

**PERRY COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS**  
**REGULAR MEETING MINUTES**  
**February 2, 2026**

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. Auditor Kristinia Hammack and Attorney Andrew Foster were also present. There was no *Sheriff* or *News Representative* in attendance.

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

**AGENDA**

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

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

a) Molly Hagman, Rivers Edge Animal Shelter

Hagman sent an email regarding a 2026 fee schedule. Rivers Edge has had to make some policy changes, as for the past three years they have been more or less acting as animal control. Hagman gets a call and goes out no matter what time and assists law enforcement. The animal is then brought into the shelter. Resources are being drained from the shelter, and can no longer take place.

This policy is the result of the above. Hagman wanted to be very clear, as there has already been some confusion, that Rivers Edge has outside kennels at the shelter. All law enforcement knows this, and know the code to get into the lock. They can access this 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. The kennel is checked every morning by Rivers Edge, and then that animal will be brought inside. There is no charge for that. The fee schedule would become in effect if Hagman has to leave her home after hours, or if she has to leave the shelter to go and assist.

Hagman stated Rivers Edge is a shelter, and she is contracted with the County and with Tell City to offer animal services at the shelter, not outside in the county.

Hagman emphasized that Rivers Edge has a good working relationship with the County, with the Sheriff's department, and she wants to continue that. Hagman met with Perry County Sheriff David Faulkenberg and explained this.

Hagman stated that the fee schedule has to come into effect because she can no longer offer these outside services for free. The shelter operates on a very tight budget, and this takes resources away from the shelter; doing this hurts their budget and jeopardizes being able to sustain the animal shelter.

RC stated he thought this was previously addressed by having the outside kennels for law enforcement, and asked if the situation is steadily growing? Hagman stated that she was trying to go above and beyond to help the situation due to not having an animal control officer.

RC stated that he does not believe there is any money set aside by the Council for any additional charges over and above what their annual payments are. Internally the County needs to determine how it could be handled if the Sheriff needs assistance. RC believes the Council needs to have an involvement in this.

RC stated that as far as trying to modify the contract, as he does not know that the County is trying to hire Hagman as animal control; it needs to keep Hagman running the shelter.

PJ stated that the County does not have a contract for animal control, and if Hagman would get hurt out in the field, there is no contract for that.

RC stated that Hagman was not asking for anything from the Commissioners, just informing them, and they will make the Council aware and let Sheriff Faulkenberg know where the County is on this. In addition, if Hagman would get a phone call from a police officer, he believes they would need to accompany her to the site for Hagman's safety.

Auditor Hammack stated that the County does need to get an updated contract with Rivers Edge, as the old contract was from 2022. It was from when there were interlocal agreements, as well as the amounts have changed that the County is paying. The interlocal agreement was broke is 2024 where Tell City and Cannelton pay individually, and not to the County to forward on to Rivers Edge. In addition, the County has changed its amount. Hammack will forward on the old contract to Attorney Andrew Foster to update it and bring to the March meeting.

**CHRISTY POWELL, RJL SOLUTIONS**

a) Powell appeared to give a monthly update.

New Perry County Economic Development social media accounts were launched in Facebook and LinkedIn. Content is being built to share across both platforms to build awareness and bring attention to Perry County businesses.

- RJL continues to work with Webb Wheel to support their project.
- A decal was ordered of the new logo to be placed on the wall behind the Courthouse meeting room bench.
- Jonathan Blake had a good meeting with Senator Schmidt and Representative Bartell last week. They continue to work together to advocate for Perry County's priorities.

**MENDY LASSALINE, ASSESSOR**

a) Opening of Cyclical Reassessment Bid

Lassaline presented the two bids that were received on time.

RC stated he received from a vendor where they have sent a bid that was delivered to the Indianapolis post office on Monday with delivery paid for overnight delivery. It should have been delivered and it is still in the postal system. Foster asked to see the Request for Bid (RFB) notice, as the language in the RFB would determine whether this was accepted if it is shipped, or sent by a certain date, but it might be that it has to be received. Assessor Lassaline stated that it was January 29<sup>th</sup> at 9:00 a.m. to be received. Lassaline added the RFB was posted and was put out on January 6<sup>th</sup>. Statute is 10 days, and vendors was given 23 days. RC stated that he believes that within the RFB, the County has the right to waive some if it was put in. Foster responded that the language of the RFB is dispositive whether the County can or not. Ultimately the County could reject all bids, with RC responding he would prefer not to do that.

RC stated that the question becomes, in good faith, if this company sent overnight expecting it to be delivered by the postal service, which they paid for that, if the County did not accept their bid, then the affected party basically would be the taxpayers of Perry County if their bid is the lowest one. Lassaline responded with all due respect, if the County has a timeline, it needs to follow that timeline.

There were two bids received that got to the Courthouse on time, one on the 23<sup>rd</sup> and one on the 27<sup>th</sup>. Lassaline feels this has been drug out long enough, and the County needs to go with the two bids they have. Lassaline added that waiving this receipt requirement is not right, and it is not fair.

Foster stated that if the terms of the RFB state that the bid has to be received by a certain time, then he believes those are the rules that everybody has to play with. Foster was not familiar with what the language in the RFB was to say whether they have complied with it. Foster added that usually the County puts at the end of the RFB that the County can either reject, rebid, do whatever the County wants to do in general, but he would want to look at the language in the RFB. There are two bidders who followed, hypothetically, what the rules were set by the proposal by having the bids come in on time. However, he also understands what RC is saying in that one person tried to, and then for essentially emergency reasons because of snow and ice, he assumes is why it is not here. Foster's guidance would be to follow what the RFB said.

RC asked if the County should give Foster the bids and he come to some kind of an understanding, rather than tearing people's bids open and then decide it was unfair to these two who also bid. RC stated that Foster can review and the County have a Special Meeting or whatever the County needs to do. Foster responded that the Commissioners can table considerations of the bids and just not open them, he can look at the request for bids language, and decide what the County can do.

RC stated the RFB was in the paper as well as posted on the County board at the Courthouse.

Lassaline stated that there are two vendors who followed the rules, and RC responded there was one vendor who took theirs to the post office on January 26<sup>th</sup>, and paid for overnight delivery. Lassaline stated that two bids were received. RC responded that due to the ineffective delivery of the US Postal Service, this company cannot be considered in Lassaline's perspective.

Another vendor was present, and stated that they as well sent in a bid by Fed Ex on Tuesday overnight to be delivered by Wednesday, and theirs was not delivered. Jennifer Bippus, who is with Vision, had the same situation. Their bid

is still floating around, and she had all the places that it has been. She was not trying to say if it is right or wrong, she just wanted to let the County know that Vision was the other company that had problems.

RC stated that his preference would be to consider all four bids for the benefit of the county residents who pay for this. Foster read the RFB that stated that the Assessor will receive sealed bids up until 9:00 a.m. on the 28<sup>th</sup> of January. RC asked the 28<sup>th</sup>, and Foster confirmed this. RC stated then that was wrong. Foster stated that the bids were not received. Foster added it also says the Assessor reserves the right to accept or reject any bid, and to waive any irregularities in bidding. Foster stated this could be considered an irregularity given that it was sent but not received because of the weather. However, Foster thinks that would be discretionary. In addition, it may be discretionary with the Assessor, as the notice states the Assessor reserves the right.

Hammack asked if the notice stated Wednesday, January 28<sup>th</sup> or Thursday, January 28<sup>th</sup>? The notice did not specify a weekday, just January 28<sup>th</sup>. RC stated that there is a document floating around that states Thursday, January 29<sup>th</sup> at 9:00 a.m. PJ asked Lassaline if it was supposed to be the 29<sup>th</sup>, and Lassaline responded that the bid specs had the 29<sup>th</sup>. Foster stated that with the notice stating the 28<sup>th</sup>, were the two bids received on the 29<sup>th</sup>? PJ responded that one shows received on the 27<sup>th</sup>, and the other received on the 23<sup>rd</sup>.

Lassaline asked RC if he is dragging his feet on this due to knowing the pricing on the other two vendors whose bid was not received. RC responded no, he wanted to give the tax payers the lowest cost provider for this service, and Lassaline responded that it is the lowest best bid. RC wanted to be fair, with Lassaline responding it is already not fair because it was rebid, and the original price was already posted.

PJ stated that she did not know what direction that Foster needed to review this. RC stated the County has other written documents somewhere where it states the 29<sup>th</sup>. Foster stated he was looking at the notice, but asked if there was a formal request for bids that had more details in it? Lassaline stated that is the bid specs. Foster stated he needed to look at those specs. Lassaline produced the RFB to Foster to look over.

### **MINUTES**

- a) 01.20.2026 Minutes

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

### **KRISTINIA HAMMACK, AUDITOR**

- a) 01.30.2026 Payroll: \$172,354.25

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

- b) 01.30.2026 Payroll W/H: \$38,382.41

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

- c) BMV Claim: \$45.00

This is for the new ambulance.

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

- d) Vision Insurance: \$244.27

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

- e) Dental Insurance: \$267.83

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

- f) Life Insurance: \$1,482.78

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

- g) Medical Insurance: \$47,170.80

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

- h) 02.02.2026 Solid Waste Claim Docket: \$4,117.59

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

- i) 02.02.2026 Accounts Payable Claim Docket: \$811,279.75

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

Hammack stated that there were two claims that were questioned. Hammack provided proof which was actually with the claim that it is an allowable expense.

The other claim was removed. The new amount is 812,418.38.

PJ made a motion to modify the Accounts Payable to reflect the new balance, seconded by RC. Motion carried 2-0.

### **COMMISSIONERS**

- a) PCDC Affidavit

RC stated this is to pay the RES for work on the Riverview West.  
PJ made a motion to approve, seconded by RC. Motion carried 2-0.

b) Open Board Appointment

RC stated that the Commissioners have a couple of them.

- Port Authority

There were two applicants, being Alvin Evans and Neal Warner.

PJ made a motion for Neal Warner, seconded by RC. Motion carried 2-0.

- Health Board

Auditor Hammack stated there was only one applicant. RC stated that the County needs to get party affiliation, and he did not know which slot is being filled. RC wants to get Attorney Foster involved with the question on physicians to serve on that board, asking if they can live outside of the county, as filling those slots might be somewhat questionable with the current makeup of the county physicians. RC wanted to entertain tabling the Health Board until all this can be sorted out. Foster responded he felt like if the County had and tried to get at least somebody, and he does not feel that the County should get somebody on the board that is out of the county, but he believes there have been some situations where the Health Officers have been out of the county, but given like a waiver from the Department of Health.

Hammack stated that State Statute has the board consisting of seven members, four persons knowledgeable in public health, at least two are licensed physicians. The other two may be in health or educated related field, plus two members of the general public, plus one member of either the health or education related field from the general public. Foster stated this was changed somewhat recently, and did not know if the screenshot Hammack was reading was from the old Statute; he feels that it has been a little more expanded. Foster will look into this.

Hammack stated that the County received the letter from Nick Devillez at the beginning of January and was tabled at the last meeting. RC stated that the appointments have a political affiliation requirement, and would like to get a definitive answer on that before the Commissioners make appointment that need to be then changed.

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

Auditor Hammack stated that there was another question within the Health Board. She had received an email, considering the fact that they only have three members right now. They cannot even meet due to not having a quorum. The longer this is pushed off, they cannot meet. RC stated that first of all, they have to come up with people willing to serve. Then the Commissioners have to figure out if it needs to be a physician or there is a way to have a waiver to that to serve on that board. RC asked if Hammack had the political affiliations of the individuals that resigned? Hammack stated that the County would because they were known previously, and had the makeup of it currently right then. Going by the current makeup, the County would not necessarily be filling the old party affiliation. RC stated that two of the terms will not be full terms, just serving out the two that resigned.

Hammack stated that the general public position could go ahead and be filled, as two of the open positions are from the general public.

PJ made a motion to appoint Nick Devillez to fill the position formerly held by Brandi Glenn, seconded by RC. Motion carried 2-0.

RC asked Foster if he wanted the bid to be taken under advisement, and then the Commissioners could have a Special Meeting once he comes to a decision? Foster responded that they could do that, or if the Commissioners wanted to recess for a little bit and then call back to order, he could look at it now.

RC stated that depending how the County goes, the other two would have to be delivered which hopefully would be on this date.

PJ made a motion to recess the meeting, seconded by RC. Motion carried 2-0.

RC called the meeting back to order.

**ANDREW FOSTER, COMMISSIONER ATTORNEY**

a) Cyclical Reassessment bid

Foster stated that he read the specifications. He also read the notice in the paper.



---

**Randy Cole**  
**President**

**Pam Jamniczky**  
**Vice-President**

**Rebecca Thorn**

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