ALLEN COUNTY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES JUNE 16, 2016 8:30 AM

The Allen County Council met on Thursday, June 16, 2016 at 8:30 am in the Discussion Room at Citizens Square. 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: Joel M. Benz; Larry L. Brown; William E. Brown; Roy A. Buskirk; Tom A. Harris and Sharon L. Tucker. Robert A. Armstrong was absent.

Also Attending: Tera Klutz, Auditor; Nick Jordan, Chief Deputy Auditor; Jackie Scheuman, Budget and Finance Director and Becky Butler, Administrative Assistant.

The meeting was called to order by President Roy Buskirk with the Pledge of Allegiance and a moment of silent prayer.

Roy Buskirk: First we will have the unemployment rate and explanation.

Nick Jordan: Good morning, Council. On your agenda, you see the March and April non-seasonally adjusted figures. May is supposed to be released tomorrow. Allen County went from 5.2% to 4.6%. Indiana went from 5.5% to 4.8% and National went from 5.1% to 4.7%. Just to shed some light on the Allen County piece, the decrease is due to more employed and not a decrease in the labor force. That is one thing that we always want to be cognizant of. It is going down due to more people working compared to people leaving the labor force.

Roy Buskirk: Okay. Next we need approval of the minutes from May 19th.

Tom Harris: Move to approve the minutes from May 19, 2016.

Joel Benz: Second.

Roy Buskirk: All in favor signify by saying aye, opposed, same sign. The motion passes 5-0-2 (Bob Armstrong and Bill Brown were absent). Next is the financial report from Auditor Tera Klutz.

Tera Klutz: Good morning, Council. In your packet is the May 2016 financial statements and we are still tracking right on schedule. We have about 40% of the revenue in and about 40% of the year has gone by. We are wrapping up collections for the 2016 Spring Property Tax Settlement and it is looking like we collected about 50% of what we expect for the year and that is also right on track.

Roy Buskirk: Okay. Are there any questions?

Tom Harris: I usually look at the Miscellaneous Revenue and is there anything different on that one in terms of shocks or surprises or anything?

Tera Klutz: No, I reviewed those individually before this meeting and I did not see anything that would send concern that we would be short for the year or extremely over.

Tom Harris: Okay.

Roy Buskirk: Are there any other questions?

Tom Harris: I will move for approval.

Sharon Tucker: Second.

Roy Buskirk: All in favor say aye, those opposed, like sign. The motion passes 5-0-2 (Bob Armstrong and Bill Brown were absent). Next is Economic Development.

Scott Harrold: Scott Harrold with the Department of Planning Services and with me is Brent Miles from Northpoint Development. Just to go over the basics with you, this project is one that we have been talking to for a long time. They had purchased about 40 acres of land from the County Redevelopment Commission a couple of years ago. This year they came back, or actually last year, and said that they could use 40 more. The Redevelopment Commission just approved the sale of that land Tuesday and so they will have the property in their hands shortly. Northpoint is a company that works with other companies to provide services. Basically they tend to construct and build the building that someone else operates out of. For this project, we are looking at a pretty large warehousetype distribution facility. It will be about 791,000 square feet with the potential to add another couple thousand square feet in the future. It will look pretty much the same as the Nestle building with that same size and design. They are going to invest about \$32 million in the building. They are expecting to employ at least 200 people there. Again, the employment would probably be run by another company operating out of the building. Actually they anticipate a larger number. I told them to be conservative and it could well be more than that based on similar facilities and what they expect, it is probably a reasonable number. The tax abatement would save them \$2,850,000 over ten years. Basically, those are the main details. I'll let Brent give you some additional information.

Brent Miles: Good morning and again, I am Brent Miles and am owner and principle with Northpoint Development. We are located in Kansas City or actually a suburb of Kansas City, Riverside, Missouri. To give you a little background of our company and who you are doing business with, we are a nationwide industrial developer. We own about 20 million square feet which makes us in the top fifteen largest in the country. We have been in existence for four years and have built that 20 million square feet in the past four years. We are aggressive and have about eighty employees and we are employeeowned. I think that is important to the success of our company and for the project itself. We do this around the country and in Indiana this will be my second project. We did a

Page 2 of 65 June 16, 2016

741,000 square foot speculative building in a suburb of Indianapolis, Lebanon, Indiana. We own a million square footer in Columbus and I'm starting another 500,000 square foot building in Columbus and I am going there today after this hearing. We like this area in the proximity of the country. It is a safe investment environment and is important for us as we invest \$32 million. As Scott said, when we build and develop this specific project, it is for an undisclosed tenant. We have a tenant in tow dependent on this tax abatement and a couple of other items. That lease would be signed immediately. We are itching to get through today, get the lease signed and start grading immediately. We need to deliver this building and I always equate this to my wife that it is eighteen football fields under roof and we need to deliver this March to April timeframe. Over the coming months, you will see grading and all of a sudden you will drive by some day and there will be walls standing. That is typically how it goes. This will be concrete tilt, Class A and we have financing in place. We put 35% cash as a minimum on every deal from us as owners. We finance the other 65% and have a lender in place and are working on closing docs with that lender. The tenant, as Scott said, is undisclosed. We always say there are 400 parking spaces. You can suggest how many employees will be but at minimum there will be 200 employees at this facility. There will probably be double shifts and will be some overlap with the parking itself. It is a large employer. Once it is signed and everything, we will work with everyone's media team on an announcement and go through those procedures but we just cannot release it at this time. I would be happy to answer any questions that you may have.

Sharon Tucker: So the tenant that is coming and we can't know who it is, they will be the ones responsible for hiring?

Brent Miles: Yes.

Sharon Tucker: Do we know if this will be a new start-up or are they moving from another city to here?

Brent Miles: It will be an expansion.

Sharon Tucker: It will be an expansion. Will they be bringing staff with them or will it be complete new hires from our community?

Brent Miles: I don't know that. I honestly don't know that. Typically, with tenants like this is a mix. With an expansion, they typically would bring some that are already familiar with the facilities and put them into management positions and then have additional new hires on top of that. That is typical with the tenants that we work with. Scott made mention of the savings of \$2.8 million, this is a triple-net lease, if you know anything about industrial leasing. We don't, as developers, see that benefit. Thank you but that is a direct benefit to the company and the company is responsible for real estate taxes. That is a benefit to the company as opposed to a savings directly to us.

Page 3 of 65 June 16, 2016

Tom Harris: The 200 positions, is there a breakdown? I didn't necessarily catch that in here but a breakdown of what that 200 represents. We are probably not going to see those until next spring?

Brent Miles: What you would typically see with a tenant like this, and I will use March assuming that we have a really good winter, you would see a roof on the building and the asphalt is down. What you would see is a transition of racking and equipment and set-up. You would typically see 50 employees right off the bat. They are tooling and getting everything set up. They are getting logistics set and racking set and all of those things done. Then you typically see that wave of hiring happening somewhere between three and six months after that date. Management is somewhat in place, the next level down from management is in place and then they are hiring pure production workers at that point. To answer your question, second or third quarter of 2017 is when I would expect we hit that mark.

Tom Harris: Then the average wage was \$30,000?

Brent Miles: That is typical for this. It is an average and I think it will actually be higher but I wanted to be conservative. Hopefully when the announcement comes, there will be more detail on the actual wages from the company.

Roy Buskirk: Are there any other questions? I have a couple. The one concern I have is on the wages. It's almost that you are asking the Council the old chicken and the egg question because your points and everything else depends on employment and wages and the number of years that you are able to get the tax phase-in for.

Brent Miles: Sure.

Roy Buskirk: The one concern that I always have is the fact that \$30,000 is not much above the level for food stamps, rent assistance and everything else which would cost the County. If you take management out of there, we don't have the numbers that we really need to make a good decision on this. I figured, as I read these, you were probably leasing it out and might not even know who the tenant would be yet but I guess you do know.

Brent Miles: Yes, we do know.

Roy Buskirk: There is just information missing on the application which I wished was filled in. It would make it easier for us to make a decision on this.

Brent Miles: When you say missing, what is missing?

Roy Buskirk: For instance, what is the production worker on the floor being paid?

Brent Miles: I am sorry, I didn't see that.

Page 4 of 65 June 16, 2016

Roy Buskirk: You say \$30,000 average that means management and employees and the production employees. By the \$30,000 average, we don't know what they are going to receive.

Scott Harrold: Roy, with a facility of this size, you won't have more than two or three...

Roy Buskirk: It depends very much on the facility.

Scott Harrold: It is a distribution warehouse type of facility.

Roy Buskirk: We have passed some recent tax phase-ins which I thought the companies were very heavy on the management side. I realize that it does.

Scott Harrold: They are going to have to pay a competitive wage just to attract employees.

Roy Buskirk: The \$30,000 average is not.

Scott Harrold: Honestly, they were looking to do more of a spec-type thing but we don't really have a spec building program that would provide the abatement that a project this size that they should receive. I understand your concerns but since they aren't going to be running the facility, the best they could do was a yes and they were expecting more employees than this and I asked them to dial it back to make sure they can deliver that number.

Roy Buskirk: Okay. I know this is probably nitpicking but when you have benefits from the company, I guess they don't have sick leave or no paid vacation because it is not indicated on this form.

Scott Harrold: Like I said, they are really just providing the building for the tenant.

Roy Buskirk: But Scott, they know who the tenant is. I am sure there is communication between the tenant and them.

Scott Harrold: Right.

Tom Harris: Just to add to that the challenge of getting information on some of these abatements even though we may not be able to be told who the company is, how do we get more information to make a decision that would be great for the community? I think that is what Roy is pointing out. That challenge is going to continue as we see more opportunities coming into Allen County. We just have to rein that in a little bit and get better at that.

Sharon Tucker: I have another question that kind of feeds off Councilman Buskirk's line that he was asking. Scott, this is more for you, will the tenant come before us for an abatement for their personal property using the same employee count?

Page 5 of 65 June 16, 2016

Scott Harrold: They will likely come for personal property for equipment but by that point I am sure the numbers will be a lot firmer. Yes the tenant will come before you for personal property at some point. This is something that Northpoint has been working on for a while and honestly it has been very recently that they got a not a firm go ahead but enough so that they can start moving dirt.

Roy Buskirk: We need the information, Scott, and I don't care how long they have been working on it. They didn't provide us with the information.

Brent Miles: Sir, I am sorry and I apologize. I take responsibility. I was not aware that your tax abatement was absolutely tied to job creation. That is not typical for us. In Lebanon, for example, the abatement is the same schedule and the same SB-1 form and that is a spec building. I am going to Columbus today for a 15-year, 100% spec building. I apologize. We gave our best estimate and we work with this tenant across the country. I have done facilities just like this one across the country with them. I was extremely conservative in the information that I provided. I take responsibility for that and apologize if that isn't what you were looking for. I would be happy to provide more direct information from that tenant. I gave you a placeholder but I wasn't aware that it was a factor in your decision making.

Roy Buskirk: I appreciate your comments but the staff should have assisted you in the information that we normally ask for. As far as spec buildings, I am one that has been actively trying to come up with a way that we can give tax phase-ins for spec buildings and then turn it around if it is a new owner, give additional years. There needs to be some work done on that.

Brent Miles: I have communities struggle with that and I do this around the country and am not trying to sound smarter but the decision making projects on the spec buildings is something that communities struggle with. I hear what you are saying and the jobs are important to people. I will say that this is a large facility even with the tax abatement as you phase out of it, it is a large tax producer and we talk about the savings and no offense to Scott but let's flip the coin a little bit. You had nothing when it was owned by the Redevelopment Commission and you are giving up 50% of something that you never had. That is not meant to be argumentative. I always try to flip the coin a little bit to say look at how much it produces.

Roy Buskirk: I always say I would rather have something of nothing than nothing of nothing.

Brent Miles: Me too.

Roy Buskirk: People don't realize that in the second year, they are starting to pay taxes.

Brent Miles: That's right and we didn't even count construction jobs and things of that nature and even the engineers and those that we have hired locally. When you do a

Page 6 of 65 June 16, 2016

building of this size, the trades that are involved, it is a concrete and steel building. That is 80% of what the cost of this building is. These are well-trained people that build these buildings. Again, I think if we could disclose the tenant, you would rest assured. I haven't looked but I think they are probably a Fortune 10 or a Fortune 50 company.

Roy Buskirk: Are there any further questions?

Joel Benz: I just have a comment. Can we revisit this at some point and set something up as far as spec buildings? I appreciate your time. Do we vote on this or have them come back with more information at next month's meeting?

Roy Buskirk: Well, the construction season is upon us. Go ahead Tom.

Tom Harris: I will make a motion for consideration of a resolution, 2016-06-16-01 to approve the Statement of Benefits for NP Fort Wayne 40, LLC at the corner of Fogwell Parkway and Lafayette Center Road.

Joel Benz: Second.

Roy Buskirk: Is there any further discussion?

Sharon Tucker: I know you can't tell us the name but what product or what will they be doing?

Brent Miles: It is automotive related.

Sharon Tucker: Okay.

Roy Buskirk: They will be working with GM. All in favor say aye, those opposed, like sign. The motion passes 4-1(Tucker)-2 (Bob Armstrong and Bill Brown were absent).

Brent Miles: Thank you. I can go home now. I couldn't go home without approval.

Tom Harris: I would like to thank you for looking at us and I hope this is not your last opportunity for bringing additional things here.

Brent Miles: I think everyone will be proud of this when completed.

Rachel Black: My name is Rachel Black and I am with the Department of Planning Services. I believe we are going to move on to topic two?

Roy Buskirk: Yes.

Rachel Black: Before you today I will have a resolution to approve the 2016 pay 2017 Real and Personal Property Compliance of Statement of Benefit forms. Council's policy

Page 7 of 65 June 16, 2016

is that those forms are to be submitted by those that are receiving or eligible for abatement each year. In Exhibit A, you were given all of the companies that were in compliance based on staff's review. We had two companies that we found may not be in compliance. Scott was going to go over those two.

Tom Harris: What do you mean "may not be in compliance"? They are or they are not.

Scott Harrold: Technically they are not.

Tom Harris: All right, just checking.

Rachel Black: Scott can review those two with you.

Scott Harrold: Why don't you take care of the resolution first? There are three resolutions and the first one is to cover all of the ones that are in compliance. The two that aren't in compliance are the same ones from last year, Terex and R3 Composites and I will get to those next. The first one is basically just approving the compliance for all of the other companies. We provided you with a summary sheet with the numbers reported by the companies. There is also an exhibit of the first resolution listing all of the companies. Do you have any questions about that?

Tom Harris: I would like to make a comment. While we are critical sometimes of the companies, as we should be that do not meet the standards that they had promised, it is an impressive list of all of those that do. We shouldn't overlook the fact that all of these companies projected and anticipated certain kinds of growth and what they could produce for the community and they are doing it. That's impressive.

Roy Buskirk: And sometimes there economic reasons that the company has not been able to attain what they had talked about. One thing that would be kind of interesting on the two companies that did not attain, if the numbers were run with what they did attain, would they still be in the same category? I am not sure if it is the number of employees or what it is that they did not obtain but with the employees that they did obtain, how much would that change on the numbering system as far as their qualifications? So we really have to depend somewhat on your recommendations.

Tom Harris: Do we need to pass these separately?

Scott Harrold: Yes.

Roy Buskirk: This will be just on the personal property one.

Scott Harrold: The first one is a resolution approving 2016 pay 2017 real and personal property compliance with Statement of Benefit forms. That is just for all of the ones that were in compliance based upon our review. We can deal with the two other companies separately.

Page 8 of 65 June 16, 2016

Tom Harris: That letter is the same as it was last year? No significant differences?

Scott Harrold: Right.

Tom Harris: I will make a motion for consideration of resolution regarding the compliance with the Statement of Benefits for companies that received tax phase-ins from Allen County Council.

Sharon Tucker: Second.

Roy Buskirk: Do we need the resolution number?

Becky Butler: Yes.

Roy Buskirk: Yes, Tom.

Nick Jordan: It is on page 37.

Tom Harris: 2016-06-16-02.

Roy Buskirk: Is that the motion you were seconding?

Sharon Tucker: Yes, sir.

Roy Buskirk: All in favor say aye, those opposed, like sign. The motion passes 5-0-2 (Bob Armstrong and Bill Brown absent).

Tom Harris: Now the non-compliance.

Scott Harrold: Again, these are companies that have had issues for years. The next one was a resolution determining substantial non-compliance for Terex Advanced Mixer. This was a project from over ten years ago. There is just a little bit left because they are in the last years. This is a company that produces cement mixing trucks and as you recall, sometime after it was approved, the economy went into a tailspin. No one was building houses and no one was buying mixing trucks and they struggled and went through bankruptcy. Just the fact that they are still operating is probably a blessing. They have improved from last year. They had 183 employees, not last year but in 2014, and in 2015 they were up to 214. They added 31 people but that is still a little short of what they had ten years or so ago. Basically, all this resolution would do is to say that you want them to come to your next meeting and provide additional information. Like I said, this isn't a new story and so it is up to you if you want to bring them in or not. You would take final action at that meeting.

Roy Buskirk: So with passing this resolution, what are we actually doing?

Page 9 of 65 June 16, 2016

Scott Harrold: You are just saying that you find them in substantial non-compliance and you want them to come to a hearing to provide additional information. At that point, you will take final action.

Joel Benz: We did this last year.

Roy Buskirk: Yeah, with a couple of them.

Tom Harris: And they can choose to either come to the hearing or simply not.

Scott Harrold: Right.

Tom Harris: And then based on that we can make a decision.

Scott Harrold: Right.

Roy Buskirk: Okay, is there any further discussion?

Sharon Tucker: I will make a motion that we have a resolution determining substantial non-compliance with a Statement of Benefits for 2016 for Terex Advanced Mixer and the resolution number is 2016-06-16-03.

Larry Brown: Second.

Roy Buskirk: All in favor say aye, those opposed, like sign. The motion passes 5-0-2 (Bob Armstrong and Bill Brown absent).

Scott Harrold: The last one is R3 Composites. They actually came in last year and talked to you. Basically when Mr. Carver bought the building and was looking to start business here in Allen County, he thought he had a customer for his product. They ended up backing out and so he really had to start over. He might have been a little optimistic on his employment numbers but based on what he thought he had at that time, he didn't have them. They are up to 125 employees as of last year. That is up about nine from the prior year. They have been able to secure some customers but not at the level that they originally anticipated. Again, the resolution would just ask them to come to the next meeting and update you on their progress and you can make a decision at that time.

Tom Harris: If the compliance is not met, just help us understand what happens if we choose not to approve the process. They simply don't receive the abatement for this year.

Scott Harrold: Right. I think there is also the possibility that you could rescind it for the rest of the time.

Tom Harris: We have generally just done it for a year at a time.

Scott Harrold: Yeah.

Page 10 of 65 June 16, 2016

Joel Benz: Did you go out last year to visit them?

Tom Harris: Yeah.

Sharon Tucker: Did they show up before us last year?

Scott Harrold: Yes.

Joel Benz: I think we need to have them come in and talk to us again. I will make a motion that we have a resolution determining substantial non-compliance with a Statement of Benefits for 2016 for R3 Composites and the resolution number is 2016-06-16-04.

Larry Brown: Second.

Roy Buskirk: Is there any further discussion?

Sharon Tucker: I have an additional question. They were non-compliant last year and again this year and what were the improvements they made between last year and this year?

Scott Harrold: They have added to their employment but I don't think they have invested any additional money. It was a personal property abatement as the building had been constructed many years ago by a previous owner.

Sharon Tucker: So making sure I understand before I am casting my vote, this will bring them hopefully in front of us again to decide whether or not we will grant continued...

Scott Harrold: Right.

Tom Harris: I will add just one more piece. I was sitting in the meetings in Grabill when they were having discussions about this vacant building costing numerous amounts of money for that community because there were all kinds of infrastructure problems. To be able to see this organization get in there and actually make a difference, it has been a positive for the community of Grabill. The challenge is, as it always is, should we give them a tax break based on what they promise. I agree we should bring them back but all in all it has been a positive thing for that community.

Roy Buskirk: This is another one that I would like to see the numbers ran on the number of employees that they have and everything and if it really makes a difference on the bottom line.

Tom Harris: Right.

Page 11 of 65 June 16, 2016

Roy Buskirk: All in favor say aye, those opposed, like sign. The motion passes 5-0-2 (Bob Armstrong and Bill Brown absent). Now we have the Sheriff's Department.

Dave Gladieux: Good morning, Council I am Dave Gladieux of the Sheriff's Department.

John Feighner: John Feighner of Haller and Colvin.

Brad Kohrman: Brad Kohrman, Deputy Chief of Administration.

Roy Buskirk: If you want to go to what Mr. Feighner needs to participate in because I know he has a phone call that he has to get to.

John Feighner: Thank you. It is a multi-party hearing in Federal Court and instead of being in Hammond, Indiana, I get to stay here but I have to call in. That is a real benefit, as you all can imagine. We are here today because of the Myatt litigation which you are all familiar with. That was the class action lawsuit that was actually tried in January of 2015. The settlement, per the court order and the verdict, has been fully paid in this sense. All of the funds that we appropriated for the judgement for general damages have been processed through the Auditor's Office. We are using a company in Indianapolis to actually contact, by mail and other efforts. Many of the people, as of about a month ago, had about 50% of that settlement actually received and cashed. Each individual member of the class, there were 962, you have to get the check to them and they have the right to be paid. We have done everything by agreement with the Court to facilitate that but there are still a number of people that have not yet received the checks and cashed them. The reasons for that are administrative, not at the County's end, but the money has to stay available because the judgment can last as long as twenty years. That is the first report. The second report is there were a number of people who have made claims that went to mediation for additional damages like lost wages, medical bills, counseling or things like that. All of those cases went through two mediations and have been resolved for a very nominal amount, anywhere from \$100 to \$200. I think the highest was about \$800. Those have been paid through the Indemnification Fund. The plaintiff's attorney continued to work on the case after the verdict and so for the two mediations, court hearings and other issues that we've worked through, the Court granted the second petition for attorney fees. We have to pay it. It is a judgment and was the same method of calculation. I went through the petition personally and compared the work that Spencer Feighner and I did and it was a fair petition. So the total amount is \$40,409.26. We are asking that it be an appropriation from the General Fund which is the same process and procedure that we used before with the judgment. This is the second judgment. There is only one case, and it is a small case of one person who has not agreed to settle, and that will either be resolved and accepting of the offer of \$500 that was made to him or there will be a trial. I don't anticipate that it is going to be significant. That will be handled under the Indemnification Fund. From our point of view for the Sheriff, I can tell you that this will be the last and second appropriation that we are seeking. We do have an order from a Federal Judge to pay it.

Page 12 of 65 June 16, 2016

Tom Harris: Just a question in terms of what is the total tally? I believe we passed an amount last year and this added to that comes to how much?

John Feighner: There were two components and I apologize, I should have that in my mind. Roughly the attorney fees were \$265,000 and so this would take it up to about \$300,000. The verdict amounts for the 962 people totaled about \$360,000 and we have paid about 50% of that as of May 2nd.

Nick Jordan: Last year it was \$637,842. If you add the \$40,000 it is \$677,000.

Tom Harris: And then the \$40,000, the fund that you referred to cannot cover this amount?

John Feighner: It should not, for two reasons. One is that this is an extraordinary case and was certainly not business as usual. There are pending cases now and if you were to pay it out of the Indemnification Fund, they would be back asking for an additional appropriation this year because we would run out of money.

Roy Buskirk: If there is any excess money in that does it come back to...

Nick Jordan: The line we have on the agenda today is in the General Fund. If it was for this particular instance, there won't be because it is a Court ordered judgment and so it is down to the cents.

Roy Buskirk: I am not asking about the \$40,000.

Nick Jordan: The payments to the former inmates will sit in that fund for up to twenty years, as John had said.

John Feighner: I think it is likely that most of them will show up in the next year but I don't know that. We had one person who has passed away and so the check is going to be reissued to the estate I think for \$800.

Nick Jordan: People have called from Chicago and said they were going to come and pick it up and haven't. There are unique instances.

Roy Buskirk: I am sure there is. So we can move forward on this, I will entertain a motion.

Tom Harris: I will make a motion for the appropriation in the Sheriff's County General fund in the Settlement of Claims in the amount of \$40,410.

Joel Benz: Second.

Roy Buskirk: All in favor say aye, those opposed, like sign. The motion passes 5-0-2 (Bob Armstrong and Bill Brown absent).

Page 13 of 65 June 16, 2016

John Feighner: Thank you, Council. As an accommodation to me, if you accelerate the last item on your agenda is the second amendment to the interlocal governmental cooperation agreement for the Combined Communications. Sheriff Gladieux serves on that as well as Chief of Police for the City, the Chief of the Fire Department and Commissioner Nelson Peters. The process in the agreement was that for the first few years we met monthly and we needed to do so. The Board thinks, quite correctly, things are running smoothly and we don't need to have four department heads meeting monthly. To meet every two months is sufficient and we can always have a special meeting, if we need to. They passed a resolution which was then presented to the Mayor, the Board of Commissioners and to City Council and they have all approved the amendment. All it says is they meet six times a year instead of twelve times a year. It is not a material change other than it is required that you also approve it. There is a signature line on the last for your approval as well. I will ask that a couple of copies be signed if it meets with your approval.

Nick Jordan: It is on page 109 of your notebook.

Tom Harris: You said to meet four times a year or six instead of four?

John Feighner: Six instead of twelve. We were meeting monthly.

Roy Buskirk: That will cut down on the per diem cost.

Dave Gladieux: My overtime too.

Joel Benz: I will make a motion to amend the interlocal agreement for the operation of the Joint Communications Department between Allen County and the City of Fort Wayne reducing the number of meetings from twelve to six.

Sharon Tucker: Second.

Roy Buskirk: All in favor say aye, those opposed, like sign. The motion passes 5-0-2 (Bob Armstrong and Bill Brown absent).

John Feighner: Thank you very much. Hopefully we won't be back for litigation for a long time. The same government with fewer meetings and that is a good thing.

Roy Buskirk: Going back, the Training Center Expansion.

Dave Gladieux: This project has been going on for quite some time and the purpose of it is to remove all of my equipment that is left at the Byron Station with the exception of the K-9 Facility. We want to move down to the Adams Center and Paulding. My request is to appropriate the funds out of the Federal Asset Seizure Fund. This is not tax money but from seizure of funds from illegal activity. My request of \$298,000 is to cover that project.

Page 14 of 65 June 16, 2016

Tom Harris: If I can ask a couple of questions, Sheriff, you have a balance of \$847,000 in that fund right now.

Dave Gladieux: If you say so.

Tom Harris: What else do you consider, in other words you leave money in that fund for these kinds of things? Do you have any anticipation to use that in certain ways?

Dave Gladieux: These kinds of things. I am going to come before you next month to do a request to make a move on the K-9 Training facility. I plan on putting some funds from that towards that project in anticipation that you guys will be so happy to throw some funds that way as well. No smiles on anyone's face that I can see. I can supplement vehicle purchases and those kinds of things. If you remember, close to 60% of the vehicles are paid for out of funds other than tax funds.

Tom Harris: For the public to understand, you have to move equipment and materials and such from one location because you are making changes to an existing piece of property and you are using the bad guys' money to pay for it.

Dave Gladieux: Yes. The location is the Byron Complex that we are going to have to vacate eventually. While the funds are up, we might as well do it now. I am not asking for any appropriation from the taxpayers or anything like that.

Roy Buskirk: Sheriff, one thing you might mention, and I read in the last week or so, we received some Federal drug funds and many people see that amount and think whoopee. The fact is that it is very limited as to the items that the money can be spent on.

Dave Gladieux: It is very similar to the Commissary Fund. It can't be used for salaries. It can only be used for training and equipment and police related operational cost.

Roy Buskirk: That training and vehicles can only be drug...

Dave Gladieux: No, I can use that to purchase other vehicles as well.

Roy Buskirk: Okay.

Dave Gladieux: And I have done so and will continue as long as we are taking money off the streets from the bad guys.

Larry Brown: Dave, did I read that the percentage distribution changed and the County is not getting what they once did?

Dave Gladieux: No. There was a suspension in the Federal Equitable Sharing Program. They suspended it for about three months. They did that back in 2011. The best way to

Page 15 of 65 June 16, 2016

explain it was they just froze things because they spent money in other places. That is all I will say about that.

Brad Kohrman: It was so they could balance their books and then start back up.

Dave Gladieux: They did that and it lasted about three months and they started it right back up again which is what we anticipated. As far as the percentage that we get in a case, it depends on the number of Officers that I have on the case and it depends on if it our Officers' case. Is it a shared case with another agency? It is always split with the Feds 80/20 with 80% to Law Enforcement and 20% to the Feds. The 80% can be split up different ways depending on whose case it was and things like that. Some cases we get a lot and some cases we share quite a bit.

Roy Buskirk: So 20% goes to the Feds and then the 80% is all of the other Law Enforcement.

Dave Gladieux: If they are involved. The Safe Streets Task Force consists of Fort Wayne Officers, State Police and us. I have three people there. If the City only has two or one, my cut is going to be a little bit bigger than theirs.

Tom Harris: With that I will make a motion for the appropriation in the Federal Asset Seizure Fund 206 in the amount of \$298,000 for the Training Center Expansion.

Sharon Tucker: I will second that.

Roy Buskirk: All in favor say aye, those opposed, like sign. The motion passes 5-0-2 (Bob Armstrong and Bill Brown absent). The next one is still with you and HR.

Tracy Mitchener: Good morning, Tracy Mitchener, Assistant HR Director.

Dawn Kennedy: Dawn Kennedy, Compensation Specialist. Today we are here to discuss the addition of a B of I Clerk. It will be an OSS 4, at \$32,720, non-exempt. This was moved from Personnel Committee to full Council for discussion. There are no salary changes and it is already an established position. The Sheriff's Department is here to discuss why they would like to add this position.

Roy Buskirk: Sheriff, would you like to introduce her?

Keisha Johnson: I am Keisha Johnson, Supervisor of the Bureau of Identification.

Dave Gladieux: I am going to let Chief Kohrman explain since he went in front of the Personnel Committee on this.

Brad Kohrman: First I would like to say that this request is being made in partnership with the Allen Superior Court. Right off the bat, Judge Gull wished she could have been here this morning and was at the Personnel Committee meeting but she is tied up with

Page 16 of 65 June 16, 2016

several sentencing. The workload of our Bureau of Identification has increased substantially over the past couple of years. The way that the Judge explained this is that there has been a change in State statute. Previously, the only misdemeanant arrests that needed to be processed by the Bureau of Identification were done upon conviction. If you want more detail, I will have to let Keisha tall you because I have a very rudimentary understanding of this. There is a State tracking system of people going through the system. Under the old statute with people being processed by the B of I were convictions, they were losing a lot of people in the tracking of all of the people that were arrested. They changed the statute and now it has been mandated that everyone arrested for misdemeanant now needs to be processed by B of I. I can tell you from personal experience that there are times when I go to meet with Keisha for some reason there are 12 or 13 people backed up at the counter because they are all sent down from Misdemeanor Court. To give you an idea of the numbers, Keisha put some numbers together when this started and in 2014, they had to process and additional 384 people. In 2015, it increased to 965 which is 151% increase. Going by the numbers of the first four months of this year, they had processed already 358. If you extrapolate that out to the end of the year, it would be 1,432. That would be an additional 48% increase. The workload is unbelievable. I was talking to Keisha this morning and anytime something like the thing that happened in Orlando, our gun permits go through the roof. We are just starting to see that start up. She only has three full-time staff members in addition to herself currently. We have looked every way that we could to make up the difference but from our HR perspective, she is making tremendous use of volunteers and I believe she is averaging almost 100 hours a month in volunteers. They can't do the technical things but they do a lot of the clerical things. She is maximizing the use of the volunteers on that. We attempted to see if a part-time position would do it but when you look at the numbers, it is taking an average of 33 minutes per the extra processes we are doing now. We ultimately have come to the point that we need an additional clerk down there. The Judge is in full agreement and actually said that this isn't going to get any better. The way the numbers are tracking with 151% increase and 48% increase the numbers are only going to keep growing. That is why we come to you for this additional Clerk.

Roy Buskirk: Keisha, do you have anything to add?

Keisha Johnson: No, he pretty much covered everything.

Tom Harris: Just a couple of comments. One is as we talked about this in the Personnel Committee, I wasn't as in favor of helping those that broke the law by simply making it more and more convenient for them to get processed but the piece of more and more individual citizens coming for gun permits, either case, the lines are backing up. I guess the challenge I would have is to figure out ways to improve that system and not just add getting busier and busier. I don't know the answer and you will figure it out maybe. It is just a challenge for you. I think Personnel Committee was in favor of it. I would make a motion for consideration of a salary ordinance establishing the pay for the B of I Clerk, OSS 4/2, \$32,720 and non-exempt.

Joel Benz: I'll second that.

Page 17 of 65 June 16, 2016

Roy Buskirk: All in favor say aye, those opposed, like sign. The motion passes 5-0-2 (Bob Armstrong and Bill Brown absent). Next is the salary ordinance for the Confinement Officer.

Dawn Kennedy: I can go ahead and introduce it if you would like.

Dave Gladieux: Go ahead.

Dawn Kennedy: The next two positions are part of a restructuring in the Jail. The first position is a Confinement Officer that is currently vacant going from POLE 3/2, \$36,686 to a Resident Advisor, which will be in Work Release, POLE 4/7, \$54,468. This will be retroactive to June 6, 2016. This was also passed by Personnel Committee.

Tom Harris: I guess I will start. Sheriff, if you could talk briefly without any major details, how this came about.

Dave Gladieux: I guess the best way to put it is that we decided to go a different direction with regards to the two top positions at the Jail. Since the beginning of time, we have had Officers running that facility and probably back three Sheriffs ago, they went to a civilian. It was not necessarily a bad idea but I think it has been quite a challenge on the top tier, as far as civilians running that facility. This move is to go back in time a little bit and put Officers in charge of the facility. The number of civilians will stay the same as far as the workforce but I think it is important from an operational standpoint that they be Officers and understand law enforcement and understand the Court system a little bit better and the running of a secured facility.

Roy Buskirk: So this is just one position.

Dave Gladieux: It is two. One position is being moved to Work Release in a lower paid position.

Dawn Kennedy: The position that they are moving to at Work Release is an established position. They already have a few of those Resident Advisor positions over there. As far as pay or duties go, I have no concerns as far as the classification. I will go ahead and introduce the second one. This one is your addendum. That position will be going from a Civilian Jail Commander which is a SPECIAL OCCUPATION at \$72,986, exempt at 40 hours a week to a Captain, Sworn Officer, \$60,578, non-exempt at 40 hours a week. That was also passed at Personnel Committee.

Roy Buskirk: Just so that I understand, the second one is going from a civilian to a Sworn Officer. It will be going from PERF to Sheriff's Retirement.

Dave Gladieux: Yes but it will be a current employee that is already getting those benefits.

Page 18 of 65 June 16, 2016

Nick Jordan: They are hiring internally.

Roy Buskirk: I understand that. The cost was the civilian position on PERF and now that position will be filled by a Sworn Officer which would be on the Sheriff's Retirement Plan which is a little over 30% that it costs the County.

Dave Gladieux: You are already paying for that individual.

Roy Buskirk: But he is in a different position and that position is costing more.

Nick Jordan: What Roy is trying to get at is that currently the Jail Commander is a civilian and there is no Sworn Officer pension and when you move him to a Sworn Officer position, you are going to hire another to the Sworn Officer pension. You are keeping the same number of Sworn Officers and so you will have one more on the Sworn Officer pension.

Dave Gladieux: Yes that is true. You have a combined salary of \$140,000 with two people and one is gone completely and one is being demoted severely and so there is a cost savings there. I don't have the exact numbers but there is a cost savings. Under the first position, there are no additional employees. For the second one, yes, it will eventually filter down to where that position will have to be filled by a brand new Policeman at obviously a lower rate than what he was making.

Roy Buskirk: Again, on the first one that was presented, the Resident Advisor, is that a Sworn Officer?

Dave Gladieux: That is a civilian.

Roy Buskirk: So there is the opposite effect.

Nick Jordan: No, the Assistant Jail Commander was a civilian and is still a civilian as a Resident Advisor.

Brad Kohrman: She was basically demoted to Work Release.

Roy Buskirk: Right, gotcha.

Tom Harris: I would just like to make mention, in my perspective, this is a big change in the Sheriff's Department. It is a strategic change in putting a Sworn Officer over the Jail. What I spoke to the Sheriff about is that we have watched litigation come up through the Jail for various reasons and this strategic change, I think should be challenged to reduce litigation over time. He is looking for different kinds of leadership in the Jail and the outcome of that will be in the hopes of more efficient process in a Jail operation. That will ultimately cost the County less if it is done the way he wants it done. For that reason, I was going to make a motion for consideration of the salary ordinance on this first one

Page 19 of 65 June 16, 2016

reclassifying a Confinement Officer, POLE 3/2, \$36,686 to Resident Advisor, POLE 4/7, \$54,468. This is retroactive to June 6, 2016.

Joel Benz: I think that is a very strong argument and I will second it.

Roy Buskirk: All in favor please signify by saying aye. The motion passes 6-0-1 (Bob Armstrong was absent). Next is the one on the addendum.

Tom Harris: I will make a motion for consideration of a salary ordinance reclassifying the Civilian Jail Commander, SPEC OCC, \$72,986, exempt, 40 hours per week to Sworn Officer Captain, \$60,578, non-exempt, 40 hours a week.

Joel Benz: I will also second that.

Larry Brown: Does that need to have an effective date?

Becky Butler: It is effective today.

Tera Klutz: It is effective today unless otherwise noted.

Roy Buskirk: All in favor please signify by saying aye. The motion passes 6-0-1 (Bob Armstrong was absent).

Dave Gladieux: I would like to take the opportunity to thank the Personnel Committee for taking the phone calls because I know you guys only meet every couple of months and this was a difficult time at the Jail. I appreciate your insight and understanding. Thank you very much. And thanks to HR, of course.

Roy Buskirk: Next we have the Prosecutor.

Karen Richards: Good morning, Karen Richards, Allen County Prosecuting Attorney.

Robyn Niedzwiecki: Robyn Niedzwiecki, Chief of Staff in the Prosecutor's Office.

Dawn Kennedy: I can go ahead and introduce it, if you'd like. The next two positions are just additional Adult Protective Services Investigators. They are SPEC OCC from \$38,000 to \$42,000, 37.5 hours a week and non-exempt. They would like to make this retroactive to May 31, 2016. This was approved at Personnel Committee and one position is already grant funded.

Karen Richards: These are two positions that are basically the same but one I would like the line item for it but it is probably not going to be filled for a while until the grant funding comes in for it if it ever does. The other position is already filled and so one position needs to go back to May 31, 2016. This is grant money that comes directly from the State and funds our Adult Protective Services Program. I would be glad to give you more details on it if you would like them.

Page 20 of 65 June 16, 2016

Roy Buskirk: If you want more details, you can call Karen after the meeting.

Karen Richards: Or you, Roy.

Roy Buskirk: Is there any further discussion? Go for it, Tom.

Tom Harris: I was going to mention that we had a thorough discussion at the Personnel Committee meeting and was in favor of both of these. I will move for consideration of a salary ordinance establishing the pay for two Adult Protective Services Investigators, SPEC OCC, \$38,000 to \$42,000, 37.5 hours per week and non-exempt and retroactive to May 31, 2016. Also move to approve the permission to apply for the 2016 Victims of Crime Act (VOCA) Assistance Grant.

Bill Brown: Second.

Roy Buskirk: Is there any discussion on the grant?

Karen Richards: Just so you know we have had this grant for the past year and it has already been funded and this is the re-upping of that grant. It provides for an Investigator to work with domestic victims in Misdemeanor Court. It also provides a Victims Assistant person to work with me on my Adult Protective Criminal cases.

Roy Buskirk: All in favor please signify by saying aye. The motion passes 6-0-1 (Bob Armstrong was absent). Next is Youth Services.

Chris Dunn: Chris Dunn with Youth Service Center. I am here to fix a mistake that we made. We had a position approved in April and we failed to have the funds to pay the person that was approved. I am back to ask you to approve that to be appropriated.

Tom Harris: I didn't hear that. You had a position...

Chris Dunn: The position was approved at the Council meeting in April however the funds were not approved.

Joel Benz: I think we thoroughly discussed this previously and if no one has any objections, I will go ahead and make the motion that we approve the appropriation in YSC General Fund in the amount of \$19,051 for Youth Care Worker, \$1,458 for FICA and \$500 for Match 401A for a total of \$21,009.

Larry Brown: Second.

Roy Buskirk: All in favor please signify by saying aye. The motion passes 6-0-1 (Bob Armstrong was absent). ACJC is up.

Page 21 of 65 June 16, 2016

Chandra Reichert: Good morning, Chandra Reichert, Allen County Juvenile Center Personnel Manager. I have come before you this morning to request a salary ordinance for two additional Probation Officers. We are not asking for this to go into effect this year. We are actually requesting that the salary ordinance be made effective for the 2017 budget. We are trying to get a little further ahead in our budget process and figured we would come to you now and ask for permission for the positions in the event that we don't necessarily have to come to the table during the budget hearing process.

Nick Jordan: There is nothing in your packet. The 2017 salary ordinance will not be approved until October. They are just getting approval to get it into their budget so that it doesn't fly in under the radar.

Roy Buskirk: Okay. You are eliminating a couple of other positions at ACJC.

Chandra Reichert: Yes that is correct. We will not be filling two Youth Care Worker positions in order to fund the two new Probation Officer positions. This is an additional shift in the services that we are providing as we continue to reduce detention numbers trying to provide those community services prior to our outside of detention. That is what this will be for. We will be eliminating some of the staffing that we have in our facility while increasing other types of supervision.

Roy Buskirk: I think it is pretty easy to see as you reduce the detention numbers you kind of increase the probation numbers.

Chandra Reichert: Correct. They have to be supervised one way or another and it is just the location of where they are supervised.

Rov Buskirk: I will entertain a motion.

Bill Brown: I will make a motion for approval of two additional Probation Officers, UPROB 1, \$32,571 and non-exempt to be included in the 2017 salary ordinance.

Sharon Tucker: Second.

Roy Buskirk: All in favor please signify by saying aye. The motion passes 6-0-1 (Bob Armstrong was absent). Circuit Court is up next.

Eric Zimmerman: Eric Zimmerman, Court Administrator for Allen Circuit Court and Chief Probation Officer for the Adult Probation Department. Judge Felts is on his way over and so he may join us at any moment. We are here this morning to request salary ordinances for three additional Probation Officers. These were granted through the Indiana Department of Corrections 1006 grant. As you may recall, we were here roughly six to seven months ago with news that we had received two grant positions. Those grant positions are now filled. As part of this process, there is a second-year grant that covered the first year money but also allowed for us to request additional funds. Adult Probation and Community Corrections worked very closely together on this and I know they are on

Page 22 of 65 June 16, 2016

the agenda this morning with their grant awards as well. We received three Probation Officer positions as part of this grant and let me just reiterate for you and the public that these are additions to the base Community Corrections grant. Just as the Allen County Community Corrections has received DOC funding for the last 23 years or more, this is anticipated to just come every grant cycle with the Indiana Department of Corrections. Often with grant funding, it seems to be every other year or each year you have to make additional requests. Certainly we will have some performance measures that we will have to meet just as Community Corrections does every year. For your information, we were granted health benefit costs and any ancillary cost associated with that employee. It could be office furniture and those kinds of things were also put in there so we would attempt as best as we could to have a zero net effect on the taxpayers locally. I will certainly entertain any questions that you may have.

Roy Buskirk: So, these three new Probation Officers are covered by a State grant.

Eric Zimmerman: Correct.

Tom Harris: The other point to that, Eric, thank you for pointing out that those funds will pay for things like the office and such. As we talked, they will pay for the benefit of healthcare as well but if those people that are brought on end up costing a lot to the healthcare plan, that doesn't necessarily. There is a potential risk.

Roy Buskirk: Counterpoint, Tom, if their health isn't very good, they won't be retained as a Probation Officer.

Eric Zimmerman: I will say that these are entry level positions and are generally fresh out of school.

Tom Harris: My point was simply a financial one that there is some potential cost but all of that said, it is a good thing that the State is recognizing that and this floor has now been raised in terms of what we would anticipate for funding each year for Adult Probation. Judge, did you have anything to add?

Tom Felts: Vote yes, please.

Tom Harris: Personnel Committee was in favor of this and with that I will make a motion for consideration of a salary ordinance establishing the pay for three Probation Officers, UPRO 1, \$32,571 and non-exempt. This will be effective July 1, 2016. **Joel Benz**: I will second that.

Roy Buskirk: All in favor please signify by saying aye. The motion passes 6-0-1 (Bob Armstrong was absent). Thank you, Judge, Superior Court.

John McGauley: Good morning, Council members. I am John McGauley, Court Administrator for Superior Court.

Page 23 of 65 June 16, 2016

Leslie Blevins: Leslie Blevins, Financial Coordinator.

John McGauley: Before I get started, there is an item on the agenda today that Judge Pratt wanted me to let you know why he is not here. He in in Indianapolis doing some training on legislation that he helped author. Allen County is one of five pilot Counties in the State of Indiana doing some important work in this area and I can give you more details if you like but he is down there today. The item was presented to the Personnel Committee and he explained why he wouldn't be here but he wanted me to repeat that he is not happy that he couldn't be here today to present. We have a lot of numbers on your agenda today but overall we are asking for a net reduction in what we are spending right now of about \$20,000. Our first item is we are trying to repair what could generously be described as a dilapidated office in the Misdemeanor and Traffic Division. When we hired Magistrate Jason Custer, he moved into an office that is old pressboard shelves and a metal desk and could be generously described as dilapidated. We went out to the market to price some office furniture and it was about twice what we are asking for today. We have basically gone to the County Maintenance Department to have them do some builtin cabinets and desk that would work for him. That is what the \$2,380 is for. The \$12,474, we are asking for the appropriation of money that Parkview Hospital basically handed to us. We didn't have to apply for a grant and they basically came to us and said that the system that we currently use to do teleconferencing between their doctors and our Courts in the case of mental health hearings that Judge Avery does is old and state-of- art when we put it in but now prone to break down. Parkview came to us and said that we should go out and get a quote to replace this and we will pay for it. It is to replace an audio and television system that we use on the first floor for mental health hearings.

Joel Benz: If I could point out too, in the fixture part that is just the cost of materials.

John McGauley: The Building Maintenance Department is going to do the work. I can continue, the \$6,000 in Extra Deputy Hire and FICA is actually for an ICLEO Grant funded position. It is a summer internship and is eight weeks of working in Judge Davis' office. It is the Indiana Conference for Legal Education Opportunity and it provides grants to a few Counties around the State trying to increase diversity in the Bar. This is our second year and we are bringing in a Clerk basically trying to give opportunities to minorities or otherwise disadvantaged law students. We have hired a gentleman by the name of Demarcus Mohammed. He is from Fort Wayne and his entire family is from Fort Wayne and he is a student at Indiana Tech Law School. I think he is a second-year law student. He is working with us through the end of July. This is again a case where the State of Indiana looked at what we are doing in this area and we had a similar position last summer that was a tremendous success. The student that was involved got a lot out of it. Judge Davis serves with Chief Justice Loretta Rush on the ICLEO Board in Indianapolis. For the second year in a row, Allen County is one of two Counties in the State that got this position funded. We got this money a few weeks ago and are just looking to get that appropriated so we can pay the gentleman.

Roy Buskirk: And the grant amount was \$6,000?

Page 24 of 65 June 16, 2016

John McGauley: Yes, \$6,000.

Roy Buskirk: For eight weeks?

John McGauley: Yes. He started the second week of June and is here through the end of

July.

Larry Brown: Do you want to add item 6?

Roy Buskirk: Yeah.

John McGauley: This is a position that is currently a Supervisor in our Family Relations Division. The incumbent, Kathleen Rusher, is UPROB 8. She has been with us for a number of years and is currently making a little less than \$70,000 a year. She is retiring after a long career with the County and we believe it would be best for us and for the organizational structure of the Court to get this off the UPROB grid and put it in the PAT grid. This is a position that supervises six employees, involved in a great deal of grant writing and administration. Kathleen has estimated for me that she works about ten hours above her time because she is frequently coming in before 8:00 and staying until after 5:00 because if you have ever been in our building on certain days you will know that Family Court goes frequently past 4:30 and sometimes even longer. She has to stay there even after the employees are gone. Instead of continuing that as a UPROB position and costing us quite a bit, we have asked the Personnel Committee earlier this month to let us reclassify that down to PAT 5 exempt. They approved that for us a couple of weeks ago. Not everyone who comes in on the UPROB grid would be making that much but it is easily a reduction no matter how you look at it. It would be a day one reduction for us of about \$22,000 dollars.

Dawn Kennedy: My recommendation for that position was to be a PAT 4. This would ensure equity within the department. I have not reviewed all of Superior Court and all of their positions. I would be open to reconsidering the classification but as I see it right now, it is a PAT 4. To give you a heads-up, there was a disagreement.

Roy Buskirk: Why don't we go ahead and have a motion on the first five.

Joel Benz: I will make a motion that we approve the appropriation reduction in County Council General Fund in the amount of \$14,854 and appropriate into Superior Court General Fund, Furniture and Fixtures for \$2,380 and in Miscellaneous Capital for \$12,474 for a total of \$14,854. Also move for approval for an appropriation in Legal Education Opportunity Fund 850 for Extra Deputy for \$5,625 and FICA for \$375 for a total of \$6,000.

Sharon Tucker: Second.

Page 25 of 65 June 16, 2016

Roy Buskirk: All in favor please signify by saying aye. The motion passes 6-0-1 (Bob Armstrong was absent). Now, let's go back to item six that we were discussing the classification on that.

John McGauley: I will add just a couple of things here. This is not to indicate any dispute with HR. They have been great and have helped us do a lot of really important things in the last couple of years to redesign the Family Relations Division. They have agreed with us in every way and we have disagreed about this much on this particular item. In our minds, PAT 5 is justified because of the supervision requirements, the grant writing and the administration requirements. We found one case in Criminal Division Services of another individual that was re-classed off the UPROB grid and wound up in a PAT 5 classification and has no supervision requirements. There is a PAT 4 elsewhere in our organization that looks similar on paper but we are requiring a Master's Degree for this new position. The position that looks similar on paper does not require a college degree. We are concerned about being able to attract somebody who can do this job correctly and bring the greatest set of credentials we can get. We obviously thought, and Judge Pratt made a good case, that it justified a PAT 5. So, we are pretty close.

Roy Buskirk: Tom, do you have any comments on that?

Tom Harris: I was just going to mention that here is a situation from Council's perspective that an Elected Official is basically saying that I want to raise the criteria that I feel is necessary to be able to do the job. HR is coming back and saying that based on the skills and responsibilities that we see in the job description, we think it can be done at this level. The Elected Official is saying that they want this level based on education and we are challenged, on Council, to figure out if we yield because of the fact any Elected Official can make that argument that we can raise that educational level because I want somebody different in that job. It puts us in a tough position of do we just raise those standards or look at what HR is looking at and saying that they don't think it needs that level of education.

Joel Benz: I have one question. Do you anticipate having an internal candidate for this or is it going to be, for sure, an external hire?

John McGauley: We are going to post the position today, after you vote on whether it is a PAT 4 or a PAT 5 and we are posting it externally. We have an internal candidate that we hope applies but we are going straight out to the open world on this.

Roy Buskirk: There is a requirement that you have to post it externally, right?

Tracy Mitchener: If you want to have candidates that are not full-time Allen County employees, yes. If you just wanted it to be for internal, full-time County employees, you can just post it internally.

Roy Buskirk: Thank you. I always thought it was a requirement to post it externally.

Page 26 of 65 June 16, 2016

Tom Harris: John, the question has come up to having Superior Court have all of their jobs looked at. We brought this up in Personnel Committee. Have there been any further discussions with the Judges about having HR do a thorough analysis of all of the different jobs particularly as we are moving forward. We are anticipating that Superior Court is going to want more things this year or more positions or whatever and so how do we get out of this corner of being able to assess similar types of jobs without a thorough analysis?

John McGauley: I think we are open to that. I actually took that to the Judges after Dawn and I discussed it and I think that was earlier this year. They were open to it and it is just a matter of when.

Tom Harris: A matter of when is when?

John McGauley: I will tell you that I took this to them during the middle of our megatrial that we had back earlier in the year involving the guy from Indianapolis. My timing might have been bad in posing the question. It is certainly something that we can pose to them again. We have not had a meeting of our Board of Judges since Personnel Committee. We have one next week and this will certainly be up for discussion.

Tom Harris: This position is going to be vacated when?

John McGauley: Her last day is July 29th.

Tom Harris: But you want to post and have the position filled in order to have a seamless transition.

John McGauley: It is a critical job in the workflow of that department. One of the things I neglected to mention was we were concerned that if it was at a PAT 4 and considering the new overtime rules that are coming into effect, this position works an enormous amount of overtime hours. That is not a wild guess but something I see every day with my own two eyes. That person is there before I get there and long after I am gone. That was another concern of ours because as a PAT 4 it would wind up costing us more than it would at a PAT 5. Back to your original question, we will certainly be discussing that. The timing was just bad on my part that I brought it up in a fairly chaotic time in the Court.

Tom Harris: The difference between the PAT 4 and PAT 5 is how much, in terms of dollars?

Nick Jordan: About \$4,300.

Tom Harris: So \$4,300, is that going to significantly change your ability to recruit?

John McGauley: We think so.

Page 27 of 65 June 16, 2016

Leslie Blevins: You pay more than that in overtime.

Roy Buskirk: I think you need to explain the overtime situation. To me they would almost be paid more being a PAT 4.

John McGauley: I presented some information to members of the Personnel Committee stating exactly that. It was our estimation that we would wind up spending more on a PAT 4 than on a PAT 5.

Tracy Mitchener: I think that after we get our Waggoner, Irwin, Scheele report back that they will be suggesting that we increase the PAT grid and I think that once that happens, PAT 4 would raise above the level. Either way, the position will probably be exempt then.

Roy Buskirk: Excuse me for a second, John. How soon are we going to have that? We need it now.

Dawn Kennedy: We are meeting with them at the end of the month to get the initial recommendation and we are hoping then to push them to the date of July 11th for the recommendations.

Tracy Mitchener: We had a conference call with them earlier this week and let them know our expectations and how they are falling behind their initial deadline. We have stated that we have had conversations about it.

Roy Buskirk: Okay.

Sharon Tucker: You mentioned the overtime. What is the guideline going to be? Is it \$50,000?

Dawn Kennedy: It is \$47,000 or just a little over \$47,000.

Roy Buskirk: And that is a Federal government number that is coming out of a committee. It is not going through Congress or anything else. They are just coming up with this magic number.

John McGauley: Which you will notice at a PAT 5 Step 2, the candidate that we are hoping to attract would be a brand new employee to the County. She is internal but she is a Contractor, a grant-funded Contractor. If you look at what we are proposing here, we are hitting that number.

Sharon Tucker: And this individual has a Master's Degree?

John McGauley: Yes.

Page 28 of 65 June 16, 2016

Sharon Tucker: And the individual that is vacating that position has done it for how long?

John McGauley: She has been with the Courts since the 1970's.

Leslie Blevins: Almost 40 years.

Sharon Tucker: Forty years with no Master's Degree?

Roy Buskirk: What about a Bachelor's?

John McGauley: Yes, she does.

Dawn Kennedy: That is why I put on the job description that a Master's was preferred.

Tom Harris: You can still have the preference of the Master's Degree in the job description but list it as a 4 instead of a 5, right?

Dawn Kennedy: Yes.

Tom Harris: You can still recruit for the Master's Degree but the pay would be off \$4,000 until Waggoner, Irwin came back with the recommendation to raise that.

John McGauley: I think it would be rather un-compelling for someone holding a Master's Degree for a position worth \$42,000 or \$43,000.

Tom Harris: You say the incumbent is a Contractor with the County now?

John McGauley: Not the incumbent.

Tom Harris: Not the incumbent. I am sorry the possible one.

John McGauley: The person we are hoping to attract is a Master's Degree and works in the Court right now.

Tom Harris: As a Contractor, what is her pay?

Leslie Blevins: \$23 and some change an hour.

Tom Harris: So you are looking at \$60,000 or something.

Dawn Kennedy: Something I always say when looking at positions is I need to look at the position and not the person or the potential person.

Roy Buskirk: Right.

Page 29 of 65 June 16, 2016

Dawn Kennedy: That is my major concern that I need to account for how I see it, how the department is right now and with my limited view on all of the positions. I would rather remain conservative and put it at the PAT 4 because once I review it in conjunction with other positions within the department I will say that it is a PAT 5. Having the big picture review but how I see it right now with the equity and limited view I have, it's a PAT 4.

Tracy Mitchener: I think it would be good to be consistent with the scoring of the position and if it is a PAT 4 and hopefully we can get that grid to come up to \$47,000, we are really going to get the same effect. It is just that we are going to keep the integrity of our HR scoring system but in the end hopefully come up with the same amount of pay.

Tom Harris: It appears that your contractor is not making more than the PAT 5/2.

Tracy Mitchener: Because they wouldn't get benefits.

John McGauley: She is making less than five and is closer to a four.

Tom Harris: You said \$47.840.

Roy Buskirk: You have to take out health insurance and paid holidays, vacation pay and a lot of benefits that you would have to take out of it.

John McGauley: I want to make sure that we are clear.

Roy Buskirk: Larry said it runs about 35%.

Tom Harris: Understood but as an employee, she would be gaining a lot of those benefits as well.

Roy Buskirk: That's correct. You can't compare what the payroll amount would be to the contract amount.

John McGauley: I am worried that we are getting off in the weeds here. We are not trying to design a position for an individual. We are trying to design a position that we think actually reflects the qualifications and duties of the PAT 5. We think we presented a pretty good case to the Personnel Committee that it is and I certainly hear what HR is saying about the scoring. We came up with a number of good precedents and incidents and other instances within the organization of PAT 5's doing this job. We are hoping that this individual applies but we don't know that she will. We posted it externally to make sure we get the best field of candidates. By no means are we trying to design that position for an individual. That is not good business.

Larry Brown: John, would it be acceptable to you, so that you can move forward and the timeline that you are faced with, could we approve this as a PAT 4 with the understanding and agreement that once HR has the time to review the position and it

Page 30 of 65 June 16, 2016

becomes a PAT 5 that we get it on the agenda and make it retroactive to whatever the start date is for that person.

Roy Buskirk: It is not reviewing this position. They already did that. They want to do all of the positions in Superior Court so that they have a better...

Tom Harris: I will just add that I think that is going to be crucial when it comes to the Waggoner Irwin study coming back and talking about changing the PAT grid. We better get the PAT grid accurate if they are going to come back and tell us what to do with the PAT grid.

Larry Brown: I lost sight. What did the Personnel Committee recommend?

Tracy Mitchener: For full Council discussion.

John McGauley: My only concern, Councilman Brown, and we are certainly not going to say no to that but it is trying to recruit people on faith. That is something that could take quite some time and is going to affect them sometime in the future. We are asking for the opportunity to recruit the best person right now. It is important and I know we come to you and say that every position is important but this position is a true logistics hub in the Family Relations Division where traffic and caseload is as high as it has ever been and the demand for quick and efficient management of that Court is higher than it has ever been. We are certainly not going to say no to that but we are looking for an opportunity that we think is supported by the facts that we presented back to the Personnel Committee to get the best person right now. I want to reiterate that even at PAT 5 we are bringing the cost of that position down from the current incumbent in excess of \$20,000.

Roy Buskirk: Because of the facts of the steps and everything.

John McGauley: Because she is a high-ranking UPROB. Judge Pratt, at Personnel Committee, was using a number that was \$10,000 or \$15,000 and not everyone is going to be a Step 8. If we left it at a UPROB and hired a Probation Officer to do that job, we would be paying more no matter what.

Roy Buskirk: Sharon.

Sharon Tucker: I might be taking the conversation in a different direction but you said something that concerns me. We have an individual that has 20 plus years of experience and working a considerable amount of overtime. Have we addressed that issue?

John McGauley: That she works a lot of overtime? No because that is a creature of the division that she helps us run.

Roy Buskirk: That was going to be a discussion after we decide this. I have had some phone calls concerning the Family Courts. Presently there are three?

Page 31 of 65 June 16, 2016

John McGauley: Three Judicial Officers? Yes.

Roy Buskirk: What is the possibility of getting a fourth which would cut down on this overtime?

John McGauley: I want to make the point that she is not getting paid for this overtime because she is exempt. She is working a lot of overtime that somebody getting paid at a PAT 4 or lower level might be getting paid for it at some time because of the new rules. Getting a new Judicial Officer, if we could do that we would do it tomorrow because that would cut down on a lot of wait time and the time it takes to get a case on the calendar but that is something that the State Supreme Court does based on caseload.

Roy Buskirk: And the caseload right now is over 1,000 cases?

John McGauley: Oh, more than that. That is not a decision that is at the local level. We would love to have a new Judicial Officer. It certainly would help things out but you have to have extraordinary utilization of each Judicial Officer before the Supreme Court will give you one because that comes mostly out of their pocket and not necessarily ours.

Tom Harris: From a contractor's potential applicant, do you plan to fill that contractor's position should this person vacate that position?

John McGauley: I believe so because that position runs the Great Kids Great Communities Program that Judge Pratt does that offers a great deal of benefit to the community. I believe that is his intention but he has not told me one way or the other.

Joel Benz: If we go to a PAT 4 here, basically what we are saying is that we are going to have to adjust the grid at some future point because...

Roy Buskirk: We will be adjusting the grid as soon as we get our report back.

Joel Benz: I am just pointing out that if we make this move and go to a four, at some point we are going to have to adjust the grid or it will end up costing us more in the long run. Just realize that if we move forward, and that sounds kind of like the direction here, that it's going to happen.

Sharon Tucker: Is the overtime mandatory or is she just doing it to keep up?

John McGauley: No. It is not dictated by the Judge but is a matter of workload. The Court frequently runs after 4:30 or 5:00. There are trainings and programs that our Court does for other entities in the community like the Department of Child Services and things like that which the Court is involved in and start at 7:00 or 7:30 in the morning. She frequently comes in on the weekends. It is just an incredibly busy job with a tremendous amount of workload there. It is not dictated by the Judge but dictated by the workload. It is simply a high pressure, high volume job.

Page 32 of 65 June 16, 2016

Sharon Tucker: The years of overtime that we have tracked haven't been enough to show the State or the deciding party that this is enough to even have a part-time Officer?

John McGauley: I think we are talking about two different things here. We are talking about the overtime worked by this position and is a supervisory position versus the caseload of the Judicial Officers. While our utilization is high, there are other Counties that are higher. It has to be pretty extraordinary. We have three and there are three more out at ACJC and if you consider the fact that we have a number of Judicial Officers working in Family Court already, it still speaks to incredibly high utilization. Unfortunately, I don't think we are anywhere near the State coming in and saying that we need a new Judicial Officer.

Tom Harris: Just to clarify, if Council chooses not to pass this or do nothing today, you are still in a position to move forward and it stays at a PAT 4/2?

John McGauley: No.

Dawn Kennedy: It stays on the UPROB grid and if you want it to move to the PAT grid, a decision would have to be made today.

Tom Harris: It is important that we at least move it to PAT 4/2 and get it off UPROB which heads it in the direction that you are hoping to go to. The one concern that I have is that this, in some respects, has some similarities to another recent decision that we made this year with ACJC. The Elected Official came forward and said that we want to be able to hire in at a higher level and HR said they didn't think it needed to be at the higher level. We went with HR's decision and for us to change course and actually go with the Elected Official it would send a spin process not only through Superior Court but possibly the entire County in terms of what Elected Officials can request in their positions even though HR, which we have turned to for that expertise to say what level we should be paying at.

John McGauley: The only asterisk that I would add to that is that in our case we are asking you to spend less. In the case you are talking about the position was going to become more expensive.

Tom Harris: Not that it is necessarily a financial thing, I am trying to figure out a system that fits best with our entire structure of compensation for the County.

Tracy Mitchener: We will when we look at the entire Superior Court. We will look at this position to make sure that it might be able to go to a PAT 5 at some level. We just can't right now with the details that we have.

Roy Buskirk: I would entertain a motion.

Page 33 of 65 June 16, 2016

Tom Harris: I will make a motion for the consideration of a salary ordinance reclassifying a Probation Officer, UPROB 1, Exempt, 40 hours to Administrator of the CHINS Division, PAT 4/2, \$43,315, Exempt, 37.5 hours and effective August 1, 2016.

Roy Buskirk: Is there a second?

Bill Brown: Second.

Roy Buskirk: Is there any further discussion?

Tom Harris: I will just make the point that it is my intent that we take a look at the Waggoner Irwin piece when it comes back hoping to fix this not only for this position but a broader sense throughout the County and particularly I encourage the Judges to allow HR to evaluate those PAT jobs so we don't have to look at these one at a time. We can do those in an organized and strategic manner for the entire County.

Sharon Tucker: I think, to support Tom's argument, we had this same discussion when the Treasurer, was it the Treasurer?

Roy Buskirk: I think what Tom was referring to was that last year we had ACJC.

Sharon Tucker: There was another department that came before us.

Bill Brown: Bill Royce in the Treasurer's Office.

Tera Klutz: I show that they want this to be effective 8/1/2016.

Tom Harris: I said effective 8/1/2016.

Roy Buskirk: All in favor please signify by saying aye. The motion passes 6-0-1 (Bob Armstrong was absent).

Bill Brown: Did you say that we were going to discuss this a little further?

Roy Buskirk: I think John pretty much, John before you leave. Do you have other questions?

Bill Brown: We have had other situations and caseload backups in the Judiciary and one way or another it is coming back to bite us. To say it is well over a thousand is really backed up.

John McGauley: We are busy. I wouldn't say we are backed up, we are busy. We are fairly consistent in terms of how quickly we can get things on the calendar. We have made some structural changes as well to try to speed things up in the way that we manage our calendars. We just got Family into an electronic calendar system and we are trying to stagger how we block calendar events so that not all of our Judicial Officers are doing the

Page 34 of 65 June 16, 2016

same thing at the same time. If, for example, we have an attorney that has three different cases in Court that day, we are not asking people to stand around and wait because everybody is doing the same case type at the same time. We are doing what we can internally to speed things up. There really aren't any divisions that aren't busy. Our Small Claims Division is the busiest one in the State, from the statistics that I have seen. Our Criminal Division is the same and Family is the same. We are just an incredibly busy Court.

Bill Brown: I guess my point, and maybe it isn't specific to John because I know you are doing the very best that you can. We have had situations in the past with the Jail where the caseload had not gone long enough in the Jail and had a lawsuit. We have a situation pending with the Public Defender and it has to do with caseload management and it sounds like it might be a situation that could be in the mix right now at some level. That is my point that it seems like it would be nice to get ahead of the curve.

Roy Buskirk: To add an additional Court, we have to have State approval, right?

John McGauley: Correct and it is purely based on our utilization numbers that we report to them as fast as we get them. They are aware of how busy we are and if they come to the conclusion that we justify a new Judicial Officer, we will hear about it from them almost as fast as we come to that same conclusion.

Bill Brown: So, just to follow up on that and having said that it is the State, does it give us a pass?

Roy Buskirk: I would think so.

Bill Brown: Okay that is all I have to say on it.

John McGauley: I would hazard to guess without looking at the numbers, we are no different than any big urban County in the State with Courts that are extremely busy. It's tough to get something on the calendar quickly but it does and can happen but most routine things that come onto our Court calendar take their place in line. I would hazard to guess that even though I sit here and tell you how busy we are, most of the big urban Counties are just the same.

Larry Brown: John, I have to admit that right off that I don't know much if anything about the actual position. From what I have heard you explain this morning, part of the overtime or extended hours is because the Court is in session later and I can fully understand if a Judge has a case that is in process and just because the clock says 4:30, he is not going to stop. Could you do some shifting, and maybe this isn't applicable, with the start and stop times so that one individual doesn't have to be there from 7:00 to 5:30? Maybe someone starts at 9:00 and works until 6:00 or whatever the case might be. Do you understand what I am trying to say?

John McGauley: I think so.

Page 35 of 65 June 16, 2016

Larry Brown: I don't know if that is applicable or not.

John McGauley: I see what you are getting at and the answer, right now, is that I don't think it would make any difference because all three of our Courts run from 8:00 to 4:30 all day, every day. If we have somebody starting later that is just someone that we unplugged earlier in the day.

Larry Brown: I wasn't talking about the Court but about the support staff that are these positions.

Roy Buskirk: There are actually three Courts going on and this particular individual has to oversee the staff working in these three Courts.

John McGauley: Whenever those Courts are in operation...

Larry Brown: Get a Deputy or whoever is second in charge and shift start and stop times.

Roy Buskirk: I wondered if maybe we need a Deputy.

John McGauley: Most of the other positions in that division are PAT 3's, I believe. We can certainly think about that but then we have to start talking does that cost us more money? We are spending more to make another position to cost less. That is when it starts to get a little sketchy on our end.

Leslie Blevins: They are actually OSS's and it would cost a lot more to bump them up to the Deputy level.

Sharon Tucker: I think there is a non-financial piece that we, as County, should be concerned about. If we have an employee that is putting in twelve or fourteen hours a day and is going home with just the base salary, there is another piece there that we should be concerned about with our employee but maybe I just care about the person.

Bill Brown: To that point, regardless of the person, you have an example of caseload that is backed up. As we talk about this global concept of our County, meaning the people in it, the families, the education and the quality of workforce I don't know a lot about the situation either. I know our Courts do a great job however, when you hear numbers well over 1,000 cases...

John McGauley: A thousand is not even close.

Bill Brown: It just speaks to the fact that if the State is creating a problem for us to get our folks through the pipeline, it seems that more resources need to be allocated. I would be interested in understanding how we address the procedure and where do we enter into the process, whether it is through the State Legislature with our legislative agenda.

Page 36 of 65 June 16, 2016

John McGauley: I don't think it is even that complicated. It is just a matter of when we hit a certain tipping point in the utilization of our Judicial Officers, the State monitors that and we report to them quarterly what our numbers are. If we develop a big utilization problem anywhere in our Courts, they won't let it slide. They will ask us why and then enter into a discussion that we need to put another Judicial Officer into the system. It has been quite some time since that has happened in Superior Court. To be fair to the State, I don't think it is something that they will let us get away with for very long. Our utilization is high but is within the limits of what they have set for weighted caseloads. There is a new system for analyzing that and the National Center for State Courts has been helping that develop this year and will implement in the fall. It will help us keep a more accurate and up-to-date look at what our utilization is. We will get a new look at it here in the fall but the answer is still going to be the same that we are busy but not busy enough to justify another Judicial Officer. That is a \$100,000 expense to the State and depending on where that Officer lands the County could be putting some money into that position.

Roy Buskirk: We would have to provide a Court.

John McGauley: Correct.

Roy Buskirk: I know there is more expense to it.

John McGauley: We are already overbooked in that building. We juggle Courtroom spaces all day, every day. We may have one Judge there in the morning and another Judge in the afternoon. I know the visual that you have is that this is Judge So-and-So's Courtroom but that is not the case. We juggle spaces in that building already. That is one of the reasons why you helped us a year or so ago move the Small Claims Court to where it is now because it was an impossible situation where they were. Their caseloads were so high with the crowds that packed into that building every day. That certainly helped alleviate the situation somewhat by moving us to the bigger space. Our options for doing that in the Courthouse are terribly limited.

Bill Brown: If we were building widgets, we would utilize our facilities and put on another shift. I realize the Courts are not a manufacturing facility. If you had a caseload of product and people are not getting served, are you saying it is acceptable.

John McGauley: If you know me and my focus on customer service, you will never get me to say it is acceptable. I don't think we are letting people hang. I don't think that backed up is an accurate way to describe it. I will tell you that we are busy. That is the case in Courts throughout the State. Where that is not the case, the Supreme Court removes Judicial Officers and reallocates those resources somewhere else. When you talk about adding an additional shift or adjusting the schedule so that we can bring more people through, it creates tremendous expense to the County. The building has to stay open; you are paying for Security, Staff and for the determined amount of the Judicial

Page 37 of 65 June 16, 2016

Officers' salaries. Our Courts are as busy as other Courts in the State of Indiana and it depends on how much you want to invest to bring that down, how much?

Bill Brown: To me, I would like to know that cost because it doesn't meet your standards for customer service. Our populace is under duress in the Family Court system. That is fair to say, I think.

Joel Benz: Can I add a couple of things?

John McGauley: I don't think so. Not to pick nits here but our Courts operate as efficiently as any other Court in the State. I don't think we are failing our public. I think when someone comes in and files a case, we are talking about cases that can wait. When we are talking about CHINS matters where there is an immediate family emergency, people are not waiting. If there is an abuse or neglect thing, people aren't waiting to get on the calendar. They are getting on the calendar. When the "routine" cases come into the Family Relations Division, they take their place in line. Emergency cases do not. I don't think we are failing our public in any way, shape or form. Like I mentioned earlier, HR helped us do a complete reorganization of Family about a year ago to improve our customer service model. It is working and we are helping people understand the process and helping them get into the workflow. Many of them are doing this on their own. The numbers of pro se, unrepresented litigants that come into the Family Relations Division are enormous. It is a majority and then some. HR helped us do a complete redesign of how we operate but there are only certain things you can do when the caseload is increasing and people are putting more demand on the Court. I don't think we are failing our public.

Bill Brown: But your standard of customer service won't allow you to say it is acceptable.

John McGauley: You have me backed into a corner here.

Bill Brown: I am not really trying to.

John McGauley: I don't think waiting six months for much of anything is acceptable. It is simply a matter of reality in the Courts. If I could get somebody's divorce case on the calendar tomorrow and get it resolved on Monday, we certainly would. That is just not a reality in the Criminal Justice system.

Bill Brown: Well, then I will take that as a bit of education. Thank you.

Joel Benz: I just want to add that Mr. McGauley is underselling himself just a little. I am the liaison and we meet regularly and he is looking for ways to find efficiencies. He has reorganized some of this staff to make things flow more smoothly. I think he is working on it within the confines that he has.

Page 38 of 65 June 16, 2016

Bill Brown: Just to reiterate, we have a great Court system. We know we have a best in class, statewide Court system. I want to make that very crystal clear. What got my attention was that there are well over a thousand folks in line.

Roy Buskirk: You don't even want to know what the number is. I appreciate you staying here and answering our questions. My recommendation is that we should follow the lead of the tv show, Night Court. Next is Community Corrections. Oh, wait, Public Defender.

Tera Klutz: I am taking that one. The Public Defender, on your agenda, is to amend two salary ordinances, the Public Defender and the Chief Public Defender. It has to do with an agreement that we made to be part of the Indiana Public Defender Commission and meet certain guidelines to hire Public Defenders, the amount per case that we are going to take as well as they have introduced Standard G a few years ago. It has that the County should pay the Public Defender what they would pay their full-time Prosecutor. Our Public Defender in Allen County is not full-time and so they are paid at 60% of what a full-time Prosecutor is paid. The same is with the Chief Deputy Public Defender who would be paid at 60% of the Chief Deputy Prosecutor. We got information that said Indiana Supreme Court Justice Chief Loretta Rush increased salaries for all Judicial Officials 3.1% effective July first of 2016. After we did the math of what our Prosecutor's pay is going to be, we calculated not a three percent increase because they were already getting a two percent increase at the beginning of the year. The amount before you totals to \$598 and would bring the Public Defender and the Chief Deputy Public Defender into standard guidelines and be part of the Indiana Public Defenders Commission. As a result, we will receive 40% of money that we spend on these cases back as reimbursement to the County.

Tom Harris: I would like to make a motion for consideration of a salary ordinance amending the pay of the Public Defender, EXEC, \$87,009 to \$87,787 and the Chief Public Defender, EXEC, \$78,369 to \$78,715. This would be effective July 1, 2016 per 3.1% State increase for Prosecutor and Chief Deputy Prosecutor.

Bill Brown: Second.

Tom Harris: This is something we are told we have to do from the State, in essence. Is that fair?

Tera Klutz: In order...

Tom Harris: To get the 40% reimbursement.

Tera Klutz: Yes and it is up to the County to decide to be a part of that program.

Tom Harris: And so the total cost for an annual increase for both of these positions is \$598. Is that accurate?

Page 39 of 65 June 16, 2016

Roy Buskirk: You need to look at the total loss which would be way over that if we did not.

Tom Harris: Exactly.

Roy Buskirk: All in favor please signify by saying aye. The motion passes 6-0-1 (Bob Armstrong was absent). Did we get the appropriation?

Tera Klutz: Not yet.

Sharon Tucker: Not yet.

Tom Harris: Move for approval of the appropriation from the Public Defenders County General for the Public Defender at \$347, the Chief Deputy for \$155, FICA \$39 and PERF \$57 for a total of \$598.

Bill Brown: Second.

Roy Buskirk: All in favor please signify by saying aye. The motion passes 6-0-1 (Bob Armstrong was absent). Community Corrections, come on down.

Kim Churchward: Good morning, Council. I am Kim Churchward and I am the Executive Director of Allen County Community Corrections.

Jeff Stevens: Jeff Stevens, Senior Finance Manager at Allen County Community Corrections.

Tracy Mitchener: Tracy Mitchener, Assistant Human Resources Director.

Dawn Kennedy: Dawn Kennedy, Compensation Specialist.

Kim Churchward: I would like to say first thank you for this morning and I would like to apologize for our part in your grueling work schedule this morning. I hope that our issues are both good news and fairly simple for your consideration. I would like to acknowledge the Auditor's Office for their concise grouping of all of our different business matters and so with your permission, I will try to address them that way to make it a little bit easier for you to consider. First, the good news, as you may not know we have the ability to share with you today that we were able to bring hundreds of thousands of additional State dollars into Allen County. This is to assist in the funding of Community Corrections. Eric Zimmerman and Judge Felts mentioned that as well in their presentation. As a reminder, in 2015 we had the ability to increase our base amount from the Department of Correction by \$170,500 and in January we applied for just under \$820,000. In April we learned that we received \$534,900. As Eric mentioned that is a permanent increase to our State funds, our annual funds, from the Indiana Department of Correction. They have indicated to us how those funds obviously can be utilized and

Page 40 of 65 June 16, 2016

should be utilized. That is continuing to increase our staff and GPS monitoring equipment. With that I will be happy to, or Dawn you can address this.

Dawn Kennedy: I can go ahead, if you would like. Do you want me to talk about the first three positions together? I think that might be easiest. They are all established positions. The first is a Finance Deputy at PAT 2/2, \$33,346, non-exempt. The second position is a Home Detention Officer, POLE 4/2, \$43,502, non-exempt. The third is an Electronic Monitoring Dispatcher, COMM 5/2, \$38,784, non-exempt. All of these positions were passed at Personnel Committee unanimously and there are no concerns with the current classifications of any of them.

Roy Buskirk: They are all new positions.

Dawn Kennedy: Correct. They are additions to existing positions. They already have these positions in Community Corrections but with the grant funding, they are able to add some additional of each.

Tom Harris: And maybe, Kim, you can tell us why we are adding these positions.

Kim Churchward: We have been talking for the last year with you about House Bill 1006 and I know you are talking about that in a variety of other areas. With your assistance, we began a 1006 related strategic plan that we have been slowly rolling out over the last year and a half. House Bill 1006 represented large scale criminal justice reform in the State of Indiana requiring the communities to supervise many offenders that may previously have gone to the Department of Correction. January first, the bulk of that legislation went into effect. I am saying this very carefully that it is way too soon to start running bar graphs and plotting numbers. I can tell you, as Community Corrections, we intake 54 individuals in January, 114 in April and we were down to around 90 in May. Again, it is way too soon but certainly we can say with some clarity that we are indeed beginning to see the increases that we anticipated. Again, we are very carefully trying to utilize the staff we have and make incremental increases in staff and the Department of Correction is working with us closely on those initiatives.

Tom Harris: So the grant has been given to the County and Community Correction but specifically said that they want you to do these kinds of things including hire these three positions.

Kim Churchward: They named them exactly.

Roy Buskirk: As Kim said, this is all because of House Bill 1006 and it is the fact that we have to maintain a lot more felonies which previously would have gone to the State. As a matter of fact, the State just closed one of their facilities, at Henryville, and so they are seeing a savings. That is the reason they are helping us pick up some of the additional cost that has been associated with this.

Page 41 of 65 June 16, 2016

Kim Churchward: You are absolutely right. As you and I have spoken, Allen County was well positioned and waiting on the starting line when the funds were announced. We have been very successful in the last two rounds of requests at the State level.

Roy Buskirk: The other problem we can see coming down the road is that our Jail is at capacity.

Kim Churchward: That is my understanding as well, sir.

Tom Harris: I am going to move for consideration of a salary ordinance establishing the pay for the Finance Deputy, PAT 2/2, \$33,346, non-exempt. Also move for consideration of a salary ordinance establishing the pay for the Home Detention Officer, POLE 4/2, \$43,502, non-exempt and consideration of a salary ordinance establishing the pay for the Electronic Monitoring Dispatcher, COMM 5/2, \$38,784, non-exempt.

Larry Brown: Second.

Roy Buskirk: All in favor please signify by saying aye. The motion passes 6-0-1 (Bob Armstrong was absent). Now for item number four.

Kim Churchward: This is just a continuation of the initiative from 2015 with identifying impacted positions raising those from the 37.5 hours per week to 40 hours per week. I wasn't at Personnel Committee but my staff was and I understand that this was approved.

Roy Buskirk: And again, this is grants from the State.

Jeff Stevens: No, this is funded through our Project Income Fund 236. You will see an appropriation request for the \$29,000 that this will roughly cost.

Roy Buskirk: So it is not out of General Funds?

Nick Jordan: No, it is out of Fund 236.

Roy Buskirk: That is what was getting me confused.

Tom Harris: I will move for consideration of a salary ordinance amending the pay for employees within the budget of the Allen County Community Corrections from 37.5 hours per week to 40 hours per week. This applies to two Security Officers, Security Coordinator, Quality Assistance Manager, Test Assessment & Program Section Chief, Mental Health Section Chief, Clinical CBT Coordinator, Case Managers, Case Manager/Problem Solving Court Coordinator and Community Project Coordinator.

Sharon Tucker: Second.

Tom Harris: The effective date is when?

Page 42 of 65 June 16, 2016

Jeff Stevens: Today.

Tom Harris: Do they know that yet?

Kim Churchward: They do not know this yet. We are working on it with supervisors.

Roy Buskirk: All in favor please signify by saying aye. The motion passes 5-0-2 (Bob Armstrong and Joel Benz were absent).

Kim Churchward: Items five through seven, because Allen County Community Corrections operates on a fiscal budget cycle with the State, represents our annual June presentation to you regarding our fiscal year 2017 Department Budget and Appropriation Request. With the new 1006 money that has come to us, our annual budget is now just over \$6 million and is between our Project Income, our Indiana Department of Corrections Fund and our Community Transition Program Funds as well.

Tom Harris: And this is up from last year by how much?

Jeff Stevens: The \$170,000 was our first increase from 1006 and then the \$534,000 also increased our base grant.

Tom Harris: So approximately \$700,000 above last year.

Kim Churchward: Correct.

Tom Harris: I will move for approval for appropriations in Community Corrections' budget State Grant 234 at \$3,857,200, Transition Fund 235 for \$389,753 and Project Income Fund 236 at \$1,967,255 for a total of \$6,214,255.

Bill Brown: Second.

Roy Buskirk: All in favor please signify by saying aye. The motion passes 6-0-1 (Bob Armstrong was absent).

Kim Churchward: Thank you. Item number eight I believe we have already discussed and it is the salary adjustment appropriation to fund some of the items that we discussed this morning.

Nick Jordan: It is to fund ten positions with benefits, FICA and PERF.

Tom Harris: I will move for approval of the appropriation for \$155,062 in the salary adjustment line.

Bill Brown: Second.

Page 43 of 65 June 16, 2016

Roy Buskirk: All in favor please signify by saying aye. The motion passes 6-0-1 (Bob Armstrong was absent).

Kim Churchward: Items eight and nine, as we come to the end of our fiscal year, it becomes necessary to take care of some of these series transfers. We have a request for a transfer within the 236 Fund between series for \$576.

Tom Harris: Move for approval of the transfer within Project Income Fund 236 from Forensic Tools for \$576 to Office and Computer Equipment for \$576.

Bill Brown: Second.

Roy Buskirk: All in favor please signify by saying aye. The motion passes 6-0-1 (Bob Armstrong was absent). Thank you.

Lisa Borgmann: I am Lisa Borgmann, Clerk of the Courts.

Chris Nancarrow: Chris Nancarrow, Chief Deputy.

Lisa Borgmann: We have two requests for your consideration.

Dawn Kennedy: I will go ahead and introduce them. The first position that we are discussing would be going from a Court Records Clerk, OSS 3/6, at \$35,576 to Central Services Team Leader, OSS 4/6, \$39,393, non-exempt. It was approved at Personnel Committee unanimously. It scored at an OSS 4 when I did the desk audit and it would be my recommendation that it moves from a three to a four.

Roy Buskirk: Let's do both.

Dawn Kennedy: The second position is a salary ordinance amending the pay of the Chief Deputy from 80.65% of the Clerk's salary at \$67,077 to 91.42% of the Clerk's salary at \$76,035. This was moved at Personnel Committee to County Council for full discussion. This is always at the request of the Elected Official.

Lisa Borgmann: The Chief Deputy position is always the most critical in any Elected Official's office. What I have always tried to do is find the most qualified and the person with the highest integrity that I can to take over when I am not there and to troubleshoot with me. I am very fortunate right now that I have a licensed attorney as my Chief Deputy. He has taken on numerous additional responsibilities from the Federal level and in compliance with our Title IV-D to working with Federal bankruptcy Judges and working with our Bar Association. He serves as a delegate to the State Bar Association for Allen County. I can't say enough good things with him. I have always tried to look for the best and have the most professional office that I can. I can say that I have that now.

Page 44 of 65 June 16, 2016

Joel Benz: I have a couple of comments to add to this. Considering the second item here, I think we have recently raised about two or three other Chief Deputies to this same pay of 90% level and so that would be consistent with what we have done in the past. I will go ahead and make a motion for consideration of a salary ordinance reclassifying the pay for the Court Records Clerk, OSS 3/6, \$35,576 to Central Services Team Leader, OSS 4/6, \$39,393 and non-exempt. Item two is consideration of a salary ordinance amending the pay of the Chief Deputy from 80.65% of the Clerk's salary at \$67,077 to 91.42% of the Clerk's salary at \$76,035.

Larry Brown: Second.

Roy Buskirk: Is there any further discussion?

Sharon Tucker: I do. Dawn, in your presentation of this you said item number two was brought for full discussion.

Dawn Kennedy: They passed it for full discussion. These are at the discretion of the Elected Official and generally they are not based on a recommendation from me. They discussed it and decided to move it to Council.

Lisa Bormann: Dawn came in and did a desk audit. She sat with Chris and we did all of the paperwork that we needed for it. We did it just like any other position and agreed with the salary.

Tom Harris: Why 91.42%?

Dawn Kennedy: That is where she requested it to be.

Tom Harris: So you basically looked at a dollar figure and that is how it came out to 91.42%. You are also not requesting any additional funds from County General.

Lisa Borgmann: I am not.

Tom Harris: You are finding the funds from within and this is for 2016 and 2017?

Lisa Borgmann: Yes. I have the funding going forward. We had a legislative change regarding our postage and now the litigants are picking up most of those costs. I think we will see a continual savings but I am asking for this transfer from Postage into the salary line items.

Tom Harris: I just want to commend you on that. You didn't have to do that and so it is impressive that you looked for the savings.

Lisa Borgmann: I am a team player and am going to try to find the money. I will not come before you until I have looked for the money first.

Page 45 of 65 June 16, 2016

Tom Harris: Tell us, without going into great detail, the postage change was what?

Lisa Borgmann: It was a legislative change where we have to cover most of the initial filings but after that the litigants have to pick up the postage.

Joel Benz: I did have a comment too on the \$79,035 that it is the same as the County Assessor Chief Deputy. Also, I have a question for you, Lisa. Regarding the Overtime line in here...

Roy Buskirk: Whoa, whoa, whoa. Let's handle the first two. Tom kind of got us off track with the Postage. **All in favor please signify by saying aye. The motion passes 6-0-1 (Bob Armstrong was absent).** And now we can go to item three about Postage, which our illustrious Clerk has answered any questions on that.

Lisa Borgmann: The reason why I am moving some of that money into my Extra Deputy and Overtime is that you have been hearing all morning is our very high workloads that we are having in all areas of the Court system. Right now we are getting ready to transition to a very big change. We are going to be doing scanning on all of the new documents coming in. We are having a pretty difficult time of keeping up let alone adding this duty. We have to go to scanning before we can go to E-filing which I think will save us time. If we can get over this hump with the scanning of every single document that comes in, we are eventually going to a paperless Court system. The Judges won't have case files anymore. They will sit at the bench and pull up their documents. It is a huge change for the Court system.

Joel Benz: I will make a motion to approve the transfer in the Clerk General Fund of \$75,000 from Postage to Extra Deputy, \$19,800; Overtime, \$31,908; FICA, \$8.109; PERF, \$9,778; Chief Deputy, \$3,790 and Central Services Team Leader, \$1,615 for a total of \$75,000.

Tom Harris: Second.

Roy Buskirk: All in favor please signify by saying aye. The motion passes 6-0-1 (Bob Armstrong was absent). Thank you.

Larry Brown: With all due respect, are we going to be in session much longer?

Roy Buskirk: With the budget and everything else, what do you think, a half hour?

Tera Klutz: I was thinking you could discuss the Personnel Committee Policies and Procedures and that will probably take twenty minutes and then break before we go over budgets or you could break now and then do both of those.

Roy Buskirk: Let's do a five-minute break.

Break.

Page 46 of 65 June 16, 2016

Dawn Kennedy: This is something that we discussed at the March meeting. I think it would be helpful if we had some Personnel Committee Policies and Procedures to give us something to fall back on when there are questions or process concerns. It is a document that I could share with Elected Officials and Department Heads so we can all be on the same page. It was provided in your packet but I did bring copies.

Larry Brown: This is what you emailed to us?

Dawn Kennedy: Yes. It was sent in the packet. It is a pretty basic document and doesn't spell out a lot of detail but it does give some guidelines. Do you want me to highlight some things in it? I kind of just spelled out who the members of the Personnel Committee are. As the Compensation Specialist, I would be the Ex-Officio non-voting member. I am at every meeting anyway to facilitate it all. The committee shall elect a Chairperson and Vice Chairperson, which we currently do. A lot of this is already standard practice but we are just putting it into a document. It spells out that you will meet on a quarterly basis and all of the meetings will be legally advertised. Agenda items kind of help us spell out things and we sometimes go back and forth on items and it will help us have a really good understanding. The items that would be on Personnel Committee agendas are salary ordinances for new, reclassified or additional positions and issues related to part-time. Issues related to part-time was at the request of the Personnel Committee.

Tom Harris: Item number two has been bolded which means it has been added.

Dawn Kennedy: Yes, I highlighted that one and some of the items that I may have changed since the meeting in March. In some of the ones I highlighted, like consent agenda, because we don't currently use that for Council. I had put request for part-time funds but Personnel Committee decided they would rather have it say "issues related to part-time". Something that we suggest should be added is hours changes and FSLA classification. I think that would be helpful for us.

Roy Buskirk: What was that?

Dawn Kennedy: Hours changes such as 37.5 to 40 and the exempt versus non-exempt.

Tom Harris: Are you looking for approval of these today or simply bringing it to our attention for consideration?

Dawn Kennedy: We had discussed whether we would pass this today but it would be up to you if you wanted to pass it today or give me some recommendations. I could then take it back and update the form and vote on it at the next Council or the next Council that coincides with the next Personnel Committee meeting. If you want to go to the back, I printed on the front and back in order to save paper. Item three is an agenda item request. This is just spelling out the process of how I would go about this. Department Heads and Elected Officials may request to have agenda items approved by the committee because it gives them timelines that they need to request at least four weeks before a scheduled

Page 47 of 65 June 16, 2016

committee meeting. They must include a Job Analysis Questionnaire signed by the Elected Official or Department Head and helping me with giving them the process. Item B, I will develop the job description and they will sign off on it. I will then score it. The disputes will be resolved one week prior to the committee meeting in order for requests to be made on an agenda item. Departments reserve the right to present their requests at Personnel Committee but shall only come once in a twelve-month time period.

Larry Brown: Between C and D or a part of C, perhaps, should it state in there that after it is scored that you will meet with that Department Head and/or Elected Official.

Dawn Kennedy: I think that would be nice to spell that out. It is common practice right now to always meet with them. If they are not able to meet with me, we get together on the phone.

Roy Buskirk: So people understand that is part of the reason for the four weeks is the fact that you need to score the position and do some other work.

Dawn Kennedy: This kind of gives them a guideline of why I need the four weeks and can spell it out for them in detail.

Tracy Mitchener: We do have a lot of talk and discussion with them. It is not like we just come up with a score and then it's not like they hear about it for the first time when they come to Personnel Committee. There is a lot of communication back and forth so if there is any discrepancy because we talk through it and see both sides. We re-evaluate and think if that score that we are recommending stays the same or changes. There is a lot of back and forth.

Dawn Kennedy: The next item is basically spelling out that I will send the agenda items to Personnel Committee one week before the meeting, which I currently do. We just put some rules in there and some of those are highlighted because I took out Consent Agenda and a couple of other items. I place the items that would like to be moved to County Council on the County Council agenda by sending it over to Becky. I report what happened at the Personnel Committee and if approved at Personnel Committee they will be moved to County Council.

Tom Harris: That last piece, "if a matter receives approval by the Committee" if the Committee does not approve it then it won't come before County Council. Is that accurate?

Dawn Kennedy: Correct.

Tom Harris: Is that different?

Dawn Kennedy: Right now you allow for them to come. This is kind of at your discretion.

Page 48 of 65 June 16, 2016

Tom Harris: But it is different than our current policy.

Dawn Kennedy: It has kind of been based on they can still come to County Council.

Roy Buskirk: The Department Head can still come to the County Council with a request for the full Council to see it even if the committee turns it down.

Tom Harris: But this sentence changes that.

Roy Buskirk: Correct.

Dawn Kennedy: I can update that to say that the Department Head or Elected Official can request that they still come to County Council.

Larry Brown: Probably should. You are putting it into writing now. It has been common practice but now we are putting it in writing.

Tom Harris: Larry, you are saying that they should not come before Council? **Larry Brown**: No, I am saying that on items that do not receive committee approval, they can be brought before full Council if the Department Head or Elected Official so requests. I am saying that it should probably be listed here even though it has been common practice. I don't think it has been in writing. Now that we are making a procedure, we probably should add that.

Tom Harris: I would agree. That goes against some of the stuff that I said before. I have said that Personnel Committee should make a decision whether they are for it or against it and this allows us to say we are against it but they can still bring it before Council. The other piece that I just added in 25 years in HR and even being in HR and running this committee, I like the idea of having some kind of a process or procedure. Policy worries me a little bit but the idea that we are trying to get some kind of strategy or format to deal with this is appropriate. When bureaucracy keeps the County from becoming more efficient by a policy that says you can't do something, it makes me a little concerned. We are trying to make government more efficient. If something were to come up, as example the Sheriff had a situation that came up that he needs action done that he can't get to you guys for the four weeks, our goal is to make government more efficient. I don't want a policy that stops that process. If it was a guideline or procedure, it gives us a little flexibility. Maybe policy is a little different in your terminology.

Dawn Kennedy: Maybe we can write some accommodations in this that would describe what would necessitate an emergency meeting.

Tom Harris: Or just the realization that an emergency meetings do happen.

Larry Brown: So is more of your concern with the word policy? Take policy out of it and make it the Personnel Committee Procedures?

Page 49 of 65 June 16, 2016

Tom Harris: It could be Guidelines and Procedures.

Larry Brown: I guess that by having that you are making government more efficient because they know what is expected of them upfront.

Tom Harris: Yep.

Tracy Mitchener: Maybe we could just add that exceptions will be discussed on a case-by-case basis. I don't want to make it so concrete that they can never come.

Roy Buskirk: I think that if it is an emergency, I understand the Sheriff this morning but I think he knew this was coming longer than a couple of weeks. To me, something can be put into this that it is up to the discretion of the President of the Personnel Committee. I agree with Larry and I think it is a very good idea that individuals that need to come before the Personnel Committee have some kind of a guideline on what is expected on their behalf. That would be my only comment is that there will still be some latitude allowed with the discretion of the Personnel Committee President. On some items, we have even had votes over the phone.

Joel Benz: I have one thought on number 3D. Disputes on classification must be resolved. Superior Court was in here today requesting a PAT 5 and you were saying it was a PAT 4. Are you saying that this would have been resolved before you came in here? Would you still present a recommendation or how would you handle that?

Dawn Kennedy: That would be resolved even before we came to Personnel Committee. That is something that we could work with them on. I am open to saying that this could just be presented at Personnel Committee if they are requesting something different from what I am recommending.

Tom Harris: How do you resolve it?

Dawn Kennedy: This was mostly to get some time because sometimes we get really close to that Personnel Committee meeting where people...I think some decisions should be made at least a week ahead so that I can send an agenda out. I think that is my major concern because sometimes I am staying until 7:00 at night before the agenda goes out to make sure it can go out.

Tom Harris: Meaning that the departments are working with you and are still in disagreement and you are saying that we can't do that at the last minute. You are saying that we need it before that.

Dawn Kennedy: If we are going to have a dispute, we either wait until the next Personnel meeting or a decision needs to be made a week in advance. I need to be able to send out those agendas in a timely fashion. My major concern is that sometimes we are really pushing up against that deadline for when I need to send it out.

Page 50 of 65 June 16, 2016

Tom Harris: This makes it sounds as if you don't reach a conclusion or agreement, they can't even make it on the agenda.

Dawn Kennedy: And that is up to your discretion.

Tom Harris: I think they should be able to make it on the agenda.

Joel Benz: I would suggest rewording this a little bit to say that the decision regarding the classification should be reached or it goes on the next month's agenda.

Roy Buskirk: Currently it is the next meeting because we only meet quarterly.

Joel Benz: Oh, okay.

Tom Harris: So it would be on the agenda but in other words, she wants the one week notice that we agree or don't agree and that is what is going on the agenda.

Dawn Kennedy: I essentially want something that says you need to decide which way or what you would like placed on the agenda.

Roy Buskirk: I think that could be handled in the fact that they must do it four weeks, well no, I see what you are saying. After you have had the opportunity to score it.

Tom Harris: Go ahead with your comment, Joel. You mentioned that is says it must be resolved in order to request to be put on the agenda. I would say that it must be resolved a week prior otherwise the disagreement is still going to be on the agenda. How do you want to word that?

Dawn Kennedy: Something that I could put on there is that maybe they need to make a decision of what they would like on the agenda a week prior to the meeting.

Sharon Tucker: I think resolve is the word.

Dawn Kennedy: Okay, I am happy to take that out and reword it.

Tom Harris: The next sentence down, by the way, is also a bit controversial. That is "departments reserve the right to present the requested Personnel but shall only come once in a twelve-month time period with the request." So what happens is they come before the Personnel Committee, we say yea or nay and they come before Council and we say nay, they go back and modify it a little bit and come back again. That is the concern from HR that they will simply keep coming back and changing it a little bit. While I agree with that I also worry about putting some kind of stipulation because things happen in a twelve-month period. They may reorganize the whole department. They may do different kinds of things and that request could come back before Council for lots of reasons. They may reassess it themselves and say maybe they should do it differently. To say they can't come back with that same job for twelve months is bureaucracy. I have

Page 51 of 65 June 16, 2016

some concerns with saying "shall only come back once in a twelve month period." Maybe say something about them refraining from coming back. In other words we want to slow that down but we are going to create a policy and we will have to change it because we are going to override it because some event is going to come up that says we have to look at a job again.

Larry Brown: It's a procedure and not a policy.

Tom Harris: Beautiful and I am fine with that.

Joel Benz: Maybe you could put something in there about being reviewed if they are coming back in a twelve-month period and has to be approved by the President of the Personnel Committee prior to getting on the agenda or something along those lines.

Tom Harris: I would be fine with the language if we would change this to Personnel Committee Procedural Guidelines. That, Larry, is a good point that it allows us some flexibility in those things. Then we can leave the language the same.

Roy Buskirk: To be honest with you, I was hoping to do something on this today but...

Tom Harris: Probably could, with those changes.

Roy Buskirk: So where were a couple of other verbiage changes?

Dawn Kennedy: I think I have spelled out most of them. I changed with removing Consent Agenda.

Roy Buskirk: I need the line and stuff so that we can make the changes here so that we can get this passed this morning. That is what I am trying to do.

Dawn Kennedy: Oh, okay.

Tom Harris: Specific changes, what are you looking for?

Dawn Kennedy: These are the changes that we made after the March Personnel Committee. You had looked at this document at the last one.

Roy Buskirk: I want the ones that have been suggested here this morning.

Dawn Kennedy: Okay. The changes that have been suggested this morning were that Personnel Committee Procedural Guidelines would be the title. That we would add to number two, agenda items. We would have section three and four and have the FSLA status, if it is exempt or non-exempt and hours changes. The next change that was suggested is on number three, agenda item requests, item C; I would add some language that the Compensation Specialist would make recommendations by meeting with the Elected Official or Department Head. Under D, I would remove resolved and put

Page 52 of 65 June 16, 2016

decided so that it would be decided one week in advance of the Personnel Committee. We can put them on the agenda, with some certainty. Under number four...

Roy Buskirk: We are not done with that because we have the twelve months. There would have to be a recommendation or approval from the Personnel Committee President.

Dawn Kennedy: I thought Tom said he was comfortable with it if it was Procedural Guidelines. I will be happy to add the President.

Tom Harris: What you said is fine, as well.

Roy Buskirk: Oh, yeah, Personnel Committee Chairman. So some verbiage needs to be changed but I am not sure what. I want to pass this today.

Sharon Tucker: I don't think you can with the changes that are being put out there.

Tera Klutz: You can still adopt it at your next Council meeting with those changes. I think it is good to go through the changes but I think they need to be made and presented to Council before you vote on it. That way there is no confusion.

Larry Brown: You can email it to us.

Dawn Kennedy: I would be happy to work on this and email it to you.

Roy Buskirk: Okay.

Dawn Kennedy: Item E, we would add "exceptions would be made on a case-by-case basis as approved by the Chair." Under Rules, we would add that the Department Head or Elected Official can bring items before County Council even if they are not passed at Personnel Committee. That would be the last change. I will make the updates and send it to you as soon as possible.

Roy Buskirk: Very good.

Dawn Kennedy: Thank you.

Tracy Mitchener: Thank you.

Nick Jordan: I put three pieces of paper under your agenda this morning. It should be the exact same thing that you received in the emails. At this point in time we are bringing your preliminary revenue estimates and the pre-allocation letter that has been sent to you. I say preliminary because these are fluid and will change as we receive more information so that we have the most up-to-date figures on your sheet. These are as of May 31 and some of it is even older, depending on what is available. Please stop me at any point in time if you have questions or would like to go into more detail on anything. I am going to

Page 53 of 65 June 16, 2016

start with the sheet that looks like this. The first thing on there is the 2017 Projected Revenue Excluding ARC and Mental Health. That has \$93,315,892. That is broken down in the next part where you see 2016 and 2017 difference columns. The first piece is the General Fund Property Tax Levy. That is the largest piece of revenue to offset our expenditures. From 2016 to 2017, we have estimated the growth quotient, which is a six year average non-farm personal income, I did an estimate but it hasn't come out from the State yet, but my estimate is at 3.8%. That is the increase that you see there of approximately \$2.4 million.

Tom Harris: When will we get that from the State?

Nick Jordan: They usually send it before July first. I am hoping that we will get that within the next couple of weeks. I am not sure if the Bureau of Economic Analysis will update their figures but if they do that will for sure change. If they don't, it should be the 3.8% figure.

Roy Buskirk: I don't think a lot of people understand that is what the State would allow us to increase our revenue by.

Nick Jordan: For most funds but there are other funds that are restricted under different statutes.

Roy Buskirk: But for this particular fund that is what the State says is the maximum amount.

Nick Jordan: Let's say for example, a couple of years ago the City of Fort Wayne wasn't at their max levy. At that point in time, they could go up ten percent. If you are not already at your max levy, you can increase at a greater rate than the 3.8%. **Roy Buskirk**: Some people look at this and think that is how much our revenue is going to go up. It is not necessarily going to go up by 3.8% because you have the tax caps and everything else coming into play.

Nick Jordan: That is a good segue into the next piece. As we are alluding to estimating, let's say it becomes the 3.8%. It is the revenue that we want to capture. Our pool of assessed value, right now the gross assessed value and the preliminary estimates from the Assessor are above 3% and that is a great starting point. You have to take off the exemptions, deductions, abatements and so forth on down the line. Let's say the net assessed value only becomes 2 to 2.5% percent. Right away, our pool of assessed value to collect these tax dollars from only increased by 2.5% and if everyone increases their levy by 3.8%, you are going to increase your Circuit Breaker Caps. Your pool only went up by 2.5% and you are trying to capture a 3.8% increase from that pool. If the situation plays out at a 3.8% increase and the assessed value only goes up by 2.5%, we will more than likely see Circuit Breaker credits increase. The second one, we are just backing out the Mental Health and ARC levy piece because we pass that on to ARC and Park Center. We take that out because it is not our operating revenue. We will do the same on the expense side. The third thing is Less Estimated Circuit Breaker Credits. You can see there that I

Page 54 of 65 June 16, 2016

have a 7% increase. Hopefully that is all it goes up. It is really an estimate based on how the other Taxing Units increase their levies, what the actual growth factor is and how the net assessed value is determined at the end of the day. That is a 7% increase that we have factored in right now. From 2015 to 2016, Circuit Breaker actually remained pretty flat. It barely changed at all for Allen County. That is because the assessed value went up around 2.6% and the growth quotient was almost exactly the same. Both boats are rising at the same level. If you look back three or four years ago, the assessed value was very stagnant, the growth quotient was still above two and we saw Circuit Breaker increases of five, ten or fifteen percent depending on the year. It is a guess or an estimate, at this point in time until we get more up-to-date information.

Tom Harris: What was it last year?

Nick Jordan: It was about zero, stagnant. We were right at that \$6.39 million figure and this year is \$6.393 million for Allen County.

Roy Buskirk: The one thing I want to emphasize is the fact that Circuit Breaker credit is difficult to come up at this time as to how much of an impact. I know from past records and everything else, I appreciate your numbers and over the past years have been very accurate but I want to point out that on your tax bill you have school corporations, fire districts and many different types of taxes. Each one of them, if they raise or stay the same, it has an impact as far as Circuit Breaker is concerned.

Nick Jordan: Exactly. At this point in time, we have estimated a 7% in Circuit Breaker and we will see how that plays out. When you start with the \$64.5 million approximately in the General Fund and Property Tax levy and back off \$3.1 million for Mental Health and ARC and take off the \$6.8 million for Circuit Breaker credit, you have a working General Fund levy of \$54.6 million. Before going to the next line, a comment to you Roy, Circuit Breaker credits for this year the DLGF will send us in July estimates of max levies and their Circuit Breaker estimates. They are estimates but it will help especially the max levy piece to see if someone goes up ten or fifteen percent from where they are currently. If they would choose to do that it would have a larger effect on the Circuit Breaker. It also depends on the size of the Taxing Unit levy. The next piece under the \$54.6 million you see General, COIT and COIT Public Safety revenue. The details are on the second sheet which is the sheet with a ton of figures on it. We can provide more information, if you would like. I will walk through a couple of large ones. Starting from the top down, the Vehicle License Excise Tax is an increase of over \$320,000 or 8.7%. That is more or less related to our conservative estimate for 2016. As of June, we have already collected \$2,089,000 a little more than the 3.7% estimate for 2016 and is between 50% and 60%. That is why for 2017 I have a \$4.1 million figure there. It is not as large an increase from our actual revenues. The next piece is the County Option Income Tax and the traditional shares are COIT and below that is COIT Public Safety. One is around a 2.5% increase and Public Safety is 2.2%. Overall, I have estimated income tax collections to increase 3.5%. That is an estimate. Some of the figures looking into that regard are the number of employed. When you look at the number of employed from 2013 to current, we have increased 10% in 2013, 7% in 2014 and 4% in 2015. When you

Page 55 of 65 June 16, 2016

look at the first five months of this year, the number of people employed has increased that amount for the last four years. The one correlation could be that you have more people employed, more people bringing in income and that is subject to tax. Subject to credits and so forth and it doesn't mean they are going to have to end up having to owe at the end of the day that is one piece to look at. We look at the withholding estimates from the Department of Revenue and when you look at the last five quarters, on average they have increased six percent from the prior quarter. The withholdings have gone up for each quarter of the last five. That is another positive indicator of potentially greater income tax revenue. Also just look at the economic environment that we see in Allen County with developments continuing at a great rate. The building permit revenues are continuing to be high and at this point in time I don't expect to see any severe drop off. Just looking at the County development that has come to this table in the last few months continues to help that picture. It is not just the County but also the City and Cities and Towns. If I estimate a 3.5% increase overall, the reason it only translates to a 2.5% and 2.2% increase for Allen County is the distribution methodology. One is based on the Property Tax Levy and distribution factor and the other is solely on Property Tax Levy. If other Cities or Towns tax levy increases greater than Allen County's, we don't go up by the same 3.5%. That is why it doesn't translate on paper there. As you go down the list you can see some other big ones. The Building Department increased by \$100,000. The Auditor increased by \$250,000. A \$700,000 revenue estimate that you will see at the bottom, we back that out because it is one-time revenue. I will explain that later. Unless you have any questions on the General Miscellaneous Revenue, I will continue moving down the main sheet. You have the \$54.6 million levy...

Tom Harris: Actually, I do have one. The 55% for the Auditor increase.

Nick Jordan: That is the Ineligible Deductions fund and is a separate fund. Under State Law that fund can only have \$100,000 in it at the end of the year after you subtract out the expenses related to the audit purposes. Let's say we bring in \$1.7 million worth of revenue, we back off whatever the expenses amounted to and this is a conservative estimate of what we think will be above the \$100,000 threshold that will have to be transferred to the General Fund per State law.

Tom Harris: That \$250,000 is a conservative number and could be higher than 55%.

Nick Jordan: It could but the context of the audit is the fact that in certain situations that we have good information and know that it is an ineligible homestead and in other situations we may not have heard anything from the taxpayer, they have the chance to bring in the sufficient documentation and we would have to put the homestead back on and possibly refund them these tax dollars. I like to think that it will be at least \$700,000 but if we see a great influx of refunds because people are finally getting in contact with our office, it may be less than that. I was pretty conservative based on our current collections.

Roy Buskirk: Nick, is there a reason why Commercial Vehicle...

Page 56 of 65 June 16, 2016

Nick Jordan: Commercial Vehicle is completely out of my hands. That comes from the State and for the last three years it has fluctuated ten percent down, up and down again. I have inquired with the State Auditor's Office and all they could provide me with was yes, the number has gone down. They said they would look into it a little more but at this point we are just on the receiving end of the dollars. The State is the one processing those.

Tom Harris: Also, the interest on investments, up 19%. Is that based on interest rates staying the same or going up?

Nick Jordan: It is based on our current year estimates and from where we are through May, we will probably be a little low at \$273,000. You can see that we have \$150,000. Let's just extrapolate this year of 53% collections of \$145,000 for only 40% of the year and so we will be around \$300,000 for 2016. It is potentially increasing only \$25,000 and two things, our cash balance is sufficient and possibly will continue to grow depending on how this year plays out. Secondly, if the Fed does decide to raise the interest rates, the banks can essentially offer more for deposits.

Tom Harris: Is that projection based on the interest rate going up?

Nick Jordan: Yes that is one of the things that I factored in.

Tom Harris: They are now wondering if they are going to do that.

Roy Buskirk: It takes a tremendous amount of research and everything else to be able to come up with these estimates. For several years, the County's estimates on revenue have been very close to the actual. I appreciate the work on it.

Nick Jordan: Thank you and to Tera and Jackie the same. Back to the starting sheet but \$54.6 million, you would add the COIT and COIT Public Safety revenue of \$38.6 million and that gets you to the \$93,315,892 as a revenue estimate. Down in the middle of the page where you start to see the table, we start with the 2016 budget that includes the General and COIT funds at \$93,607,824. As I mentioned, we will back off ARC and Mental Health because they are just a pass-through and not part of our operating expenses. The second piece that we take off is the County Council Capital. The \$450,000 is what we had budgeted. That is not a concrete figure. As I mentioned if we are going to budget \$700,000 for the Auditor's one-time revenue estimate possibly that will be the same figure on down that I backed out for one-time capital expenses. The third one is an increase for the UPROB grid employees. This is decided by the State and is a 3% and includes the PERF and FICA. That is the approximate \$113,000 figure. Then you have step increases for County employees. This also includes a 10% contingency. There are a lot of steps and are very detailed and so every year we have items that need to be changed and so we threw in a 10% contingency for the amount of \$220,000. The next section says "Changes In" and the first one is Sheriff Pensions. This year the actuary determined right around \$2.2 million contribution that we will need to make for 2017. For the General Fund piece, it is budgeted at \$1.8 million and that is a \$200,000 increase. This year it is \$1.6 million. I budgeted \$1.8 million and the difference of \$400,000 is estimated to come

Page 57 of 65 June 16, 2016

from the process service fees. This year that fund is almost double what it was last year because the fee has been increased. It is right around \$250,000 right now but Jackie will need to pull some of those funds out to pay this year's pension contribution. Then, depending on how the beginning of next year trends, then we will use whatever is in that fund. We always use all that is in that fund or almost all of it to pay the pension first and whatever is left over, we will take from the General Fund. If we only need \$1.6, that is all we will take.

Tom Harris: How is that compared to last year? Is that a significant improvement? In other words, you are pulling \$200,000, how much did we pull last year?

Nick Jordan: No, I am increasing it \$200,000. This year, we budgeted \$1.6 million and we won't know until the end of the year how much that is going to be. The service of process fee revenue has already doubled what it was in 2015 year to date. If there is \$500,000 to pull out of there and the pension is \$2 million, we are only going to use \$1.5 million from the General Fund. I was conservative in saying the process fee was only going to get \$400,000 and we will use \$1.8 from the General Fund. Group Health Insurance, through May of this year, we are having a very, very, very good year. We have had for the last couple years. In 2012 and 2013 claims peaked up and this is a very cyclical trend that we see almost every three or four years. In 2012 and 2013, it was a little over \$13 million. The last few years it has been a little over \$11 million. That has allowed us, as we contributed \$10 million from the General Fund and almost \$3 million from the outside funds, the special revenue funds like Highway and Board of Health, as an example. We have been able to build up the cash reserve that is in the Health Insurance Fund. Therefore, I decreased the contribution \$500,000 from the General Fund for next year as well as anticipated that this may be the year in that cyclical time. Next year, if the claims go up from \$11.5 million this year to \$13 million next year, we are increasing the expense \$1.5 million and dropping our contribution by \$500,000 which is a \$2 million hit to the balance. I think this \$9.5 million is sustainable for at least 2017 and 2018...

Tom Harris: Is that the cash reserve, \$9.5 million?

Nick Jordan: No, the cash reserve right now is a little over \$8 million. You have to keep in mind that we are in the first half of the year and the deductible hasn't been met yet and so what we tend to see is that in the second half of the year, claims spike up. As of May 31, it is at \$3.8 million.

Tom Harris: That is the number that we try to meet?

Nick Jordan: No. We like it around \$2 to \$3 million. It is very, very high and that is because of the experience. It is really a guess. If you remember years back, we actually had to contribute more because we were experiencing the very high \$13 million claims. What that does is cause fluctuations in the budgeting process. For example, a \$500,000 increase or decrease is a big hit especially when you think that some departments that is over their whole budget. I think if you take \$500,000 in 2017 and \$500,000 in 2018 and possibly into 2019 that is sustainable for the next three years. We can bring that cash

Page 58 of 65 June 16, 2016

balance down and also be willing to pay \$13 or \$14 million claims for the year. The balance is very high right now but it is a guess from year to year. If you or the Commissioners, in a discussion, wanted to take a bigger part of this, it could definitely be done but keep in mind that a one-time take, you can't sustain it year-over-year if claims go up. It has been on behalf of you guys and the Commissioners and the rules that have been put into place, going to one provider and the spouse rule, we pay a good amount and it has helped when you look at the insurance claims and the amount we are paying in that regard. We may see ten percent increases on the administration of the plan but we are seeing those claims stay stagnant or decrease in an environment where people's medical costs are skyrocketing every day and putting them into bankruptcy and so forth. That is the \$500,000 decrease and will leave \$9.5 million contribution from the General Fund. The other funds pay what the cost of their insurance is. The other piece is other Countywide expenses and you see a decrease of \$116,278. One of the largest pieces of this is under the Affordable Care Act which is the transitional reinsurance fee for three years. In the 2016 budget it was around \$83,000 and that goes away starting in 2017. Also, another very big unknown is how unemployment trends. I am not anticipating any big layoffs or decreases in staff that would cause unemployment to go up but as HR will tell you, each case is individual and we may lose or win and I have dropped that budget from \$100,000 to \$70,000. The next decrease you see in the changes in departmental operating allocation adjustments is the Election Board. It is a non-election year and we are going from approximately \$800,000 to around \$280,000. I have bounced it off Beth and she was fine with it. She said she can work within it. I used 2016 salaries as a basis and for the 200 and 300 series, which is Supplies and Services, I used the 2013 figure and gave them a ten percent increase for time. That is only \$5,000. The figure that was arrived at was \$514,000 from this year's budget and election year. The next one is Increase for Salary Classifications previously approved by Council. At this point it is \$149,270. I say at this point in time because just like this morning you guys heard positions like the B of I Clerk. They need those funds so if the next couple of months you guys approve more positions or people come before you and need funds for 2017, if you grant them it will factor into this figure and it will potentially rise. In essence it is salaries that were not in the 2016 budget and you guys have approved throughout the year and need to be factored into 2017.

Tom Harris: And the fact that the Clerk didn't need money.

Nick Jordan: They are not in there. We have a detail of that if you would like it. At that point in time, you see for 2016 the budget of \$93,607,824; once you tally all of those up you see the approximate 3.9% decrease which would leave us at an adjusted allocation of about \$89.7 million. When you look at the revenue of \$93.3 million and back off the \$89.7 million, it gets you to about \$3.6 million. You will see that I have taken off \$700,000 which is related to one-time revenue and potentially set that aside like the \$450,000 for one-time capital expenses. That would leave you with \$2.9 million available to fund ongoing operations. One other item that you don't see on the sheet but if you recall, we put \$1 million in Council's budget for the grid reclassification and some other litigation that is going on and there is no reason to back that out because if the grid reclassification goes through and we need to reclassify the grids, all that happens is we

Page 59 of 65 June 16, 2016

take it from Council's budget and put it into the departments' budgets. That will offset the salary increases. If the litigation cost happens, it is more of a one-time thing and we wouldn't need to continue budgeting that. More than likely, if HR and their expectations are correct and we see grid increases, the \$1 million will just be moved to other departments' budgets.

Tom Harris: So it is sitting in Council's budget now and will basically be there next year as well.

Nick Jordan: Depending on when everything goes through or if you decide not to take any action on the grids. This just looks at the General Fund and you get the cash balance in your monthly notebook along with the other funds. The County is in a very, very good financial position. The Rainy Day fund is not in there and has a little over \$7 million right now. When you put back the \$5 million for cash flow then it will be between the target of 12% to 15% of the General and COIT fund budgets. It is a very, very positive environment at this time and hopefully that continues.

Roy Buskirk: Since you mentioned that Nick, the Highway Department truck loan...

Nick Jordan: They have already paid this year's payment and I think it is \$340,000 a year and it may be a four-year loan.

Roy Buskirk: The \$13 million that you mentioned, this would be additional to it? **Nick Jordan**: Yes, we will put that back in. Right now, if you added the \$5.5 it would be between \$12 and \$13 million and we get the approximate \$1 million in the remaining couple of years, it would go back in there.

Roy Buskirk: Then we would be at \$14 million.

Nick Jordan: Or maybe mid-\$13 million.

Roy Buskirk: Oh, thank you.

Larry Brown: Thank you, Nick. Nice job.

Bill Brown: Good job.

Nick Jordan: Like I said, this is fluid. Don't hesitate with questions at any given point in time as well as we will keep you updated on the next step in the process. We are not done yet. Next is the pre-allocation letter and I apologize it is supposed to say DRAFT as a watermark but I guess it didn't want to print it. I hope you have had a chance to read it and if not, take a second to do so. What we are asking for today is for your approval of this letter and then we will send it to the departments. They will respond back answering the questions on the second page. We compile those responses and then in July you will set the budget allocations. They will work within or appeal. It is your letter so recommend the changes as you see fit. This is simply a draft.

Page 60 of 65 June 16, 2016

Tom Harris: I was going to say, nicely done on this letter. I have one concern that it might be too much positive but it is accurate. That is more important overall. The only risk we have is if we send too much of a positive note, we are going to have too many coming back to us. It is accurate which is ultimately what we want to be at this stage. This letter does not, however, suggest any kind of a pay increase or what that amount might be.

Nick Jordan: All it talks about is that you have engaged a third party to look at the grids and will take it into consideration as Council determines compensation increases. It does say compensation increases for 2017 but I can just say compensation for 2017.

Tom Harris: It is fair to say that there will be a compensation increase but I just didn't want to pin down a number to give them at this stage. We usually do that in the July meeting, right?

Nick Jordan: Yes because you want to put it in their allocation. It is easiest operationally for us too. The farther along you go to change things...

Tom Harris: I understand. In the July meeting, we will also have stats then.

Nick Jordan: Let's say that the growth quotient comes back at 3%. At that point, you will know.

Joel Benz: Okay, you need from us the approval to send this letter out.

Nick Jordan: Yes.

Roy Buskirk: Is there any more discussion? I do have a question and Nick, you and I discussed that some of the verbiage was going to be changed. On page two, last sentence in the second paragraph. "If you wish to incorporate these programs or positions into your General Fund budget allocation, you are welcome to do so." What it is talking about are grant positions, the way I understand it and if the grant is discontinued, then we are welcoming them to put it into their General Fund budget.

Nick Jordan: Yes, so let's give an example. This morning, the Prosecutor came with two funds that are being paid out of special revenue, a grant fund and if that program was discontinued, in July you are going to set an allocation for the Prosecutor. If she can absorb those positions into her General Fund allocation, you are giving her the go ahead to do that. If she needs above and beyond the allocation because that grant is gone, you guys have it expressed here that the longstanding approach is that she is going to have to find the funding for that and appeal or discontinue the program.

Tera Klutz: Because the sentence right before that says "As departments continue to seek grant funded programs and positions, we ask that you also have a contingency plan in place should these funds become unavailable as it has long been the position that County Council will not authorize continued funding for these programs or positions. If

Page 61 of 65 June 16, 2016

you wish to incorporate these programs or positions into your General Fund budget allocation, you are welcome to do so." I think you have to read the whole paragraph together but I think Roy's point is that there is some confusion whether Council is condoning the funding or the position or the program and maybe it could just be clarified. I am not sure.

Roy Buskirk: To me, I mean, I guess "welcome".

Tera Klutz: Change it to "you may do so"?

Roy Buskirk: Right.

Tera Klutz: We will take out three words and add one.

Roy Buskirk: I am always willing to look at the program and everything else but this is almost like you are laying out the carpet and welcoming them. I think it should definitely be up for discussion. I would appreciate that change. Are there any further questions? Do you want a motion on this?

Sharon Tucker: So you are going to change the sentence to "If you wish to incorporate these programs or positions into your General Fund budget allocation, you may do so"?

Tera Klutz: Yes.

Roy Buskirk: They may request it.

Sharon Tucker: Maybe that is what we should put is "they may request it".

Tera Klutz: Okay.

Sharon Tucker: To do so means you can, period. Before, we were inviting you to do it and now we are saying you can do it.

Nick Jordan: You guys really wouldn't know because you give them an allocation and they are within that allocation, you don't hear from them.

Roy Buskirk: Right.

Tera Klutz: You are not agreeing to increase the General Fund allocation. What you are allowing the Elected Official or Department Head to do is determine if that is still a necessary position or they feel it is necessary to keep doing it. If they need an increase, they most certainly have to come before you to ask for it.

Joel Benz: With that wording in place, I will make a motion that we go ahead and approve this letter.

Sharon Tucker: Second.

Page 62 of 65 June 16, 2016

Roy Buskirk: All in favor please signify by saying aye. The motion passes 6-0-1 (Bob Armstrong was absent). Again, thank you to the Auditor's staff and all of the work they put into accumulating all of this information.

Nick Jordan: Just as a reminder, there are two meetings, July 20th and July 21st.

Tera Klutz: Allow for a full day.

Tom Harris: I wanted to find out if anyone from Council is going to Saturday's annual

County Council meeting down in Shelbyville?

Larry Brown: I am a definite no.

Sharon Tucker: I am a no.

Tom Harris: I may be. I wasn't planning on it but may take the opportunity to be there for Allen County.

Roy Buskirk: I would have liked to but I think most of you know I have other plans. Are there any other things that anyone thinks Council should hear about or anything on the liaison appointments?

Larry Brown: Dave Fuller's last day I believe, is July 29th, I think.

Roy Buskirk: It is 29th or 30th.

Larry Brown: I have no knowledge of a replacement yet.

Roy Buskirk: They do have a replacement but I was not privy to any name or anything else. Roger Clark would be running the department, he is the Deputy Director, for a short period of time.

Larry Brown: I was told yesterday that the short period of time could be an hour.

Roy Buskirk: I was quite surprised because Roger Clark had indicated that he was going to retire when Dave retired.

Tom Harris: I would like to make a comment. GFW, Greater Fort Wayne Chamber, is meeting with us and keeping us up to date on some of the different things they are looking at. Obviously it has been in the community that they are looking at five major projects and as we go into the budget season, I think we should be thinking about that from the CEDIT perspective, not necessarily that we need to do something but where do the Commissioners stand on CEDIT funding for those. I would anticipate possibly this year but definitely next year that Greater Fort Wayne Chamber and the entities around those projects are going to be coming to local governments in some capacity, wanting something. The CEDIT Fund is going to be crucial. Understanding what the

Page 63 of 65 June 16, 2016

Commissioners want to do going into the budget season for next year will be crucial for County Council to understand. I just wanted to make that point.

Roy Buskirk: The other point is that most of those projects that they are looking at are inside the city limits. It would be mostly City funded instead of County.

Tom Harris: I have a feeling that they will still come to us. We represent Allen County.

Roy Buskirk: I realize that but I meant for matching funding. There has been a real effort on Greater Fort Wayne Inc. on opening up better communication lines. As a matter of fact, Tuesday I met with Eric Doden and one thing that he made a comment on was that I really appreciated him doing that is I quizzed him on the fact of the sales tax issue. There are some miscommunications on that because I understand you are basically talking about the Food and Beverage Tax. His response was no, we are talking about both. The Food and Beverage Tax would increase a cent and so will the general sales tax. The good news was that he said he definitely would support a referendum vote on that item which therefore would also include the downtown arena would be a referendum vote.

Tom Harris: It is interesting. There are a lot of pieces moving with Regional Cities and all of these projects and a lot of initiatives and things moving in northeast Indiana. As we go into the budget season, from a County Council perspective we need to take a closer look to strategies and long-term projects.

Roy Buskirk: On the economic side, we are working with six or seven different companies currently on locating in Allen County. Some of that, I don't know the locations, has to be with Northpoint and their acquisition. They are buying additional acreage across from GM.

Tom Harris: Just another point, Larry and I met with Greater Fort Wayne Chamber and the challenge I threw out to them is that while they are going out and selling the City of Fort Wayne with these projects and the hopes and plans to bring more economic development and more business and more jobs this way, the County has to think about how you fund the infrastructure improvements for those. We can't give all the money for the projects because we are going to be working with the real jobs that are coming in. From a strategy perspective, we kind of have to hold our money back to make sure we can live up to an expectation when they want to come to northeast Indiana, we can help them do that. Anyway, just some thoughts there.

Roy Buskirk: It is more complicated than that because I asked him a couple of months ago when the Road to a Million, have you taken into consideration the impact it is going to have on school corporations and other utilities and fire departments and everything else. It is quite an undertaking. It has to be flexible and be able to change as you move forward. Anybody else have any comments?

Larry Brown: Approval to waive the reading on any matter approved today for which it may be deemed necessary for the County Council meeting of June 16, 2016.

Page 64 of 65 June 16, 2016

Sharon Tucker: Second.

Roy Buskirk: All in favor please signify by saying aye. The motion passes 6-0-1 (Bob Armstrong was absent).

Joel Benz: Move to adjourn.

Bill Brown: Second.

Roy Buskirk: All in favor please signify by saying aye. Opposed like sign. The motion carries 6-0-1 (Bob Armstrong was absent). There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 12:21.

Page 65 of 65 June 16, 2016