

**ALLEN COUNTY COUNCIL
MEETING MINUTES
APRIL 15, 2010
8:30 AM**

The Allen County Council met on Thursday, March 18, 2010 at 8:30 a.m. 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: Paula S. Hughes, President; Darren Vogt, Vice President; Roy A. Buskirk; Maye Johnson; Paul G. Moss; Larry Brown and Bob Armstrong.

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

The meeting was called to order by President Paula Hughes with the Pledge of Allegiance and a moment of silence.

Paula Hughes: First on the agenda is the Consent Agenda. Is there anything that anyone wants to remove from the agenda for discussion?

Roy Buskirk: I have a concern about the Consent Agenda because in the minutes for last month, there is nothing in the minutes on the items that we approved. I think that we should at least mention the items that were on the Consent Agenda. I thought it was, at first, so that the department heads didn't have to sit in the room here for us to approve it but I still think that there should be something in the minutes on the items that are in the Consent Agenda.

Paula Hughes: The list of items on the Agenda...

Roy Buskirk: And they should be read.

Paula Hughes: Okay. I would be happy to read the Consent items. I want to talk about that a little bit. I am very sensitive about any commentary that would indicate that we are not interested in transparency. I think this Council and the County, in general, really strives to be transparent. One of the things that I talked with Becky about, ahead of time, is that she scans in the entire contents of the information that County Council gets in order to make decisions. The agenda is posted on line as well as the minutes and I talked to Becky and she is receptive to putting the packet on line as well. I think that is a good idea if the rest of Council is agreeable to that. I would say that starting next month, let's put the full packet out there so that anyone who is interested can see everything that the Council sees. I agree, Roy, that it is a good idea to include, in the minutes, the listing of the items on the Consent Agenda. The minutes are there and the Financial Report. Salary ordinances are already discussed

ALLEN COUNTY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

at another public meeting and so I think that is fine. Are there any other comments or discussion?

Darren Vogt: I will mention this, if we have someone who is already on the agenda and they have an item that is in the Consent Agenda, maybe we ought to just for the sake of public appearance, pull that item out because they are already here and to Councilman Buskirk's point, the original point was to not have our department heads and elected officials sitting here waiting to come onto the agenda. I would like to make sure that we are trying to coordinate that. If they are already here, maybe we should make sure that they have some public conversation about that item since they are already going to be in front of us anyway.

Paula Hughes: That is fine with me. Councilman Buskirk, how much detail do you want? Do you just want a listing of the things that are included in the Consent Agenda or what did you have in mind?

Roy Buskirk: In the future, if someone makes reference to this meeting, if it was done as it was last month, there would be nothing in the minutes about Community Corrections and the four positions that they had and the Sheriff's grant. Just those items be mentioned so that they are in the record.

Paula Hughes: All right. In the Consent Agenda, we have the approval of the minutes of March 18, 2010; the Financial Report; a grant request from the Sheriff for a Criminal Alien Assistance grant for incarceration of undocumented criminal aliens that were incarcerated for at least four days during the period of July 1, 2008 to June 30, 2009; we have four salary ordinances. All four are tied to Community Corrections and for the changes made to the Kelley House. They are A Unit Supervisor at a POLE 5/1 with an annual salary of \$45,702; Confinement Officer at a POLE 3/1 with an annual salary of \$32,525; Intake Case Manager at PAT 2/1 with an annual salary of \$31,535 and Case Management Section Chief at PAT 4/1 with an annual salary of \$40,962. I look for a motion to approve the Consent Agenda.

Maye Johnson: Motion to approve.

Darren Vogt: Second.

Roy Buskirk: I would like to make a comment on the Community Corrections and it is because of the Kelley House. When Sheila Hudson came before the Personnel Committee, all of these wages are being covered by State grants.

Paula Hughes: Great. **Is there any further discussion? All those in favor please signify by saying aye. All those opposed same sign. The motion carries 7-0.** Moving onto item one, Appropriation Reduction in County Council, Vehicles for the Sheriff in the amount of \$289,267. Good morning.

ALLEN COUNTY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

Ken Fries: Kenny Fries, Sheriff of Allen County. I think items one and two are tied together.

Paula Hughes: Yes.

Ken Fries: Last year, I have to give Council credit because they took it upon themselves to decide that we were no longer going to have funding with the purchases of squad cars, since we have been running into issues with the Commissioners. Last year we had to use money that we had saved up in Commissary, for cars, to use in co-location. Council took it upon themselves to put it in their fund to set aside for the purchase of squad cars. The reason that I am coming for \$454,940 is to try to replace a total of twenty squad cars, nineteen marked and one unmarked. Primarily, we are trying to get the number of miles on the cars down. We have a total of 139 vehicles for the Sheriff's Department. That includes reserve motorcycles, reserve cars, SWAT trucks, jail trucks and everything. Forty-four of our cars are over 100,000 miles. It gets into a problem as far as maintenance concerns and safety. After 100,000 miles, these cars are in the Service Center more and it starts costing more money. The Captain in charge of the fleet had purchasing run some numbers for cars with 50,000, 75,000, 100,000, 125,000 and 150,000 miles. The numbers are staggering, as far as maintenance is concerned. When I saw them, I was a little concerned because I thought the numbers were way too high. I asked how we came up with those numbers. In Purchasing, maintenance has to include everything and so the numbers are a little skewed because it includes fuel. For a car with 150,000 miles, the average maintenance per year is \$10,089. One with 50,000 miles is \$5,373. There is a \$5,000 gap there. I would caution the Council to not believe that the \$5,000 is all for maintenance because fuel is included. There is certainly a progression that it costs more, per miles, to maintain the cars. The new cars that we are purchasing are the Chargers. They get an average of a mile more per gallon than the Crown Vics. By all the reports from the other agencies that have had them for years, it is the flagship that everyone else is trying to build towards. We are hoping to purchase nineteen marked and one unmarked. When I took over as Sheriff, I thought that it was abysmal that we had less than fifty percent of our cars marked. Through the last three years, we have gotten it up to over sixty percent of the cars are marked. This will help to put more marked cars out there.

Paula Hughes: Great.

Darren Vogt: Is there a reason why the fuel is included in the maintenance?

Ken Fries: They said they couldn't break it out differently and I don't know why. Every car that is assigned, all of the maintenance and fuel is included in one. I wanted to get a breakdown of actual maintenance cost. We have several that have had to have engines replaced after about 120,000 miles. To me, that makes no sense to put a new engine in a car that has 120,000 miles on it. If we can get these twenty cars, we are still going to have cars with 109,000 on them, as of yesterday. Next year,

ALLEN COUNTY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

when we replace them, they will have 140,000 miles on them. For a marked squad car, that is too many miles.

Paula Hughes: Councilman Brown?

Larry Brown: Tera, can you help Purchasing figure a way to get that broken out?

Tera Klutz: Yes.

Roy Buskirk: That throws the numbers way off.

Tera Klutz: This is the first time that this has ever happened.

Ken Fries: I want to caution you that I know that these numbers are not totally accurate. They are skewed because of the gas consumption.

Darren Vogt: The point is that we should be able to have a clean number where it is truly just maintenance.

Paula Hughes: And the point also is that even without fuel, it does cost more to maintain a car with over 100,000 miles on it.

Ken Fries: Ideally, I would like to get 25 or 26 cars this year to get the marked cars down and trade them off. Next year we will still be up at 130,000 miles and it will take some time to get it back to where it belongs.

Paula Hughes: Is there a certain amount of time to process cars through the Service Center to get them ready to be on the street?

Ken Fries: Yes. If this is approved today, we can order the cars and it will probably be sixty days before we get them. As they start moving them out, they can get two done a week. It will be late summer.

Paula Hughes: How is pricing on vehicles right now?

Ken Fries: Right now, Crown Vics are \$187 cheaper than the Chargers. With the fuel economy that we get with the Chargers, it is a wash over the years. They are still staying about \$22,000 apiece.

Darren Vogt: Is that dressed?

Ken Fries: It is marked and with none of the equipment in it. The Commissary money that we have set aside is going to be used to buy some of the equipment for the cars. We try to reuse the equipment that we have from every car. After a while, some of it wears out and you have to buy new. We try to be frugal.

ALLEN COUNTY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

Roy Buskirk: I talked to the Sheriff about this earlier and actually, this year, the cars are \$150 less than what they were last year.

Paula Hughes: That's good.

Bob Armstrong: Can you take the cages and stuff out of the Crown Vics and will they go in the Chargers?

Ken Fries: No, the only cage cars we have are the K-9 cars. Otherwise, we transport prisoners in the front seat.

Bob Armstrong: All right.

Paula Hughes: Are there any other questions? I look for a motion to approve.

Darren Vogt: Move for approval of items one and two for vehicles.

Bob Armstrong: Second.

Paula Hughes: **We have a motion and a second. All those in favor please signify by saying aye. All those opposed same sign. The motion carries 7-0.** Thank you. Next we have an appropriation in Homeland Security for a maintenance agreement, Councilman Brown.

Larry Brown: I would prefer that Lori gives the information on this.

Lori Mayers: Lori Mayers, Assistant Director of Fort Wayne-Allen County Homeland Security. Several years ago, maybe ten or more, there was a gift fund established in our office, for taking in donations. That project has since been completed and we left the fund open because we had some people that wanted to donate some money for tornado warning sirens. Unfortunately, we don't have enough money to purchase a tornado siren and the fund hasn't been used for a couple of years. The Auditor's Office wanted us to close out that fund because there was no activity for two years. The balance in there was \$1,286. Tammy said that if I told her where we wanted it transferred to, that we would just have to come to Council and have the money appropriated. We would like to have it put into our Maintenance Agreement line so that when we have a siren that has a problem, we can put that towards it. We would not use it towards purchasing a new siren but put it towards maintaining what we have.

Paula Hughes: Councilman Buskirk?

Roy Buskirk: If I understand this correctly, you are closing out the fund in which people were able to donate to in the past.

Lori Mayers: Yes.

ALLEN COUNTY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

Roy Buskirk: If somebody wants to donate next week, can that still be done?

Lisa Blosser: It can be reestablished.

Tera Klutz: It hasn't had any activity since 2003.

Roy Buskirk: Oh, okay.

Maye Johnson: Question. What is the cost for a new tornado siren?

Lori Mayers: For the purchase of the siren, the pole and electrical, it is about \$20,000.

Larry Brown: I offer a motion to approve.

Maye Johnson: Second.

Paula Hughes: We have a motion and a second. All those in favor please signify by saying aye. All those opposed same sign. The motion carries 7-0. Thank you. Next on the agenda is an appropriation in Circuit Court for Translator Services. Oh, that was withdrawn, I'm sorry.

Darren Vogt: The only reason that it was withdrawn is because the people that run the program had training in Indianapolis today. I prefer that they are here to talk about it and they will come next month.

Paula Hughes: Okay, great. Appropriation in County Council, Other Capital, \$3 million and this is the fulfillment of the County Council's pledge towards co-location. Good morning Commissioner Peters.

Nelson Peters: Good morning, Nelson Peters, Allen County Commissioner. You did a great job of explaining it. I am not sure what else I can say. We are here to request \$3 million out of the General Fund to begin the process of co-location between 200 East Berry and the City-County Building.

Paula Hughes: Councilman Moss?

Paul Moss: The only thing that I would clarify is that this wasn't, way back when, allocated for co-location. Everybody likes to talk about that because it feels so good. It was actually allocated for the Sheriff's building. I thought the amount was \$2.5 million and the other \$500,000 was coming from where?

Nelson Peters: I can't tell you. We put away \$500,000 in the CUM CAP for aiding in building out the Sheriff.

ALLEN COUNTY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

Paula Hughes: We initially pledged \$2.5 million out of County General towards the Sheriff's relocation. The Commissioners pledged \$500,000 out of CUM CAP. In November or December of last year, this body pledged \$3 million toward co-location. We had a conversation about the CUM CAP fund and the sense that I had is that there are projects that are in excess of that fund's ability to pay for them. We can do just \$2.5 million out of the General Fund and take \$500,000 out of CUM CAP but there are going to be projects coming through CUM CAP that are going to need General Fund contribution. It just felt like a lot of moving around and this was cleaner. But, whatever the pleasure of the Council is.

Nelson Peters: I spoke with Councilman Brown earlier this week and you are exactly right. It doesn't really matter where the money comes from. If the \$500,000 comes out of the Commissioners' CUM CAP fund, that simply diminishes the amount of things that we can do on the other end.

Paula Hughes: Both funds are appropriated and approved by County Council.

Darren Vogt: Are we going to have any discussion? I want to make sure that we are looking out for the taxpayer. When we re-co-locate, I will call it that way because we are co-located now, we need to make sure that we are looking at the taxpayers and who is going in to get the service. That is the taxpayer. When we decide where everyone is going to go, in this building or the other building, we need to be clear in making sure that the general public goes to one building, for taxes, for economic development and all of those kinds of things. We really need to sit down and have that discussion. I know that we had a small committee of three look at that but I think that we need to be more proactive and interactive with all of the department heads and elected officials. We have to look out for the taxpayers and now is the time if we are really going to do this and we have to do it right and make sure that everyone benefits from it. I have asked for a meeting of all of the department heads and County elected officials so that we can do that and I would like to see us get that done.

Nelson Peters: Council, I think that the only real issue, at the time, was whether there were efficiencies in co-locating City Police and County Police together. I think that since the notion has been to move City and County Police into this building, we will be looking at the development team, all of those that people have to get permits from and deal with on a day-to-day basis, together. I don't think there has been any disagreement. I agree with you and that is the track that we are taking. At the end of the game, that is where we hope to be.

Darren Vogt: I want to make sure that we use the existing information that we have but we make sure that we are getting input. I know that right now we are leaving the tax team in this building and I am not sure that it is the best thing. The only reason that it was left here is that it was set up in an existing parameter that we are going to leave them here because we just remodeled them. I am of the mindset that we

ALLEN COUNTY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

remodeled them but now we have a different scenario than we did three years ago. We have to make sure that we look at that at the end of the day.

Nelson Peters: I think the slate is really clean right now. There were some broad assumptions that were made with respect to arriving at a number for the co-location subcommittee. You are absolutely right. We are at a point now where I hear people talking about that they heard they are going to be here or they are going to be there and I am thinking that I don't even know where I am going to be. The slate is clean and as we proceed, we will take all of those issues into consideration.

Darren Vogt: Can you give us a brief summary of the next steps? Where do you see the next steps going?

Nelson Peters: We have a small committee that is working with the City of Fort Wayne to try to coordinate some of those efforts. Part of the motion that was made at that meeting was to have the City do their thing at 200 East Berry and the County would be responsible for building out the City-County Building. Our next step will be to bring on board a construction manager. The construction manager will be responsible for bringing on a general contractor or perhaps doing some of the general contract work. That person will be responsible for bidding out and get the subcontractors on board.

Darren Vogt: In that scenario, I didn't hear the conversations with department heads and elected officials. Is that after you have hired a construction manager?

Nelson Peters: That is what a construction manager is all about. The part that I did fail is about the architect. He will spend some time with the departments ensuring that they are located in the right place.

Darren Vogt: I just want to make sure that we are not only having the conversation architect to department head but also department head to department head to make sure that we are catching the interactions within the community.

Nelson Peters: And further, department head to City department head as well.

Paula Hughes: Keeping in mind the ease of access for the citizens which is what started the whole conversation with parking and all of those kinds of things. Councilwoman Johnson?

Maye Johnson: I was sitting here thinking that couldn't some of that work be transferred or dealt with on the strategic planning for the County?

Nelson Peters: Absolutely.

Maye Johnson: I think that would be an ideal place for some of those discussions to take place.

ALLEN COUNTY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

Paula Hughes: Councilman Buskirk?

Roy Buskirk: I will start out that I am an elected official and not a very good politician. We have all attended a lot of meetings and talked to a lot of citizens. I think that there have been a lot of myths in this whole process. In looking at law enforcement, there has been a myth on the fact that there would be a lot more crime solved if they were in one building. Also that this building was built for law enforcement because of the tunnel to the Courthouse when in fact, when the City Police arrest somebody, the booking is at the jail. That will not change no matter what is done on co-location. The Sheriff is the one that is responsible for transporting prisoners to the Courthouse. A lot of times the hearings are done within the jail because the new jail contains those rooms for security purposes. Another thing that has improved, and there is a lot of movement going on with the cooperation, is the 9-1-1 in that all law enforcement was before on different frequencies and now they will be on the same frequency within that section of the County. There will be more instant communication back and forth between County Police and City Police. I think, as many of you know, Councilman Brown and I are on a permit committee that is looking at how we can improve the permit process. There have been some myths on that as far as time delay in the economic development community. This past Tuesday, we met with several of the architects and engineers in the County. The Chamber of Commerce did a survey last year and most of it was not the location but it had to do with timing. One suggestion is electronic submission of drawings and everything instead of having to deliver the papers. That would cut down on some storage areas within the County and City departments. Before the meeting was over, we asked them if it was important as far as the co-location and that they be in one building. Their response was that there are other things that would be an improvement. It would be okay but it wasn't necessary. It was like, fine if you want to do that but it isn't necessary as far as improving economic development through this County. There are other things on the remodeling, we had just spent about a quarter of a million to remodel the Auditor, Treasurer, Recorder and Assessor's Offices. Most of the plans had included them staying here. The City is ending up with all of their offices in one building and the County would end up with their offices split between two buildings. I can see confusion with people not knowing which building that they need to go to. That is especially true for outside people coming to our community. We committed \$2.5 million and now it is \$3 million for co-location with the City. Once you start down this process, there are going to be many more change orders involved. How do you stop it when you are halfway through? If you need change orders for half a million more, it would be irresponsible to not approve that change order when you are already halfway through the process. After you start this process, there is no turning back. There are a lot of small problems but they do add up. In your notebook, the Auditor's office has pointed out several additional expense items which have not been included. Some of them are the actual physical moving of the offices. Some of them are IT and I know there is an estimate on moving that. One of the other things that comes up is the parking situation. I know at the Task Force meeting, the Mayor said to not worry about the parking and it's taken care of. When he was pushed on the subject, then it was that

ALLEN COUNTY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

the parking will be within two blocks. That is making reference to the current City-County Parking Garage. These are some of the little things that happen. Each employee that uses that facility is going to have additional time in the morning and evening of walking two blocks. That's about five or ten minutes each way. Another problem is, and in working with multi-tenant commercial buildings, but heaven forbid that one department needs to expand a little bit, who is going to reduce their space? Or who is going to move out to give up additional space? To continue the discussion on, I would make a motion that we had on the Task Force, Scheme A and Scheme B were presented to us and I would make a motion that we use Plan C. That motion is that we commit \$3 million to locate County offices within 1 East Main Street.

Bob Armstrong: Second.

Paula Hughes: We have a motion and a second. Is there any discussion?

Paul Moss: Yes, really what you are talking about is, and I have said this before, I don't know how we move from scenarios to schemes. The scheme that you are referring to, there were four of those, and they were discussed by the Task Force. If I recall correctly, Scheme A is what you are now suggesting. That is essentially the City moving out of the City-County Building and we backfill this building.

Roy Buskirk: Correct.

Paul Moss: And using the \$3 million for that.

Roy Buskirk: Correct.

Darren Vogt: I guess that is not what I heard. I want to be clear on the motion that I heard was spending \$3 million, and I am paraphrasing, to co-locate in this building and spend the money on this building. Restate it in simple terms for me. I'm not getting it and I am not sure I can support it because I don't understand it.

Roy Buskirk: The motion is that we commit \$3 million to co-locate County Offices into 1 East Main Street.

Paul Moss: I think we are getting into semantics here. This is why co-location should be stricken from any dictionary that is out there. You are talking about just backfilling or filling this up with County departments.

Roy Buskirk: That is correct.

Paul Moss: It is not really co-locating.

Darren Vogt: That is where I was confused.

ALLEN COUNTY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

Paula Hughes: You are advocating separation.

Roy Buskirk: Yes.

Paula Hughes: You are advocating separating the County and the City.

Roy Buskirk: Correct.

Paul Moss: There would be some components of the development team as there are City component of the development team that would not be here.

Roy Buskirk: That is correct. Like I said, the engineers and architects that we talked to, that wasn't very important to them that they be in one physical place. It was more important that they could electronically submit their plans and even the possibility of teleconferencing.

Paul Moss: And using credit cards to pay for things.

Roy Buskirk: Correct.

Paul Moss: You are absolutely right.

Paula Hughes: How are we going to fund the system that allows for that electronic filing?

Roy Buskirk: One way that it could be funded is through fees. When we talked to the architects and engineers about it, they said yes they would be willing to pay additional fees. It would also save as far as storage because currently they bring in a roll of plans for each permit. Another thing, having them all in one building, it is a misunderstanding that you can go to the Planning Department and pull your land use permit and go to the Building Department and pull your building permit. There has to be time between those and currently it is a day or two. Maybe that can be shortened but you can't just go down the hall and pick up the fourteen permits at one time.

Paula Hughes: Roy, Commissioner Peters wants to speak as well. I disagree with that approach because it is very much an insider focused approach. You are speaking as an insider in government, as somebody who knows who all of the departments are, knows where they are located and knows how to navigate the system. The focus should be how do the people that are coming to us for the first time, citizens and companies that are looking to locate here, how do they know where to go? We do a terrible job of that and I think that putting everyone in the same building, ideally on the same floor, facilitates an ease of navigation through the system. It would be great if we could do it all electronically. I don't have any hope that we could accomplish that quickly. Bringing everybody together is the first step towards changing our focus to a customer focus, to the people that are doing business with us. Government exists

ALLEN COUNTY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

to serve the citizens of the community. Your perspective puts the focus on those citizens can find us wherever we are.

Roy Buskirk: No it is not. I appreciate your news conference yesterday in the fact that we need to be customer friendly. This is one thing that the permit committee has been studying and the suggestion is that there is one focused person. We talked with the Planning Department, Kim Bowman, and she agrees with it. That individual would be like an ombudsman.

Paula Hughes: To help them through the system.

Roy Buskirk: I am in favor of that. Currently, a lot of people have not had the opportunity to see this. Currently, if they submit the plans by 10:00 Monday morning, then there is a review. Everybody sits around the table by Thursday. There are suggestions of additional changes or information that needs to be done. That is pretty fast and they actually told us that it doesn't make a difference as to the size of the project. They have to report back. They have a policy that if it is turned in by 10:00 Monday morning, then by Thursday they have a meeting with the architect, engineer, owner or whoever. As far as the electronic submitting, that is the way it is with the State of Indiana. You electronically submit all of your drawings and everything to the State. There are other Counties with a lot less population than Allen County that allows you to electronically submit.

Paula Hughes: Like Howard County, Kokomo.

Roy Buskirk: I am not sure which Counties.

Paula Hughes: I can appreciate your perspective but what you are proposing is directly contradictory to what you voted on in the Task Force.

Roy Buskirk: No, it's not. In the Task Force, I voted for Scheme A and made the statement before I voted for that. I was voting to get it out of the Task Force and get it back to this Council because there were only three of us on the Task Force and we can not speak for the seven on this Council. My vote was to move it out of that committee and get it back to this Council so we could discuss it and decide it. I felt that the Task Force had served its function and it was time to move on.

Paula Hughes: I agree with not wanting to sit through those Task Force meetings anymore. I can support that. Councilman Moss?

Paul Moss: Roy, frankly I admire your willingness to take the position that you are taking because I have been there and done that. I know how difficult it is to swim upstream when there are a whole lot of forces out there in the community that wants to see something occur. To use your analogy of talking about the construction and renovations and move and all and the change orders and how difficult that it would be to say no to those, this whole process has been flawed from the beginning. To

ALLEN COUNTY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

think that the City went out and purchased a building and their stated need was that they needed 80,000 square feet, which for those of us that went through the Police Department realize that it isn't very accurate, they probably need about 50,000 square feet. Then to go out and purchase a building that is 252,000 square feet, in my mind is just atrocious. In the business world where you have to gain your revenue in a competitive environment and provide services to people, if I was to suggest buying a building for one of our hospital departments with a perceived need is 80,000 square feet and I suggested a 250,000 square foot building, I would be out of a job pretty quick. Unfortunately, people have short memories and many of these folks will probably get reelected. That is the reality that we have. The toothpaste is out of the tube in a big way. That building was purchased. Now we are at the point with the Task Force having a unanimous vote. I supported whatever scheme that was as well, after supporting the other scheme that I think most objective individuals would agree with and would have been considerably less to the tune of over a million dollars less by not having the City Police co-located here. It was very clear, however, that there was a sentiment of that Task Force to move forward with that and my biggest concern is that if we reverse course now, I think it may end up being even more costly. Even more plans will have to be rewritten and reviewed and changed significantly more which equals additional dollars needed. I am conflicted, at this moment. I would be interested in knowing what everybody else is thinking.

Maye Johnson: Didn't you support Option B or Scheme B?

Paul Moss: I supported having the City Police in Renaissance Square and the County Sheriff in this building.

Paula Hughes: Councilman Vogt?

Darren Vogt: When the architects started this, they gave us the three prongs approach and the approach that was missing was the cost piece of that. They did it the other way around. The direction that I gave them was that we had \$18.9 million to co-locate again and that is what they came up with, \$18.9 million. What I think that we need to do is, as elected officials, is hold their feet to the fire when it comes to those change orders. We have the plan that will get us to \$18.9 million and look at these options to see if they are realistic. To go backwards, to your point Councilman Moss, I think it would be moving backwards and not going forward and we have to continue. We have a situation where there are two buildings that need to be filled and we have a plan that will keep local government together and spend the money that is allocated and we need to move forward with that. As change orders come, they need to be realistic and we can discuss those optional pieces that the architects came up with to increase the cost over and above the \$18.9 million. That hasn't been done yet. I personally haven't fully flushed out what those options were.

Paula Hughes: Councilwoman Johnson?

ALLEN COUNTY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

Maye Johnson: I'm for moving forward. I have supported the option of having the Public Safety providers in this building. I think that we have to move forward in the fashion that encourages a greater working relationship between the City and the County. Whatever Scheme or Option that is, I support.

Larry Brown: I think what I bring to this Council is a vast knowledge of construction. I would be negligent of my duty and knowledge if I didn't share with you the fact that many of you may not have picked up on the fact that one of the ways that those dollars, referring to the \$19 point whatever, the way that it was achieved was that they did a more in depth study. To use their terminology, they came from the 50,000 foot level down to the 5,000 foot level. We are still not down to ground zero. Another factor is that there were design team recommendations that were in the original \$22 million or whatever that total figure was. Those were pulled out but they are still design team recommendations. When we are talking about the \$3 million from the County plus the million from the Mayor, \$4 million for this building and a total of \$14 million something for that building, those recommendations are not covered in those figures. Sometime, whether it is now or later, those recommendations are going to have to be done. Most of the dollars are in the Berry Street building but there are some in this building. In other words, we are putting off what needs to be done to get to those numbers. At this very moment, I am torn, really torn. I see the construction side. I see the value of doing those recommended things now when it is cheapest during the construction phase rather than coming back later and tearing up everything to do something.

Darren Vogt: I wholeheartedly admit that I haven't looked at those recommendations in detail and I don't have construction knowledge and the background that you do. I guess what I want to understand is are those things that need to be done, are they maintenance issues or are they structural issues that need to be adjusted for the co-location? I see those as two different expenses. A needed requirement for co-location or a needed requirement for a building that is going to have it updated and modernized so that, like a new roof for arguments sake or new boilers or chillers or those kinds of things. Those are routine maintenance and are not needed for co-locating.

Larry Brown: Let me address that. It is still taxpayer dollars. Most of the dollars were in mechanical and electrical, plumbing, heating and electrical. Structural, I don't think there was hardly anything. There are many areas where ceilings are being maintained. In other words, we are not opening a ceiling and what is above that ceiling is not being updated. Remember, this building is old.

Darren Vogt: When you say "this building" are you talking about this one or that one?

Larry Brown: This one. There are lots of things above those ceiling tiles that are aged. Whether you do it now or you do it later, it still needs to be done.

ALLEN COUNTY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

Darren Vogt: That is my point. It has nothing to do with a co-location scenario. It is going to need to be done five years from now or ten years from now whether it is a City building only or a County building only or a co-located Sheriff and City Police Building. Is that a fair statement?

Larry Brown: It won't be ten but within five is reasonable. It will be twice to three times more expensive then.

Darren Vogt: So, in my mind, those are not expenses related to co-locating. Those are expenses that we as a County, who owns this building right now, will have to spend either way that we look at it. To your point, I may agree, that is where we need to look at do we spend the money now while we are tearing up the building to make sense to do it. That is where you are talking about spending the money now versus five years from now when the economy and the bids are coming back at 25% less than they normally would. That is a different discussion that we need to have. I don't look at that as money that is coming from co-location but as planning ahead. We are a County that has been fiscally conservative. We have money that is set aside and do we take the advantage now to do the recommendations that you are talking about that are really maintenance oriented and not co-location oriented? Am I the only one that thinks that way?

Paula Hughes: I agree with you that it is the right perspective on it.

Larry Brown: I agree.

Paul Moss: You could almost call them incremental and not related to normal maintenance.

Roy Buskirk: Capital maintenance.

Paula Hughes: Right. We have always been good about doing that with this building. Through the years, we have repeatedly as things broke down, we fixed them.

Larry Brown: As part of this discussion, I would like to hear from Commissioner Peters. I know that he is anxious to talk.

Nelson Peters: Let me just say that first off, that is what the CUM CAP budget has been all about. It has allowed us to maintain this building and other buildings that we have. I understand what you are saying and it makes a lot of sense. We would be remiss in not including Dan Freck in that picture and I am sure that he will be a large part of the decision making process as we move forward. The thing that I wanted to bring up was that there will be change orders. I hope that the architects have put together enough of a projection to allow for some of the change orders that may occur. There is no silver bullet to make us great. We have come a long way in the days gone by. I have heard from building people, developers, architects and from

ALLEN COUNTY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

other citizens and I think that the changes that we have made, they all suggest are good changes. It is always kind of “what have you done for me lately” type scenario and can we do better? The answer is absolutely we can do better. The architects sat down with the Surveyor, DPS, the Building Department, City Utilities and the Highway Department and asked them, as a part of this process, will co-location help the builders and architects and their response, almost to a fault, was yes. And there was one exception and I don’t remember, off the top of my head, exactly who it was but they said it wouldn’t hurt anything but it wouldn’t necessarily help. I think for those who suggest that we have City folks in 200 East Berry and County folks over here, perhaps are suggesting that there is absolutely no benefit whatsoever in locating like departments near each other. Intuitively, that just can’t be right. I am convinced that you learn more from your neighbor by discussing at the water cooler than you do if you are forced to pick up a telephone, email or fax machine and all of that stuff. I think that the Scheme that was laid out and discussed mostly at the Task Force meeting is one that seems to make a lot of sense. To suggest that we can move County Operations in here, at \$3 million, I also think is erroneous because the same architects came to us right at the outset and said that it is probably going to cost about \$3.5 million and they hadn’t done a very concise study at the time. They said it is probably going to cost about \$3.5 million if you take the folks that are in the outer buildings, renovate this building and then move them in. I think that part of what I thought the Task Force had gotten to was a recognition that by keeping like departments kind of together and with some recognition that the costs were going to be generally the same for doing that or just putting County offices in this building, I thought that the understanding was that it probably made sense to move ahead in the co-location direction.

Paula Hughes: Councilman Vogt?

Darren Vogt: Question for Commissioner Peters. This is more of an administrative type question but what conversation has gone forward, since the Task Force, as far as continual ongoing maintenance? The County owns this building and the City owns the other building. We are going to have both entities located in both buildings. What is the agreement set up for maintenance? Is the County going to continue to maintain this building and the City maintain that building?

Nelson Peters: That is the agreement.

Darren Vogt: That is the agreement right now?

Nelson Peters: Yes.

Darren Vogt: So then what it boils down to, I think, back to Councilman Brown’s point is those optional things. The only thing that we have to consider, from an expense standpoint, is the optional things that are located in this City-County Building. I would like to have, at some point, a discussion among Council members and Commissioners as to the price tag of those items if it goes forward and if it

ALLEN COUNTY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

makes sense to do it while we are under renovation. I know that we have a motion on the floor and I think that we have kind of lost sight of that but I want to make sure that we are talking through this discussion. I want to make sure that we have that and that those options are looked at. As a County with a Rainy Day Fund and funds available outside of the Rainy Day Fund, we need to take a really good, hard look at that maintenance and if that maintenance means spending the money now instead of down the road, maybe that is the thing that we need to do. I am not saying that I advocate for that because I haven't fleshed that out. I rely heavily on Councilman Brown and his knowledge and expertise and Councilman Buskirk's expertise in that area so that we make sure that we get it figured out and do the right thing for the taxpayer on down the road.

Paula Hughes: Yes we do have a motion on the table and we have had some clarification of that motion. I will ask for that in just a second. I know, from my perspective, this Council at the start of the process said that we had pledged \$3 million toward relocation of our Sheriff and that we would pledge that \$3 million toward a revised co-location of City and County government offices. As we go through this, I am struggling to understand why it would be better for the community for us to completely separate City and County government at the same price tag as putting similar functioning teams together. For me, and I agree with Commissioner Peters on this, as we move forward we know that the demands and needs of our local government system are going to shift through the years. The decisions that we are making now are going to impact generations to come. We have been in the current situation for forty years. We are making long-term decisions here and if we move toward a complete separation, I believe that we are short circuiting future reallocation of resources in City and County government and any cooperative agreements. Even though we are in an age of electronic and digital communication, there are still definite benefits to riding in the elevator with somebody or running down the hall to talk to somebody. They don't care if they are coming to City or County. Hopefully they know that they are visiting local government over State government and they may not even care about that. They know that they are going to a government office and we need to think about how it is for the person coming to visit us. I am struggling to understand why it is more advantageous, in the long term, to completely separate the offices. Yes, there are things that we need to work on. We've had discussions at the Task Force level about a joint ownership or building authority or some other entity that owns both buildings to get around any future discussions like this to put in place institutional communication that provides for cooperation. I don't think that what we are deciding today affects that at all. It hasn't been discussed yet, as thoroughly as it should be. I have heard you say that there are some people that don't think putting departments that work together in the same physical space is advantageous. But I haven't heard why putting the list of County departments that in many ways are completely unrelated in function makes more sense over co-locating City and County departments that do function in the same way and serve the same people.

ALLEN COUNTY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

Roy Buskirk: In response to Councilman Moss' question about the expense with the architects and everything, their plan as far as the different locations of the offices is totally up in the air anyhow in the work that they have already done and the expense that we have had with them. Some of the remodeling costs and those numbers, it doesn't make any difference as to who goes where, you will still have basically the same thing on that. It will be adjusted as to how many linear feet, wall space and some of that. Councilman Vogt, on the \$18.9 million, that does not include a lot of additional cost such as moving and furniture. Another thing is the downtime that you are going to have with all of the offices being moved. Another thing that I want to point out is that the City had said that the \$1 million that they were offering has now changed and is for the laboratory for the City Police. The architects stated that because of moving the City Police in here, and with Nelson's idea that I appreciate of the County taking care of this building and the City taking care of Renaissance Square, is that there would be an additional cost because of moving the City Police and the Sheriff into this building of \$700,000 for security. That is another thing that we need to take into consideration. As far as the co-location, several people have pointed this out to me is the fact that the County is the one ending up being split, as far as the offices. They keep saying that you need to run County government like a business and basically, as far as the County is concerned, our Auditor is our Chief Financial Officer. There is a proposal and I realize that it can change, they are in one building and a lot of the other departments that they work with as far as payroll and a lot of different functions and are in and out of the Auditor's Office at least once a day. They are being split into two different buildings. That is one thing that would be an advantage to have it. The thing of the warm, fuzzy feeling, we can still work together. Just because we are in two separate buildings doesn't mean that we can't work with the City on the functions. You name one other County, besides Indianapolis, that has the City Hall and the County Headquarters in one building. We had a report that one of the public input sessions that we had with the Task Force, one of the leaders mentioned about moving and having a good working relationship with the County. It so happens that the City that they moved to and the County seat are almost fifty miles apart. Because you are not located in the same building doesn't mean that you can't work together. That is the image that the newspaper and people on the street are talking about. That is where I have a problem with what Commissioner Peters is saying about people saying that being in the same building would be better. Engineers and architects on this committee, I have talked to others and looked at the Chamber of Commerce report and that is not the big concern of being together in one building. That really doesn't concern me in the fact of them not being in one building. Most of the time, you can't go through the whole permit process in one day. It will take multiple trips unless we do it electronically.

Paula Hughes: I hate to interrupt but you have a circular argument that you believe that it is okay for all of the entities, the outside people that are coming in to deal with City and County government for the development team for example, it is okay that they are split. But it is not okay for the departments that work with the Auditor's Office to be split? It is more important that the inside departments that have to work with the Auditor's Office all be clustered in one building? The people that are

ALLEN COUNTY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

working with folks outside of the insider government employees be together? One or the other.

Roy Buskirk: Yes, it is more important that they all be located in one building because they have onward going, every day or multiple times a day walk between the offices and deliver papers and paychecks and other items of that type. In talking with the people that work in Economic Development, it is not necessary to be located together. I think it would be better that the County has one building and we are responsible for that building. It can still be in the press, as far as the City and the County working together. I see no reason why that should stop. One of the things that was in the Chamber's report, which I thought was very good, was the high marks as far as the co-location of the various City and County Planning Commissions. Some of them made comments that there are still improvements that could be made but they felt that it was a good step in the right direction. Just because we are not located in the same building doesn't mean that we can not cooperate.

Paula Hughes: But can't the same be said of County departments.

Roy Buskirk: No.

Paula Hughes: If they are in separate buildings, they can't work together? You are arguing both ends of that. I don't know how you can make the argument that it doesn't matter if the City and County departments who impact the development process, it doesn't matter if they are in the same building or not. But it does matter if County departments are all in the same building. They all have to communicate.

Paul Moss: Using that argument, we should have one big building. We should all be together and have State government together

Paula Hughes: We are going to have departments that are split regardless. We don't have one building that is big enough and I am certainly not advocating that we bring a third building that is big enough for everybody, into the mix.

Paul Moss: But that is your argument right now.

Paula Hughes: No, my argument is that Councilman Buskirk is arguing both that it is important that departments be together and it isn't important that departments be together.

Paul Moss: Some departments, it is important to be together. I think that his reference was to the Auditor with the Administration, primarily. Others, it is not so important.

Darren Vogt: I think that we are missing the point that I was trying to make earlier. I think Commissioner Peters concurred with me that where people are going is not set in stone yet. I hope it's not because if it is, I have a problem with it. We haven't

ALLEN COUNTY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

addressed, as I stated earlier, and I talked to the original members Mark Royse, Pat Roller and John Stafford that they left the taxing unit alone because it was just remodeled. That is the only reason that they left it alone. Now we are moving forward with the co-location in two buildings. We now need to take the next step and put the Auditor's Office and the taxing units and say that all of the cards are on the table. Let's get together with each department head, all of us, and say who works with who the best, where do they need to go and how do we get there? We know that we can do it with the money that is on the table. Now we have to make sure that the pieces of the puzzle, and to your point, we are talking about linear foot of office space and it is office space. It is not construction of jail cells and things like that. In reality, it is just office. We have offices now that have an open floor plan. The Auditor's Office is completely open and so is the Recorder's Office. Let's stop worrying about who is going where, get together as a group and discuss who needs to be together and why they need to be together and put the importance of that with the taxpayer. They are ultimately paying the bill. That is what we have to focus on. I hope that at some point we end this discussion because it is just going nowhere.

Paul Moss: You have just described very well how inept this whole process has been. You described everything that should have been done at the beginning. As I listen to this whole conversation, there is a very diverse opinion about whether the building should have been purchased. The process has been primarily Commissioner Peters was the lead on working with the City and coming up with a variety of options to co-locate and do things along that line. We were brought in, essentially, towards the very end and as soon as we get brought in and people start to realize that there is some diverse opinion here and some concern about the taxpayers, the Mayor runs out and closes that deal just as quick as he could. He shuts the door. Now, that is where we are at and we have to talk about co-location. I'll tell you what, if the Commissioners and the Mayor will commit to broad transparency in communication in advance and in the future, I will vote against Councilman Buskirk's motion. That is a big issue for me. That's very frustrating for me. We shouldn't be in this position that we are in by having to have this type of discussion. The toothpaste is out of the tube.

Nelson Peters: We will commit to that but secondly, I take exception to your comment. You were involved as soon as the Commissioners were involved last June.

Paul Moss: That is not true. You all had a letter and we can go back and have this discussion if you'd like but there is documentation, clear documentation from the Commissioners Office, about what you wanted to do prior to us being allowed to have a public discussion. That's a fact.

Paula Hughes: Councilman Armstrong?

Bob Armstrong: This whole issue that is at hand is just mind boggling to me. For forty years, we have been co-located and now we want to separate. We have two buildings, one here and one there. The money of \$3 million is on the table and it was

ALLEN COUNTY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

my understanding and is still my understanding, the beginning of all of the talk about the \$3 million was to reassure that we got the Sheriff put into a building. I don't care about Berry Street. I don't care about Creighton Street or where the City Police is going or any of that. In my viewpoint, I am responsible to make sure that we take care of our County people and departments and stuff in a financial way. The \$3 million, it's obvious that this co-location talk is going to go on and it is probably going to happen. I have a hard time because we all know it is going to be more than \$3 million. It is just uncalled for that it is going to happen. When I ran for the position, my goal was that I was going to represent the taxpayer and not the tax spender. I really have a hard time voting for the \$3 million now because, to me, it is not being utilized for what it was actually talked about in the beginning in putting the Sheriff in either this building or building him a building. I've talked to a lot of people and they don't understand and I certainly still don't understand, we are co-located. Right now, today, we are co-located. I am sitting here deciding how to vote because I am representing the taxpayer and not the tax spender. There is a whole lot of tax spending that is going to happen in this whole co-location scenario. It's going to go over, which I approved and voted on the \$3 million. It will be interesting to see where it goes. At the end of the day, we might have the warm and fuzzy feeling between City and County and the taxpayers and everything but really, at the end of the day, how much is it actually going to cost the taxpayer? That is my question and my main concern.

Roy Buskirk: It is not only the taxpayer but the benefit that is going to happen. Councilman Vogt, in your question on moving the Auditor's Office and the tax unit, it is probably going to be backfilled, most likely, with County offices.

Darren Vogt: Our County is currently in many different facilities right now. I am not sure that I understand that having them in this building and that building makes a difference. Maybe there are City departments that could come over here as well. I am not saying that they all have to be County departments in here. That is where both government entities need to be in a room discussing it. Then everyone can hear what everyone has to say and it may look like sausage being made. At least we need to discuss it. Then you will know if there are agendas or what the issue is but we will know this is why we are going together because of relationships with each other within department heads. I think that is an important part of it.

Paula Hughes: Councilman Brown?

Larry Brown: I appreciate the discussion but I have to remind everyone, and this is what keeps eating at me, on two different occasions over the past few months, we have had 100% unanimous consensus agreement that we would support \$3 million. If it was co-location, that was fine. We're the fiscal body, let's concentrate on the fiscal issue and let the Commissioners do their job with the physical arrangement. We'll hold their feet to the fire. Commissioner Peters has promised that he would be open and transparent. Sorry, Roy, I don't think I can support your motion.

ALLEN COUNTY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

Roy Buskirk: Call for the question.

Paula Hughes: Councilwoman Johnson wanted to add something.

Maye Johnson: I just wanted to make a comment. Councilman Brown, we must be connected here in thought because I agree with you too. I am not going to support Councilman Buskirk's motion. We can not resolve all of the issues that have been talked about here at this table today. This is a work in progress. By moving forward and having transparency, there is not one issue here that can not be resolved. I concur and I agree with my fellow Councilperson in regards to the process. Some of what we are talking about now should have been discussed before. Having said that, let's move on.

Paula Hughes: All right. Councilman Moss, you asked for a roll call vote. Would you like to go first?

Paul Moss: Sure.

Bob Armstrong: Are you going to ask what the motion was?

Paul Moss: Do you want to repeat the motion?

Roy Buskirk: I will change the co-location to locate. The motion is that we commit \$3 million to locate County offices into 1 East Main Street. That is this building and to be honest with you and I am not trying to be smart, I didn't know how to refer to the name of this building and so I took the address.

Paul Moss: Well, I am going to vote no on that. The reason that I am voting no is for a couple of reasons. I will certainly preface this by saying that the taxpayers of the entire County and particularly the City better hold on real tight to their wallets because it is going to cost a whole lot more than people are saying. I guarantee that but hindsight is always twenty-twenty. We'll keep a close tab. We did make a commitment at the Task Force and here and I am very hesitant to go back on that. As I said previously, I would have preferred a different Scheme at the Task Force but it was not successful. That is very important to me. I also want to state that, at least going forward with change orders and things of that nature, if it gets anywhere beyond \$3 million, I am going to be extremely hard pressed to support anything. Keep in mind that the architects' estimate was \$3 to \$4 million for furniture for this thing. That was conveniently set aside in all of these discussions. All of the other things that are going to end up happening, it is just going to be an expensive, expensive thing and I am quite pleased that I at least tried to convince others to look at different options.

Maye Johnson: I vote no.

ALLEN COUNTY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

Darren Vogt: I will make one brief statement. Some of the things that we have talked about are furniture and moving costs. We are not adding new employees and so to your point about new furniture, I want to see why we are spending money on new furniture. It needs to make sense to me as to why we are buying new furniture. Moving costs, we are going to have it either way but I vote no.

Paula Hughes: I vote no.

Larry Brown: I, as well, vote no.

Bob Armstrong: Like I said before, at the end of the day, my main goal is that we need to take and get the Sheriff in a position that he is either here or in a new building. I'll vote no.

Roy Buskirk: I just felt that we would have more control over the cost. Councilman Vogt, part of the problem on the new furniture is that some is built-in furniture and you would automatically have some cost on that. I wouldn't have made the motion if I didn't feel that it is actually best for the County taxpayers, City and County, and the ones that I have talked to. Most of them live within the City do not feel that this is a good plan to move forward on and that mainly we would have more control over the expenses. That is the one thing that I am real concerned about and so therefore, I will vote yes.

Paula Hughes: The motion dies 1-6.

Tera Klutz: Fails.

Paula Hughes: The motion fails 1-6.

Darren Vogt: I will make an additional motion that the County Council appropriate \$3 million for the co-location of the City and County offices.

Maye Johnson: Second.

Paula Hughes: We have a motion and a second. Is there any further discussion? All those in favor please signify by saying aye. All those opposed same sign. The motion carries 7-0. We are now off of page one.

Nelson Peters: Six, seven and eight are also mine. I always love to be here right after a discussion like that.

Paula Hughes: We will move on to items six, seven and eight, Youth Services Center, Mr. Dunn?

Chris Dunn: Good morning, Chris Dunn with Youth Services Center.

ALLEN COUNTY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

Nelson Peters: The request that you have before you today is a transfer from Mr. Dunn's budget to the County Human Resources Department. This is for a part-time employee at the front desk. In our process of reorganizing the Human Resources Department, it has happened on more than one occasion that we would have a higher dollar individual at the front desk simply because there haven't been other people to cover at the front desk. When we are paying fifteen to eighteen dollars an hour for someone to cover the front desk that we believe that we can get done between nine and twelve dollars an hour, it doesn't make a lot of sense. In recognition of that need, Mr. Dunn stepped to the plate and said that he could probably help out this year by transferring some dollars from his account to the County Personnel Department's account. This is a position that we will be requesting going forward. It will serve about twenty-five hours a week and we are requesting a range between nine and twelve dollars an hour. As I said, Mr. Dunn has agreed to pick up the portion that we will need for this year. You will likely see it in the budget request for 2011.

Paula Hughes: That will be counter-set by other changes made in the Human Resources Department?

Nelson Peters: Right. I would like to add that this request did go through the Personnel Committee.

Paula Hughes: Councilman Vogt?

Darren Vogt: Let me make sure I understand where you are going to be, Mr. Dunn, in the 2011 budget. Will you be able to reduce the budget for 2011 by this amount or is this a one-time, this year, kind of scenario?

Chris Dunn: One time. This is a position that I left open after the reorganization last July when the group homes closed. I hope to fill it in the next couple of months.

Darren Vogt: Okay so it is going to be filled but you haven't filled it at this point in time. This is money that is left.

Roy Buskirk: Actually I think this is the money that has accumulated because it hasn't been filled.

Darren Vogt: Right.

Paula Hughes: Are there any other questions? I look for a motion.

Larry Brown: Motion to approve.

Darren Vogt: Second.

Paula Hughes: Is that items six, seven and eight?

ALLEN COUNTY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

Larry Brown: Yes.

Paula Hughes: We have a motion and a second. All those in favor please signify by saying aye. All those opposed same sign. The motion carries 7-0.

Nelson Peters: I am not sure but I think you will need to vote on a range.

Tera Klutz: We already have a salary ordinance for part-time in the Human Resources Department.

Paula Hughes: All right, moving on to Appropriation Requests in Other Funds. Youth Services Per Diem Fund 737, Councilman Armstrong.

Bob Armstrong: I will let Chris handle it from there.

Chris Dunn: We have five items before you requesting to use the money out of our 737 Fund. I can go down through each one if you want to keep them together or vote on them separately. The first one is for our clay room. We have a budget that is presented to me by a volunteer. We did not come before Council last year and did not put it in the budget. We were trying to the supplies that we already had and we have used them down and so here I am asking for these items. The lawnmower is a replacement. We had a mower that was twelve years old and it finally gave out. I did a lot of research and worked with Purchasing. She went over all of the quotes that I collected and she called them back to see if she could get any more money taken off. We chose a mower and it is here before you and I can give you all of the information on all of the quotes if you want that. We have some history items at the Center that I have been storing in my office for a long time. I have over two hundred pictures of the old Children's Home kids. I've got old movie reel that probably was shown when Councilman Buskirk was back in school, the big old reels. It really needs to be put on CD's. I have slides and a lot of old historic material that I am trying to save and put on DVD. I have three quotes and I don't have a finalist yet because I am trying to go through the material and take things out that don't need to be saved or are bad pictures or don't really show anything. There are some landscapes that we don't need to copy and save. We are trying to reduce it down. We are also working with a couple of the individuals that are working to get grants and may reduce the amount. Right now I am only asking for \$2,000 and I am hoping to get it down to \$1,500.

Paul Moss: Is there some legal requirement for saving some of those or is there some other purpose?

Chris Dunn: No because they are not kid files. That is a whole other issue that I am dealing with. We are dealing with kids files back to the 1940's to put on DVD and save. It is a long process but these are not covered by that. We have a digital signature pad that we need for people who admit kids to the center and we are trying to go paperless. The bacteria sewage waste treatment, the whole complex out north has flunked their water quality and it goes back to the City for years. We pay a fine

ALLEN COUNTY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

on it. We have tried to explore reasons for this. I am working with Dan Freck and his department and this is one of the items that are going to be suspended in our grease trap. I am told that basically they are putting healthy bacteria in there to try to break down the waste and improve the whole quality of water that we send back to the City sewer. We have our grease trap pumped about every three to four months. Our goal is to cut that down as much as possible and limit the amount of fines that we are getting. That is everything and I can give you detail on anything that you might want.

Roy Buskirk: I have a question on the pictures and everything. There is nothing in there that is private? These can all be shown?

Chris Dunn: That is open for debate. The library came out to look at everything and they were interested in it but I have so much information that they didn't know what to do with it or how to get through it. Most of the people in these pictures are going to be in their seventies, eighties or older.

Roy Buskirk: That is what I was going to suggest of possibly giving that material to the library.

Chris Dunn: I approached them about two years ago and haven't heard back from them. It is getting old and brittle. I don't like taking it out of my office. The movies are even more brittle and both ends are broken off. We can't show it anymore. The paper files that we have on the kids going back, the paper is falling apart.

Roy Buskirk: I understand.

Darren Vogt: Move for approval of items nine through thirteen in the Youth Services Per Diem Fund 737 in the amount of \$14,909.

Maye Johnson: Second.

Paula Hughes: **We have a motion and a second. Is there any further discussion? All those in favor please signify by saying aye. All those opposed same sign. The motion carries 7-0.** Moving on, there is a transfer within County General Fund for the JTAC Project.

Therese Brown: Good morning, Therese Brown Clerk of the Allen Circuit and Superior Courts.

Ed Steenman: Ed Steenman, County IT Director. Last year, as you mentioned, we appropriated \$240,400 for the JTAC migration. That is the migration of our Court system to the Statewide Court system. At that time, there were dollars identified for various portions. One was the data conversion from our system. The second item is overtime for staff for fixing data that we know, over the period of over forty years, has not been consistent and has to be massaged to be in the format that the Odyssey

ALLEN COUNTY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

or the statewide system can accept. The third item was, if staff needed to be supplemented by outside temporary staff that was the third item that the dollars were supposed to be spent on. We are now at a point where staffs within Circuit Court, Superior Court and the Clerk's Office are going to be massaging some of that data to get it into the format so that it can be recognized by Odyssey. They will start to use overtime hours. This request is to move \$50,000 from the general project budget that was established last year into a line item in the 100 series so that it can be used for salaries or overtime.

Therese Brown: If I may, I would like to add that the process is under the direction of Mr. Steenman but with the approval of both Judge Gall and me as co-sponsors of the movement towards the JTAC Odyssey system. Just to give you a little update, the goal was to go live, 100% and roll the project out in one process. As JTAC has acknowledged, it is a little monumentous in Allen County based on the size of the operation that we do have. We would be their, and are their, largest County that they are moving forward with. Right now, Misdemeanor and Traffic is their focal point. It is a considerably large department obviously feeding not only Misdemeanor and Traffic but also into the Criminal Division to which Judge Gall obviously oversees. A lot of the data issues that we are running into are going to be addressed in this first push. That push, for all intents and purposes, is a go live in that department by July 4th weekend and subsequent total roll out of the entire process, not to say that there won't be bugs past the point of total conversion, but the goal of total conversion by the end of November of 2010. I don't want to give any false hope that there is going to be 100% no bugs involved. At this point, both the Clerk and Courts staff have been reviewing data and have been working within the confines of their budget but we know as we continue to move forward that won't be the case. That is why we are here to ask for your assistance.

Darren Vogt: If there are no questions, I will make a motion for Information Technology transfer, item fourteen from the JTAC Project of \$50,000 to item fifteen, Overtime.

Bob Armstrong: Second.

Paula Hughes: We have a motion and a second. All those in favor please signify by saying aye. All those opposed same sign. The motion carries 7-0.

Darren Vogt: I just ask for a quick moment. As the liaison with the Data Board, we just had our first joint meeting with the City Data Board. Can you give us a synopsis?

Ed Steenman: On Tuesday, we had the first meeting of the Joint Data Board with sixteen members. Eight are from the City and eight are from the County and widely distributed across the departments. It was a good meeting. A chair was selected. Tim Miller from the County will be running that Data Board and Garry Morr from the City Parks will be the Vice Chair for the next year. It was a great discussion and brought out some of the differences between the City philosophy and the County

ALLEN COUNTY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

philosophy but that is what it is all about or part of what it is all about. One of the main purposes of the Board is to bring IT projects to them for them to vote on from a yea and nay standpoint going forward and to prioritize projects. Then the appropriate ones will be finished first or on time. It was an hour and a half long discussion and I thought it went very well.

Darren Vogt: I think that I will add, my comments were, it is a work in progress. It was interesting because in the beginning, there was a lot of “how are we doing” and by the end there was a lot of good conversation. Eventually, once everybody gets going and is comfortable with each other, I think this will be a great thing. This will get the technology processes across the entities and will be good overall for the taxpayers.

Ed Steenman: There will even likely be some subcommittees that will form and meet separately from the full Data Board and will be across City and County lines as well.

Paula Hughes: Okay, great, thank you. Next we have a transfer with Community Corrections Home Detention Fund.

Sheila Hudson: Good morning. I will make it short because I am last. I am Sheila Hudson and I am the Director of Community Corrections. I am requesting that we can transfer between series in our Home Detention Fund, \$27,000. This is between the personnel line and the contractual. The reason is that I hire, historically, between fifteen and twenty law enforcement officers to work the Community Corrections Field Operation. Four of those officers are County officers working a part-time detail and throughout the last year or so, we negotiated a contract with a private vendor who has hired these County officers so that there are no problems with overtime.

Darren Vogt: Move for approval of items sixteen and seventeen in the amount of \$27,000.

Larry Brown: Second.

Paula Hughes: **We have a motion and a second. All those in favor please signify by saying aye. All those opposed same sign. The motion carries 7-0.** Councilman Buskirk?

Roy Buskirk: We asked you to come this morning, in the Personnel Committee meeting, because I would like to give Sheila the opportunity to explain on the wages that we approved on the Kelley House and what that plan is ongoing and that you have received several grants to run that facility and what the facility is actually for.

Sheila Hudson: The Kelley House is a comprehensive in-patient day treatments and out-patient treatment facility. This is for MICA Offenders. They are mentally ill, chemically abusing offenders. They will be under a court order and they will placed there for many of the other different components of Community Corrections for up

ALLEN COUNTY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

to a period of a year. The staff that you approved today will be part of the staff. I will be coming back to you as we roll this out. The staff that we will need for this facility, I am going to try to shift over some of the staff that I have now in dual roles. I have a very large Federal stimulus grant, to me it is large at \$640,000, and a lot of that is for services and it only lasts a year and a half. I want to spread it as far as I can and re-appropriate money that I have from the State. They have given me more money to renovate the building. The plan is, for the middle of May, we will be up and in operations for at least the outpatient portion of that and the day hours will be between 7:30 and 9:30. We will introduce the programs and then introduce our first residents by the end of summer.

Paula Hughes: Great.

Roy Buskirk: That house will have both ladies and men.

Sheila Hudson: Yes.

Roy Buskirk: What will be the population?

Sheila Hudson: Up to twelve women and the rest will be men. The place can house 48 inpatients.

Roy Buskirk: I think it is just great that this is one of the first facilities in the State.

Sheila Hudson: To house MICA offenders outside of prison, this is the first in the Country. This population rotates in and out of the jail and prison and is four times more likely than the regular offender. We are hoping to make a difference in that and over the next couple of months we will be able to put an adequate per diem with this to show how much it actually costs to run this facility. It is really brand new and I am going at it slowly because it is really a very daunting task. I am not usually daunted by too many things.

Paula Hughes: It is a big deal. Okay, thank you. I am going to ask that we recess briefly because we have been given some erroneous information and I want to have a conversation about what is happening with shovel ready sites and land banking.

Short Recess.

Paula Hughes: One of the first things that I want to talk about in the Other Business to Come Before Council is just an update. I emailed this to you ahead of time and this will be submitted for part of the record. We have a couple of documents here. The Alliance's Land Use Committee has been meeting as well as Mark Royse and Scott Harrold from the County's Economic Development Department and have been doing a lot of work talking about what parameters should be put in place should the County decide to move forward, more formally, with a Land Banking program. What you have in front of you, the Site Certification Program, Phase One and looks

ALLEN COUNTY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

like this, is a list of items that we consider as we look at different parcels. I wanted you to have a feel for the level of detail that is being pursued in this property. The last page, in this packet, is a list of eight different potential properties and it talks about the acres, what it would cost to purchase that land and other things that need to be considered. Road costs, water costs, sewer costs and what kind of infrastructure would be needed to move forward with that project. You will know that we are evaluating it that way and can see some idea of the general sums. Some of this is just rough estimates. When you talk about water and sewer, it is kind of per lineal foot and how far it would have to go to get to that property. It doesn't include anything if there needed to be a lift station and there have not been formal engineering estimates done at this point. This is kind of a broad scope estimate. I wanted to let you know that this is how we are moving forward with this and we are hoping that we will have, maybe by next month, a proposal for Council to consider on a couple of things. One is to approve a program for considering property acquisition. We are investigating options through the County Attorney, Bill Fishering. Number two is a program to put in place that would give a preliminary authorization to our partners at the Alliance if we did go forward and had acquired property, what commitments they could make on behalf of the County given certain benchmarks of employee growth or just recommendations for Council to consider. I just wanted to let you know that we had been talking about it. This is the direction that we are heading and I am asking for any feedback, at this point. Councilman Vogt?

Darren Vogt: One of the things that I have talked about and I hope that we are continuing down is the long-term and short-term and mid-term plan so that when we spend taxpayer dollars, they need to know why we are doing it and how we are doing it and what methodology. The actual acquisition of land and all of that is not what I am referring to. I want to make sure that we have the plan in place and that is the part that we need to discuss. I know that Mark has been working on that and we can get that out so that when we do spend taxpayer dollars, there is a reason and here's why and here is how we are doing it so that it is transparent.

Paula Hughes: Other Council members? I agree that it is part of it. What is interesting about these sites is that each of them really is situated and would appeal to a different type of prospect. They are scattered all over the County and that is going to be one of the things is that some point we will have to prioritize and do we do that based on the lump sum figure for getting that site up to shovel ready or is it an emphasis on a certain type of industry over another? Those are going to be discussions that this Council will be involved in.

Darren Vogt: One more point that I want to make is as the County is prepared financially to potentially put some money behind this, and I don't want to commit the rest of us because we really haven't made any votes or motions on that. I hope that our brethren on the City side, whether it is City Council, New Haven, Huntertown or all of those folks, that when we put a plan together we can all come together to realize that this is for the good of the surrounding communities as well as the surrounding counties. As we are the largest County, what happens here helps

ALLEN COUNTY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

those around us because not everybody wants to locate in a metropolitan type area. I hope that once we take our plan we can coalesce and get together with those folks and make sure that we are all on the same page and that we are not trying to step on anyone's toes. We are committed from a County standpoint to do something instead of just continue to talk, talk, talk, talk, talk. Now we want to put the money and actions together.

Paula Hughes: We have requested that this be put on the agenda for future Alliance meetings for that very reason. We want to make sure that there is good communication and coordination among all of the parties.

Roy Buskirk: I know what you are talking about with cooperation with other communities and all of that stuff. Any employment is good for the region. I am just throwing this out that this is something that you might think about. If the actual site selection might be in an adjoining County, would you be willing to furnish some funds to make it happen?

Paula Hughes: Are you proposing that the Allen County Council fund a project in another County?

Roy Buskirk: I didn't say fund it but if they needed some additional assistance and because of the benefit that we would receive of the employment in the region, it is something to think about. I am not sure which way I would go on it. I just happened to think about it and threw it out so you can think about it.

Paula Hughes: Okay. Is there any other business to come before the Council? Are there any other liaison reports? Councilman Vogt?

Darren Vogt: I owe the Prosecutor a phone call. We had a brief conversation and there was a piece of legislation that was passed and slipped through and I don't know the details so I may butcher this. It may have had to do with Infraction Deferral and funds and how much they could cap and things like that. It is significantly going to impact them and their initial thought was almost \$400,000 in revenue and starts July 1. They have used Infraction Deferral money to supplement their budget quite a bit and this new legislation has really hampered that. I will get more details.

Larry Brown: Update on the Courthouse. It is progressing quite well. The unforeseens are very minimal. They have had a couple of setbacks, weather and Court schedules but they are looking at the same ending date.

Paula Hughes: Is it on budget?

Larry Brown: Yes. Don't forget that we did appropriate additional funds for an extra cost item that came along. The contingency has been used a little bit.

Paula Hughes: Okay. Any other Council members?

ALLEN COUNTY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

Roy Buskirk: Do you want to say anything about the Permit Committee or do you want me to talk about it?

Larry Brown: Sure. Roy and I are on a development process review committee. There are two City Council members, two County Council members, a Commissioner and a Mayor's representative. We have been meeting every two weeks and I think we have met four times. We are continuing to meet and what it boils down to is trying to make a smoother system. We've acknowledged some drawbacks in the way that we operate currently. Those can be improved. The cooperation we have received has been phenomenal. There is no turf war. We will keep you updated as we progress.

Roy Buskirk: Adding to that, it is making the best better. That is what we are trying to do with the permit process in being able to expedite that. We do have, on both the private sector and the government sector, some tweaking to improve it.

Larry Brown: I might add that just recently the Chamber added a representation on that. The community is well represented.

Paula Hughes: Does anybody have anything about any Recent or Upcoming Meetings? Public Comments, I know that Joanie Howell, Vice President of Legislative Affairs from the Chamber is here. Is that the right title?

Joanie Howell: Government Affairs. I am Joanie Howell, Greater Fort Wayne Chamber of Commerce. I wanted to make a clarification on a couple of things. We had a couple of issues getting mixed into one a little bit earlier. First is the permitting issue which the Chamber has been working on pretty diligently for probably ten years now and we kind of dove into it a little more last year. What was earlier referred to as the Chamber report was a survey issued by the Planning Department of the users of that department. It was a survey done before the building issues and basically on services. The Chamber also has done some research on the ease of the permitting process including a comparison of our permitting process compared to other cities which included out members and the process there. That has not been released. I am more than happy to get you that information but I believe what was being referred to as the Chamber report was the Planning Department survey.

Roy Buskirk: I stand corrected. When you gave that to me last Tuesday, I thought it was the Chamber's.

Joanie Howell: That was just for informational purposes and I wanted to make sure that it was known. I believe that it was mostly service oriented and before the building issues came out. The second issue that I wanted to clarify was that the Chamber stands in support of the co-location issue and as we move forward, does wholeheartedly favor looking at customer service issues and how we can make it as much one-stop as possible. Thank you.

ALLEN COUNTY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

Paula Hughes: Are there any other comments from the public?

Darren Vogt: Approval to waive the second reading on any matter approved today for which it may be deemed necessary for the County Council meeting of March 18, 2010.

Bob Armstrong: Second.

Paula Hughes: **All in favor please signify by saying aye. Opposed like sign. Motion carries.** The next meeting is May 20th. I look for a motion to adjourn.

Darren Vogt: Move to adjourn.

Bob Armstrong: Second.

Paula Hughes: **All in favor please signify by saying aye. Opposed like sign. The motion carries.**

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 10:28 a.m.