

**POSEY COUNTY COUNCIL, TUESDAY, MAY 9, 2023**

The Posey County Council met in regular session at the Hovey House on Tuesday, May 9, 2023, at 9 am. The following members were present at the said meeting: Heather Allyn, Aaron Wilson, Dave Dausman, Zach George, Brandon Deig, Tom Schneider, Jerry Chastain, County Attorney Josh Clayborn, and Auditor Maegen Greenwell.

H. Allyn called the Posey County Council meeting to order at 9 am with the Pledge of Allegiance.

Posey County Sheriff Tom Latham led the Council in prayer.

**MINUTES**

T. Schneider made a motion to approve the minutes from March 14, 2023; D. Dausman seconded. The motion carried with a vote of 6-0, with H. Allyn abstaining.

**CLERK'S REPORT**

J. Chastain made a motion to approve the March Clerk's report; B. Deig seconded. The motion carried with a vote of 7-0.

**TREASURER'S REPORT**

A. Wilson made a motion to approve the April Treasurer's report; J. Chastain seconded. The motion carried with a vote of 7-0.

**SHERIFF/JAIL SALARY DISCUSSION**

H. Allyn: We have been in deep discussion for months regarding the Sheriff's salary and salary in general. We asked a third party to prepare a salary study for us, and we received those numbers last week and held a special meeting on Thursday. I can speak for all of Council when we say that we have all been diving deep into those numbers and working very hard the last four or five days digging into those numbers and trying to come up with what is the right thing to do to reward our officers and also be fiscally responsible with the money that we are tasked to handle for our County. I will open that conversation to the Council for whoever would like to speak on this.

B. Deig: I like the numbers they came back with on the salary study; I think it puts us competitive on where we need to be around the area. I think it is very doable, and given those numbers, they are very deserving of the numbers that came back. They are a little higher than what the committee and Sheriff Latham came up with, but the differences are not that extreme that it can't be done. I like the numbers, and those would be the numbers I would move forward with.

D. Dausman: We are waiting on numbers from Baker Tilly to see what tax implications this could have.

H. Allyn: Right; Maegen reached out to them.

M. Greenwell: Right, I reached out to them on Thursday, but we are knee-deep in bond rating issues, and they have not acknowledged that email yet. They are working really hard on getting our bond rating done in time to close on that. I will continue to work on that, but I have not received an answer on that yet.

D. Dausman: It would be within the next week, wouldn't it?

M. Greenwell: That they could get me those numbers? I can't promise you that, like I said, they have not even had a chance to acknowledge that I asked for that yet because, like I said, we are knee-deep in trying to get this bond rating done and closed before the original bond that was taken out is due.

H. Allyn: Josh, do you want to speak to the timeline that we would have if we were to do this?

J. Clayborn: Sure, and just to be clear, spending more money doesn't necessarily automatically affect taxes. I don't know where we are in hitting the tax caps, but we are probably close. Your question is if you end up increasing the pay to certain Sheriff or law enforcement, it's going to require a tax increase. I think we are waiting on that from Baker Tilly, but my sense is to pay for this; it will take either cuts in other expenses or an increase in taxes, or a combination of both. To increase the local income tax, which is what you guys have, probably the easiest, most direct ability to effect, if that is adopted prior to September 1 this year, it would take effect October 1; if it is after, this is weird the way the statute reads if it's after August 31 and before November 1 it takes effect January 1, and if it is after October 31 it takes effect October 1 of the following year. I think at the last meeting, I thought July 1 was the deadline, but you have a little more time. As I noted, there are going to be notice provisions to all of the other taxing bodies here in Posey County, and in addition to that, we have the opportunity to send all of our ordinances and notices up to DLGF to get their blessing, and I always like to do that for these kinds of tax increases,

**POSEY COUNTY COUNCIL, TUESDAY, MAY 9, 2023**

The Posey County Council met in regular session at the Hovey House on Tuesday, May 9, 2023, at 9 am. The following members were present at the said meeting: Aaron Wilson, Dave Dausman, Zach George, Brandon Deig, Tom Schneider, Jerry Chastain, County Attorney Josh Clayborn, and Auditor Maegen Greenwell.

H. Allyn called the Posey County Council meeting to order at 9 am with the Pledge of Allegiance.

Posey County Sheriff Tom Latham led the Council in prayer.

**MINUTES**

T. Schneider made a motion to approve the minutes from March 14, 2023; D. Dausman seconded. The motion carried with a vote of 6-0, with H. Allyn abstaining.

**CLERK'S REPORT**

J. Chastain made a motion to approve the March Clerk's report; B. Deig seconded. The motion carried with a vote of 7-0.

**TREASURER'S REPORT**

A. Wilson made a motion to approve the April Treasurer's report; J. Chastain seconded. The motion carried with a vote of 7-0.

**SHERIFF/JAIL SALARY DISCUSSION**

H. Allyn: We have been in deep discussion for months regarding the Sheriff's salary and salary in general. We asked a third party to prepare a salary study for us, and we received those numbers last week and held a special meeting on Thursday. I can speak for all of Council when we say that we have all been diving deep into those numbers and working very hard the last four or five days digging into those numbers and trying to come up with what is the right thing to do to reward our officers and also be fiscally responsible with the money that we are tasked to handle for our County. I will open that conversation to the Council for whoever would like to speak on this.

B. Deig: I like the numbers they came back with on the salary study; I think it puts us competitive on where we need to be around the area. I think it is very doable, and given those numbers, they are very deserving of the numbers that came back. They are a little higher than what the committee and Sheriff Latham came up with, but the differences are not that extreme that it can't be done. I like the numbers, and those would be the numbers I would move forward with.

D. Dausman: We are waiting on numbers from Baker Tilly to see what tax implications this could have.

H. Allyn: Right; Maegen reached out to them.

M. Greenwell: Right, I reached out to them on Thursday, but we are knee-deep in bond rating issues, and they have not acknowledged that email yet. They are working really hard on getting our bond rating done in time to close on that. I will continue to work on that, but I have not received an answer on that yet.

D. Dausman: It would be within the next week, wouldn't it?

M. Greenwell: That they could get me those numbers? I can't promise you that, like I said, they have not even had a chance to acknowledge that I asked for that yet because, like I said, we are knee-deep in trying to get this bond rating done and closed before the original bond that was taken out is due.

H. Allyn: Josh, do you want to speak to the timeline that we would have if we were to do this?

J. Clayborn: Sure, and just to be clear, spending more money doesn't necessarily automatically affect taxes. I don't know where we are in hitting the tax caps, but we are probably close. Your question is if you end up increasing the pay to certain Sheriff or law enforcement, it's going to require a tax increase. I think we are waiting on that from Baker Tilly, but my sense is to pay for this; it will take either cuts in other expenses or an increase in taxes, or a combination of both. To increase the local income tax, which is what you guys have, probably the easiest, most direct ability to effect, if that is adopted prior to September 1 this year, it would take effect October 1; if it is after, this is weird the way the statute reads if it's after August 31 and before November 1 it takes effect January 1, and if it is after October 31 it takes effect October 1 of the following year. I think at the last meeting, I thought July 1 was the deadline, but you have a little more time. As I noted, there are going to be notice provisions to all of the other taxing bodies here in Posey County, and in addition to that, we have the opportunity to send all of our ordinances and notices up to DLGF to get their blessing, and I always like to do that for these kinds of tax increases,

and that could take a couple of weeks. Basically, I think if you want to go down that path, I think we have until mid-summer to really get our ducks in a row. So, it doesn't have to be this meeting, it can't be this meeting, but we have to do it sometime.

A. Wilson: It has to be advertised, so it has to be the next meeting.

H. Allyn: We have reached out to Baker Tilly to get those numbers. I think we are all aware we have a decent balance, but you can not continue to spend deep without having a way to refill that pot. You cannot just spend from a bottomless barrel. We know there has to be a way to fill that pot, and as Mr. Schneider noted as we were talking, this is not our only department, so this won't be the only department we are dealing with, and there will be other money that will need to be discerned so we can continue to move forward with that. In March, we had advertised additional in an amount that went along with what the committee had come up with. Correct? And we tabled those.

A. Wilson: I made a motion in February, right?

H. Allyn: March

A. Wilson: Excuse me, right, March.

H. Allyn: To table them until May, so I am looking to Council for additional discussion on where do we move forward.

A. Wilson: I think it needs to be said that if we do anything besides the motion that was made in March. It will have to be readvertised, so even if we were to vote on it today and approve numbers that are any more than what are the numbers that were already advertised, it would have to wait another month, right?

H. Allyn: Correct, it would have to be advertised; the additional would have to be approved in June if it were more than what was advertised already because those numbers would have to be calculated in order to be advertised per statute.

J. Chastain: I do want to make a comment, not about this, but Tom, I want to give you a pat on the back for getting out there and really pushing along and doing your research. It is always easier to spend the money than figure out how to pay for it. So, it's kind of that spot we're in. When we met before I was even sworn in, we sat down and said our goal is to get our starting deputies over \$50,000 and look what we got; both options are phenomenal and way more than that. We are making good progress, and as a board, we need to figure out where we are going to head with that.

A. Wilson: I don't know what the percentage is, but the previous committee that was made up of Brandon Deig, myself, and Tom Schneider had made the recommendation in March for the numbers that have been advertised, and that would be an eighteen percent increase in salary across the board for the Sheriff's department which in my opinion is a very good start and where we should have been previously. Obviously, the salary study came in, and it was more than what we advertised, so that's the decision we have on the table today, what we are going to do. I tend to agree with what Brandon said previously; however, money is the obstacle in these discussions, and raising taxes is never a fun discussion, regardless of what it's for or what it is going to be used for. I will leave it to the rest of the Council; again, we waited three months for the study; I think the salary study is what everyone believes we should follow at this point, but whether we have the money is another discussion.

D. Dausman: We do have the salary study back on the Sheriff's department; what we don't have is the salary study back on the rest of the County. We don't know what that impact is going to be, but we have a fiscal responsibility to do that, and that study won't be back until?

A. Wilson: End of June.

H. Allyn: So, when we look at the pay study that you came back with as a committee, there were two detectives on that, and it was making them where they were not getting overtime, and I don't like that. I would most definitely like if that is the proposal that Council is wanting to go with, I would like to see that changed.

B. Deig: Agreed

H. Allyn: They do not have the option to say I'm not going when they are called. I would want to amend that part of that if that is what the Council as a whole is wanting to do. The difference in that proposal and with the salary study proposal in the Sheriff's department, not including the jail, is about \$53,000.00, and within the jail, it is about an \$80,000.00 difference. Sometimes we say that's not a significant number, but these are reoccurring costs, not one-time costs. We are not buying a building, and then we don't pay for it again. It is an ongoing cost. I will say I was adamant about waiting for the salary study, so we had third-party information so that we were able to utilize facts over emotions. Anytime we talk about people's jobs and what they are paid, it becomes more emotional than factual because obviously, our officers put their



lives on the line each day, and that is a difficult choice to make, and it is admirable and due of honor but trying to find factual like how are we stacking up places near us so that we are competitive, and we are staffed, and we have officers in jail so we get our numbers up and then we have the income coming in so we are able to have the inmates there that we can house. Being competitive is extremely important, and everyone knows the employee market has changed dramatically in the last year. This is nothing that is being taken lightly.

Z. George: So, I dove into this with Dave and Jerry; we did that actually before we were ever elected because we knew this was coming. Back in October, we worked on it; we worked a lot of hours on it last Saturday. I took and went through what the pay study said, what that would cost the County. I took all of those employees, found an average and came up with a figure, and then projected on what if this is going to be what we get back from Mr. Irwin, then we are going to incur a very large cost very quickly. If we are going to do this across the board, not saying that we have to; again, speaking to Brandon's point, I like the numbers from that; I think a version of that is what we are proposing here. I also think that if you go back and look and it speaks volumes to the Sheriff's office as far as they are right on this mid-point number with where we are starting and what we had already looked at. Some of them are higher, and some are lower. Agree to your point, and I think the two detectives should be getting overtime. I also think that special assignments k9 should get the bump that was proposed in the first proposal; that is a huge commitment to have a k9 in your home and make it part of your family. I think there are some other things there as far as the education bump; I don't think that is something we are able to do right now. My opinion would be to make some changes to what was already proposed, what has already been published in those areas, and the training officer area; I would like to see those two areas get that extra bump that Tom had already proposed. That is my opinion of it; like I said, I was not here when the salary study was put in place, I am not a seasoned veteran, and this is meeting number four for me, but I do understand how as both sides, one as a taxpayer you want to give every department everything you can give them, that's my opinion. Not just the Sheriff's department but the EMS, everyone, the highway department. You want to give everyone everything you can. As a Council person, it is different; as far as you have to be fiscally responsible, you can't be reckless. You can't spend the money and then figure out how to pay for it. You have to do what is financially responsible; you have to do it mindfully of everything else you have coming down the line. I think this problem wasn't created yesterday, it wasn't created last year, it wasn't created five years ago, and this problem stems from a long time ago; I am not pointing fingers at anyone, but that is what we are here to do, here to fix it and I have put a ton of time into this, I know Dave has, and I know Jerry has, Brandon has, I have talked to Heather, I have talked to Aaron, talked to Tom some too. It is a very hard spot to be in. I think we all want to do all we can, but my opinion would be what we proposed in Aaron's numbers and make an adjustment to that and add overtime for two deputies. Aaron, do you remember in that motion what stipends you included in that?

A. Wilson: I did not include the education, but everything else was included, as I recall.

H. Allyn: The motion was just to table the number.

A. Wilson: But the motion didn't include any of that.

Z. George: What was published?

J. Clayborn: That would be my question also.

M. Greenwell: The additional did not include any of the extra stipends; they were just the salary.

B. Deig: So, it would have to be published again and advertised.

A. Wilson: No matter what.

M. Greenwell: These numbers are different than what we advertised anyway, so no matter what, it will have to be readvertised.

A. Wilson: Right

Z. George: Brandon, what would you like? I know you said you are good with the pay study, and I don't disagree with that.

B. Deig: I think those are numbers we need to advertise. Looking at that, I think some of them are not going to like what I am about to say, but I think we hold off on the incentives right now until budget time, but we advertise the pay study and go from there; that's the best option right now. If we want to add the stipends along with it, we can always come back on numbers advertised, but we can't add more than what has been advertised. I think advertising and publishing the salary study is the way we need to go.

Z. George: without the bonuses, you're saying?

B. Deig: I think we can advertise for them just so we are covering ourselves right. If that is something that the board doesn't want to move with, then we won't have to.

H. Allyn: I think what we are looking at with the salary study, it notes longevity, and I want to just change that verbiage. We did it with the matrix; instead of saying "years" of service, we changed it to say "level" of service because that allows us should an officer want to transfer in from somewhere else, that we are not sticking them at the bottom. There is value in someone coming from another agency that is already gone through the academy, and we are not paying for them to go through the academy, so I think we need to be careful where that longevity is, yes there is value with being within our organization as well, but I think changing that from longevity to levels of service or some other name I am open to, I just want it to not necessarily say longevity.

A. Wilson: I think it is important to make our Sheriff's department attractive to people who already have years of service at a different agency or different department.

H. Allyn: Part of this is to be competitive so we can attract for the open position. That is part of the discussion that spawned this. While we are discussing amongst us, is there anyone in the audience that wants to speak to this?

A. Wilson: Sheriff, do you want to get up and say something real quick before we open that up?

Sheriff Latham: Good morning, Sheriff Tom Latham; I do want to commend this board; it has been sleepless nights for me, sleepless nights for a lot of my staff, and a lot of emotions have been involved in this painstaking process. I guess from my standpoint in this, I am going to speak for my staff, I know I have asked them all if they would be willing to wait for another month for the advertisement of these numbers, and the ones that have responded, which was well over majority, are content with waiting an additional month for that advertisement. Of course, I am going to come to you and request that you fill all of the stipends, but in the process, I also understand that you have fiscal responsibility, and I agree with that. However, I will say that again this has been a long process, and maybe longer for me and my staff because we live with it on a daily basis, we are looking at each other on a daily basis, so it is very fresh every single day. With that being said, I think that, beyond a doubt that the staff that I currently have today is probably one of the best staff we have ever had. I know I have spoke to a couple of Council members, and I have always been raised in the public realm that you always praise in public and criticize in private, but I will also not give credit where credit is not due. So, if you are not or have not gained praise, I will not give it to you, not one of these green ribbon people that everyone gets a prize. I think that is what's wrong with our society today, we don't want to hurt anyone's feelings. You have to fail to be successful, and that is ok, and I also believe in rewarding those who have worked hard and earned that right to whatever that prize may be. I stand before you today, requesting that all of those stipends be fulfilled in order to not only maintain the current staff that we have but also be attractive to outside folks who might be interested in this County to come and live, reside, and raise a family. As the Sheriff, it is my responsibility to ensure the safety of this County, and I take it very seriously. I take it seriously as such two nights ago, I received a phone call that my neighbor was holding someone at gunpoint because they broke into their home. That is, although an uncommon occurrence, when I am going over in my crocks and shorts and t-shirt with my gun strapped to my side, I responded, and there is no doubt in my heart of hearts, no doubt, that if another deputy received that phone call, they would do the same. An instance and I shared the video with Mr. Wilson a few days ago, what my jail staff deals with is unbearable to most folks. I know we have had prior conversations through budget hearings that several statements were made that they would never do that job for the amount of money that the jail is expected to do it for. I know no one on this board thinks they are better than anyone on my staff, so I wouldn't take it that way, but we are asking our jail staff to deal with folks who are covered in their own feces, that have feces in their mouths and face, and we have to go hands-on with them. The wild thing about that whole scenario, there is no hesitation within my staff to deal with that situation. Dealing with the jail population is very challenging on a daily basis, you cannot just hire someone off the street and expect them to go in and deal with that type of scenario; I think they should be rewarded for those folks who are willing and able to do that job without hesitation. It takes a special person, as it takes a special person to do a deputy's job. Picking legs and arms off the highway, dealing with dead infants in car wrecks, being handing a dead infant expected to bring that infant back to life as their arms flop up and down and the mother is begging for life to be reentered into her child are things that stick with you your entire life. The odor of decomposition of the body, the cries of a mother or father because their loved one is not coming home. Those things will stick with you for the remainder of your life. The odor you smelt twenty years after you dealt with the situation that you smell; your mind automatically goes back to that scene where you are dealing with someone who took their own life or someone who took the life of someone else. I just beg this Council to make a decision in the best interest of not only the taxpayers but the people who fill these positions on a daily basis without hesitation. There are a couple of things I would like to clarify, and I know we have had discussions pertaining to the matrix position, and I don't know obviously what your

pleasure is going to be, but what I proposed, based upon the email that I sent, I think last Friday, those numbers are the numbers I request to be fulfilled. I am obviously here for any questions that you have.

A. Wilson: These numbers right here?

Sheriff Latham: yes

D. Dausman: Tom, the one comment I want to make, there is no one on this board, and I can speak for everyone here, has the utmost respect for your officers and what you guys have to deal with in this County. In a different world and a different place, I would make a motion to pay you all six figures, no question, but unfortunately, that is kind of what our federal government is doing, and look at where we are at. We are faced with we have to find a way to recover these funds, so there is a balance. You and I have had a lot of phone conversations, and for every phone conversation I have had with you, I have had two more with these folks. On top of that, we are reaching out, and all of us have connections, a friend, a contact in another county, and we are being advised. We are being advised to move slowly so that this thing will, to use one word, hemorrhage cash. We can't do that, so if it appears that we are tiptoeing, we are tiptoeing because there are 25 thousand, 26 thousand people in this County that we also represent, so it is a tough spot. You all earn a hell of a lot more than what these papers show, and I think I speak for everyone in the County, and God bless you for what you do.

Sheriff Latham: I certainly appreciate those kinds of remarks for sure, I guess I would only reflect what numbers I provided initially, obviously came back seven hundred dollars less than what the pay study had recommended.

D. Dausman: You did a heck of a pay study.

Sheriff Latham: Thank you.

D. Dausman: You did a great job.

Sheriff Latham: But in the same breath, you know the board wanted to wait for the pay study, the pay study has come back, and the pay study is from a field of experts from the field of salary. If those experts say this is the recommendation, and obviously the investment of the taxpayer's dollars to get his study completed. I look at it from the standpoint I don't know any other direction to go than the recommendations of the expert within the field. That is why I come to you just asking for those numbers to be fulfilled, because if the experts say it, then I guess it has to be right.

D. Dausman: In remarks to that, if it appears as if we are moving slowly, it has nothing to do with what you all deserve. It has to do with how to pay for it, and that may take time. I like to use my business hat; it goes back on cash flow. I like to see, I think, what we are going to end up doing, I think, is making a proposal here today, it may not include all those stipends yet, because we have to watch the cash flow, if that makes any sense at all.

Sheriff Latham: Sure, and within in that, as hard as it is for me to say, if it was a negotiation type situation, you know, slicing the educational stipend to fulfill the other two stipends, that would not exactly 100% what I like to see but understandably that is something this board can come back and look at during budget time.

D. Dausman: Keep in mind that doesn't mean if a stipend or two doesn't get passed this year, as we watch the cash flow, we know what is on your wish list for next year. The cash has to flow, it has to make sense, and we have the taxpayers to keep in mind too.

H. Allyn: Even without these stipends, we're looking at 18 plus percent with that increase is, at least, what I was looking at. If we go with the salary study with just the levels of service, that was in the twenty range, I believe, so a good bump and a well-deserved bump. Sometimes you can't eat an elephant in one bite, and we have to find out how.

Sheriff Latham: I am pretty fat, Heather; I can probably pull it off.

H. Allyn: Everyone wants to fight for their own department, we don't have that luxury, because we have multiple ones that we do, and we know that we have others coming. Does anyone have any questions of Sheriff Latham? Is there anyone else that wants to speak to this?

A. Wilson: Sheriff, I just want to say thank you and thank you to your staff as well. Growing up in this County and being here my whole life, this town, at one point when I was a young man, was called meth Vernon by a lot of people in this region, and I distinctly remember that, and it's no longer that place anymore, that has a lot to do with our Sheriff's department so that you guys for stopping that crap.

H. Allyn: Is there anyone else that would like to speak?

J. Clayborn: Maegen, on the prison matron, can you help me understand what was advertised for that?



M. Greenwell: It would have been advertised as the level of the matrix she was on for a deputy because that is how she was previously paid.

J. Clayborn: Ok.

Daren Seitz, Taxpayer: Couple of thoughts, I work in a totally different industry, but we do have budgets, we do have to balance them. The number one thing that comes up is safety, it is for the community, it is for the employees, and the decisions I make could be detrimental to this community. With the chemicals we have at Sabic when it comes down to it, that money comes from somewhere because we have to keep the people safe. I am just thinking ahead where you guys had this study coming, you had to know it was going to, should have known it was going to be higher than what they are currently getting paid, or else you wouldn't have had this study, you thought it was coming in lower, I don't believe that. So, what preparation did you take in order to look at your budget and say, hey, we have this coming forward, were going to have this study, and we are going to have this huge impact, it's not just these deputies, it is across the County, and I recognize that, and Dave I recognize these other ones are coming. Do I think they are going to be lower, absolutely not. You guys are faced with a big challenge, but I think when it comes to safety, you have to look at your community, and you have got to do what you have got to do. If you didn't have a diligent Sheriff who put his proposal together, what else would you have? You would have the study that the taxpayers paid for. That's all you would have to go off of. He did, he busted his butt to put that thing together in hopes that you would see the light and say this makes sense, but the study came in, and it's higher, and you have to make that choice and say that the study makes sense. That is all I have to say.

H. Allyn: Thanks

T. Schneider: I really only have a couple of thoughts, and they are not too detailed. This is a huge undertaking, and trying to find the finance on how we cover the expenditure, is something that lies heavy on the back of my mind, although I think the allocation is right in front of us, and I think it will be fairly easy to see as we move forward. I have been the one that has cautioned the board all along to take baby steps and to take this slow. To try to absorb the information as it is given to us, so we make a good decision, so we make a decision that is going to be impactful on the taxpayers, that is going to be a huge impact on our deputies and our leo's and our jail staff, it is going to be monumental for those folks, and I think it is well deserved. Our job from the fiscal standpoint is to try to fund this and fund this in a manner that is not horribly detrimental to the taxpayer. We have to fund it, but we have to be mindful in doing so. We are charged with that duty because it is our duty to finance, to cover the fiscal side to providing a service to the taxpayer, be that emergency services, be that law enforcement services, quality roads to drive on, etcetera. All of the facets of county government, with that, said, and with my caution of taking this slow, we have been able to examine numbers from the pay study, which I think are very valuable and very much valid. Something that really sticks out about the pay study is this is something that we have never done in this county before, and I have been a part of this board for twenty years, and we have never really had a pay study to speak of, we have never really had any what you would call qualified information in regard to how we set our salary or how we pay our employees, with that said, this is an unprecedented thing for us in the County to have this presented to us in this manner. It is something we asked for, I think it is something that is very important, and it is something that needs to be considered. However, is the pay study exactly what we need to be sitting out in front of us in the way we pay our people? No, I don't think so. Is the information the Sheriff took a great deal of time in compiling information and putting together salaries and proposals for us to review, is that exactly what we need to pay our people? No, not necessarily, but it is very good information, and I appreciate the Sheriff taking all the time and effort that he did to discover those numbers and present to us a package that would be deserving of our law enforcement officers and our jail staff and etcetera. We have had a relatively short time, what maybe ten days, with our pay study, and to be able to match that with what the Sheriff gave us to try to seek out information outside of that, that is still relatively a short amount of time. The thing that rises to the top, and here is the comment, the thing that rises to the top is that our people as very, very much deserving of an increase in salary, and they are going to get an increase in salary, and I think it is a substantial increase in salary. There is an awful lot of things that are being put into this in this request that I think we still need some time to process. So, to bring this full circle, I think it is time for us to make a motion to put something on the table to bring the salaries up of our people in these departments knowing that we have more coming from other departments, and to examine these side item lines at another time, if and perhaps budget time. That is kind of what I have watched in this process, and I think we have come to a crossroads that we have some numbers in front of us that are amicable, it is going to be a big step for us, and our next job is to try to figure out how to fund that. Those are my thoughts.

A. Wilson: I think the main way we fund it is by growing the County, I said this in our last meeting last week, but one of the things we have to take and make a public point about is that we are the only County in Southwest Indiana that has gone down in population since the year 2000. We have got to start growing, that is how we create revenue for this County so the next time your neighbor says I don't want that in my

backyard, you need to say hey, we need the money. Seriously we need the money. Do you want to have safety? Do you want to have a deputy get to your house quickly when you are in trouble, then you need to let that go in your backyard because it is important to have the County grow. So, keep that in mind, please. I hope that when we have a big project that comes along, potentially one of these days, we will have a greatly attended meeting with people saying this needs to happen.

Z. George: I have a question to Tom's point. The question is for people who have been on Council longer than Jerry, Dave and I, does anyone know percentagewise, what the largest raise you have ever given the Sheriff's office and/or any other department?

H. Allyn: So, the Sheriff's office has always been on a matrix so they kind of arrange their own matrix and jumped those levels. Sometimes it would be a \$500 jump, sometimes \$750. Part of the reason the matrix was ineffective was because the raises that were given in the County as a whole were higher than what the matrix already lines out. So, the matrix continued to fall behind, we've jumped it several times to make it make sense, and at no time has it truly worked. So, percentagewise, often it was less than what the County was. So, it was an ineffective way to handle their salary.

M. Greenwell: To piggyback to answer your question, last year they received \$3,000 the matrix went up \$3,000 but I don't have a percentage for you because we do not work in percentages, we always do a dollar figure.

Z. George: Well, you can take the current and figure it out.

H. Allyn: So, we did try to jump it to get it there.

Z. George: Ok

H. Allyn: Jerry, anything?

J. Chastain: We have put in a lot of time; the committee has worked on it. We have got Tom's hard work right here; we spent money on a pay study that has really set in stone that our numbers are close. Either way, you look at it, whether we go with what is on the table or advertise for more, we are still looking at a ginormous raise for the deputies, and jailers. So, it is a matter of what this board wants to do, I want to give them everything we can. The jobs they do, how hard they work. As is said before, it is easy to spend the money, but it is harder to figure out how to pay for that. We have to balance that so that's why there is a board and now it's time to see what actions we are going to take.

H. Allyn: Just as a point of reference, the current salaries of both the jail and the deputies if you combine them all together and if you do the salary study base, as proposed by the salary study, with the addition of the levels of service, I am not going to call it longevity, that would a total difference of about \$413,000.00 from where they are today as to what that jump would be with that addition. I would have to do a little math to get to what that initial proposal was.

A. Wilson: It is three hundred or something.

D. Dausman: Tom had three proposals in front of us, which one did we advertise?

J. Chastain: number two.

A. Wilson: yes

Z. George: Heather that number is \$292,930.

H. Allyn: So, we are at a \$130,000 difference we are looking at.

Z. George: I have a question on that, you said it was \$400,000 what was the growth quotient last year?

M. Greenwell: I feel like it was 5% which was the largest Posey County has ever seen in the last twenty years. Right, Tom?

T. Schneider: We have never had one that large.

Z. George: In dollar-wise, what did that relate to?

J. Chastise: 300 grand.

H. Allyn: It was more last year.

M. Greenwell: It was more last year. Shelley, I am thinking 470 for some reason, that number is sticking in my head.

Z. George: My point is you are talking about the largest growth quotient you have ever had and spending the whole thing on one department.



H. Allyn: Right

Z. George: I am not saying that can't be done, but you will have to find funding somewhere else for the rest of the County.

H. Allyn: Keeping in mind that 1170 is LIT funded, and that is outside of the tax levies. That funds a good portion of the Sheriff's department, and that comes from income taxes.

J. Chastain: Zach, will you share what you found out from Gibson County? Didn't you talk to them last week?

Z. George: Yes, I actually grew up with a Gibson County Councilman, and I talked to him last week quite a bit, and we are a little different because their Sheriff's office they fund its own pension, and they have a different insurance structure than we do, and they get some subsidies from Toyota in the Sheriff's office and EMS. What their numbers are, they actually sent them to me; it is public knowledge, you can go look at this if you want to go look at it you can. If you look right now at the Chief Deputy spot there that is, not saying it is right, but it is substantially lower than what we are currently, we looked at some of the jail staff, and it's substantially lower than we are, not comparing ourselves to Gibson County, they are a different animal obviously being they don't have zoning, we don't have Toyota, but that is something. Dave has reached out to Vanderburgh, it is hard to compare with them because their growth quotient is probably, I don't know I haven't seen it, but I assume it is substantially, if not four times higher than ours, which would be expected. To kind of, my thought on this, we've talked about this outside of here until we were blue in the face; it was probably eleven o'clock last night when we got done with it. My opinion would be I would, before that, Brandon to your point there a while ago, so what you would like to see, or what was proposed there, I guess, is to drop off the extras, go with what the salary study is calling longevity pay, and those bases.

A. Wilson: Honestly, I think we can talk about this, I am the one who made the motion in March at the March meeting, and I know, I do this in reluctance because I know there is a chance that we will have to raise taxes, a very high chance in order to do this, but to me the right thing to do and what we have said, what this Council has said for the last three months is that we are going to wait for the pay study, wait for the pay study, wait for the pay study, and I think in order to justify the expense of the pay study, you have to go with the pay study numbers almost. That is my opinion. Granted I realize that Sheriff Latham did a great job in giving us his pay study back in February and those numbers were less than what the actual pay study was in at and that is what was made a motion on in March. But to me, we need to move forward as a Council, if we are justifiably going to pay for a pay study, then you have to justify why you paid for it so. Sheriff Latham sent us this document, I think everyone has gotten it, everyone has been able to review it, I would make a motion to adopt the numbers within that document.

B. Deig: To publish and advertise those?

A. Wilson: Yes.

Z. George: I think Arron to kind of speak to that on the salary study, there are 1/3 of us that weren't here when that was put in place and didn't have a say on whether it was or not. I think my opinion on that was to wait, so to be fiscally responsible, you are going to spend \$80,000 in taxpayer money on a salary study and we were roughly forty days away from it.

M. Greenwell: Just to clarify, it was only \$35,000 for the salary study, not \$80,000.

Z. George: Ok, I was told \$80,000.00.

A. Wilson: My motion is to advertise these numbers, ok, that doesn't mean we have to adopt every single one of them.

D. Dausman: Ok, Josh, explain how does this work now.

J. Clayborn: I guess, let me ask this. I thought I had asked this earlier, what was advertised was the job classification study done by Wagner, Irwin, and Schelle, is that right?

M. Greenwell: No, we did not have these numbers in March.

J. Clayborn: So, it was Sheriff Latham's proposal that was advertised?

H. Allyn: Yes

J. Clayborn: This pay study came in higher than what was proposed. What the Sheriff proposed did not include what some would call longevity pay correct?

Inaudible: correct

M. Greenwell: It did have longevity built into the matrix as years of service.

J. Clayborn: We have already advertised that, so I guess the suggestion Councilman Wilson is to readvertise?

A. Wilson: in order to vote on these numbers, if we would want to do the pay study numbers, we would have to readvertise those numbers for next month's meeting.

J. Clayborn: Right

A. Wilson: So, my motion is simply to just readvertise these numbers that came back from the pay study, and we would vote next month. Sorry guys but that is the way it has to be legally. That is my motion on the table.

H. Allyn: Is there a second for the motion? If not, the motion fails.

B. Deig: It is for the pay study numbers, correct?

J. Clayborn: Base and longevity is what you are proposing?

A. Wilson: Yes, again, that is the motion is to advertise those numbers and we would come back next month, and we would decide if we would do those numbers or not.

H. Allyn: But that has all of the stipends in it and adjustments.

A. Wilson: Yes, whatever the pay study calls for, which is what we have all gotten that document.

H. Allyn: But there are adjustments, these are not all pay study numbers is what I am trying to say. This is not direct to the pay study.

J. Chastain: yes, that's not (inaudible) a few changes to be made.

A. Wilson: What changes are there? The matron?

H. Allyn: and some of the years of service were a little off.

M. Greenwell: I know the Auditor's office has a few questions on how we want to enforce longevity, or whatever word we want to use for it. We need clarification so it can be put across the board equally. So, is it from the date of hire when they started working for Posey County, is it their current position, if they were promoted, or moved departments, do they still keep that date of hire? We are going to need some clarification so we can make sure those numbers are accurate.

A. Wilson: My clarification is we advertise; my motion is we advertise the pay study numbers period. That's what my motion is. So, whatever the pay study numbers call for, we advertise those numbers, then we can vote next month what we are going to do,

M. Greenwell: In order for me to give you accurate numbers, though, because there are some people that they put in here from the day they are hired from Posey County, and then there are other people that the longevity is set based on the time they moved to that position. We have people move throughout the County regularly, so we need clarification on when do you think their longevity should start, day one they are hired for Posey County, day one they were full-time with Posey County, day one in their current position, where does that start at, so I can make sure you have accurate number across the board. Does that make sense?

D. Dausman: Yes, it does. I noticed some of these on the last spreadsheet we got, that the years of service do not match up with when the pay study showed these people were hired. Some of them don't match. So, we do need to clarify what is the definition of the hire date.

A. Wilson: Let me make a clarification on the motion, let's advertise the numbers that Sheriff Latham sent, in this document, let's advertise those numbers. The motion I am going to make is to advertise the pay study calculation that Sheriff Latham sent to us as a council on May 5<sup>th</sup>.

M. Greenwell: We can't just advertise one number, we advertise per fund and per line, so I need to know what number needs to go in each line. I can advertise those exact numbers but

A. Wilson: That is exactly what I just said a minute ago. Just advertise the pay study numbers.

M. Greenwell: Let me flip that so we are going spend hours putting that together and then you're not even going to have the right numbers in front of you and we will have to do the work all over again. I just need you to tell me when longevity starts. That is all I am asking. Is when does that start.

D. Dausman: Do you need that answer today?

M. Greenwell: If you want accurate numbers, yes.

D. Dausman: Today? Because I feel like I need to talk to Tom.

A. Wilson: I think longevity starts when you are in the position that, whatever position you start, the day you start that position. That's my opinion on it.

H. Allyn: I still don't have a second on the motion, so I am going to call for a second. If there is not a second, it's going to fail and we're going to start over again.

D. Dausman: Let's define hire date.

H. Allyn: I have motion so let's take care of that first. If there is no second on that motion, that motion fails, and it will have to be readdressed and then we will address the hire date. Aaron, I am sorry we can't discuss a motion but keep changing the motion.

Sheriff Latham: I guess the question is my opinion is it should be the date of hire, now prior to me, there were sets where folks were hired and they were on a year probation, and that first year did not count toward longevity. I think that's bologna, I don't think that's right, they still worked here, and they still provided a service. Whether you called it probation, the probation period is nothing more than the Sheriff having the authority to discharge someone of their duties outside the presence of the merit board. After that year, if there were to be charges brought against that deputy, I would have to go before the merit board and a trial would have to be presented before a judge. The merit board acts as the jury, I have my attorney and they have their attorney and that's the process. During that first year of probation, it's nothing more than me having the authority to discharge someone of their duties without cause.

H. Allyn: When a person is hired in November of 22, when do they have a year of service in? November 23 or January 24.

Sheriff Latham: To me it makes sense that is November of the following year, that is 365 days or 354 1/4 but, and this is where it has gotten goofy over the years because the Auditor's office has in the past, made it where the following, the beginning of that calendar year was the beginning of their second year, which they haven't put in a full year but I understand the issues that the Auditor's office has to face within that so I think we addressed that within the last matrix system where if you were hired after July 1, you had to wait basically a year and a half for your second year.

A. Wilson: I think we keep that.

H. Allyn: I think we stay there.

Sheriff Latham: I guess my question would be because I guess there is some confusion within the numbers. I have heard some statements on years of service. When I compiled the excel sheet that I sent to you on Friday, those were years of service. For instance, Deputy Middleton was hired and technically he would have twelve years, eleven years but the paper the Auditor's office because of that probationary year, shows him as a year ten. Well, the guy still worked here for a year, he is just not getting compensated for that year, he paid into his pension for that year.

T. Schneider: I don't think I ever knew that.

Sheriff Latham: Yes, that is factual.

T. Schneider: I know for years we have had that probationary stipend, where an employee makes a thousand dollars less and they get half of it at six months and so forth, but I don't know that I have ever been aware that a person that comes into your department is not accruing longevity from day one. Where did that come from?

M. Greenwell: There is an old matrix that it is on.

H. Allyn: There is a zero year or something.

M. Greenwell: That was years ago.

T. Schneider: Where did that come from?

Sheriff Latham: That is the way the matrix was presented when it was initially presented to the Council at that time.

T. Schneider: That is interesting, you are standing there today saying that is the first I recall of hearing anything of that nature.

Sheriff Latham: So initially, Deputy Middleton is going to have to work twenty-one years in effort to getting a full retirement.



H. Allyn: So the ones that caught me off guard are the jail officers that you have noted as two years and the reason that stuck out to me is because we have had so many open positions and you have been filling positions so when I saw some at two year, I was wondering how they have been there for two years because you said we had all these open positions, so that was what made me look at those and notice they don't fit the hire dates I have.

Sheriff Latham: That would probably be accurate, and the reason I did it that way and I probably should've said something but inside my brain, you already knew what I was thinking. That was if you were to pass it, it was there for next year. Those should reflect a year less.

H. Allyn: Ok that's where my numbers weren't accurate to me. I will make a motion to move forward with the numbers that the pay salary study gave us, with the addition of the levels of service. It is a larger number than I would like to swallow but I feel like we have got to move forward, with the hire dates as discussed, if you are hired after July 1<sup>st</sup> it is a year and a half before you get that year, we will make sure we adjust everyone's years correctly to discover those numbers, without any of the stipends, the education or the shift. Let us digest this big number and reattack those as we go into budget for the 24 years. That is my motion. Is there a second.

D. Dausman: I think that is the same motion you made Aaron.

H. Allyn: No, it's not because yours had all the stipends on it.

D. Dausman: Ok

A. Wilson: It's just to advertise it, that's all I said was to advertise those numbers.

H. Allyn: But I want to go ahead and get all of these on a salary ordinance, so we are doing that as well. This would then take effect and hit their pay in late June. Is there a second? If not, it will die, and we will move forward. Is there a second.

A. Wilson: If we advertise the salary study numbers, we can come back next month and make all the minute changes within that document that we want to make. That's what my motion was, that's all I was saying, instead of sitting here talking about it more and more, then we have a whole other month to go through those numbers again and define them and make them perfect and then have the document sitting here that we can put up here on these boards that we paid good money for so everyone can see them.

D. Dausman: Heather, will you tell me that one more time.

H. Allyn: Yes, the salary base study numbers as presented by Mr. Irwin and Mrs. Rooker with the addition of what they called longevity but I would like that to say levels of service, with the correct hire dates, making sure those are all adjusted so that the numbers are figured correctly, at those numbers to start with their pay in June, so we can advertise the correct numbers then they can take effect.

D. Dausman: I would second that motion.

H. Allyn: I have a second.

Sheriff Latham: Deputy Straub was hired as his longevity as he had five years and he was moved into a three-year slot, so I didn't know if the Auditor's office would need clarification because he was actually hired last year but he started at that three-year level.

H. Allyn: He would have his level of service.

M. Greenwell: My suggestion is you type up a formal letter that you can place in their file so that eight years from now and I am not here, someone else can pull that out and find out why they are paid that way. I think we should start that process. Can I ask one clarifying question? You are saying from date of hire, but I want to clarify from the date of hire for Posey County, so if they started as a jailer and now they are a deputy.

H. Allyn: No, the position changed from that position.

M. Greenwell: So, does that mean from a jailer to a shift lead, do they start over as shift lead? See what I am saying? I want to make sure we don't do something different in two years than what we do. We have it in writing.

B. Deig: If you get promoted you keep your years of service. So, if you go from jailer to the next promotion then you keep the years of service, you don't start over.

M. Greenwell: I agree, I just want to make sure that is what you guys want.

B. Deig: That is what I want.

M. Greenwell: Ok

J. Clayborn: Otherwise, you will have someone at a very low spot that has been there for 16 years gets \$12,500.00 longevity/level pay they probably aren't going to want to be promoted.

B. Deig: You don't want to be promoted to make less.

A. Wilson: That happened not too long ago.

H. Allyn: That has happened. The old matrix, if you were promoted to shift lead you went back to level 1.

M. Greenwell: That is why I'm asking because we did.

A. Wilson: That actually happened like two years ago.

Z. George: In your motion, does that include the two detectives being able to do overtime?

H. Allyn: Yes, in the salary study they are eligible for overtime.

J. Clayborn: (inaudible) Level of service with the Sheriff's department

H. Allyn: Sheriff's department and yes as presented by the salary study.

T. Schneider: I really wanted to see a pay rise put in place today, not just a motion to advertise for even more money than we have already advertised for.

A. Wilson: So, there is a motion that has been made and seconded, at this point we need to vote.

H. Allyn: It's called discussion, it's ok, and it is a valid point. Yes, we have been dragging you guys along and I apologize for the delay in things. Sheriff said, as I understand, you polled your individuals and they felt ok with waiting to get the raise until June.

Sheriff Latham: Yes, what I explained to them, if the Council were to pass a pay increase today, the board would have to advertise those numbers before they could start getting paid, and they would be ok with that.

H. Allyn: Everyone nod, you are all here to attend. I see heads nodding.

Sheriff Latham: I agree with what Tom is saying, I think the intention behind that poll to the staff was that if you guys were to pass an agreement on what the pay increase would be they would be willing to wait that extra month to start getting that pay.

T. Schneider: That is not what the motion on the floor is.

H. Allyn: Yes, it is.

A. Wilson: That is exactly what it is.

T. Schneider: No, because your motion is to just advertise for money, your motion is not to set a pay raise.

A. Wilson: We can't though

H. Allyn: No, my motion is to advertise such that this would take effect in their payroll in June. To advertise with salary study numbers so that in June, we can appropriate that number, but that we are going with these dollar figures as presented in the salary study.

T. Schneider: We have already advertised an amount of money.

H. Allyn: Right, but it was not enough to cover this.

Schneider: It is not enough to cover the salary study. Correct.

J. Chastain: Just to be clear, do we have a dollar amount on your motion so I know? Do you know what that is, or will we have to figure all of that out?

H. Allyn: We will have to go line by line to figure out what the additional will be.

J. Clayborn: I took Heather's motion to be what the salary study calls for and with terms of service and years of service but with a commitment that this body would vote yes for this next meeting. I understand your point, Tom, you haven't taken the official vote that'll take place at the next meeting, but I think implicit in that this Council intends to do that and will do that.

H. Allyn: With the salary ordinance to come in June, yes.

A. Wilson: All this is, we aren't voting on a salary increase today, period, unless we vote on the numbers.

H. Allyn: That is the intent. I mean, do I need to explicitly say that? That is exactly what I am saying, these numbers, with the longevity, to be advertised so that it takes effect in June.

A. Wilson: And that is what the motion was and what was seconded. Correct?

H. Allyn: Correct

A. Wilson: Ok.

J. Chastain: I have to ask; we've got number two appropriated today; if you take all the stipends off the end of the pay study, are we not almost apples to apples?

Z. George: We are.

J. Chastain: We are apples to apples; you're talking minuscule.

H. Allyn: Like a 130,000-dollar difference.

H. Allyn: Ok, we have a motion on the floor, let's vote; if it fails, we can move on.

A. Wilson: so, the motion is this will take effect next month.

H. Allyn: Correct.

A. Wilson: this will be the raise, and this will not be voted on again next month. That's the motion, correct?

H. Allyn: yes

A. Wilson: I just want to clarify that for everyone.

H. Allyn: Yes, does everyone understand what the motion is? Shelley, do you have it because you have to write it all down? That is the motion, all in favor say aye, opposed same sign. Ok. Motion carried.

A. Wilson: Was that unanimous?

H. Allyn: No one voted against it, did anyone abstain? Do we need to do roll call? No one voted against.

### **SPRINGFIELD ASSESSOR'S PROJECT**

This item was tabled until the July meeting.

### **ABATEMENT REVIEW**

CountryMark:

Kevin Chestnut, on behalf of CountryMark, spoke to the Council regarding their two personal property abatements and one real property abatement that are ongoing.

Mr. Chestnut outlined the three ongoing abatements and the progress of each.

H. Allyn asked how many Posey County residents were employed by CountryMark. Mr.

Chestnut stated he would provide that number to Council as soon as possible.

T. Schneider stated the community would like to have a place to purchase the CountryMark product.

T. Schneider made a motion to continue the ongoing abatements; A. Wilson seconded. The motion carried with a vote of 7-0.

Valero:

Chris Rae, on behalf of Valero, spoke to the Council regarding their ongoing abatements.

Mr. Rae stated of Valero's 66 employees, roughly 42.4% are Posey County residents, but like many other local industries, the housing market in Posey County is their biggest challenge. Mr. Rae outlined the charitable contributions made last year by Valero and its employees.

A. Wilson made a motion to continue the ongoing abatements; T. Schneider seconded. The motion carried with a vote of 7-0.

### **EMS SLEEP TIME/SAFETY EQUIPMENT**

Paul Micheletti: Good morning, Paul Micheletti, EMS director. We have been waiting quite a long time for this, for the salary study. I mentioned in January, and in March, I sent you guys some information



about the increasing sleep stipend. I met with our EMS management team last night, I met with the EMS Advisory board last night; they unanimously recommended this pay increase recommendation that I am about ready to give to you guys today. We are going to meet with all of the EMS crews tomorrow night to talk to them about this. The increased sleep time stipend pay is asked for the employees to receive their regular rate of pay rather than the \$10.00 per hour pay. In the big picture, the projected cost for this is approximately \$104,390.00. There is projected savings in this by increasing the part-time employees, which we did a few months ago, and being fully staffed. When we are fully staffed, we are not paying overtime. We have been bringing in over \$100,000.00 every month in receivables. By increasing the sleep time, the stigma of this \$10.00 per hour that we are getting from employees that we are trying to get is removed.

J. Chastain: The \$104,390.00 that was the sleep stipend increase?

Paul Micheletti: That is correct. I have some handouts for you when I am done with this opening statement that I will give all of you.

H. Allyn: I was going to ask you about that savings. You said it was going to save on part-time?

Paul Micheletti: Part-time filling positions that are open. A few months ago, I gave you a study that shows, from June 22 to December 22, the amount of overtime that we are spending and amount of shifts that are open. For example, in November, 56 shifts, 1344 hours that had to be covered in November of 22. In October, 48 shifts 1152 hours. So, if we can reduce those hours by putting them to part-time employees, and part of these hours are open full-time positions. So, we fill our full-time positions, and we fill some of the vacancies. We are never going to get out of no overtime at all, but we can reduce it by 25-30% by increasing part-time employees, using them for open shifts and being fully staffed, and having all paramedics and EMTs in all positions.

H. Allyn: Are you not fully staffed right now?

Paul Micheletti: We currently, yes, we are right now.

T. Schneider: How long has it been since we have been fully staffed? You probably wouldn't know because it predates you.

Paul Micheletti: It's a cycle. Today you might be fully staffed, and tomorrow down two. It's crazy, but it's been a while. Let me hand out these. What I put together here is not only the sleep stipend cost but also the salary study figures. I went over this with both my management team and advisory board.

H. Allyn: Zach, are you on the EMS Advisory Board?

Z. George: Brandon is.

H. Allyn: Brandon, were you there?

B. Deig: I was out of town.

Paul Micheletti: I want to note some pieces of information on the top. This is listed by priority. Should I wait?

A. Wilson: Go ahead; I am going to take over the meeting while Heather steps out.

Paul Micheletti: That little star on the top there listed by priority, the first priority in my book is the changing of the sleep time stipend to the hourly wage of the employees. This gets rid of that stigma of \$10.00 an hour at night. These people are not at home, they are at work, they are working, they are at work and can't be with their families. \$10.00 per hour is just a stigma. I think I told you last week, but I will tell you again. I got a text from a potential paramedic who wanted to come here but didn't like the stipend, and the stipend is why she didn't come here and went to Warrick. We lost an employee because of that.

A. Wilson: Thanks for giving us that information; this stuff is important to hear from our prospective.

Paul Micheletti: The number two is both from the salary study; they had mentioned in the salary study that EMS specifically was 6.11% below the wage recommended. They also followed up with a second

recommendation of a 4% differential between our classifications of EMT, advanced EMT, and paramedic. The recommendation I have in number two is to increase the pay rate for the EMT by 6.11% from \$20.40 to \$21.56 (65) and then create a job classification separation of 4% with the advanced EMT from \$20.88 to \$22.51 and a paramedic from \$22.04 to \$23.42. Again, this is in an attempt to be fully staffed. If we are fully staffed, we are not paying overtime because we are not paying time to fill those positions. These are mandatory positions that have to be filled; you can't just leave it, leave an ambulance open. The cost of those increases to number two are \$71,651.00. Then in this salary study, they also gave us four pole EMS positions, they gave us EMT, advanced EMT, paramedic, and specialty. Under the specialty, there is the training officer, the community paramedic, and, I believe, the team leads. I would like to see them making \$2,500 specialty pay for all of those positions. The cost of that is \$6,500.00 a year. Lastly, on number four, the longevity or level pay that we were talking about, that is a number that I got off the salary study as well, \$145,000.00. I want to present that to you today. We have been waiting on the salary study to come in to give you this information; the only thing I really gave you pre was the sleep pay, but the other things are from the salary study.

H. Allyn: I reached out to Kent because the salary study did not directly address the sleep stipend; it looked like it was more of a 24-hour thing.

Paul Micheletti: It was 40 hours a week pay. 2080, we actually work 2880. So, they were missing 800 hours a year. On that there was, on the salary study wage, the hourly wage was correct, and the salary wage was correct, but not the hours per year worked.

H. Allyn: A while back, we increased the part-time rate, is that helping elevate some of the overtime? Did you guys talk about that while I was gone?

J. Chastain: I asked Paul last month.

H. Allyn: Are you getting those people?

Paul Micheletti: We are in the process of, we are burning our training officer out having him orient new employees, so we are in the process of hiring new employees, mostly part-time, which is going to help us because the greater number of part-timers we have, we are paying them straight time, not overtime like we pay full-timers when there are open shifts so that will help. Also, having a pay rate that is respectable and in the ballpark of everyone else around here will help us retain and get when we need medics, people coming over here to work.

J. Chastain: Paul, we have had several conversations on this. Sleep stipend makes sense to me; I mean, I wouldn't, if I put myself in those people's shoes, I would expect to get the wage rate in the form of a stipend. I have no problem with it, but it's a board decision, and I think we should wait until budget time to take care of more pay increases, but we as a board have to figure out our next step to fund this.

H. Allyn: So, the sleep stipend would not be anything that would increase their overtime, it would just be a flat amount as a stipend.

J. Chastain: Right.

Z. George: I agree with that.

H. Allyn: But they still, if they have a run, then are paid.

Paul Micheletti: Time and a half because they are over 40 hours. That reduces the \$104,390.

Z. George: Paul, in your item number two, where it says EMT, this is just a range of what they are making, then you come down here to advanced, that is what you would like to see them go to?

Paul Micheletti: So, the EMT from, the EMT, the advanced EMT, and paramedic are current salaries, current wages. Then the EMT wage would be 6.11%. I didn't do 6.11% for the EMT, then 6.11% for the advanced and 6.11; I went because they are asking us to do separations in classifications as well. So, I did 6.11% for the EMT, then when the EMT wage went from 2041 to 2156, I did the 4% from 2156 or 2165 for the advanced with the 4%, that brings that wage up, and then I did 4% from the advanced to the paramedic.

J. Chastain: Part of my thought process on that was if we get the sleep pay where it needs to be, take some time to see what that does to the overtime number; it should, in theory, subtract and offset.

Paul Micheletti: A lot, I am going to stick my neck out and say it's probably 25-30% of our overtime budget that we can reduce.

H. Allyn: Is that a motion, Jerry?

J. Chastain: I will make that motion, but I the pay I would like to defer until budget time.

Z. George: I will second that motion.

H. Allyn: I have a motion to adjust the sleep stipend to the hourly wage, to remain at a stipend, and address the other issues at budget time. Is there any further discussion?

J. Chastain: I would like to get some feedback as to how that is helping us as we get closer if you don't mind.

A. Wilson: Thanks for everything you have been doing; I know you came into a hornet's nest, and we appreciate how you have managed it and handled it a great deal.

Z. George: I agree with that, you are transparent in your emails, and I appreciate that because it makes our jobs a lot easier.

A. Wilson: I know it was a lot to overcome at first, so thank you.

H. Allyn: Making progress. That's good. I have a motion and a second, in favor, say aye, all opposed same sign. Motion carried. Effective next pay date.

### **ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATION REQUESTS**

Posey County Prosecutor, Thomas Clowers, is requesting the two following additional appropriation requests:

\$11,425.00 from the infraction deferral fund into the equipment account. Mr. Clowers stated this would fund five radar units for the Sheriff's office that are needed. Mr. Clowers reminded the Council this fund is funded by traffic tickets being issued.

\$2,600 from the infraction deferral fund into the investigation cost account. Mr. Clowers stated this will cover expenses incurred by hiring an expert witness who testified in an infant death to help secure a lengthy prison sentence.

J. Chastain made a motion to approve this request; B. Deig seconded. The motion carried with a vote of 7-0.

Posey County Sheriff, Tom Latham, is requesting an additional appropriation in the amount of \$420.00 into the repair and maintenance line of his reserve deputy fund. Sheriff Latham stated these funds were a donation to his department.

T. Schneider made a motion to approve this request; J. Chastain seconded. The motion carried with a vote of 7-0.

Posey County Coroner, Bill Denning, is requesting an additional appropriation in the amount of \$8,000.00 into the autopsy line of the County General. Mr. Denning stated this would cover the autopsy cost, which were unforeseen expenses that were discussed at budget hearings for this year.

B. Deig made a motion to approve this request; Z. George seconded. The motion carried with a vote of 7-0.

Posey County Auditor, Maegen Greenwell, is requesting the following additional appropriations:

\$31,000.00 into the time clock software line of County General for the new time clock software

Z. George made a motion to approve this request; B. Deig seconded. The motion carried with a vote of 7-0.

\$4,795.00 into the system support line of County General for the needed sonic wall security upgrade.

A. Wilson made a motion to approve this request; Z. George seconded. The motion carried with a vote of 7-0.

\$1,000.00 into the economic development line of the EDIT fund for needed fees for EREP.



A. Wilson made a motion to approve this request; Z. George seconded. The motion carried with a vote of 7-0.

\$25,000.00 into the contractual services line of ARPA fund needed for the donation granted from the Posey County Commissioners to the Posey County Learning Center.

J. Chastain made a motion to approve this request; Z. George seconded. The motion carried with a vote of 7-0.

\$14,424.75 into the insurance line of County General fund for the funds needed to pay a court order payment to the insurance company regarding a theft case.

A. Wilson made a motion to approve this request; J. Chastain seconded. The motion carried with a vote of 7-0.

Maegen Greenwell, on behalf of Posey County Health Department, is requesting an additional appropriation in the amount of \$12,000.00 into the equipment line of the Health Board fund. Mrs. Greenwell stated these funds are needed to purchase a new network server for their building.

A. Wilson made a motion to approve this request; B. Deig seconded. The motion carried with a vote of 7-0.

### DEPARTMENT UPDATES

H. Allyn stated the Council needs to appoint a representative to the ARPA Committee. B. Deig made a motion to appoint Zach George to the ARPA Committee; A. Wilson seconded. The motion carried with a vote of 7-0.

Posey County EMS Director, Paul Micheletti, stated that one of his units was recently in an accident, and the particular ambulance that was hit is the only one in the fleet without chevron markings. Mr. Micheletti, while the ambulance is being repaired, is going to have that one marked to match the others. Mr. Micheletti stated this unit also has a cot that doesn't have the needed brace to hold it into the box. Mr. Micheletti stated he would correct this issue through his 1223 fund.

Posey County Extension Director, Kristin Lowery, stated she would like to thank the business that appeared before Council today for abatement reviews. Mrs. Lowery stated both Valero and CountryMark are great community partners to the Posey County 4H program. Mrs. Lowery stated their office is down an ANR Educator, and the office is handling the gap in programming that this vacancy has left.

Posey County Sheriff, Tom Latham, gave the following inmate housing update:

29 Vanderburgh County

9 DOC

83 Posey County

121 total

\$30,525.00 was taken in from Vanderburgh in April.

Posey County E911 Director Jamie Bradford addressed the Council regarding the radio information that was sent. Mrs. Bradford stated the Commissioners recently signed a contract with a new vendor and appropriate changes will be made in the near future. H. Allyn asked if they have provided totals for the items that need to be addressed on the audit. Mrs. Bradford stated not yet, they are currently working on the issues at the New Harmony site.

Mrs. Bradford asked the Council to clarify longevity in the salary study, what is the stance on employees who are full-time, then back to part-time, and then back to full-time. Mrs. Bradford stated this will be a question in her department that will come up. Z. George stated if they resign from full-time to go part-time, this is considered leaving that position and the hire date would reflect the new date.

No further business was discussed, and the meeting was adjourned.

Heather Allyn

Heather Allyn, President

Aaron Wilson

Aaron Wilson, Vice President

Brandon Deig

Brandon Deig

Dave Dausman

Dave Dausman

Jerry Lee Chasin

Jerry Chasin

Zach George

Zach George

Thomas Schneider

ATTEST:

Margen L. Greenwell