: Sometimes it is the same money.

**Bill Hartman**: It absolutely is.

**Roy Buskirk**: You are getting reimbursement for engineering and it has to be appropriated every time. Do you have the Purchasing Department, as far as the bids on this material?

**Bill Hartman**: Yes, we have them do the bids.

**Roy Buskirk**: Through the Purchasing Department?

**Bill Hartman**: Oh yes. It is a book about this thick and we have the load and pick up prices from all of the local pits. Then we have delivery prices to each township and all of the suppliers. All of the suppliers can bid to all of those locations.

**Paul Moss**: Any additional questions or comments on items sixteen and seventeen?

**Roy Buskirk**: Move for approval of items sixteen and seventeen.

**Darren Vogt**: Second.

Paul Moss: We have a motion and a second. All in favor please signify by saying aye. All opposed same sign. The motion carries 6-0 (Miller absent). Eighteen and nineteen is Aboite Center Road and Structure Repair.

**Bill Hartman**: We have one parcel of right-of-way that is in condemnation right now. The rest of those have been acquired. In the next sixty to ninety days, there will be a bid date for this project. The cost is estimated right now at \$7 million and we need \$1.4 million for our 20%. We have \$200,000 already in the line item and as we have gone through this project, we have been reimbursed nearly \$1.5 million. The \$1.5 million represents the 80% reimbursement. We have \$300,000 of Allen County's money invested in this project and the rest has been federal money. The \$1.5 million has gone into our funds and so we are here to re-appropriate that to go into construction.

**Roy Buskirk**: I am not sure I understood that figure of what you have that the County has invested in it.

**Bill Hartman**: In the engineering and right-of-way, we were approved for federal funds to pay for the engineering and right-of-way but it is reimbursement. We pay up front and that was approximately \$1.8 million. We are reimbursed approximately \$1.5 million and so we are here to essentially re-appropriate that for construction.

**Roy Buskirk**: So we are being reimbursed 100%?

**Bill Hartman**: We will actually have about \$300,000 of our money in this \$7 million project.

**Paula Hughes**: And this is all flowing through CUM CAP?

**Bill Hartman**: Yes, this is coming from CUM CAP. Because of the situation with Aboite Center, it has already been annexed, we had started the design of this in 2002. As I said before, it takes six to eight years for a large project to go through its course. We want to appropriate out of CUM CAP since that is money that is accumulated county-wide. We don't want to put CEDIT money into this project because that is specific to maintaining.

**Paula Hughes**: I have another question. I am a little concerned that this request of \$1,642,450 is exactly the amount that is left for appropriation in CUM CAP. This will empty the CUM CAP account.

**Bill Hartman**: For this year, yes.

**Paula Hughes**: Last year, there was \$2 million left for encumbrances. I know there are several projects, and I am not speaking specifically for Highway, but is this the only CUM CAP fund?

**Lisa Blosser**: This is the only one.

**Jackie Scheuman**: When they spend this \$1.6 million, they will get reimbursed.

**Paula Hughes**: I thought this was a reimbursement for money that they had already spent.

**Jackie Scheuman**: Right but they will be reimbursed 80% for construction.

**Bill Hartman**: No, no, no, this money is the 20% match for construction. This money will be spent and not come back.

**Roy Buskirk**: So it is more than \$300,000.

**Bill Hartman**: But we have been reimbursed \$1.5 million over the past six years.

**Roy Buskirk**: But what I thought I heard earlier was that our total cost was going to be \$300,000.

**Bill Hartman**: Right because we are re-appropriating money that's come back to us already. We have spent \$1.8 million in engineering and right-of-way and we have been reimbursed \$1.5 million. Right now we are asking for \$1.2 million towards our match to the State for our 20% of the \$7 million. When you add and subtract all of this we really only have \$300,000 of Allen County money in this.

**Roy Buskirk**: Plus \$1.2 million. So, we have \$1.5 million in the project.

**Paula Hughes**: The \$1.6 that they are requesting, part of it is the \$1.5 million that you received in reimbursement.

**Roy Buskirk**: But you send that money down there and then they send it back.

**Bill Hartman**: Then the project is bid and we send them our match and then they pay the contractor out of that money.

**Roy Buskirk**: No, no, no. Let's go back to when the engineering started and you sent down...

**Bill Hartman**: When we start the engineering, we make a contract with a design engineer. They bill us. Say they bill us \$200,000. We send in a reimbursement to the federal government, through the State, and they pay us \$1,800 back. That goes into County funds and builds up and then at the end of the project, we come back and reappropriate what we have been reimbursed for the 20% match. Once we send that money back to the State.

**Roy Buskirk**: So the total cost, if I remember the figures that you gave me for Aboite Center Road, by the County is going to be \$1.5 million. There is \$300,000 that was spent on engineering...

**Bill Hartman**: We spent \$1.8 million on engineering.

Roy Buskirk: But we got money back.

**Bill Hartman**: We got \$1.5 million back.

**Roy Buskirk**: So we had an expenditure of \$300,000.

Paula Hughes: A net expenditure of \$300,000.

**Roy Buskirk**: Then we have to send down, for construction purposes, how much has the construction cost us?

Bill Hartman: \$7 million.

Roy Buskirk: No, no, us.

**Bill Hartman**: It would be 20% of \$7 million which is \$1.4 million.

**Roy Buskirk**: Add that to the \$300,000 and we have \$1.7 million and that is what the road is costing us. Not \$300,000. We have engineering cost and we have construction cost.

**Bill Hartman**: But we are reimbursed \$1.5 for that.

**Roy Buskirk**: I am not using the total number of the engineering cost but only the portion that we did not get reimbursed for.

Bill Hartman: Right, \$300,000.

**Roy Buskirk**: It is complicated and that is the reason that it gets difficult for us because we pay out a large sum and we get reimbursed 80% and then we have to

turn around and have to appropriate that money again for the construction phase. What we are spending out of CUM CAP, we will not be reimbursed for.

Bill Hartman: No sir. We have been reimbursed.

**Paula Hughes**: We have gotten what we will get back.

**Darren Vogt**: To Councilwoman Hughes' concern, is anybody else concerned that the exact dollar amount matches and we are wiping out CUM CAP?

**Roy Buskirk**: I think what they did was put the amount that they had left into structural repair so it would equal out. If there would have been more in there, they would have asked for more. It states that in typical years, in the past, it has run higher.

**Darren Vogt**: Once it is appropriated, it is appropriated and we can't do anything with it.

Paula Hughes: Yes.

**Darren Vogt**: What happens if you don't get the \$1.2 million?

**Bill Hartman**: We have to find it somewhere because we committed to the State to do this project. When we accept their money for engineering and right-of-way, we would have to reimburse them for what they spent into the project, at this point. We have gone through the process and have the federal money lined up for this project.

**Darren Vogt**: This goes back to the original point about putting things in line items. Was it always the intention of the Commissioners or your office, to pay for Aboite Center out of CUM CAP?

**Bill Hartman**: Not necessarily always, no. It was wherever funds might be available. This is where I was instructed to make the request.

**Roy Buskirk**: One of the reasons why CUM CAP, as he mentioned earlier, is that CUM CAP is a fund that is collected county-wide.

**Darren Vogt**: I clearly understand that.

**Paula Hughes**: But it also has much greater flexibility in its uses.

**Darren Vogt**: Correct and it also illustrates the point that we need to be forward thinking the road projects.

**Roy Buskirk**: This is one that I mentioned and we have all mentioned, in the past, that there has to be an interlocal agreement with the City on any potential roads. If it

is not annexed, they don't pay but if it is annexed, they help us because at the time that the money switches from the County to the City, what expenditures are left, they should pick them up.

**Bill Hartman**: Right now, the Commissioners are trying to negotiate with the City for an overall universal agreement that whatever project that they annex within a certain timeframe, we will be reimbursed.

**Darren Vogt**: Talk to me about the structure repairs that you plan on the \$442,450. What is the intent of that?

**Bill Hartman**: When we went through the budget meetings, we had a list of the different repairs of our bridge inventory from 2006 and this will help us work with that program. Generally we spend about half a million dollars each year just for a few bridge repairs.

Paula Hughes: Are any of those bridges within incorporated areas?

**Bill Hartman**: They were before but it depends on the outcome January 1<sup>st</sup>, which still seems to be somewhat indefinite.

**Paula Hughes**: I am looking at the Commissioners' agenda for tomorrow and there is consideration of an interlocal agreement with the City of Fort Wayne for the Spring Street Bridge over the Norfolk Southern Railroad and it seems to be going contradictory to the direction that the County has been going.

**Bill Hartman**: That particular bridge, the interlocal is for the City's portion to improve the intersection of Leesburg Road and Spring Street. The City was able to get additional money, because of the expansion of the University of Saint Francis, to improve that intersection. If you piggyback that on to the bridge project, that agreement says that the City will pay a portion of all of the matching for engineering, right-of-way and design for that portion of the project.

**Paula Hughes**: So they can find money to add sidewalks to bridges but not to pay for bridges. I am being a little facetious, I apologize.

**Roy Buskirk**: The thing that it still comes right down to is that they are not participating on any of the cost of the bridge. The County is still getting stuck with it.

**Bill Hartman**: We are proceeding with a project that we started six or eight years ago.

**Roy Buskirk**: We constantly keep doing this.

Bill Hartman: Between that and Aboite Center Road, that is the end of the trail.

Paula Hughes: Is it?

**Bill Hartman**: The State Street Bridge but Nelson can answer that.

**Nelson Peters**: Let me give you an update on where we are on a couple of things. Councilman Buskirk talked about agreements with the City and the response was that we are negotiating with the City right now. That will be an overall agreement for anything that is in a close-to-being annexed area. We have lost about \$17 million over the last ten or fifteen years, on projects that have been annexed just as soon as they have been completed. We have made it known to the City that we are not going to do that anymore. I was promised, initially, a response from the City by September 17<sup>th</sup> and, as you can see, we are well past that date. I spoke with the Mayor yesterday regarding that agreement. He made some valid points and promised a response by this time next week and I said that all we want to do is collect back from these projects the taxes that we had invested before you annexed them. Part of the point that the City has made is that they have extended the infrastructure to some of these projects that have enhanced the assessed valuation to begin with. There should be some value to that. Our response was that I heard what they were saying but come up with a number and let's see what it is that they are talking about on a formula basis. The Spring Street Bridge is indeed on the agenda for Friday. I don't know that it won't get deferred again like it did last week, until we can get some more answers from the City. Whether or not it is at the end of the loop or whether or not it will get completed, I don't know. I am as interested in getting answers from the City and getting some compensation for the expenditures that we are making up front, as all of you are.

**Roy Buskirk**: The one item that you mentioned about the City extending the utilities to enhance the assessed valuation, I would want to be sure and check that it wasn't the private developer that extended it.

**Nelson Peters**: I agree. All I said was that it was an interesting argument that they posed. If you look at Stratford Forest and some of the stuff that aligns Bass Road, I am not sure that it...

**Roy Buskirk**: I know that out on Bass Road, some of the developers extended the sewer and water lines out there.

Nelson Peters: I am not surprised.

**Darren Vogt**: That is typically the case.

Roy Buskirk: Yes.

**Nelson Peters**: It is an argument that has been made and so we suggested that they come up with a number and we have been promised that number by this time next week.

**Roy Buskirk**: What I have always said is that when the funding source goes from the County to the City, that it when it needs to be picked up. That is usually even a year after the annexation takes place. I am talking about the revenue stream from mainly from the gasoline state tax.

Nelson Peters: Right.

**Roy Buskirk**: When that funding stream switches from the County to the City, I think the City should pick up the cost, at that point.

**Nelson Peters**: Our concern is getting reimbursed for the money that we have into it. If you are purchasing right-of-way, if you are doing engineering or if you are doing construction, we want that money back. As an example, if Bass Road is completed, for sake of argument by 2012 or 2013 and that is probably too aggressive, what we have said to the City is that if we are receiving tax revenues out of a projected area of about \$950,000 a year and it is a three-year project, then they don't get to annex it for three years until we have recouped all of our money. We are trying to develop a formula that says if you go a year without annexing it, you owe us 67% of the cost. If you go two years, you owe us 33% of the cost and if you can make it three years, then you get it for free. By that time, we will have recouped all of our costs. Irrespective of gas tax and when it may come off, all we are interested in is getting our dollars back from tax revenues that we have up fronted for that particular project.

**Darren Vogt**: I agree that makes sense.

**Paul Moss**: Okay, we have beaten this pretty hard.

**Darren Vogt:** Commissioner, since you are up here, let me ask you this. Are you concerned that we would be depleting CUM CAP all the way?

Nelson Peters: No.

**Paula Hughes**: There are still funds, in the encumbered funds, to account for other projects that the Commissioners have committed to?

**Nelson Peters**: We have budgeted, as you have recently seen, CUM CAP funds for 2009. That, with some of the CEDIT funds and some of the other revenues that we have, we believe it will get us to what we presented to you as a reasonable picture for 2009. Does it get everything done that we want to get done? Not even close.

**Paul Moss**: Is there a desire to offer a motion on this?

**Paula Hughes**: Move for approval of item eighteen for \$1.2 million for the Aboite Center Road project.

Darren Vogt: Second.

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

**Roy Buskirk**: What about item nineteen?

**Paula Hughes**: Are you making a motion?

**Roy Buskirk**: No, what is going to happen to it?

**Darren Vogt**: I think we move on to items twenty and twenty-one.

**Roy Buskirk**: What do we want the Highway Department to come back with? There is going to have to be something done with maintaining those bridges.

**Darren Vogt**: I would assume that they put something in their budget to maintain the bridges for 2008 in 2009.

**Bill Hartman**: There was \$100,000 made available to us for 2008. When we still had Cum Bridge, that was \$750,000 that was used for bridge repair and maintenance, and it was dropped down to half a million dollars in subsequent years. We were hoping to supplement the \$100,000. We work with the Commissioners and they offered this money. They suggested that we come to you to get this appropriated.

**Darren Vogt**: Are you aware that in the General Fund we have set aside \$3 million for bridge repair?

**Bill Hartman**: I thought that money was for bridge reconstruction and leftover bridges on the bond.

Darren Vogt: It is bridge repair.

**Paula Hughes**: From Council's perspective, it was dedicated to bridges in the unincorporated areas of Allen County. We were told that \$3 million was the approximate expense needed to address that.

**Roy Buskirk**: The other thing is that what we spent last year or the history of what we have been spending on repairs would be considerably less because of the number of bridges that are being turned over to the different government agencies throughout the County. I would suggest that you come back after the first of the year and have a list of the number of repairs and cost involved for bridges in the unincorporated area.

Bill Hartman: Okay.

**Paul Moss**: Okay, we will now move to items twenty and twenty-one.

**Paula Hughes**: I will express the same concern I had with CUM CAP. The \$1.3 million request is remarkably close to the \$1.39 million.

**Bill Hartman**: Again, that was my direction from the Commissioners Office.

Paul Moss: Comments?

**Roy Buskirk**: The Woodburn/Webster Intersection, I have seen your explanation and I know there is an agreement with the State for the County taking over Old 24. Because of some additional improvements that have to be made to the county roads but I forget, what was that number?

Bill Hartman: It is \$4.8 million. That is what we have in our agreement with INDOT. With that money, we have to rehabilitate the surface of Old 24 when they turn it over to us. We also have to rehabilitate one bridge. We have tried to apply for federal funds on this Woodburn/Webster Intersection and we were turned down. We intend to try to approach INDOT again but in the meantime, this is a very dangerous right angle turn by Midwest Tile. This will be one of the interchange access points from Old 24 and the bridge for one of the Maumee crossings. We have studied to reconstruct this intersection and came up with about a \$3 million price tag. The \$800,000 is for engineering and right-of-way and to start the design in hopes of getting federal funding for the construction. It will take a year and a half to two years to get the design done and three or four years for Fort to Port plan to reconstruct it. We need to proceed with this.

**Roy Buskirk**: So you are laying out \$800,000 for engineering and you don't know where the \$3 million is going to come from for construction?

Bill Hartman: Not yet. Not absolutely for sure.

**Roy Buskirk**: You don't know if we are going to get any State or federal funding.

**Bill Hartman**: Not right now.

**Paula Hughes**: Isn't it a little big of a slippery slope for us to commit, if I understand the structure that you presented for Aboite Center Road, if the State of the feds partner with us for the engineering, then we are obligated to complete the project?

**Bill Hartman**: This engineering will be on our dime and we are going to proceed and build this intersection and I truly believe we will find the money one way or the other. If we have to go back and take Old 24 and chip and seal it rather than resurface it and take the money to build the intersection, we may have to do that. I am still trying to get federal money for this but we can possibly do it within the relinquishment. Old 24 will have considerably less traffic on it and it won't need near the maintenance that it did. We will get the \$4.8 million and about \$6,000 a mile for the eleven miles, from MVH and LR&S. Right now, if I have to resurface the whole

stretch, it would be \$1.6 million but if I chip and seal it, the cost is \$200,000. There is \$1.4 million, if I choose that option. This intersection is already dangerous without near the traffic. There is a guardrail that gets hit about twice a year and trucks can barely make the right angle turn now. It will be one of the two interchange access points.

**Paula Hughes**: I know that there are plans that Planning Commission has approved, for a rezoning of this area to allow for industrial building. Do you recall that Councilman Moss? I know that it came in front of the Redevelopment Commission, earlier this week, to be considered for a TIF area. Potentially, the TIF funds could be used to fund the road improvements. Was that the thought?

**Bill Hartman**: I appreciate that. We are looking wherever. The 24 project is underway and we need to address this intersection.

**Darren Vogt**: One question that I have is how is the cost determined in this consultant's study? Those are the kinds of things I would like to see. It gives us a little bit more. I would like to talk about Diebold Road. I am not sure what the annexation situation is out there but is there any chance that they are going to annex Diebold Road and that area?

Bill Hartman: I do not know.

**Darren Vogt**: It is important to note that it is a very dangerous road. It is in my district and we have Parkview doing a whole lot of building and construction out there. That road is very narrow. What is the intent to do out there?

**Paula Hughes**: Is this north or south of Dupont Road.

**Darren Vogt**: I am assuming that it is north of Dupont.

Bill Hartman: Yes, it is north of Dupont. It is from Dupont to Union Chapel.

**Darren Vogt**: There are going to be hill cuts.

**Bill Hartman**: Yes, right now we are in the middle of an engineering study for that. I don't have all of the information. Part of the engineering study is also that INDOT will also be improving the bridge over I69. When I met with one of their officials, I implored him to look at three-laning that bridge for the future traffic in that area. He told me that we had to present him with a study to show that and so we are in the process of developing that study. There are some sidewalk and trail issues also by Parkview and some pathways on Union Chapel Road too. We are going to incorporate all of those into the study. There is a lot more traffic because of development on Union Chapel Road and people are using Diebold more because of congestion on Tonkel Road and getting access to I69 quicker.

**Paul Moss**: When Roy and I were in your office a while back, I thought the number was higher than \$500,000. Was it like \$1.3 million?

Bill Hartman: That was for engineering.

**Paul Moss**: What is the total cost of the project?

**Bill Hartman**: I don't know what the total cost is going to be.

**Paul Moss**: As I brought up at that meeting, my recollection may be bad and I am going to ask Kim Bowman to go back and look at the actual record of the Plan Commission, I seem to recall asking specifically about whose dime is it for Diebold Road. You can talk about the residential and all of this other stuff but we are going to have a project out there that is almost the size of General Motors. I think anybody subjective would agree that we are going to be creating a need for improvements on that road. So my question, at the Planning Commission, was who is going to be paying for that? I am pretty confident that the response was the developer, meaning Parkview. Keep in mind that this is an entity that does not provide any support to our roads via property taxes. My point remains that I was under the impression that they were going to pay for those improvements to that road. I am going to have trouble supporting this until I at least have this cleared up.

**Bill Hartman**: I can check this with Mike Eckert in our office. He works with Kim Bowman on the development. His recommendation was that we needed to proceed.

**Paul Moss**: I understand his recommendation but what was his recollection of that?

**Bill Hartman**: His recollection was that the improvements that have already been made from their entrance were what was discussed at the time. They resurfaced that area from their entrance down to Dupont. Generally we partner with developers on those kinds of things. We take care of the two-lane mainline and all they pay for are the additional lanes. You and I and Kim and Mike should sit down and discuss all fo that.

**Paul Moss**: It is just a matter of what the record says. They keep pretty good records.

**Roy Buskirk**: So Parkview has made the improvements?

**Bill Hartman**: Just from their entrance south.

**Roy Buskirk**: So it isn't all the way to Dupont.

**Bill Hartman**: Yes, it is all the way to Dupont. This would be up to Union Chapel and be about three-quarters of a mile.

**Paul Moss**: So it is the northern section.

**Bill Hartman**: Yes, it is the northern section.

**Paul Moss**: Council, is there any desire to move this forward one way or the other?

**Patt Kite**: I will make a motion to approve item twenty-one in the amount of \$500,000 for the Diebold Road improvement.

Darren Vogt: Second.

Paul Moss: We have a motion and a second. All in favor please signify by saying aye. All opposed same sign. The motion carries 6-0 (Miller absent). Did we go out of order? Did we do item twenty?

Paula Hughes: No.

**Roy Buskirk**: I guess it is the same as nineteen.

**Paul Moss**: Okay, moving right along, we have transfers in Highway. These are items twenty-two to twenty-seven.

Paula Hughes: Move for approval of items twenty-two through twenty-seven.

Roy Buskirk: Second.

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

**Bill Hartman**: Item twenty, we did not vote on?

Paula Hughes: Nope.

Darren Vogt: Correct.

**Paul Moss**: Is the Surveyor back?

**Paula Hughes**: We already covered these. They were tabled.

**Paul Moss**: Okay, we are on to salary ordinances now. Roy, would it be helpful to do the Personnel Committee update now?

**Paula Hughes**: They were both approved in Personnel and that is pertinent. These both went through Personnel, earlier this week, and were approved.

**Paul Moss:** That was my point.

**Roy Buskirk**: The two that are listed here for salary ordinances were both presented to Personnel on Tuesday and were passed out of Personnel to the Council to get their review and opinion on them. There might have been a little hesitancy because of the classifications that they were put in. We should go ahead and have Homeland Security present what they have.

Bernie Beier: Bernie Beier, Director of Fort Wayne-Allen County Homeland Security. What I have asked for is to reclassify the Data Entry Clerk to Homeland Security Planner. That position identifies what the true job really is. In writing plans and coordinating the planning effort, which has become the focus of our office and most Homeland Security offices. We get a lot of documents and guidance from the federal government and from the State. I brought some reading material for today while I waited and it is on the newest guidance on how we plan and coordinate the planning effort to make sure the plans are consistent with the State's direction and the federal direction. The point is that the planning effort has become her main task in the office now as opposed to data entry, answering phones and typing correspondence. We don't have fax machines anymore, we have IP based phone systems and computers and we all do our own administrative work within our office. That need is a lesser need than planning. It is easier to assume the administrative roles between the three of us in the office than it is to assume additional planning roles.

**Darren Vogt**: Where is the funding coming from for this?

**Bernie Beier**: What we do is what you do and that is continue to appropriate the salary line for the Emergency Management Director on the County side. As long as we have the successful City-County partnership, we don't need that because my salary is paid 100% by the City, up front. The State reimburses 50% of our salaries, a year in arrears. There is no additional cost or additional appropriations needed for this. What I would simply do is take the surplus from the Director's salary line, which is already appropriated, and shift it to this position. As long as we have the City-County office, that still will turn about \$15,000 back in to the County General Fund. We appropriate that in case we don't get the annual reimbursement from the State or the City-County partnership falls apart.

**Darren Vogt**: Wouldn't it be less, though, that would come back to the County if you are appropriating more in the salary line?

Bernie Beier: Yes.

**Darren Vogt**: So there is a cost.

**Bernie Beier**: Yes, there is a cost but not an additional appropriation.

**Paul Moss**: I thought that you had said, in the Personnel Committee, that you did want it appropriated from the General Fund or was I confused?

**Bernie Beier**: It is already appropriated in the salary line.

**Paula Hughes**: He can transfer within the 100 series.

**Roy Buskirk**: There were a couple of numbers that you mentioned, that I don't recollect from the Personnel Committee. On your salary, 50% is paid by a State grant or a State and federal grant and the remaining 50%, half is paid by the City and half is paid by the County?

Bernie Beier: Correct.

**Roy Buskirk**: So it is a quarter, quarter?

Bernie Beier: Yes.

**Roy Buskirk**: Then the other staff in your department is paid half by the grant and half by the County.

**Bernie Beier**: Correct. Those are the original County employees that the County employs.

**Roy Buskirk**: And now, because of the combined units, the City picked up a fourth of your wages. The County still pays all of the rest that is not reimbursed by the grant.

**Bernie Beier**: I guess it is a matter of perspective. What the County saves is the entire Director's salary. It is 75%...

**Roy Buskirk**: Let's not discuss that because it is funny figures coming in. You said that you didn't know for sure if that grant was going to continue on in 2009 or not.

**Bernie Beier**: For all of the personnel, correct.

**Roy Buskirk**: So then it would be our cost. The other part of the equation of this is that the City is providing your office space?

Bernie Beier: Correct.

**Roy Buskirk**: And your equipment?

Bernie Beier: Correct.

**Roy Buskirk**: And your utilities because you are out at the, what do they call that?

**Bernie Beier**: Public Safety Academy.

**Roy Buskirk**: I just want the other Council members to know how your combined City and County department is being funded equally.

**Bernie Beier**: Commissioner Brown asked that in an Emergency Management Advisory Council and when we run all of it together, we found out that the City is actually paying a little bit more. The County is getting a good deal out of this particular combination.

Paula Hughes: Glad to hear it.

**Darren Vogt**: How is the funding working out with the City and the County right now?

Bernie Beier: Funding for?

**Tera Klutz**: I think what Darren is trying to say is if the relationship continues with the City of Fort Wayne and you alluded to making this work. How is that relationship going?

Bernie Beier: I am a little biased here but I think it is a great relationship. I think it demonstrates a success story of how a small office of three has the leverage of a combined commitment to make this work. It generates great interest at the State level, in the Governor's office and State Senators. They see it as a success and it is something that they wish to invest in. Senator Tom Wyss has three very senior folks from the Federal Department of Homeland Security coming in the week after next to see what it is that we are doing together to see if it is a model of something that they want to invest in, from an operational standpoint to do federal operations from a building in this area of northeast Indiana. It has become a moderate success to be replicated in other places. It has generated interest and I honestly believe it is generating additional grant dollars and additional opportunities because it is something that is working well and people are willing to invest in it.

**Roy Buskirk**: Do you know that if this grant disappears, the County picks up the entire wages?

**Bernie Beier**: That is the old way of looking at it and that is the old way of doing business when it was a County office. It is not a County office anymore, it is combined. I can't speak on behalf of the administration but I would expect, since it is a joint venture that any obstacle that would challenge that in the future, the joint bodies would develop an equitable solution and recommend a course of action that best serves the community, whatever that may be.

**Paul Moss:** Councilwoman Hughes?

**Paula Hughes**: I wanted to voice that I think this is a good move for Homeland Security. My concerns were both the continuation of the grant funding and also the

fact that they are converting an administrative position to more of a senior level position. Mr. Beier referred, in the Personnel Committee meeting, that they may need some administrative support again in a couple of years. I want to make very clear, as I did in that meeting, that my support of this reclassification indicates, in no way indicates a support for adding staff in down the road. I wanted Council to be aware of that. We had some conversation about that I was concerned that the position was going from an OSS3 to PAT4. He explained that the person that is in the position has been in the process of pursuing a graduate degree in Homeland Security and he felt that he was fortunate to get someone of those qualifications to take what is basically a supportive position. It eased my concerns about making the big jump in the position.

Paul Moss: Councilman Vogt?

**Darren Vogt**: Move for consideration of a salary ordinance reclassifying a position within the budget of Homeland Security 100-4801-429, Planning Coordinator, OSS3 to PAT4 for the amount of \$40.000.

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 6-0 (Miller absent).

Roy Buskirk: Did we mess up on any of the Highway numbers?

**Lisa Blosser**: We had the wrong fund number on the salary ordinance for the two deputy positions, in the Sheriff's Department, that were approved last month. We had used the wrong fund number and we just need to make a correction for that.

**Darren Vogt**: We just need to make a motion on that?

Lisa Blosser: Yes, please.

**Darren Vogt**: Move for approval of the consideration of a salary ordinance amending the pay of employees within the budget of the Allen County Sheriff's Department 206-0501-421, Deputy SHR-2-1 and SHR-2-2, \$41,694 retroactive to September 13, 2008.

**Paul Moss:** Is there a second?

Paula Hughes: Second.

Paul Moss: We have a motion and a second. All in favor please signify by saying aye. All opposed same sign. The motion carries 6-0 (Miller absent). ACJC, how are you doing?

**Joe Brita**: I am Joe Brita of the Allen County Juvenile Center and this is Chandra Reichert, the Finance Administrator. We are here to request a salary ordinance for reclassification from Lab Technician to Shift Leader.

**Chandra Reichert**: The position of Lab Technician has supervisory duties on the third shift. Up until we were able to reclassify some of the Shift Leaders, they were paid the same salary until this past year. We are basically requesting that the name be changed from Lab Technician to Shift Leader to get more in line with the other Shift Leaders that we have.

Paul Moss: Councilman Buskirk?

**Roy Buskirk**: Correct me if I am wrong here but the first and second shift supervisors were being paid as this Lab Tech because of the number of years and everything. He was at a different step level than what the first and second Shift Leaders. With the reclassification of the Shift Leaders, first and second shift personnel were receiving more money than what the Lab Tech was even though he or she was doing more. There was an injustice or a wrong and you are trying to correct the wrong. Joe assured us that he would have funds in his budget to pay this. He feels very obligated to this employee and wants it retroactive to the first of the year.

**Chandra Reichert**: We will take care of it in the 2008 budget as well as the 2009 budget.

Roy Buskirk: That is music to my ears.

**Darren Vogt**: Move for approval of consideration of a salary ordinance reclassifying a position within the budget of the Allen County Juvenile Center 100-5501-421, Shift Leader, POLE3/5 to POLE 4/5 in the amount of \$45,080 retroactive to December 8, 2007.

Paula Hughes: Second.

Paul Moss: We have a motion and a second. All in favor please signify by saying aye. All opposed same sign. The motion carries 6-0 (Miller absent). Thank you. We also have the Purchasing Department, which is not on the agenda.

**Lisa Blosser**: There is an addendum.

**Paul Moss**: That is correct. It is for another reclassification.

**Nelson Peters**: Good morning, Nelson Peters, Allen County Commissioner.

**Bill Greer**: Bill Greer, County Purchasing Director. I am here to request that the Purchasing Assistant position be reclassified as a Buyer position. Shortly after I arrived here, I was asked to come up with a strategic plan for the Purchasing

Department and to look at best practices that we could get in place. I started to develop that plan by writing a vision and mission statement for the department and looking at where we wanted to be in five years. You will see those mission statements and goals on our website. In order to make the strategic plan work, what you need to do is to begin to use E-procurement technology. That is going to help us improve our customer service and to reduce the total cost within the Purchasing Department. We are not going to be able to bring on best practices without having a fully qualified staff. That has to be a staff this is also anxious to be looking at these new changes. Unfortunately, that is not the position that I see us in right now. I have already taken some steps, before I came here, to see what we really did need to do. To gain more man hours, what I have begun to do is to work the process of all of the activities that are going on within the Purchasing Department. The goal of that workflow evaluation is to eliminate the unnecessary activities that are going on. What I am looking for is to squeeze minutes out here and there and pretty soon that comes to a full FTE if we do that properly. I see also that numerous changes need to be made if we are going to have a fully qualified staff that knows how to use the best practices. I don't find those strengths there now. Some of the other things that we're going to have to do to stay competitive in an E-procurement world are that some new skill sets are going to have be required. I feel that in order to attract qualified talent to move us forward into the E-procurement environment, we are going to have to have a competitive salary. The current Purchasing Assistant that we have has been selected for another position in another department. If it were not for that, I would not be sitting at this table requesting to upgrade this position. From training, it would take longer for us to bring everyone back up to where I think we need to be. The advertising for an Assistant Buyer and I have been in purchasing for over thirty years and have hired a lot of people over that time and an Assistant Buyer is not going to draw the qualifications that you need and want in a fully qualified buyer. I think that if we select the right qualified buyer, that buyer can assist us in training the remainder of the staff that we have. I used, as an example in the Personnel Committee meeting, that when we began to look at centralized purchasing in the last county that I was in, in the first three months we were able to document \$230,000 in savings. I think that adding a few dollars to the salary of an employee is far going to pay itself back in a very short period of time.

**Paul Moss**: Very similar comments that you made at the Personnel Committee meeting and I appreciate that.

**Paula Hughes**: Mr. Greer, one of the things that I thought of is that, I guess, as you go through looking at ways to make County government more efficient in the purchasing area, please let Council know of where we can be of assistance.

**Paul Moss**: Such as areas where people are not coming through your department.

**Paula Hughes**: One thing that comes to mind is that we did a centralization in tracking of all of the software maintenance agreements, didn't we?

**Lisa Blosser**: We added a new appropriation line for software.

**Paula Hughes**: We have done a lot of different things and identified the line items that all of that is coming out of so that we could track them better.

**Bill Greer**: Are you talking the barcodes?

**Paula Hughes**: No, within the budget and within the payment procurement process, the Auditor's Office has tagged the lines within each budget that ties to certain expenditures.

**Bill Greer**: Commodities are what you are talking about.

**Roy Buskirk**: No, what she is talking about is the fact that the maintenance agreements, on copiers are, for 50,000 or 100,000 copies a year. They are not using 100,000 copies a year. That number could be lowered and be a savings to the County.

**Bill Greer:** Yes, as a matter of fact I had a conversation with the vendor yesterday about that. We need to know what copy machines we have, what the capabilities are of those machines and if we are not using the full capabilities of that machine, then it needs to be transferred to someplace else within the County.

Paula Hughes: We just went through that didn't we?

**Lisa Blosser**: Yes, we have gotten that done. We paid for that study.

Paula Hughes: That was from Council's intervention.

**Paul Moss**: Is it safe to assume that you have seen the IKON study?

**Bill Greer**: I have looked at it and have had some conversations and had some unsolicited comments back to me.

**Paul Moss**: That doesn't surprise me at all.

**Bill Greer**: It has some bad history to it.

**Paul Moss**: We are getting off the topic here.

**Paula Hughes**: Mine was a simple comment to assure you that if there is a way that County Council can assist you in your journey towards making us more efficient and cost productive, please let us know.

**Bill Greer**: I will certainly take you up on that offer.

**Darren Vogt**: Bad history but good information in it.

**Roy Buskirk**: I do want to reemphasize my memory on it, did you not say that there are 86% of the purchases, in this County, that are not going through your office?

**Bill Greer**: Directly through Purchasing, no. From requisition processing to converting it to purchase order, in many cases, is the only activity that they have on it.

**Darren Vogt**: There is an increase in salary. How are we paying for that?

**Bill Greer**: The increase, if I understand the process, with a change to a PAT4 is about \$3,000 to \$4,000. I do not have that money in the budget. I have looked at the budget every way that I can look at it. Please remember that this is the budget that I inherited. One of the problems that I think we have right now is that fuel costs have gone up and postage costs have gone up. There are other things in the budget that you just can't draw from. So, it is back to Council to say that we need some money in order to move forward.

**Roy Buskirk**: There are some funds being made available.

**Lisa Blosser**: She had more seniority so there are funds available. It is not as large an amount as it could be.

**Roy Buskirk**: I think that was brought up in Personnel.

**Bill Greer**: The rating came in at about \$4,000 over the incumbent's.

**Roy Buskirk**: Right but that is because of steps. It is a possibility that you will have a vacancy in that line item for a while. It depends on how soon you find a replacement.

**Darren Vogt**: Move for approval of an amended salary ordinance reclassifying the position within the budget of Purchasing Department, 100-3901-415, Buyer/Property Manager, OSS4 to PAT4 for \$37,284.

Paula Hughes: Second.

Paul Moss: We have a motion and a second. All in favor please signify by saying aye. All opposed same sign. The motion carries 6-0 (Miller absent). Personnel Committee also discussed the payband recommendations and we are going to discuss that again right now.

**Nelson Peters**: Let me preface Mr. Dumford's remarks with a couple that I did make at the Personnel Committee the other day. The compensation process is subjective, at best. One of the things that we strive to do is to put in as many checks and

balances as we could. Hence, you will be hearing about it in the appeals committee. The other thing we tried to do is have as many variables as we can balance whether we are looking internally, externally or wherever, to insure that the margin for error is very small. Doing all of that, you still don't end up with a perfect system. It is just impossible to get there, no matter who or what you are. With what I have seen with the number of variables that have been utilized and the salary surveys that have been conducted, I am comfortable that we have gotten to a system that we can move forward on. There was some discussion the other day about looking at the pay ranges for each job and we have carved them out. While I am still not in agreement that it is the most appropriate way to conduct a salary compensation plan, you are the ones with the dollars.

**Paul Moss**: Do we have that?

**Paula Hughes**: It was emailed to us yesterday afternoon.

**Roy Buskirk**: This is the email.

**Nelson Peters**: Do you have additional copies?

**Brian Dumford**: This is the email that I sent out.

**Nelson Peters**: Do you have any more of those?

**Paul Moss**: For those of us that weren't in the office, I will take a copy.

**Nelson Peters**: I think you will find that the only position that is not included is the Health Commissioner.

**Brian Dumford**: For the record, Brian Dumford, Director of Human Resources. Seeing that the Health Commissioner position was an outlier of the pay range for band four, we pulled that out.

**Nelson Peters**: What we are asking for, today, is really an approval of some range scenario, preferably the one we started out with. As you go through this data, you will see better how the ranges were constructed. There is information that shows the salary surveys indicated the minimum market data for each of the respective positions and there was a maximum market point as well. What we did was look at the positions on that basis as well as the basis of relative responsibility to one another, budget oversight, employee oversight and six or seven other variables. We grouped them into four different paybands which isn't dissimilar from what the City of Fort Wayne does, Parkview Hospital does, the federal civil service does and what the State of Indiana does. If there is a desire, by this body, to forget about those groupings, which I think helps from an internal equity standpoint, and utilize the ranges based on minimum and maximum market data, then that is your prerogative.

**Paul Moss**: Council, just so you are aware, I have been on the Personnel Committee longer than I care to admit but I think I have been consistent that it is the most appropriate direction to take is to have salary ranges for individual positions. I think if you group positions together even if there is some similarity, they are not necessarily identical job descriptions, I think you create some inequities. That is why I have been pushing for individual salary ranges. I don't believe it is that difficult to do and I think Mr. Dumford indicated that it would be very difficult to do but apparently you were able to accomplish it.

**Brian Dumford**: I have had the info all along. It makes the management of the process more complex.

**Paul Moss**: I am not sure I understand how the management of the process is more complex but I take you at face value. I still feel pretty strongly in that regard. I have to confess that I am not prepared to go through these line item by line item or take them in a group and say that I agree with the salary ranges. What I would like to do is have the Council take some additional time and look through the data that was utilized to develop these ranges. From the data that I looked at, I have some additional questions. In Brian's defense, he has afforded all of us the opportunity to sit down with him and look at the information. I don't know how many of you have done that but I suspect most of you have. If you are comfortable with that, then it is certainly the direction that we can go.

**Paula Hughes**: I would like to propose that we designate a full Council work day. I spoke with Councilman Miller and he wanted to be involved in that and has asked that, due to his schedule in November, we push that back to the first week in December. I would like to do it as soon as possible but if that week works for most of you, then that would be great. I would love to get this done before the end of the year but I think that we should be prepared for a full day work session. Ideally, the agenda would start with an overview by Mr. Dumford of how the data was collected. We received spreadsheets that showed specific data within each of the positions and walk us through how the data was collected, what are the sources, how old are the sources and then maybe stay in the room to assist us, if called upon. Then Council could go through each of the positions and talk about the methodology and come up with the appropriate line item range. I love the idea of ranges and I think we are moving in the right direction but it is painful. I think putting a work day together for Council iust to get through this is what is needed. I say that in one day we could do the merit employees and the elected officials and chief deputies. We could close out this equity study.

**Darren Vogt**: This five year study.

Paula Hughes: Yes.

**Darren Vogt**: That makes the most sense. To your point, Mr. Dumford, of talking about the complexity, be ready to explain why it is more complex. Commissioner

Peters, you said that this wasn't your favorite idea. Did you have a different idea that you thought would be better? I would love to hear it with the nature of your background.

**Nelson Peters**: Favorite idea, no, I think what I was alluding to is in very few places that I have been involved in Human Resources have there been singular pay ranges for each individual job. They teach you, from an internal equity standpoint, that the way you do is to group various jobs together. That is what we did here. If Council is looking for specific pay ranges for each job that is your prerogative. I just don't think it is the most appropriate way to perform salary management.

**Darren Vogt**: I want to get through this thing and if we walk through the methodology behind what was there, we may come to the conclusion that maybe this makes sense or maybe it doesn't. Maybe we will feel as strongly as Councilman Moss does and put them in individual salary ranges and go from there. To sit here at this hour and try to go through these, I think it needs to be a specific focused with outcomes and this is what we are going to do.

**Paul Moss**: Let me give you one example here. Circuit Court Administrator, Director of Court Services for Circuit Court, the market data minimum is \$51,767. The maximum is \$105,854. The proposal by the County, as far as the bands are concerned, shows that the bottom would be \$55,781 which is \$4,000 in the market data minimum. The top, proposed by the County is \$92,969 which is \$8,000 below the market maximum. We instantly put ourselves out of the market. I don't understand the logic. I apologize because I want to get through this too. That is one example where we would have them coming back to us and say that they have someone to hire and the market says \$105,000 but my band says it has to be \$92,000.

**Brian Dumford**: Something to think about, as we are chewing this over in our minds, is that by grouping positions into paybands, what this is doing is internally is saying that this is what our organization considers the value of these positions to be to us. The way we have done that is look at many consistent factors throughout those departments which is the same way that we have done all of the other positions. All of the administrative positions, all of the PAT positions and it is the exact same thing that we are saying here is what we have done with the other positions in the County. By putting the positions into a classification, we are saying to the County of Allen that this position is worth X to Y.

**Darren Vogt**: If we are going to have this discussion another day, let's have it another day.

Paula Hughes: Let's schedule a date for the first week in December, if we could.

**Roy Buskirk**: Can I say something? I think he needs a little bit of guidance of what we are looking for so that when that day arrives, he will have some of the answers. That has been my frustration.

**Paula Hughes**: Councilman Miller is drafting a list of questions that we will send to Mr. Dumford.

Paul Moss: Much of what he has...

**Roy Buskirk**: I thought we had an understanding that the information was going to have a high and a low on each position on this sheet and also your recommendation for that position.

**Paula Hughes**: No, we have said clearly that we do not want the recommendation at this stage of the game.

**Roy Buskirk**: That is what is on here is your recommendation for that position. Correct?

Paula Hughes: Yes.

**Brian Dumford**: Additional backup, yes.

**Roy Buskirk**: I have a problem here, the one I pulled out here is Superior Court, the comparable counties, Elkhart, Hamilton, Marion, St. Joe, Lake and Vanderburgh, and of the counties mentioned, Elkhart and Vanderburgh have Superior Court Executives? The other ones are left blank.

**Nelson Peters**: In the State of Indiana, that would be correct.

**Paul Moss**: Roy, I think that is exactly what we are going to try to hash out. He has given us the market data, the minimum and maximum. I think what the intent is, correct me if I am wrong Councilwoman Hughes, is to go through there and make sure that we are all comfortable in asking Brian to reconcile this information that he has provided on this summary sheet. We can ask those specific types of questions so that we are comfortable with the market data. I think there are some questions out there and I have some questions. This is obviously a critically important process and I think we can get through line by line on these positions.

**Roy Buskirk**: I'm sorry but if I set a day aside to discuss this, I hope that at the end of the day...

Paula Hughes: We're done.

**Roy Buskirk**: ...we make a conclusion. I don't want it to be that I will get back with you. I don't want that answer.

**Darren Vogt**: We have the data. We are going to walk through it line by line and see if we agree with the data. Then we would decide, as a Council, if we agree with that their banding positions or if we want to do the band for each individual position. I

think that the key discrepancy here is do we do it individually or do we do it the same way that we had before.

**Nelson Peters**: There is one other step beyond that which we had hoped to get to in November and that is buying into the recommendation for a specific salary.

**Paul Moss**: For each of these positions, you have this type of information. Some of it is blank and I think that is the reason for some concern. We need to take that into consideration, understanding that it may not be complete information because, for whatever reason, you didn't get that information. For the working session, what was the date that Cal liked?

**Paula Hughes**: The first week in December. I can't do Thursday the 4<sup>th</sup>.

**Paul Moss**: What about Tuesday, the 2<sup>nd</sup> or Wednesday, the 3<sup>rd</sup>?

Paula Hughes: Let's go for the 2<sup>nd</sup>.

Paul Moss: We will start at 8:00.

Becky Butler: I will check for a room for that.

Paula Hughes: We want a conference room.

**Lisa Blosser**: I think you will want to sit around a table.

**Brian Dumford**: Let's use the HR Training Room.

**Paul Moss**: Okay, that will work.

**Roy Buskirk**: This will also give us time to look over the material that was emailed yesterday.

**Brian Dumford**: Once Councilman Miller has those questions put together, I can go over them.

**Paul Moss**: Okay. Are there any other comments on this? We have eleven different nominations for board appointments.

**Paula Hughes**: This does not include the Redevelopment Commission which is a new one.

**Paul Moss**: That is correct.

**Paula Hughes**: Are they annual?

**Lisa Blosser**: It depends. Some are four year appointments and some are annual.

Becky Butler: I don't have that with me.

**Paula Hughes**: I am asking specifically about the Redevelopment Commission.

**Tera Klutz**: I think those are annual but I am not 100% positive. We can find out.

**Paul Moss**: These nominations will be for the future?

**Becky Butler**: These have all agreed to be reappointed.

**Paul Moss**: In the past, we have had these folks come before us and give us a little update. My feeling was that the agenda was pretty full today and these eleven people would have consumed an awful lot of time. I think everyone is quite familiar with these people and the performance that they provided. What I would suggest is that if there is a desire, on down the road, we should get in the habit of having them come before us and tell us how things are going. I would certainly entertain a motion to approve these or if you want a name removed.

**Darren Vogt:** Move for approval of the nominations for board appointments for County Council.

Maye Johnson: Second.

**Paula Hughes**: For discussion on that, I know that there were other folks interested in the Alcohol Beverage Commission appointment. I think that we should consider that and it is an annual appointment, I think we should give other people a chance to serve. I think that to automatically roll over the same people year after year...

**Darren Vogt**: I think that on the one-year appointments, some of them only meet quarterly, I would rather that people have a two-year taste of it.

**Paula Hughes**: We don't get to say how many years the appointment is.

**Darren Vogt**: We can do it our own way, if it is annual.

**Lisa Blosser**: If you want them off after a three-year appointment, then you can do that.

**Paula Hughes**: So internally we can do that.

**Darren Vogt**: I agree that if we have people that are interested, I would rather rotate people through.

Paul Moss: There is a motion and a second for all eleven reappointments. All in favor please signify by saying aye. All opposed same sign. The motion carries 6-0 (Miller absent).

**Roy Buskirk:** When we see something on the agenda or if somebody expresses interest of getting on to some committee, that information should be provided to the Council President. Then when it comes to that time, then they have the opportunity to present it to the Council.

**Paul Moss**: And I suspect that Becky will do a great job of letting us know that. Any recent or upcoming meetings that we need to talk about?

Paula Hughes: Consent agenda, what is that about?

**Darren Vogt**: We were discussing if we were going to do it.

**Paul Moss**: What would be nice is that those that are interested in that could come up with a specific proposal in terms of criteria for the consent agenda. I think a consent agenda is a good idea to have it.

**Darren Vogt**: Some framework for it.

**Paul Moss**: The Planning Department or Planning Commission has a consent agenda and maybe the Auditor's Office can come up with something.

Lisa Blosser: Sure, I think we can come up with something.

**Paul Moss**: You are going to have to be flexible about it.

**Darren Vogt**: That is the hardest part about it. On recent meetings, I went to Indianapolis and I testified in front the Tax Commission. They clearly understand the role of County and looking at budgets. AIC was there, Cities and Towns were there and the key thing is that something needs to be done differently. What we are doing now doesn't make sense from a timing standpoint. The Legislature hears it and understands it and I assume that something will be addressed this year but I am not sure what. We will need to keep an eye on that piece of legislation as it goes through.

**Paula Hughes**: Some internal meetings, as you have all heard and gathered, since the last meeting the discussion between the City Police and the Sheriff has broken down in terms of co-location. The Commissioners and the Sheriff are moving ahead with renovations of the New Haven Avenue building. Council should be prepared that in the not to distant future, we will have an approach from them to fund the project. They are moving forward with an architect to design some plans. We are also still in the middle of negotiations with City over their usage of the iMAP system. There has been some amending of the initial agreement on this. I am not sure whether or not that is going forward. On the 911 consolidation, City Councilman Tim Pape, at this

week's Council meeting suggested that the County just take over the entire 911 system and that the City should just give it to us.

**Darren Vogt**: Was that flip or was he actually serious?

**Paula Hughes**: No, well, with Councilman Pape, it is hard to tell. However, I think it is something that we should seriously look at because we do have approximately \$3 million a year coming into the E911 Fund. That is distributed to all of the entities that provide 911 services but we should look at the annual operating budget as well as capital expenses. I have been warned that we are going to be facing a refresh on a lot of those operational systems. We are going to have some significant expense in the terms of the hardware necessary to keep that system going.

Darren Vogt: I thought we just did that.

**Paula Hughes**: Six years ago. That is the gist of the conversation and I just wanted to bring it closer to the top of your mind. I am sure that other things have happened but I am not sure what they are.

**Maye Johnson**: I would like to talk about the questions that Councilman Moss had in regards to Metro and the increase that was submitted as a part of the budget. I would be more that happy to discuss this with any member of Council. The reason for that was that the issue of the co-mingling of federal funds has been an ongoing issue. This issue was brought to the attention of the Controller's Office when I chaired Metro almost four years ago. The directive came from the Feds in that the monies had to be kept separate and they were not. Everything was going into a general fund. Let me just say that if the methodology that I have witnessed and participated here, at this table since I have been on Council, had been in place along with just basic accounting procedures, we would not be in the situation today. But as it stands right now, we have a number of weeks before HUD and EEOC and if we can not give a complete accounting of how every dime of those federal funds was spent, then those funds are going to be suspended. That means that the federal revenue will be stopped, to this agency. That was part of the reasoning for submitting the budget as it was because we transferred a lot of the funds or expenses over to the property tax side. We don't know what is going to happen with the federal funding. It has been jeopardized by the commingling of federal funds. Do you have a better idea, now?

**Paul Moss**: I don't have a better idea or anything along that line. I appreciate your service on that commission. My point was that it was one of the outliers, so to speak, because it was such a significant increase. I think I understand, although I don't know the details, the issue and appreciate the explanation with regards to the federal funding. I have said before that with the economy where it is and where it is potentially going, we will probably be faced with a real need to look at what government's role is in a variety of areas. Metro may need to be one of those. I could go through a fairly significant list of entities that are providing some type of service

or another and at some point we may not be able to afford it. It may be a good thing if that has to go on the property tax rolls it may force a discussion a lot sooner than Metro supporters would like. Nobody should be afraid of that discussion.

**Maye Johnson**: I am not afraid of that discussion and it will be a lively discussion. In fact, I would welcome it.

**Paul Moss**: I think you are right. I am not coming down on either side of it. I just think it is the reality that we are faced with. I certainly appreciate the additional information.

**Roy Buskirk**: I have one quick comment. On this thing and it totally blew my mind, in essence, 86% of the purchases...

**Lisa Blosser**: I am not sure that the number is correct.

**Roy Buskirk**: Even if the number is off, it still shocks me that we don't have the Purchasing Department doing the purchasing for this County. I think that the City has a law or regulation or whatever you want to call it that if a contract is a certain figure, maybe we need to ask the Commissioners to draw a line in the sand that if the purchase is over \$5,000 or whatever, that it has to go through the Purchasing Department. Something to think about. Thank you.

**Darren Vogt**: Move for approval to waive the second reading on any matter approved today for which it may be deemed necessary for the County Council meeting of October 16, 2008.

Paula Hughes: Second.

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

**Darren Vogt:** Move to adjourn.

Paula Hughes: Second.

Paul Moss: We have a motion and a second. All in favor please signify by saying aye. All opposed same sign. The motion carries 6-0 (Miller absent). The next meeting will be held on November 10, 2008 at 8:30 am.

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 12:35 p.m.