

Randolph County Council

August 6, 2024

The Randolph County Council met for its regular meeting at 8:30 AM in the Commissioners and Council Room of the Courthouse with the following members present: Council President David Lenkensdofer, Tom Chalfant, Mike Stine, Tom Kerns, Todd Holaday, Missy Williams and Beverly Fields. Also present was County Auditor Laura J Martin.

Council President David Lenkensdofer presided.

Pledge of Allegiance

Commissioner's update

None

Jake Donham – Funding request Transfer from Commissioner's Cum Cap to Community Corrections Bldg. maintenance \$15,000.00

Jake said I have requested \$15,000 to be transferred from the Commissioner's Cum Cap to the Community Corrections Building Maintenance fund to be used for some of the many repairs on that building.

Tom Kerns made a motion to approve the transfer. Mike seconded. All aye votes. Motion carried.

Jake said I want to get quotes for the lawn maintenance and snow removal for all of the buildings. This way I can shop around and possibly get a better price, so I can try to eliminate so many invoices. Right now, we have the courthouse, soon to be two EMS buildings, Community Corrections building, the old hospital and now we have the three towers as well. So, I'd like to streamline this.

Tom Chalfant asked Jake how many people are involved in mowing these facilities now?

Jake said right now we just have Meijers Landscaping because they do snow removal and lawn care. I'd like to shop around for lawn and snow removal because everybody don't want to do both.

Missy made a motion to approve Jake getting quotes for lawn care and snow removal. Mike seconded the motion. All aye votes. Motion carried.

Missy said I have one question. I think you already addressed it, but there're some pretty shabby looking trees and a dead tree. Is that probably going to get taken care of in the fall, in the courthouse lawn?

Jake Donham said yeah. I got that approved, a gentleman at Duling Tree Service out of Muncie. They've been approved to do the courthouse, old hospital, and EMS buildings. They're just going to go through, they looked at everything, put a price on everything in all the facilities. And so, they're going to come in. Because it was kind of in the middle of the season, I know he was booked, but he has some work scheduled over here this month or next, I think, so he's going to try to come over and just top to bottom, get everything taken of.

Missy said thanks.

Jake Donham said yep.

David said alright. Thanks Jake.

Jake Donham said yep. Thank you, guys.

George Caster – Updated disaster report

David said George, you're next.

George Caster said I sent this out. Some of you may have seen it, some of you may not have. But, since I've sent it out, the next day it changed. So, I just updated this. What this is, is a, as of August 1st, this is the status of our damage valuation and our possible income getting back or possible gains for the March tornado. You'll see the initial assessment, it was determined that roughly 367 properties were impacted varying from minor damage to just totally destroyed. In July, we did a comprehensive re-evaluation. Was conducted to incorporate the changes and property conditions due to insurance claims and sales. We found that there were some property owners that had undertaken structural removals that we were not aware of because they did not obtain a permit for various reasons. One of them, they were being told, well you're not have to pay for permits, we're not going to give you one. Well, that is our way of knowing that they're taking something down unless the taxpayer tells us. Which, they're more likely to tell me they took something down then in building something. But, it's kind of obvious if they're building something, you can see it. When questioned, they claimed they were informed of no license. The validity that's claimed those uncertain, but it's prompted investigation, so we went out and we re-did the whole thing again. This time, we found there were 315 properties that were considered majorly damaged. Had their values adjusted do to the unpermitted removals or alterations. Unfortunately, due to unforeseen circumstances, permits for additional removals were not secured or, and unpermitted structures based on insurance claims were only discovered through subsequent property transaction. The total disaster that we've come up with, percentages of value, was 8% of the overall county value. That don't maybe seem a lot, some, but that's a lot of money. And so, on the next page, I've included some pivot tables that I've pulled off of the data we've collected. As you'll see, there were 5 taxing districts, 4 of them being townships and 1, being Winchester that were affected. And various loss totals \$17,148,800.00 or approximately \$248,000.00 in tax dollars, and that is based solely on cap

values because I don't know what the deductions are everybody has, it'd be different. So, I just went 1, 2 and 3%, this is the max you can charge them, so this is the max we could take. And so, that's what that number there is based off of. And to go down the next block, it shows Winchester took up about 83 ½% of the damage. They had 263 of the parcels, so that's a major one. Now go down to the last box, it shows the potential gains. Why are these higher? Well, a lot of these homes were older. They had higher depreciation. These homes or these new buildings are going to be brand new. There's not going to be any depreciation. And they're going on at cost, per the state guidelines. So, you go down through there, now you have some miscellaneous gains. These are things that are sheds, a garage, or stuff that wasn't really part of the major structure. We have a total of \$7,301,321.00 of AV gain. That's a total of 42 ½% increase for 26. So, our projection of 2, 3 years out, is about right. In 26, we can expect to get at least 42% or 54% of our loss back. Now this is only through the end of July. Every two months until the end of the year, I'll be back in here updating where we're at. If it levels off, and there's not sense in coming back and telling you it's changed again. But for, currently as of today, in 26 we should be gaining about 109,000 of the \$247,000.00 loss in tax money. It'll be 7-million-dollar valuation versus the 17 we lost, and that's only on 45 parcels compared to 315. So, if you use that proportionately, we're going to gain quite a bit more back, as it comes going forward as things progress. Any questions?

Tom Chalfant said George, you said we've lost 8% of our assessed valuation in the county?

George Caster said yes, the county, this is the county, the whole. I didn't break it out by just, but I broke it out to show you, but it's over all, 8% of the AV was lost in that damage.

Tom Chalfant said we don't qualify for FEMA, and that's sort of interesting isn't it?

George Caster said well and unfortunately, like I explained to liaison, smaller rural municipalities and counties have a hard time meeting that because they don't have the mass amount of structures and buildings and stuff to get destroyed. To us, 8%, that was quite a hit.

Tom Chalfant it would be to anybody.

George Caster said yeah, but I mean, 8% in New York City, that's just a borough. They don't care.

Tom Chalfant said that just shows you our policies are skewed, aren't they?

George Caster said correct. And I have talked with our representative, JD, because the law stated that in a disaster, they get their assessment affixed so the next year they have a lower tax bill, unless it's a flood. Then that year's taxes are affected. Now, I'm sorry, but there is nobody up here that's going to distinguish between a tornado wiping your house out and a flood coming in and taking your property. There's no distinction. It's still a disaster. But the way the law is written, because somebody somewhere had a flood and they got a law written for them, he is supposed to be, and he affirmed this to me, that they were taking it to their committee chairman and their committee is going to run it to get that changed. It's either all or none. So, everybody either gets the benefit of that year's tax or everybody gets the benefit of the next year's tax. I

mean, that's how they want to run it. No difference in the disaster, because a disaster is a disaster to anybody.

David said and the FEMA was what, 12.4 million? We had to meet that threshold?

George Caster said yeah.

David said I agree. That's totally wrong for a small community.

Tom Chalfant said about 8% anywhere, yeah.

George Caster said yeah, the 17 million, you know, to us, is quite a bit of money. To some of these bigger places, Indianapolis, 17 million would have been 3 parking lot garages. You know, it doesn't equate. So, unfortunately, we live in a world where one size has to fit all, and it doesn't.

David said right.

George Caster said we need to figure out a way of making it comparable, equitable to the situation, and the area you're working in.

Bev said thank you. Thank you for the information. Appreciate it.

David said other questions for George?

Missy said I guess a comment. George, I met with him a little bit yesterday and so, I did contract OCRA, office of rural community, and they're willing to sit down and talk with us on what they can do as far as this loss. And he also said Indiana Housing Development, we should kind of get them, maybe get a meeting together of you and commissioners' president, and then George, and sit down and say where do we go from here? What grants are available? Because they can't, at least OCRA, he couldn't understand this. He said I don't understand that.

George Caster said we've had people that had to just sell what they had and move on or go do something because they can't afford to rebuild. Insurance companies, some are right on spot, others are just dragging it out, you know. We got a case right now there are 4 condos or 2 duplexes being built out at Summers Point. They got permits. I just got sales in for X number of dollars. And I said what did you buy? Air? Because you don't own anything, there's nothing there to buy. Well, we bought the rights to finish, because the Housing Authority is building the house, so that it looks like everybody else's. They bought the rights to go inside and finish it and then flip it. So, we're already seeing people starting to take advantage or not, of some of these situations. I'm going to try to stay on top of that as much as I can, you know. I've seen that. It just didn't make, didn't register any sense. What are you buying? It's air, because there's nothing there. Well, I'm going to do this and then I get the right to go inside and do that. So, okay, but yeah, there're 3 other ones, they're working the same deal. Well you say deal, to me, means you're somebody trying to figure an angle, that are taking advantage of people. Most of the people that live out there are not of meager income, but they're not the wealthiest of the

county either. And they're taking this money, and okay, what do I do now? This OCRA would help us figuring all that out in the long run for everybody. And I'm willing to, whenever, be part of that.

Missy said John and Bear may be able to talk more about this, but there're a lot of people who had homes, they were destroyed, and their insurance company has depreciated the house to where they can't even come close.

Tom Chalfant said if you don't keep replacement cost, you're pretty much screwed.

Missy said yeah. So, there's going to be a lot of empty lots, and some of it, they buried some of the stuff in the short foundation they had. Thanks for your time yesterday too, by the way.

George Caster said no problem.

David said this is a good report, George, for us. It shows the financial picture.

George Caster said yeah, right. And that's why I did it, for you guys mainly.

Missy said does Winchester have a copy of this?

George Caster said Winchester got theirs yesterday. Winchester did state, I believe Mayor McCoy said that next year's, based on all this information, will end up having a flat budget because they see their increase coming the following year. But, there's no sense of speculating, just let it be what it is. But I see we're going to rebound a little quicker than we should, normally. But it's going to be substantial when they do. I mean, part of the Winchester's income was Taco Bell. They've already rebuilt it. They're ready to open up. They're hiring people right now. That's a 1-million-dollar project. So, things are starting to come back around. It's just taking it slow. TK is making a mint over here. They're building every, almost all the homes are being TK homes. So, they're not cheap.

David said okay. Thanks George.

George Caster said no problem.

Other Business:

Art Moystner, Randolph County Sheriff

David said sheriff, next.

Art Moystner said the only thing I have this morning is a quick update. My jail commander told me on Monday that probably for the first time in 2 or 3 years, we're fully staffed in the jail. So, that's good news and I wanted to share that with you. Other than that, I don't have anything today unless any of you have questions for me.

David said I have one question. The generator out at the old radio station, is it doing anything anymore?

Art Moystner said I don't know anything about a generator at the old radio station.

David said well that's part of the sheriff's department.

Art Moystner said really? Never knew that.

David said yeah. It's communications.

Art Moystner said I have no idea. I can check with Shaneyfelt and see if it is.

David said okay.

Tom Chalfant said which one?

David said there's a generator that we purchased several years ago out there.

Missy said shop 27?

David said yeah. And I know with all our new towers, I don't know if it's really.

Art Moystner said I think there're generators at the towers, but I would have to check with Shaneyfelt.

David said there are there. I don't know if they're needed anymore at the radio station's tower.

Art Moystner said yeah, I had no idea that we had that. I can talk with Shaneyfelt and past sheriff's, previous sheriffs, and see what information I can get.

David said okay.

Art Moystner said and we can go from there. I don't have any idea, Dave.

David said didn't mean to put you on the spot.

Art Moystner said no, you're absolutely fine. That was apparently well before my time.

David said yep, sure was. Okay.

Art Moystner said does anybody else have questions?

Missy said I do.

Art Moystner said yes?

Missy said we talked about the trees in front of the, I won't take long, sorry.

Art Moystner said no, you're fine.

Missy said I should just come and ask you. The trees around the jail, what have you decided on that?

Art Moystner said have we had an update from that person?

Jake Donham said it's all in your court now, the trees and sidewalks.

Art Moystner said that's news to me. I'll check with commissioners and see where we're at on that. I don't have an update for it. The last I knew was there was supposed to be an arborist or something that Jake had talked to, and I haven't heard where we were at.

Jake Donham said so we had an arborist come in, the commissioners went through and they approved all the buildings except for the jail because there was confusion on sidewalks and this and that. So, I gave all my information to the maintenance director at the jail and said here's all the information. There's no need in me being in the middle between all this, and you guys just figure out what you want to do sidewalks and trees and I'll do mine. And so, that's where I left it with him.

Missy said it's no big deal. I just wondered.

Tom Chalfant said I can give you the phone number of the arborist if you're interested, Art.

Art Moystner said I'm more interested in getting the trees, I hate to take down trees, but I have trees that are pushing into a wall, so I will address that with the commissioners at the next commissioner meeting to see how they want to move forward.

Missy said no big deal. I just thought it was an issue there for a while, a danger

Art Moystner said I think it still is. So, I'll check with the commissioners. Anybody else? Thank you.

Minutes of June 4, June 13 & July 2

David said next on the agenda, Minutes of June 4th, June the 13th and July 2nd. They have all been sent to you for your review.

Bev made motion to approve. Mike seconded the motion. All aye votes. Motion carried.

Salary Study Committee

David said alright, the next item we have on our agenda is the salary study committee. We have 3 members on the county council part of that team. Would you like to bring us up to date, where we're at?

Bev said I was not at the 31st meeting, although I understand what happened. Were either of you at the 31st meeting?

Todd said yeah. I believe Gary was going to come and present that to us this morning, but I'm not sure.

Laura said he said yesterday he wouldn't be here today.

Mike said he told us he would be.

Todd said so, I don't have a presentation, personally. To summarize the meeting, we had quite a few people attend from different areas of the courthouse and the highway department, and the police department. We talked in depth about difficulty of paying for time worked during lunch or not worked during lunch. And there was quite a bit of concern about how that would affect the ability to have a workable shift, you know, for the certain departments and just a lot of concerns about how that affected peoples' pay overall. So, in the end, that was one of the discussion points that we agreed to or we decided would be best not to pursue. The main thrust of the, besides the increase in pay for each department person, the main topic that we discussed was that and the switch from comp time to time and a half for hours worked over and above the 40-hour workweek. And, so, there was difficulty with that in the emergency services area and in the highway department. It conflicted somewhat, with the handbook itself in the ability for Art and others to staff those areas. So, I believe Meeks, you were going to have a presentation this morning from what I read in the email to kind of talk about what you've discussed with Irwin.

Meeks said let me go over the 9 points a little bit. So, I think was no comp time and then time and a half over 40 hours. I think that was discussed and we kind of thought that. The question's whether or not you have flex time then, probably have to have some sort of flex time the more I thought about it. And that would be, I come in at, you know, 7:30 and I leave at 3:30 or something like that. You take the flex time during the week that you have it. And I thought more about that and that's probably something that we'd want to look at. I thought that the paid lunch was out. And the more I thought about the paid lunch after we discussed it, if we don't pay lunch, we would provide the benefit after working 7 hours. So, it would be a benefit, not a paid lunch. Well, what happens if I actually worked that paid lunch, I got the benefit, I'd probably have to pay you for that hour also, along with that. I don't see how you can work. I think that's kind of unworkable. So, I think the committee decided not to pursue that avenue. And the more I thought about it, the more I don't know how you can do that. Then we would go from, you would have 2 baskets. You'd have a vacation and then you'd have paid time off. And that would be the sick days and our personal days would be one basket, paid time off, not sick days anymore. And then you would then get your vacation. We would want to keep those separate because you don't have to pay out paid time off at the termination of employment, but you do have to pay out vacation. And I think we pay out paid time off after 20 years. So, we would keep that. That wouldn't change. And your paid time off would reflect whatever. The more I thought about that is if you did, and this kind of goes in the next one, is the 1 extra week of vacation after 15 years. Don't know when that would go in effect. So, if I'm been here for 17 years, let's say, and my hiring date was July 1, when do I get that week? Do I get it on January 1 when we start this or do I get it, that's something that we didn't address that we would have to

think about that in the next 4 or 5 months. I would assume you'd get it when we decide to do it. I mean, if I've been here 17 years, although, maybe my hiring date was January 5th, I mean, we would have to let you roll that over. I mean, there would have to be some sort of 1-year roll over of your vacation, which we didn't discuss. But, came up what I was thinking of afterwards. Hours of work can be flexed by the direction of the department head. We kind of talked about that. All budgets would need to be developed to include overtime. That's kind of you guys. Then all accrued comp time would be paid out, and there was a discussion of do we cut that off on a certain date, what date do we cut off the comp time. I think we came to a consensus of not cutting, having a fast, hard and fast date. Although, when I talked to Laura, Laura was thinking maybe December. There was a December date where it had, make it the 22nd or something?

Laura said beginning December 16th through December 30th, that pay would be paid in January, which we would have overtime money to that point. So, if we cut it off on December 15th, that would be the last day for comp, then everything you earn over that would be overtime, would be paid out of January at your next pay. Danita and I went over the payroll dates and came up with that.

Meeks said and so we'd have to look at what, who works and how we're going to pay you but, for the holiday pay, how much is holiday pay? That's 2 ½ times?

Laura said if they work it, yeah.

Meeks said yeah, if you work it, that's 2 ½.

Todd said and comment on that would be Irwin presented 4 different payout plans for that, but the overall amount was the same. It just was the timing, the accrued, or the accumulated comp time calculation to date, at the time we had the report, was around \$135,000.00. And that wasn't all incurred in, I mean it didn't all accrue in 2024 in 7 months. It was everything had been carried forward that had not been paid out.

Meeks said yeah, that could have accrued 5 years ago at a lower pay rate. But we have to pay you at your current rate.

Todd said so, there was some, I think Irwin's representative came with the thought that maybe that was a lot of money for us to take all at once, so she had comes up with some plans about paying part now, part later. But, knowing our financial situation better, we thought that it probably just made more sense to pay that at the end of the year, as close to the end of the year as made sense from a reasonable standpoint

Meeks said so, the transition would be using Irwin. I think she thought we could do it this year. I'm still not convinced that we can get everything done. I'm just not convinced. I hope we can. I mean, that would be a good thing. So, with that being said, I talked to Kent the next day, Kent Irwin and he recommended and I agreed 100% with him on these two issues, that we have a small committee for the handbook, reconstitute the handbook committee. We used to have a handbook committee a long time ago. I think Mike Wickersham said yesterday he'd serve on it. We need one, a council member to serve on it. We did have Laura from the Auditor's they're

going to be you know, kind of maintaining, I mean they're the ones that are going to have to implement some of this stuff. And then when we talked about, say the highway department, we have a highway person in there. When we talk about EMS, we have, when we talk about the sheriff's department, so we don't like, you know, kind of a small working committee and we rely pretty heavily on Irwin. They recommended also that one handbook with appendages for different department heads. If you look at our handbooks, I'd say 90% of all 4 of those handbooks are the same. And FMLA, I mean, FMLA, I don't care where you work, it's going to be the same. And that's half the handbook talks about FMLA. The discipline is the same, right. I mean we have tier 1, 2 and 3. And I can bump through all 3 of those, 4 of those handbooks and that's all the same. What's not the same is specifically for you know, 911, the emergency services, and really the highway was some quirky rules. So, my recommendation is for them, absolutely, I think make Laura's life a lot easier too if we have one standardized handbook with appendages. So, I think the commissioners agreed with that. That's not really a council decision. But to let you guys know, I think that's what they're leaning towards.

Todd said and with that said of two buckets for the accumulated time off or paid time off, there was no change in light caps or anything like that, that was discussed where the words currently in the handbook would be what stays in the handbook. It's just that it would make it easier for, the thought was at first, to make it all one paid time off accumulated bucket. But Irwin pointed out the difficulties of that. But by combining the personal and sick days, a person no longer has to say I'm sick to take a personal day, which is something that Gary pointed out numerous occasions that it was forcing employees to be dishonest about their time.

Meeks said we also discussed, so the department heads, the elected officials are excluded from the FLSA so they would maintain their exclusion. Everybody else would be non-exempt. And we looked at the, it's about \$58,000 you have to pay somebody next year, so the vast majority of our people would be none exempt anyway. I'm not sure who would be, I'd have to look through the thing, but that's, I mean, they're going to be non-exempt. And that number has just been going up every year. So, by the time, you know, a couple years, if we make people exempt, they're going to become non-exempt at some point. So, what I need is a member for the committee, then I'm going to email Irwin to see if we can set up a meeting this month to really get on that. And then if that's the recommendation, I'm going to tell Irwin that we're going to go through with this.

David said would anybody off the county council like to serve on that committee?

Bev said since this is my only employment and the others are employed, I think I'm probably, and I was on the other committee, I would gladly serve.

David said okay. Thanks Bev. You got that Meeks?

Meeks said I've got Bev on it and I will set the time and let you know. I'll let the board know and one of us will let you know.

Bev said okay. Thank you.

David said okay. Anything else Meeks, on that?

Meeks said I don't think we need necessarily a vote on the other stuff because that's going to come up at budget time.

Laura said well, if they're in favor or not, because Irwin is going to know whether to move forward with the handbooks or not.

Meeks said should we go forward, I guess you should vote on that then.

Laura said the 9 points minus the 8 hour with a paid lunch.

Meeks said subject to, I mean you guys can change your minds.

Laura said yeah, I mean it's not like set in stone, but they just need to know whether to go forward with those handbook changes or not, and to get them done by the end of the year, which you know is iffy, I mean she said she can do it. But I think she needs to know now that we're going to want to move forward.

David said and you said the commissioners agreed to it yesterday?

Meeks said yes.

David said so, we do need a vote here. I'd entertain a motion to proceed ahead with Irwin making the change to our handbooks for Randolph County.

Bev made motion to approve. Mike seconded the motion. All aye votes. Motion carried.

Laura Martin - The county fiscal body shall review at its first meeting in August the estimated property tax levy limits and the estimated reductions due to circuit breakers- Council consideration for the 2025 Budget

David said okay. Next item is Laura Martin.

Laura said I sent you guys the estimated levies for 2025 and these are definitely estimated. Our roll is not complete. Although, it's supposed to be complete on August 1st, we had some issues with assessor software and my software speaking to each other, so we had to make a lot of manual corrections to make it work. Anyway, per IC Code, I have to present you with the estimated maximum levy. So, this is what I came up with, and I sent those to you in an email. But, like I said, we don't have a final certified net assessed value yet. As soon as I get that, I can update that and get it out. It's just information I am required to give you.

David said and I believe the maximum of levy growth is going to be 4%?

Laura said correct. And that's set by state.

David said right. Because they had discussed about maybe going to 5% in the minutes in a meeting a few months ago. I see it's 4%.

David said do you need a vote on that or?

Laura said no, it's just. Yeah, it's just so that I have to give you that information. And then I also wanted to bring up to you that in getting the budget information into Gateway that we had to, we have to get it in for the state to approve. In our meeting with Baker Tilley, Jason was telling us that both the health fund and the reassessment fund was growing at a rate more than what we're using. So, what we did when we entered the information into Gateway, we entered, we took 50,000 out of reassessment, 50,000 out of the health fund, put that into General, which is an extra 100,000 in General, 50,000 less in those two. Per the numbers in the reassessment, cash balance, if they spend everything in their budget this year, there will still be \$170,000.00 cash in that reassessment fund. If we continue the levy that's there without taking the 50 out, there will be another 170,000. So, that fund just keeps growing. So, I don't think it's going to hurt that fund at all to do that. And then the health fund, if they get the total amount that the state is going to give them, I don't know the exact, but it's over \$500,000.00, we have to match. And our match would be about 160. So, again, right now, the amount that we're putting in per levy would be 210. If we take 50, that's a 170, we'll still have more than enough to match what we have to match. So, if we take those two, and this is just something for you to think about for the budget hearings, because we can change it back if you guys choose to change it back. But just based off of Baker Tilley's presentation, right now reassessment would be at 210, we take 50, that leaves them 170, which is more than their budget. Like Jason said, it just continues to grow. Health is at 210. So, take 50 out, that leaves them 170.

Tom Chalfant said 210?

Laura said if we take 50,000 out of the 210, that they're originally going to get, with the levy that's current, okay, if you take.

Tom Chalfant said that's a 160,000.

Laura said yes. When you do the budgets next week, you need to make the decision whether you want to go ahead and reduce those two levies by 50,000, and that 100,000 would go into General to be used for wherever, or to leave it as is, and those funds keep growing. So, those are just the two options and I just want to bring that your attention. That way, when you get to budget hearings, you'll have some time before then to think about do we want to do this or not? We put it in so that, basically, right now, that it's where it's at, the levy is where it's at, we put it in both ways so that whichever way you decide, that levy will go wherever you decide to put it.

David said we've used Baker Tilley for years and their recommendations have always been strong.

Laura said and those are just going off the numbers that Jason presented to us. So, anyway, I wanted to bring that to your attention just so you'd have time to think about it before the budget hearings.

David said okay. That brings us down to additional appropriations then.

Laura said APC attendance report. Just mention that you got it.

APC/BZA Attendance report

David said the APC/BZA attendance report. She sent that out and we've all got a copy of it. Now down to the additional appropriations.

Additional Appropriations:

Highway Wheel tax

Road projects	\$700,000.00
---------------	--------------

Highway MVH 1173

Stone/Gravel	\$50,000.00
--------------	-------------

Bituminous materials	\$350,000.00
----------------------	--------------

Highway MVH 1176

Stone/Gravel	\$410,000.00
--------------	--------------

Bituminous materials	\$100,000.00
----------------------	--------------

Professional Services	\$5,000.00
-----------------------	------------

Equipment rental	\$15,000.00
------------------	-------------

Highway MVH 1176

Repair trucks/tractors	\$27,000.00
------------------------	-------------

David said do you want to take all the highway at one time? There're 4 requests there. Yeah, I think that's the way to go. We have 4 different additional appropriations. One is Wheel tax, one's from MVH 1173, one is from MVH 1176 and the last one is also from 1176. It all deals with road projects, stone, gravel, bituminous materials and repair of trucks and tractors. So, I would entertain a motion for all four of these items. Excuse me, Jay, would you like to speak first?

Jay Long said actually, I got a little packet I want to hand out to everybody. Basically, it just shows we had to use \$27,000 out of truck, tractor repair to finish a portion on our building which we had vehicles parked out there. But every time you wanted to use them, you pretty much had to clean the windshields and everything like that. There was no lighting out there. To do a DOT inspection you had to either use a flashlight or try to hold your light and open the hood and check the oil and stuff, it was just, it was pretty bad for safety. So, basically, that was in the works before I took over. So, we just pretty much moved ahead and finished that portion. And also, the sheriff's department had a SWAT vehicle that actually was parked out there too. So, anything an emergency or something, you know, they had to clean the windows, things like that. So, basically, the first picture just shows where the roof wasn't finished, and then the back picture shows where we had it finished with metal and had lighting put up. Basically, just keeps the birds out from building nests and things like that.

David said anything else, Jay, you might have?

Nate Moore said I don't know if I've met you. I've never met you guys, but I'm Nate Moore. I'm his assistant. I've been at the highway for 15 years, been an operator for 8. This is all new to me, so I don't know they got their money, but I know how to spend it.

David said well, your monies come in at a different level which is through the gasoline tax.

Nate Moore said that's what I'm learning.

Jay Long said basically, a lot of this money is just, we want the highway to go in a different department so, basically you know, snow, things like that, we want to be more proactive instead of retroactive trying to come in the day, we'd like to come in earlier and you know, make the commute for everybody a lot safer, things like that. The stone and stuff, that's going to be for our edging projects along the roads, things like that, just keeps people if they get off the road, you know, that 4-inch lip, it's a lot harder to get back if the road isn't level.

David said what berming, have you?

Jay Long said actually, yes, we have. We started berming. That's a major thing now. We're getting ready to do a spot on 100 East and 100 North. The bridge is closed. It's got about a 6-inch lip along the edge. We're going to remove that while the bridge is closed so we ain't got to fight traffic, things like that.

David said I remember when I was commissioner, we, berming was a big, big thing.

Jay Long said it's never too hard to get rid of the material.

David said and we used to have areas where we even filled up big holes.

Nate Moor said yeah, we're always for places to get rid of like, the road chunks and concrete and stuff like that. That's a little bit harder to get rid of.

Jay Long said and that's, we have a pretty good pile at the barn that we keep soil for things, projects we use, things like that..

David said any questions for Jay or Nate? Okay. We'll go ahead and approve these four requests for additional appropriations.

Tom Chalfant made motion to approve. Missy seconded the motion. All aye votes. Motion carried.

ARPA

Building Maintenance Jail \$12,408.35

ARPA

Farmland ambulance Bldg. \$435,000.00

David said the last two items under additional. One is for maintenance of the jail for heating and walk in freezer repair, and the other one is for the new Farmland ambulance depot. So, I'd entertain a motion of both of those to approve.

Todd made motion to approve. Missy seconded the motion. All aye votes. Motion carried.

Citizen Comments (3 minutes)

Dave said our last item on the agenda, anybody in the audience would like to speak, please come up and state your name. Come on up, Ronnie.

Ron Brandon said my name is Ron Brandon. I'm here with the West Martin Street gang. We've all tried to keep our properties really nice and everything. And the neighbors have cleaned up the corner down there on Martin Street, back there at the stockyard road. We have a problem with 3 or 4 kids using that road as a racetrack. The Winchester High School used that as the track, uses that to run. The kids run up there to the stockyard and they then turn around and come back. We have a lot of golf carts out there. We have a lot of pedestrians. We have a lot of bicyclers. Well these kids, they just, I've been to the sheriff's office once because I found one kid that was, and I named him, and they did talk and they got him slowed down. But we still have more kids that just tear that road up. They start at the factory and go wide open all the way down. We would like to see maybe a 30, 35-mile speed zone from down to the stock yard road, like you did on the old 27 going out north. We would like to get that kind of cut down and maybe save somebody's life. That's what we'd like to see happen.

Meeks said you'll need to come to the commissioners. This is the county council. They don't decide the speed limits. So, you'll need to talk to Mike Wickersham, would be your commissioner representative for that district.

Tom Chalfant said is that in the county's?

Ron Brandon said yes. It is in the county.

Missy said well, here it is.

Ron Brandon said it is in the county.

Meeks said okay. You'll want to come, talk to Mike Wickersham and now, they'll tell you speed limits aren't designed, that's not a traffic control, but putting a speed limit sign may be what they need to do, or one of those signs that tell like, how fast you're going. But you want to go to the commissioners or Mike, or Gary Friend or Gary Girton.

David said yeah, you're right Meeks. It's commissioner, but Jay Long is here. Maybe he can look at it.

Meeks said you can talk to the highway

David said I think it's a good idea if you've got some problems out there it needs to be addressed. Anybody else from the audience like to speak? Seeing no other person, I'd recommend adjournment.

Adjournment

Tom Chalfant made motion to adjourn. Mike seconded the motion. All aye votes. Meeting adjourned.

Reviewed and accepted this 4 day of September, 2024.

RANDOLPH COUNTY COUNCIL

David Bendersdofer

Tom Chalfant

~~Mike~~

Mike

Judy

Steve

ATTESTED:

Laura J Martin
Laura J Martin, Auditor