

MEETING MINUTES
Monroe County Income Tax Council
Public Safety Option Income Tax Committee

Nat U. Hill Meeting Room
Monroe County Courthouse, 100 West Kirkwood, Bloomington, Indiana
July 25, 2017 - 7:30pm

Allison Chopra called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

1. ROLL CALL

Committee Members Present: Allison Chopra (Bloomington Common Council), Susan Sandberg (Bloomington Common Council), Isabel Piedmont-Smith (Bloomington Common Council), Dorothy Granger (Bloomington Common Council), Ryan Cobine (Monroe County Council), Cheryl Munson (Monroe County Council), Scott Oldham (Ellettsville Town Council), Lois Purcell (Stinesville Town Council)

Staff Present: Jeffrey Underwood (Controller, City of Bloomington), Thomas Cameron (Assistant City Attorney, City of Bloomington), Dan Sherman (Council Attorney/Administrator, City of Bloomington), Michael Flory (Council Attorney, Monroe County), Michael Rouker (City Attorney, City of Bloomington), Michael Diekhoff (Chief of Police, City of Bloomington), Jeff Schemmer (Communications Manager, Monroe County Central Emergency Dispatch), Brad Swain (Sheriff, Monroe County), Stacy Jane Rhoads (Deputy Council Attorney/Administrator, City of Bloomington)

2. AGENDA SUMMATION

Ms. Chopra gave a summary of the agenda.

3. MINUTES – Meeting on June 15, 2017

It was moved and seconded to approve the minutes of June 15, 2017 as corrected. The motion was approved by voice vote.

4. ADDITIONAL OVERVIEW OF LOCAL INCOME TAX RATES, REVENUES, AND DISTRIBUTIONS

Mr. Underwood provided background information about the creation of the local income tax. He displayed a spreadsheet entitled 2018 PS-LIT Analysis (Exhibit 1) and reviewed the 2017 distribution of PS-LIT revenue as contained on the spreadsheet. He then explained how 2018 distributions to the various entities might be affected under the assumption that the amount available for distribution did not increase and that the amount requested by the Public Safety Access Point (PSAP or dispatch) was granted in full. He then explained that a 4% increase in distribution was needed to both fully fund the budget request from PSAP as well as maintain the amounts allocated to the other incorporated entities. He said that the amount of revenue available for distribution would not be known until later in July or early August.

Mr. Cameron followed up on issues raised at the committee's previous meeting. He explained the process that the committee would need to follow should it decide to adjust the local income tax rate and the process needed if the committee chose not to adjust the rate. He also explained the deadlines by which the committee would need to act. Ms. Munson asked when a new rate would take effect. Mr. Cameron said that, depending on when the Monroe County Local Income Tax Council acted, a new rate could take effect on October 1, 2017, January 1, 2017, or October 1, 2018. Ms. Munson clarified that not all of the rates within the 1.345% local income tax rate could be adjusted. Mr. Cameron agreed, noting that the juvenile services rate could not be changed as that rate was under the control of the Monroe County Council.

Ms. Piedmont-Smith asked what taxes were included within the 1.345% local income tax. Mr. Cameron said that general local income tax was 1%, public safety local income tax was .25%, and juvenile services local income tax was .095%.

Mr. Underwood provided additional detail on the percentage of PS-LIT revenue that was distributed to PSAP in 2017 and what percentage would be distributed in 2018 if PSAP's request was fully funded. Ms. Munson asked for clarification on what Mr. Underwood meant when he said above the line. Mr. Underwood explained that above the line referred to distributions that the tax council could allocate before distributions would be made to the four incorporated units of government.

Mr. Cobine clarified a portion of the displayed spreadsheet to ensure he understood it correctly. Mr. Underwood explained how the net amount on the spreadsheet was calculated.

Ms. Piedmont-Smith said she did not understand how the 2018 PS-LIT Analysis spreadsheet related to the Central Dispatch worksheet (Exhibit B). Mr. Underwood explained that the total proposed budget for dispatch was \$3,737,820, with \$862,635 coming from E-911 funds and the remaining \$2,875,185 to come from PS LIT funds, which was reflected on the 2018 PS-LIT Analysis spreadsheet. Ms. Piedmont-Smith clarified that some of the amounts had been updated since the previous meeting, which might explain some of the confusion.

Ms. Munson said she was concerned about making distribution determinations before knowing the exact amount that would be available for distribution. Ms. Chopra pointed out that the same situation had existed the previous year. Ms. Munson said the committee had met in August after learning the revenue amount from the state. Ms. Chopra said that there was a tentative meeting scheduled for August. Mr. Sherman said that it was common to work with estimates when working on budgets and the committee had not needed to make adjustments the previous year when it learned the exact amount of revenue. Ms. Chopra suggested that the committee use conservative estimates for revenue while deliberating. Ms. Munson asked if a 4% increase in revenue was a conservative estimate. Mr. Underwood said no, though he was hopeful the revenue would increase some amount. He explained that various indicators led him to believe there would be some growth in revenue and doubted that there would be a decrease in the amount of revenue available.

Ms. Piedmont-Smith asked Mr. Underwood to explain why the 2018 PS-LIT Analysis spreadsheet listed the total 2017 PS-LIT distribution to PSAP as \$2,574,507 when the Central Dispatch spreadsheet listed the PS-LIT funding portion of its total budget as \$1,946,584. Mr. Underwood noted that the amount that was allocated to PSAP was actually \$2,182,947, as \$391,560 had been allocated to the townships. He explained that the \$1,946,584 amount listed on the Central Dispatch spreadsheet was a revised figure, which had been the result of combining budgets for dispatch. He said that they had spent less than had been allocated and noted any amount remaining would be put into a capital replacement fund. Mr. Cobine summarized Mr. Underwood's explanation to ensure the committee understood it correctly.

Ms. Granger asked if the funds allocated to the townships would revert to a similar capital replacement fund if not all allocations were spent. Mr. Underwood said no, as it was his understanding that there was no written agreement with the townships to spend allocated funds in any particular way. He recommended having such agreements in the future if the committee wanted to ensure funds were spent on the proposals presented to the committee.

Ms. Munson asked for a further explanation of the difference between the amount allocated to PSAP in 2017 (\$2,182,947) and the amount listed as the total budget for dispatch (\$1,946,584). Mr. Underwood restated the explanation he had provided in response to Ms. Piedmont-Smith's earlier question.

Ms. Piedmont-Smith said she was disappointed that no written agreements had been executed with the townships for the funds allocated to them. She said that it seemed like good governing to have such written agreements.

Ms. Granger asked how dispatch had spent the money allocated to it. Mr. Underwood said dispatch was in the middle of its budget year, but he could provide her with a six-month look back at the budget. Ms. Granger said she and other committee members would like that.

Ms. Sandberg said that the PS-LIT allocation process was relatively new, and there might be loose ends that needed to be tied up from the previous year. She agreed that there should be written funding agreements. She also said that those involved with the process could provide feedback on the criteria used by the committee to assess requests.

Mr. Cobine reported on some conversations that had taken place between the county and city attorneys about the possibility of some sort of monthly reporting that might be put in place in the future.

Ms. Munson commented that the difference between the amount allocated to PSAP and the actual amount in its budget was approximately \$236,000, which she thought was a large amount to explain through variations in the budgeting process. Mr. Underwood elaborated on some of the factors that had led to the difference.

Mr. Cobine asked for further detail about the leftover PS-LIT allocations and how the capital replacement fund would work. Mr. Underwood explained that any unspent distributions for dispatch would roll over into a capital replacement fund, which would be controlled jointly by the city and county.

Ms. Piedmont-Smith and Mr. Underwood further clarified portions of the two spreadsheets.

5. FURTHER DISCUSSION OF REPORT FROM UNIFIED CENTRAL DISPATCH POLICY BOARD

Mr. Rouker highlighted notable portions of the proposed 2018 budget for central dispatch. He pointed out that the 2018 proposed budget included money for six new dispatchers, which would help align the central dispatch center with national standards for the number of dispatchers recommended for a center that size. He also noted that the proposed budget included funds for the purchase of mobile data terminals (MDTs) for the seven township fire departments.

Ms. Munson pointed out that the Central Dispatch spreadsheet reflected capital outlays of \$800,000, while a spreadsheet distributed at a previous meeting, entitled Township Communications Breakdown, listed the price of laptops as \$435,600. She asked if the \$800,000 capital outlays contained in the proposed budget would be used for more than the mobile data terminals. Mr. Schemmer explained that the requested amount would be used to purchase laptops, while any money remaining after the purchase of the laptops would be rolled over to the next year to help with the purchase of radios. Ms. Munson asked if the price for the laptops included ITS support. Mr. Schemmer said yes, and explained what that support would entail. Ms. Munson clarified that there would be a request the following year for the amount needed to complete the purchase of the radios. Mr. Schemmer confirmed that was the case.

Ms. Piedmont-Smith asked why dispatch was requesting \$800,000 for 2018 when the purchase of the laptops would cost much less. She asked if the intent was to purchase all of the laptops and some of the radios in 2018. Mr. Underwood explained that the intent was to try to keep the budget request for dispatch level over the two years. Ms. Piedmont-Smith pointed out that the total cost of the laptops and radios would be approximately \$1.2 million. Mr. Underwood said that was a very rough estimate, as there had not been bids completed for the purchases. He said dispatch used a higher estimate in the request to allow for that uncertainty. He also noted that after purchasing the laptops, the money could be used to begin the next phase of the project.

Ms. Granger asked for information regarding the six new positions for dispatch. Mr. Diekhoff said the request was for six additional dispatchers to help staff the dispatch center. He said the request would raise the number of full-time dispatchers to 29, which would still be short of the national standards for a dispatch center of Monroe County's size. Ms. Granger asked if there would be additional funds requested the following year. Mr. Diekhoff said possibly. Ms. Granger asked how many vacancies the dispatch center had at that time. Mr. Diekhoff said three. Ms. Granger asked if the dispatchers were paid enough. Mr. Diekhoff pointed out that there was an ongoing salary survey being conducted by the city that was looking at that question.

Mr. Cobine asked for background on the dispatch center. He said his understanding was that one major constraint of the previous dispatch location was physical space and when the new dispatch was built, it provided additional space for dispatchers. Mr. Diekhoff said that was correct and provided background information on the dispatch locations. He explained adding additional staff would allow dispatch to better schedule during peak call times, while also taking some of the stress off of the current dispatchers.

Ms. Chopra asked whether the MDTs would work anywhere in the county. Mr. Diekhoff said there could be dead spots, as the MDTs functioned on radio and cell phone technology, but said they should function in most of the county. He said they were working on standardizing how fire departments were dispatched. He said the police department and sheriff's department were dispatched the same way. He said the proposed equipment would go a long way in helping with fire dispatch. The current system left open the possibility of problems and errors, which could be dangerous. Ms. Chopra asked if there was a technology that could provide 100% coverage. Mr. Diekhoff said he did not know of anything better than proposed, other than the possibility of satellite technology, which would be much more expensive.

Ms. Sandberg asked what the rationale was in making the proposed purchases all at once and through a standardized, uniform process. Mr. Diekhoff explained that all of the purchased equipment would be the same format, would get better service for maintenance, and would be less expensive if purchased in bulk. Ms. Sandberg asked if maintenance was included with the purchase. Mr. Diekhoff said yes.

Mr. Cobine noted that he had heard concerns about the estimate for the radios being high, and asked for a response to that concern. He also asked if someone could comment about whether fully functional laptops were needed by every fire and EMS responder, or whether those responders could get by with the sort of status indicators that had been used in the past. Mr. Schemmer said dispatch had based the request on the type of MDTs used in the police department, as that equipment was familiar to the IT staff, even if not all of the functionality would be necessary. He also said the number of MDTs requested was the result of asking fire departments how many MDTs would be needed for frontline equipment. He said if the estimates for the MDTs were high, the leftover money would help offset the cost of radios the following year, which he acknowledged were expensive. He pointed out that the cost could fluctuate based on technology, manufacturers' specials, or other factors. He explained other efforts aimed at standardization through the use of new dispatch software, which involved using MDTs as part of the information delivery system. He said that if laptops were not used for the status indicators, something else would need to be used, and there had not been success in the past in coming up with an alternative. Mr. Cobine asked whether the hardware was constrained by the software choice used for dispatching. Mr. Schemmer said yes, and explained dispatch had proposed hardware that was familiar and reliable. Mr. Cobine asked if there would be any downsides to a more distributive approach to purchasing the equipment, where each fire department would have more leeway in purchasing as long as it reached the standards set county-wide. Mr. Schemmer said the logistics of such an approach would be difficult and said most county-wide communications programs were based on bulk purchases and standardization. He said it would also be easier to keep everyone on the same timeline for training and for going live. He said it would also keep everyone on the same cycle for replacing the equipment.

Ms. Piedmont-Smith asked if there had been any reevaluation of the number of laptops needed. Mr. Diekhoff said the plan was to provide every frontline vehicle with a laptop, so which vehicles needed laptops and which did not had already been considered. Ms. Munson commented that the number of laptops requested by some of the townships seemed high to her. Mr. Diekhoff said that each township had been asked how many laptops would be needed to equip all of the frontline vehicles, so the number of laptops came from the townships. Mr. Cobine added that he would like some additional information regarding the number of laptops needed for each township, which could be provided later in the meeting.

Ms. Chopra asked Mr. Diekhoff what his priorities were for the PS-LIT money that would be allocated to the police department. Mr. Diekhoff said there were many capital needs that would be addressed, including vehicles and some remodeling projects. Ms. Chopra commented that the previous year's PS-LIT money seemed to be used primarily for things related to fire protection. She asked if that imbalance would be addressed in 2018. Mr. Underwood said the city administration worked with both the chief of police and fire chief to develop a rolling five-year capital plan, in addition to facilities maintenance for the various groups. He noted the fire department had more facilities, but funding would be cyclical, based on needs and priorities. He said each department submitted requests, then the administration worked with them to develop the plan. The hope was that, over time, the funding would equal out to the need of each department. He explained that equipment for fire protection was more expensive, but police needed more vehicles and staff. He said the city had committed to use PS-LIT money to fund capital requests, not personnel.

Ms. Piedmont-Smith asked Mr. Swain to comment on the dispatch proposal and his other public safety needs for the funds. Mr. Swain said that during the previous year he had asked and had been granted ten new deputies for the Sheriff's Department. He said that hiring all ten deputies at once was not realistic, so the department had decided to hire five each year for the next two years. He was concerned that the dispatch request would impact his ability to hire the second group of five deputies as previously planned. He pointed out that once the deputies were hired and outfitted with equipment and cars, the cost associated with them would drop dramatically as they would not need to replace any of that equipment for a while. He appreciated what dispatch was asking for, but did not want to be penalized for spreading out the hiring of the deputies. Ms. Piedmont-Smith asked if his department's needs for the PS-LIT funds were the same as the previous year. Mr. Swain said there were some changes in what the money was needed for, but the amounts had essentially balanced out.

Mr. Cobine asked how bad the need was for the MDTs and radios, given the context of limited resources and the need to prioritize the requests from other entities. Mr. Schemmer said the requested upgrades were very important. A dispatcher using the wrong frequency might not be getting important information to the people responding to a call. He provided additional detail regarding the difficulties related to using two different frequencies. Mr. Rouker added that the enhancements requested could save lives, which would mean they were worth the cost. He also noted that the Dispatch Policy Board had met in May, June, and July. He said those meetings might have been a better place to raise some of the issues being discussed.

Mr. Oldham commented that the tax under discussion was created to fund dispatch, and everything else was secondary to that. He said the primary focus should be to fund dispatch and enhance public safety county-wide.

Ms. Piedmont-Smith asked why there was a request for \$10,000 in building repairs, as the dispatch center was a relatively new building. Mr. Schemmer said that was part of the ongoing maintenance that was needed for the building. Mr. Underwood added that the dispatch building, while relatively new, was also in use 24 hours per day, 365 days per year, so it received much more wear and tear than other facilities.

Ms. Munson said she did not view the PS-LIT revenue as being primarily for dispatch. She viewed it as being for dispatch first, but also for other public safety needs. She said she had taken a broader view of the tax since it had passed. She noted the different county departments that dealt with public safety issues. She said the projection prepared by Mr. Underwood that showed a potential decrease in distribution to the county worried her because she did not know which department could bear that decrease. She said she was being critical of the dispatch communication project proposal not because she thought it was a bad idea, but because it seemed premature and that it deserved more scrutiny. She also had concerns after talking to some of the fire departments and learning of their priorities and needs. She hoped the committee would be able to learn more when talking to each applicant.

Ms. Granger thanked the presenters for the information and said she looked forward to the township presentations yet to come.

Ms. Sandberg thanked the presenters as well. She said she would be basing her decisions on what she thought would benefit the county as a whole. She encouraged everyone to communicate with each other.

Mr. Cobine reminded everyone that the amount of PS-LIT money for dispatch was less than a third of the revenue brought in by the tax. He also said that the Dispatch Policy Board made a recommendation, which should be taken under advisement by the decision making group, to be followed or not.

Ms. Chopra said she noticed some disjointedness and problems the previous year in how fire protection worked. She was excited to hear about the communications project proposal as it seemed to be addressing some of the problems she noticed the previous year by moving toward a more seamless way of providing fire protection.

6. PRESENTATIONS FROM APPLICANTS FOR PUBLIC SAFETY LOCAL INCOME TAX REVENUES

A. Bean Blossom Township Stinesville Volunteer Fire Department, Inc.

Cathleen Cook, Clerk of Bean Blossom Township, introduced herself and said she had worked on the application and would highlight a few items. She said the request had increased since the previous year, when about \$17,000 of PS-LIT money had been granted to Bean Blossom. She said those funds would be used to hire some part-time help, which was a priority because it was a volunteer fire station. She highlighted the requests for 2018 as listed on the application. She said the township was at its maximum tax levy. She asked if the committee had any questions about the application.

Mr. Oldham asked how many frontline vehicles the department owned and staffed. Ms. Cathleen Cook asked what he meant by frontline vehicles. Mr. Oldham said he was thinking about the number of MDTs needed for the vehicles that got staffed and sent to every fire. Ms. Cathleen Cook said she could provide some follow-up information after the meeting. Shane Chapman, with the Perry-Clear Creek Fire Protection District, introduced himself and listed the vehicles he knew were owned by Bean Blossom Township. He also provided an explanation of the function of each piece of equipment. Mr. Oldham asked if the water tanker ever responded by itself. Mr. Chapman said yes, and explained how the equipment was used for different calls. Mr. Oldham said he was trying to understand which vehicles needed MDTs and wondered how many runs required the use of the different vehicles in a given year. Pamela Cook, Bean Blossom Township Trustee, introduced herself and said the department responded primarily to medical calls. She said the department had requested five laptops for the frontline equipment in the department.

Ms. Piedmont-Smith and Ms. Cathleen Cook clarified the amount of funding the fire department received.

Mr. Cobine asked what purchases or funding the department would prioritize first. Ms. Cathleen Cook said the priorities were the turnout gear, which was state-mandated, followed by the capital improvements to their building.

Ms. Piedmont-Smith clarified whether the fire department could levy taxes, separate from the township, which it could not.

Ms. Munson asked if the department would prioritize the MDTs and radios requested through the dispatch proposal or the items requested in the application. Ms. Cathleen Cook said she was not yet prepared to answer that question. Ms. Munson said she would appreciate a follow-up email with the answer.

B. Benton Township of Monroe County Volunteer Fire Department, Inc.

Hellen Caves, President of the Volunteer Fire Department, said the department was all volunteers and had limited funding. She said they were requesting \$65,824, which would be used to help replace self-contained breathing apparatus (SCBA) bottles that would be expiring in the next couple of years. She said they were trying to get the bottles on a rotation so they would not have to replace all of the bottles at the same time.

Ms. Granger asked how the department spent the PS-LIT allocation it received the previous year. Ms. Caves said the trustee of the township could provide a better explanation, but she believed that much of the allocation was used to pay Bloomington Township for mutual aid. Ms. Granger asked if the trustee could provide that information. Ms. Piedmont-Smith pointed out that the application submitted by the department noted that the township had hired a fire and emergency services consulting firm for \$23,000, while they had received an allocation of \$25,000. Ms. Chopra asked if the department's request from the previous year included such consulting work. Mr. Sherman said the department had asked for funding for personnel, but instead the funds were used to pay for the consultant to look at how to cover personnel long term. Ms. Caves explained what the consultant was looking at, and some of the difficulties faced by the department.

Ms. Chopra asked what the department's total budget was. Ms. Caves said it totaled around \$290,000.

Ms. Piedmont-Smith asked whether the department would prioritize the items requested in the application or the laptops and radios proposed through the dispatch communications project. Ms. Caves said it would be difficult to choose, as there was a need for the equipment to go into fires, but the fire fighters also needed to be able to communicate while on scene. She said the laptops were less of a priority.

Mr. Cobine asked whether it was only Benton Township fire department's SCBAs that were expiring, or whether there was more of a county-wide expiration of the bottles. Ms. Caves explained that they had received their bottles in approximately 2004, along with many other departments in the county, through a grant. She thought that there might be other departments with expiring bottles.

Ms. Munson said she would be interested to learn more about whether the expiring bottles were a county-wide issue. She also said that she wanted to know about the department's priorities vis-à-vis the laptops and radios versus the requested SCBA bottles.

C. Indian Creek Firefighters, Inc.

Vicky Sorensen, Indian Creek Township Trustee, and David Parsons, President of Indian Creek Firefighters Board, introduced themselves. Mr. Parsons provided background information on Indian Creek Firefighters, Inc., including the number and type of vehicles used, the types of calls received, and the volume of calls received. He said the most important thing in the request was money for staffing. He reviewed the other items requested in the application, including extrication equipment, thermal cameras, and funding for training. He said he was available to answer any questions.

Mr. Cobine asked where training took place. Mr. Parsons said there were classes offered through Ivy Tech and some training was available online. Ms. Sorensen noted some training was offered between different fire departments themselves. Ms. Sandberg encouraged departments to coordinate and think about efficient ways to work together, such as utilizing free training between departments.

Mr. Oldham asked for more detail about the possibility of Indian Creek joining one of the fire territories or the fire protection district. Ms. Sorensen gave an update on the status of Indian Creek's attempt to join the fire protection district.

Ms. Chopra asked whether the tax rate for fire protection was at its maximum. Ms. Sorensen said yes. Ms. Piedmont-Smith and Ms. Sorensen clarified the levy amount, which was \$55,002. Mr. Cobine further explained the process used to arrive at the tax rate, which was derived from the levy.

Ms. Munson asked how the MDTs and radios would fit into the department's priority list. Mr. Parsons said they did not need the radios as they had recently purchased radios. They also had software they used for dispatch purposes. He noted that he appreciated the goal of the communications project proposed by dispatch, but explained some concerns he had with the proposal. Ms. Munson asked if the radios the department had acquired the previous year were combination radios that supported both 800 MHz and VHF. Mr. Parsons said the radios could be programmed for one or the other but not both.

D. Northern Monroe County Fire Protection Territory

Joel Bomgardner, Chief, Northern Monroe County Fire Protection Territory, reviewed the requests included in the application. He said he was available for questions.

Ms. Piedmont-Smith asked about a grant program to replace expiring SCBA bottles. Mr. Bomgardner explained there was a county-wide grant that funded the purchase of the bottles years ago. Because those bottles were expiring, a number of departments had joined in applying for a new grant to replace those bottles. The grant was competitive and there was no guarantee that the funding would be available. Ms. Piedmont-Smith asked if all other township fire departments or territories were part of the grant application. Mr. Bomgardner believed so. Ms. Piedmont-Smith asked whether the grant would include just the bottles or all of the equipment associated with SCBAs. Mr. Bomgardner explained it would include all of the equipment.

Mr. Oldham asked for an update regarding the construction of a new station. Mr. Bomgardner explained the status of the project.

Ms. Granger asked for information regarding the PS-LIT money the territory had received the previous year. Mr. Bomgardner said that money had been coming in incrementally to the territory and would be used to purchase a truck.

Mr. Cobine asked what training was available through the territory. Mr. Bomgardner explained the equipment and types of training that were available through the territory. Mr. Cobine asked whether compatible and comparable equipment was important for SCBAs. Mr. Bomgardner said yes, it was important when responding with other fire departments.

Ms. Chopra asked for clarification on an intended allocation from the previous year. Mr. Sherman explained that an allocation of \$50,000 intended for Washington Township was not disbursed because that township's application had not been eligible for funding.

Mr. Oldham asked whether any reserve vehicles were included in the numbers for the MDTs. Mr. Bomgardner said they did not have any reserve vehicles.

Ms. Piedmont-Smith asked whether the territory was at its maximum levy. Mr. Bomgardner said no and said the territory was under pressure to decrease its levy. Ms. Chopra asked for more detail. Mr. Bomgardner said when the territory was created, the residents were surprised by the amount of taxes, which put the territory under great scrutiny.

Ms. Munson asked Mr. Bomgardner what the funding priorities were for the territory. Mr. Bomgardner said the laptops and radios were not priorities, as the territory was planning to purchase similar equipment anyway. Mr. Cobine asked for clarification. Mr. Bomgardner said that if the other requests in the application were funded, the territory would likely buy the MDTs. He noted they already had 800 MHz radios.

Mr. Cobine provided additional information about the creation of the territory.

E. Perry-Clear Creek Fire Protection District

Dustin Dillard, Fire Chief of Perry-Clear Creek Fire Protection District, introduced himself. He detailed the numbers of automatic aid and mutual aid responses for the various fire departments. He then explained the requests contained within the district's application, which included funding for personnel. He explained how the funds the district received the previous year were used, as well as how the district's budget compared to that of other departments. He said many of the challenges facing the Monroe County fire departments were problems being faced across the country. He explained that using the PS-LIT funds to pay for equipment instead of personnel limited his district's flexibility, as the district's cumulative fund could only be used for certain purposes. He said he was available for questions. Mr. Chapman also spoke in support of the district's application.

Ms. Munson asked what the district's priorities were between the requests in its application and the dispatch communications project. Mr. Dillard said the district would prefer to see the PS-LIT money go toward personnel. He said the district could purchase the radios and laptops with other funds and could commit to meeting the same timeline as proposed by dispatch.

Ms. Piedmont-Smith said she found a document distributed by Mr. Dillard to be misleading, as it lumped automatic aid and mutual aid together when they were two different things. She asked why the document was distributed. Mr. Dillard explained what each term meant, and said he distributed the statistics on types of aid because the topic was discussed heavily the previous year and he thought it could help explain how the different departments worked together.

Mr. Oldham asked how often Perry-Clear Creek was receiving aid from other departments. Mr. Dillard said he could provide that information after the meeting. Mr. Oldham asked for more detail about the district's request for personnel. Mr. Dillard explained how staffing currently worked at the district's stations and how the proposed funding would impact staffing. Mr. Oldham asked what portion of the district's budget would be made up of PS-LIT funds. Mr. Dillard said 12%. Mr. Oldham asked what the district's budget was for 2017. Mr. Dillard said \$2.19 million in the general fire fund and \$360,000 in the cumulative fund. Mr. Oldham asked how adding Indian Creek Township to the fire protection district would work. Mr. Dillard explained the expected revenue that would be generated by adding the township to the district, as well as the services the township would receive.

Ms. Chopra asked how the district would be impacted if the committee chose to fund the dispatch communications project rather than provide funding to the townships or other fire departments. Mr. Dillard said it would mean the district could not hire a fourth fire fighter.

Mr. Cobine asked if there were national staffing standards that the district was trying to achieve with the proposed fourth fire fighter. Mr. Chapman said there were recommendations for staffing that called for four fire fighters on certain pieces of apparatus. Hitting those standards was why the district had proposed hiring a fourth fire fighter. Mr. Oldham clarified that the requested funding would allow for four fire fighters at each station in the district. Mr. Chapman said yes, and would allow for the recommended number of fighters on a piece of equipment. Mr. Oldham asked how many responders were needed for medical calls. Mr. Chapman said typically two would respond. He provided additional detail on how volunteers helped keep stations and equipment available for calls.

F. Van Buren Township, Monroe County

Rita Barrow, Van Buren Township Trustee, introduced herself. She said the township was requesting \$276,500 for personnel. She acknowledged the committee was interested in funding requests for equipment, but said staffing was necessary to make use of equipment. She said the request was for three additional fighters and EMTs to get closer to meeting staffing standards. She noted other requests in the township's application. She said the two stations in the township responded to 1,294 calls the previous year. She said the levy was at its maximum. She said the township's budget for fire and EMS the previous year was \$1,582,499. She said the department would likely not be able to continue without combining with another department. She had reached out to Perry-Clear Creek about joining that department. She said she was available for questions.

Ms. Piedmont-Smith asked whether the personnel requested were the first priority for the township. Ms. Barrow said the requested equipment was the top priority. Ms. Munson asked about the township's priorities regarding the dispatch communication project. Ms. Barrow said she was in favor of the project and the radios were a priority.

Mr. Cobine asked for information about the township's responsibility for airport coverage. Ms. Barrow explained the procedures the department followed for responding to calls originating from the airport. Mr. Oldham asked if the truck reserved for airport calls was manned 24/7. Ms. Barrow said no.

7. OTHER BUSINESS AND FINAL COMMENTS

Mick Renneisen, Deputy Mayor, City of Bloomington, said that he could have staff provide additional information before the committee's next meeting in response to unanswered or unclear questions.

Ms. Piedmont-Smith said she respected fire fighters, both professional and volunteer, as they had a difficult job. She said the committee had hard decisions to make with limited funds. She said there were clearly a lot of unmet needs, but there was only so much money to be used for the greatest good for the community as a whole. She thought there were efficiencies to be gained in the county through centralization and standardization. She therefore appreciated the communications project proposed by dispatch, but did not want to ignore the townships. She specifically noted that she would like to look into funding the Washington Township project that went unfunded the previous year.

Ms. Sandberg said many lessons had been learned from the previous year's process. She said funding salaries was difficult, as those requests would come back year after year. She said the committee should focus on equipment and capital improvements. She said it was a difficult decision that year.

Ms. Piedmont-Smith said the committee would like to take up Mr. Renneisen's offer of additional information.

8. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 10:56 p.m.

2018 PS LIT Analysis

	2017 Distribution	No Increase in Distribution		4% Increase in Distribution	
Overall Tax Rate	0.25%			0.25%	0.25%
Total PS LIT Distribution	7,527,404	7,527,404		7,828,500	
Tax Rate	0.1775%			0.1545%	0.1582%
Less estimated funding for PSAP*	(2,574,507)	(2,875,185)	38.20%	(2,875,185)	36.73%
Tax Rate	0.0725%			0.0955%	0.0918%
Net	4,952,897	4,652,219		4,953,315	
			Decrease		Increase
City	2,436,451	2,288,540	(147,911)	2,436,657	206
County	2,376,182	2,231,930	(144,252)	2,376,383	201
Ellettsville	139,405	130,942	(8,463)	139,417	12
Stinesville	859	806	(52)	859	0
	(0)	(0)	(300,678)	(0)	418

*This represents the total amount of PS LIT that was allocated to Dispatch and the Townships

	2017	2018
PSAP	2,182,947	2,875,185
Townships	391,560	0
Total	2,574,507	2,875,185

Central Dispatch

		2018 Budget			Revised 2017 Budget		
Major Category	Minor Category	Public Safety LIT	E911 Funds	Total	Public Safety LIT	E911 Funds	Total
Personnel Services							
	Salaries and Wages - Regular	1,056,105	277,635		1,055,904	23,306	
	Salaries and Wages- Overtime	119,995	0		118,559	1,436	
	FICA	111,211	0		89,754	1,893	
	PERF	206,430	0		165,287	5,000	
	Health and Life Insurance	442,494	0		350,850	6,000	
Total: Personnel		1,936,235	277,635	2,213,870	1,780,354	37,635	1,817,989
Supplies							
	Office Supplies	750	0		750	0	
	Institutional Supplies	3,000	0		3,000	0	
	Building Materials and Supplies	2,200	0		2,200	0	
	Other Repairs and Maintenance	1,000	0		1,000	0	
	Other Supplies	53,000	0		53,000	0	
Total: Supplies		59,950	0	59,950	59,950	0	59,950
Other Services							
	Exterminator Services	1,000	0		1,000	0	
	Communications Contract	0	475,000		0	400,000	
	Instruction	12,000	15,000		0	15,000	
	Telephone	4,000	0		4,000	0	
	Electrical Services	40,000	0		39,280	0	
	Water and Sewer	1,000	0		1,000	0	
	Building Repairs	10,000	0		10,000	0	
	Machinery and Equipment Repairs	5,000	0		5,000	0	
	Other Repairs	1,000	0		1,000	0	
	Other Services and Charges	5,000	0		5,000	0	
Total: Other		79,000	490,000	569,000	66,280	415,000	481,280
Capital Outlays							
	Other Capital Outlays	800,000	95,000		40,000	410,000	
Total: Capital		800,000	95,000	895,000	40,000	410,000	450,000
Grand Total		\$2,875,185	\$862,635	\$3,737,820	\$1,946,584	\$862,635	\$2,809,219