

ALLEN COUNTY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
May 19, 2022
8:30 AM

The Allen County Council met on Thursday, May 19, 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, Sheila Curry-Campbell, Tom A. Harris, 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: Welcome to the Allen County Council meeting of Thursday, May 19th, 2022. I'm calling the meeting to order and we're going to begin with a pledge of allegiance and a moment of silence.

Chorus: 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 00:01:01]

President Kerley: Amen. [coughs] I will entertain a motion to adopt the agenda unless there are any changes.

Councilman Fries: So move.

Councilman Harris: Second.

President Kerley: We have a motion to second. All those in favor say aye.

Chorus: Aye.

President Kerley: All those opposed? We have adopted the agenda 7-0 approval of the minutes of April 21st, 2022.

Councilman Lagemann: Motion to approve.

Councilman Harris: Second.

President Kerley: We have a motion and a second to approve the minutes of April 21st, 2022. All those in favor say aye.

Chorus: Aye.

President Kerley: All those opposed? Minutes are approved 7-0. Mr. Jordan, welcome.

Nick Jordan: Good morning, Council. In your packet, you see the financials through the end of April, you'll see property tax revenue, nothing noted on there yet, there will be come next

month. I can tell you we've already processed the May advance. We'll be distributing that out next week. They're right on par as usual. The miscellaneous revenue, I did mention a couple of months ago about the local income tax supplemental distribution we will receive. That we know already that we'll receive approximately 3% more, about 700,000 for the local income tax line, which is a positive.

With the issues at the jail, when you look at the-- it says care of federal prisoners, but it's actually care of prisoners, there's federal and state revenue in the line in your miscellaneous revenue sheet. That will be down. We historically received about \$50 for reimbursement per day per inmate for the federal inmates. The contract has been terminated here in a month or so. That revenue will [unintelligible 00:02:57] the Feds, the state sends a lump sum, so potentially we'll see about a million dollars less. We've estimated 3 million there, I'm guessing we'll be around 2 million figure, maybe a little bit more than that.

The offset of the income tax is going to be the care of prisoners will be down, possibly interest revenue will be out up the Fed raising rates. As we know, miscellaneous revenue will ebb and flow. I can take any questions you got. You'll see all the funds, they look healthy. If you look at the expenses to date, we're trending well below, at least in the major funds that are in your financials. Off to a good start for the year.

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: Mr. President?

President Kerley: Yes.

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: Thank you. Good morning.

President Kerley: Good morning.

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: You said that the jail-- Repeat that statement, what did you say?

Nick: Yes. The commissioners have terminated the contract for the federal inmates. We receive I think it's \$55, if not, it's low 50s, as reimbursement from the Feds. The state, we receive right around \$40 reimbursement. If we're not going to house the federal [unintelligible 00:04:06] federal inmates anymore because we're above capacity, we won't receive that revenue into your miscellaneous revenue sheet that you see here.

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: Okay, so anytime we say the word jail, we just have to reiterate it, our community is kind of in a disarray right now. I want to make sure that anytime we say the word jail, that our constituents really have a clear understanding. Nothing personal to you, Nick, you do an awesome job. I just heard the word jail. I know someone at home heard the word jail. We just want to be clear. Thank you, sir.

Jordan: Yes. There's both sides of that. If you're not aware, then we can also talk about it afterwards, too, but there's the commissioners have entered into contracts with other counties that will have an expense associated with it. There's multiple facets to it.

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: Thank you.

President Kerley: Any other questions?

Councilman Harris: Mr. President, I'll move for the approval of the financial report.

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: Second.

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

Chorus: Aye.

President Kerley: All those opposed? Finance report is accepted 7-0. Thank you, Mr. Jordan. Total appropriations requested in the general fund, \$0. Total appropriations requested and other funds, \$5,888,924. I will now open the floor for public comment. I believe Mr. Jordan has a couple of letters to read in.

Nick: Yes, Council. The first one is for Mr. John Modezjewski. I'm not sure how to pronounce his last name, but he could not be here physically. He's got some questions. I'm going to run through them. The first one is, what is the actual cost of the change to the new Allen County logo seal? Two, where in the budget can I find the line item for the costs associated with the professional service contract for the Allen County local seal change? Three, how does the fiscal body of Allen County track the professional service contracts and amount being spent by the Allen county commissioners under the title of professional service contracts?

Four, how many professional service contracts have been issued by the Allen County commissioners in the past two years, and for what amount of taxpayers' money? Five, why can't I find any line-item budget for professional service contracts in the Allen County budget? Six, the Allen County commissioners used \$62,000 of COVID-19 pandemic money for a horse trail grant. What does a horse trail grant have to do with COVID-19? Was this expenditure approved by the fiscal body of Allen County? Thanks, John Modezjewski, 46808. Then, the second public comment is from the Izaak Walton League. It's from Major Patrick White.

It's addressed to the highway department but there's some mention of Council within it. Mr. Sackler, on behalf of the Izaak Walton League of America Fort Wayne Chapter, we wish to thank you for your efforts to design and install new directional signage to assist motorists to navigate their way to both the Izaak Walton and the McMillen Girl Scout camp in Northwest Allen County. My thanks also goes out to Allen County Councilman Ken Fries who spearheaded this project. This project has been the desire of both parties for many years and thanks to you both. It's been brought to life. Both the design and location of various signs has been instrumental in directing motorists to both our facilities.

I hope this communication is placed in your personal file and is transmitted to those in county council for their review. Many times government is scorned, but in this case, it deserves nothing but the highest praise. Respectfully, Major Patrick White, United States Air Force, retired Vice President Izaak Walton League, FortWayne, and NRA certified range safety officer.

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: Mr. President, I have a statement. May I read it, please, sir?

President Kerley: Sure.

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: Allen County Council members and constituents, this past week in the nation once again face grief and horror as a member of Buffalo's black community were targeted, terrorized, and killed in a white supremacist mass shooting. As we join the millions across America mourning the lives and unnecessary deaths of 10 people murdered at Tops Market on this past Saturday. I come before you with a clear message. White supremacy and democracy cannot coexist. The domestic terrorism and violence perpetrated by those exposing white supremacist ideology attacks the very foundation of our nation. It's simple.

No one is free until the rights and safety of all Americans are fully guaranteed, regardless of race, ethnicity, or religion. Battling the terrifying rise in racism, hate crimes, bigot rhetoric from politicians, pundits, and online radicalization must be made a priority by our nation's leaders. The future of American lives of people are at stake. I'm shaking right now just reading this, sir. It's hard to imagine how I feel. I am getting ready to travel to Baltimore and I'm afraid. I'm afraid because of the color of my skin. I'm afraid of how people feel about black people, but I'm going. I think that this should be a wake-up call to us. Silence is acceptance. 10 people lost their lives. 10 people. Thank you.

President Kerley: Thank you. Any other comments? Motion to close public comment? Sorry. Yes, come forward, please.

Dustin Peterson: Thank you. Dustin Peterson [crosstalk]--

President Kerley: Please state your name and your zip code, please.

Dustin Peterson: Dustin Peterson, 46818. Mr. President and Council members, thank you for hearing me on the matter of the Allen County Regional Water and Sewer District this morning. While I understand that City Council votes are believed to be against acquisition which they will consider again next week, it's too close of a margin for me to sleep at night. The acquisition isn't about lower rates for 3000 customers at the district currently. It's about control the water and sewer throughout the unincorporated county. It's about control of growth and development in the unincorporated county.

Many of you correctly recognize concerns about county representation on the proposed management structure for city utilities in the district. Make no mistake, under the agreement, the district will have no authority despite the board remaining in existence. The agreement clearly states they will be responsible for education and outreach, for soliciting new customers and referring them on to city utilities, and for making recommendations to city utilities. They will have no authority. If this agreement is signed, even if it is later terminated or expires, city utilities will remain in control of water and sewer in the district. This is also clearly stated in the agreement.

This will also have an impact on county residents with a change in relevant state statutes and protections from Title 13 to Title 36 as the Allen County Regional Water and Sewer District is structured very differently from city utilities as a city municipal utility. This includes exemptions for working septic systems up to 20 years. For folks who have a sewer system within 300 feet of their property line, either now or in the future, under city utilities, with this agreement, they will be forced to connect or face stiff penalties assessed on a daily basis without any recourse. This is for folks that potentially have just installed a system or recently up to a cost of maybe \$20,000.

That rate decrease doesn't seem like much of a deal to them. I will let you know that having contacted the Health Department, there are approximately 14,000 folks' households in Allen County who are on septic. That's a lot more than the 3000 customers that they would lead you to believe they're affecting rates for. This includes a waiver of rights as well to remonstrate annexation under Title 36. Although I'm told that that's different, that annexation is very difficult in the state of Indiana, City utility attorneys would certainly not take the time and effort to write this into the agreement if this was not an important point.

The editorial and the paper on Sunday would lead you to believe that this is about city and county cooperation. You will know that county government and the sewer district are not one and the same, most readers do not. I understand that you do not have the power to change this at this time, but I cannot do anything other than urge you to please desperately, I urge you to reach out to City Council, do not allow this acquisition to occur. Thank you.

President Kerley: Thank you.

Councilman Harris: Mr. President, I'll move for close of the public comment.

Councilman Lagemann: Second.

President Kerley: Motion and a second to close public comment. All those in favor, say aye.

Chorus: Aye.

President Kerley: All those opposed. Public comment is closed 7-0 and we will move on to the Highway Department. Good morning.

Kim Yagodinski: Good morning, Council.

Bill Hartman: Good morning. Bill Hartman, [inaudible 00:14:39] Highway Department.

Kim: Kim Yagodinski, Finance and Personnel Manager for the Highway Department.

Bill: [inaudible 00:14:45] unfortunately wasn't able to acquire [inaudible 00:14:50] cash. [inaudible 00:14:52] from last year's projection was 18% less than the year before. However, people did drive nearly as much, and so we had quite a lot of money that came in and was not set up appropriated by our budget. This year, we're trying to keep up and be able to execute the program that we got approved last year due to fuel costs going up quite a lot and liquid asphalt prices going up, some end prices going up.

We'd like to apply all this money to the various line items below here on the agenda in order to be able to accomplish what we set out to do last year in September, October when we submitted our budget.

Councilman Harris: Since that didn't work, you got to repeat the whole thing, Bill.

[laughter]

Councilman Harris: Just kidding. Kidding.

Bill: I think everyone heard me. [inaudible 00:16:10]

Councilman Harris: Yes.

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: Yes.

President Kerley: Do you just want to go through each appropriation line by line or?

Bill: I'll have Kim [inaudible 00:16:25] [crosstalk].

Kim: Sure. The first appropriation line is in our special distribution fund, which is the 858 fund. We're requesting an appropriation of \$628,000. That's actually a reimbursement that came from the state. We applied in late 2021 for community crossing funds and this is the match money that we can get. We can get up to a million dollars--We received a little over 300,000 in the first call and then this is the money that came for the second call. This actually comes ahead of time. Like most of our reimbursements, we get reimbursed after we've paid the money out. In the community crossings program, we get 50% of the match money upfront. This is to appropriate those dollars that we can use this year for that contract that we have for HMA Resurfacing. I think if you refer to the sheet that was turned in, that resurface package includes Carroll Road, Johnson Road, Hathaway Road, McComb road, Old Lyme Road, Simon Road, and West Shoaff Road.

I spoke to Margaret Hershberger, who's our chief project manager, and she told me that that project is ready to start in the next week or so. The estimated completion date is July 2022.

President Kerley: Just probably just go down.

Kim: Oh, okay. Sorry. [chuckles] The next section is appropriation for \$353,924, that's in the lit economic development fund 329. We are asking for an appropriation of 180,899 for road drainage improvement and then \$173,025 in our contractual line. That's primarily going to be used for our Maples Road improvement. We're getting an engineering design done on that. That's the total of \$353,924. The next appropriation would be in our LR&S fund, that's fund 255. In this, we're asking for increase for fuel, 300,000. Our fuel costs right now, the wholesale cost on fuel per gallon is running about \$3.58. We've all seen the price at the pump, so we know that it's actually going up not down at this point.

The average in 2020 was about \$2.01 wholesale, and in 2021, it was about \$2.71. When we submitted our budget last year, we certainly weren't expecting prices to be quite as high as they are right now. We're doing everything that we can to conserve fuel, but at the same time, we're still trying to get our projects done and spend the dollars that you've appropriated for us.

Councilman Lagemann: Kim, is that diesel fuel or is that gas?

Kim: That's diesel fuel.

Councilman Lagemann: Okay. That was 2.71 wholesale last year. What is it now?

Kim: It is 3.58 right now, but rising. We anticipate that it'll near \$4 probably the next time we fill our tanks. We have diesel tanks at both barns. We try to keep those full for not only our use but emergency use also for the county if that would ever need to be used for that. The next line is our road striping line. We've seen an increase in price from the bid that we just put out for that. We're asking for an additional \$200,000 there to continue our road striping program, and then the road reclamation program, we're asking for an additional \$400,000.

The next appropriation is in the 250 fund, that's the MBH fund. We are looking to do additional HMA work, that's our hot asphalt mat.

1.5 million additional there, road drainage, again, another million dollars, road conversions, 500,000, and then an additional million dollars to start construction on a Union Chapel Road project that we have in the works. Together, that's the \$5,881,924 that we're requesting for appropriation today.

Councilman Harris: I thought, Bill, you mentioned that these were things that were slated to do last year, but you're now able to do it this year, help me understand that again.

Kim: Actually, these are dollars that we have that have come back in reimbursements and also an additional revenue that we didn't have budgeted last year, and the actual revenue exceeded the projections. This is just to keep our programs going and put those dollars to use. For example, in our HMA program, we already had budgeted \$3 million which would allow us to do about 25 miles of HMA work, but with this additional 1.5, that would allow us to do another 12 and a half miles for a total of 37.5 miles.

Councilman Harris: Basically, in addition to those projects that were [crosstalk]--

Kim: Yes, an addition to what we budgeted.

Councilman Harris: All righty. How is the fact that the gas price is going up that's going to be an influx of additional dollars coming back to us based on that tax, how do you figure that additional amount that's going to be coming back? That's going to be a year from now, right?

Bill: We haven't done that as yet. See, we get monthly payments from the state as that money accumulates. If it accumulates to a significant enough amount to fund more resurfacing mileage or another bridge project or whatever that might be, we would come back later in the year to Council to appropriate that or we would put it into our budget for next year.

Councilman Harris: I was thinking from the standpoint of price increases though, would that not offset some of those price increases including the fuel that you have to purchase?

Kim: That's correct.

Councilman Harris: Okay.

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: Mr. President?

President Kerley: Yes.

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: Good morning. Thank you for being here. I guess I'm just trying to see if there's any way that the ARPA funds can be used. Some of these projects, I know you said they're ready to go in two weeks or whatever, but I know there's a folder somewhere with a bunch of projects. I don't know if this project is in that folder, but can you tell me about this other than using ARPA funds, the American rescue plan? Thank you.

Bill: Well, we understand, we've been working with the commissioner's office on the ARPA funds, and what we understand what's available, the highway would primarily be in drainage areas. We and a AllenCounty surveyor have submitted a list of projects to them that we thought would be a priority if that does seem to be the case. They're studying that situation to

see what those funds are really applicable to, but they don't seem to be directly to roads and bridges, but hopefully drainage.

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: Would that affect what you're presenting us today?

Bill: That would be in addition to what we're presenting today.

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: In addition to?

Bill: Yes, ma'am.

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: Thank you.

President Kerley: Yes, Councilman Fries.

Councilman Fries: Kim, do you know what we're paying per gallon for gas?

Kim: I don't have that with me.

Councilman Fries: We don't have a contract though.

Kim: We do not have a contract. That is through the purchasing department. We purchase our no lead through them. We have tanks also at the barns for no lead, and I think they're encouraging people to use those tanks because we can buy at wholesale prices, but I don't know right off the top of my head what the cost per gallon is today, but it is less than it is at the gas station.

Councilman Fries: So you're going to talk to purchasing about trying to get a contract because I know the city has one that's really good for the rest of this year at least and is certainly going to go up.

Kim: I don't know what Dawn has in the plans for that. I haven't really spoken to her about that. We don't use very much of the no lead. Most of our equipment runs on diesel, so I focus on the diesel prices and try to watch that, but I have not spoken to Dawn about that, so I can't answer.

Councilman Fries: In the old days when I was a county policeman, we filled up at all the barns. We didn't stop at the Lassus Bros, and it's cheaper to do it at the barns.

Kim: That's correct because we pay wholesale price.

Councilman Fries: It would make sense if we're trying to save money to have all the squad cars fill up at the barns.

Kim: Correct.

Councilman Fries: Thank you.

President Kerley: Mr. Spurr.

Chris Spurr: Mr. Hartman, how much was returned from the highway department? You said obviously we had a lot of monies that were basically returned, how much in total was returned?

Bill: Oh, you mean reimbursements on our federal aid projects?

Chris: Yes, for this 5.8 request.

Bill: I think--

Kim: Well, in the LIT economic development fund, that's where all of our reimbursements come back, so that would be the 353,924. If you're asking about the carryover dollars, that is part of that 4 million in the MBH. The dollars come back into the MBH fund, they don't go back to the general fund like other departments might.

Chris: Yes, because I'm looking at this statement, it says 4.3. Does that sound about right? [inaudible 00:26:13] [crosstalk]-

Kim: That sounds about right.

Chris: -appropriation.

Kim: That was additional revenue plus the rollover that came back, correct.

[pause 00:26:20]

Councilman Harris: Well, Mr. President, I'll move for the appropriation within the SEA67-2016 special distribution fund 858 for \$628,000.

Councilman Fries: Second.

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

Chorus: Aye. Approved 7-0.

Councilman Harris: I'll further move for the appropriation within the LIT economic development fund 329 for road drainage improvement, \$180,899, contractual at \$173,025 for a total of \$353,924.

Councilman Fries: Second.

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: Second.

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

Chorus: Aye.

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

Councilman Harris: I'll further move for the appropriation within the LR&S fund 255 for a total of \$900,000.

Councilman Fries: Second.

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: Second.

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

Chorus: Aye.

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

Councilman Harris: Lastly, I'll move for the appropriation within the highway fund at 250 for a total of \$4 million.

Councilman Fries: Second.

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

Chorus: Aye.

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

Bill: Thank you.

Councilman Harris: Thank you and good luck.

Kim: Thank you.

Councilman Harris: Decent weather to come hopefully.

Kim: Yes.

President Kerley: Discussion and other business to come before Council, first up would be discussion of the 2023 Southwest Fire District budget.

[pause 00:28:05]

Brett Wygant: Good morning.

President Kerley: Good morning.

Brett: [inaudible 00:28:17] [crosstalk] stand or sit or [crosstalk]--

President Kerley: Whatever you feel more comfortable with.

Brett: Good morning. My name is Brett Wygant. I'm the fiscal officer for the Southwest Fire District. I took that position last July and I met with you for our budget meeting in September, October, I believe it was. A couple things I was wanting to discuss with you today as we start to think about preparing our next year's budget if there's been any discussion on what pay raises the county is going to be given. The reason I say this is when I build the budget, I don't want to put 5% in there, and then you come back and say, no, I got to reduce that to three. On the other hand, I don't want to put 3% in and say, well, we would allow five.

I wasn't sure whether there's been any discussion with the council regarding that. In the past years when Alice McFadden had always done the budget, he had always talked to the county auger and they said 2%, 3%, whatever it was, and he just put that in. We're having problems

like most businesses in places trying to find people to fill the shifts for our part-time people. I always want to ask that question, that was one of my questions.

Councilman Lagemann: It's a great question.

[laughter]

Councilman Lagemann: I'm going to say a higher number than some of them will, so it's hard to say.

[laughter]

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: I will say a higher number also. I will also tell you to ask for funds to retain folks, some type of incentive. That's what she was going to say, some type of bonus, some type of reimbursement for education, whatever perks that you can throw in there. That's what Sheila would do, ask for it all.

Brett: Okay. Along the same line, as our district isn't large, I guess, we've got a \$2 million-dollar budget, basically, \$2.1. Three weeks ago, we had a meeting with the plant manager of General Motors to discuss with him the tax abatements that they get and whether they could help with any funding because I've got a sheet here. In the last four years, county government has allowed \$4.2 million worth of tax abatements within our district, which comes out, basically, \$1 million a year. We only have \$2 million budget, so we're struggling right now a little bit with trying to purchase equipment, maintain all of our shift positions, and so forth.

We've got less staffing now than we had 10 years ago, just trying to do the best we can. They told us no, there was nothing they could do to assist us. I did not know whether there was anything, as the county government, that you could do to assist us with either equipment purchases or something like that because these abatements are hitting us very hard. If everybody paid their taxes, technically we could have a \$3 million budget. We don't need that much money, but an extra couple \$100,000 a year in our budget, and along that line, the homeowners and farmers in our district are subsidizing those tax abatements because our tax rate is very high, so it's not like I can go out and increase our tax rate.

We're already a very high tax rate for our fire district. Those are some questions that I wanted to pose to you today.

President Kerley: Yes.

Councilman Lagemann: Yes. Just out of curiosity, what's the run volume to GM because you guys are out there quite a bit, aren't you?

Brett: They're our number one customer.

Councilman Lagemann: Any sense of how many runs were made there last year?

[pause 00:32:19]

Councilman Fries: On top of that, I assume most of them are ambulance runs?

Brett: Yes.

Councilman Fries: Have you charged for that?

Brett: We get a reimbursement for that through insurance companies. Glad you brought that. Part of the ambulance run is due to the Three Rivers ambulance issues. We're swamped and there's been volunteer firefighters that have been coming in to fill in shifts that are declining that because they're up 24 hours a day on weekends doing runs, so it's a vicious cycle.

Councilman Fries: Do you get paid by Fort Wayne for all the runs you guys are making there? Because I know Friday night there were nine ambulances in Fort Wayne from the county.

Brett: Yes, we are getting money back from that. While it may seem like a windfall, when you start factoring in all the wear and tear on our ambulances and the fact that there's times when, if our ambulances are running outside our district, our constituents may or may not have an ambulance and that's what they're paying taxes for and their ambulance is out of the district, so it's not a complete gravy train. There's give and take, and the cost of replacing our equipment by the excess runs is going up.

Councilman Lagemann: Sorry for the barrage of questions, but just out of curiosity, if you had to guess, how many times a week do you have [unintelligible 00:33:50] level 0?

Brett: I don't have that number at the top.

Councilman Lagemann: If you just had to guess.

Brett: I really can't right now, because the chief takes care of all that run information and I'm dealing more with the budget and actual hard numbers.

Councilman Fries: I know you're trying to get the number of how many runs you had made to the plant last year, but can you increase what you're charging them? If they don't want to pay one way, you can have them pay the other.

Brett: Well, we haven't looked into that avenue yet and I'm not sure whether you can increase it for one customer and not across the board, how that [inaudible 00:34:41] [crosstalk]--

Councilman Fries: I'd increase it for all of them.

Brett: Yes. [chuckles]

President Kerley: Ms. Curry-Campbell.

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: Thank you. Thank you for being here and maybe people need to know more about your story and what's going out there. The people's lives that you are saving is in the space. Have you spoken with this group? Look at me, please, sir.

Brett: Oh, I'm sorry.

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: Have you spoken with this group with our commissioners? Did you go to them by yourself? I'm just trying to understand. Maybe you need to revisit this with them and take someone with you that's a decision-maker, maybe our president or the commissioners. I'm just trying to help you.

Brett: Well, my first point was to go directly to General Motors because of the tax abatements. They amount to about 80 to 85% of the abatements, so all the other abatements with our district is small. That was our first point, to go to them. Then, last week, they had a Team's meeting with myself and they said that they had ran it through their channels and there was nothing they could do to assist us. I was on the schedule for today's meeting, I wanted to discuss the pay issue as well as our forthcoming budget, so this is my second point, is to come to the county council to present this, and then, thirdly, it will go to the county commissioners.

When we met with the General Motors people, it was the fire chief and myself. I came here today by myself. I'm not sure if you're saying that I should ask the president of the county council to go with me to [crosstalk]--

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: Yes, I think you need reinforcement because it's a necessity. Some of the things that need to be said, maybe you can't say them, but I believe someone up here may be able to say them or our commissioners be able to say we're doing them a service that goes through this body. Like I say, I think you need some reinforcement. They need to know that they're in our space and that times are hard. We've got to work together, and collaboration is one of those ways, so I think you need to revisit this with a group of individuals that make decisions that affect them. Yes, we need to play fair. Thank you.

Brett: I believe that run number is around \$160 a year, \$165 in the past year, so about every other day we go there for a run to General Motors.

Councilman Lagemann: Every other day?

Brett: Well, you have 365 days in a year, so yes.

Councilman Lagemann: That's crazy.

President Kerley: Do you just have total runs or do you have that broken out as emergent, non-emergent?

Brett: They're statistics. I can get those for you. I didn't bring all those with me. They're our number one customer. The second-leading place that we go is a nursing home, but they outpace the nursing home. Anyways.

President Kerley: The reason I ask is many times some of those non-emergent runs are non-revenue producing.

Brett: Yes. I've been told there are a lot of trivial runs out there as well as other places, but when they're dispatched, they go. They can't tell over the phone whether it's life-threatening or not. I'm not sure, in future tax abatements, is there any way that public safety can be exempted from that abatement where they still have to pay the public safety portion of the tax?

President Kerley: Sure. Well, I'll defer to our attorney.

?Male Speaker: Or auditor, right?

Atty Mitch Harper: Yes, [unintelligible 00:39:02] auditor [unintelligible 00:39:02] and the commissioners may want to weigh in, too, but you can negotiate a payment in lieu of taxes for them, and that statute's open. Not just between, for example, utilities, where Fort Wayne assesses a payment in lieu of taxes on their city utility customers. They pay a little higher rate.

Brett: Yes, I'm familiar with that.

Mitch: That money goes into the general fund. That can also be done with private entities, too.

Brett: Okay. I was not aware.

Mitch: Certainly, they ask regularly for a tax abatement on personal property, generally, whenever they introduce new machinery, and so that's probably something for the executive and for the county council and the auditor to indicate with the county economic development folks when they're preparing the next abatement.

Brett: Okay.

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: Yes. I'm a firm believer you have to teach people how to treat you and it sounds like we need to teach them because, at this point, you shouldn't be here having this conversation, it should have been taken care of when you went to them. That's how I feel. Thank you.

Councilman Harris: Well, and back to the percentage of increase, I guess it depends on which way, if you were to err, which way you want to err because the challenge that we're going to have, and you're an example of that, is that all entities are facing this challenge and it's going to grow. Not only because it's a growing community and the demands are going to increase, but we're going to be watching inflation and rapid inflation coming at us and we're going to be challenged with not giving everybody what everybody needs. That's really what's coming at us right now. We'd love to do more. We're excited that, I think, what this weekend, GM is trying to hire 400 employees out there right now.

That's an exciting thing for our community but maybe there's a balance in there that we can [crosstalk]--

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: At \$16 an hour.

Councilman Harris: The other that you can think about is a long-term strategic plan with GM, right? Maybe you've done that already, but maybe not, and they're going to be here for another generation because of those abatements. We were able to secure them for another generation. Maybe there's something that we can do for the next 10 or 20 years with that to help you and to help them, not just because of high inflation and challenges today. What can we do for the next 10 to 20 years for your service that you provide? Might need some considerations there.

Councilman Fries: Mr. President. Then, one thing that I'm going to suggest whether it goes anywhere or not is to try to tell the elected officials and department heads to keep your 2023 budget the same as your 2022 budget, and then any money we have extra goes for pay increases.

Brett: Okay.

Councilman Fries: That kind of gives you my view.

Brett: You're all aware it's a double-edged sword, you can cut your equipment funding and go more for personal services, but then you've got huge repair bills, or you can go the other way and have nice equipment, and then nobody's there to run it, so it's a sticky situation that [crosstalk]--

Councilman Fries: Along with what Sheila said, we can't give the employees enough money to make them whole but the commissioners can do more to give them more PTO days or something, so any benefits they can get to have them look at Allen County to come and work here and stay here is what we're pushing for, which I'm sure is the same thing you're doing.

Brett: Okay. I appreciate your time.

Councilman Fries: Thank you.

President Kerley: We appreciate you coming. We'll have more conversations.

Brett: Would you like me to leave these here for you to look at?

Councilman Lagemann: Sure.

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: You can email them.

Brett: Pardon?

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: You can email them.

Brett: Okay, we'll do that. Thank you.

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: You're welcome. We're going to have to put some bass in your voice, you're going to have to get tough with these people. Don't let them talk to you like that. Call me, I'll go with you. Make some stuff happen because I'm not happy with them right now.

Nick: Can I add something?

President Kerley: Sure.

Nick: Council, for your knowledge, it's not just GM too, Micheline, every abatement that's given, there's over 300 abatements, if you think exempt property is awesome, it's not just Southwest Fire District. Every public safety entity would have this problem, and one thing you guys have the keys to, if you think about it, just like you have the tax abatement development fund where the entity receiving the abatement can voluntarily contribute X percent to that fund, possibly look at something similarly with public safety and the fact that if you're exempt, exempt doesn't come before you but the abatement aspect does.

That, "Hey, GM, Michelin, whoever it may be you're receiving this abatement, you're still going to call 911. Do you want to contribute X percentage to a public safety," and that's something where you guys approve abatements that can be added into the mix-

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: Added in there.

Nick: -if you wanted to look at it that way. Authority-wise, you can add that to your discretion of, well, maybe we don't want to prove the abatement if you don't want to help public safety. It's just something where you guys have control over that aspect of Brett or Southwest Fire District, Northeast, Northwest, whatever it may be, goes in that entity doesn't want to work with them, they wanted to work with you guys on the abatement or the tax phase-in.

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: Can we do that in the 2023 budget discussion?

Nick: It's not a budget item, it's when the entity comes before you to ask for the abatement-- [crosstalk]

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: Oh, so we can't do anything until the act [crosstalk]--

Nick: I mean, you guys, there's already been east central credit their fire territory, Northwest talking about merging there's, Southwest is talking about it. There's multiple facets of it, but something from the providing public safety services to a abated or exempt entity. There's no discretion when you call, "Are you exempt or abated? Well, we're not going to come or it's going to take us longer." They come but it's you guys knowing that you do have the keys to that aspect, potentially at least asking, just like with the tax abatement development fund, do you want to make a contribution.

Then if you did do that, and they paid X percent of the abatement, we would pass that along to the public safety provider for that area.

Councilman Lagemann: Nick, as the folks in economic development come to us, having the payment in lieu of taxes as a component of the request for the abatement, I mean, that's something that we could essentially say to economic development, "Hey, if you're going to come and ask for the abatement, be ready on the public safety payment in lieu of taxes, and include that as a component of this package."

Nick: Yes. [inaudible 00:45:47] [crosstalk]--

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: [inaudible 00:45:47] [crosstalk] packages.

President Kerley: It should be right on the score sheet.

Nick: Yes, and to the term of pilot, just keeping in mind that the public safety aspect may not be the only entity coming and saying, "Well, we're a school and we're not getting any things of that regard." So it affects everybody but more often than not, potentially, if they're calling public safety however many runs and when you look at a large taxpayer and some of those that are being abated, they may have to get a specific truck just for that entity that they would use nowhere else.

Councilman Lagemann: Well, I think the uniqueness though of public safety is they're funded 100% locally.

Nick: Yes, agreed.

Councilman Lagemann: Or 90% locally, as opposed to a school who has funds coming from all sorts of different places, including state and fed.

Nick: I hear you.

Councilman Lagemann: This is a unique situation [crosstalk]--

Nick: That would be the discussion for those other entities that may ask, yes, but that's something that you guys-- I talked with Brett prior and others, same to Chief Boren multiple because it's not something thought of, but when you look at the hundreds of millions of dollars [unintelligible 00:46:48] or phased in, potentially if nowadays, fire or police and fire don't have the funds to operate maybe that's an aspect council wants to go. You only have control over the county, if City Council want to do something similar, but on the county side, it would help Southeast Fire District and then potentially these new territories that are being created.

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: Was there anything else you noticed that would help him, I mean, you said you guys had spoke before, but is there anything else other than?

Nick: From the operational side, I'm not proficient in public safety. [unintelligible 00:47:23] that on the revenue side, as I've talked with all of them, especially when you talk with the chiefs, when you look at an EMS aspect, they charge a user fee. Is it high enough? Because if not, then it becomes a tax need potentially out of their words, not necessarily mine. That's something that they look at also, but we don't, we as a county, Council will approve the district's budget, the territories are on their own. They have their own discretion and the participating and provider units is the terminology that the county doesn't really have authority over. You're not even involved in the process. There's state law that they follow.

There's been one created, revised, another one created, and then we get the calls the next year when the tax bills come out, people hooting and hollering because their taxes increased tenfold, depending on what the area is.

Councilman Lagemann: Nick, is it similar to a township budget in that you have a separate cum fund?

Nick: Yes, they'll have a general and then they can have an operating equipment fund.

Councilman Lagemann: You all have a cum fund?

Brett: We have a cum fund. It's around \$1.5 million right now but we got--

Councilman Lagemann: How much is a truck?

Brett: We just started two trucks in January, they're \$2 million-

Councilman Lagemann: Right.

Brett: -so our cum fund will be gone February or March of next year when the trucks arrive.

Councilman Lagemann: One of the other things that I think everybody has to take a look at right now, especially with the cost of equipment, et cetera, is to the degree that you can max

out the cum fund considering the tax gaps and circuit breaker, we need to max those cum funds out. Everybody has to.

Nick: If you need the money, you got to try whether the circuit breakers are there or not, and it's one thing, not only Southwest Fire District that I mentioned to Chief Boren, every entity that I do talk to because I don't let them skate by, Southwest Fire District, the last six years, they're operating and cum funds have not dropped below \$500,000. So the entities, the territories, townships, city, town, whatever it may be, they do also need to look at the reserves just like we do to say if you're saying we need this money, well, what are you already doing with the cum fund or operational. We know, like you mentioned, the truck's going to cost us.

It's going to wipe the cum fund out but if you're in the operational side, if you're carrying a \$500,000 balance, and you need personnel, what is the plan for that?

Councilman Lagemann: Right? [crosstalk] Because then the hard part with these trucks is you blow a couple of tires and you could blow through a quarter-million dollars really fast with tires, pieces of equipment, compressors, I mean, I understand how expensive this stuff is. When we see those numbers that are resting in a QIM fund, that can also be used for the repair of heavy equipment, and so making sure that those repair dollars are there if something breaks. At the end of the day, there are a lot of things that we have to deal with from a tax standpoint that we all might roll our eyes at.

Having somebody come out and put a fire out at our house or pick us up in an ambulance are not things we roll our eyes at. I appreciate all the hard work that you guys do. It's something that we're going to be taking a look at from a countywide perspective as more and more Fire Department struggle with the trial zero issue and everything else. Maxing those QIM funds out are critical right now, I think. I support that for sure.

Councilman Harris: I presume, obviously, GM's going to have some kind of a safety committee and such. Do you work with those folks at the GM facility? I'm sure one of their KPIs is, how do we reduce the number of calls and what can we do internally to help in that case.

Mr. Wygant: I know we have an upcoming plant tour with them in their safety guide, because we've got a lot of new people.

Councilman Harris: How often do you do that? Is that a regular thing?

Mr. Wygant: It's not anything that's scheduled, but we've got a lot of new part-time people that are working for us now.

Chairman: Microphone.

Councilman Harris: You need this.

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: You need the microphone or else we can't hear you.

Mr. Wygant: We have a lot of new part-time people that aren't familiar with the plant, so we're going to be scheduling another plant tour with the Safety Director to go through there for things.

Councilman Harris: I was thinking, you could help them understand of the concern. They probably do. I'm sure they understand.

Mr. Wygant: When we met with the Plant Manager there three weeks ago or so, he was a little caught off guard that they were our number one customer. That's when I told him, I said, "From day one, when 911 is called I said we or the police department show up." I said, "We don't discriminate that you're not paying your fair share of taxes, so we're going to disregard this run." They were a little embarrassed actually at how many run volumes they have. It's just something as the plant manager you have no clue how many times that that is called.

Councilman Harris: Working with that safety team could be an option for them to try to figure out how to do their end better possibly. Good. Very good. Thank you.

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: Keep telling your story. Don't be afraid to tell that GM is your number one customer. Thank you.

Mr. Wygant: Okay.

Chairman: Mr. Cloud? Mr. Beck? Or maybe just Mr. Cloud?

Mr. Cloud: Council, Chris Cloud, Chief of Staff, Board of Commissioners. If you could indulge me for two minutes to set up a presentation, turn the TVs.

Chairman: Great.

Mr. Cloud: Talk amongst yourselves, stretch. Whatever you gotta do. Listen to background music.

[pause 00:53:12]

Chairman: You ready, Mr. Cloud?

Mr. Cloud: I hadn't done my stretching yet, but I think I can manage. I don't want to, I won't pull something up here.

Chairman: Think you need a taller microphone.

Mr. Cloud: I really do. This is--

Councilman Harris: Just talk louder maybe.

Mr. Cloud: Well, that's a struggle for me as well, Tom. I apologize. Whenever Bill Hartman comes to our meeting, he's always crouched down. I always feel so bad for him because he's so tall. Good morning, Council. As I mentioned, Chris Cloud, Chief of Staff, Board of Commissioners. I've cutely titled this *Building Toward The Future* because we're here to discuss a building purchase. Hope you appreciate the 30 seconds I spent on my cute little slide here. It was all for you.

I want to start with a recap of 13 months ago. I came before you in April of 2021. At the time, had made a request. On the budget was \$8 million was the appropriation request. Our goal at the time, our goal still, our goal for the last five or six years has been trying to find an appropriate new home for the Day Reporting Center for Community Corrections. I came

before you last April about a building on 333 East Washington Street. The building purchase was going to be about \$2 million. It was going to be accomplished by an arrangement with the City of Fort Wayne.

We were going to swap them some real estate and some cash in exchange for the building, for the Redevelopment Commission. All in realistically, the project was about an \$11 or 12-million-dollar project to provide a new home for the Day Reporting Center. You did not act on that request.

To summarize what we may be better as I heard from the council, "heard". The impression I've gotten over the last year in talking to some of you is that our request in April solved one space need problem. That was a concern for the council because the council knew that there were other needs now and in the future out there and the preference was, we're going to do this. Let's do something that actually checks a lot of boxes and solves whatever's out there and helps us towards the future. That's what I received.

Council was willing to look at something that was more expensive if it checked boxes, that it wasn't a purely dollars and cents situation but it was really more value. Given the most we can get for a price council could live with, but that the single-purpose project was not what the council wanted our focus to be. We spent the better part of the year working toward the proposal today for discussion.

Again, this is a discussion. There's no request for anything today outside of discussion and direction. Some operational realities. These are not new to you. The law enforcement and judicial system departments represent a majority of the Allen County general fund budget. That's just a reality. In '93, it was 51%. In 2001, it had grown to 58%. 2020, it had grown to 72%. It's not a criticism. That's a reality. It is by labor force and allocation and work product. It is the largest function of county government. That's not a criticism. That's just a reality of what it is.

The court system, people just think of the people in robes and judges. What they don't realize is, behind the scenes, there are lots of departments involved in that, and across the county, there's lots of programming involved. Then there's the sheriff's department, everything going on with that large labor force, and everything there.

This is a big critical component of county government. It's a big portion of our priorities and where we allocate our resources. We also, through a justice system space study last year, which we've shared with you, which we've talked about publicly, that the judicial system needs to be close to the courthouse. Those courts and the personnel there and the departments that interact with them is a spoken wheel thing. They all really do interact or relate to one another. The courthouse is the heartbeat of that.

The other thing we know operationally is that the administrative departments, myself, HR, IT, don't do court stuff. We don't do sheriff stuff. While the internal departments might have their customers as well, our IT department serves them and HR serves them, there's little overlap operationally between administrative departments and public safety and court department to a degree compared especially to the interaction between the auditor treasurer, assessor, and recorder.

It's a group that works tightly together and people route through them, people route through them. There's just not as much overlap between those two groups. It's almost like we have

two arms, big piece arms of county government, operations, and then law enforcement and judicial.

Taking last year's request that was unacted upon, what we heard from the operational realities, some goals for the proposal today. We need to accomplish that original goal. We need to find a new home for the Day Reporting Center. Whatever we do needs to locate the judicial system departments in close proximity to the courthouse. We need to locate county administrative departments together to maximize efficiencies, collaborations, and customer access. You would think that being two blocks away wouldn't be a big deal. Yet it actually causes a lack of communication between those offices and I.

Nick and I chat frequently. There are times where it would be great to haul him into a meeting. It's a lot harder when he's in another building and not at his desk and trying to track him down. A little different when it's next floor down or something like that. That last 12 years, we've lost that touch amongst ourselves in some of the administrative departments.

Finally, we own a lot of real estate. You all are well aware of this. I don't know that the public is aware of this, but the county owns a lot of buildings. We own a lot of facilities. So does the city with fire stations. Government owns a lot of buildings in the county. Whatever we do needs to try to consolidate that footprint, especially given the realities of downtown government buildings. We've got big buildings. Obviously, we've got the Rousseau Centre, Courthouse, big buildings.

We also have some smaller ones. The reality is that those are probably better suited in the private sector's hands to do something else with than our function. If we were starting from scratch, we wouldn't put a single department in a small building and a single department in that building over there. If we would've known back in 19-whatever the realities of downtown and of our operations, we may have consolidated or functioned them a little differently. A goal should be to get those buildings back on the tax rolls, put them in their highest best use and consolidate our footprint.

Here's the proposal. We heard that one building for one department was not your direction. Here's another idea. If we would purchase and remodel a large office building and relocate administrative departments to this new space, put them together, re-purpose the Rousseau Center entirely for the judicial system by relocating and remodeling spaces for criminal division services, community corrections, small claims court, and traffic and misdemeanor, to join the judicial system departments already in the building, and then sell the three buildings being vacated.

Traffic and misdemeanor is currently in Bud Meeks. It's attached to the jail. That's a conversation for a different day on when and if and how that would be disposed of, but we know three buildings would be vacated, CDS, Community Corrections, and Small Claims immediately.

To meet this proposal, we've been searching high and low. What I would bring for you today is a proposal for the county to purchase Abridge Pointe. It's not a bridge. I've been pronouncing it wrong for a better part of a year, as well as I've been pronouncing wrong the company that manages it for the better part of a year. It's 172,000 square foot office building about a quarter-mile south of here, plus a basement. It's owned locally by Abridge Pointe, LLC, and is managed locally by VIA Developments.

The building most recently was leased to Lincoln. Their lease expires in 2022. They are consolidating back to their mothership building. They only had I think a floor and a half of people when COVID hit. They weren't working in the building anyway. Really, their use of it now is they have some IT operations in the basement that they will consolidate at the end of the year. Effectively, it is an empty, massive office building near downtown Fort Wayne.

It's not cheap to do all this. We're talking about large office buildings. We have negotiated with them a purchase price of \$12.25 million. This is below market value for the property. They have lowered their price drastically. We started off with a much higher price. They, on their own, when we could not come to terms with them, have lowered it.

This is the average two appraisals. They were willing to come down to that due to tax implications for them because it's in an opportunity zone and the way that the purchasing worked at the building. For them, they need to either sell this or not sell it. Opportunity zones work in a way where you need to own the property for a length of time. I think they still have another seven and a half or eight years left.

If not, you need to repay the taxes that were deferred from your purchase there. For them, they have some timing issues with the opportunity zone where they're needing to do something now or wait and hold. Key to us is that the seller's willing to buy back the property. I just talked to them recently. The number initially we talked to them was two years. They're now actually more inclined to even earlier than that.

In the next 12, 18 months, if we would have second thoughts, something would happen to this, we couldn't get it done or whatever, they're willing to buy it back for the price that we buy it at. They are oddly community-minded. Most private businesses would be money-minded, and they are for most things, but for this one, they are being a little more community-minded.

They still see value in the property, so they'd be happy to buy it back and put it to use. They think that they have some uses for it, but they also recognize that they live here, they work here, this is their home, and they also want to see if they can be good partners to their local community.

Remodeling is necessary in this building. The floor plan obviously is what it was before. An architect and I met with all administrative departments. Through that, we just put together some preliminary designs, nothing final by any means. The departments would obviously have a say in their spaces but based on how they function now, how they're set up now, a right-sizing of some departments, who, over the years, we've been in Rousseau since 1971, I think has been open, so some of those departments have been there for a while. Some of them are even in the same spaces they were. Very few of them, but a couple are in the same spaces they were.

We need to right-size some sizes up and down. This price includes a 15% markup for contingencies in the market conditions. The purchase and remodel, if we add them together, building size is about \$156 a square foot. That's well below the new construction value. That's always another option for us with anything is, if we can find the land doing new construction, this is a more value-oriented proposition.

For future use, we'd have part of one floor left. Everything can fit in there, and there's part of one floor that would be left over for future use. Or if we wanted to do additional

consolidations or something came up in the future. The other part of this is, people move out of Citizen Square, people move out of Rousseau, they consolidate into 1300 South Clinton Street and then we go back in. I'll get to the obvious elephant in the room in a second, but we go back in then and remodel Rousseau Center.

We already own that building, so there's no cost to buy. It would free up buildings, 201 West Superior Street, which is Community Corrections, 1 West Superior Street, which is Small Claims Court, 100 West Columbia, which is CDS, and 101 East Superior Street, which is Bud Meeks. Again, eventually, however, that works on that one.

The remodel of Rousseau is several years out. This number has a 23% markup for contingencies and market conditions. This does leave space available for additional consolidations. There are a handful, maybe one or two other opportunities for consolidation that may be able to occur, but that are not part of anything we've talked about or thought about right now, but there would be space for that on some of the upper floors of the tower to do that.

Given the sequencing of events-- I'll show you the math in a second. You're not dumb. This adds up to a tidy sum, but it would not all be at one time. The next slide shows the breakout of when those costs, my best guess when they might occur.

Hypothetically, if you would want to move forward with the purchase of this, we'd obviously have the purchase price, but also you'd have some professional expenses. I estimated professional services at 10%. That'd be an architect, a construction manager, soft costs for engineer. Anything that we might need professional service-wise.

FFFE, furniture, fixtures, equipment, again, is a guess. If we would need new IT equipment for a server rack, the racks themselves if we would need new desks or chairs or something in the move. There's a lot of built-ins in the county departments and sometimes those don't move well. If we would need furniture, just want to plug in a number. Moving is a plugin, but it's based on reality, based on the cost we had from the Rousseau move. I looked at that as a baseline, looked at that.

We go from 22 through 26. Rousseau's on the backside. Again, these are guesses as to years, but this is the same proposition then for Rousseau. You see there I put a placeholder for asbestos abatement. We had EMS, Environmental Management Services look at Rousseau. It isn't a requirement to abate because we've changed out to HEPA filters when we did the big remodel 10, 12 years ago.

If an area does not need to be abated, you don't have to abate it. The way our asbestos works is it's fireproofing on the underside of the deck. Largely, the prices that still exist, it's undisturbed. It's not an issue. They would do a-- they tried to explain it to me, I'm not an engineer-- but this vacuuming thing and see if the parts per million were a certain size. If so, they might abate an area, but they said, really, it's a placeholder. You might have to do nothing if you don't want to and you might do some if you choose to.

That was a, they felt, a good placeholder for if you needed to do some spot abatement here and there based on remodeling. We totaled up to a grand total, again with the built-in contingencies and estimates for professional services and soft costs and all that and the purchase price of the building, of \$49,817,012. That would be the cost projections.

Things to note. This plan would require Fort Wayne PD and Fort Wayne Fire Department to move out of Rousseau. That's the only way it works. We would then obviously vacate our office space here in Citizen Square. We would do that as soon as possible to accommodate whatever remodeling the city might need to do to accommodate PD and FD. They also re-acquired the public safety academy, I think at the beginning of the year or shortly thereafter. Not that it's empty. The fire and police do use first floor for training.

Part of the second floor is available. If there were some spaces they needed there, between that building and this building and whatever else they would have, I can't speak for them, but I think it fits. The square footage is there, but again, I'm naive to their uses so I can't speak for them.

We've mentioned this idea to the city administration-- it'd only be fair, we are partners in two buildings-- to tell them what we're thinking. The response was tepid. That might be favorable to call it tepid. Lukewarm. They were not enamored with the idea, but those are the things to note. That is the reality. This plan would require PD and FD to move.

That's where that option to buy back becomes interesting because while I think we have an excellent relationship with the City of Fort Wayne and have worked together very well on many things, you never know. Some issues we disagree on and some issues we have never been able to come to a compromise on. Other issues we've been able to find a way to work. I would hope that we'd find a way to work together on this, as we have through many things, but I don't have a crystal ball.

Next steps, if council would desire to continue conversations on this proposal, then I would place a request for appropriation for \$12.25 million on your next agenda and ask for permission to purchase the building. As you recall, council has to approve the purchase of buildings valued over \$5,000, so pretty much everything we might buy building wiser or land wise comes to you.

Also, in June, make a presentation on possible funding for the future year's expenses. It wouldn't be a part of what you'd be asked for now, but you got to have the conversation about total package, so we would need to talk about that. I do have some ideas, but I think that's a larger conversation.

The commissioners would need to engage in haste with Fort Wayne about relocating. They would not need to do this, honestly, until 2024, so this is not a tomorrow thing for them. They'd have some time to yell at us and scream and get angry and go through the steps of grief and hopefully be partners with it or not.

At this point, I don't have an answer for you on that willingness of theirs, but again, we have a great relationship. I really do think that. We've been able to overcome some impasses in the past and have worked together collaboratively for the betterment of community, so I would hope they would see the reason.

We've explained the reasons why we feel this proposal is necessary and the relocation and the use of Rousseau due to its connection to the courthouse with a tunnel underneath, the building connections mechanically and electrically to the two buildings, and the proximity. It's just a great re-purposing and refit for us. Those would be the next steps outlined. Since this is a discussion, I'll ask for questions.

Chairman Kerley: Miss Curry-Campbell.

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: Thank you for being here this morning. You didn't say the word jail, but I did hear address 101 E Superior, which is the Bud Meeks building which is connected to the jail. I didn't see 101 E superior in your plan for 2026. Like I say, our city is in an uproar about conversations about the word jail.

Mr. Cloud: I understand. We hear it.

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: With that being said, when would 101 E Superior, the Bud Meeks building, come into play with this move?

Mr. Cloud: I would say it depends. This was in our filing to the federal court this week. One of the things the county could do, needs to do, is new construction of some sort of facility has to take place. It's just the reality of the current jail facility. Some new construction has taken place.

The question really is the size and location, but size of that component. It is hypothetically possible to reuse the new towers that were built in 2000, 2001, somewhere around that time, and the 234 beds that are there, in addition to a second smaller facility built somewhere else. If you would do that, then you would retain Bud Meeks for however long of time the life of that building has. It's 20 years old at this point, but however long.

If you would find or we would find that that is not cost-effective to do, then whenever the new facility is done, then this would be an excess property. I don't know that the county has determined yet what the best way to handle that is and be the size to know if this is the right idea and then just the cost. It's really a cost-benefit analysis of, does operating two facilities-- and one of them being 20 years old and potentially the aging out and needs to be replaced anyway-- is it a good idea? I'll use that phrase.

I'm not the person to answer that question, but it's something we have to figure out before we just decide to go build a massive building somewhere. If we would do that, then Traffic and Misdemeanors could stay there. I would not want to. I want to consolidate them in the courts, but they are a small component of that building. The biggest part of that building is the new addition for the jail, but timing-wise becomes less of a question. You could phase it later, you could do it in the beginning, you'd have more time, but when we could dispose of that building is entirely dependent on whether or not it is adaptively reused or not.

If it's not, then it's whenever the rest of the jail is not needed. If it is, it's whenever the life of the building is expired and the county decides to build onto whatever is built now and expand. It's a TBD truly up in the air of don't know yet, but the other ones we do know. They'd be consolidated, they'd be totally available. There's no issues on those. I couldn't tell you today exactly when that will be available because we haven't decided yet the function-

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: I just want people at home to hear you say that.

Mr. Cloud: Yes, it's still a question.

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: Like I say the word "jail" has something that has been flowing in the community about we're building a jail on the south side of Fort Wayne, and try to explain to people it's a process. It's a long, long process. I'll probably be dead and gone by the time you build this jail.

Mr. Cloud: I hope not.

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: My concern is that we be very transparent with folks, not afraid to say the word "jail" and to make sure that people hear us, that we're not building a jail on the south side of Fort Wayne. Thank you.

Mr. Cloud: Thank you for the platform. Whatever we do will be the largest public works project in Allen County. The commissioners have committed to making it as publicly transparent as possible. There's a website, allencounty@us.jail. Anything we can post there, we'll post there. Our order that we filed with the court Monday is there. The 1263 study they did in January is there. As anything becomes available and updates become available, that's where it's going to be.

In addition, every Friday, the commissioners in their legislative session have put an item called update, where updates in the process, things they learn, and whatever, they are sharing publicly. The message is not lost and has not been lost on them from the beginning that the public cares about that. There may be a lot of things government does that the public just isn't interested in. This is one they're interested in, and you can't do it privately. It needs to be done publicly. That's not lost on them.

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: Thank you.

Chairman: Councilman Fries.

Councilman Fries: Mr. Cloud, you talk about the big remodel we did 10 to 12 years ago with Rousseau Center when the city said they wanted to move out, and I told the commissioners, "Let them move out and we'll just take the Rousseau Center," which was a city-county building. We didn't do that. We spent a lot of money on the big remodel. You know what we spent 10 to 12 years ago between the Rousseau Center and Citizen Square?

Mr. Cloud: We spent nothing on Citizen Square.

Councilman Fries: Remodel?

Mr. Cloud: No. City covered that. That was how we arranged it. My recollection, because we did spend a fair amount of money on asbestos abatement because of some areas that we gutted, I think all in ended up being four-five, four-six maybe, but a million and a half of that may have been abatement. It was an extensive amount of abatement. We also did the change order to remove the escalator. That ended up being \$450,000 change for the security of the second floor.

Councilman Fries: Do you know how much over budget that was?

Mr. Cloud: It's been long enough I couldn't remember. Over budget versus change in plans. We didn't plan on the escalator that was requested by the previous Sherriff. We accommodated that for good reasons, for the security minister, we have accounted that. The asbestos abatement, I think until they got into it, they didn't know, but even then that was budgeted. It was probably a couple of hundred thousand dollars over maybe what we had thought it was going to be based on things we ran into or found. Again, it's been long enough.

Councilman Fries: Are those numbers available someplace, do we know?

Mr. Cloud: Gosh. Probably, but in a drawer somewhere of our big binder of things. The overall cost, we have claims from past payments, so we know the overall cost. We know the bid and so you can do the-

Councilman Fries: What I'm getting at is, I hate to go to the public and say, "We need to spend another \$49 million of your tax money," when the economy is tanking the way it is, when just 10 or 12 years ago, we spent a bunch of their money remodeling that and we're going to remodel it again.

I often say in county government, it seems as though we're very short-sighted. We need to make sure that we do look to the future that this is going to be something that lasts. You talk about the Meeks Justice Center. If that does have to get removed, I don't know why you couldn't just go ahead and build there for more of a jail and keep it all in one complex. You'd have to check the price, I suppose, but I have a hard time telling the public we're going to spend another \$49 million on top of what we have spent for the jail when people can't pay their taxes.

Mr. Cloud: I understand that, but I would argue that this is forward-looking. That's the whole point. That's what we heard from council last year is, be forward-looking, so that's the proposal.

Councilman Fries: We thought that was 10 or 12 years ago.

Mr. Cloud: I don't know that that was the unanimous belief of why we did what we did. I think it was to preserve a relationship that at the time was necessary to preserve. I think everyone has a different opinion on why or what we did.

Councilman Harris: I've got 100 questions, which I will not ask, but one of them is that we would not want to put an escalator back in the Rousseau Center. Is that fair?

Mr. Cloud: You could not.

Councilman Harris: Good. Thank you.

Mr. Cloud: You could put stairs in, though.

Councilman Harris: Just checking.

Mr. Cloud: If you wanted to get light from the lovely well-designed likes-

Councilman Harris: The monies that were put into the Rousseau Center and the investment and the renovations would still remain with the county at that point under this plan.

Mr. Cloud: Again, not having really thought about that building much over the last 10 years, as I've put that whole process out of mind with new things that have gone on in the last 10 years. The part of the building I could say would be an absolute loss would be that we would not need the, for lack of a better term, interrogation, the questioning areas for suspects. Those are really heavily built areas. That would be something we wouldn't need, but the rest of it, office space is office space.

Large parts of that building are just open areas or offices. That would absolutely be able to be reused but there are certain parts that were custom done for public safety purposes. Clearly,

those may not be needed or may not be usable for whoever would have that area. Obviously, the goal would be to reuse as much as possible. It's a goal for any remodeling you do is to reuse as much as existing infrastructure as possible to lower your overall cost.

Councilman Harris: What would the estimate be? This is a tough one, right? How do you quantify efficiencies in moving everybody into another new building? You really can't.

Mr. Cloud: I can't. This is one of the problems the government universally has is, because we don't make a product or necessarily have sales of a service or product, it is harder for us to put in number too, if we take this action, it will result in X. It is all anecdotal. I fully admit that, that much of what we do, it's anecdotal evidence.

Councilman Harris: Just as in looking at the jail piece, what about the length of time this goes out? Is this a 30-year investment per se for that office building?

Mr. Cloud: Well first off, the appraisal noted the buildings, I think it was built in 1975. It's in good shape. The current owner has made some improvements to it. Part of the remodeling cost is additional building envelope mechanical system boiler chiller upgrades to make sure that the building is move-in ready and updated. It's not like we're going in and leaving those things for future capital costs down the road. This is an all-in number to try to get it.

It's still an almost 50-year-old building. Rousseau is a 50-year-old building. If we had not moved out and done the arrangement we did for this building in 2011, that building in 2012, we'd probably still be in Rousseau until I'm retired from county government, because these buildings are built well. They're built to last.

The commercial buildings or these high-rises are well constructed. They're adaptably reused, they can be remodeled. The issue is just keeping up with the building envelope and mechanical electrical stuff. Part of this, I think, it's maybe close to 4 million of that 19 for remodeling is those bigger system things so that they're all done and be done with.

Councilman Harris: It would be anticipated that we'd be there for 20 or 30 years? Is that fair to say?

Mr. Cloud: I believe I'm retiring in 2048, and I never intend to move if we would do this.

Councilman Harris: I know it's a 'me' world, but it's not necessarily-

Mr. Cloud: No, it's a great question, though. That's why I say building towards the future. What we didn't do 10, 12 years ago with all of this, is we did not look to the future. Again, my opinion of what we did, preserving the relationship that was there because, at the time, it needed to be preserved.

Picking on the permitting department side, we didn't have a cell. Everything was hand-routed. You needed to be in close proximity with city and county. It's not the same today as it was back then. I'm not sure that that proximity is as important, but my goal is that this would be the county administrative head for generations to come and they'll never know any different that there was ever any place else because this is where we've been. Same for the courthouse. Long-term, that courthouse doesn't go anywhere. A, we spent a lot of money maintaining to make it look as beautiful as it is. It's been there for I think 120 years. It's not going anywhere. It's there. Rousseau Center, we couldn't beat the proximity of the two facilities. It's there. Yes,

this is not looked at, in 15 years, future councils getting to see my face and asking for another 49 million. That is definitely not our intent with this.

Councilman Harris: You try to figure out the efficiencies, and then the flip side of the equation is you try to figure out risk. I don't know that we need to have that discussion right now, but it would be interesting to understand from a commissioner's perspective, what is the risk analysis of what could go wrong. What might be the errors that could be made in purchasing that building both in terms of structure but also in terms of just strategy for the county? Again, we don't need to do that right now, but between now and that June time, I'd like to have some understanding of that risk analysis.

Mr. Cloud: Could you clarify 'risk?'

Councilman Harris: Again, from a structural standpoint, building location, all that stuff, but also from a county efficiency effectiveness standpoint, what might be at risk here.

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: The street building, sir?

Councilman Harris: Yes.

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: Oh, okay. Thank you.

Councilman Harris: Yes. Trying to understand what might, because we want to understand the benefit, but we want to understand that risk too. Then finally, the last question I want to ask is, the city has to go first in this discussion. Is that fair? Because they have to come back and say, "Yes, we're willing to do something with you." Otherwise, it's a mute issue about that facility or what? There's other options for us, but for that-

Mr. Cloud: Internally, I've called this project Domino because that's what it is. It's a series of dominos. The first domino is easy. We buy a building, we relocate our own departments. We have total and 100% control over that process. Always like to have control over what we do as a county.

The second part is the city moving out and relocating to somewhere, probably Citizen Square and RPSA. I couldn't tell you what that is. Yes. If that doesn't happen, this is pointless. You know what I mean? Because the whole point of this is the Rousseau part.

Councilman Luis: Is it fair to say, between now and that June meeting, you're going to get some assurance from administration, city administration?

Mr. Cloud: No.

Councilman Harris: You may not get it?

Mr. Cloud: There's no chance between now and June that we get positive feedback from the administration where they say, "I have no concerns. This is a wonderful idea. We have no problem with it." That's where the owner of the building offering to buy it back and putting that in writing and committing to it. Actually, the way they would do it is they would basically keep the money in Escrow to buy it back. That's the only reason I'm bringing this to you because that risk is the risk. That is a 100% the risk, from my perspective of all this, and has been from day one, is the city. I can't control the city.

Again, we've been partners with the city for a long time on a lot of projects that we're big, complex, complicated, risky, contentious projects. We have found a way often to find middle ground and work together. I don't doubt that we can. I just can't promise you it's going to happen between now and June 19th. Mr. Lagemann.

Councilman Lagemann: A couple of quick questions, Chris. Thanks for being here. 911 is already in the process of considering a move. Is that correct?

Mr. Cloud: There is a committee of sorts, city county, CCP who are looking at that. They, I believe at this point, are either looking at a relocation or a secondary backup, but probably a relocation. I'm not on that committee. Yes, that is their goal, I think, is to be in a more hardened, appropriate for their usage facility as opposed to in an office building.

Councilman Lagemann: Community Corrections, I know when they went into that building initially-- I don't have the institutional knowledge, I wasn't necessarily involved in those conversations obviously-- but the degree of expansion of the department. If everything works out and we make this move, you're confident that Community Corrections is going to have adequate space?

Mr. Cloud: There are sufficient spaces left over after the consolidation for them to grow in their back-office area. I can't speak for Camon on how that growth has occurred, but the largest growth for them has probably been program participants.

All those workers, they've grown in workers and they've got people triple bunked in offices, and that needs to get fixed, and that obviously is a concern. They also have a lot of people coming through the door. That's classroom space, that's meeting room space with their-- I became a case manager person, that area will grow with participants, the officicary has probably grown at a less rapid pace over the last how many years they've been there since the late 90s. Yes, I believe there is adequate space in that building left over if they would need to take over for additional office space. The constraint for them is always going to be what new thing the state-- or for anyone in the court system, what new thing the state might push our way, that they suddenly have to offer program for, that involves stirring up a staff and things like that.

Councilman Lagemann: I know there is a conversation about the inter-local agreement with DPS, and I think to some degree the building department, how do you see this because those are combined departments, how do you see that trouble with the county?

Mr. Cloud: Building department is-

Councilman Lagemann: It's a county that serves.

Mr. Cloud: -combined, but it's a little different, that's a county department, fully county. The DPS merger with the land inside of city plan because they still retained planning stuff. I, personally, again, I'm not in those conversations and I can be naïve, but I don't see why it matters where they're located. The people start with DPS, the fact that DPS is not in the same building as the city administration or the city plan side that is more doing neighborhood plans and downtown planning and not necessarily land use planning.

Again, they have phones, they have technology, they have video conferencing, it's a quarter-mile south. If that causes that much disruption to operations, I think we're doing it wrong. If

that's that big of a deal, being a quarter-mile, we can't get business done. I can't speak to how the city might feel about them not being in one place, if hypothetically, the city and county were to say, or the city were to say, "This is around the same building, we're taking that function back," nothing changes on our part.

DPS still takes permits for unincorporated Allen County, and that's the thing, is you didn't merge planning commission and the BZA, those are all still separate. We inherited I think five staff members from the city, that's really what we inherited in that move. We would just need to figure out what a right-sized department looks like, but I would hope it's proven it's worth to everyone in the community over these last years. It's functioned very well in addition to the directors going well, I think it's going well.

Councilman Lagemann: I would say so, and having DPS and the billing department in the same space.

Mr. Cloud: They need to be together, that's the thing, so many people go from DPS to billing department, that's a natural segue. While the billing department to their credit, former director K Wood really pushes, they do more and more permits online. Who really doesn't come online are individual homeowners who do this once every decade, they have no idea what they're doing, they want to talk to somebody and they need more handling, same for DPS. The developers, they know the process, it's really the people who come in with, "I don't know what to do." You need those departments together because there is a lot of overlap with them.

Councilman Lagemann: I would agree. Then, finally, the number of buildings we have downtown, obviously like highway garage, the Sheriff's space and range and training facility, those kinds of things are different kinds of necessities, but how many buildings do we have downtown?

Mr. Cloud: Geo complex, Small claims, community corrections, Reserve Center, Prosecutors Office, CDS. We have the service center, which is where our vehicle's fleet's maintained, part of it at least not the non-highway stuff. What we have in the Reserve Center, Courthouse if I didn't say that, Prosecutors Office, maybe 10 facilities, some office buildings, some just little things, but 8 to 10.

Councilman Lagemann: Okay, very good, thank you.

Mr. Cloud: Tom, I think you still have 86 questions left if you want, happy to go through them all.

Councilman Armstrong: Can I ask one more?

Chairman Kerley: Mr. Armstrong, please.

Councilman Armstrong: Could you give me your, for us, a hard copy of that presentation?

Mr. Cloud: Yes, I'll email it to you, right after this.

Councilman Armstrong: All right, thank you.

Chairman Kerley: I think councilman Fries also had a question.

Councilman Fries: I have so many.

Councilman Armstrong: I know, me too, but just in terms of one of those risk things, the parking, if we're going to move all these people to a different building what's the parking look like. Let's say three years from now, somebody decided, "I don't want a parking garage, or I'm going to flatten that and put another building in," do we lose the parking or does that go with the agreement or what happens?

Mr. Cloud: We would lease parking spaces. The Abridge Points LOC bought the Lincoln building, this building, three outlots plus their parking garage, Lincoln parking garage, from Chrysler's Pension Fund. Don't ask me why pension fund owned it, it's good rental rate, I guess it makes sense for a long-term investment for them. Abridge Points owns all of that, but again, because of tax implications, if they sell us that lot, the person who bought it has to pay tax on the tax deferring they're trying to do.

We would lease those spots just like we lease right now for people in Citizens Square, we lease very spot we park in for this building. There is sufficient parking in that parking lot to handle our employees and there's sufficient parking out front to handle customers as well with knocking out our small plazas there. There could be 100 spots there out front that should be sufficient for the interest we have.

Then on the other side, part of our arrangement with Fort Wayne, when we donated our jail parking lot to the city for the lovely Headwaters project that is almost complete, which is looking great, is we get an entire floor of parking in that building. We have 287 spots. Between Reserve garage, that garage and the flat lot that we're talking about, just south of this building, there is sufficient parking for our downtown police.

Councilman Armstrong: Do we own the parking lot on the other side of Mikes carwash, near the--

Mr. Cloud: We wouldn't own anything else, we would lease. We would tie that into this arrangement as well.

Councilman Armstrong: Okay, thank you.

Chairman Kerley: Councilman Fries.

Councilman Fries: [chuckles] Do you know, when we moved dispatch from the basement up to the 8th floor, wherever it is, how much did we spend doing that, was that the whole part of that \$4 million?

Mr. Cloud: No, it was actually a later day, it was six, eight months later. We did the bulk of the work with County Maintenance Labor, [unintelligible 01:36:48] ran miles of Cat 6 cable.

Councilman Fries: I go back to no site now looking into the future, because at the time we complained about the fact that it was not a hardened facility. That a dispatch center should not be in a facility like this, but yet we moved it there, and now we're talking about moving it again.

Mr. Cloud: I'm not the decision-maker of those decisions. I will disagree. I think they wanted to be there but-

Councilman Fries: They wanted windows, I work in dispatch many, many years [crosstalk]-

Mr. Cloud: It's exactly what it was.

Councilman Fries: -they wanted windows.

Mr. Cloud: That's exactly what it was. It's a better environment than the basement, but it may not have been the best place in the long run. Also, the time we did that, money was very tight, and had been for a little while.

Councilman Fries: Just like now. It will be, it's going to be tighter.

Councilman Lagemann: We talked about obviously looking at those future buildings, building to the future. I look back to the Elevator Study from last year, community corrections was obviously on their needing space. Criminal Services Division was on their needing space, were there any other departments or standalone buildings that were in that list that needed more-

Mr. Cloud: I believe Superior Court was on the list for needing additional office space. The other challenge the county runs into in the future is, and I'm really naïve about how this process works, but if down the road because of case volume there added another superior court judge, there's obviously stuff that goes with a judge besides office staff and whatever.

I can't tell you that the courthouse won't have to accommodate additional courtrooms in the future, I have no idea. Again, we're thinking 20, 30, 40 years, I couldn't tell you, if the state would ever do this. If it would ever go to regional courts for something. It's really a state court function that we're doing locally, paying for locally, but it's a state court function.

If they would change the way they arrange things and we would pick up smaller counties around this court. I couldn't tell you that that building, because it can't be expanded, the courthouses are fixed envelope. I think that's everyone that had a need, but it's not to say there wouldn't be a future. Down the road, we might need, but those were the ones that were identified specifically in the study.

Councilman Lagemann: Going back, community corrections, Criminal Service Divisions, if we wouldn't go this route and we keep going the piece mill route that the county's used for the last 40 or 50 years, where we moved from building to building and keep shifting around, we'd still probably be looking at a 25 million to 30 million spend for two departments? Would that be your estimate?

Mr. Cloud: If the one we looked at last year was 11 or 12 just for one, then you add CDS onto that, and anything else, other challenges, land downtown is harder and harder to come by, which is great. That means that we're growing and businesses are developing, a star took up a parking lot to build their new building. I think there's another one just down the block, did similar. The flat lots are going away and they'll continue to go away. Finding land downtown is going to become harder in years to come.

Given the proximity, these departments need to have to the courts, it becomes a bit of a benefit to us to put them all in one building because we own it. It can't go away. It's got some area for growth in the future and so we aren't going to be in a situation where 10, 15 years from now we're paying an arm and a leg to try and get a small little postage stamp of a lot. We're renting space in somebody else's building just to make it work. Yes, we would be in the same boat.

Depending again, what would happen with Bud Meeks, got to put that somewhere. I don't have any other space downtown. Right now there is no available office space for Allen County, any building downtown. I can't accommodate a move. I can't accommodate a situation that would come up. An office called us and said, "We're going to have to put people in the basement of our building. We don't really want to do that. Do you have room for these five people?" No, I don't know where I'd get a room from anyone.

I understand it's probably more concerning for me because I do plan to be here until 2048, if they'll allow me to, I am thinking about in the future. It scares me to think about, we have a need in 10 years and we have no solution and we're stuck. I don't want to be stuck. I like controlling our future and controlling our ability to handle future problems that our future space needs that may arise and things that we don't know of yet that might come down to us.

We've seen the growth in the law enforcement and judicial system budget over the last, however many years. Obviously you haven't seen a huge growth in the administrative department side, that just grows at a much smaller rate. It scales slower with population than other things might. If there is an area of our county that's continuing to grow, it's going to be the judicial system, more people, more lawsuits, more divorces, more marriages, more child. The court system does more than criminal issues.

There's civil stuff, administrative stuff, small claims stuff. You go to small claims court, it's busy with just evictions and hold right now, but protective orders, neighbor issues about fences that got to-- There's just a lot of people in small claims court. That traffic gets bigger as the community gets bigger in size and we are going to keep getting bigger in size thankfully.

Chairman Kerley: Mr. Armstrong.

Councilman Armstrong: Explain to me, we purchased this building and we're going to sell off community corrections, and I call it the old highway building.

When we go to sell those two-owned, county-owned buildings, do those go to sell on market value? Because you just said, "We know those two corners are hotpots."

Mr. Cloud: Indiana code requires us with only one exception, to sell property for no less than the average of two appraisals. Those are market value appraisals. We can sell for more and if we can great, but we can't sell for less. The only exception is if you wanted to sell property for an economic development reason, you can hold a public hearing and there is a process for that.

Even then there's a margin where you can't just give something away because you want to. There are all sorts of arrangements you could figure out with somebody, a long-term lease or something like that. Effectively we'd be required to sell them for market value. I will tell you that as part of this deal Via Developments wants to buy those two buildings and they want to make it as part of this deal. They've offered to, at whatever, the average two appraisals is at a minimum, buy small claims in the community corrections building.

Even if we had stay in them for a while, we would negotiate a small rent to cover their caring cost of-- and we pay obviously utilities like we still do now. They want to buy them as soon as possible. There is a market for these properties. Thankfully the massive investment the city has made with our tax dollars on the riverfront has increased the value of those properties and

will increase the value of all our properties downtown, which is again, goes back to putting them to their highest and best use.

There are important to us uses, but better uses from the community going forward for some of these smaller buildings. To us, they're critical. We cannot have them for something or have them somewhere, but we definitely cannot give them away, we can't do sweetheart deals to people. It's the average of two appraisals, is the state law and you all have to approve sales as well.

Councilman Fries: They wouldn't get preferential treatment. Somebody else could come in and offer more and still get it.

Mr. Cloud: Sure. We, more than likely we'd have to put for sale signs out and you can do an auction. There's three or four methods for disposing of a property. You can do auctions, you can do for sale signs. Again, the economic development thing, but we don't have that now. There's no agreement with them, but they would like them. It's not a contingent part of this, but they offered, they think there's-- They actually have somebody who right now could already use one of the buildings.

Councilman Fries: Is there a parent company to these two places that own this and are managing it?

Mr. Cloud: Ambassador Enterprises is the apparent company of Via Development. Abridge, LLC, much like every development in anywhere is just a shell that the owner starts just for that project, just like every development of a neighborhood is a new LLC for that development. Via is a subsidiary of Ambassador.

Councilman Fries: All right. Thank you, Mr. President.

Chairman Kerley: Mr. Harris.

Mr. Harris: One of the pains that I have on this is that it takes away office space from the private sector. Here's government sucking up, if you will, available space that could be used. Then I balance that with the fact that they've been trying to fill that building, trying to sell the building and nobody's buying and nobody's going in, and now they're wanting to get rid of it because of--

Mr. Cloud: It's been for at least, I think, close to two years.

Mr. Harris: Yes. Then I ask, okay, why is that not happening? Is it because they're located by the federal building post office location that nobody wants to move into or all the movement is happening in another part of downtown? Then if government takes that available space to the private sector, does that drive the private sector to put another building downtown? Because they need the space, right? Does that happen?

Mr. Cloud: There's a lot of available office space downtown, it's just not in one place. That's why this is attractive for us because the-- There's office space available for office suites for downtown.

Mr. Harris: I'm saying another company could have come downtown and bought that, a big company, right?

Mr. Cloud: They could have.

Mr. Harris: That's not happening, but if somebody else wanted to locate downtown by government taking that available space, if another large company wants to locate in the downtown arena, they're going to end up building a building of some kind. That comes to mind. All those things--

Mr. Cloud: Is that a negative for us?

Mr. Harris: No, I'm not saying it's negative. I'm just saying it's a balance trying to understand.

Mr. Cloud: From your perspective, I think if we weren't vacating other buildings and selling them back and we were taking more space, the concern would be greater for the availability of space downtown. There is available space downtown, not a lot of it, but there is available space, but it's pockets in buildings. That's the challenge for us and for any large business, they need 30,000, 40,000 or 50,000 square feet, but they can only get 10,000 here and 5,000 there and 1,000 there.

Mr. Harris: Lot of it's, but this potentially could drive additional growth for the city of downtown city.

Mr. Cloud: Sure. It's certainly an area of downtown that the baseball has been there forever. At this point's been there for over a decade and you've seen cityscape flats. You've seen some stuff on Jefferson, but you haven't seen a lot of other private development take place there. It seems to be more Harrison and the riverfront seems to be where more of that new construction's taking place. One thing to keep in the back of your mind, which is slightly terrifying to me is that Lincoln's lease on that building only goes through 29.

They're not obligated to be in thereafter 29, and when Via, who owns that has talked to them, they've asked, "Well, let's extend this. Let's keep you here." Apparently Lincoln is taking a very short view of leases on properties around the country. Just probably given just the times and things, they're not willing to make long-term commitments. That's a long-term concern for me, is that you may end up with Lincoln saying, "Everyone, you're either going to go to Philly or North Carolina, work from home and we're going to abandon a 600,000 square foot office building."

That would be a concern to me, for sure. 200,000 square feet of RD empty building that they can't find someone to take. I think it's proximity if I'm being honest of, I think people who move downtown, they're doing that much likely do it best they want to be. It's about the environment of the office space just as much as it is being downtown. They want their employees to what she had talked about. Those incentives, those inducements to work for us. They want to, for lack of a term, cool office.

Mr. Harris: This isn't exactly close, but it proximity-wise, I guess it's a little bit closer to the electric works facility. Putting in a large group of county employees in that building-

Mr. Cloud: The neighbors are-

Mr. Harris: -a little bit more than walking distance to electric works, but we've invested in electric works and this would be pumping-

Mr. Cloud: Yes, we are investors.

Mr. Harris: -people resources down that way.

Mr. Cloud: Yes. The neighbors or the post office at this and Fort Wayne's administration building, in the federal courthouse, it's a very government area already, but I definitely don't see a lot of bars and restaurants opening up right next door to this in the future. I think it's probably is what it is and we'll see not much there. That's just my lack of--

Mr. Harris: Except for Powers hamburgers.

Mr. Cloud: Except for what?

Mr. Harris: Powers hamburgers.

Mr. Cloud: That will stay.

Councilman Armstrong: Mr. Cloud, just so I'm clear, there would be no attachment whatsoever to the sale, the current community corrections building to this purchase then, correct?

Mr. Cloud: No. They just expressed they would be interested in that.

Councilman Armstrong: There's an interest, but there's no legal option.

Mr. Cloud: They would not require of us that they'd be tied together. They just have expressed interest if that would make a difference because they're a development company, but what they don't do is they don't tend to buy bare ground and build stuff. They like to buy existing office spaces. I think they've owned some apartment complexes in Cincinnati, that they prefer to be more of a property manager renter sort of thing that are built from the ground up. A small office building in downtown is a sweet spot for them. I think of investment, but no, not tied together at all.

Councilman Armstrong: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Cloud: Council, the only thing I'd ask of you, just as direction of is, do you want to continue the conversation? There is a time-sensitive factor to this for the building owner. We've been working with them for a while, I want to be respectful of their time. They have been generous with the time they've allowed me to work through this. Is this a conversation you want to continue? I just can't, that's the only objection I really need is--

Chairman Kerley: Oh, you said you're coming back in June.

Mr. Cloud: I want to come back in June, but I also want to answer any questions and make sure that if you have questions that come my way, and we can get those answered for you that-- I'm just saying we don't have--

Councilman Fries: I don't know how it can be answered without a vote. We can't vote.

Mr. Cloud: Oh, I'm not asking. Well, you--

Councilman Fries: Because I'm going to say no when somebody else may say yes.

Mr. Cloud: Just if you want to carry on the conversation, I'm happy to keep carrying this, but I will put it on the agenda for June. That doesn't mean you have to take it up.

Chairman Kerley: I was going to say, I would hope you would come back in June, because one, we owe the owners an answer-

Mr. Cloud: I think we do. Yes.

Chairman Kerley: -publicly and we also owe community corrections and some of those other two judges and an answer on what our direction is as well.

Mr. Cloud: I would agree. April 2021 on that request, we didn't go that way. If you don't go this way, we still are in that. We need a solution for this. I don't currently have a plan B. My Plan B is probably new construction. There's not a lot of available space downtown. That's for sale, that we haven't already looked at and tried a vet so we'd be looking at probably new construction as at least something to consider, but I don't really have something else in the works at the moment. This is where what's made sense is this larger plan for all this.

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: Mr. President, what would make you a yes? Because you said publicly you would vote no. I think he needs to know that. Why are you saying no.

Councilman Fries: I have a variety of reasons. The biggest one is \$49 million.

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: \$49 million.

Councilman Fries: That when we have the jail expansion or something come right on top of that, and who knows how much that's going to be. There's so much money for the taxpayers, a burden for them.

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: The working conditions, I think is the biggest complaint that we've heard from community corrections, what would we do to satisfy that?

Councilman Fries: I don't know, we'd look at it.

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: I'm sorry?

Councilman Fries: We have to look at it. I don't know.

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: Okay. Because I believe that's one of the biggest challenges is that some of the working conditions is overwhelming. Yes, there's no space.

Councilman Fries: Is that worth \$49 million to taxpayers? That's my question. That's what I'm trying to justify.

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: Okay. Thank you.

Chairman Kerley: Well, further questions please direct them to Mr. Cloud.

Mr. Cloud: Please. My intention in June is to come back with your abrogation, but also a suggested idea of paying for the future cost of this because obviously right now it's only the building purchase cost later use, but we've some ideas for that. I understand your concern. It's a big number, it's not lost anyone's big number. I understand. Anyway, please, if you have

questions, information, you want to see the place, whatever, just let me know, we can understand.

Chairman Kerley: Thank you, Mr. Cloud.

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: Thank you, Mr. Cloud, and you're going to email this to us.

Mr. Cloud: Yes, I will do that. I want to get back to my desk.

Councilwoman Curry-Campbell: Liaison reports.

Councilman Lagemann: Just a couple of things I wanted to mention, first of all, NIRCC is going to be coming to Personnel Committee, they will have a request for one additional person with all the influx of the transportation bill opportunities. That's a \$2 trillion bill. One of the key things that are part of this bill is to be able to have federal assistance on secondary roads.

Places like Hand, Carroll, a lot of these key roads out Northeast, and I certainly am concerned about that, because that's where a lot of buildings come in, but the secondary roads that wouldn't otherwise have assistance, they need another person to help run point on making sure that we get our fair share of those dollars, and it doesn't go to Peoria or Indianapolis or wherever else.

There'll become personnel and just wanted to make everybody aware of that. Then secondly, want to hit on DPS over 3000 lots platted so far this year, which is got to be a record somewhere. One of the things that we're working on right now is to expand the permitting. We've had single-family-connected homes that have had to go to the board of zoning appeals multiple times, it always gets the yes vote, and always comes through, no controversy.

This is row housing for all intents and purposes that you own. You own the land, you own the house, it just happens to be connected to your neighbor. We're going to move that or that has been discussed and will be on the agenda this afternoon to move that on to the business meeting coming up next week. Pretty exciting stuff going on in those two areas.

Voter Registration is very busy because apparently there is two things happening, potential remonstrations of \$100 million library ask. I have a feeling that we're going to have some petitions coming in, sounds like, or at least they think so. Then there is an independent candidate for Congress, who is also rolling in tons and tons of petitions, which is very interesting, and surprising. Those were a few big items on some of my liaisons.

Councilman Fries: As far as your NIRCC position, I think, if I remember correctly, from what I saw from Personnel Committee notes is that that position is budgeted or funded until 2024 budget cycle. There's a concern that if we take that position on, that in 2024, if we really take it on, I'm going to tell him if it's not funded in 2024, the position goes away.

Councilman Lagemann: Yes. Two things about that, first of all, the county's component cost component's about \$10,000, the other I believe, a little over \$40,000, right around \$40,000 is covered by the federal state. The only \$10,000 per year that we'd be looking at from a county expenditure standpoint. Then when I asked Dan, "Hey, what happens if A, the economy tanks, and we're backing off construction, and everything that's happening now

doesn't happen, that goes away?" He's ready to let it go away. If it's right now, they're just super under the gun.

The one consistent call that I get on a really regular basis from neighborhood associations, from individuals is, "Hey, we built all these neighborhoods on secondary chip and seal roads. They need to be wider. They need to be paved, they need to accommodate the level of traffic that we're seeing out here. We're growing faster than some of the roads can't accommodate. How are you going to fix that?" The nice thing is NIRCC has some options to help answer that question. It's not a panacea, but it helps us get there. One step in the right direction, at least.

Councilman Armstrong: Is there-- Oh, I'm sorry, go ahead.

Councilman Lagemann: No, go ahead.

Councilman Armstrong: To Kenny, to your comment since a lot of that growth is outlet Huntertown area, can Huntertown help fund any of that if it goes away?

Councilman Lagemann: I didn't answer that question.

Chairman Kerley: I guess my only update would piggyback off, Paul, I guess, is I'm working with Mrs McGauley. Obviously, in the last six or seven months, we've had two companies come before us for housing abatements, which is new. The state this year also passed farm abatements into the system. At a minimum, not only for ourselves but for future councils, we need to develop some scoresheets because the one for commercial industrial maintenance abatements does just not fit either of those requirements.

I have a meeting with her this afternoon to see what she's found from other communities and other areas that have some scoresheets. My loss of bringing up with her about what steps we may need to take to start addressing some of these public safety issues and in terms of the payment in lieu of taxes or things like that as well. I'm glad that Southwest came today to raise those concerns.

Mr. Armstrong: In my thought that they won't be alone in those concerns, although it's unique to their one major client that they're assisting out there, but the challenge of budgets and departments and government entities getting squeezed just like every business out there is coming our way, you can feel it.

I think we have to think that way that the stock market dropping, went 1100 yesterday. If those choppy waters are coming our way, we've got about a two-year cushion, maybe three. I think our auditor tells us before we start facing some real tough decisions, so we've got to keep all that in mind as well.

Chairman Kerley: That's something too that's not going to go away. They're dealing with personnel shortages due to the training that's required and coverage issues. We need to keep it at the forefront.

Mr. Armstrong: is Nick back here?

Nick: Yes.

Mr. Armstrong Nick, I got a question for you since highway was here and talked about diesel fuel, gasoline stuff, have you heard any other comments or anything from any other departments that are struggling with their fuel lines?

Nick: No, no as of now.

Mr. Armstrong: Not yet?

Nick: No. They can transfer within series or some could be transferring if they're having an issue, but you got to think highway and Sheriff's Department are probably the heaviest users as far as driving. Potentially the assessors maybe if they're out in the field, things like that that could run into a bind. As of now, I have no-- We're only a quarter of the way through the year also.

Mr. Armstrong: Right. I might be wrong on this, but in years past, they always bid out or sign a contract for set price for fuel. I think it's in August into September, somewhere in there. It'll be interesting to see what purchasing plans on doing now because I don't see gas going down.

Nick: Yes, I don't know. I think historically--

Mr. Armstrong: I don't know what the lock number would even be. Okay, thanks.

Mr. Armstrong: Mr. President, I'm moved for the approval to waive the second reading of any manner approved today which may be deemed necessary for the county council meeting of May 19, 2022.

Councilman Lagemann: Second.

Mr. President: Of motion, second, all those in favor say, "Aye." Motion is approved 7-0. The next county council regular meeting will be held at 8:30 AM, Thursday, June 16, 2022, in Chambers room of Citizens Square and I will entertain a motion to adjourn. We are adjourned.