

## **COUNTY COUNCIL REGULAR MEETING – JANUARY 14, 2008**

The meeting was called to order by President, John Price.

### **I. ROLL CALL**

The following members were present: Charles Canary, Steve Hollenbeck, Josh McCarty, Beth Boyce, Ron West, and Anita Knowles. Phil Wilson was present as the Council's attorney.

### **II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

### **III. INVOCATION**

### **IV. APPROVAL OF 1/14/08 AGENDA**

Mr. Price commented that he would like to add under New Business, the County Assessor, Marla Hash to give the Council an update on the business with the DLGF.

Mr. McCarty moved to approve the agenda as amended. Mrs. Boyce seconded the motion that unanimously carried.

### **V. APPROVAL OF 12/3/07 MINUTES**

Mr. Canary moved to approve the minutes as presented. Mr. Hollenbeck seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

### **VI. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Vaughn Moore, a taxpayer in White River Township, appeared to ask the Council to consider a referendum on three points: trails, parks, and incorporation. He feels like there are a lot of people saying they want these things and then there are a lot of people saying they don't want these things. The only way to find out is to have a referendum, which will give the people who are going to live with it and pay for it a voice that they might not otherwise have. Again, Mr. Moore respectfully asked the Council to consider a referendum to address three questions: (1) Do you want it? (2) Will you use it? and (3) Are you willing to pay for it?

### **VII. NOMINATION AND ELECTION:**

#### **Council President**

Mr. Canary nominated Josh McCarty as Council President. Mr. Hollenbeck seconded the motion. There were no other nominations. Mr. West then moved to close the nominations. Mrs. Knowles seconded the motion, which unanimously carried. The motion to approve Josh McCarty as Council President carried unanimously.

Mr. McCarty congratulated Mr. Price for the work he did last year while serving as the Council President.

#### **Council Vice-President**

Mr. West nominated Steve Hollenbeck as Council Vice-President. Mr. Price seconded the nomination. There were no other nominations. The motion to approve Steve Hollenbeck as Council Vice-President carried unanimously.

**VIII. APPOINTMENTS:**

**Council Attorney**

Mr. Hollenbeck moved to appoint Mr. Wilson as the Council’s Attorney. Mr. Price seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

**Alcoholic Beverage Commission Board (ABC)**

Mr. McCarty noted that he had received a letter from David Pollard, stating he was interested in still serving on the ABC Board.

Mr. Price made a motion to appoint Mr. Pollard to the ABC Board. Mr. West seconded the motion that unanimously carried.

**Solid Waste (Council member)**

Mr. Canary moved to appoint Mr. Price as the Council representative to Solid Waste. Mrs. Boyce seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

**Plan Commission (Council member)**

Mr. Price moved to appoint Mr. Canary to the Plan Commission Board. Mrs. Knowles seconded the motion that carried unanimously.

**IX. SALARY ORDINANCE AMENDMENTS, ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS, REDUCTIONS, & TRANSFERS:**

**HEALTH MAINTENANCE – (214)**

John Bonsett, Health Administrator, appeared to request a transfer of funds in order to fund the new position that was approved at budget hearings. This new position will be paid contractually and will not receive any benefits. Mr. Bonsett also noted that the State requires that certain “deliverables” be done and without this person, they could not get those ‘deliverables’ done as the State requires.

Mr. Canary just wanted to clarify that this is not new money, just a transfer of funds.

Mr. Bonsett concurred.

Mr. West moved to approve the request as presented. Mrs. Knowles seconded the motion, which unanimously carried.

From: 214.11503.000.214 – Health Specialist	(\$ 36,060.00)
From: 214.14200.000.214 – Social Security	(\$ 2,758.00)
From: 214.14300.000.214 – PERF	(\$ 3,336.00)
From: 214.36201.000.214 – Insurance	(\$ 8,625.00)
To: 214.36102.000.214 – Contractual Services	\$ 50,779.00

**INSPECTION FEES – (276)**

Brian Waterman, Planning Director, appeared to request an appropriation to purchase computer software, maintenance agreements for their scanner/plotter, and to upgrade their building equipment.

Mr. Price moved to approve the request as presented. Mr. Hollenbeck seconded the motion that carried unanimously.

276.20000.000.276 – Claims \$ 10,000.00

**PROSECUTOR DEFERRAL PROGRAM – (327)**

Michelle Murray, Office Administrator, appeared to request an appropriation of funds for the Victim Advocate Supplement line item. She explained that they have not had to use this line item for the past few years; however, they are using it now to give two grants their annual cost of living raise that the rest of the county employees already received. Mrs. Murray also stated that the City of Greenwood and the Indiana State Police are requesting their portion of the fees collected through the traffic deferral program.

Mr. West moved to approve both requests as presented. Mrs. Knowles seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

327.11548.000.327 – Victim Advocate Supplement \$ 3,000.00  
327.33500.000.327 – Deferral Program Participants \$ 15,575.00

**EMERGENCY PLANNING & RIGHT TO KNOW – (212)**

Forrest Sutton, Director, appeared to request the following appropriation of funds into Office Supplies, Travel & Training, and Equipment. He commented that the bulk of these monies came from their Tier II monies, which are fees that hazardous material companies pay to the State.

Mr. Price moved to approve the request as presented. Mr. West seconded the motion, which unanimously carried.

212.21500.000.212 – Office Supplies \$ 977.75  
212.31500.000.212 – Travel & Training \$ 590.55  
212.44100.000.212 – Equipment \$ 7,479.33

**HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION & RECONSTRUCTION – (205)**

Highway Director, Gary Vandegriff, appeared to request an appropriation of funds for the Stones Crossing/Morgantown Road project and to request a part-time hourly rate of \$13.00 to pay a small pool of truck drivers who have a CDL; these drivers would only be used during weather emergency situations.

Mr. Price moved to approve the requests as presented. Mr. Canary seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

201.48100.000.205 – Stones Crossing/Morgantown Road \$ 185,427.38  
201.11400.000.204 – Part-time \$13.00 per hour

**CUMULATIVE BRIDGE – (206)**

Mr. Vandegriff noted that for the Olive Branch/Morgantown Road intersection project, they had money budgeted in 2007 for the right-of-way acquisition; however, they did not get to that point. The only funds they could encumber was for the design contract and the consultant's contract to acquire the right-of-ways; therefore, they are asking that the funds be re-appropriated to actually purchase the right-of-ways.



from that full-time line item into a temporary part-time line item, with an hourly rate of \$21.21 to pay a reserve officer who will be cover the deputy's shift. He has set up a contract with the reserve deputy and this person will not work more than 364 days in a year and they will not have any pension or health benefits, but will be covered under workman's comp.

Mr. Price moved to approve the request as presented. Mrs. Knowles seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

From: 100.11532.000.105 – Deputy	(\$ 42,462.00)
To: 100.11409.000.105 – Part-time Deputy \$21.21 per hour	\$ 42,462.00

Next, the Sheriff noted that at budget hearings, he originally asked for a 5% salary increase for his office staff personnel and was given 3%. He is here again to ask for additional appropriations of \$5,512.00 to allow his office staff another 2% increase to make their salaries comparable to other county offices. Sheriff McLaughlin also commented that every year he has returned funds at the end of the year back to the General Fund. Last year alone, he had over \$400,000 that reverted back to the county. What he would really like to see is a plan in place for all departments to help raise the salaries of the county employees. He added that he spends a tremendous amount of time, money, and effort to get people hired, trained and to come to work.

Mr. Canary commented that he has a problem with allowing additional appropriations so soon after they passed the budgets and does not want to set any precedents for other offices. He doesn't have as much of a problem with transfers, since it is money already available. His main concern is what the State Legislature is going to do, realizing that they may say we have to cut the whole budget or pass an Income Tax – neither of which he wants to do; maybe would should put a freeze on everything. He added that he doesn't disagree that the employees are deserving of these additional funds or even the amount of the increase, he is just trying to look at the bigger picture.

Mr. Price stated that he feels like they need to look at each department and make a prioritized list and try to make salary adjustments accordingly. We need to be pro-active in maintaining our current employees because when there is turnover, there is a greater cost involved; it is counter-productive to the taxpayers.

Mr. Canary agreed that they need to have a plan in place. However, he cautioned that if they allow raises for some departments one year, and then the next year for whatever reason they don't follow through on the raises for the other departments, then they are right back where they started. They need to try to index everyone up at the same pace.

Again, Sheriff McLaughlin relayed that he has reverted revenue back to the county every year and now he is asking for a little of that back for his agency. He does not raid his accounts and is able to revert money back, but he is afraid that other departments may not be so generous. He also understands that not all departments generate revenue and have the capability to revert money back

Mr. Price commented that they need to take the time and come up with a plan and have joint meetings with the departments. Hopefully this will help alleviate some of these problems. He also noted that they need to try hard to stick with the plan.

Mrs. Knowles stated that she would be willing to sit a Special Council Committee of three Council Members to study salaries.

Mr. Price was in agreement with Mrs. Knowles and felt like they need to set some goals that the departments can look forward to.

Mr. West expressed his concern for setting goals because we don't know how the revenue stream is going to be and how it is going to be affected. Goals can only be set if you can correctly project what your revenue is going to be; he feels that we would be misleading the departments. There is no easy answer, it is a tough situation.

Mr. McCarty commented that he feels like they have to take these types of requests on a case-by-case situation.

Mrs. Boyce agreed with Mr. McCarty that the requests need to be addressed on a case-by-case situation. She also concurred with Mr. West, such that they can't promise the departments anything because they don't know what the funding is going to be and she also agreed with Mrs. Knowles as far as meeting with the departments to address these concerns before they are brought before the entire board.

Mr. Canary also added that he agrees that doing nothing is not the answer.

Mr. Price moved to approve the requests for salary increases as presented and retroactive back to January 1, 2008. Mrs. Knowles seconded the motion, which carried five to two; Mr. Canary and Mr. West voted nay.

100.11222.000.105 – Bookkeeper \$29,007 to \$29,570	\$	563.00
100.11701.000.105 – Administrative Asst \$33,959 to \$34,618	\$	659.00
100.12710.000.105 – Investigation Secretary \$27,319 to \$27,849	\$	530.00
100.12720.000.105 – Records/Warrants Clerk \$27,319 to \$27,849	\$	530.00
100.12730.000.105 – Civil Process Clerk \$27,319 to \$27,849	\$	530.00
100.12740.000.105 – Sheriff Sales Clerk \$26,265 to \$26,775	\$	510.00
100.11398.000.105 – Payroll Clerk \$27,319 to \$27,849	\$	530.00
100.12800.000.105 – Computer Adm \$30,900 to \$31,500	\$	600.00

Sheriff McLaughlin then asked for a transfer funds from fund #374 Blitz 53, DUI, and FCRE into their Overtime line item.

Mr. Price moved to approve the transfer in the Overtime line item as requested. Mr. West seconded the motion that carried unanimously.

100.19900.000.105 – Overtime	\$	5,138.14
------------------------------	----	----------

**JAIL – (124)**

Sheriff McLaughlin commented that this is the same situation with office staff as discussed with the Sheriff's budget.

Mr. Price moved to approve the request as presented and retroactive to January 1, 2008. Mrs. Knowles seconded the motion, which carried six to two; Mr. West and Mr. Canary voted nay.

100.12901.000.124 – Claims Clerk \$27,319 to \$27,849	\$	530.00
100.12910.000.124 – Adm Clerk \$27,319 to \$27,849	\$	530.00

**DRUG ALCOHOL RESISTANCE EDUCATION PROGRAM – (304)**

Sheriff McLaughlin then asked for a transfer to buy fingerprint kids for children.

Mr. Price moved to approve the request as presented. Mr. Canary seconded the motion that unanimously carried.

304.20000.000.304 – Claims	\$	300.00
----------------------------	----	--------

**BYRNE JUSTICE ASST. GRANT – (349)**

Sheriff McLaughlin also asked for a transfer to purchase tow gun racks and the mounting equipment for the gun racks.

Mr. Hollenbeck moved to approve the request as presented. Mr. Price seconded the motion that carried unanimously.

349-21600.000.349 – Supplies
------------------------------

**CIRCUIT COURT – (131)**

**TITLE 4-D JUVENILE COURT – (137)**

**MAGISTRATE COURT – (136)**

**SUPERIOR COURT NO. 1 – (132)**

**SUPERIOR COURT NO. 2 – (133)**

**SUPERIOR COURT NO. 3 – (134)**

Circuit Court Judge, Mark Loyd, and Superior Court No. 2 Judge, Cynthia Emkes appeared before the Council on behalf of all the other Judges. Judge Loyd relayed that they have talked with most of the Council members individually to review their three part plan for salary adjustments for all of the courts' staff.

Mr. Price expressed his appreciation to all of the Judges for meeting with the Council members individually to review their situation and for all of their hard work they did to compile information help the Council better understand their request. He also commented that he has come up with a proposed compromised salary structure, which entails all of the courts reducing their Jury Expense line items from their respected courts in the General Fund and paying their jury expenses from the Jury Pay Fund (fund #308). He noted that as of December 31, 2007, the balance in the Jury Pay Fund was \$165,872.26.

Judge Emkes stated that they had previously discussed in 2004 using the Jury Pay Fund to pay jury expenses. The Clerk's office collects these fees when there are convictions for criminal cases or infractions in other criminal cases. The money is paid when the court costs are paid. At that time, the balance wasn't very high and was decided to wait to see if the balance builds up. Over the past few years, the collection has increased, as the amount of criminal cases has also increased; in fact, it has more than doubled. The other thing that was discussed previously was what exactly could be paid from this fund. At that

time, they could only pay for juror's mileage and daily expenses from that account; however, she feels that according to the statute now, they could possibly pay for everything from this fund, including meals. She would need to check into this further for clarification.

Judge Loyd commented that the Judges would be willing to pay for meals out of their individual Jury Expense Line items and pay the remaining out of the Jury Pay Fund.

Mr. Price then distributed his proposed salary structure for the Judges to review.

Mr. West commented that the issue that needs to be addressed now is the how the departments are trying to bring parity among comparable positions within different offices, just like the old grid system. His question to the Judges was do each of their employees have equal ability, equal efficiency, and equal tenure?

Judge Loyd responded no, no, and no.

Mr. West then said that he has a problem grouping employees together, like the grid system, and not give raises based on merit, performance, or tenure. If that is the case, don't start at the top of the salary structure to give parity among offices, start at the bottom and then build from there. He also noted that there is probably going to be a new court within the next year or two, which will call for additional funding. In addition, the new court would possibly lessen the workload of the other courts.

Mr. Price stated that they need to work on a plan for adjusting salaries. They may need to do this on a case-by-case basis. The Judges have been asking for salary adjustments for their employees for a few years now and they have put a lot of hard work and effort into this. He also feels that when departments have turnover, it is counter-productive and more money usually gets spent. With his proposed salary adjustments, it would be an additional appropriation of about \$16,000, but that would help out six courts.

Mrs. Boyce expressed that originally, she did not agree that everyone was worth the same, salary wise; but after she met with Judge Loyd, her opinion changed. She felt like the Judges are making their best effort to figure out a way to bring their staff up to a certain point. If you take any of the courts' staff, who are doing similar types of jobs and have similar years of experience, then they should make around the same amount as their co-workers. If the Judges feel confident that this is how they want to do this, then she feels confident in their decisions.

Mr. McCarty stated that over time, the salaries have gotten out of control and he feels that it is the Council's job to help retain employees, which costs less than to hire and train new personnel. As an average, the county employees are still underpaid compared to other municipalities. He feels that with Mr. Price's proposed salary schedule, it is more cost neutral to the General Fund and they need to work with it.

Judge Loyd stated that it would be great if the county allowed enough money to pay the employees for their quality, longevity, effort, and education. That is not the case, it is a two-way street and they are asking for what they feel are fair and reasonable salaries for their personnel.

Mr. West commented the ideal mechanism for salaries would to have a revenue generating system and use those funds specifically for salaries.

Judge Emkes added that the courts do generate a lot of revenue that goes straight to the General Fund.

Judge Loyd then stated that the Judges are prepared to make a commitment for at least two years to use the funds in the Jury Pay Fund to help offset the General Fund, as long as there is a plan in place to give salary raises.

Mr. Price stated that he feels like his proposal is not the final answer, but it is a step in the right direction. He also feels like it is consistent with what was talked about during budget hearings. With the reductions from the Jury Expense line items in each court, they could use that money, which equals about \$35,000, and then an additional appropriation of about \$16,216.20 would be needed to fund this proposal. If it is the consensus of the council, then the courts will need to come back in February, with revised 144's and letters for transfers, reductions, and additional appropriations, as necessary.

Mr. Price then made a motion to approve the proposed salary structure dated 1/13/08, with the two corrections, and to make the salaries retroactive to January 1, 2008. Mrs. Boyce seconded the motion, which carried five to two; Mr. West and Mr. Canary voted nay.

#### **BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS – (122)**

Commissioner Tom Kite appeared and asked to table their request for \$100,000.00 for Capital Improvements until the February so they can get better numbers for the Council concerning the bank building.

Mr. Price moved to table this request until the February meeting. Mrs. Knowles seconded the motion; the motion unanimously carried.

#### **ANIMAL SHELTER – (219)**

Dr. Emily Williamson, Director, and Dawn Phelps, Animal Control Employee, appeared to request some title changes and salary adjustments for their personnel. Mrs. Phelps explained that they have realigned many of the duties of their staff and therefore, they are requesting that their titles and salaries better reflect these changes. She also noted that there are no new monies being requested.

Mr. West inquired about the number of calls or runs that are being made now and how things were working out.

Dr. Williamson replied that Animal Control has a fully staffed, well qualified crew and they are running a more efficient place. The employee moral is great and they are actually doing more with fewer hours and with better qualified people.

Mrs. Phelps added that they could provide the 2007 to the Council at a later date.

Mrs. Knowles moved to approve the requests as presented. Mr. Price seconded the motion, which carried six to one; Mr. West voted nay.

219.11701.000.219 – Administrative Assistant to Receptionist \$19,200 to \$19,500  
 219.11361.000.219 – Senior Kennel Attendant \$19,420 to \$21,743  
 219.11362.000.219 – Dispatcher to Animal Control Officer \$25,805 to \$25,023  
 219.11363.000.219 – Lieutenant to Animal Control Officer \$26,795 to \$24,239  
 219.11364.000.219 – Deputy Warden to Animal Control Officer \$25,023  
 219.11365.000.219 – Sen.Dep. Warden to Dispatch/Sen. Animal Control Officer \$27,618

From: 219.11362.000.219 – Animal Control Officer	(\$ 300.00)
To: 219.11701.000.219 – Receptionist	\$ 300.00
From: 219.11363.000.219 – Animal Control Officer	(\$ 2,323.00)
To: 219.11361.000.219 – Senior Kennel Attendant	\$ 2,323.00

Part-time Rates Approval (same rates as approved in 2007)

**ANIMAL SHELTER BUILDING DONATION FUND – (264)**  
**CUMULATIVE CAPITAL DEVELOPMENT FUND – (254)**

Mitch Ripley, Commissioner, Dr. Williamson, and Doug Franklin, with Schneider Corporation, were present to discuss the status of the new Animal Shelter. However, first, Mr. Ripley, on behalf of all the Commissioners, wanted to publicly address the Council to let them know that the individual who is currently running the Animal Shelter is by far the best person that has been running it since he has been here. He also added that Dr. Williamson has decided to stay with the county longer than originally intended to make sure things keep going smoothly with the new building.

Dr. Williamson stated that the new shelter would be a well built, functional building. She stated she had a timeline that she would distribute to the Council as to when they would be dedicating the building in the fall, which would be on October 25th. She also noted that they added another row of kennels, which will give them a total of forty runs. The additional runs will help allow for growth, help control spreading disease, and help protect the public from the vicious dogs.

Mr. Franklin added that this facility is not an extravagant facility; it is a well built, low maintenance building that will look nice and last for years to come.

Mr. Price questioned if there was any contingency for any overruns or unexpected costs.

Mr. Franklin replied that there is no contingency in the documents, but they could add one; on a project size like this, they normally would add a 5% contingency.

Discussion was held on the amount of a contingency and whether or not one would be needed.

Mr. West moved to approve the requests as presented. Mrs. Knowles seconded the motion, which carried unanimously.

264.31000.000.264 – Professional Services	\$ 335,561.82
254.43300.000.254 – Johnson County Animal Shelter (new)	\$1,018,214.82

## **OLD BUSINESS**

### Stormwater Discussion-

Commissioner Ripley, and Mr. Waterman, Planning Director, were present to discuss the Stormwater project and the expenses related to that. Mr. Waterman stated they have made progress in establishing statutory requirements for the department. They have the mapping done, they have permits in place, they should have the fund created by the end of January for the money to go in, and they have one project already lined up. They are looking at about \$30,000 for this one project for the stormwater alone. As far as expenditures, they are preparing pamphlets and setting up a new website.

Mr. West inquired about the fees.

Mr. Waterman replied that the Commissioners approved the fees back in November. He added that the fees are in line with other jurisdictions, with the exception of having a flat fee; our fees are associated with the size of the building. He also touched upon the permitting process as it relates to Rural 5 and Rural 13.

Mr. West asked if the landowner did something to mitigate any disruption of the water quality, does he get any consideration for that? For example, if you have a golf course and retained all the water on the course and re-circulated the water through their irrigation process so that the water remains good quality and the water is not discharged to other areas or into streams, would there be consideration for that?

Mr. Water answered certainly, as part of the post-construction evaluation; however, they still have to abide with the pre-construction. The number one pollutant is sedimentation. Previously, his office just looked at this on the plans and sent a note to Soil and Water, but now, his office has to review it and sign off on it.

Mrs. Boyce then expressed the reason for bringing this discussion back pertained to the billing.

Mr. Price added that there were some unanswered questions relating to the bills. Mr. Price then specifically asked if both Mr. Ripley and Mr. Waterman had read Part C of the manual.

Mr. Waterman replied he had read Part C; Mr. Ripley replied that he had read parts of it.

Mr. Price then asked them if they realized how much of the information in there was inaccurate. He then gave some examples of the false information.

Mr. Waterman agreed that Mr. Price was correct in stating the manual had false information.

Mr. Price stated that we have a contract with Commonwealth for \$68,950 and asked if there was a supplemental agreement since the contract. If not, then how can we legally pay for this? It is now up to \$96,879.98, and \$18,900 with Umbaugh. Overall, we are at \$115,779.98 for a book with a lot of inaccurate information; that is \$27,929.98 over contract with no supplementals.

Mr. Waterman replied that he did not have the answers; he inherited the contract. He started looking at this contract with the Auditor in December and agreed that there is no accounting of how the money was spent and it is opinion that no money be paid to Commonwealth until we get a full accounting from them as to where that money went to. He also added that the contract with Umbaugh is valid and feels like it should be paid.

Mr. Ripley added that Mr. Waterman is completely aware of the deficiencies and they are in the process of contacting Commonwealth to schedule a meeting to discuss these issues. Once they get answers they will report back to the Council.

Mr. Price also asked that someone from the Council be included in the meetings with them and Commonwealth.

Mrs. Boyce then inquired about the bills from Umbaugh, which they voted against paying at their last meeting.

Mr. Ripley commented that he does recommend payment of the Umbaugh bill because they did complete the work that was required, even though the County doesn't follow through with enacting the tax fees. He also explained that when Umbaugh came on board two years ago, they did the first year for free basically, knowing that their fees would come from the fee structure, once it was enacted. Since we did not enact those fees, they still want their payment.

The Council members agreed that there was a misunderstanding on how the fee structure was set up and stated that this was not explained to them.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

### **Resolution #2008-01 – Transferring 2008 Cash from the Cumulative Capital Development Fund to the Rainy Day Fund**

Mr. West moved to approve Resolution #2008-01 as presented. Mr. Canary seconded the motion, which unanimously carried.

### **County Assessor – Update on business with DLGF**

Marla Hash, County Assessor, and Mark Alexander, County Appraiser, were both present to update the Council on the work status of their office. Ms. Hash explained that her office sent out Form 11s to all of the taxpayers, which a lot of the other counties did not. The taxpayers then had 45 days after they received their Form 11 to appeal their assessed value, and then the State gave them another 45 days after they received their tax bill to appeal it as well. During these 90 days they basically lost regular work time because they were busy with counter traffic and answering phones and scheduling appeals. She added that they have held 75% of their tax appeal hearings, which most counties have held none. She felt that if they hadn't lost those 90 days of work schedule, they would be in a lot better shape than they were now, but they are getting there. She also stated they had about 80% of new construction done for this year and have over 7,000 sales disclosure forms from 2007 that need to be scanned and sent to the State. Her staff has diligently working on getting these accomplished. Ms. Hash noted the problem seems to be when they send information to the State; it takes them a while to okay it and return it to the County. Her office has a plan in place to help keep things on schedule.

Mr. Price asked if Ms. Hash thought the State would hold any of their settlement money.

Ms. Hash replied that she had no idea; it depends on what the legislators do.

Mr. Price also asked if there was anything the Council could do has a fiscal body to help.

Ms. Hash commented that one thing that takes additional time is that the Assessor's software is not compatible with the Auditor's and Treasurer's software. Hopefully, the State will mandate that everyone have the same system so that the information gets processed quicker and in the same format, which will make it easier for everyone.

Mr. Price then asked if there was a timeline when they would have their work done and given to the Auditor?

Mr. Alexander replied that they have a timeline scheduled for March 7<sup>th</sup> to turn it over to the State, who is suppose to have a two-week turn-a-round. He noted that they have visited Morgan County and they submitted their information to the State on October 15<sup>th</sup> and they have not had it returned yet. Mr. Alexander also commented that once they submit the information to the State, and if they don't respond within the two weeks, then they would enlist the help of the Council and everyone concerned to help get to the next phase of the process.

Mrs. Knowles asked if they would keep the Council updated on how the process was going.

The Council members thanked Ms. Hash and Mr. Alexander for their time.

There being no further business, Mr. Price moved to adjourn the meeting. Mrs. Boyce seconded the motion that carried unanimously.