

PERRY COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
MEETING MINUTES
December 2, 2025

The Perry County Board of Commissioners met at 9:00 a.m., as was duly advertised. Commissioners: President Randy Cole (RC) and Vice President Pam Jamniczky (PJ) were in attendance. Deputy Auditor Leisa Ecker and a News Representative were also present. There was no *Sheriff* or *Attorney* in attendance.

The meeting opened with all present reciting the Pledge of Allegiance.

AGENDA

PJ made a motion to approve the agenda as modified, seconded by RC. Motion carried 2-0.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

- a) Leonard Hahus, PCMH EMS Director

Hahus stated that the EMS is requesting an additional appropriation in the amount of \$210,400, which would cover the hospital's cost through the end of October for all things EMS related. This would zero the hospital's balance.

Hahus provided the October P&L statement, which has the total figures for closing out the end of October. The salary and wages continue to be one of the main expenses. In addition, the auto maintenance continues to be high.

RC stated that he thought in July or August, they were at a nearly break even.

Hahus responded that in June they showed a profit for that month. RC stated that he thought there were a couple months of profit. RC added that he thought from an email that Hahus was working with the billing company to get some of these things worked out, which would continue to make things better. Hahus responded that they are still working on that and it is getting better. The biggest issue that is being addressed is the write-off of bad debt, which means someone has not paid their bill. It is then sent to a collection agency, who attempts to get the bill paid. Hahus stated that instead of sending a little bit each month, they were sending it two or three times a year. October shows a big month of bad debt due to not sending for several months prior. Hahus stated they are working to see how this can be done monthly. RC asked that the bad debt is held and put in one month? The P&L shows a net loss for October in the amount of \$151,000. Hahus responded that on the line for bad debt, it was \$123,000, which was the bulk of October's loss. This was sent to the collection agency.

RC stated that YTD, bad debt is \$201,000, and Hahus responded that for June, July, August, and September, the P&L had zero in bad debt for those months. It was all caught up in October. Hahus stated that in June, they showed a profit. Hahus added that bad debt for at least four months was not sent to collections until October, which is why the amount for bad debt in October was so high.

Hahus stated that bad debt for 2024 was \$224,000. Annualized bad debt for 2025 is expected to be at approximately \$241,000.

The Charity amount has increased the last several months, and Hahus explained what that was. The patient with a bill has contacted the hospital and requested some sort of payment plan due to not being able to afford the bill at one time. There is an application process, and depending on income and other factors, the hospital determines that due to that person's financial situation, the debt would be an extreme burden. A lot of the time, this is written off as charity care. The patient pays a certain amount; the remaining is written off. RC responded that then the hospital comes to the County and asks it to reimburse for that written off amount. As the hospital hands out the charity, it then comes to the County and ask for reimbursement.

RC asked what is generating the huge bad debt, is it people asking for services and not paying, with no way to forcibly collect any money because they have no resources? Hahus responded that it is not that they do not have resources. If someone receives a medical bill, other than being a good person and paying your bills, there is nothing that says that they have to pay them, other than the collection agency making contact. It does not affect a person's credit, nor does it

affect that person's future health care needs. Hahus added that there is nothing that says that a person has to pay the bill; there is no consequence for not paying it except for it being sent to collections.

RC stated that six to eight months ago, there was a study done to look at how much overtime was being generated at the EMS. RC asked if this has been addressed? Hahus stated that they were in the midst of addressing that. EMS has built in overtime the way the schedule falls for the full-time staff. EMS has advertised full-time and part-time positions. One full-time applicant was offered a job, and he chose not to accept it, based on he did not know if he would have a job on January 1 due to the request for proposal that was going on. With the unknown, he did not want to risk starting there.

Hahus stated EMS uses a modified Kelly Schedule, where employees work every other day for five days and have a four-day period off. Every third week, every other day falls within all three 24-hour shifts in the same pay week. This generates 24 hours of overtime every third week. There are three shifts, so every week there is at least one shift that has a crew with that extra 24-hour shift, which is overtime.

RC stated that in the study, they suggested changing that, and asked Hahus if they were still using the Kelly method? Hahus responded that they are, as it is their only option at this time, with not being able to find staff. Hahus stated they need two additional paramedics and two additional EMTs full-time to modify the schedule and eliminate overtime. At the current schedule being used, they are staffed.

RC asked Hahus if he knew how much the overtime costs per year, and Hahus responded he would have to get back with that answer. RC stated that if the EMS has to pay the overtime to retain employees, they may be better off changing the schedule and paying them more money necessary to keep them on staff. This might be less costly.

RC stated that when Deaconess originally came in, part of the agreement on the management end of it was a contribution towards the EMS. RC asked if this was being provided? Hahus stated he was not aware of anything.

PJ asked what is the overall increase from last year, and Hahus responded the overall increase in year ending 2024, there was a net loss of \$476,196.

Annualized, they are projected to lose \$567,122 for 2025. Hahus added that YTD, they are already over where they ended in 2024, as cost in general has gone up.

RC asked Hahus what their billing company has to say as to why the bad debt is not more averaged out by month rather than one big hit? Hahus responded this has been asked at several different meetings, and the billing company does not have a good answer. They are looking into it.

RC stated that the Commissioners are going to need more information, such as the bad debt, as well as changing the schedule if there was no overtime, and would wages have to be raised but still have a cost savings that could be achieved. RC is also wanting Deaconess reached out to regarding the subsidies that were in their original offer when they became manager. Hahus responded that a schedule change eliminating the 24 hours of overtime would drastically reduce the salary and wages, however, without the staff, that would be near impossible.

Hahus asked that to aid in hopefully drawing more people for employment, were the Commissioners willing to say yes or no if the hospital will keep the service in 2026? RC responded that what there is now is an ongoing contract with the hospital that was done in 1984. It is a continuation until either party opts out.

Hahus asked that the request for proposal was not the Commissioners saying that they did not want the hospital anymore? RC responded that the request for proposals was to get an idea of what others might provide the service where the County's costs were. The County sometimes bids things to see what might be offered. RC added that there was nothing in the proposals that signaled that was the way forward. The County is continuing with the old contract, and there is no intention of cutting that relationship. It is a written document between the hospital and the County. Hahus stated that the employees knowing they have a job next year will be a huge help, plus to retain the employees that they have. RC stated that the County Council will need to be involved as they make the appropriation. If the deadline to advertise is missed, RC stated that the fund is

replenished in 2026 which can be used, and after the Annual Financial Report is submitted in March, additional appropriations can be made.

RC asked for additional information, such as how changing the overtime schedule would affect dollarwise. Hahus responded that off the top of his head, he estimates \$300,000 per year. RC asked that it would save that much? Hahus responded he thinks it would be close. He can get a hard number to report back. RC responded that a \$300,000 saving in labor would be substantial. If the hourly wage needs to be increased slightly, this would give a little room to do that; whatever has to be done to retain the employee. RC stated he is basing that on Hahus operating and knowing his staff, knowing his competitors, being Spencer, Warrick, and Crawford Counties. If there is an opportunity to save half of that amount, being \$150,000 by switching that rotation. That would go a long way to what Hahus is asking for. Hahus responded that he is definitely trying to work on the schedule, they just have to get people.

Tabled.

MENDY LASSALINE, ASSESSOR

a) Cyclical Reassessment Bid

Lassaline stated that she came before the Commissioners requesting to put out a request for bids based on specifications, sent that to Attorney Andrew Foster, along with sending them to the Commissioners. At the next meeting, Lassaline requested to put out the bids, which was approved. Bids were advertised, and a bid was received and opened. This bid has still not been signed off on. Lassaline is requesting the Commissioners approve the cyclical reassessment that was bid on the specifications that the County posted.

RC stated he talked to Tyler Technologies, and where the County stands is it is looking at this and how it might use the Eagle View, which is flying, to collect the documentation. Troy Fryman, Tyler Technologies, informed RC that they do that at other counties of a similar type.

RC stated that what the Commissioners are looking at, as he truly believes that overflight versus driving to the person's property, if they can have access to it, will give a better overall determination of building, property, sizes, and these things. Tyler Technologies stated to RC that they do that also.

What RC would like to see happen is a list of things from the desktop that Eagle View would provide to get the information into the X-Soft software, and what those costs would be. Lassaline stated that her office would have to data enter those; the two systems do not talk. Lassaline added her office would look at the pictometry, get those measurements, and still data enter those. This is the same thing they do with someone who is out in the field. The data is imported into an excel spreadsheet, and her office data enters those changes. Lassaline stated that Tyler Technologies data enters commercial and industrial, and her employees data enter residential.

RC asked what service would Tyler Technologies provide? Lassaline responded that there are a lot of services that they provide outside of just data review. If there is an appeal, Lassaline review those, and then passes them on to her field reviewer. That way there are two sets of eyes. In one year, there were four appeals that went to the IBTR (Indiana Board of Tax Review). Tyler Technologies, which is part of their contract, represented the County and prevailed in all four of those cases to support the County's value. Lassaline added that Tyler Technologies help with trending, they validate sales, work on the ratio study, and send that to the State. Tyler Technologies and the Assessor office work together to get all of this done. Lassaline stated that Tyler Technologies has been an excellent partner for Perry County and her office.

RC stated that if the County is going to go with some sort of overflight versus a manual, then the County needs that wedge of service between what they provide by flying the County, and what is needed to get in the format that Lassaline is comfortable with in her office. This might be going to court, ratio studies, a land order, etc. Lassaline stated that the County has to do a land order and get it approved every four years in the four-year cycle.

RC stated those services, whatever they encompass, is something that Tyler Technologies would provide. What the County's interest is to fly, this wedge of services to get the information, in whatever the process is that Lassaline is

comfortable with, in her office. RC asked what the costs would be? He stated that the County knows what the Eagle View cost is, needed is the cost of the wedge services, as well as the wedge services that are requested to get it in Lassaline's office in a suitable format and form.

Lassaline made a public statement regarding shortage in funding from the budget workshop for 2026, and where the funds for Eagle View would be coming from was for a want, not a need.

Lassaline stated that what her office is currently doing has been proven time and time again, and it is working. She stated that her office is doing an excellent job for every County taxpayer, and is not sure why the Commissioners want to change that.

PJ stated her question was if the County should purchase Eagle View, would there be a change in Tyler Technologies price? PJ added that it appears that Eagle View would be helpful to Tyler Technologies, as there is not as much foot traffic. Fryman responded that in a previous conversation with the Commissioners, Eagle View is a tool. Tyler Technologies is in Perry County already at a price point of about anywhere from five to eight dollars less because they have done it here so long. Fryman stated that in an email to RC, he indicated that that over a four-year basis, Tyler Technologies could have a potentially cost savings if they had to define a scope between \$18,000 to \$25,000. Fryman added that Tyler Technologies uses Eagle View in a lot of other counties, with exception of the three counties in this area. Fryman stated that it is a tool; it is not changing a lot of the process of what they do besides what they are able to do in the office.

PJ stated that the County hears from taxpayers asking if the current assessment is fair? Can the County make sure it is being totally fair, getting correct information, and what is the County missing that is out there? Fryman stated that having Eagle View is added value, however, the process in terms of what the Assessor has done has not been in place to utilize that tool due to the cost to have it.

Fryman stated that when looking at the cost savings he indicated in his email that was sent to RC, would be \$18,000-\$25,000 of the original price that Tyler Technologies provided at \$378,000. This amount is over the four years. Fryman added that Eagle View is a tool to Tyler Technologies, one of twelve tools that they use, and they welcome it. However, there are things that still have to be done.

RC stated he does not want to put additional work on the Assessor office. Fryman stated what Eagle View does is oblique aerial photography. It is four views, with different resolutions, how many sectors are they flying, how often is it being done i.e. once a year, twice a year, three times a year, or over the four-year period once? Regarding change detection, that is an added value and ROI (return on investment) one time. That one time might find a variance in square footage, which is a good thing, but over time it just becomes a tool that can be used.

Fryman stated that if the County is in a position where it can at least look at aerial photography, Tyler Technologies solution in terms of services they provide, the contract can still be signed and it can be modified. Fryman added that if the County has not gone through the procurement process and done more due diligence on Eagle View besides having them come in, that will be probably another six months to a year out from when the County starts. Tyler

Technologies could always modify what they do as far as the process. Fryman reiterated that Eagle View is a tool, with out of the 92 counties in the state, there are only 78 that have Eagle View. Fryman welcomes all the counties to have it.

RC stated that the County wants to have a vendor, such as Tyler Technologies, that would come in to assist. The County needs to determine what that assistance would be, as the County has changed from the original specs, which was more of a manual. RC believes the County needs to put together an assembly of what they are asking a vendor to do, and advertise it. Fryman responded that could still be done with their contract, in what they call an ADV (appraisal desktop verification) approach. There are physical characteristics within the CAMA solution, whether if it is anything that the County actually has physically with the address and all the information that is in there. Then there is documentation from whatever images that are taken from a street level if need be. Then on top of this, there would be the aerial view. All this can still be set up within the same proposal that was submitted. The only thing it would do would be tweak Tyler Technologies statement of work, between \$18,000-\$25,000 over a four-year

period. RC stated he thinks that the County should identify what they are wanting.

Lassaline asked for clarification how the County would pay for Eagle View when there was not enough money in the budget to give County employees a raise. In addition, she feels that a high 90% is accurate as far as assessed value. Lassaline added that the County does not have a good permit system, with RC responding this would resolve that.

PJ stated that her opinion is that Eagle View would be beneficial, however, personally she does not feel that the county is ready for it. PJ thinks that it is needed, but it is not needed right now mainly due to the finances of the County, but also the County needs time to plan.

RC stated that if Eagle View could be shared with other entities, it would lower the cost of the flying.

PJ asked when a decision has to be made, and RC responded the contract with Tyler Technologies begins in May. Fryman stated that the contract starts in May, but the work begins a few months before that. RC responded if the County put together a request for pricing and get it in January utilizing Eagle View as a resource, then the County would have firm numbers. Lassaline responded that they probably cannot fly it that soon. RC responded that the representative of Eagle View led the Commissioners to believe it could be flown while the leaves were off, which would be until March.

PJ made a motion to table the reassessment at this time, seconded by RC. Motion carried 2-0.

CVB

- a) Reappointment of CVB member

RC stated that there is an opening on the CB due to Stan Goffinet resigned from that position, and Brad Harth offered to serve Goffinet's position out. Harth is a Councilman, and Goffinet was a Councilman.

PJ made a motion to approve, seconded by RC. Motion carried 2-0.

MINUTES

- a) 11.18.2025

PJ made a motion to approve, seconded by RC. Motion carried 2-0.

KRISTINIA HAMMACK, AUDITOR

- a) 11.21.2025 Payroll: \$186,999.78

PJ made a motion to approve, seconded by RC. Motion carried 2-0.

- b) 11.21.2025 Payroll W/H: \$39,915.16

PJ made a motion to approve, seconded by RC. Motion carried 2-0.

- c) Dental Claims: \$188.62

PJ made a motion to approve, seconded by RC. Motion carried 2-0.

- d) Vision Claims: \$218.03

PJ made a motion to approve, seconded by RC. Motion carried 2-0.

- e) Life Insurance Claims: \$1,541.80

PJ made a motion to approve, seconded by RC. Motion carried 2-0.

- f) Health Claims: \$68,996.25

PJ made a motion to approve, seconded by RC. Motion carried 2-0.

- g) 12.02.2025 Solid Waste Claim Docket: \$11712.49

PJ made a motion to approve, seconded by RC. Motion carried 2-0.

- h) 12.02.2025 Account Payable Claim Docket: \$9,083,119.05

RC stated in this amount is the property taxes that have been collected and distributed for the Fall.

PJ made a motion to approve, seconded by RC. Motion carried 2-0.

COMMISSIONERS

- a) Rock hauling

PJ stated that she and Highway Superintendent Steve Howell had spoken briefly regarding budget for trucks to be able to haul rock, with Howell responding that in the current budget, all the money has been spent. Howell confirmed this.

PJ stated she has asked for the past three to four months for rock to be delivered to the roads. The County will still use the huge stockpile that the Highway already has. PJ stated that the Commissioners want trucks to haul rock

immediately. PJ felt this would help with the Highway department due to some staffing issues. If other trucks take the rock directly to the roads, it is going to get there quickly.

Howell stated that the Highway department just finished up on Apricot Road, with Cottonwood finished as well. This will free up his employees to haul rock on their own now. PJ responded that it is not happening, as Howell has said this for the past three months.

PJ was very clear in stating that she wants Mulzer Crushed Stone to take the rock to the road and apply it. Howell responded that he does not have the money to do this, and PJ responded that the County will find him the funding. Howell responded that he cannot move on this with PJ stating that the County will find the money, he has to know the money is there. PJ responded that the money will be there, and that the money is already there in the Highway department, which is the taxpayer's money. PJ added that the taxpayers want gravel on the roads. RC asked Howell if he wanted this amount appropriated, with no response from Howell.

Howell stated that the Highway department has been hauling rock, and PJ responded that the County trucks are smaller and cannot keep up.

Howell stated that if the County gets the money, the Highway department will let them haul the rock. However, he needs to know where the money is at due to not having anything left right now. RC responded that the County will find the money. The roads have got to be in better condition. RC feels there is a problem with their gravel roads, and with the weather, they are getting too much moisture down inside of them. RC added that the way to address that is when the weather is better, get those roads where they are sealed so that water does not get in there. The County has to get the water out of the road so that it does not have to continually haul and grade the road. Those roads have got to be sealed. RC stated there is a solution out there, and it has to just be figured out what it is.

PJ made a motion to review budgets to see where funding might be secured in order to engage Mulzer Crushed Stone or another vendor to assist the County Highway with transportation of rock to specific roads, seconded by RC. Motion carried 2-0.

b) Ride Solutions—requesting a letter of termination authorizing Resolution R-C-25-2

RC stated he has read through this again, and the Commissioners had signed that letter, and it was specific to 2025. He does not see any reference to 2026. PJ added that this did not make any sense to her as well.

RC asked the Council, and they have not funded Ride Solutions for a couple of years. What the Commissioners had done in 2025 was sign a document for Ride Solutions so that they could secure additional grant funding from the State. That expires December 31, 2025, and has no reference to 2026.

No action taken.

c) Commissioners and Council are accepting letters from residents who are interested in serving on any Local Governing Board for 2026. The appointments will be the beginning of the year. There is an online portal where someone can fill out the information, or they can hand their interest to one of the Commissioners or Council.

The next meeting will be Tuesday, December 16, 2025 at 6:00 p.m.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:22 a.m. CST.

PJ made a motion to adjourn, seconded by RC. Motion carried 2-0.

Randy Cole
President

Pam Jamniczky
Vice-President

Rebecca Thorn

*Minutes reviewed by:
Kristinia L. Hammack, Auditor
Minutes prepared by:
Leisa M. Ecker, Deputy Auditor*