

ALLEN COUNTY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
July 21, 2022
8:30 AM

The Allen County Council met on Thursday, July 21, 2022 at 8:30 am in the Chambers in 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: Robert A. Armstrong, Tom A. Harris, Sheila Curry-Campbell, Kyle A. Kerley, Paul W. Lagemann, Ken Fries, and Christopher Spurr.

Also Attending: Council Attorney Mitch Harper, Nick Jordan, Auditor and Jackie Scheuman, Finance and Budget Director.

President Kyle Kerley: Good morning and welcome to the Allen County Council meeting for Thursday, July 21st, 2022. I am calling the meeting to order and we will start with the Pledge of Allegiance and a moment of silence.

All: I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

[pause 00:01:00]

President Kyle: Amen.

Female Speaker: Amen.

President Kyle: The first item for today is the adoption of the agenda. Do we have any changes, amendments, or deletions?

Paul Lagemann: Mr. President, I'd like to take and move the financial report to the end of the agenda today.

President Kyle: Sir, we have a motion and a second to move the financial report to the end. All those in favor say aye.

All: Aye.

President Kyle: All those opposed? Motion passes 7-0.

Speaker 5: Mr. President, I'd also like to move the county council item up before economic development. We have quite a few folks in the room, I believe for that item for the public safety of our community. We'd like to get them back out there.

Speaker 6: Second.

President Kyle: We have a motion and a second to move county council to before economic development. All those in favor say aye.

All: Aye. 7-0

President Kyle: All those opposed? That is done. With those changes. Do I have a motion to adopt the amended agenda?

Speaker 7: Moved?

Speakers: Second.

President Kyle: Motion and multiple seconds. All those in favor say aye.

All: Aye. 7-0

President Kyle: All those opposed? Agenda is adopted. Approval of the minutes for the June 16th, 2022 meeting.

Paul Lagemann: Motion to approve the meeting or the minutes as written.

Speakers: Second.

President Kyle: Motion and multiple seconds. All those in favor say aye.

All: Aye. 7-0

President Kyle: All those opposed? Minutes are approved. Total appropriations requested in the general fund \$15,500,000. Total appropriations requested and other funds \$10,831,440. We are now going to open the floor for public comment. I believe we have one letter to be read in by Nick Jordan and we have other people coming forward. We'd ask that you try to limit your comments to three minutes. Thank you.

Judge Jennifer DeGroot: That three minutes is kind of a big ask for me, you know that. [laughs] Good morning, everyone. I'm Judge Jennifer DeGroot, Chief Judge of the Allen Superior Court, and I am here this morning on behalf of our judges and the Superior Court workforce to offer a comment on the purchase of a real estate agenda item you will be considering shortly. All of you should have received a letter from Superior Court earlier this month, laying out our concerns about what comes after the purchase you are considering and the shuffling of spaces that is expected to follow the purchase.

It has been proposed that court functions from several locations will then be relocated to the Rousseau Centre. Call them aspirational, or an exercise if you will but the proposals we have been shown about how to insert these various court functions into the Rousseau Centre, heard our workflow, impair our ability to serve the public, and detrimentally impact the working conditions of our staff and that makes it hard for us to embrace. We are concerned that the point of no return comes after any yes vote today because once you have said yes to the purchase, it's difficult to go back regardless of any buyback language that might be present in that purchase agreement.

As I pointed out in the recent letter we sent to you, the courts have not asked for additional space. We have put years of work into optimizing the spaces we have and there is no plan that has been proposed thus far that is better than what we already have. I can speak from experience that when court functions have to operate out of deficient space, such as small claims had to do several years ago in the former annex on Berry Street. There's a lot that we lose when it comes to accessibility for people and also with efficiency for the court.

That negatively impacts the court process and that leads to a sense of frustration and distrust from the public based on their court experience. I just hope you will all consider that and the contents of those letters moving forward as you consider that agenda item. Thank you.

President Kyle: Thank you, Judge.

Auditor Nick: [silence] Morning, council. Auditor Nick Jordan, reading a letter from Lee Powell from 46765. Your council members I respectfully ask this body to fully fund our county parks at a level that would allow for two full-time maintenance workers and allows enough money that trail improvements, picnic shelters, bridges, walkways, and stairs can be constructed without having to rely on volunteer labor from the Boy Scouts or other volunteers. Our schools are fully funded as our police roads and library if our county can afford to fund the main library in all its branches why must be bypassed to get into Fox Island and Metea parks? Studies prove that we need green spaces for mental health as much as we need books for mental stimulation.

I am begging you please to fund our county parks with the same consideration that is given to police, roads, schools, and our excellent library. Payton North County Park is in desperate need of a new staircase at the top of the Nature Preserve. It could really use a bridge built across the creek on Trail Y? It is a challenge this time of year to keep up with the mowing of trails. I realized that the county parks have tried to copy the state parkway of funding with gate receipts or annual passes but the cost is as much for two main parks as it is as it costs for 32 State Park properties.

Please just raise our property taxes entrance to the county parks is free, we can get rid of the gate guards and annual passes and have two maintenance people so that the parks can be well maintained. Lee Powell.

President Kyle: Thank you.

Sarah: Good morning. My name is Sarah [inaudible 00:06:54] I live at 5211 South Wayne Avenue here in Fort Wayne. I am the associate pastor at Plymouth Congregational Church in downtown Fort Wayne and I am here today to ask the county council not to approve any funds towards building a new jail in Allen County, and in particular, not on the southeast side of Fort Wayne. Before I came to Fort Wayne, I worked at a homeless shelter in New London, Connecticut and I can tell you that every day, we dealt with individuals coming out of incarceration, who clearly did not receive the help that they desperately needed.

Rather, they were sent to jail no one would have to deal with them or their problems. People with mental illness should not have to go to jail to get treatment. People struggling with addiction should not have to go to jail to get detoxed. People with substance use disorder and people who are poor end up in jail longer than they should be because they can't make bail and they lose access to housing, employment, and other essentials. People need help, not handcuffs. It has been eye-opening to me these past few months to see how our city and county officials pay lip service to this reality but are completely unwilling to think creatively about alternatives to incarceration. They just keep singing the same song we have to build a bigger jail but we don't have to do that.

Our elected officials are simply suffering from a gigantic failure of imagination but our coalition imagines something better than building a new jail. We imagine a community where everyone has access to the care that they need. We imagine a stronger, more caring, more

compassionate, more just community where we don't lock people away simply because they're struggling with poverty, mental illness, and addiction. Please don't approve funds for this project until we have exhausted other alternatives that would be better for the whole community. Thank you.

President Kyle: Thank you.

Sean Collentine: Good morning. My name is Sean [inaudible 00:08:54] and I'm at 46807 is my zip code. Today I'm here to highlight the fact that you the Allen County Council is our last defense against government authority that has become too expansive and too expensive. You are responsible to oversee the cost of our county spending and try to keep it in check. We the taxpayers are relying on your oversight. First, we have the proposed new jail that has been much in the news, a federal judge has ordered the following, a copy of the judge's order. He has ordered the following, provide a safe environment for inmates of the jail, not an unreasonable request.

Two, to provide sufficient staff to ensure adequate supervision of inmates. Three, requires the prisoners be given five hours a week of exercise. In fourth, he wants to see the county commissioners' long-term plans to prevent this problem in future years. He said and if the long-term solution requires construction, I want to see the plans. Newspaper stories have been wrong about the judge's orders. He did not order new jail construction. This is the route the commissioners have chosen, and the new jail if constructed could cost taxpayers upwards of \$350 million. Today's issue is not the jail. At the last council meeting, the commissioners proposed buying a \$13 million office building at 1300 South Clinton. Fortunately, the council tabled the issue until today, until you had more information and could analyze the need for more space. Along with buying properties, they also propose spending.

This is an addition to the property purchase, an additional \$19 million on remodeling it, another \$14 million to remodel the Rousseau Centre for changes there. Right now the project has an anticipated cost of over \$50 million. This has nothing to do with the jail. We've already been confronted with a \$350 million bill there. This figure does not include the \$30 million in addition that it would take to move the fire and police departments out of Rousseau. This commissioner proposed spending exactly why we need Allen County Council to be the taxpayers' Watchdogs. Our commissioners are bringing us the taxpayers items that will require over \$400 million in additional tax burden to pay for them next year.

None of the above costs would solve the underlying overcrowding issue because of the four-year construction site. We're not going to change the overcrowding at all with this plan. Here's my proposal, do a census of who was held in jail today. My latest numbers from May of '22 show that there are a large number of inmates in the Allen County jail that could be possibly early released upon a judge's order and discretion. Our jail population goal is 592, which is 80% of its rated capacity. Here's how we achieve it in a one-year plan. We presently hold 135 people charged with level six felonies. These are the least serious of the felonies.

There are such things as theft, burglary. If you have two DUIs within five years, you're a level six felon. Breaking and entering. We also have 166 people who broke probation. We have a pool of 300 people that could possibly have their sentences reduced. If we only had half of them, we could achieve the overcrowding solution and it wouldn't cost us anything other than take a little risk and get with the judges and this is what we're going to do. An alternate plan, not the financial plan that's been shoved down our throats. All this would satisfy the judge's orders and would save us \$400 million in unnecessary taxes.

Once the county's financial deck is cleared of this short-sighted debris, we could develop the long-term solution to better deal with preventing the overcrowding in the future. Do the right thing. Vote no on the building purchase on South Clinton. Thank you.

President Kyle: Thank you.

Timothy Murphy: Good morning. My name is Timothy Murphy, address 4601, Beaver Avenue. Also, a senior pastor at Plymouth Congregational Church and a coalition member of the Help Not Handcuffs Coalition. I would just like to use a metaphor of my current situation as it relates to our jail situation and the Allen County Commissioners. I had surgery yesterday on my foot. I had pain in my foot for close to a year and it was hard to live with. I was like, "What am I going to do about this?" I met with a doctor. He looked at some options and one option was to live with it. One was to remove the thing that was causing pain. One option we didn't talk about that is cutting off my foot.

We spent more time talking about what's going to be done to help my foot pain, than the Allen County Board commissioners have spent on alternatives to building a new jail. I think if we can spend a few months looking at what to do to relieve a personal issue with my left foot, then surely the county as a whole can come up with some solutions that doesn't cost \$1,500, but \$350 million plus maintenance and staffing. I would just encourage you all to not approve any funding at this point because I really don't think the Allen County Board of Commissioners has done the work that needs to be done to look at alternatives to incarceration.

They have not looked at all the options and they're ready to chop off the foot and build a new foot as opposed to saying, what can we do to make this work? Thank you very much.

President Kyle: Thank you.

Alicia Roush: Hello, my name is Alicia Roush. I'm from ChangeMakers Fort Wayne. We're a social justice organization here in the city. [clears throat] I'm just here to say, I don't think we need a new jail. There are so many people in the jail right now with mental health issues, addiction issues, and I think we need to take a second [clears throat] and not rush into this and look at how we can help those people. I see that it took them two seconds to get it under overcrowding. Why couldn't that have been done a long time ago? We have a property Byron Health Center. Why are we rushing to put it on the southeast side, the poor side of the city, that will be so negatively impacted? It will cripple their neighborhood.

We're already trying to revitalize that side of the city with businesses, houses, whatever it may be and that will negatively impact that community and pretty much cripple it. All the housing around it, the values will go down. You guys already know this. I'm really just here to say that I don't believe we need a new jail. I think we need to work on trying to help some of these people out of their situations, addictions, and mental health issues and look at what we can do in the city, what programs we have that can help them or what programs can we build that can help these people so we can stop the revolving door of going in and out of jail?

Rather than keep this up and build a bigger jail, so we can house more people with mental health issues and addictions. I think it's just going to-- if they can't staff it now, sorry, if they can't staff it now, what makes us think they'll be able to staff a larger jail? It just really doesn't make sense to me. I'm here just to say no new jail. I also want to say that we at ChangeMakers has personally been in this fight for I think, three months now. Three months

ago, we said, online, and we shared a post that said that if this jail would go to the southeast side because where else would you guys think to put it? Or where else would they think to put it? We said that online.

We got so much backlash, specifically from Sheila Curry-Campbell saying that, "If you knew about it, if this was going to happen, you would tell your community and you'd be the first to know." We could have been proactive then and started fighting it really with the community and gathering the community to fight it. Now we have to be reactive. Now we only have six weeks left. I really hope that in the future, and that-- I really don't know what to say about. I'm kind of disappointed that we failed our community at that moment.

I hope that in the future, that you won't be put in a position where you have as much influence to impact the community the way that impacted the community because we were running out of time. Thank you.

Bryan Remke: I'm Bryan Remke, 21721 [unintelligible 00:18:39] Harlan, Indiana. I'm a member of Allen County Farm Bureau, a landowner, and taxpayer. I'm here today to encourage you. It may sound strange with the following facts, but we all know that inflation is at a 40-year high and there's every possibility that the recession train is heading our way. In light of those facts, you council members will have an extraordinary challenge in front of you. I'm confident that you will listen to your constituency and do things to start tightening your purse strings now before it becomes a crisis. Taxation for those of us who are on a fixed income is a real burden. Things that you can't plan for. Thank you for your time.

Tom Miller: Good morning, counsel. Thank you for your time today. My name is Tom Miller. I live on Webster Road near the Woodburn area. I appreciate the council considering the request of the Allen County Fire Chiefs Association to purchase the 800 megawatts radio equipment. for all the volunteer firemen and EMTs. As you well know the volunteer fireman department is such a huge asset for the health and safety of the citizens of Allen County. The benefit of all volunteer fire and EMS personnel to be able to communicate with each other when they're on an emergency situation is priceless for that health and safety of our citizens. Also, I'd like to address for the county council to table any decisions for the purchase of the Lincoln Financial building on South Clinton.

News articles state that the judicial system would be moved to the South Clinton location. With the planning for a new jail maybe the judicial system should be incorporated into planning a new jail so the majority of the system could all be on one campus. I believe until a plan is adopted for the jail I think a plan to purchase any additional buildings is not warranted at this time. We please the council to keep the property taxes at the current levels for the next few years. Let's keep property taxes low for the citizens of Allen County. Thank you very much for your time.

Robert Shopper: I'm Robert Shopper. I live on Sampson Road near Woodburn. Before the council, I'd like to thank them for allowing us to speak. I think before the council rushes into either buying or selling county-owned property, they need to take a long hard look at the property already owned and see if it can be repurposed, be used for their needs and our needs as citizens. As Brian stated earlier, the economy that we're in starting to look tougher and tougher with inflation and looming recession coming we need to be more prudent with our money and follow through and take better care of the resources we have and not just rush into selling or buying property that we may or may not need. Thank you.

President Kyle: Anybody else for public comment? [unintelligible 00:22:23] a motion to end public comment.

Member: [unintelligible 00:22:25]

Member: Second.

President Kyle: Motion and a second in public comment. All those in favor say aye.

All Members: Aye. 7-0

President Kyle: All those opposed, public comment is closed. Next item on the agenda will be the Fort Wayne Allen County Airport Authority.

Scott Hinderman: Scott Hinderman, executive director of the airport authority.

Robin Strasser: Robin Strasser, Director of Administration and Finance for the airport authority.

Scott: Morning council we come to you today asking for an additional appropriation to our existing budget. A little bit of background before we make that formal request. Our formal request will be the \$9,633,583 for additional probe. Why that dollar value? We have the federal bill or bipartisan infrastructure law. We wanted to compete favorably for some federal funds for our project, that terminal building.

We did receive a grant for \$13.8 million. In order to be ready for that grant, we have to enter into a design of the East project. That portion of the effort is within this additional preparation request. Our success is a good thing but it does cost money. Both Smithfield and FWA have been at a hangar capacity for a couple of years now. Throughout the pandemic, we actually grew in aircraft based at both airports. We have a need for an additional hangar construction.

That's another portion of it. Taxiway Alpha at Smithfield. There's federal funding behind that project, but we need some additional funding or appropriation to complete that project, which does attract federal funding to reimburse us as well as the design of Taxiway Charlie 2 at FWA. We have to do the design. We anticipate receiving federal funds as a reimbursement to that project. What we're looking for is the additional appropriation because it's not within our budget now.

Now that said, we saw these projects coming although we're bringing some of them a little bit forward faster than what we anticipated in 2023 or 2024. We have the funds set aside in our budget so we're not asking for any additional funding. We have the dollars, but we're asking for the appropriation. The ability to use funds that we already have in our reserves. Thank you. Looking for a word. We have those funds, we're just looking for the additional appropriation per state code.

The Allen County Council is our fiscal body so we need the additional appropriation from this council. It actually helps us we received a grant. Of course, we're going to accept the grant but it helps us be prepared to use the federal grant or 13.8 from the bill fund or the ATP or Airport Terminal Program. Robin, am I missing things from the financial side? If you guys need details, you'll bury me so that's why Robin is up here to help me. I'd be happy to answer any questions that the council may have.

President Kyle: Mr. Fries.

Mr. Fries: Does this mean with this appropriation that you would be reducing your future budgets by \$8.9 million? Since this is money that you already have set aside for the future, I assume that in the future, you won't be asking for that \$8.9 million because you're using it now.

Scott: That is correct, although some of the funds that we're doing is anticipating the design work for the construction, so the construction will be in our future budget. The budget might not look like it's reduced but these funds that we're spending here for this additional appropriation would be dollars that we would spend in a future year, which we will not be asking those dollars in the future year.

Mr. Fries: You're asking for an advance on your allowance.

Scott: We're asking to use the funds that we already have in our reserve that we would be in a future year or so. I guess yes, to your question.

Mr. Fries: Thank you.

President Kyle: Mr. Lagemann.

Mr. Lagemann: Over the last couple of years, I know you guys have been pretty aggressive in grant funding requests. Can you give us a sense of how much you've been able to offset costs through grants?

Scott: Some projects are not eligible to get a grant. If there's a project out there, that's eligible to receive state or federal funding, we chase it very aggressively. I would like to say possibly more aggressive than any other airport. When we get a grant they're typically funded at 95% of the grant funds, 5% local. That's primarily why we chase it so hard that we're bringing in outside funds into our community, as well as it keeps our cost down to our tenants and the users of the airport. We are always chasing federal funding to offset our costs.

Mr. Lagemann: We could comfortably say that out of the \$13 million that you're going to be receiving that is \$13 million that Allen County taxpayers are not paying for and that we're bringing in dollars from Peoria, Illinois, from New York City from San Francisco, California, to help fund our airport right here offsetting the cost the taxpayers would otherwise spend, is that correct?

Scott: That is correct.

Mr. Lagemann: Thank you very much.

Mr. Harris: Mr. President, I guess, Scott, is this work toward the additional gate development or this is the additional gate to the left, if you will, as you come into the terminal?

Scott: Yes, it's the additional gates to the left/east. We actually call our project gateway. What's under work right now is project gateway West, that should be done by let's go somewhere between April and June of next year, and we are doing the design work. That's what part of this appropriation is for the project gateway East. When we're done, we'll have

gates that can accommodate and be used all at the same time and everything will be second-level boarding.

Mr. Harris: Now the challenge for the airport and other organizations in the community is that it's not necessarily where we are today, it's where we need to be 10 years out. You've pointed out in the past, and for those that don't understand it, or know about it, that the wingspan is getting longer on the planes. Therefore, it makes us have to get to a different gate thing for the future. You want to just touch on that?

Scott: I can and to use your words, and not throwing them back at you, Councilman, but use your words. This project is for both today and in the future. We have eight gates at the terminal building today. We can't park eight aircraft at our terminal building at the same time, because the aircraft have gotten larger and the width of the wingspan. Now if we have two aircraft parked adjacent to each other, we have wingtip conflict. The wingtips will actually hit each other.

That's why we're needing to expand and what we're doing is putting more lineal foot in between each gate. Then in the future planning because we have 10 years of growth. We are actually adding some additional gates to take care of us in the foreseeable future as northeast Indiana continues to grow. It's both. It's taking care of what we have today, and as well as anticipating some growth because we've seen that growth over the last 10 years. Even with the pandemic, when the country is directed to stay home, don't leave your house. Of course, travel went down, but Robin and I did some planning and some regression. When I say that Robin did it, as far as what we would think is when we would come back and how we would recover from the pandemic. Initially, when we did it, we thought it would be 2024, 2025 for our recovery. We're at about 93% recovered now, and the demand for travel has never been higher.

In fact, I would say we could have easily finished this year at pre-pandemic levels. The thing that's hurting us is our capacity. There's a pilot shortage in the airline industry, and we just need more seats in our market, and we are trying to accommodate to bring that back with this project.

Mr. Harris: This \$9.6 million is coming from the \$13.8 grant, is that correct?

Scott: It is not. The \$9 million, some of that is out of our reserves. We're spending that money. We have to spend the money in the design so we can be prepared to utilize the \$13.8 in construction dollars. The \$13.8 that we got awarded is an early announcement of the award. It will go towards the actual construction. We will have construction figures sometime in the mid-December of this time period, but we're doing a design which we had to, so we can be ready to receive those federal dollars yet this calendar year.

Mr. Harris: Thank you.

Ms. Sheila Curry-Campbell: Thank you for being here. I was stuck out on the tarmac this week for about 45 minutes on a Delta flight, Atlanta to Fort Wayne. One of the things that they said was that they didn't have any staff. That's my concern with all of the expansion and staff. What are we doing to retain, recruit staff?

Scott: I'm going to make some assumptions make maybe some bold statements. I think there's a staffing shortage for everybody. The Airport Authority, we are not at 100% staffing,

but we're close. You were on the tarmac because of staffing shortages not by the airport authority. That was the airline. The airline handles their aircraft. They are going through some staffing challenges. They clearly hire, and some people have an opportunity to move on and take a different job. They are at Delta. Our airport uses Unifly as a ground handling agency, and they are hiring just as quickly as they can.

Anybody who's listening, watching, and wants to work with airplanes, they certainly call Unifly and I'm sure they're hiring.

They're looking for people. Yes, they have challenges especially when there's dual operations where Atlanta flight and I don't know your scenario, but Atlanta flight comes in at the same time, a Delta flight. If one's earlier, one's late, that causes some challenges for the airlines, but they are looking to hire some additional staff.

Ms. Curry-Campbell: Is there any bonus or retention? I don't know this company. I've never heard of them. It seems like there's been a problem in that space. I don't know if they're listening. I think we need to have a conversation offline about this because that was ridiculous. Thank you.

President Kyle: Mr. Fries.

Mr. Fries: One thing I'd like to make sure everybody understands that we are very clear on, we appreciate the fact that you're chasing the federal dollars. Many times we talk about federal dollars like it's a big bucket out there someplace that we don't know how it gets there. We all know how it gets there. It's from us. The federal dollars and the grants are still our money. It may come from San Francisco, it may come from all across the country, and we appreciate you chasing it down, but we all have to remember that's still our tax dollars.

It concerns me, if you didn't have that money set aside for future use, I would be a no vote, but since your budgets are going to be reduced in the future because you have that money set aside, I'd be in favor of it.

Mr. Harris: Mr. President, I move for the appropriation within the airport general fund of \$9,633,583.

Ms. Curry-Campbell: Second.

President Kyle: We have a motion and second. Any further discussion? I just have a couple of questions, which I know is going to prolong the vote. Anyways, first question is, have you already hired a designer for the east part? Designer, architect?

Scott: We have. We have engaged with Mead & Hunt. They are an architectural firm that specializes in specifically aviation terminal buildings.

President Kyle: Are they the same ones that did the west?

Scott: They are. We were able to save significant money on our design because the learning curve is already consumed in the west project. They knew our project. They had some of the drawings or existing terminal building already in their software.

President Kyle: I know when we originally started talking about this, 2018, 2019, one of the things that I had brought up was looking at what Indianapolis did, where they had ghost

gates. We went back and forth on that discussion. If I understand correctly, you have included some ghost gates for the future. Yes or no?

Scott: Yes. Ghost gates are easily expandable without actually spending those dollars now. We have eight gates today. When we're done with our project, we'll have 10 gates, 11 positions. If Northeast Indiana continues to grow, we'll have two more positions beyond that that could be built or modular could be expanded relatively easily.

President Kyle: Now I need a motion to entertain a motion to end discussion.

Mr. Fries: So moved.

President Kyle: Okay.

Mr. Fries: Second.

President Kyle: We have a motion to approve \$9,633,583 from an appropriation within the airport general fund. All those in favor, say aye.

All Members: Aye.

President Kyle: All those opposed? Motion passes. 7-0

Scott: Thank you.

Mr. Fries: Thank you very much.

Robin: Thank you.

President Kyle: I need to step away for a minute, so Councilman Armstrong is going to take over.

Councilman Armstrong: All right, thank you. The next thing on the agenda will be the Southwest Allen County Fire District on the funding for a new ladder truck.

Auditor Nick: Morning, Council. I don't see Brett or anybody from Southwest Fire District. If you recall, last year we did this exact same thing. The Southwest Fire District had planned or budgeted for a new ladder truck, I believe. They didn't purchase it last year. We rolled it over. Excuse me. We reduced the appropriation so they can budget it in '22. They haven't bought it in '22. They're seeking again to reduce that appropriation so that the Department of Local Government Finance, or DLGF, will let them budget it in '23. If we don't reduce the appropriation, the DLGF goes under the assumption that that money is out there and will be spent in '22 and they can't budget it in '23.

That's all they're doing again, for whatever reason. On the delays, I'm not sure, but they're not asking for new money. They're actually asking reduced so they can budget it for '23.

Mr. Harris: With that, Mr. Acting President, I'll move for the appropriation reduction within Southwest Fire District Fire fund of \$800,000.

Ms. Curry-Campbell: Second.

Councilman Armstrong: All right. With the motion and a second on funding for the new ladder truck from the Southwest reduction. All in favor, say aye.

All Members: Aye. 7-0

Councilman Armstrong: Opposed? So moved. Next on the agenda, we will have the discussion on the lit money for public safety radios and pagers.

Speaker: You can go ahead. [inaudible 00:39:12]

Fire Chief: I hired off the best IT guys [unintelligible 00:39:25]

[laughter]

Member: [unintelligible 00:39:28]

Fire Chief Robert Boren: Good morning, Council. Thank you very much for allowing us to come back in front of you again. We want to thank the Allen County commissioners and the Allen County Council for all of your hard work and due diligence to allow us to present for you here today for our continuous request for funds for the 800 MHz Paging system to help update our current system so we have a more accurate and better system in place that's more reliable, along with the computer-assisted dispatching in our trucks and alerting systems for our stations. Just to reiterate and review on this, we're asking to help take our system into the next level and to be more of a reliable system. Currently, we're relying on a paging system with a VHF backbone that is not supported by Motorola, not supported by many other agencies and it's slowly going to be out of the ER, the use of what we can have for it. Also what that means is we're one catastrophic event from that failing.

If we lose our communication abilities to be able to page our volunteers, the bulk of these gentlemen and ladies that are sitting in the audience with us today, we lose the ability to be able to have prompt service for our constituents and those who are in need, and that potentially puts life and property on the line. That's not something that we would like to do. Obviously, we want to make sure that we are improving on this. The computer system like I stated before is going to help us keep track of units, give us real-time data and mapping.

The Sheriff's department does a phenomenal job, but the mapping system now puts it into the Spellman system. That mapping is crucial for us, especially with all the new developments that are going on across the county, streets are changing every single day. To have that real-time, data is just crucial for life response and property conservation. We wanted to come back and review some of this so you guys know what we're talking about and moving forward. The paging system we're talking about, you can see the picture up on the screen here is an 800 megahertz paging system. This takes us away from the VHF system.

This puts us totally reliant on 800 megahertz system. This is the system that has been true and proven through the Sheriff's department, the city police department, and the city fire department. They use it on a daily basis. In fact, the alerting system, when we talk about that, it's the same learning system that the city fire department uses, and it works phenomenal for them in getting their crews out there in a timely fashion but these are the pagers. These pagers will be able to broadcast all the channels that we currently monitor. It gives real-time data and information in the hands of our first responders, as they're responding to emergencies or at their homes to be notified in case of emergencies.

The learning system in the station it works off of the VHF system as we have now. Again, we're trying to get off of that VHF system and move totally to the 800 megahertz system. This is the same system that is already loaded up in the combined partnership downtown in the communications center. It's the same system that the four Fort Wayne fire department uses. We know it's tried and true. It's a great technology. That's going to last a very long time.

Councilman Harris: Any idea how long?

Fire Chief: That's a good question. I am not a technical person to give an answer. If Mike Reichert was here, I'd make him talk. I don't have a specific date on that, but I know we're not adding- we're not investing into a system that is going to be outdated within the next 5 to 10 years. In fact, one thing that the county has done, the county fire departments is we have collectively come together to work towards a grant to help get some new radios for us. The new technology is the same 800 megahertz radio system that we're using here now.

Motorola is going to guarantee those new radios for the next 15 years. We know we're investing into a system that's going to be here for quite some time. That's a roundabout back doorway of answering your question a little bit.

Councilman Harris: Thank you.

Fire Chief: The CAD system, Computer-aided Dispatching Spillman is a system that is used by all public safety personnel excluding Allen County Fire as a whole. We are riding on the coattails of the Allen county Sheriff's department. They've been gracious enough to allow us to be a part of their system, but now it's time for us to grow, expand our wings, be a part, and vested venture into the Spillman system itself. This system not only lets us do the dispatching that gives us quicker notification in the trucks' location of our apparatus but also gives us the ability to put in back plans information of representatives for locations at buildings.

Instead of taxing our dispatchers, we can actually pull that information up ourselves and make those phone calls rather than taxing our already busy system as it is. This is just an outline of all the stations that represent Allen county fire. There's 22 stations now. Well, technically 23, I should say, excuse me, that make up a county fire as a whole. This is excluding the city of Fort Wayne. The city of Fort Wayne has their own 18 stations that run a great system as it is, but this is what is surrounding.

This is what's taking care of the county as it is right now. Just giving an outline of where all we are located throughout. You can clearly see we're throughout we're 595 people strong. We used to use the number 550. We just did a recent poll on that and found out we're a little bit stronger than we thought to. This is just a small sampling of what we represent in Allen county. I do want to also go back and thank you for bringing us up a little bit earlier because probably right after this, you're going to see most of these people go back to their coverage area, but they wanted to show how important this is.

Allen county fire over the past 5 years has collectively come together to become a stronger, more herd group. It's because we are working collectively more than we ever have. A fire that might take place in the Northeast corner of the county might bring units from the City of New Haven to come up and help somewhere up in Hunter Town. It's not unheard of in the Southwest fire district are constantly being pulled over to the west side, excuse me, to the east side of the coverage area of Allen county to help back it up because we rely so much on one another.

Volunteerism is down, we're struggling and getting, finding those people that want to dedicate the time for free to do this. That's why we're working so collectively together and as a group and we're going to continue to do so. We've been working great this way and it's only going to continue to get stronger and this is just one more example of how we're all coming together. This is a breakdown of all the departments, as you can see here I'm not going to read down all the numbers, but that grand total of 594. Now that 594 does reflect also auxiliary members.

Maybe some support staff within departments could be some part-time staffing and career staffing because we represent a wide range of staffing across Allen County. The cost breakdown of what we're asking for today, we're asking for \$1,460,258 and 47 cents. This money goes for the mock alerting system, also goes for the AVL system, and data for our computers, for our trucks, and our 800 paging system. The numbers there are reflected in the quantity, the mock alerting system that says the quantity of one, but that actually represents all 23 stations.

I wanted to give that breakdown. Now there is this doesn't come free for Allen county fire departments as a whole, there is a cost that we're going to incur on this as well. Now it's a substantially smaller cost than what we're asking for from the county commissioners and county council and yourself but there is a cost we're looking at about \$227,000 in some change that county departments collectively are going to have to pay into this to make this whole system fulfill everything that we need. Some of that is getting air cards.

We can actually have the mobile data terminals working in our vehicles. The Spillman subscription fee, the Allen county fire chief association is going to take care of that on a yearly basis. The money that we raise for the chief's association is through dues that volunteer fire departments pay into the dues and computers in a station run Spillman and also the speaker systems for some departments that don't have that. We're roughly looking at a \$227,000 investment on our own behalf. That's about a 13.5% chunk of the total project. That's going to be a total project of a little over 1.6 million.

There is some cost onto us. Obviously, if the county is able to assist us with this, it takes a huge burden off of our hands.

I represent the departments, and the 11 agencies at hand, and through those agencies, we still have departments that rely on fundraisers to make their business go. The Arcola Fire Department, if they did not have the tractor pole, they would not be floating and being able to sustain what they have today. The Pole fire department, constantly putting on benefits to be able to get more money for themselves.

The example can go on and on. This relief would help us take our budgeted money and go further to what we need for other public safety things. Collectively coming together as a group is why we wanted to be here today because we knew that this was a chance for us to be able to move together as a group and maybe get some pressure off of us. Can I open up to any questions you may have?

Councilman Armstrong: I saw Councilman Fries his hand goes up first.

Mr. Fries: Many, first of all, timeline, if after we approve this today, hand to hand when will first responders have these in their hand?

Fire Chief: The pagers we can see in our hands probably within about two months they are in stock. They're ready to go. We have to get them to do the programming on them and then get them distributed out through the departments.

Mr. Fries: I don't see anything up there for a maintenance agreement.

Fire Chief: The maintenance agreement comes into what we would have on, on the additional cost in ourselves. Like the mock learning system and the pagers come with the standard maintenance that they have for like a two-year agreement. Then after that, it would be relying on each department.

Mr. Fries: Okay. And is GPS in any of those radios?

Fire Chief: The radios, not the pagers, but in the radios, they will be. We're not asking for radios today, we're asking for pagers. The GPS is actually going to come into the MDTs that we'll be putting in the trucks and that's where our GPS tracking will be at.

Mr. Fries: Okay. Thank you. [unintelligible 00:48:57]

Councilmember Spurr: Chief on the subscription services on the annual expenses. What is the expectation or historically, what have you seen in that fluctuation in cost increase percentages? If it's, I guess what I'm saying is if it's \$30 this year, this month did you do a five-year look back and see maybe how much they increased those costs?

Fire Chief: We've seen historically for at least the past four years, I don't have a five-year data for you for the past four years. We stayed at that \$30 mark. Okay. and that's through Verizon, Verizon will give all the equipment for free and it's the \$30 subscription that you have to pay into that. They have a good, really great first responder program that they work with. Then first that also out there is starting to try to compete for some business in that too. We could probably see some competitive pricing come back from that, but that \$30 is what we have historically seen.

Councilmember Spurr: You don't anticipate any issues whatsoever. Moving forward, say projecting 10 years out on those subscription services.

Fire Chief: I can't read what 10 years is going to have. Obviously, that's really hard for me to say that right now and no one will guarantee anything, especially in our economy [unintelligible 00:49:59] today but from what we've been told from the companies that we've talked to, we don't see an expected growth on that.

Councilmember Spurr: Okay, but this entire system is based on a subscription service, correct?

Fire Chief: Not the entire system, no. Just the computers in the fire trucks. Everything else is based off of what we have here in front of us.

Councilmember Spurr: Okay. Thank you.

Councilmember Lagemann: Ms. Curry-Campbell.

Councilmember Curry-Campbell: Is there any training in this request? How are you going to do the upkeep? You said 15 years, is that the life of this?

Fire Chief: The expected life expectancy for these pagers itself is I can't guarantee 15, we weren't given that exact month on that, or a year time-frame on that. The training that would go in place is basically handing someone to pager, going through a department and saying, this is how you work, your department, your pager. The county fire departments, the Chief's Association will implement individuals to go through each department to talk about the Spillman system. The local Spillman board just recently granted unanimous decision to allow Spillman access to the Allen County fire chiefs, which we're really happy about. With that will come some training about three or four personnel and then those personnel will go out to individual departments and get that training out for them.

Councilmember Curry-Campbell: That would be what a one day training?

Fire Chief: Yes, probably like a one day, maybe a few hours and move on. Then we'll always have those people that'll be in line to be able to handle that maintenance.

Councilmember Curry-Campbell: Thank you.

Councilmember Lagemann: First of all, I want to say, thanks for all of you coming out. We don't usually have these big crowds at county council, and it's great to see. I also want to say, thanks for all you guys do, you put your lives on the line on a regular basis to help save other people's lives and property and that's commendable and I consider that heroic. Thank you for all you do on a regular basis. I want to go back to one of the things that you said that we are one weather event, one disaster away from losing communications in the county. Can you elaborate on that just a tad?

Fire Chief: Yes, I don't want to make it sound like it's all the communications would all fail at once, but the paging system that we have in place right now is based off the VHS system, and the towers that we use for the VHS system do not have replacement parts for them. The radio specialist, we depend on Mike Riker, I'm sure that's the name everyone knows. He's flat out told us we were one catastrophic event away from that going down, and he used the best example of just a lighting strike. Imagine a very tall tower out in the middle of an open field.

Councilmember Lagemann: That's metal?

Fire Chief: Yes, it sometimes draw some attention from the lightning gods, so that is a concern that we have. We've been living on borrowed time with that. Currently right now today, if the system failed, the main system failed, there is a backup system, but unfortunately that backup system is just as old and just as brittle.

Councilmember Lagemann: Okay. Thank you very much and and Mr-- You have a question?

President Kyle: Just to clarify, you guys are asking for 1.46 approximately.

Fire Chief: Yes Sir.

President Kyle: That's basically an upfront, buy the equipment and the county departments are prepared moving forward to basically out of their own budgets, pay for the maintenance fees, the subscription fees and stuff like that. You're basically asking for us to buy the equipment with the understanding that the departments are going to take care of the maintenance fees and subscription fees and stuff like that.

Fire Chief: That is correct. It's a lot easier for a department to put in the yearly maintenance that they would have to inquire into that, than being able to budget the one lump sum that we would need to be able to purchase all that. To add to that, to be able to get the whole county to move in the same direction at the same time would be near to impossible to do, because everyone has their own timeline of their capital expenses that they would have to put in throughout the years. For one department that might be able to do it tomorrow, it would take another department maybe four years to get to that point. This would be that huge jump start to be able to get us all on the same page at the same time.

President Kyle: That answers the question. Mr. Spurr.

Councilmember Spurr: Just to elaborate with what Kyle and Kenny have said, that was the reasoning for my questions on the subscription service, because I know those tend to fluctuate, having been in that industry in a former life. My question is the smaller departments are going to be able to absorb those costs, correct? To move forward on the same system?

Fire Chief: Yes. I'm going to use an example in the fire chief from [00:54:20] Scotty Schrader is right back here. He's probably one of the departments that struggles just as deep as anyone else does in his department. In he's able to find that fluctuation and he's one, I'm just going to be blunt honest, they depend on peanut brittle to make their operations succeed. They are able to make that work into that for the yearly subscription fees. We really took a huge array. My department in Perry Township and Hunter Town, we're very fortunate, we're very lucky with what we have. We did take into consideration other departments that are not as fortunate with their funding and they're able to find ways to make that happen.

Councilmember Spurr: Okay, good. Thank you.

Fire Chief: Thank you.

Councilmember Harris: I Wanted to check. I thought we had had some discussion that ARPA could possibly be considered for some of this, or did I miss that? Had we had that discussion previously?

Councilmember Lagemann: We did. One of the issue with ARPA is it's going to back up about six months on this process. Again, endangering life and property. I appreciate Kenny's question earlier to how soon can we deploy? And this does allow us to deploy. My understanding of ARPA you can based on this expenditure be reimbursed, so this wouldn't necessarily clear out the public lit, and we could have a reimbursement from ARPA to reinsert in there

Councilmember Harris: Whatever mechanically we have to do to keep that consideration in front of us, we need to do that.

Councilmember Lagemann: Absolutely.

Councilmember Harris: I don't know if that comes from the auditor of these guys, or we'd have to look at that, but let's keep that up. If that opportunity exists, I don't want to miss that, I guess, is the thought there. The other, we had 1.8 listed but they're suggesting 1.4.

President Kyle: That was approximately the fund balance.

Councilmember Harris: I see.

President Kyle: That was the maximum we could allocate. They worked the last two or three weeks to get us a more definitive--

Councilmember Harris: The 1.4 is the accurate number, [crosstalk].

Councilmember Lagemann: Let me just talk about that real quick. The 1.8 is what's in the public lit, that is in addition to having fully funded the sheriff's pension. We didn't want to use any anything that would interfere certainly with the sheriff's pension. That is additional dollars that are going to go unused for this year and I know Nick could speak to that if we need him to, but that's why this particular fund is being used,

Councilmember Harris: It was listed at 1.8, but we're actually going to move for 1.4. Is that accurate?

Councilmember Lagemann: It's actually 1.46.

Councilmember Harris: I know. With that, Mr. President, I move for the appropriation within the lit public survey-- within the lit public safety fund, \$1,460,258.47.

Councilmember Curry-Campbell: Second.

Ken: Second.

President Kyle: Motion and multiple seconds, any further discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor, say aye.

Councilmembers: Aye.

President Kyle: All those opposed? Motion passes. 7-0. Thank you.

Fire Chief: Thank you very much.

Councilmember Harris: Thank you very much.

Fire Chief: I appreciate it. Thank you all.

Councilmember Lagemann: Thanks guys.

Councilmember Harris: We're still stuck.

Councilmember Spurr: Does that make sense?

President Kyle: If they don't spend it, we'll just transfer it back, but if you say not to exceed then if they only spend.

Councilmember Kerley: It comes back.

President Kyle: It automatically comes back. That's why I was feel good. Paul had that ready to go.

Councilmember Lagemann: Are we in recess?

Councilmember Kerley: Oh, I get you know? Oh, sorry.

Councilmember Lagemann: Are we in recess?

President Kyle: I don't believe we are.

Councilmember Kerley: No, we're not.

Councilmember Lagemann: Feels like it.

President Kyle: I'm just letting the room clear. Economic development, you'll be next.

Councilmember Harris: I don't know that they heard you. Mr. President.

President Kyle: She's coming up

Councilmember Harris: Are they coming? Okay.

Councilmember Kerley: Who do we have coming?

President Kyle: Economic development.

Rachel Black: Sorry, did you call me up?

Councilmember Harris: Yes. It's all right. There are a lot of people--

Rachel: I couldn't hear you in the back.

President Kyle: We're fine. We were trying to let the room clear.

Rachel: Thank you. Good morning. Rachel Black, Allen county economic development, and I have with me--

Steve Cowen: Steve Cowen, General Manager at Sparks.

Rachel: You have before you today, resolution 2022-07- 21-1, waving noncompliance for Stonebridge Property, LLC. Just as a reminder, Icon Exhibits LLC, Silverado Properties LLC was granted approval for tax abatement back in 2013 for its real and personal property investment of 7.3 million. The property was purchased by Stonebridge Property LLC at the end of 2020. Icon Group Delphi was acquired by Sparks also at the end of 2020 and they're in the trade show and event business as well.

In previous years Icon Group Delphi was the company that would supply the CF1 forms. Last year, when I received the real property and personal property forms, there was a note on the personal property CF1 form stating that the new company no longer wanted to follow through with their abatement on that side, but the real property was still in place. Last month, you found that Stonebridge property LLC was in non-compliance for failing to file in a timely manner, which was the May 16th deadline. I do want to note that Sparks has now filed that \$500 fee that is required in your tax abatement policy, as well as a letter of explanation which should have been in your packet and the CF1 real property form. That form was filed on June 22nd of 2022.

I did look over then the compliance based on your compliance policy and they are in compliance. I will read you just a couple of those numbers for employees. They had stated on the original SB1 that they would retain 35 jobs. They have 48, so that leaves them at 137%. Their salaries for those retained jobs was estimated at that time in 2013 at 1.5 million, they are now at 2.8 million. 193% of what they promised. They were to create 68 jobs. They have 51 of those 68 jobs, which is 75%, which also meets your compliance. They were to have 2.8 million in salaries, and they have those 51 employees at \$3 million in salaries.

Before you today is a resolution for your consideration to approve the waiver. If approved, Sparks would be treated as if they had complied originally with the requirements and retain the deduction for 2022 pay 2023. They were approved a 10-year tax abatement originally and they're in year eight of that. If you have any questions for me or for Steve, we'd be happy to answer them.

Councilmember Harris: Mr. President.

President Kyle: Go ahead Mr. Harris.

Councilmember Harris: First of all, I just want to say thank you for the \$500 fee, first of all. Secondly, thank you for being here. As you're here today, can you tell us a little bit about what you anticipate for business, what you do and looking forward over at least the next two years how does look for the business?

Steve: Well, again, my name is Steve Cowen, I'm the general manager. I was just aware of this meeting two days ago, so I didn't know what I was stepping into. I was part of the Group Delphi that was acquired by Sparks. I don't have the history of Sparks other than what I've learned in the last two years of them absorbing us and acquiring us. Sparks as an exhibit house per se in Fort Wayne. The recumbent was Group Delphi, they did museum work and they're based out of Alameda and they had this tradeshow section here in Fort Wayne. Sparks acquired just the trade show section.

Trade shows to you guys would be like the auto shows, if you've been familiar with the Detroit Auto Show, the exhibits that you see that the shows off the product. Well in this facility here we have like STI, we have Medtronic, Microsoft, Google, Lego. Those are our clients that we build exhibits for to go to trade shows. We build something that's very unique and it's like a one-off. It's very, very, very cool. We do a turnkey in-house where we have engineers, project managers. We have our own graphic department. We offer a lot to the community of different arrays of I guess, careers.

We have the Boys and Girls Club coming in last week showing them the different careers they can look forward to coming into. We work with the anthems, the local trade school to bring in internships in our facility that we started with Sparks. We're involved a lot with the community, as my myself sitting on a committee Made By Me. We're a manufacturer, but we also do design virtual trade shows. We do permanent installs. It's very unique of something a skill set that they bring to Fort Wayne here. Group Delphi touched on it. Again, ICON had it, Group Delphi purchased them, and then Sparks purchased them.

I think the hiccup with the paperwork and everything really, the process was what Group Delphi productions main facility in Alameda [unintelligible 01:04:41] clients like Google, you got procurement, you have preferred vendor, you can't go changing names in there. They

created Group Delphi exhibits and I think there it caused confusion on us getting the proper paperwork to make sure we were staying compliant on there.

Councilmember Harris: I see. The biggest challenge you have today for the business [unintelligible 01:05:03]

Steve: Hiring.

Councilmember Harris: Hiring.

Steve: Hiring. It's the same as staffing. When I came on with Group Delphi, we had 200 employees in an office, we are now at 48. Right now we have our new employees. Throughout Sparks itself, they've hired 86 people in the last three months, 86 before that. We're up to 580 employees throughout Sparks, and they're still only at 80% capacity. That's our challenge, is getting out talking to younger kids and promoting trades. That's something I'm constantly doing at the job fairs, and at the schools. That's our biggest challenge because we do some cool stuff.

Again, people don't know what we do here in Fort Wayne and they're very surprised when they walk in my facility. We have extern teachers coming in from schools we invite that they shadow our different departments. They can go back to the high schools and tell the kids you don't have to leave Fort Wayne to be a cool graphic artist, or an engineer detailer. Those are things that we offer here locally.

Councilmember Harris: Well, thank you. Thanks for being here in Fort Wayne and Allen County, specifically. With that, Mr. President, unless there's any other questions, I'll move for the resolution 2022-07-21-1 waiving non-compliance for Stonebridge property LLC.

Councilmember Curry-Campbell: Second.

Councilmember Spurr: Second.

President Kyle: Motion and multiple seconds. Any further discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor say aye.

Councilmembers: Aye.

President Kyle: All those opposed? Motion passes 7-0. Thank you.

Councilmember Harris: Thank you.

Rachel: Thank you very much.

Councilmember Harris: Thank you. Good luck to you. Thank you.

Councilmember Curry-Campbell: Thank you.

President Kyle: Sheriff's Department.

Gary Grant: Good morning council, Gary Grant, Deputy Chief Sheriff's Department.

President Kyle: Morning.

Gary: Morning.

Jamie: Good morning, Jamie Hardy comptroller Allen County Sheriff's Department.

Gary: Thank you for your time this morning. We're here to ask for a transfer within our budget, from monies that are in our 300 series to transfer into our 200 series, our gasoline and maintenance. It's money that's currently in our budget, we're not asking for extra money. We're just going through quite a bit in gas and vehicle repairs right now and we need to make a transfer if we could.

President Kyle: Mr. Fries.

Fries: You think it's going to last the rest of the year?

Councilmember Lagemann: Good question.

Gary: I'm hoping. Our original budget was \$450,000 for gas this year, and we've already reached about \$600,000. I think one of the issues that we're seeing right now is we weren't able to buy a lot of vehicles this year because of supply and demand, so we're spending a lot more on repairs. Obviously, gas prices went way up, so we're spending a lot more in fuel. The vehicle repairs are quite expensive right now because we're trying to keep these vehicles running as long as we can.

Councilmember Curry-Campbell: Question Mr. President.

President Kyle: Yes.

Councilmember Curry-Campbell: What is your budget looking for next year when it comes to gas, because we know we have an issue? What are you looking at [crosstalk]

Gary: We're really hoping, Jamie and I are working really hard right now on that budget for next year to be able to present to you guys. We're going to have to do a cost analysis on what we've spent this year and compare that to next year. We're really hoping that we get locked in as a county in a gas price, which we're not currently. We're at the mercy of the gas prices right now.

Councilmember Curry-Campbell: Are you looking at locking in those gas prices with the whole county with the City of Fort Wayne? We know that gas is an issue and we know that your budget is probably going to double. I'm just trying to figure out how can we Allen County, City of Fort Wayne, do we need to do something like the department? Consolidate in that space?

Gary: I would say so. I think in years past we have locked into gas prices, and this year it seems like we didn't lock into a gas price. That's above us at the sheriff's department because that was commissioners. I think they make that decision on what price we lock into and who we do that with. The city of Fort Wayne is within our county and they do it. I don't see why we can all be together and contract with somebody to lock into a gas price and conserve quite a bit of fuel and money.

Councilmember Curry-Campbell: Thank you.

President Kyle: Are you encouraging the officers to use the north and south barn?

Gary: Yes. We were using BP cards due to the locations and not driving so far. We have three locations in the county. The North Barn, the south barn and service center downtown. We have actually mandated for them to use that. We're getting gas I think at 7¢ cheaper a gallon through the county service center in the north and south Barns. We've mandated for our guys to use those pumps.

President Kyle: That's just billed inner, highway basically bills the Sheriff's department then for--

Gary: Yes.

Councilmember Harris: You're pulling from contractual as well as auto. Help us understand why you need less there.

Gary: What I explained earlier, we can't buy cars. We had quite a-

Councilmember Harris: Is that the auto equipment?

Gary: Yes. We were able to get our hands on a few vehicles this year and we had to equip those cars. Usually we would on average buy probably 10 to 15 vehicles a year to replace, and we weren't able to buy that many, so we have that money left over in vehicle equipment. Jamie and I thought that it'd be a good idea to use that money to transfer that over. What we're trying to do is, we're trying to use every dime within our budget to solve this problem without having to come ask for extra funds.

Councilmember Harris: Like contractual services on here.

Gary: Contractual services on the Sheriff's side. We have quite a bit on the jail side. With the population going down and we're being able to save some money at the jail right now on some other issues. Contractually we've met all our obligations this year on the sworn side of the department, so that money is available to us also.

Councilmember Harris: Thank you.

Councilmember Curry-Campbell: One last question Mr. President.

President Kyle: Yes.

Councilmember Curry-Campbell: Do you have any electric vehicles at all?

Gary: No. Obviously, we're looking at next year and what is going to be available to us and we had started research and looking at hybrids and things like that. Now we're looking at quite a cost for those vehicles compared to what we buy normally. If we're spending \$30,000 on a vehicle to put out on road patrol, we're looking at spending 35,000 to 36,000 for a hybrid vehicle that would do the same thing. We're just going to compare cost when our gas price is going to be more than that, or the cost of the vehicle, and then upkeep.

Councilmember Kerley: Charging stations.

Gary: Yes.

Councilmember Curry-Campbell: There's funding out there [unintelligible 01:12:09], everyone else is applying for grants. There's APRA funds, there's all type of funding for electric vehicles and so on. Thank you.

Councilmember Fries: With that, I'll make a motion to approve the transfer within the general fund from Sheriff's department from contractual service to 200,000 auto equivalents, 230,000 to gas, oil, and lube, total of 430,000.

Councilmembers: Second.

President Kyle: Motion and multiple seconds. All those in favor, say aye.

Councilmembers: Aye. 7-0

President Kyle: All those opposed? Thank you.

Gary: Thank you council.

Councilmember Harris: Thank you.

Jamie: Thank you.

President Kyle: Prosecutor's office.

Councilmember Lagemann: The prosecutor's office and the liaison. They asked me to sort of pinch it, because we've got several trials going on. Then Mike McAlexander is in Indianapolis today for prosecutors meeting down there. Essentially this is a grant that they've received for approximately 17 years. They've had a domestic violence coordinator position that has been state funded. This is through Indiana Criminal Justice Institute. They fund approximately \$61,291.85. They have to get permission to apply for the grant. They've received a grant to fund the position for the last 17 years and the anticipation is it'll continue.

I did ask Mr. McAlexander, who will be our next prosecutor if his intention is to not have that position if the grant funding dries up. He said, if the grant funding dries up he will not request from council to fund that position. The position contacts all felony domestic violence victims, last year there were 863 contacts made by the coordinator. The position is also the liaison to law enforcement and provides training to officers and the coordinator also works with local immigration agencies and such. It's doing some real work and this is a really critical component for minimizing domestic violence and dealing with domestic violence in Allen County.

Councilmember Harris: Are you making a motion or by the way?

Councilmember Lagemann: Go ahead.

Councilmember Harris: I'll go ahead and move for a permission to apply for the renewal of the domestic violence coordinator grant through ICJI.

Councilmember Lagemann: Second.

President Kyle: Motion and a second. Any further discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor, say aye.

Councilmembers: Aye.

President Kyle: All those opposed? Motion passes 7-0.

Councilmember Harris: Paul, thank you for that presentation as well.

Councilmember Lagemann: Thank you.

President Kyle: DPS.

Bob Eherenman: Good morning. I'm Bob Eherenman. I'm the attorney for the county planning commission, county BZA. I have with me deputy director, Patrick Rew. I'm here this morning, Ben Russel had a family matter, so he couldn't attend, so I'm pinch hitting. We're here this morning to present the amended and restated interlocal agreement. By way of short background in 2007, the city of Fort Wayne and the county had different staffs, different departments that served both of their BZAs.

In 2007, an interlocal agreement was approved to have a combined staff within the department of planning services. The agreement went through. the process was approved by all the zoning boards, county council at the time, city council, and then the mayor, And the county commissioners. It had been, obviously some 15 years since that agreement had been reviewed. The department of planning services is governed by a governing board that's made up of four city members, and four county members. The governing board reviewed the agreement, there were proposed changes to that agreement to update it, to actually make it more how the governing board was operating and add some crucial other provisions.

I believe the blue line or the red line was submitted in your packets. What I will do is highlight just one or two elements. Mr. Lagemann was very involved in that review as well, so he can also offer some comments. In particular and probably the most important, when the agreement was originally approved, the cost of the department, which is a county department, had a division of 60-40, that is 60 to the county, 40 to the city. At the time in 2007, I believe the way that permits were going, the county had more permits and it was figured that they would have that cost. In the new agreement that cost sharing has been made 50-50, that is 50% to the city, 50% to the county.

The other provisions that are material is that to amend the agreement. We rather than go through this process where we have to go through all of the different boards to do that, because it's a slow process and we might want to amend it. We came up with a procedure so that in order to amend the agreement, it will take six votes, six out of eight members to amend that agreement. However, out of those six votes, you have to have a member from the county council, you have to have a member from the city council, you have to have a commissioner member, and you have to have the mayor's appointment. That is so the elected officials have to constitute six of those eight members. That's also in effect to actually terminate the agreement as well.

There was an executive committee that was formed in part of the agreement. The executive committee has been operating as de facto basis, but basic allows for quick review of the executive director, allows for a review of my performance as the planning commission and BZA attorneys. I'd be happy to answer any questions about the agreement, but what we'd like you to do is approve the amended and restated interlocal agreement. We have a resolution which we will present to Mr. Jordan and have you sign afterwards.

Councilmember Lagemann: Thanks Bob. I just want to make a couple of comments on this. First of all, this has been a pretty long process. I got started with this the first of the year when I came on the governing board. The couple of things that were the big ones that Bob mentioned are the 50-50 split going from 60-40. County 60, City 40, now to a 50-50. Part of that too is the volume of BZA permits that go through in the city, we just don't have that in the county. However, we offset that with permits and plats that happen in the county because that's where everybody is building stuff.

It really is more of a 50-50 split in terms of workload for the department. The second thing is, and we've had a lot of statewide discussions on this issue of unelected boards and the authority that they carry. Frankly in putting this together, I wanted to, and I think Nelson did as well to some degree, wanted to make sure that the elected officials are clearly making the decision and not just appointed folks on what happens with the interlocal agreement as it moves forward. Whether or not it can be dissolved. That's why we have the weighted vote with the elected officials that have to have this conversation.

It began with a unanimous vote, which I think that's probably unlikely to get a unanimous vote on almost anything these days with the exception of this council, it was done today which is great. I think we've come up with a pretty reasonable interlocal agreement. There's not a lot of stuff in there that gave me pause. I really went through it with a relatively fine tooth comb, but I think we put a lot of time and effort and work into this document. The other component of this is we really need to have this before we go into our comp plan because it does have an impact on that as well.

Councilmember Harris: Mr. President?

President Kyle: Yes.

Councilmember Harris: Just a couple of thoughts. One, help me understand what initiated this change. Was it the time was up on the first agreement?

Bob: No, the agreement had what we would basically call an evergreen provision. It had a provision where it was supposed to last every three years and then renewed every three years. It really came down to-- and you have to remember when the agreement was really written there was no joint department. We had a thought this is how it was going to operate. It's been operating for 15 years. A lot of it was it had not been reviewed. I would say part of it was the cost sharing, because we now know over 15 years that there's maybe a 50-50 split would be where it would be at.

Also the fact that now you have a 15 year experience. There were some things that the practice had evolved over 15 years, wasn't maybe strictly called for by the agreement. Just like everything else, we do with our comprehensive plan, excuse me, the comprehensive plan, our zoning ordinances. It was reviewed by the governing board and after 15 years they thought it was time to review it and make some changes.

Councilmember Harris: Bob, I tried to go through and all the blues lines written out, and added and searched and tried to understand what the extent of the changes amount to that split. The split is more cost to the county. Is that accurate?

Bob: Less cost to the county?

Councilmember Harris: Less cost.

Bob: It was 60-40.

Councilmember Harris: I thought it was the other way around, so 50-50.

Bob: It was 60-40, 60% county and now it's going to a 50-50 split.

Councilmember Harris: Very good. The commissioners are in agreement on this, or have we gotten input from the commissioners?

Bob: Yes. Actually as part of the sub-working group, it was both commissioners, the mayor's appointment, the deputy mayor, myself, actually the city attorney, the county attorney, there was a group that worked on this. Yes, the commissioners have reviewed this and have [unintelligible 01:23:13]

Councilmember Harris: Having served on both planning commission as well as governing board, it seems to operate well and it's greatly appreciated for your service to that group as well. Thank you.

Bob: Thank you.

President Kyle: To summarize it, the big changes are funding and then the other change would be currently any changes this amendment have to be approved by the mayor, the commissioners, city council, and county council. In the future it'll just--

Bob: The representatives of.

President Kyle: Just be approved by the representatives of those bodies.

Bob: Representatives of those boards, plus they would have to have two other members to do that.

Councilmember Curry-Campbell: Question.

President Kyle: Ms. Curry, go ahead.

Councilmember Curry-Campbell: I just want to be clear. This is a 8 person body?

Bob: Correct.

Councilmember Curry-Campbell: You need six votes, and it has to have a county, a city and a commissioner, and a mayor appointment as one of those six.

Bob: Correct. It basically would have to a 75 or 80% vote, but out of that vote the elected officials who are serving on that board would have to constitute four of those six. Correct.

Councilmember Curry-Campbell: Who's on that board. I'm just curious. I know you're there.

Bob: Currently right now, on the county side, Nelson Peters is the county commissioner appointment. I believe the BZA is David Bailey, he is the chairman of the BZA. Suzy Hoot, who is president of the planning commission and Mr. Lagemann. On the city side, we have

Nancy Townson who is the mayor's appointment. We have Tom Freistroffer who is the city council appointment. We have Tony [unintelligible 01:25:05] who is the president of the city planning commission. Then Jim Hoke who is chairman of the City BZA.

Councilmember Curry-Campbell: What is the term limit?

Bob: Those positions actually can turn over every year. I can't remember how long. I know Mr. Harris, I know Mr. Armstrong, I know Mr. Lagemann. I think those appointments can go every year because it's not really based on-- For example, you could be on the BZA this year and you suddenly get appointed the chairman. Now one of the things we did is we built in the flexibility, because what we've had situations where for example the chairman of the county BZA for some reason couldn't serve. We allow the BZA then to pick a substitute member to do that. I would say the appointments probably are yearly because it's based on the officers of these board.

Councilmember Curry-Campbell: The subcommittees, how are they formed?

Bob: We have an executive committee that's going to be handled by this agreement. The subcommittees, I will say were appointed by the governing board. Clearly less than a majority, but usually involving somebody who was an elected official. To give you an example of what some of the subcommittees did. For example, our executive director retired last year. Well we had a small group that then took in the applications, reviewed candidates, and then presented candidates to the entire governing board.

I'll tell you this, one of the things the subcommittee does is they review the annual performance of the executive director and then make a recommendation to the governing board because the governing board actually is the hiring body for the executive director. I submit an annual report of what I do for the boards on an annual basis. They review my performance and then make a recommendation to the governing board. That probably covers a good chunk of what a lot of the sub-bodies do.

Councilmember Curry-Campbell: Is there any diversity?

Councilmember Harris: Yes. There has been.

Councilmember Curry-Campbell: Currently, is there any diversity?

Bob: Thomas Black served as the chairman--

Councilmember Harris: Appointment of the county I believe. Appointment of the county.

Councilmember Curry-Campbell: I know Mr. Black has been there for a while, so that's why I was just curious.

Bob: Mike Bynum was chair of the BZA for a long time. Mike Bynum was chairman of the BZA and he served on the committee as well.

Councilmember Curry-Campbell: In the past.

Bob: Yes.

Councilmember Curry-Campbell: Like I say, I was just curious. I know Mr. Black is there and he's been there for a while so that's why I was curious about the term limits and how do we diversify? How do people get on the subcommittee? Just a question. Thank you.

Bob: Thank you.

President Kyle: I think I have this in my head straight but basically the four representatives of the elected bodies basically have super veto majority. The vote could be seven-one, but if one of those four elected bodies votes no, it's a no, correct?

Bob: Correct, because I think the point was is that being an interlocal agreement that it was very important. Because if there were an elected official who was not on board with it, we probably have some larger issues other than just a vote. We thought it was very important to build a consensus among the representatives from the elected bodies.

Councilmember Curry-Campbell: We don't have a copy of the resolution, do we?

Bob: Yes, it's in your packet

Councilmember Curry-Campbell: Oh, thank you.

Councilmember Harris: It's only written on. Mr. President I'll move for the approval of resolution 2022-07-21-02, approving the amended and restated interlocal cooperation agreement for the operation of the joint land use department for the County of Allen and the City of Fort Wayne.

Councilmembers: Second.

Presidents: Motion and multiple seconds. Any further discussion? I do have one further question. Has this been approved by city council, commissioners, mayor, already?

Bob: No. The order that we have taken the approvals is it's been approved by both BZAs. It's been approved by both planning commissions. You were next. We are taking it to city council in two weeks. Then we figured we would save the executive bodies for last. We are taking it to city council in two weeks and then it'll go to county commissioners in a month.

Councilmember Lagemann: Essentially Bob, you would say that the county council is leading the county once again as we move forward on this second agreement.

Councilmember Harris: Thank you for stepping in today very much.

Bob: No problem. Thank you.

President Kyle: Any further discussion? I'll entertain a motion and discussion on the motion.

Councilmember Lagemann: To move.

President Kyle: The motion before us is approved resolution 2022-07-21-02. Approving the amended and restated interlocal cooperation agreement for the operation of the joint land use department for the county of Allen and the city of Fort Wayne. All those in favor say, "Aye."

Councilmembers: Aye.

President Kyle: All those opposed. Motion passes 7-0. Thank you.

Bob: Great. Thank you.

President Kyle: Being that it is 10:00 A.M, Mr. Jordan, is Baker Tilly here.

Councilmember Kerley: Here she comes. We can take a pretty short break.

President Kyle: We're going to take a three-minute recess.

Councilmember Kerley: Thank you.

Councilmember Lagemann: Thank you, Mr. Chairman for the break.

President Kyle: As was second.

Councilmember Kerley: Against what?

President Kyle: As was noted in our agenda, we have representatives from Baker Tilly here today. Quiet please. Quiet please. We have representatives from Baker Tilly here today, and to respect their time that they came in from Indy, we had a provision in the agenda to allow them to present at 10:00 AM as close as possible. They are going to give a brief overview on a subject that has been in the media a lot lately. Those are the funding mechanisms that would be available to the county to fund construction and/or renovation or whatever the final plan may be for the Allen County Jail. Take it away Mr. Cloud.

Chris Cloud: You have stolen my thunder, which is great. The only thing I would add is, this is purely for educational purposes. I think only maybe two of you were around the last time we even considered a bond issuance. It's just not something we do often, and it's not regular county finance that we're-- I guess it might be helpful for people who know a lot more than the rest of us to just walk us through how you fund large capital projects. Picking the term, the funding stream is inconsequential in some ways, just the process and the mechanisms, and how it works, and how debt service works.

Anyway, today is educational in nature by people who have been at this a very long time. Emma and Jason are here, and they have worked with us on this, but they work with municipalities around the state on everything and anything. Water projects, building projects, school projects. Baker Tilly, this is their thing. Formally, they were Umbaugh. Probably a name you're more familiar with. We did a lot of business with Umbaugh over the decades. Anyway, I'll hand it over to Emma and Jason.

Emma Adlam: Thanks, Chris. Good morning, everyone. My name is Emma Adlam, this is Jason Semler and we're from Baker Tilly. Like Chris said, we just wanted to provide some introduction to possible financing options for the jail project that's under consideration. Presentation will introduce different revenue streams, illustrative scenarios just purely to illustrate what impacts could look like. These are definitely not solid numbers, but for illustration purposes, we have some numbers in this presentation.

Councilmember Harris: Excuse me a minute. Chris, can you get this screen working, because this one isn't.

Councilmember Spurr: That one?

Emma: That one is on. I don't know about--

Councilmember: [unintelligible 01:34:00].

Councilmember Harris: There you go.

Emma: Go Chris.

Councilmember Harris: Thank you.

Emma: Sounds good. This is an informal conversation, so if you do have questions along the way, please stop me. You definitely don't need to hear me talk straight for these couple of slides, so stop me if you do have any questions. Just to start off, for financing a jail, you have options to fund it. You could use cash on hand. Probably not in entirety for a jail the size you're considering. You can also issue bonds that are payable from property taxes or income taxes, or you could do a combination of those two different revenue streams. Then you could also do a combination of issuing bonds and using cash on hand to reduce the amount that you would need to borrow.

Councilmember Harris: Emma--How about ARPA? Have you guys used any ARPA funds recently in projects around the state? Does that not work?

Emma: Communities throughout the state are definitely putting together their plans for ARPA. I think you could use certain components of the project, but you'd need to make findings to make sure that it fits within the parameters of the ARPA plan. I don't know Jason if you have seen anything.

Jason Semler: We have seen counties consider using ARPA funds, as you know when the ARPA funds first came out, the guidelines were worse or strict on the different projects that had to be eligible. They had that \$10 million threshold of revenue loss, they gave you more flexibility. I know some counties who are looking at doing jails or other public buildings, they are maybe funding those projects or a portion of the project into the revenue loss portion. I know some counties who are looking at if it's HVAC systems, whether they can determine that that's helping keeping the air segregated, trying to prevent future pandemic, future COVID.

They're trying to get that eligible for the COVID bucket that's outside of the revenue loss. We are seeing some communities trying to use the ARPA funds as part of that cash contribution.

Mr. Harris: Thank you.

Ms. Curry-Campbell: I have a question. Who has successfully used the funds? Because I know there's folks in the south, they got in a lot of trouble for trying to use ARPA fund to build a jail. You're saying here in Indiana, that is a possibility, or that has been done?

Jason: I would say, I don't know if any county that's gone through the process, especially building a new jail. I know, again, the restrictions, for ARPA were much stricter when the original guidelines came out, and now with the revenue loss, that has reduced some of the restrictions that we previously had. It's case by case again.

Ms. Curry-Campbell: You're not recommending that for us to use ARPA funds to build a jail in Allen County. That's not a recommendation that's coming from you today.

Jason: No, I think it's something that we could look at as the possibility, but definitely, it's case by case if you want to look at the specifics.

Ms. Curry-Campbell: Thank you.

Emma: To focus on income taxes, if you were to issue bonds payable from income taxes, there's a couple of items that you would want to consider when looking at issuing those bonds. First is just looking at the county's existing income tax rate structure, do you have capacity from your current rates to the maximum allowed rates to increase your income taxes? Then if you do increase income taxes, what is the process, and what is the impact to taxpayers?

Then for jails specifically, a question to think about is, are there additional operating costs that would be incurred if you were building a larger jail than you currently have, do you need any additional revenue stream to pay for some of those operational costs? Then finally, if you are issuing a bond payable from income taxes, you just need to be aware there's possible fluctuations in the revenue stream. The income tax stream that you have for your debt service, you want a little bit of cushion in what your annual payment is to allow for fluctuations in income levels.

If there's another pandemic or something like that, or another downturn in the economy, you just need to be aware that you need a little bit of cushion or we call it coverage and structuring your bonds payable from income taxes.

Mr. Harris: That's true.

Mr. Spurr: Just a couple of quick questions. Where are we at with regards to bonding capacity first of all? Then second of all, as you max out your capacity, how does that affect your bond rate or bond rating, which will also affect the rate? Let's get started with those two.

Emma: Sure. A bond of a project of the size that you're considering would be above your general obligation debt capacity, but you could issue the bonds under a lease rental structure, which you have before, I believe your Coliseum bonds are under that lease rental structure. It's very common. You have the capacity to issue, you're not constrained by that general obligation debt limit. Now, the question to how it impacts your rating, a bond issue of the size, it is a significant undertaking. However, it would be considered by the rating agencies, if you adopted a new revenue stream, or if you have a property tax in place to show that it is not a significant hardship.

They would take that into account that you have that revenue stream identified to repay that debt.

Chris: I have a quick question. You say bond of this size, what's the size?

Emma: Give me like three slides and we'll get to-- it really depends though. If it's that question of cash on hand versus bond issue, I think the county's still looking at what size jail do they need. These are just illustrative numbers that we have out there. It's just to start the conversation.

Chris: That's what the public is most interested in, how much is this going to cost?

Ms. Curry-Campbell: How much is this going to cost? You keep saying this bond size, but we're not hearing a dollar amount. I'm sure the folks that are at home right now probably want to hear a number, not size. Thank you.

Emma: I do have that in a couple of slides.

Ms. Curry-Campbell: Thank you.

Emma: Sure. To start with the existing income tax rate structure, if you're thinking about increasing income tax rates, start thinking about where are you currently. The county's total income tax has three buckets. There's property tax relief, there's the expenditure bucket, and the special purpose bucket. Moving from the left to the right, property tax relief is an income tax in place to reduce property tax bills that taxpayers are paying. The special purpose rate on the far right-hand side, you do not have in place, but that is a income tax that needs to be approved by state legislation. That is a special rate that you would get adopted.

The expenditure bucket in the middle has four components. There's certified chairs, there's public safety, economic development, and a correctional and rehabilitation rate. The yellow boxes are the current rates that Allen County has in place. Your total combined rate is 1.48, and then the additional allowed on the bottom is how much room you have left to increase your rate until you get to the maximum. To put Allen County in perspective, that 1.48, and how do you compare 66 counties have rates higher than Allen County? You're on the lower end of the stream of counties and where you fall on your income taxes.

Ms. Curry-Campbell: You just spoke about the special purpose, which would have to go through legislation, what's that timeline?

Emma: You'd have to do it during the legislative session and you'd have to talk, get an attorney and start working on that legislative language. It is a process. The state did put in place this correctional LIT so that counties didn't have to keep going to get special legislation because a lot of counties a couple of years ago were going to the state to get the legislation in place. They did give you a little more autonomy for this 0.2 correctional LIT. It still can be done, but they would probably look to see, have you first looked at this correctional LIT before they look at the special purpose LIT?

Jason: The process is correct working with your attorneys, working with your local legislators because they would basically put this on a proposed bill in January and February when the legislators meet again. It's something that if you wanted to look at specialist legislation, you'd probably have it start having those conversations now, especially towards November, December, so they could put that on the bill, and then it would go in front of the legislators in next spring, the next legislative session.

Ms. Curry-Campbell: Do you have a lobbyist that's doing this for-- you have it on your slide, so apparently are you talking to someone or is there someone at the state house? Do you have a lobbyist? You have it on your screen, so I'm just curious.

Jason: No, we don't have a lobbyist. That's just one approach that the communities could take. Your lobbyist is really your community, your legislators selling it to the other legislators that, "Hey, this is a need for Allen County. This is the revenue source that we want to use." I will tell you five, six years ago, a lot of counties did go to the legislation and asked

for special rights. A number of counties have that. As Emma said, in the last five or six years, a lot of counties have constructed new jails or new additions.

Legislators didn't like the continuing number of new counties asking for that new legislation so instead of them saying yes or no on this new legislation, they created this new correctional rehabilitation facility, which we shortened to jail LIT. Because that was what it was put in place that says, "Okay." The legislator said, "We don't want counties to come to us, asking for permission. What we're going to do is within this expenditure rate, within this 2.5% rate that we allowed counties to adopt, we're going to carve out up to 0.2% and let counties keep 100% of that rate, but it specifically has to be used for new construction of jails."

Right now you could increase your edit rate by 0.2%, but you have to distribute that to the county, but then also cities and towns get their share. For this jail rate 0.2, the county keeps 100% of that, but again, it specifically has to be used for the jail. It's to try to prevent as many counties coming to the legislators for a special rate.

Mr. Armstrong: [unintelligible 00:11:13]. Yes, go ahead.

Mr. Spurr: What's the process to adopt a jail LIT? I presume it's a similar process to adopt any new LIT rate. That would come first to county council and just walk through the internal process in a county to adopt a new LIT.

Jason: Do you want to take that? For this, since we're a cohort county in front of your income tax council, where each municipality has the percentage of the votes, and that's how they would vote on a traditional local income tax. If you want to increase your income's year, edit. For the jail LIT, since it's county-specific, it's just the county council would have a public hearing and approve that.

Emma: For Allen County, as Jason mentioned, it's a cohort county, Fort Wayne controls the income tax council based on their percentage of the votes, but for this jail LIT, you guys control the adoption of this correctional LIT. It's a little--

Ms. Curry-Campbell: Please repeat that. People at home, you need to listen to what she's saying. Please repeat that.

Emma: That the county has the control of adopting the correctional LIT, which is in statute that it's different. Even though in a cohort county it's based on the income tax council, the adoption of this rate is different. The correctional LIT, just to give a little bit more detail, like Jason mentioned, is a component of the expenditure rate. It's a maximum of 0.2%. It's adopted by the county council. It can be in increments of 0.01 to that maximum of 0.2%. The county collects the full amount. It doesn't get allocated to the units like public safety does get allocated to the various units, but you would collect that full amount.

The maximum number of years it can be in place is 22 years, and the statute restricts how much of that you can use for operational costs. Only 20% of the revenues that you collect can be used for operational costs. The remainder needs to go for that construction of a new or renovation of an existing jail. This slide, just so some illustrative scenarios.

Jason: Sorry, you might mention that if that's something that they--

Emma: Oh yes. I was going to hit on the next slide, this slide, but if you wanted to start collecting revenues now to build up cash to reduce how much you need to borrow, you would

need to adopt that rate by the end of October this year to start collecting revenues next year. This slide is just illustrative of different scenarios of what that 0.2 could support. This does assume that you adopt the LIT by the end of October because this does assume you are accumulating some cash in '23 to reduce the amount that you'd need to borrow.

Both scenarios, we've structured these examples based on the 2022 revenues, and it has that cash-on-hand assumption. To start with, the scenario one, the left scenario, this is the higher end of what that 0.2 could support. Starting from the top and working down, it would generate a bond issue of just under 200 million. You would collect some cash on hand in '23 and there'd be an interest-only period where you could use some cash towards the project of about 36.4 million so that the total revenues to go towards the project is about 236.4 million.

There is some issuance cost associated with issuing this bond issue so the net proceeds for construction is 234.8 million to round. To support the bond issue of this size, the average annual payment to keep working down in that column is about 19.7 million, would be the annual payment. The 0.2 correctional LIT based on '22 revenues would generate about 21.62 million, and that's just based on '22. We're not assuming any increases. You would have just under \$2 million remaining for additional operating expenses. It would also account for some fluctuations in the revenue stream. That ratio of your revenue to your payment is that 110% is what we call coverage.

That's important for marketability that bond purchasers want to make sure that revenue stream if there are dips, you're still going to be able to make your debt payment. We're assuming there's a property tax backup on this bond issue to get a better interest rate, to get a better rating. To make it so you don't have to go through all of the controlled project approvals, you need to make a determination that you really expect to be able to use that LIT revenue. That 110% coverage is really the lowest coverage that you would want to have on a bond that you pay from income taxes.

Mr. Spurr: Just a real quick question on the income tax backup, does that process force a referendum?

Emma: When you don't intend to levy the property tax, it does not go through the controlled project process. That's part of why that coverage is important because you have to show there's a reasonable expectation that you wouldn't levy that property tax, and so then the bond issue wouldn't be subject to a referendum.

Mr. Spurr: If you did a hybrid between property and jail LIT, for lack of a better term, you would have to go through a referendum on the property, right?

Emma: The bonds could be subject to referendum. There's a question of if the process is initiated by voters and then this is really where you'd need to look to your bond council. Depending on how the judge's order has been written, it may not apply. It may be an exception.

Mr. Spurr: It's federally mandated by the court.

Chris: In Baker Tilly's experience of doing this, if we enter a recessionary period is a 10% coverage factor enough?

Emma: I look at the history of Allen County's adjusted gross income, which is what your income tax collections are based off of. From 2010 to 2019, you've grown very steadily. One year it dipped by less than 1%. You have a fair amount of cushion and really in '20, the numbers that we're basing this off of '22, this should be a lower collection year. You should see an increase in '23, just because of the pandemic, and because of the collection period for income taxes. This should be a lower more conservative number but 110%, should be fine.

Jason: We could calculate how big of a decrease the county would see in their adjusted gross income before we'd wipe out the whole 1.9 million.

Chris: That's something I would be interested in.

Jason: Really what we've seen, as Emma referred to talking to counties it's going to be a new jail. If you decide to go for a new jail, it's going to be a new jail. There's going to be some efficiencies on utilities and things like that, but it's more likely going to be a bigger building so utilities are going to probably cost more, utilities are going up. You may need to hire more staff. One of the questions that we work with counties is it's that coverage ratio, and Emma's going to talk about this in your second scenario.

It's not so much always how much more do we need than that service. It's how much more do we think we are going to need for operating? Because that 1.9 million you might determine once you decide more about your project, what your additional operating costs might be, you might determine you might want more than 1.9 million just to cover additional operating costs.

Mr. Spurr: You said those operational's were capped at that 20% factor, correct?

Emma: Yes. That's what the second scenario if you look at that amount remaining, the 1.97 in scenario one if through your studies and your analysis, you determine you really need more annual revenue for those operating expenses. That's really what scenario two is illustrating. You see, on that amount remaining column, it's about 3.6 million. If you need more remaining after your debt payments, that necessarily means that your debt payments would be lower because it's based on that same revenue number. Looking upwards, the net proceeds for construction would decrease to just over 220 million.

A lot more conversations need to be had. This is just for illustration of how much additional revenue would you need for operating. What size do you need to build? This gives you an idea of what that 0.2 could support.

Chris: Does that decision impact A, the rate of the bond or the interest rate on the bond or B, the overall bond rating for the county?

Jason: Are you talking about the coverage?

Chris: The coverage?

Emma: For both of these scenarios, we're assuming that they have a property tax backup and that's really what you would be rated on. Is that property tax backup? In terms of the pure rating, you would get 110% coverage versus 120. It doesn't matter as much, because it's really going to be on that property tax backup.

Chris: Then what's the assumptive of rate on the bond?

Emma: This is pretty high. That's something I did want to touch on, is that we like to be conservative. We took current market rates and we added a full 2.5% interest rate. As you get closer to the time you need to issue the bonds, you can fine-tune it. We are expecting the federal open market committee to increase rates over the next year or two. There's a question on to what extent. That's why we added the 2.5% increase from current rates to try to be conservative. Also, your estimated '23 income taxes should be coming out in a couple of months. That will give you a better idea what the next year would look like. These numbers can be fine-tuned as you get further down the process.

Jason: This assumes, we wouldn't. Again, this is for illustration, but we're assuming that these bonds wouldn't close till over a year from now, a year and a half from now. That's why we've increased interest rates by so much 2.5%. We think that's conservative, but as you've seen the last six months rates have increased quite amount, so we're trying to--

Chris: They're talking about another 100 basis point increase in the next month. The ability to service the debt is based on your NAV then, right?

Jason: Adjusted gross income.

Emma: Your adjusted gross income.

Chris: No, but I mean on the property tax side of things.

Emma: To levy, we do have a property tax scenario later that is based on the county's not assessed value.

Chris: I think that's what you were counting. Get it--

Mr. Spurr: No, not necessarily. Really, what I was trying to do is figure out what rate [chuckles] are we assuming here. Because if the rate dips, that would affect the overall amount, it would affect all those numbers.

Chris: Yes, it would affect all the numbers.

Jason: I guess you're talking about two rates here. One is the rate for the income tax, your revenue stream. We're basing that upon what you received in 2022. Everyone who filed basically a year and a half ago, what they filed for income taxes, that's what we're basing our revenue on.

Chris: I wasn't talking about the revenue. He was talking about the revenue, and you answered that question.

Emma: You were talking about the [crosstalk]

Mr. Spurr: I'm thinking more on the property side than the adjusting.

Jason: He's right. The interest rate on the bonds that you'd be charged, it's based upon today's current rates plus 2.5% increase.

Ms. Curry-Campbell: I know this is a lot of information and we're only on slide number six. I guess my concern is this is 20-year bond that we're speaking of and you're basing this on 2022 with a 2%. Are we being realistic on a 20-year bond?

Emma: I'll address it to a couple of points. In terms of the revenue stream that we're assuming no growth is pretty conservative. That you have a history of growth in Allen County, you see all of the new businesses and all of the announcements that have been coming. I feel like almost every week you see something new. The more jobs that are coming into Allen County only will help increase the income tax revenue stream. The revenue side we're being pretty conservative. The interest rate side, this is where we included the current rates, plus 2.5% between now and when the bonds sell. We're assuming they sell sometime in the fall of '23.

Then from that point on, that rate is fixed once you issue your bond. It's not like there's going to be rate increases in 10 years or 15 years from now. Once you sell in '23, those interest rates are fixed.

Jason: You'll know what your annual payment on the bonds are for the next 20 years. You'll know them.

Mr. Harris: Maybe too many variables to answer this, but you're dealing with other communities building jails. How many of them, or as a percent maybe how many of them select local income tax to help fund their projects?

Emma: I'd say all. [crosstalk]

Jason: About 100%. It goes back to your comment, if you use property taxes, which we'll talk about as an option because the projects are such a large size, and it potentially could be triggered the referendum process, which we'll go into. That's a whole other process where it goes on the ballot and then it's up to the taxpayers, whether they want to increase their property taxes. There's a lot more uncertainty and a lot more risk to the project failing and it might have the delay a couple of years. Also, most communities just don't want to increase property taxes.

Those various reasons, everyone that we've worked on the last five, six years, which we've probably done more than a dozen have all been income taxes.

Mr. Harris: Thank you.

Mr. Spurr: That was my reasoning for my question on circling back to that was based on the NAVs and we've experienced unprecedented levels of growth. Once you head into reset, all those numbers are going to be affected. That's why I was asking about the coverage. I know that's a different scenario, but those revenues wouldn't even be realized for two or three years.

Jason: We'll talk about the property taxes, but you're right. There's probably more volatility with property taxes than income taxes.

Mr. Spurr: The fact that those on a fixed income are going to be hit by that property tax and not the income tax.

Jason: I would say the property taxes are more secure than income taxes from a rating agency because you know you're going to charge property taxes, no matter what it is, you adjust the rate to make it work. Income taxes, you do the 0.2 and you just collect whatever comes in. Property taxes, if AV goes down, you just charge people more. From a bond purchaser's standpoint, from rating standpoint, property taxes are more secure, but from your perspective and the taxpayers, it's more volatile. Like you said, AVs go down then you still

need the \$21 million. You're just going to charge people more through property taxes. That's why I think people try to look at property and income taxes.

Chris: When you have an economic retraction, even on the income side of things, you know what I'm saying.

Mr. Harris: You had mentioned that 66 counties have a higher LIT than we do. If we were to adopt a 0.2%, where would that move us on that list? Because one of the reasons Allen County is so attractive is we have a favorable tax structure.

Emma: This is all based on 2022. Other counties can be adopting their income taxes, but if you were to adopt a 0.2, there would be 55 counties ahead of you based on 2022.

Mr. Harris: 55 would still be higher than us?

Emma: Yes.

Mr. Harris: You may not be able to pull this directly up, but how would that compare to the immediate surrounding counties both in Indiana, and I guess Ohio would be harder to judge?

Emma: I can pull that for you. I don't have it sorted in a way that would be easy for me to answer that, but I can get that for you.

Mr. Spurr: 55 counties would charge more income tax?

Emma: Correct.

Mr. Harris: So that'd put us about the middle of the state.

Ms. Curry-Campbell: Yes, the middle of the row, but we're one of the largest, and so, this number, and putting us on a scale really has more to do about this versus this.

Emma: We can send that information over.

Ms. Curry-Campbell: Thank you.

Emma: To keep with the income taxes, I think this is my last income tax slide, but this shows the illustrative annual tax impact for taxpayers. Based on that 0.2 correctional LIT rate. It ranges, we're showing a range of income levels. The 57,000 based on the census data is the median income. You could see it would range from \$56 and then go up from there on an annual basis.

Mr. Spurr: Increase annual.

Emma: On annual basis.

Mr. Spurr: This is household?

Emma: Yes.

Chris: No. Income tax.

Emma: Yes.

Mr. Spurr: Per person?

Chris: No, I'm saying it's income tax, but it's household.

Jason: Basically, the 125,000, that's the adjusted gross income that a household would file on their income taxes each year.

Emma: I know we've touched on some property tax already, so some of this might be a little bit repetitive, but in looking at a property tax bond issue, there are some different considerations that you would look at in deciding to move forward property taxes. First, is the bond subject to a referendum, or do you want to elect to go through the referendum process? The property taxes you levy for your debt service payment, that there is no additional revenue stream for operational cost like there would be for the LIT because that coverage is not a consideration for property tax bonds. You just levy for your payment.

Then you would want to think about how would this impact your tax rate. How would this impact taxpayers? Then if it is not subject to a referendum, how would this increase circuit breaker losses for not just Allen County, but it would be spread through all units of government throughout the county? In thinking about, bonds issued through a referendum process, there are some considerations in that you can-- this is just some high level, there's a lot more conversations to be had.

A couple of different categories to think about is that for bonds subject to referendum, voter proof referendum. You would have a higher tax base because all of the tax increment, the TIF area, all of that incremental assessed value would be added to the tax base. For bonds approved by referendum, they are outside of the property tax caps so taxpayers would see an increase. For bonds not approved through a referendum, only taxpayers who are under the caps would see an increase in their tax bills.

Chris: But that's the full amount or the full rate.

Emma: Yes. Looking at on the other side is circuit breaker and circuit breaker losses to communities. If it's approved through a referendum, if it's outside of the tax cap, it does not increase losses to units of government. If it's not approved through a referendum, it does increase circuit breaker losses. That's an analysis we can run if we want to go down this path of what that circuit breaker impact could look like.

Chris: I would certainly be interested in seeing that.

Mr. Spurr: Say that again, Chris, I didn't hear.

Ms. Curry-Campbell: I mean, because there's no--

Chris: How it's going to affect the losses through the chain.

Emma: Once there's a better idea of the dollar amount involved, we can definitely run that analysis to show what that could look like.

Chris: Okay.

Emma: Some other considerations is if you go through the full referendum process, it is longer and it is a little more costly to go through. Jason alluded to this point earlier that if it's

not approved by the voters, there is a one to two-year waiting period before you can move forward on your project. You do risk a delay in getting your project built.

Mr. Armstrong: What triggers the referendum for you again?

Emma: Two parts to this answer. First for a normal project, if it's bonds over a certain size, it's about 17 million. For a project over about 17 million, it's subject to the process, but then it would need to be initiated by voters to actually have it go on the ballot. This is where you would need to talk to your bond attorney is that in the federal ruling for this jail, it might be an exception to the referendum process and you don't have to go through it, but you really need that attorney opinion to look at that.

Ms. Curry-Campbell: Why did you say it would be an exception?

Emma: That there is an exception to referendum if it is, I think it's federal a judge mandate to build a jail. It really depends on, not the attorney. It really depends on the attorney interpretation.

Ms. Curry-Campbell: I don't think we had a federal mandate to build a jail. I think that's probably the illusion with a lot what's going on. I don't think the judge told us to build a jail.

Emma: Build or renovate and this is where you need that attorney to come in and give their opinion, whether or not you would need to go through that referendum, it would be subject to referendum.

Chris: In your professional experience, if it goes to a referendum, what is the likelihood that the voters would pass that?

Emma: I don't think we've--

Jason: It's country-specific. Think about it be going in the ballot, election time. There would be a question on the ballot. It's similar to school operating [crosstalk]

Chris: I understand how it works. I guess what I'm asking you is in all your years of experience, how many times have you actually seen that go?

Emma: I don't think we've seen one for a jail specifically.

Jason: I know one county that did get it approved and it was almost 20 years ago, 15 years ago. I think that was the first one. I think because the whole referendum process was so new, I don't think people realized what they were saying [crosstalk]

Chris: I was going to say, I would venture to say that it's not going to happen.

Jason: I only know of one other county who's actually put this on the ballot and it failed.

Ms. Curry-Campbell: What size county was that?

Jason: It was Hancock County.

Chris: It's a donut county, so that's--

Jason: It's cricket size and definitely growing. To your point, most counties don't even try to put on the ballot because they know the success rate is going to be very small. The next point there that Emma has, if it goes on the ballot, you have to wait another year to try to do that similar project. Then when you talk about waiting for another year until process, it's really almost waiting two years. Most communities, the reason they're even talking about building or renovating a jail is because the need's now and they don't want to take the risk of having to wait two more years having two more years increase costs.

I can't say our professional opinion, what's a percentage of approval. I guess it's probably 0%, but very few people even attempt it.

Chris: I just wanted to bring that to light because that's what I would assume.

Emma: Promise, there's only two more slides left. This just looks at what would a property tax bond issue look like. I think the number that's been thrown around is illustrative is a \$300 million project. We ran what would that look like for a property tax bond issue? Similar to the income tax scenarios, there are issuance costs associated with it. The net amount available for construction is just under 298 million. The annual payments needed to support a bond issue of this size based on that conservative interest rate that we already talked about is 29.8 million.

Then the question is, what would that property tax rate look like? It's different for referendum and non-referendum because of the different tax base involved, but around 14 cents plus or minus, depending on whether or not it was approved through the referendum process. In the last slide is what was that property taxpayer impact? We have various home values on this screen, starting from a 100,000 to 250,000, recent census data. The median home value is 136,700. That's why that number is very weirdly specific on this slide and stated because that's what has your median home value.

We also show agricultural land and commercial rental properties. Now, for the non-referendum scenario, this is not taking into account the property tax cap because it really depends on the tax rate for that particular property. Where they're located within Allen county. If they're already hitting the cap, they would not see an increase in their property taxes if it was not approved through referendum.

Chris: If it's not a referendum. This is on the standard per 100 of any [unintelligible 00:39:53]

Emma: Yes. This assumes all the homes take the deductions that they're allowed.

Jason: For instance, if you have a home that has an assessed value, gross assess value of \$250,000, that person's annual property taxes would increase by about \$168 if you go through the non-referendum, about \$185 to the referendum

Chris: On an annual basis?

Jason: On annual basis.

Emma: On an annual basis

Mr. Harris: Why 100 acres? Is that an average or-

Emma: Just something--

Mr. Harris: -average size of a farm?

Jason: Easy to do the math. They have 200 acres.

Mr. Harris: The farm community will argue, "There's nobody living on our land. Why do we pay more?" That's out there as well, anyway.

Emma: That is our last slide. I know you've been asking questions throughout, but are there any final questions that you would have for us?

Mr. Harris: Thank you for that presentation. I appreciate that.

Mr. Spurr: Thank you.

Ms. Curry-Campbell: Thank you.

Mr. Harris: I know we get the slides or is that something that we-- I don't think we've seen it.

Jason: Yes. You have them in your email.

Mr. Harris: I haven't seen them.

Emma: There you go.

Mr. Harris: Oh, that just came in. Thank you.

Emma: Thank you very much.

Jason: If I understood correctly, two things that you'd like for us to see is the current income tax rate for the local counties, and then maybe what the circuit breaker impact would need for our \$300 million project.

Mr. Armstrong: That's correct. Thank you very much.

Jason: We can do that.

Emma: Yes, we can

Mr. Armstrong: Thank you.

Ms. Curry-Campbell: I had a question. You brought up October. Are you expecting us to do something?

Emma: That's a policy decision, but if you wanted all of the income tax numbers that we showed, we're assuming that you did adopt the rate by the end of October of this year, so you can start collecting revenues in '23 and build up cash to reduce how much you need to borrow. Yes, our numbers were based on that assumption.

Jason: If you think about it, if you were to adopt it this year and start collecting revenue next year, we're showing about \$20 million of revenue that you could collect. If you waited a year

and the not adopt it, that's \$20 million that you either have to come up with somewhere else or reduce your project size by \$20 million or increase your property tax rate. What we see for a lot of communities, if they know they're going to go through the process of doing a jail project, jail projects has multiple lives. [chuckles] It's one of the biggest projects the county's ever going to do. It's not a quick process.

There's a lot of thought which has already occurred to this point. There's still a lot more to discuss, but if you know you're going to do it eventually, we recommend going ahead and adopting the rate, getting that revenue in place and even accumulating it because if you accumulate it, that's just that much less you have to borrow going forward. It's going to make it cheaper for you in the long run.

Mr. Harris: I have another question then. Your assumptions on the income tax were basically no growth, so our income stays stagnant. If our income grows and we receive money beyond the 110% or 120%, how much more costly would bonding be? Because obviously, the income tax has a 22-year sunset. If we have extra revenue, can we make additional bond payments to pay it off early? If it's paid off early, does the income tax expire earlier? Do we have to carry it for the full 22 years?

Emma: When you issue bonds, you can't refinance them usually for 10 years, you can refinance them just because that's a comfort that bond purchase is like, but if you do build up extra cash and you want to refund your bond issue, you could reduce the principal that you have outstanding. To the question of, if it's paid off before the end of the 22-year period, it's very specific in what you can use this revenue stream for. If the bonds are no longer outstanding, you can end that income tax before that 22-year sunset. That's just the maximum.

Jason: A real-life story is that we did a jail for another county 10 years ago. Exactly how we talked about the income tax with the property tax backup. They put in a special rate. That time the jail land wasn't available, they had to go to special legislation to get a rate. Just like you said, we were concerned to assume that the income tax was flat. Of course, it has grown over time. 10 years have gone by, they have accumulated enough money to pay those bonds off completely. On August 1, they're going to pay those bonds off 10 years early.

Ms. Curry-Campbell: What county?

Jason: Perry County.

Ms. Curry-Campbell: What's the size of Perry County?

Jason: I don't know the population. To your point, you would have that flexibility. Then at the end of the 10 years, then you could reduce that rate. In 10 years, 20 years, you might have some additional improvements that might be made, so you'd have that flexibility to keep that revenue, or you could reduce it. You don't have to go to the max 0,2 but you have that flexibility to do that.

Mr. Harris: Has the general assembly given money to, or state legislature given money to any of these projects or what you said earlier, they've moved it to a system that we can tax locally. They don't want to give money away. At the state level, have they provided that extra amount or [unintelligible 00:45:44]

Jason: The last county, since this 0.2 jail rate has been in place, which I think was in 2018, 2019, I've worked with one other county that went to the legislation and asked for a special purpose rate and they were denied. Part of the reason was because they said, "No, you hadn't tapped into the 0.2 jail rate for your other rates." It is what they said. "We're giving you the flexibility to get that special rate within your 2.5."

Mr. Harris: My beef has been and continues to be, the state caused this whole problem in the first place. They basically stopped taking folks to these prisons, 1006 said, "You guys take care of it locally." All the counties all over the state started having problems. We all start building jails. Now they flipped and said, "You know what, maybe we'll take them back down at the state now." We're just playing Ying yang with the state. It's crazy.

Jason: I'm not saying it's impossible that you couldn't go to the legislatures and ask for a special rate, but it's definitely much more difficult to get it approved than it was five or six years ago, because, in their eyes, they've given you that flexibility to adopt that 0.2.

Mr. Spurr: The State is not given any direct funding for jails to anybody. My follow-up question, let's say that this council does nothing. We do not adopt a jail LIT, we don't push for a referendum and there is a mandated construction requirement of some sort by the federal judge. What happens at that point if this council chooses not to act?

Jason: This is more of probably an attorney question because that question does come up a lot. If it's mandated by the judge, it could be where they're going to mandate for you to create a new jail, and they're going to be in charge of what is constructed in specifics, and all that could be out of your hand. That's what you don't want. You don't want--

Mr. Spurr: No, the question is, what's the financing on that scenario look like?

Jason: You'd still be responsible for financing it, but you would have not nearly as much say on the project itself.

Ms. Curry-Campbell: After the seven years?

Mr. Spurr: No, immediately.

Jason: Immediately.

Ms. Curry-Campbell: You're saying that we do nothing in October? I'm trying to follow this timeline.

Chris: We're not talking about it. Just--

Mr. Spurr: It's not in October. [unintelligible 00:48:22]

Jason: Just hypothetically speaking if--

Mr. Spurr: Where I was headed with this, councilmen is that if we don't do anything, the October deadline notwithstanding, if we don't do anything and the judge says, "You've got to do something." What does the financing look like? Does the judge then require us to adopt a rate and we have to do it, or does the judge force property tax increase that we have no say over? How's the financing work? Because I thought there was a scenario where if the judge

does mandate the financing that the judge chooses, then how they do it they choose property taxes versus income taxes then they just mandate it. Has that ever happened in Indiana?

Chris: You mean that just arbitrarily choose a combination of the two that was--

Mr. Spurr: If the judge has purview over the entire project presumably then, and we've not adopted anything, they presumably have purview over the financing component as well.

Ms. Curry-Campbell: The voters do.

Mr. Spurr: No. The judge does.

Mr. Armstrong: The judge would at that point.

Jason: I don't know. I've only heard of the judge saying based upon this particular search situation, they would require you to fund X project. They could go in and say, "This is how we want X project to look." Then they may leave it up to you on how about it's funded. A judge could say, "No, we're going to require you use property tax [unintelligible 00:50:02]" I've not seen that happen, it could but that might be case specific. What you want to avoid is, it gets to a point where a judge requires you to construct a new jail, and then they're under control on what you build, because they may pick something that's above and beyond what you think is necessary for your county. They may require you to install a bunch of bells and whistles that you don't think are necessary. You could be funding a much larger project than what you think is necessary if you let a judge decide that. That's what you want to try to avoid and get to that point.

President Kyle: Anything else?

Mr. Armstrong: Thank you for your presentation. I appreciate it.

Ms. Curry-Campbell: Thank you.

President Kyle: I'm going to ask the Council for a favor. Is the member from the Regional Development Authority still here or did they leave? I know you're on a tight time schedule as well. I'm going to ask Council's permission to allow them to speak now because I know they needed to leave by 11:00 and it's 11:00.

Speaker 4: I got a school board meeting to go to so no big deal. Thank goodness, we've already passed our building project so we don't have to go through this. Mitch Harper actually asked me to run up here. I ran five and a half mile yesterday, so I decided to just take the car up. To talk to you about the READI funding that's coming up for Northeast Indiana. Northeast Indiana was fortunate enough to get \$50 million to spread throughout Northeast Indiana.

We're in the process of working on that. This is Ryan [unintelligible 00:51:58] from the regional partnership. I brought him along today to answer the real questions. He's been working with the [unintelligible 00:52:06] and that throughout Northeast Indiana, on how we'll spread the monies throughout the counties. I believe Fort Wayne and Allen County, in the regional cities monies which we obtained back in 2015/2016 received about 54% of the \$42 million that we were fortunate to receive throughout Northeast Indiana.

We're in the process of receiving applications this time. We've had seven presentations, I believe-

Ryan: Six or seven.

Speaker 4: Six or seven in the last couple of weeks. We're looking for more presentations from throughout Northeast Indiana coming up in the future. Would you all have any questions on how we can [unintelligible 00:53:02]

Ryan: If I can add just a bit to that. The Regional Development Authority is a statutorily created body. It was created by the state legislature back in 2015. It has an eight-year term so it's set to expire at the end of 2023. The members of the RDA they're 37 members, the 11 county commissioner's offices, and then the 16 towns and cities throughout the 11 county region are the actual members of the RDA, who elect a five-member volunteer board of directors.

What we're asking today is for Allen County to pass a resolution to reauthorize its membership in the Regional Development Authority, which would then make our projects within Allen County eligible to receive some of that \$50 million in READI funding.

President Kyle: A quick question. Obviously, the last time I think the county did this was, as you said, seven or eight years ago. There's probably only two members on the Council that were present at the time. This is new to the other five members. How many other counties in the region have already taken action?

Ryan: Sorry, off the top of my head. Noble, Huntington, LaGrange, Wabash have taken action. The others are scheduled. Those County Council meetings, they haven't been [unintelligible 00:54:31] yet.

Mr. Harris: No one's suggesting not to come on board.

Ryan: Correct. The four that have, it's gone before County Council have approved it.

President Kyle: Is there a deadline to opt-in or opt-out or is it basically just before the current term expires at the end of 2023?

Ryan: The statute itself says within 18 to 12 months of expiration, so we're actually a little past that point. It doesn't appear to be any specific ramifications. As we look at it and have conferred with our counsel, it's just between now and July of 2023. The hiccup there is that again for projects that are within Allen County or a county whose membership but within the RDA is still in flux, it's going to be a little difficult to work with the IEDC on ensuring funding for those projects that may not be within a member municipality or county between now and then.

Mr. Harris: You mentioned six projects, are there any from Allen County, or did you mention that was Allen County?

Ryan: We have I believe six projects have come before the RDA at this point. One has received some READI funding and that was the airport gateway west project. That received approval of \$3 million. That was in a partnership with the IEDC. The three projects from the City of Fort Wayne have been presented to the RDA and one Wabash County and one Huntington County project.

Mr. Harris: What can this money be used for?

Ryan: The origin of the funds is ARPA dollars. The IEDC is engaged, Ernst & Young or EY to think creatively. The whole READI Program is focused, in fact, READI stands for Regional Economic Acceleration and Development Initiative. It's focused on economic development and quality of place, really population creating an environment, which would be attractive to new residents or current residents.

Mr. Harris: Trails would be-

Ryan: Trails were funded through regional cities, and there are some trail projects that went into the original application to the IEDC.

Ms. Curry-Campbell: Question.

Ryan: Yes, ma'am.

Ms. Curry-Campbell: I know there's some development. There's some homes being developed- Jerry Starks, is he one of your recipients?

Ryan: Right now only Fort Wayne, Allen County website. The Fort Wayne International Airport has been a recipient of funding. Up to this point, or is that funding approved? We are still in the process of just hearing applications. I don't believe that Jerry Starks has an application in the portal just yet but I would not be surprised to see one.

Ms. Curry-Campbell: For folks that's doing economic development on the South side of Fort Wayne, how do they get in touch with you or how did they get the application? What is the process?

Ryan: We did an open process for applications back in July of last year as we were putting together the application that went to the IEDC that resulted in the \$50 million award to the region. We've since opened up a new application now that we have more the details around what the ARPA funds or require what IEDC anyway are looking for.

We've opened up a new publicly available application. It's available on the RDA website. Anyone can access that. We do one of the projects that has been heard by the RDA and the RDA will be making a motion on this week is the village premier project on the southeast side of Fort Wayne. We do have preliminary projects, a handful of preliminary applications including bridge of grace as looking at an application. They're actually Southeast Fort Wayne was featured as a goal area in both the workforce growth and entrepreneurship and innovation portion of the original application. It's been a major area of consideration.

Ms. Curry-Campbell: Thank you.

Mr. Harris: Is there a deadline for this recent that you just opened for applications?

Ryan: RDA is accepting applications on a rolling basis. The actual deadline for our agreement with the IEDC is all funds have to be obligated by the end of June 2023. The governor has said in a recent press release that he'd like to see all funds obligated by the end of this year, the end of 2022. Things are starting to move pretty quickly. There's some urgency.

Mr. Harris: This is for Council when we initiated this I think we were the first maybe in the state to initiate this in '15. I think I made that motion. I believe that the state decided this is another economic development tool technique to give monies out to regions rather than giving them to communities. We got on that board and ended up bringing back some money if you will. For that reason, I'll move for-- Oh, we have one more question.

President Kyle: Do we have to join so that New Haven and Fort Wayne and all those can join? Are they separate on their own?

Ryan: If Allen County joins, then those are automatically within and members of the RDA. If Allen County were to opt out, opt not to join, they would have the opportunity to separately join as individual municipalities. Assuming that a contiguous county maintains its membership in the RDA. It would make projects within unincorporated Allen county that are not within one of those communities ineligible for funding.

Ms. Curry-Campbell: You said ineligible?

Ryan: ineligible. Yes.

Ms. Curry-Campbell: Thank you.

Mr. Harris: What is the cost to the county to be part of this?

Ryan: There is none. There's no cost to the county. In fact, statutorily, the RDA could not ask for funds from the county for membership.

Mr. Harris: All right. Thank you.

Ryan: This is the one time you will be hearing something today that no one will be asking for money.

[laughter]

Mr. Harris: Thank you.

Mr. Spurr: Taxpayer funds are funding the existence of the RDA.

Ryan: With regional cities, it was tax amnesty funds that were collected that created the regional cities initiative. This is all ARPA dollars that the state received as part of their allocation. They carved out \$500 million to create the statewide program and we were a recipient of \$50 million. There's a lot of talk and why, I think there's some urgency from the governors to create similar programs going forward using against some of that state surplus budget, surplus dollars, but yes, it is taxpayer in the origin.

Mr. Spurr: Mr. President, I'm going to abstain from the vote.

Mr. Harris: Mr. President I'll move for the approval of an ordinance committing the county of Allen Indiana to an additional eight years as member of the Northeast Indiana Regional Development Authority or in the alternate joining the Northeast Indiana Regional and Development Authority.

Ms. Curry-Campbell: Second.

President Kyle: Motion and a second. Just for clarification, I believe this will be resolution 2022-07-21-03.

Ms. Curry-Campbell: Correct.

Mr. Armstrong: Yes, correct.

President Kyle: We have a motion in a second. Any further discussion? Hearing none. All those in favor say, "Aye."

All Members: Aye.

President Kyle: All those opposed.

Council Member: Aye.

President Kyle: We have a five one with one abstention 5-1 (Bob)-1 (Spurr). Thank you.

Ms. Curry-Campbell: [unintelligible 01:02:15]

Mr. Spurr: Thank you very much.

President Kyle: Council, thank you for allowing that change. We are now back on the normal agenda and I believe the next department is ACJC.

Mr. Harris: [silence] Check the tapes.

President Kyle: Thank you for allowing us that quick change.

Wendy Kyler: Sure. Wendy Kyler, Budget Analyst for the Allen County Juvenile Center.

Ashley Inge: Ashley Inge, Juvenile Justice Specialist for the Allen County Juvenile Center.

President Kyle: Welcome.

Wendy: We have one item, should be quick and easy. We made application to the Juvenile Justice. I can't remember our-

Ashley: Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative program.

Wendy: [laughs] I'm sorry. I still have other things from all of them. We were awarded \$55,000 again this year. This is our ninth year receiving grant funding from the program and we're asking today to have those funds appropriated.

President Kyle: Any questions?

Ms. Curry-Campbell: I only had one question. What are some of the incentives?

Wendy: The incentives. Why don't you go ahead with that one?

Ashley: We currently have incentives such as gift cards to restaurants. We are working on gas cards, potentially working with Uber for transportation. We do youth-identified

incentives so our officers do speak with each youth about what potentially they may need or want that could motivate their behaviors.

Ms. Curry-Campbell: Thank you.

Ashley: I would mention snacks and food is a big incentive for our youth.

Mr. Armstrong: These are for the juveniles.

Ashley: Yes.

Wendy: Correct.

Mr. Harris: Mr. President, I'll move for appropriation within the JDAI fund 223 for \$55,000.

Members: Second.

President Kyle: Motion and multiple seconds. Any further discussion? Hearing none. All those in favor say, "Aye."

All Members: Aye.

President Kyle: All those opposed? Motion passes 7-0. Thank you for coming.

Wendy: Thank you.

Ashley: Thank you.

President Kyle: Circuit court.

[pause 01:04:42]

Nick: Council, I wasn't planning on doing this one, but it's a grant that they received from the state for a Legal Ed opportunity as a separate fund for \$7,500 and they hire an intern. You will see a little brief description in the document they provided in your notebook. Unfortunately, I can't answer any questions unless they're technical related to the financing aspect.

Mr. Harris: Mr. President I'll move for the appropriation within the Legal ED opportunity fund of 850 for \$7,500 for extra deputy hire.

Mr. Spurr: Second.

Ms. Curry-Campbell: Second.

President Kyle: Motion and multiple seconds. Any further discussion? Hearing none. All those in favor say, "Aye."

Members: Aye.

President Kyle: All those opposed. Motion passes 7-0. Thank you.

Nick: I was asked to do this one.

President Kyle: Oh.

Nick: Allen Superior Court, you'll see the document and they're asking to transfer from the consulting services to furniture and fixtures. They have some chairs that need reupholstered, so to speak. You will see they received a grant that's covering or received more than expected on a grant and so that's why they have more monies available in the consulting services expenditure line. You need to see the chairs or anything in that regard, we'd have to give a superior court, but John was here. It just things ran long and so he couldn't stay.

Mr. Harris: What's the consulting services what are they pulling it from? In other words--

Nick: It's an expenditure line. If you see in the notebook on their document, they have a specific reference. I'll grab it.

Mr. Harris: Yes, I can as well.

Ms. Curry-Campbell: How many chairs, Nick? [inaudible 01:06:27]

Mr. Harris: Council, I just want to point that one out because I think I read that a few days ago. In many times they come over and ask for more interpretation or interpreters funding here that are taking money from that account. We'll trust that they won't be here in October asking for interpreters funding, if I'm saying that right, Nick.

Member: They'll have to trade in their chairs.

Ms. Curry-Campbell: Yes.

Mr. Harris: We usually see them-- It seems like we see them somewhere around that September, October, looking for additional funds for interpreters if that's the same account that it's coming out of. I just wanted to make Council aware of that. If it happens, we should be talking to them about the chairs they purchase.

Ms. Curry-Campbell: I was just curious about the chairs. Is there anything in there about, is this one chair, is there's five chairs or what type of chairs?

Nick: This is to replace the old fabric chairs in the small claims courtrooms

Ms. Curry-Campbell: Five chairs?

Nick: No, no, no. Fabric chairs. Excuse me.

Ms. Curry-Campbell: Fabric chairs.

Nick: There's a small claims courtroom so there's definitely more than a couple. Then the current chairs are over 15 years old.

Mr. Harris: That's fair.

Nick: I don't know the quantity, unfortunately. Sorry,

Mr. Spurr: Nick, I just had a question. You mentioned that it was the proceeds were from a grant. If we move that, we're able to do that within the constraints of the grant and not violating anything?

Nick: Actually, my understanding was happening is the grant has provided additional funds so they need less from this line in the general fund.

Mr. Spurr: It wouldn't be in violation of any?

Nick: No, they're still using the interpreter grant for interpreting. It's just they don't have to rely on this general fund line to pay for those interpreter expenses because they can pull from the grant.

Mr. Spurr: Okay.

President Kyle: Do you know how many chairs since they said they discussed it with you?

Nick: I do not.

President Kyle: Okay.

Ms. Curry-Campbell: You don't know how many chairs? \$13,000. I would've been asking, how many chairs. I'm not directing it to you. I'm just saying they're not here. I'm sure they can hear me and they'll send me an email to let me know how many chairs for \$13,000 for the superior court. Thank you.

Mr. Harris: I'll be excited not to see them in October asking for interpreter funding. I'll move for the transfer within the general fund from consulting services of \$13,000 to furniture and fixtures of \$13,000.

Member: Second.

President Kyle: We have a motion and a second. Any further discussion? Hearing none. All those in favor say, "Aye."

All members: Aye.

President Kyle: All those opposed.

Ms. Curry-Campbell: Aye.

President Kyle: Motion passes, six-one 6-1 (Sheila). Thank you. Community corrections.

Community Corrections Rep: Good morning.

President Kyle: Good morning.

Mr. Harris: Good morning.

Community Corrections Rep: You've had a full morning. You still have a little bit yet to go, so I will try to keep this pretty brief. I just have a minor item to request of you today. We're requesting an appropriation of \$35,357. Once again, we are fortunate enough to receive support from the Indiana office of court services to support our three problem solving courts,

re-entry, restoration of veterans, each court received \$8,000. Those funds are used to provide staff training, client incentives, client needs, it assists with chemical drug testing fees as well as any housing needs in certain situations. The second part of my request is for funds that were refunded and returned to us due to COVID in addition to the accumulation of interest since the inception of the fund in 2015, we'd like to appropriate those funds. We would use those to mirror the same type of expenditures that are acceptable within the grant.

Mr. Harris: I'll just ask no chairs are involved.

Community Corrections Rep: There are no chairs.

Mr. Harris: I agree. Mr. President, I move for the appropriation within the problem-solving court fund E52 for \$35,357.

Ms. Curry-Campbell: Second.

President Kyle: Motion and multiple seconds. Any further discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor say, "Aye."

All Members: Aye.

President Kyle: All those opposed.

Member: Aye.

President Kyle: Thank you. Motion passes, 6-1(Bob).

Community Corrections Rep: Thank you and good afternoon.

Mr. Harris: Thank you.

President Kyle: Mr. Jordan, I have a question for you on timing.

Nick: 11:46.

President Kyle: Yes, I know.

[laughter]

Actually, it's 11:00.

Nick: That was easy.

President Kyle: Whatever. We have to be out of this room at what time?

Nick: I don't know.

President Kyle: Is there-- There's Planning Commission, correct?

Mr. Spurr: Not here.

President Kyle: That was the next [unintelligible 01:11:32]?

Nick: I think [unintelligible 01:11:33].

Mr. Spurr: Oh, it should be, yes.

Nick: [unintelligible 01:11:34].

Mr. Spurr: No, it would be here because it's our voting.

Nick: Then I think that's at 1:30.

Mr. Spurr: That's at 1:00, yes.

Nick: I don't know what time they get into [unintelligible 01:11:43].

Mr. Spurr: It's at 1:00 PM.

Nick: I can run upstairs and check.

Mr. Armstrong: We should be here.

President Kyle: Well, I'm just I'm trying to-- the last three items on the agenda. Are those things you're handling?

Nick: No. Well-

President Kyle: The transfers? [crosstalk]

Nick: Yes, the transfers are seconds unless you guys have detailed questions.

President Kyle: Okay. I just wanted to know what time we're going to be out of here. I think the next two items may take some time, so we may have to move to the other room for the budget.

Nick: While you're doing the next two items, I'll go check.

President Kyle: Okay.

Nick: It starts at one o'clock.

President Kyle: Right. That's what I-

Nick: Then, I'll go check and see if we can bounce over there.

President Kyle: Okay, cool. I just-

Nick: I don't need to be here for the items.

Mr. Spurr: Man, I hope we're out of here by then? [chuckles]

President Kyle: I'm just-

Mr. Harris: Unless I talk so much in the next two items.

President Kyle: I'm just trying to-

Mr. Harris: No, I know. I'm just giving you some stuff.

President Kyle: Okay, Commissioners would be next. No, we already did.

Mr. Harris: Or you can jump to department 80 if, I think that's when he mentioned he wouldn't need to be here.

President Kyle: Well, no, he needs to do those. Those are at the end, but they're just housekeeping. The next item would be the Commissioners, and this would be the salary ordinance for the balance.

Mr. Spurr: Is there any way possible we could go through back to HR?

President Kyle: Chris is handling all those.

Mr. Spurr: Okay.

President Kyle: That's what I asked.

Mr. Spurr: Okay.

Chris Cloud: Morning, Council. Chris Cloud, Chief of Staff Board of Commissioners. We were asked to bring this item back this month, and have some sort of ordinance in place for part-time employees, as was in your packet. Happy to answer any questions.

Mr. Harris: I think- did it go up from last time we spoke?

Chris: The last time we were here, the ordinance only covered departments in the general fund. This number would cover, at your request, all county departments regardless of if they were general fund or special fund.

Mr. Harris: I think it was 1.6 or something to 2.5. [crosstalk]

Chris: Correct, yes. That was what the direction was last month is to bring it back to them that covered everybody. Generally, the practice would have been anytime you all gave anything, or a step increase or anything that those departments after the general fund, have to find it or come to you or whatever. The direction we received, I received last month--

Mr. Harris: We've also put in a scale for part-time employees.

Chris: Correct, and that was based on actual numbers, so I-- part-time is a weird word because we actually have five different things that mean part-time. This is part-time that excludes seasonal or temporary. This is part-time like truly what we think of as part-time people and there are I think 334 on that list. This was based on the actual hours submitted through June 30th.

President Kyle: Could you explain that chart?

Chris: It's broken up by actual hours. Just to do the math based on the hours' buckets, and again, you all can amend this. It's your prerogative to amend the salary or this is just a

suggestion. There'll be eight-- Again, this is also hypothetical because the auditor's office will process this based on what actually is. When I had the report run, this is what the numbers would have been if broken up into those buckets. Eight people would have gotten \$500, 21 \$400, 36 \$300, 84 \$200, 76 \$100, 46 \$50, and 33 part-time would have gotten zero because they have not logged 50 hours in the last 6 months. Most people, if you look at their chart, there are a couple of hours a month.

It's not really what we think of when we think of our part-time employees who are actually here every week working a couple of hours. That's people who are scattershot every now and then. Again, it is your prerogative what that do. Everything on that.

Mr. Harris: You gave us, oh, wait a minute. Can you run those numbers by-- I just tried to write those down, and I must know,

Chris: Eight people?

Mr. Harris: Yes.

Chris: Again, this is hypothetical because it'd be based on real world. From the last from wherever the poorest run till now.

Mr. Harris: That's fair, it can change, yes.

Chris: Just hypothetically, eight people.

Mr. Harris: 21, 36, 84, 76.

Chris: 76, 46, and 33. What you're probably trying to get at is what's the bottom line total? It's \$49,000. That would be-- if you put the people in their buckets, it's 49K.

Mr. Harris: That's a \$50,000, \$49,000 addition for part-time people.

Mr. Spurr: Yes, do not forget.

Chris: Yes. Well, which and the only reason again, you'll see the thing for the Coliseum on there, if you all would want the Coliseum to pay its own cost, we just wanted to put that on the thing for consideration, but they'd also be in that 49K number. Their \$28,000 of that 49 is there are part-time people and the other \$21,000 is the rest of the department. It's clearly up to you guys. The dollar amounts are up to you guys. I wanted to at least give you something to-

Mr. Spurr: Would they not need that \$100,000 just coming up?

Chris: That is, well, I wish Nick were here, but I believe that is correct. That is-- it's sort of an either-or scenario. Either you can cover them, or if you want them to cover themselves out of the revenue they've earned, you could have them do that. The same with the 2%. That's up to you guys. [crosstalk]

President Kyle: Is it included in the-- is the Coliseum included in the 2.5?

Chris: Yes because again, it's a small dollar amount. It's covered by that. It's really just however you guys want to move forward. If you want to just cover all county employees out of, that's like option one, that 2.5 number should cover 2% for full-time plus that whole list of

people for part-time. Then if you would desire to have the Coliseum pay its own way, then that would be [unintelligible 01:17:42] thing.

Mr. Spurr: Just a point of clarification, Chris. There are no elected officials covered by any of this stuff, right?

Chris: Correct. Correct. I believe that may even be in the ordinance, Nick, put in your packet for the 2%. I don't know, but either way, the official salary can't be changed in the year in which it was set, so it wouldn't matter anyway. Nick is taking interpretation, I think we'd all on the surface logically agree that whether it's a bonus or anything else, it's still changing the salary of an elected official. Even though it's not a pay increase, per se, it is.

Mr. Spurr: It is.

Chris: He would take these. Now, if you all because they are elected officials, they do great work. Many of them aren't paid what they could be elsewhere, yourselves included. [unintelligible 01:18:30] If you all wanted to do a bonus for elected officials, you could cover that in the budget process this year for '23, but for now--

Paul: I know. No way suggesting that we've never even--

Chris: No.

Mr. Spurr: I just wanted to clarify, but we're out of here.

Chris: Even beyond you seven, for others, I'm saying you could handle that if you wanted to in the budget process, but no, under this there would be no elected officials because they could not have a salary change. Unless there was a new elected official. Generally speaking, when your salary is set in the budget for the next year, you're all salary is a fixed number.

Ms. Curry-Campbell: Mr. Chair, I just have one question. How did you come up with the dollar amount?

Chris: Madam Councilwoman, I took a dart and I threw. [crosstalk]

Ms. Curry-Campbell: I know but I--

Chris: Again, these were just- you all can change them. These are illustrative, but what I would say is when you look at 2% full-time employees, when you go to the bottom end of our OSS grid or LTC grid, you're in the 30,000s number. Part of it was not wanting to have a part-time person's bonus. This is their full-time job. This is their only source of income. This is a part-time job. They've either chosen to work elsewhere or don't need the full-time job. You know what I mean? There's other-

Ms. Curry-Campbell: Yes.

Chris: -circumstances and so, as far as what we as an employer would be doing this is super generous of you all to even consider in the first place. Our full-time employees, just in my own opinion, should be the priority as far as where the money would go. This is your all's push, include the part-time too. Great. I don't know that they should be the same level. My concern was just picking a number that I knew would be less than the full-times not knowing exactly where the bottom of the grids were. Also recognizing that they're not full-time

employees, and so they have either chosen or have other opportunities for employment elsewhere.

Ms. Curry-Campbell: I accept your explanation.

Chris: I like too there's a formula. It seemed reasonable.

Ms. Curry-Campbell: Thank you.

President Kyle: The number is 2.5 million and obviously, for ease on the auditor we're going to appropriate that from the general fund. Could you comment on how much 100 series we already have not used through the first six months?

Chris: I think when I looked at it in May, we were already up in the general fund alone to 1.6 or 1.8, of money that would be unused. If an employee is hired mid-year, and that salary line has been unused, so far, they're only going to spend half of it. It's the combination of all of those places where positions have been unfilled or when you have a change in position where someone who was at a higher step on the grid retires, and they get replaced, there's always a delta between the two.

When you add those things up of what would not be needed to care for the rest of the year, what you're effectively doing to use Councilman Fries' analogy from earlier about forwarding allowances. Effectively, what you're doing is you're using what will be rollover early. That's effectively what you're doing. For Nick's sake, and the sake of his payroll staff, it's just easier to have that be a new appropriation, and then you all just realize, you're going to get 2.5 back and 100 series rollover.

It's a net number that's zero net, but you're paying it in advance, knowing that you'll collect on the back end because if not, you got to go through every single budget and figure out if they have enough to cover. If they don't have enough to cover, then you got put in. It's as simple for them if you just do it straightforward.

Ms. Curry-Campbell: When will they receive this bonus?

Chris: My assumption would be in the next payroll period, but I don't do payroll. It could be in the second payroll, but it would be relatively near future.

Mr. Spurr: Between 15 and 30 days.

Chris: Because I know, we just submitted Wednesday payroll. We've already missed the next-- Probably the paycheck after that so it'd be four weeks when they would see it in paycheck. At our quarterly executive leadership meeting Tuesday, there was an expression of gratefulness that even you we're considering this from departments that were there. Just on their behalf, I provided to you that they were thankful that you were even looking at this.

Mr. Spurr: Mr. Chair.

President Kyle: Yes.

Mr. Lagemann: I want to comment on this. First of all, thanks for Councilman Fries for including the part-time folks in there. That's probably an omission, I just wasn't thought of, and I'm really glad we did that. Number two I spend a lot of time since I got on Council just

going from department to department. The one thing I will say about our departments is, I really feel that the value that the taxpayers get out of the folks that work for the county is pretty high.

I don't walk around and see people playing computer games on the computers. I see people pretty hard at work. I don't walk around and see, five guys watching a guy shovel a hole, or dig a hole. I see everybody pitching in. I'm really proud of the work ethic and the productivity that we see out of our county employees. I think this is the least we can do.

Mr. Harris: Mr. President, I'll be in support of this. However, I just want to really caution Council, that this doesn't become an annual thing. I work with businesses and a 10-county region and all kinds of industries are considering these kinds of things at this point in time. I'm willing to do the same, but I really don't want to get us into, "Hey, we've got monies left over in accounts next September or next August. Let's give more money back to the employees." I think that sets a dangerous precedent. We're not doing our due diligence, I think in managing the budget if we do this on an annual basis.

Mr. Spurr: I'm glad we are doing it in a time of hyperinflation.

Mr. Fries: With that being said, I guess I will make a motion for the amended salary 2022 salary ordinance and for the inflation bonus. Then go down to number two, which is appropriation within general fund a one-time bonus of \$2.5 million. We haven't gotten to number three yet.

Mr. Fries: Second.

Mr. Armstrong: Mr. President, I'd like a roll call vote on this.

President Kyle: Council one quick question from the auditor.

Nick: We need clarification on whether or not you want chief deputies to receive the bonus.

Mr. Fries: They're employees, I would say yes.

Nick: That's fine. I just needed confirmation.

Mr. Harris: Is that in the 2.5?

Nick: The 2.5 is more than enough because that's baked in the special revenue funds as well. It should more than cover the amount needed.

Mr. Harris: Then I will read Second with that minor inclusion.

Nick: Then Kenny read off the agenda but the actual ordinances if you can read the part-time and the full-time separate just so we have votes on them. Separate ordinance.

Ms. Curry-Campbell: I'm sorry, amended salary ordinance of 2022 now, therefore, be it ordained by the Allen County Council that for all employees not considered full-time the Allen County Council desires to give a one-time bonus according to the following scales. Hours worked are based on January 1st through June 30th 2022, hours worked 800 to 1,000 hrs \$500 bonus 600 to 799 hours \$400 bonus, 400 to 599 hours \$300 bonus, 200 to 399 \$200 bonus, 100 to 199 it's \$100 bonus and 50 to 99 hours work is \$50 Bonus. This ordinance

reconsidered and adopted by the members of the Allen County Council on this 21st day of July of 2022.

Mr. Lagemann: Second.

Mr. Armstrong: Mr. President, can we have a roll call vote on this?

President Kyle: Roll call vote for the part-time ordinance that was motioned and seconded. I guess I'll just start from-

Mr. Armstrong: What about the 2.5? Was up first or **[unintelligible 01:26:52]**

President Kyle: Well, there's two.

Mr. Armstrong: -separately.

President Kyle: -there's two ordinances.

Mr. Armstrong: You're doing that? You're doing a part-time first.

President Kyle: Yes. That was the one that you ask.

Mr. Armstrong: **[unintelligible 01:26:57]** doing both at the same time since **[unintelligible 01:26:59]** 2.5 went out there.

President Kyle: Somebody would have to read that.

Ms. Curry-Campbell: Amended salary ordinance of 2022 now, therefore, be ordained by the Allen County Council that the Allen County Council desires to give a one-time bonus of 2% to all eligible full-time employees to offset significant costs of living increases. Only full-time employees currently hired as the date of their ordinance will be eligible for the bonus. The bonus will be calculated using the employee salary as the date of this ordinance. This ordinance read, considered, and adopted by the member of the Allen County Council on this 21st day of July 2022.

Mr. Lagemann: Second.

President Kyle: Motion and a second. We will do a roll call vote. I will call the vote from my right to the left. Ms. Curry-Campbell.

Ms. Curry-Campbell: Aye.

President Kyle: Mr. Harris.

Mr. Harris: Aye.

President Kyle: Mr. Armstrong

Mr. Armstrong: No.

President Kyle: President Kyle, aye. Mr. Lagemann

Mr. Lagemann: Aye.

President Kyle: Mr. Fries.

Mr. Armstrong: Aye.

President Kyle: Mr. Spurr.

Mr. Spurr: No.

President Kyle: The ordinance passes 5-2 (Bob and Chris). Thank you. Next item, and Nick, just for clarification, we don't need to do the Coliseum math that was included. Number three for the commissioners on the agenda would be building purchase and renovation.

Nick: It's going to be the appropriation of the 2.5.

President Kyle: Oh, do we have to appropriate it? Sorry,

Nick: Yes, you need to. Then I guess in the Coliseum as long as the majority approves the 2.5, then we don't need to do the Coliseum piece.

President Kyle: Now we need to appropriate the money.

Chris: Mr. President, for a moment. If it is not though it has to be broken out separately, correct?

Nick: For right now the only one that on there-- The only fund on there is the Coliseum, so you don't vote on the 2.5 then it makes all the other special revenue funds are left to fund theirs if they can, if not they'll be back when the time comes for those monies.

Mr. Fries: Then I'll make a motion to approve the one-time bonus of \$2.5 million.

Mr. Lagemann: Second.

President Kyle: Motion and a second. You still want a roll call, Mr. Armstrong?

Mr. Armstrong: This is on the 2.5?

Ms. Curry-Campbell: No.

Mr. Armstrong: No.

President Kyle: We have a motion and a second. Any further discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor say, "Aye."

All Members: Aye.

President Kyle: All those opposed.

Members: Aye.

President Kyle: The same 5-2 (Bob & Chris) vote. Thank you. Now, building renovation [unintelligible 01:29:37]

Chris Cloud: Council, we were here last month, I'm not sure the technical legal term table laid told to come back next month, whatever the [unintelligible 01:29:51] would be on that. Subsequently, on Tuesday afternoon, we finally became aware of a letter Superior Court had written to the County Council that had never been shared with the board of commissioners at any point in time in light of the letter, which judge of the group made public comment in reference today that I believe you all received, that we just received Tuesday afternoon of this week. The commissioners can no longer support the project that is performed today if the building occupants have no desire to move into it. We cannot compel them to move into it, which is the case with the court's space. It seems like a waste of time and energy and a waste of 15 months of my life, by the way, has a personal aside to move forward with this project.

The commissioners at least the two that supported this project, we will never find a building this cheap again. It is still a wonderful project. The building purchase is only needed and used because of the use of the Resource Center. If the occupants do not want to move into the Resource Center, then there is no logical reason to afford, purchasing a building and modeling it, and spending the money if the back end it's not used or wanted, or needed. It's hard not to be personal about these things, but I'm a little bothered by the fact that the commissioner's office did not receive that letter it would've saved a lot of time and energy on our part.

Actually, anytime in the last nine months, when they saw the schematic drawings, it would've been helpful to have received this specific and helpful feedback in that letter. We don't do court operations. We don't and that's their world. It would've been helpful to have known months ago that no matter what, they had no desire or need for this space. That is not the message our architects received so miscommunication on their part is what it is. The commissioners cannot support and cannot advocate to you the purchase and remodeling and spending a \$49 million when the end occupants who are doing this for don't want it, don't need it, and are opposed to it.

Mr. Harris: Are you withdrawing the request?

Chris Cloud: Unofficially? Yes, but officially, no, because you all asked us to bring you a proposal. We're telling you where we're at on it, but you guys were the ones that asked us for it so we didn't feel it was right to not close the loop on bringing the request before you. We were asked to do that.

Mr. Harris: Several of the members of our judicial community set on the Community Corrections Board, does Community Corrections support this change?

Chris Cloud: Well, Community Corrections, is the only department who desperately wants or needs to move.

Mr. Harris: Were they in favor of the move or were they not in favor of the move?

Chris Cloud: Community Corrections, I can't speak for them. They're in favor of whatever gets them out of their building.

Mr. Harris: Judicial got us into this in a big way, and judicial has pulled that plug or whatever at the end, and we're left with their need still not being fulfilled. We're back to square one and Community Corrections will set for another period of time across from a local park. That's just been established by the City of Fort Wayne.

Chris Cloud: I have to take Superior Court at their word that they didn't need this space and that they don't want this space and that they were misunderstood about this. I have to take them out of their word that they were misunderstood. I have to take them out of their word that they were misunderstood. In the increases in space, they were a very small part of that. The whole point of this project was to find a new home for Community Corrections and at the same time, we could accomplish other things too. The whole point was a new home for community corrections. To your point of-- I don't think it's fair to put the blame on the judiciary for the need for Community Corrections--

That's just a factor of the program participants. It's a great program. I'm glad they need more space because that's an alternative to incarceration. That's a good program [unintelligible 01:33:58]

Mr. Harris: We've expanded that department that function-

Chris Cloud: Drastically

Mr. Harris: -extensively in the last several years.

Chris Cloud: Yes, but their building is not. We are in some ways back to square one actually, where we've been the last eight years and that they need a new day reporting center.

Mr. Harris: Is there room in that building that they could lease? Well, we probably don't need to get into that discussion right now because we could be here for the next three hours talking about the next options for our county.

[crosstalk]

Ms. Curry-Campbell: I'm curious, how much did we spend? Could I ask that question, sir?

Mr. Harris: You can ask anything you want, but what I would suggest is that we don't end this process. Somebody needs to get back together, sit down and talk about the next steps.

Chris Cloud: I don't disagree on that.

Ms. Curry-Campbell: How much did we spend on this?

Chris Cloud: I think I mentioned this at the last Council meeting between architects and engineering firms because we wanted to know what we'd be buying. We wanted to do an exhaustive, look and see what we were getting and what the costs would be. Along with an answer to a short answer to your question, part of that \$49 million number included some building things HVAC, boiler work, windows, doors, things like that, that would eventually be needed, that are best to be done when the building's empty because it's really invasive work. Even though some of those things might have been three years when it was really needed or five years was needed so to that at the front end is while the building's empty. That added to the cost so that all in number to get that investigation to the architect to the appraisals. Appraisals were expensive too, was about \$100,000.

Ms. Curry-Campbell: Is there anyone we could sell this to because we spent a lot of money on it? I know they're trying to sell the building.

Chris Cloud: It's not useful, it would be in some ways useful to know what we identified as you fixed. I think \$30,000 of that cost was for the appraisals. Doing appraisals on 200-square-foot office buildings. There aren't a lot of those in Fort Wayne and so it was out of market research. Those costs were, we know normally appraisals are a couple of grand, typical appraisals. Those would be not really useful for other people because only the government is constrained by the need to purchase based on the average of two appraisals. It is on cost.

Ms. Curry-Campbell: That's a lot of money, I was just trying to see how we could cycle, refurbished. You spent a lot of money on that.

Chris Cloud: We did. On the flip side, we have the information.

Ms. Curry-Campbell: Thank you.

Chris Cloud: We have the date and the information, but it's on cost. We are back to square one on Community Corrections, but we cannot with a straight face advocate the Purchase Center modeling of a project when the whole reason's being done is for part two and part two is not wanted by anybody but it's by--

Mr. Harris: These are representative of Community Corrections, so that will be of interest. I think in that next meeting that should Community Corrections be upset that no movement is happening, several of their board members are in the judicial wing so they should be well aware that the people on their board basically stopped the process.

Councilman Kerley: FYI is what it is.

Councilman Fries: Is it withdrawn?

Mr. Cloud: You all can choose not to vote on it but I-- The many agenda the day before the meeting didn't make a lot of sense not to give you some context for why and what, but I would not expect a vote from council on this personally.

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: We don't need to vote on it actually.

Councilman Kerley: I'm just going to make a comment. I want to thank the representatives from [unintelligible 00:00:32] for going through this process with us. I apologize for how this has transpired. I think, obviously in light of no commissioner's support, I don't really see a path forward. If there is no motion, I think it just dies-

Mr. Cloud: Yes. It's just not [crosstalk]

Councilman Kerley: -a painful death. Mr. Cloud, I appreciate-

Mr. Cloud: Sure, [chuckles] and I will-- Yes.

Councilman Kerley: -the explanation. Mr. Holman, I apologize.

Mr. Cloud: Yes. I expressed similar sentiments to Matt. They have been nothing but patient and helpful in helping us think through, even alternative to financing when it was sort of how it might we do this. They've been nothing but helpful and appreciate their [crosstalk]

Councilman Kerley: I know it's been a-- I think it was April of last year when we decided not to move forward on the Washington Street property. We had a rather long and spirited meeting about alternatives and how that transpired at the time this building emerged as, probably, at the time, the only alternative outside of new construction. We have spent a lot of time on it and so I appreciate that. I know you've spent a lot of time on it. I've spent a lot of time on it.

Mr. Cloud: A lot of people have spent a lot of time because it was worthy of investigation. You don't spend this money without actually examining things.

Councilman Kerley: That's why, in the whole scheme of things, I understand we spent \$100,000, but due diligence costs money, We could have uncovered something in that due diligence that would've said there's a major flaw. That's why you do due diligence. Mr. Cloud, I thank you.

Mr. Cloud: Sure. I will also say that we still do have some space needs. They may not be in the court, as their letter indicated, they never need an inch more space so they're fine but we will, in the future, have some other non-court space needs that-- I'll go back to something I've said over and over again, we have no more office space downtown. We've been out for five years.

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: But you have property.

Mr. Cloud: Well, we don't have empty properties. [chuckles]

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: When you have property, you can build [crosstalk]

Mr. Cloud: There will come a point in time where we have to come back before council for some need. Why? Because we offer community corrections where they just, they can't go on anymore in their current situation. They are, clearly, the most dire. We're all aware of their issue and they are the only one I'm aware of who is in that situation. Board of Health needs to expand their clinic space on New Haven Avenue and Meyer Road. They desperately don't expand that. There are other departments who have needs. We will not stop trying to find a solution for community corrections. I think we've all committed to that for their staff of-- We recognize the problem. We want to solve the problem. We just need to find the right solution for that problem.

Councilman Kerley: Chris--

Councilman Spurr: I want to concur with Kyle and just say thanks for all the time that you had on that because I know you've poured a lot of time into it.

Mr. Cloud: It was a good investigation though because it did uncover, I think, a lot of the interconnectedness of departments in helpful ways.

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: Just share with us, what did you learn from this experience? This hundred thousand dollar question, I mean, what did you learn?

Mr. Cloud: Well, I mean, appraisal [unintelligible 00:04:14] aside. I think one of the biggest things I learned is that when departments who would've been consolidated to the new building heard about the project, they're very excited. 10 years ago, 11 years ago when we separated our own departments for the sake of keeping unity with Fort Wayne in this

building, I don't see Nick as often. Is that a big deal? He used to stop by the [00:04:35] auditor's office a lot. In some ways it is because one of the unique things about our world is a lot of our work with other departments it's ad hoc. It's not like--

I sometimes will have to do a project with that department and so being in the same building had advantages and being in the same building and the proximity and just the, "Oh, we just go talk to him." A block away, two blocks away shouldn't make that big of a deal, but it's a little harder to just pop down for a quick conversation. I think we identify some departments who are really actually looking forward to having that again but, again, we provide technology for these things. They've got email. They've got webcams with their phones, and they're a block apart. It's not like they're in two different states. I think they were excited about that.

I think we also showed, and you all received this in the report from [unintelligible 00:05:27], the interconnected nature of court departments and which ones rely on which other ones. That was helpful to see. Court system, it's a huge complicated bundle of departments. We think of it as a system and it is, but it's got all components. Just seeing who works most closely with who was helpful. It really helped me get a better clearer picture of some of the long-term issues and complexities and intricacies of the court and the court system and why certain departments are more connected to others than I realized. There were some helpful things. I think I personally learned from that but they don't have--

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: Maybe you can use that information with all this discussion about a new jail because, I mean, I think the research and everything that you've done and how important it is for these facilities to be connected means a lot. Thank you.

Councilman Kerley: Do you have any--With no motion then, thank you for coming.

Mr. Cloud: Thank you for your vote on the pay increases. We will let employees know of your graciousness today. On their behalf, thank you. Some of us make a little more than others in the county, but we have a lot of employees who make- that medium wagger below it. It's been hard. I mean, we can see it. It's been gas, food. It's hard. I know that they will be appreciative of your gracious act today. Thank you on their behalf.

Councilman Fries: Thank you.

Councilman Kerley: Okay. We don't need to do the coliseum because that was covered. Next would be Acdem.

Mr. Jordan: These next three are all, as we've had in the last couple of months, transfers requested by the [00:07:10] auditor's office just simply due to making sure the purchase is coming from the appropriate series, whether that'd be supplies or services. For the one here from Acdem, we're transferring from promotional to supplies, again, a 300 to a 200 series transfer of \$800 just so they purchase the item out of the correct series.

Councilman Fries: I make a motion to approve.

Councilman Lagemann: Second.

Councilman Fries: \$800 from promotional to supplies in Acdem.

Councilman Kerley: Motion and a second. Any further discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor say aye.

Participants: Aye.

Councilman Kerley: All those opposed. Motion passes, 7-0. Human resources.

Mr. Jordan: HR is from general supplies, the capital in the amount of \$29.

Councilman Fries: Motion to approve from general supplies capital \$29.

Councilman Lagemann: Second.

Councilman Kerley: Motion and a second. Any further discussion? Hearing none, all those of favor say Aye.

Participants: Aye.

Councilman Kerley: All those opposed. Motion passes, 7-0. Election board.

Mr. Jordan: Election board is going from a 300 series, election expense line to a 200 series supply line.

Councilman Fries: Motion to approve an election board transfer in the general fund from election expenses to supplies, total of \$2,652.

Councilman Lagemann: Second.

Councilman Kerley: Motion and a second. Any further discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor say aye.

Participants: Aye.

Councilman Kerley: All those opposed. Motion passes, 7-0. Now you get to--

[background conversation]

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: [laughs] Did our attorney leave?

?Participant: Yes. He's in the hallway, I think.

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: He's in the hallway?

?Participant: Yes.

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: Meeting with a company. He's coming back?

?Participant: Yes.

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: Oh, okay. Great.

Councilman Kerley: If the meeting went to noon he'd be back then [unintelligible 00:08:41].

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: No, I was looking for our attorney. I had some questions about that [unintelligible 00:08:46] invoice and I know I had gave him an assignment. I just wanted to see if he was going to be able to speak on that.

Councilman Kerley: We'll do that after.

[background noise]

Councilman Kerley: Financial report, Mr. Jordan.

Mr. Jordan: Well, council, in your notebook, you see the financials through the end of June. I'm going to go into great detail here in the budget piece of it. If you have any questions specifically on the June aspect, I'm more than happy to handle them. If not, we'll walk through as they're incorporated in the 2023 budget over.

Councilman Fries: We need a motion to approve the auditor's report.

Councilman Kerley: Yes.

Councilman Fries: I'll make a motion to do so.

Councilman Lagemann: I second.

Councilman Kerley: Motion and a second. All those in favor say aye.

Participants: Aye.

Councilman Kerley: All those opposed. Auditor's report is approved.

Mr. Jordan: This is for your knowledge so stop me, interrupt me, ask questions as needed. I want to make sure you get out of it, what you need. Just to start at the top, what we're looking forward today, decision-wise is we can have guidance on the raise figure you would like us to use for 2023. We can delay that. We've done in prior years but--

Councilman Fries: I would like to make motion like 8%, but I don't think that's going to happen. It's only single digits. I'm getting generous.

Mr. Jordan: The other thing that if you don't make a decision on the raise today that we definitely need guidance on is we're going to send communication either today or tomorrow, what you would like us to tell departments, do you want to say, "Start with your 22 allocation, work within that. Come in September and appeal if you need more than that." Do you want us to say, "Work with an X% of your 22 allocation or something different?" Those are the two takeaways that we would like to have for today. We definitely need to know what guidance you want us to send communication-wise to departments when they submit their budgets to council, to us. Should it match 22? That's what the takeaways are for today.

Councilman Kerley: Go ahead.

Councilman Lagemann: Nick, we have this wage and benefit study that we're in the hot middle of. As that comes back, how do we make the adjustments for these departments? If in some cases we have certain classifications that increase in wages and other classifications, they may stay the same. How does that affect this whole process?

Mr. Jordan: It's a great question. The only thing I can say is, you'll see in the documentation, I've asked for a 4% raise. I assume we did the compensation study, we being HR, council, commissioners did the compensation study because we think the wages need to be increased, not because they need to go down. If the compensation study comes back and wages need to decrease, any raise granted today would essentially require future councils to either freeze wage compensation where it's at or take that into consideration each time. If the compensation study comes back and says we need to increase wages by X% as it did in the prior, about seven years ago in 2015, 2016, when we did it, then the 4% may just be a head start of what that compensation study says.

I don't know what it says. What I do know is the fed has asked for 4.6% in their budget presentation. We know that last year, the City of Fort Wayne gave a different amount than what council gave. We know the City of Fort Wayne police as part of their union thing are granted 5% increases over three years. If you gave the county police 3% last year, they're already 2% behind. If you give 4%, they're another percent behind.

For those that were on council in '18, we had to do a big jump in the county police. The reason I mentioned that county police are an expensive portion of the whole compensation structure and they have, if you want to say, a direct correlation as far as competitiveness between the different police force, whether it be the state police, the City of Fort Wayne, and the county. These are just knowns.

To answer your question, the 4% may just give us a head start. If not, then we look at it and say, "Wait, we gave too much" when the compensation study comes back or you guys delay it. If you delay and don't take an action on the raise in this year, off the top of my head, I think the only people you're going to affect, again, would be the elected officials because you can't change that compensation in the year that it's already been set. Everybody else, you could make it retroactive. It would be annoying for us, but you can make it retroactive.

Councilman Fries: Why'd you pick the 4% number?

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: Yes, I was--

Mr. Jordan: Why?

Councilman Lagemann: Why did you pick the 4% number when the cost of living's 8.1, CPI is 8.1, 8.9.

Mr. Jordan: I don't disagree with you one bit. The CPI will change. Kenny you asked last year when we talked about this, the CPI was I think 5%. We didn't know which direction it was going. The fed was telling us it's transitory. It's temporary. We know here we are almost a year later. It's almost doubled. 4% is a starting place. I feel from the controller for the county, so to speak, or auditor for the county 4% we can afford for sure. You'll see on the documentation as we get higher, you're going to narrow the amount you have to give appeals or reduce that amount you have to give to appeals.

On the revenue side, the property tax-- That's why it may be helpful to at least look at that what we're talking about. Our biggest 80% of our general fund revenue is property tax and income tax. Income tax is slowly increasing in that mixture of the 80%. It used to be around 20%, 25% in 2013. Now it's around 35% in 2020, 2021 was the last full year that we had. Income tax is increasing there.

We know the income tax estimate-- I don't have as much confidence in, as I know telling you property tax-wise, our growth quotient is 5%. Our net assessed values, which are based on the market, has been extremely strong as of 1/1/22, not today 1/1/22, which is what you'll pay for in '23, the market was extremely strong. We can assume assessed values, which have been on a tear of around 7% increases the last three years in net assessed value. They should be higher than the 5% we can increase our property tax levy. The pool we're grabbing the taxes from is going up, in my estimates, by more than we can increase our property tax levy. I feel confident on the property tax that we'll collect in the region I have estimated here. The income tax--

Councilman Lagemann: The income tax is volatile.

Mr. Jordan: It's volatile. Just to tag along with what Baker Tilley was talking about this morning, our collections have gone up. The ARPA Act did offer some reprieve for unemployment. You got to remember there was a subsidy, I'll call it a subsidy, but there was additional unemployment given. Well, that's taxable with the exception of a little bit, I think it's 10,200 that is, and under the ARPA Act that's not taxable. That was part of the reason that our income tax collections have jumped, probably, because people received additional unemployment that wasn't given before.

Even beside that, as I mentioned, we have grown in our income tax, but which is expected to be because the economy's grown here. Right now in your packet, you'll see on this 49 figure here, which I have highlighted, and you can see it close on your documentation, but the LIT, local income tax, is in there. I'll blow it up more. It's the bulk of that. In the fifth page, just if you want to see it, in your packet, and I'll put it up on the screen too, you can see the breakdown in the third column from the right. It says 2023 estimate, EST, that's the breakdown of the \$49 million in miscellaneous revenue I have here on the spreadsheet.

The biggest piece of that, if you look from the top, which I'll go to that. I'll pull up here so you can see also. This all here, which again, you guys have on that doc, is 20,192,651. Right below that, you see LIT public safety. The combination of those of, approximately, 24 million of the 49, it's about half of it. You'll see the percentage increase here. Those are about half a percent around a quarter. I estimate our income tax to be relatively flat, our income tax revenue. There's a couple of factors that go into that. You look at the collections with the state certifies to us. We won't know that, as Baker Tilly mentioned, for approximately another month, two months.

Then you also have to take into consideration all the other units. It goes to their levies because the allocation formula is your prior year distribution plus tax levy. One of the things that has been happening that has changed the allocation a little bit slightly, as fire territories are created, which we've had a few of them, they're allowed to, essentially, choose a new levy. Well, if their old levy was very little, the property tax levy, when they create a fire territory of \$1 million or \$2 million, now they're going to take a bigger piece of the income tax because it's a factor in the allocation.

Others may increase by a greater percent than ours but I've budgeted in here ours to be relatively flat. That includes a supplemental distribution. I have that factored in here and that was approximately 1.9 million in '22. That's what we received as supplemental. That's of the miscellaneous revenue. We can go through any of these other ones here. You can see the various changes I'm happy to touch on, but the biggest one I have uncertainty on is the income tax piece, just because we're subject to what the Department of Revenue sends to us

initially. Then we have to wait until May of the next year to get the supplemental piece or know what that is.

Some other highlights here, you'll see the 40 indirect costs. For child support, we had an error. We submit a plan to the state. There was an error in that. Our consultant does it for us. That's requiring the state's capturing back approximately 123,000. That's why I have that big drop there because the 600 that I had previously estimated for '22 is going to be way off. Some other big changes here. The building department, I have an estimate of 2.5 million, that's down from the record lows. I think if we pay attention to the media, the building industry is starting to slow down. 2.5 million is still a good-- It shows it's up 300,000 of my estimates, but it's down from where we're at actuals. I'm happy to talk through any of these others, but I don't want to bore you with them. If you have any questions on them, we can definitely walk through them. If not, I'm going to jump back to this main page. Again, it's in your documents here. You can look at it up close and personal if you want.

On the revenue piece, you'll see here the cell I have highlighted, it shows 3,889,527 or a 3.3% increase over '22. That's for the 121,697,748. That's where I have our starting revenue estimates. That is highly liquid. We heard this morning, we're going to get potentially get 50% of the DPS, Department of Planning Services, reimbursement. We used to get a smaller chunk. That's about \$100,000 I can add to this mix now that wasn't already in there. We will change this as we receive better information as time goes on but we start with the revenue of 121,697,748.

On the expense side, we start with our 2022 budget. That's the best-known information we have. We back off, the ARC and mental health levy, because we take that off on the revenue side as well. We pass that through to Easter Seals ARC and Park Center. We take off the county council capital. I'm going to put that back in in a little bit but we're taking it off right here, subject to you guys approving, us putting them back in. We're on the grid longevity system for the classified employees. Next year, that'll cost us about \$130,101 for those employees that received steps due to longevity.

Sheriff pension, I only have increasing \$50,000. The favorable market conditions, meaning, stock market, has kept our sheriff pension liability relatively flat if not benefited. We've been on the benefit side from that. The market hasn't performed so well lately. Next year, when we come back, this figure will probably be up, meaning, I have to say we need more for it because the market returns haven't been as good as they were a year in arrears.

Group Health Insurance, I have going up \$250,000. We have a balance in there of, approximately, a little less than \$3 million. That is, approximately, 17% of our net expense. I have estimated on here. This \$250,000 will leave us around the 17% balance in the self health insurance fund. That's highly subject to discussion. If you guys felt, "Hey, you don't need 17% or 2.5 million balance in there- because we don't know what claims are going to happen. They haven't flown. If you thought that balance needs to be higher or lower, we can change this figure accordingly.

Councilman Harris: What's the 10,5 or 10 million [crosstalk]

Mr. Jordan: The 10,5 is how much we're going to contribute to the self-health insurance, from the general fund. That's going up 250,000 from where it was this year. This year it's--

Councilman Harris: That balance has been in that account?

Mr. Jordan: No, no. The balance in the account's been, \$3, \$4 million, \$2 million. I'm trending it downwards because instead of being 17% it was closer to 25% or 30% of net claims. Trending it downward to the, again, approximately 2.5, 2.7, around the 17% region is where I envision it going. If that-- Go.

Councilman Harris: Well, I was just going to say should we also be considering inflationary in those claims, numbers coming back from those claims? You factor that in as well.

Mr. Jordan: Yes, 100% because the way I look at it is instead of sitting more in the health insurance fund, if that balance were to be exhausted, the balance we have in there in the self-health insurance fund the \$2.5 million, we can come to the general fund, we can come to the rainy day fund. What I don't like to do is have balances sitting, double-digit percent balances, sitting in multiple funds because it creates multiple rainy day funds. We can always leverage the general fund if there were exhausted.

Drop below that, the other county-wide expense is \$389,116 going up. The biggest chunk of that I have is an increase of \$400,000 for worker's compensation. We budgeted \$900,000 in this year. Next year I have \$1.3 million budgeted. Last couple of years and this year trending year-to-date, we're aiming in that \$1.3 million worker's compensation claims. I will note, we do charge back some of the special revenue funds, for example, coliseum, Board of Health, highway, they do pitch into the worker's compensation fund because their employees are paid from those.

Councilman Harris: Not the sheriff?

Mr. Jordan: The sheriff is out of the general fund. That's just part of the contribution, the \$1.3 we have from the general fund, since his operations are funded from there, the sheriff's operations are funded from there. They come from the general fund.

Councilman Harris: The expenses coming from what overall department? If you had to identify one department, what would that be? Worker's comp.

Mr. Jordan: Well, obviously, the jail is one you can always pick on just to the nature and the environment but we can send you. We have historical tenure, however, I forget how long back is.

Councilman Harris: Council, we've talked about this one in the past. We ought to get a handle on that workers comp number because that's people getting hurt. It's needless expense that we've got to figure out how to keep a county employee from getting hurt. We should start to work with either HR or whomever at that point to narrow that number down or figure out ways to reduce it.

Councilman Lagemann: We had a conversation yesterday, Councilman Harris, with the sheriff. One of the questions I asked was, "How often do your guys go to the hospital?" because every corner in that massive facility is a blind corner. The quarters are far too close. It's terrible conditions and it's terrible conditions for work environment. They're sending people out everything from a massive concussion in the ICU for three weeks to broken noses, and all that sort of thing, stitches on a regular basis. These are injuries that are happening every single day.

Councilman Harris: Correlation to that is new hires, right? You get the highest turnover rate almost in a county, probably, there so when you correlate high risk and new employees getting trained all the time, that's where that happens. You got to figure out how to break that curve.

Councilman Lagemann: It's hard to want to go to work when you know you're going to get hit every day.

Councilman Fries: Yes. It happens on the street too, though.

Councilman Lagemann: Yes, it does.

Councilman Fries: We have to remember that bad guys have to get caught to get taken there.

Mr. Jordan: That section we just went through, we started, again, with the 125,112. We backed out these top two negatives, added that 130 in, then we added the 50, 250, 389. Now we're going to take out \$1.5 million, was in the '22 budget for the coliseum. We don't anticipate that being in there for '23 so I'm backing it out. It'll be something [unintelligible 00:26:56] come and ask for or you guys can put it in if you [unintelligible 00:26:59]

We're adding in \$306,828 due to positions that you've already approved through this year. If you approve them at '22, we assume they're going to carry forward. That total is \$306,828. The adjustments you see there, \$4,746,151, that brings your '22 adjusted budget allocation that we start, our expense side for the '23, \$120,366,495. When we look at that \$120 million in comparison to the 121 revenue, we have excess of 1,331,253. That's essentially the money we would have to fund appeals but I'm going to add in a couple of expense items here as well.

Councilman Lagemann: Real quick, can I ask you a question on the 306? Of the salary reclassifications for new employees, how many of those positions we can fill at this point?

Mr. Jordan: Well, I don't know the answer to that but I will put it this way. If they're not filled, then I will be capturing them the \$3 million rollover figure that I'm going to add to the revenue side here in a second.

Councilman Lagemann: Okay.

Mr. Jordan: Whether it's the new ones--

Councilman Harris: I get where you're going. The concern is that 100 series is the rollover problem that we have consistently year after year and when we get-

Councilman Kerley: I'm going to make a recommendation.

Councilman Harris: -\$7 million, and then monies back off of unused budgets.

Councilman Kerley: I'm going to make a suggestion and, hopefully, the rest of council would stick to once Nick gets down about the 100 series.

Councilman Harris: Nick, just on a technical piece, your handout is different than the screen by a few dollars or something. Is that the new--

Mr. Jordan: Yes, it looks like 100 something dollars, I apologize. I must have changed something in here in the Excel version.

Councilman Harris: Which would be better, this one or that one?

Mr. Jordan: Given we're talking-- Yours is one \$1,331,347 and mine is 253 so yours is higher by a little less than \$100 [unintelligible 00:29:10]

Councilman Harris: Paper is better.

Mr. Jordan: \$96 I think is what we're talking about.

Councilman Harris: Yes, I did [crosstalk]

Mr. Jordan: It's not going to make or break this budget.

Councilman Harris: I understand.

Mr. Jordan: We have excess revenues, the \$1,331,253. I'm going to add back in \$3 million of rollover. Please keep in mind I'm actually adding in \$4.5 million because I took out the coliseum of \$1.5 that would have rolled over. I'm already taking that out on the expense side. I'm adding back in \$3 million. If we're adding in total going into '23 we're anticipating \$4.5 million. That's what's being factored in here for council to cover the '23 budget. You see the \$3 million rollover added to-- You guys, as mentioned, 100 series or any series which we can pull up the unspent from the last five years, 10 years, whatever you'd like.

I have taken off 500,000, meaning. I'm adding that to the budget. That's for council's capital. You see that figure is lower. Historically, been around 700. The request haven't come to you in the last few years for capital. I chose 500 this time just based on the average. If next year those requests come in, you guys are going to have to handle them accordingly. Then I have a 4% COLA or the raise. That's for simplicity purposes. If you ask them at around 750,000 for 1%, then we can do whatever denomination in your head to--

Councilman Harris: That 4% reflects the 2% increase that we passed today.

Mr. Jordan: No, the 2% was just the bonus.

Councilman Harris: The one-time bonus.

Mr. Jordan: Oh, it's just the bonus.

Councilman Harris: Oh, good. Thank you.

Mr. Jordan: Yes, that's just bonus. It takes nothing in [crosstalk]

Councilman Harris: That's right. Yes, we said that. That's right.

Mr. Jordan: Yes. That being said, the revenue excess of 1,331,253 factoring the 3 million rollover, and then taking off the raise and capital, that would leave you with \$751,953 of recurring revenue to cover appeals. You see below, I've got 21,694,351. That is net of \$20 million because I took out 20 million not knowing what decision was going to be made on a building earlier in the meeting today.

If we take, if we still need to decide on where community corrections goes, you can leave it and take it out but if that 20 million is put back in here, your cash reserves, I anticipate at the end of the year, more around 41 million compared to the 21 that was there. You actually have around 60 million right now in the general fund.

Councilman Kerley: Something that's been a big discussion is we have a number of departments that have rollover year after year after year. I know you're putting that up on the sheet. I think I counted 16 departments that have-- The five-year average of rollover is \$40,000 or more. What I would like to see, this is just personally, because that's money that could be possibly used by other departments, is the budgets for those departments should be cut by the lowest rollover of the previous five years, and that money, the difference be allowed.

If they need more than that, then they can come to us for an appeal. We have a number of departments that consistently have six-figure rollovers, and that's money that could be used elsewhere in the county.

Mr. Jordan: You can't double count it. What I mean by that, if I am taking that rollover into my 3 million, so if you're going to already reduce the budget, then we need to reduce that \$3 million rollover figure. It's not the same. It's just we got to make sure we do it on both sides.

Councilman Kerley: Yes. I just think from a budgeting perspective, personally, I think it makes more sense to put the onus on the departments to dig into their budget and say, "Why am I rolling over \$100,000, \$200,000 \$300,000 every year than just to say, we're just going to continue to put this \$3 million number in the budget because it's going to come from somewhere because in reality, it's coming from the same 10 or 15 departments.

Councilman Lagemann: On that, I've taken a pretty hard look at that spreadsheet. Thanks to Nick and the numbers. There are a couple of things that we do see. Number one, as a percentage of their overall budget, if you look at the dollar number, the Sheriff's got the most rollover but they also have the highest budget and it's one of the lowest percentages. We look back 15 years on this, from an ongoing standpoint, the Sheriff's department has been pretty consistent about not having a ton of rollover from a percentage standpoint.

Number two, one of the departments that I think we need to highlight as the gold standard here is voter registration. They have done a really good job of saying, "Hey, we need X number of dollars because we have a consistent election cycle that goes up. Rather than say we want 2% more and then average it out over four years, they've said, "This is what we need for 2021, 2022, 2023 based on the election cycles because you have no election and you go all the way to a presidential election which is very expensive. They've been clear about the specific cost in the next four years. This is exactly what the departments need to be looking at or need to be considering.

Now, people want to call that zero-based budgeting. They can call it whatever they want. That's not really what that is. It's just anticipating what you're actually going to need and then asking for it. If you know, "Hey, we got to buy a bunch of computers in two years but we really don't need that money now," rather than playing the game of trying to average it over time so you have it in a few years, the best thing to do is, "Hey, we're going to need it in a few years. We'll take a hit the next couple years, but in three years, we're going to have to come back and ask you for the computers." That's how budgeting should go.

Unfortunately, we do this every year, and then it's just kind of a mad rush to figure out how are we going to make it all work. I wanted to throw that out there. That is how you eliminate the rollover over time. Our Councilman Armstrong's been working on this and I appreciate his efforts. Maybe we can't make that happen this year but in subsequent years, we need to really be thinking about this.

Councilman Kerley: Mr. Fries.

Councilman Fries: As a former department head, I can tell you. I would rather see some rollover come back to us than have departments head think, "Oh, my gosh, I've got this money. I've got to spend it before the end of the year." I can tell you as the sheriff, I would every year, we'd look at what do we need, not what we wanted, what are we going to need throughout this year. Then sometimes you get stuff cheaper, you don't have employees or something, you're going to have some rollover, but I would rather there to continue to be some rollover than department heads think, "They're going to take this away from me if I don't spend it." They're going to spend it and we'll have no rollover.

Councilman Harris: That challenge has gone on with every company that has any budget anywhere, right? I agree with you on that one. Most of the rollover is 100 series. Is that fair?

Mr. Jordan: You're always going to see over 50%, with rare exception.

Councilman Harris: The challenge for department heads is they will literally have to just cut a position before they try to eliminate that rollover? I mean, because they basically have slots that 100 series our people and slots for their people, for them not to have rollover, they will have to eliminate a slot?

Mr. Jordan: There's different ways to look at it. Say, just pick my department here, if this is my rollover with the exception of 2018 with the IRS audit, I can look at it and say, "Well, was it due to people leaving? Was it due to positions that have constantly have the turnover?" As we did with the confinement officer specifically last year, you guys gave the positions, you didn't fully fund them because they're never fully filled.

If you're X department, say, you get this sheet and you look at it and say, "Why do I keep having this?" They can say, "Well, my court reporter or whoever it is, that position's constantly cycling," then maybe they budget it 98%, 95%, whatever that magic number is. This council, knowing that if it is filled for the year, say, that magic happens, they're going to have to come back and ask for money because you have to pay the person.

Councilman Harris: What I was--

Mr. Jordan: I've to say it's going to happen.

Councilman Harris: What I was getting at is it's not going to be easy for them to figure that out.

Mr. Jordan: Yes, it is. We budget line-by-line. You can easily see and as in--

Councilman Harris: If I've got somebody at \$30,000 scheduled on one line item and that position stayed open a few months or it stays open because of turnover because that person's constantly moving and coming and going, I can say I don't need 30,000, I only need 20,000, right?

Mr. Jordan: You could say, yes, whatever- divided by 26 payrolls, here's how much is [crosstalk]

Councilman Harris: The department head to try to figure that out is not easy.

Mr. Jordan: We're here to help. I mean, we can put a spreadsheet together. I think I've done it with you guys five times with the jail and sheriff. We can put it together in five minutes, send it your way with the percentages saying, "Hey, look at this color. It looks like there's excess money in that line."

Councilman Harris: The challenge on a department head is I don't plan to have it 70% filled. I plan to have it as a budget. I want it 100% filled, but then it doesn't happen so--

Mr. Jordan: Has it ever happened?

Councilman Harris: I know.

Councilman Fries: If we paid them more, maybe it would.

Mr. Jordan: Yes. Maybe they have to answer. I don't know, but it's not just county. You look at the dispatch, they're the same way, the CCP. They've had, since the beginning--

Councilman Fries: Their pay is horrific too.

Mr. Jordan: I'm not saying that's not the problem. I'm just saying for budgeting purposes, and you guys need to please keep in mind because we're spending a lot of time on the 100 series rollover, that we can send guidance saying, "Hey, here's the sheet. Five, three-year average showing five-year detail." 100 series is what this sheet reflects. "Please provide counsel response as to how we don't have this." If they say, "We're not going to budget 183, 438," we're just taking out the \$3 million rollover piece that I already have budgeted in there because we can't do both of them.

Councilman Kerley: Yes. To explain it, I'm going to pick on you, Nick, and this is for illustrative purposes, but-- What I was suggesting was if you look at the auditor, they have a five-year average of 200,000 rollover. One of those was an outlier. I'm not suggesting cut the budget by 200. What I'm suggesting is you take the lowest number in the previous five years, which would be 59,000, and that would be where they start from. If and if they need more than that, they simply come to us with an appeal during the appeal process and explain or justify why they need more than what we're cutting. Because we have to start somewhere because there are a number of departments that year over year-- and the sheriff's always going to come with an appeal. I can't remember a time when the sheriff hasn't appealed their budget because maybe it under you it didn't.

Councilman Fries: Perfect. Every year was just perfect. They gave me nothing, so I had nothing to appeal.

Chairman: The sheriff is a big number dollar amounted and is a small percentage, but a number of these departments, it is a six figure number and it is a big--

Councilman Fries: Two-digit percentage.

Chairman: It is a two-digit percentage. To simplify it and make it even to everybody, some people are probably going to have to appeal that shouldn't, and some people like the sheriff are going to appeal.

Councilman Fries: Why punish everybody if you've got a couple bad actors? At home, you don't spank all the kids.

Chairman: Well, I'm not punishing everybody. I'm just punishing the ones that-

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: We're not spanking our kids, Tim.

Councilman Fries: If we have some that are in triple digits, why don't we find out why do they have this big rollover?

Chairman: Well, that's all I'm saying, is through the budget process, let's give them a smaller number so they come to council and explain why they have a big rollover to everybody. That's all I'm saying is, we give them a smaller number so they're forced to come to us and explain why they need that 6-figure 100 series rollover. Some of them may justify it, like Nick said, and we just have a lot of positions that are constantly cycling, and we have two or three months where it's open, and we may find some departments that have position X that hasn't been filled for five years. I don't know. There's--

Councilman Spurr: I don't think that would happen or, would it, based on that?

Nick: You're won't find a position completely unfilled year over year over year. You won't see that. You're going to see positions open you're with the exception of confinement officers. You're going to see positions open at various times.

Councilman Spurr: It's always in a constant state of flux.

Nick: Just so I understand, if council chooses to do that, wants us to communicate that, you want the lowest year out of this five-year period, the departments to substantiate why they need the lowest amount in the five year period?

Chairman: Well, that would be my recommendation. For you, we would cut your number by 60,000. If you needed more than that, you would come and say, "Hey this is what I need."
[crosstalk]

Nick: Just understand you may have 30 appeals in September.

Chairman: Well, but I was only looking at the ones that had a \$40,000 more rollover. I wasn't doing every department, but-

Jackie Scheuman: I just wanted to add, for instance it probably would be best if you want to do that to look at, if they have cut their budget over the five years, because in the case of the auditor's office and the county assessor, we've had rollover, but we've also turned in a lower budget every year. Even though we had rollover, we did cut it. If you cut it now, according to this, it's double doing it.

Chairman: Another variable. Yes, you've done well by-- [crosstalk]

Jackie Scheuman: Not all departments. I know definitely the auditor and county assessor have downsized.

Chairman: The worst thing in that is we're just asking you to come back and-

Jackie Scheuman: You'll just have more appeals, as he said.

Chairman: Yes. We would just have more appeals to where the departments would have to say, this is why we actually.

Councilman Fries: I'd be more in favor of saying, hold your budgets at the 2022 level for 2023, along with a 6.25% pay increase. Done.

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: You said 6.5?

Councilman Fries: 6.25.

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: 6.25?

Councilman Fries: Yes, six and a quarter. It doesn't get us to where we need to be, but it helps.

Councilman Lagemann: Nick, ultimately the guidance that you're looking for today is what's the pay increase factor, number one. What was the other thing?

Nick: The pay increase factor, we can walk away without that. We'd just like to have it because when we communicate tomorrow, "Hey, you're going to factor in--" or today. The thing we really need today is just, as we're talking about whether you need to substantiate why you need that roll over piece, or just in general, work within your 22 allocation. We need to know which is this page.

In your packet is page four. You'll see the far right column is a 2023 budget pre-allocation. That's based on starting with your 2022 approved budget. If you want that to be anything different, we need to know today, start with your 2022 approved budget, 98% of that, 95% or 100% of that. That's what I need to know today so we can give the departments that communication.

Councilman Lagemann: What I see here are really two questions. Number one, what's your pay increase factor, and then number two, your pay increase factor assumed. Then what's the percentage that we want to deal with, either hold 22 numbers or increase or decrease that. Mr. Chairman, can we begin with the pay factor then move into how we're going to deal with the 22 budget from each department after they factor in the pay increased factor?

Chairman: Everybody's open to-

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: This is just information. You didn't expect anything from us today. You just wanted to share your story.

Nick: Those two things, yes.

Councilman Fries: I would like to see them hold their budget for next year at 22 levels, but with the 6.25% increase on pay. Everything else stays the same on their budget.

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: The 6.25 is where we're at?

Councilman Harris: What's the state general number that they give us that says you can-?

Nick: The state's on a different year.

Councilman Harris: I understand, but they generally give us a number each year that we--

Nick: Yes, I'm getting it. Let me see here. We've already had what the sheriff and-

Councilman Spurr: I would suggest that we hold that part of the discussion.

Councilman Fries: Until when?

Councilman Spurr: Until next month, for sure.

Councilman Fries: Because things will be different then?

Nick: Effective 7/10/22, the state's judicial was 3.333. That's the state judicial. The state as a body does things differently. They have more of merit arranged types of-- [crosstalk]. Yes.

Councilman Spurr: I would also like to see not a 100% factor. I would like to see a 98% based off 22.

Councilman Fries: The only issue I have with that is we know the cost of everything has gone up. Holding it steady from last year is going to be a challenge for almost every department head.

Councilman Spurr: It cause a reassessment. It would force a reassessment.

Councilman Harris: What did they receive last year?

Councilman Spurr: Another look. It would force the department head to-

Councilman Fries: It would just cause an appeal.

Councilman Harris: What did we give last year? We gave it 3% last year, and in essence, we just gave it 2%, but it's a bonus. For '22, they basically received a 5%.

Councilman Fries: No, not even close. That 2% bonus is not a pay raise. That's a one-time check.

Councilman Harris: For dollars this year. [crosstalk].

Councilman Fries: No.

Councilman Harris: Well, you get the 3% and then you figured a 2% against it.

Councilman Fries: A 2% bonus, one-time check, not all year long. You're not getting that extra 2% all year long, so it's a different amount of money.

Councilman Harris: It's figured annually.

Nick: Yes. You're taking your annual salary.

Councilman Harris: I get the idea that it doesn't escalate the next year. I get that. I totally get that, but you are in essence giving them-

Nick: The W2 increased by a little over-

Councilman Fries: 2023 now, they drop back to that 3% pay increase they got.

Councilman Lagemann: The other thing we're going to anticipate-- and I'm paying attention when I'm sitting in the few meetings that we've had with the wage and bonus group. We know we're low. We know we're relatively uncompetitive, and if we roll in with a 4% knowing in advance that we're going to have to bump it up and that's going to screw the whole budget process up later on, why not go in at least so that we're going to be close.

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: Yes. May I speak, Mr. Chair?

Chairman: Yes.

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: Thank you so much, Nick. You put a lot of love into this. In my mind, I'm not running again, so I'm fighting for a lot of people that's out there, but I'm with Ken with the 6.25. We have this committee right now that's looking at the salaries. With that being said, if they find, which I'm sure they already know that we've got issues with our scale and our pay, what we're paying our county employees.

The 6.25, if they find one particular job, maybe it's-- I'm just trying to figure out how would we tie those two together once we make those adjustments, HR. Then if we give you 6.25%, how would that work?

Nick: I definitely can't speak to where we'll go or what will happen. All I can say is what happened previously when we did the compensation study is that, they gave different increases or different percent increases based on the different grids. They also gave an option of, because we have a grid system and we have steps at six months, three years, five years, you could have implemented those increases at the different points within the grid.

In simplest terms, if we get 4% and next year they say it's supposed to be 8% or whatever it is. If the council at that point in time wants to do it, and we can fund it, then the majority would have to vote accordingly at that time. We'd have to pass an amended salary ordinance saying, "Hey, these are going to be the new rates for X grid." Assuming we can fund. That's the biggest thing.

It's a bad position to be in. I don't want to advocate against employees getting a higher raise, but if we do put 6.25% in here, we go back to the drawing board to say, where can we increase revenues? Or do we want to use one time monies to pay for it?

Councilman Fries: Yes. Do we want to use the bank account that we've got?

Nick: That's fine. I'm-

Councilman Fries: The taxpayers' money that's sitting in an account that's not being used.

Nick: I'm just saying we will look at it that way based on what. We'll try to fine tune the revenues even more than we can, but the offset will definitely be, to start, we'll dip into the cash reserves that are in here. It's not a way to balance a recurring budget.

Councilman Harris: I'm just looking at this. The last number, you got 2023 anticipated revenues available at 700,000, 752. That's what would be left over. Now, you've got 3,000 for rollover, and that number will what? Come down?

Nick: The 3 million?

Councilman Harris: If that number comes down, that 750 gets less, are we out to money?

Nick: If we were doing the 100 series like you guys want to do it, I'm reducing the budget size. It's the same net difference. You just reduce the expense instead of increasing the revenue. Here, it's increasing the revenue saying, we're not going to spend this, we'll build it back in. If you guys want to tell departments to come in at 98, whatever percent, then we just reduce the expense side so that number gets, but the net difference is zero.

Councilman Harris: If we go up 1%, we used to look at that as what? It used to be 5. It's 700 now?

Nick: I don't know when it was 5, but it's around 750. Some time, yes, it was 5.

Councilman Harris: Thank you for that. All right. If we've got 750 right now, and we try to get to a 6% increase-

Nick: It's 4.2 million, 4.4 million. Like I said, 750.

Councilman Harris: We're under underwater at that point.

Nick: On this presentation today I have, it would be 980 underwater. That's today. Again, I know I can throw back in 100,000 of revenue on the 50/50 split.

Councilman Harris: Ken, I don't think that's a good way to run a budget, come up with a million dollars short.

Councilman Fries: If we were running a business, I would agree, but I also don't believe it's a good way to run a government business when we're sitting on millions and millions of taxpayers' dollars, that we have taken in too much of their money and we're sitting on it doing nothing with it.

Either we give it back to them or we use it for something like this. We have way too much money sitting in budgets, different places that doesn't get spent. We're going to go ahead and increase their property taxes again this year the maximum amount of level. Every year we do it.

Councilman Spurr: Or we lessen the bond.

Nick: The other thing council needs to take into consideration-- I can't speak for the sheriff, I have no clue if it'd be an appeal-- but if the federal judge told him he needs to hire more personnel, that is not factored in here, so it's just something to also take into consideration.

Councilman Harris: Anything else you want to add, Nick?

Nick: No, but you guys have got to think forward, not just for-

Councilman Fries: That gets into the problem with the pay. You can't hire people if they're not willing to come and work.

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: Right.

Councilman Fries: Sometimes you have to pay him more money to get them incentivized to come to work.

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: Yes.

Councilman Spurr: We talked about that yesterday.

Councilman Fries: I stay at 6.25%, and stop me, or I'll go up.

Nick: I don't get to decide. You guys are going to-

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: 6.25%. I'm with you, Ken.

Councilman Lagemann: I second that.

Councilman Armstrong: I've got a question. Do we know when this study, wage study's going to come back to us? Do we have any clue?

Councilman Harris: We're having a meeting at two o'clock today, but that's the second meeting that I think we've had so late. It's going to take some time. [crosstalk]. Yes, we're done, right? It's going to probably take some time, I would think. I don't think that's going to be wrapped up anytime soon.

Councilman Lagemann: I did talk to H.R about it last week. They have all the factors that they need. They're anticipating getting that in the next two, three months. If we said October, that's probably a reasonable expectation.

Councilman Fries: I thought it was aggressive from the start, when they were hoping to have it done by the end of the year. It was-

Councilman Lagemann: I think it'll be the end of the year. We were talking, and they were hoping to have it done by July when they originally did it. That, I agree with you, was probably unrealistic, but I think October, November's probably realistic. You guys are both on it.

Councilman Harris: Our rollover number, what did you say? I wrote down. I thought I heard you say it was 4 million.

Nick: Yes. What I've done on the expense side up here, I took out one and a half million for Coliseum. The alternative would be, instead I would just put four or five down here.

Councilman Harris: Right.

Nick: In essence, this presentation is capturing four and a half million rollover.

Councilman Harris: Okay, just so I-

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: Mr. Chair?

Chairman: Yes.

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: I just have one last question. Do you need a motion for this 6.25% for us to change it?

Nick: Yes. The four doesn't even count until I get a motion.

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: Okay. Ken, what are we doing? I'm not sure what-

Councilman Fries: I'd make a motion then for the 2023 budget of a pay increase for county employees with 6.25%.

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: Second.

Councilman Lagemann: Second.

Chairman: Okay. We have a motion and multiple seconds. Any further discussion?

Councilman Armstrong: We need a roll call vote.

Councilman Harris: How will that leave us? Where will we be? If that would pass-

Nick: We'd be upside down.

Councilman Harris: That's what I want to understand.

Councilman Lagemann: Not increasing taxes.

Councilman Harris: That's what I want to understand, what that number is. Yes, I would like a roll call as well.

Chairman: Okay. Motion to-

Councilman Harris: Wait, we're trying to get an answer.

Nick: Wait, I didn't hear. Sorry.

Councilman Harris: If a 6.25% passed-

Nick: Yes. The rate, but what did you guys about taxes?

Councilman Harris: I didn't say-

Councilman Lagemann: Oh, no. What I'm saying is, what we don't-

Councilman Spurr: You're saying what the surplus.

Councilman Lagemann: I'm saying that this goes into surplus does not dictate a different rate.

Nick: No, but to you guys are-- to Kenny's point-- I have factored in this presentation taking the growth quotient of 5%. The property tax levy will increase 5%.

Councilman Harris: That's the number.

Nick: It's important to keep in mind too, it's just a play on numbers. We haven't increased the tax rate for years because the pool of assessed value has grown at a greater rate than the levy. There is no increasing the tax rate at least to almost the last decade. We increased the tax levy. In this presentation-

Councilman Harris: She needs to write that down.

Nick: -the levy is increasing by property tax approximately \$3.4 million. Our Allen County general fund levy. That is, to Kenny's point, we are taking the max levy. Not because specifically the raise. It's just that's what's baked into here. If you guys don't want to do, that 980 just becomes that much more. It's 4 million.

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: We have a motion on the floor, Mr. Chair.

Councilman Harris: I'm trying to get an answer here.

Chairman: We're still on discussion.

Nick: As it currently shows 6.25% in here, 980,153.

Councilman Harris: 980,153 is what we'll be short in our budget.

Nick: As of today using yesterday's information.

Councilman Harris: About a million dollars will come up short, and that means we're going to make tough decisions-

Councilman Spurr: That's not factoring in added appeals.

Nick: If you went Kenny's route using cash balance, that's the tough decision. Just saying we're using the reserves on hand, and you could still grant whatever appeals, but the appeals, keep in mind, would come out to that cash balance too.

Councilman Harris: To your point, we don't even know what those appeals are going to be.

Councilman Armstrong: I won't vote for that.

Chairman: We have a motion and a second, and we had further discussion. Is there a motion to end further discussion?

Councilman Spurr: So moved.

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: Second.

Chairman: The motion is for a 6.25% increase.

Councilman Harris: This is not to end this discussion. This is the actual vote on the motion. [crosstalk]

Councilman Spurr: It's a roll call vote.

Chairman: This will be a roll call vote. I will go from right to left as I did earlier. For a 6.25% raise, Ms. Curry Campbell?

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: Aye.

Chairman: Okay. Mr. Harris?

Councilman Harris: No.

Chairman: Mr. Armstrong?

Councilman Armstrong: No.

Chairman: Mr. Kerley, no. Mr. Lagemann?

Councilman Lagemann: Yes.

Chairman: Mr. Fries?

Councilman Fries: Aye.

Chairman: Mr. Spurr?

Councilman Spurr: Absolutely not.

Chairman: That is defeated. 3(Sheila, Paul, Ken-4(Tom, Bob, Kyle, Chris). I will make a motion for a 5% pay increase, which would leave us approximately 1.2 million for appeals.

Councilman Paul: I'll second.

Chairman: Quick math. I'm asking.

Councilman Harris: Yes.

Nick: No.

Chairman: No? Okay.

Nick: No, because you give [crosstalk]-- you're taking off 750,000. We were at 980. You're barely breaking even.

Chairman: I'm good with breaking even.

Councilman Harris: Well, wait a minute. That's the 700 number that you're saying. It's about 700 off the 981.

Nick: It's about 750. I'm saying 1% of a raise is about-- well, we took a one and a quarter off. Because Ken was at 6.2-

Councilman Harris: A 5% increase we'll still lose-- [crosstalk]

Nick: It is approximately 17, 872 negative.

Councilman Fries: They believe you don't care about the employees.

Councilman Harris: Oh, you've already got that. That's 17,000 probably?

Nick: Yes, I'm doing these on the fly.

Councilman Harris: Oh, good. Nice job.

Chairman: For your information, we have about nine minutes.

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: Ken--

Nick: No, we're good in here forever.

Councilman Harris: Well, not forever.

Nick: I mean, but the people that got to go to plan commission, not so much, but yes, we're okay in this room.

Councilman Fries: Last year, I had to give up and make the concessions.

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: I know. We need to be thinking about these county employees. We really should. I think that we're doing a disservice to them not to represent them and fight for them here. Ken, thank you for attempt.

Councilman Fries: I didn't hear a second on 5%.

Councilman Lagemann: I did. I seconded it.

Nick: Paul seconded it.

Chairman: We have a motion to saying 5%. Any further discussions?

Councilman Harris: Just for point of clarification, that's going to leave us \$17,000 in the hole without the appeals.

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: Who cares?

Nick: That's correct. It will actually leave it positive. I'm going to go back. I can do it on the fly here, but we know we can-- I'm going to bump up DPS a 100,000 because of the 50/50 split now instead of 60/40.

Councilman Fries: Oh, well, that changes it.

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: Was that factored in our 6.25 we just gave you?

Nick: Well, no. It would've been 880. I apologize.

Councilman Fries: Tentatively, 880.

Nick: It could be better next month. If we get income tax that's 5%, then, hey, next month you guys can say we want to revisit it. Nothing prevents it from-

Councilman Spurr: That's my whole thing. I don't understand why we have to make a decision right now.

Councilman Lagemann: So they can get a-- [crosstalk]

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: We want to give the department something.

Councilman Fries: Yes. You have 1500 employees to watch this and they don't whether you care about them or not.

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: Because they're going to come back to us. If they're closer--

Nick: It sets the basis for-- you know have in September for appeals. If I take a raise out of here, you have 3.8 million for appeals, but that means you didn't give any raises.

Councilman Spurr: Right. We still have another month.

Nick: Yes, but we can put something on that. Yes, definitely.

Councilman Spurr: Yes. We still have another month. I don't understand the rush to judgment. I don't understand it.

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: You think we should just leave it at 4.0 for the departments to use that number?

Councilman Spurr: I'm saying we hold the discussion until next month.

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: Did the departments look to you to give them something to base?

Nick: We will communicate today. We'll say, "Council said work within your '22 allocation, and we have already baked in X percent increase," or we'll say, "They didn't make a decision on raises. We'll pass that along later." As we've said in prior years, the later you do it, it just creates work because we have to budget at an X amount and then we revise them. If you'd make a decision in August, fine, but historically--

Councilman Spurr: You don't want to deviate either. We don't want to set something and then reassess and deviate.

Nick: Yes. Definitely not backwards. If we go forward, we'd have to do an additional appropriation if it's after the budget's adopted.

Councilman Harris: Nick, can you give me a number on 4.5%? If that number were 4.5%?

Councilman Armstrong: We have a motion on the table.

Councilman Harris: No, I know. We're still having a discussion. I'm trying to understand that.

Nick: Potentially, this says 367, but I like I said, that'll be 467 at the very least.

Councilman Spurr: Motion to end discussion.

Councilman Harris: Positive.

Councilman Spurr: Second.

Chairman: Motion to end discussion, and a second. We will take a vote. I'm assuming roll call vote is requested.

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: Aye.

Chairman: Okay.

Councilman Spurr: We're voting on ending discussion?

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: To end discussion.

Nick: Don't need a roll call for that.

Chairman: No. All those in favor to end discussion, aye.

All: Aye.

Chairman: Okay. Roll call vote on the motion for 5%. Yes? No?

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: Is that where we're at, the 5%?

Chairman: Yes. We're five now. That was the motion. Motion was for 5% percent.

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: No.

Chairman: I haven't called your name yet. We're going to go from right to left. Curry-Campbell?

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: No, sir.

Chairman: Okay.

Councilman Harris: No.

Chairman: Armstrong.

Councilman Armstrong: No.

Chairman: Kerley, yes. Lagemann?

Councilman Lagemann: Lagemann is yes because it's better than 4.

Chairman: Kenny?

Councilman Fries: No. It's not better than five and a half.

Chairman: Chris?

Councilman Spurr: No.

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: Where are you Chris? I'm sorry.

Councilman Spurr: No.

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: Oh, okay.

Councilman Lagemann: We're back to four.

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: All right.

Councilman Harris: Or 4.5.

Councilman Kerley: That was 2(Kyle & Paul)-5(Sheila, Tom, Bob, Ken, Chris)

Councilman Harris: Yes.

Councilman Kerley: Kyle and Paul.

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: We got work to do.

Councilman Kerley: Me and Paul were the only two in favor.

Councilman Fries: I'll make a motion for 5.5%.

Councilman Lagemann: I'll second.

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: Second.

Chairman: Motion and multiple seconds for-

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: 5.5.

Chairman: -5.5%.

Councilman Armstrong: That's where we're at this time around?

Councilman Lagemann: That's where we're at. [crosstalk]

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: We're at 5.5.

Councilman Harris: You're going up guys.

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: No, we was at 6.2.

Councilman Harris: No, you just voted on five.

Councilman Fries: I didn't vote. Five was too low.

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: It was too low.

Councilman Harris: You're going up?

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: Yes.

Chairman: Roll call vote. It's been moved and seconded. Yes. Curry-Campbell?

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: Aye.

Chairman: Harris?

Councilman Harris: No.

Councilman Armstrong: No.

Chairman: Kerley, yes.

Councilman Lagemann: Lagemann, yes.

Chairman: Ken Fries?

Councilman Fries: Yes.

Councilman Spurr: Spurr, No.

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: Did we get it?

Chairman: It passes, 4(Sheila, Kyle, Paul, Ken)-3(Tom, Bob, Chris).

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: Oh, praise the Lord.

Councilman Fries: Thank you. The employees will thank you.

Councilman Harris: 5.5. Where does that leave us for a budget then?

Nick: As of today, it would be 302,785 in the hole.

Councilman Harris: In the hole?

Nick: Yes. As of today.

Councilman Harris: Congratulations. We're now in the hole. We'll have to make some tough decisions coming.

Councilman Lagemann: We're sitting on about \$150 million.

Nick: A lot of money.

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: Thank you.

Councilman Spurr: That we don't control.

Councilman Lagemann: That we need to control and we can if we do this budget process right.

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: There you go.

Councilman Lagemann: We will.

Councilman Spurr: We were just talking about bonding. I mean-

Councilman Fries: We're all bonding.

Chairman: We did a 5?

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: 5.5.

Chairman: Here's my next discussion because we have to give guidance on the rest of the budget. We approved at current, a 5.5% raise, which is going to leave us 300 and some thousand in the hole. At a minimum, I encourage any department with a five-year rollover to come back with a-

Councilman Harris: Smaller budget.

Chairman: -smaller number than they have. I would venture to say those departments that have a five-year rollover that don't come back with a smaller number should come to appeal and explain why. Is council fair with that?

Councilman Lagemann: Yes.

Chairman: Because we have to find at least \$320,000.

Nick: Should be easy.

Councilman Lagemann: I am confident we'll find \$325,000.

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: Nick will find that.

Chairman: Is that clear as mud?

Nick: No, it's good. Our communication, we're going to include this spreadsheet. Our communication's going to be start with your '22 allocation. If you have a five year rollover-

Chairman: Do we want to put a dollar amount?

Councilman Lagemann: No, just-

Nick: Not so much as, please take this into consideration, and if not, you're going to appeal in September.

Chairman: Okay. We have set aside an entire separate day for appeals already. Are there any other things that we need to address?

Councilman Lagemann: Motion to adjourn.

Chairman: Nope. She has a question for the attorney.

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: Oh, yes. I have a question for the attorney, and Nick might be able to help on this. Mitch, I know I have gave you assignment sometime ago in reference to William Lebrato. We had requested some information using the public information. Where are we? Has he paid back any of the monies, the legal fees? Where are we with Lebrato?

Attorney Mitch Harper: There were several parts of expenses that were contributed to that investigation and to the plan as much, as one could find out about it, that was announced with the public defender's counsel or public defender's board. They probably have only sought repayment of one of the parts of those expenses.

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: How much, Nick?

Nick: Retired Judge Surbeck, he had said that Mr. Lebrato was only responsible for the Van Gilder invoices and not Beckman Lawson. That was a little under 7,000.

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: 7,000? How much has Lebrato paid back of the 7,000?

Nick: I don't believe anything has been paid back as of today.

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: As of today?

Nick: As of yesterday, excuse me. I don't

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: His salary is what? 165. He makes \$165,000?

Nick: In that region. They just got an increase because the state--

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: He just got an increase?

Nick: They follow the state. The prosecutor is tied to the sheriff and-- when the state granted an increase on 7/1, he would have got that 3.3% increase.

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: He just got a 3.3 increase from the state. He makes 165,000. He's probably the second highest-paid employee.

Nick: Yes, county employee, your sheriff and public defender are going to be neck and neck, and then the Coliseum General Manager will be paid higher.

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: Now I'm just trying to figure this out. What can we do to get him to pay these fees that are still on our books? He's making \$165,000, just got a raise. He owes us \$7,000. What can we do? What can our county attorney do in reference to these funds that still owed to us??

Attorney Mitch Harper: Legally from the standpoint of the county council, nothing.

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: Can we garnish his wage? What can we do? I'm salty about this. I wish one of the local stations would investigate this a little bit further because this is ridiculous. I'm not happy about it, Mitch. What can we do?

Attorney Mitch Harper: It's under the jurisdiction of the public defender board and of the state public defender's office, which is governed essentially by the Indiana Supreme Court, which manages the court system in the state.

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: Should we send them a letter?

Attorney Mitch Harper: That might-

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: To let them know our concerns. We don't want to give county employees a raise, then we got a county employee that won't pay us. I'm not going to let this go. I'm not happy. We don't want to give county employees anything, but then we got folks like Lebrato abusing the system. I'm just not happy. Can you do something to follow-up or?

Nick: I was going to say the only thing-

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: Can you send him an invoice?

Nick: -you know from recollection-- I can't send him an invoice. From recollection of recent years, I think it was only three years ago, the public defender at that time was Michelle Kraus. The board approached county council to make that a full-time position.

Council had the purview of setting the salary, in accordance with the public defender commission guidelines, which ties into the prosecutor and the sheriff. If the body wanted to revisit it being a full-time compared to a part-time position, you guys set the salary ordinance. You shouldn't stray from what the law says, but it was only three years new that it's been a full-time position.

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: Three years, yes. I don't know. Can we request, with the Freedom of Information Act, that his swipes coming in and out of the-- can we request that?

Nick: I can request and see if building maintenance has it.

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: Because if he's working part-time, maybe that's something that we need to be talking about.

Councilman Harris: Can you have a talk with her? This doesn't need to be-

Nick: If you send me an email, then I'll pass it on to building maintenance or whoever oversees that and see if they can get it.

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: Okay.

Chairman: Any other discussion items?

Councilman Harris: If not, I'll just add one discussion item or one comment is, I've been on here 10 years. I've never voted for a budget that was underwater. That's not something I'm pleased about today. With that, I'll move for the approval to waive the second reading of any matter approved today for which it may be deemed necessary for the County Council Meeting of July 21st, 2022.

Councilman Spurr: Second.

Chairman: A motion and a second. All those in favor say aye.

Speakers: Aye.

Chairman: I'll entertain the motion. Sorry. The next council meeting will be held 8:30 AM, Thursday, August 18th, 2022 in the chambers room of Citizens Square. I'll entertain a motion to adjourn.

Councilman Armstrong: So moved.

Chairman: We are adjourned.