

Joint Facilitated Board of Commissioners and County Council Meeting  
August 13, 2008 – 6:00 pm

Meeting called to order by Commissioner President Rininger. Councilmen Spaetti, Kroeger, Bunner, Ebert, Kress, Winsett, Cochenour, and Council Attorney Wetherill were present. Also present were Commissioners Rininger, Logsdon, Gogel, and Board Attorney Lueken. The meeting facilitator was Sue Ellspermann.

Rininger welcomed the attendees and stated that even though the commissioners and councilmen will be the ones making the decision on the public safety building, they felt it was important to get public input into the project. Logsdon stated that the purpose of the meeting was to have a joint discussion and reach a consensus on the project.

Ellspermann briefly stated the rules of a facilitated meeting.

Bunner questioned the commissioners as to why the meeting agenda was changed from a “needs determination” meeting to a meeting intended to justify the construction of a public safety building. Bunner sited the minutes from the previous meeting where commissioners agreed that this meeting would be a facilitated meeting to prioritize the needs in Spencer County. No commissioner responded.

Lisa Gehlhausen of Indiana 15 explained the process to receive a Pre-Disaster Mitigation Competitive Grant. She stated Spencer County received a Preliminary Award of \$2,517,990 (75%) in July 2008. The county share of the grant is \$839,330, which is 25% of the eligible costs. The ineligible costs of the complete proposed project would be \$1,764,704. Gehlhausen stated the estimated timeline has construction complete by April 2011.

Councilman Kroeger discussed how the county could pay for the project out of the COIT fund. Kroeger stated that he felt COIT funds should be put to work on infrastructure projects and not put aside. He said the question for the council and commissioners to decide is if the building is a good use of the taxpayers’ money. He also stated that there are other funds in the county, such as the Rainy Day Fund, which could also be used. Kroeger used the following numbers, obtained with the help of Umbaugh and Associates, to show how it can be done.

I. Review of Building Costs – (01/28/2008 Universal estimates)			
	Eligible Costs		3,400,000
	Grant		<u>-2,500,000</u> 75%+/-
	County's Share of Eligible Costs		900,000 25%+/-
	Additional Costs (Ineligible Costs)		<u>1,700,000</u>
	County's Cost Before Reduction for In-Kind Work		2,600,000
	In-Kind Contribution by County		<u>300,000</u> (Guess)
	Estimated Cost to County (For Discussion)		2,300,000
II. Review of Amortization (06/06/08 Umbaugh Estimate)			
	Project Size		2,300,000
	Debt Service Reserve		150,620
	Issuance Costs and Contingencies		150,000
	Less Cash on Hand (see below)		<u>-800,620</u>
	Bond Par Amount		<u>1,800,000</u>
	Estimated 20 year Annual Debt Service @ 5.5%		150,620
	Average Annual COIT Revenue (7 years)		485,000
	Annual Payment on Safety Building		-150,620
	COIT Obligations:	Santa Claus Water	-100,000
		Luce Sewer	-150,000
		Highway (After 2010)	<u>000</u>
	Estimated Annual COIT Surplus		<u>84,380</u>
III. Review of Estimated Fund Balance at 12/31/08			
	COIT Fund		850,000
	Cum-Capital (Before '09 Budget)		<u>500,000</u>
	Estimated 12/31/08 Fund Balances		1,350,000

Kroeger noted that the costs and fund balances were based on current information. The project will not be completed (if undertaken) until at least 2010. Discussion was had on some of the figures used in the calculations.

Bunner asked if the numbers used in the calculations were for the current drawing. Kroeger stated yes; it was not yet scaled down. Lueken added that the numbers used for the income were conservative estimates.

Kroeger also discussed the possibility that the county could discontinue putting a portion of the COIT funds toward the homestead credit.

Engineers from Universal Design reviewed the current plans for the building. The square footage of the current offices and the proposed offices were discussed.

Facilitation

Ellspermann then facilitated the discussion asking the following questions. The answers from the attendees follow each question.

**Why is this project important to Spencer County?**

1. Over the years of 2000-2008, the reason for this project was public safety centralization. Other uses were secondary.
2. We were running out of office space at the courthouse without it being a hardship.
3. We are now leasing and spending \$45,000 per year for extra space.
4. In addition, we may need another court space.
5. This is a future investment in the county using taxpayer money.
6. With funds granted, would we not be foolish not to do this?

**What are the major concerns about this project?**

7. No one has come requesting this.
8. This is suggested to be built on land we don't own.
9. Giving 5% rent increase, the cost is still \$500,000 or more (much less than if we built).
10. If someone offered \$500,000 and I wanted to build a \$1M house, would I borrow \$500,000?
11. It is a debt obligation for 20 years.
12. What is the need for the upstairs? Do we really need it?
13. If we did not have federal funds, would we pursue a public safety building?

**What do we know, based on today's presentations and earlier work, that is particularly relevant to this project?**

14. The money to be spent will not be cheaper in the future.
15. The property we are considering is owned by the 4-H Association. There are some considerations that need to be "pinned down" regarding the land. We believe the fair market value will be less than we pay...which will be considered "in kind" for the project.
16. We began discussing this project in 2000 for fire department training and other needs. This is an investment in the future of the county.
17. It is important to consider all things in the range of discussion from minimum to maximum. This project should not be "all" or "nothing".

**What don't we know, but wish we knew?**

18. We don't know what impact the new tax laws will have on the county.
19. We don't know the "hidden costs" (operating costs) and their impact: insurance, utilities, etc.
20. We don't know if this solves the problem of space and how far into the future.

**What are we assuming that we should not?**

21. Several visited Green County Correction building. There is a possibility we can acquire office space at low cost to the county. DOC pays salaries and one-time expenses. Twenty-five participants pay the lease.
22. There is tremendous space (square footage) between vehicles and offices. Are we assuming the space could not be used for anything else? (It can)

**Other**

23. The Community Correction and Public Safety building have two different reasons and primary uses.
24. This provides fire training per guidelines of the state to serve firefighters. All 9 departments participate.
25. Part of the 2005 plan was to do a Needs Assessment. This project was #1.
26. The 4-H building is for future needs.
27. There has been no public request for the public safety building.
28. EMA did look at another existing building, but it would not be safe.

**Possible Design Changes (eliminate, reduce, or add later)**

(Dots denote "votes" by Council and Commission members. Highlighted items are the consensus of the group.)

1. Design the upper floor for Extension rooms and leave the rest as open space. [This could save the cost now, but later costs will go up.]●
2. Consider a building for EMA, firefighters and ambulance section that is not a hardened structure. [Hardened structure is valuable; the other would be a pole barn.]●
3. **Wait/delay moving the Dispatch Center until the 911 10-year cycle.●●● (do what makes sense).**
4. Use the first floor as a "Community/reception hall" for all space to be open except outside walls. Put in a commercial kitchen to use for scout jamborees, flea markets, etc. [The existing structure is OK, but will need work. It would be hard to justify a community center. Could encompass the Community Center within the hardened shell].
5. **Use the Safe Room for large community gatherings.●●●●**
6. Space for Council and Commissioners could be added.●●
7. Build on land we own (i.e. near the County Garage) for no cost with infrastructure. [There are mile long trains that pass nearby and we expect the 4-H land to be \$0.]
8. Vacate the storage building at the 4-H Center as a community center and extension offices. [It would cost about \$700,000 to renovate]
9. **Scale back the Health Department space by 50%. [Consider which personnel to move.]●●●●●●●●**
10. Consider a coroner office somewhere in the building. [A space of their own.]●
11. Consider putting building inspectors in the building [This would be a central location.]

**Target Amount**

1. Build it as it should be done.
2. Best deal for the money
3. \$2.3M, less scaling back the Health Department

*No consensus was achieved on a target amount the county could afford. Instead, an action plan was developed for moving forward.*

Action Plan

What	Who	By When
Run the numbers on total costs with reductions and the cost of filling in the second floor later	Tom Schipp	August 20
Get details on 4-H land	Extension Office personnel	September 2
Develop true operating costs	Tammy and Cindy	September 2
Decide on whether to build the Public Safety Building	Dan with Cindy set up meeting(s)	November, 2008

The commissioners thanked everyone for attending.

County Council,

\_\_\_\_\_  
President

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Attest:

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Cindy Shelton, Auditor

\_\_\_\_\_

=====