

PERRY COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
February 17, 2026

The Perry County Board of Commissioners met at 6:00 p.m., as was duly advertised. Commissioners: President Randy Cole (RC), Vice President Pam Janniczky (PJ), and Rebecca Thorn (RT) were in attendance. Auditor Kristinia Hammack was also present. There was no *Sheriff, Attorney 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 modified, seconded by RT. Motion carried 3-0.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

- a) None

MARY KAY ELDER & CINDY TAYLOR, ELECTION BOARD

- a) Polling locations
Elder and Taylor appeared to get approval on the precincts that are used for election. PJ asked if there were no changes from last year, and Elder confirmed this.

RT made a motion to approve the polling locations for the 2026 Primary and General election, seconded by PJ. Motion carried 3-0.

MENDY LASSALINE, ASSESSOR

- a) Cyclical Reassessment Contract
Lassaline asked the Commissioners where the County is with Eagle View? RC responded that they are flying this spring. Lassaline asked that with Eagle View flying this spring, when will that data be available? Lassaline asked if the County has contracted with them yet? RC responded yes, and it is already scheduled. Lassaline asked when that data would be available, and will it be available before May? RC responded sure. Lassaline asked RC if he knows that for sure, with RC responding that he is speculating. RC added that Eagle View is well aware that it has to be available for reassessment purposes. Lassaline stated that her staff has to be trained on this.
Lassaline stated she was asking questions due to RC stated in December that the County was already flown. RC will call Eagle View as he knows that they have it scheduled. RC does not know if they have a specific date, but they had told him that it needs to be flown in Perry County before the leaves come out. RC was not given a specific date. RC believes once it is flown, the data shortly thereafter will be available. RC can call the next day to get an update.
Auditor Hammack asked if the Commissioners already signed a contract, and RC responded yes, it was approved in January. Hammack stated she does not have a signed contract. All contracts have to be loaded in Gateway within ten days of being signed.
PJ stated that she did have a question regarding Tyler Technologies. When their values are ready to be uploaded, or how that process works, are the Commissioners allowed to see those values before, or is it just the Assessor who can see those values? When Tyler Technologies do their values, who puts that data in the software? Lassaline responded that when Tyler Technologies perform data review, that is not a value. They are looking at a property and if they make any changes, that is in a database. The Assessor's office pulls up that database and also pulls up XSoft. The Assessor's office then reviews Tyler Technologies suggested changes and then the Assessor's office data entry those.
PJ stated that the few questions she has received were how do these values get changed? If Tyler Technologies says the value is \$150,000, with Lassaline interjecting that Tyler Technologies does not say that a property is valued at \$150,000. Lassaline added that there is a big process. When that value is determined, and the County is doing mass appraisal, that is done during the ratio study process. Sales data is pulled and starts January 1 of this year. By February 1st, Lassaline has to pull all of the 2025 sales and upload those to the State. The State has to approve those sales files. Lassaline stated that her office just got

approval Friday for the County sales files. The ratio study process has already been started, which is basically taking all of those sales, and average those sales in a particular neighborhood. The whole county is in neighborhoods. The sales from 2025 are put in those neighborhood buckets. The neighborhood bucket is then taken and average those sales. After that, the neighborhood assessed values are averaged. Based on those sales, based on what the market is saying, are the County's values where they need to be, or do they need to trend them up or do they need to be trended down, or do they need to be left alone? Lassaline added that based on those sales and based on the average assessed value, a market adjuster may have to be added of XYZ percent. It is not looking at each individual parcel, it is mass appraisal based on neighborhood and a market value. The County does not individually look at values, but when that ratio study is being done, the County and Tyler Technologies are working together, looking at the sales in neighborhoods, looking at is there an area that is selling more rapidly that does not match the rest of the neighborhood. Does that area need to be pulled out and delineate that out, making it its own neighborhood?

Lassaline stated that there are a lot of moving and shaking parts that go into this. Before any values are set, Lassaline and her staff sit down with Tyler Technologies and review that ratio study, adjusting neighborhoods as needed. PJ asked if her office keeps track of that history, and Lassaline responded that ratio study is approved by the DLGF (Department of Local Government Finance). Lassaline did not know if the DLGF has this information on their public website, but Lassaline has this information. PJ asked if the Commissioners are allowed to see this, or does she need to call the DLGF requesting to see these values? Lassaline responded that if PJ was wanting to see a neighborhood, you are not going to see an individual's property value.

RC asked that by using neighborhoods, if it had a 2% increase, the entire neighborhood would have a 2% increase? The only thing that would be an outlier is if somebody built a garage or something? Lassaline responded that there are multiple different factors. If there is a particular parcel, the market adjuster is adjusting 2%, but that same house a newer home but is still getting depreciation, which may depreciate 5%. Therefore, that house may see no change at all, or may see a decrease.

Lassaline stated that the County is trending based on the neighborhood factor, but within that neighborhood, everybody may be affected to that differently based on age of their property, condition of their property, and different variables that go into that.

Lassaline stated that based on Eagle View is going to be up and ready, she is asking the Commissioners to approve the Tyler Technologies contract that was opened at the February 2nd^h meeting.

PJ made a motion to approve the Tyler Technology bid, seconded by RT. Motion carried 3-0.

STEVE HOWELL, HIGHWAY

a) Bridge Inspection Contract

Howell stated that he had the next four-year contract, and asked the Commissioners to sign off on it. It has been approved by INDOT, and they are requesting to have it back the next day of this meeting. RC asked that this is an 80/20 split, and Howell confirmed this, stating the Federal government will reimburse the County 80%.

Howell stated that the cost is less that what he expected, as everyone was saying it was going to be from a 28% to 40% increase due to the changes that INDOT made last year. This contract is 19%. RT asked how much the contract was for, and Howell responded the total is \$374,067 for the four years. The Federal share is \$299,253.60 and the County share will be \$74,813.40, which is \$18,703.35 each year. RC asked Howell if this paid out of bridge, and Howell responded yes. The County pays it up front, and then the County is reimbursed.

RC asked Howell that the County does not have any bridge that is less than a two-year inspection, and Howell stated that there is one that went on this time. The County compliance month is January, so in January INDOT went and looked at the bridges. Each year they look at a different thing on them; every two years they do a complete inspection on all 100 of them. Howell stated that the bridge on Opera Road went on annual inspection. RC asked what was the problem with that bridge? Howell responded that it is a historic bridge.

Howell stated that when this was started, there were 12 bridges on annual inspection. Within two or three years, the County got them all back to two-year inspections.

PJ asked how the engineer was selected, as she believed that Lochmueller is doing this one? Howell stated that the County sends out RFPs (Request for Proposal). He received three back, along with a letter from another company that they were not interest in giving one. They are then reviewed, INDOT approves all of it and sends it back to the County. They are then scored, which Howell included the scoring in the email he sent to the Commissioners. Howell added this is all controlled by INDOT after they are scored and the paperwork is filled out. It is then sent back to INDOT who approves or does not approve it. Howell stated INDOT has approved everything the County has done so far. RC asked how the scores are picked? Howell responded ERC's (Employee in Responsible Charge), who have to recertify every year. The Highways department was down to two employees, but now has four employees that are ERC certified, which did the scoring on this. RC asked if there is a certain requirement from the State how many people have to score each? Howell responded no, the State wants the County to have three ERCs, but you can get by with less than that.

RT made a motion to approve the Bridge Inspection contract, seconded by PJ. Motion carried 3-0.

b) Additional Appropriation Request:

- Cumulative Bridge Fund—Highway Dept: Br#6 on Co Rd 10
#1135.37702.00000.0531 \$97,800.00

Howell stated that during the last bridge inspection, it was needing replaced worse than any of the other bridges. Howell was going to try and replace it last year; however, the company did not get to it last year and will start on it this spring. It usually takes two to three months to build. RC asked if this will create a traffic problem, with Howell responding that hopefully the school is out before he starts on it. If not, the school will have to detour and go the long way around. RC asked Howell if he had a temporary bridge, and Howell responded no. The Forest Service has one, but the Highway department does not. They loan it to the County.

PJ made a motion to approve, seconded by RT. Motion carried 3-0.

- c) Howell stated that the Commissioners tabled his reappointment as Highway Superintendent, and asked if they had given any more thought to any of that or made any kind of decisions? RC responded that they have not done anything, other than they are looking for a kind of plan. RC asked Howell if he received anything back from Lochmueller, and Howell responded that they were supposed to have to him by the end of the week some estimates on a road plan. Howell has also contacted a second one, Cash Waggoner, as the Highway department does some business with them, who will be getting him an estimate on the plan. They were going to set it up like a menu, and the County can pick what it wants, being just part of it, or the complete plan.

RT stated she has a copy of another County's plan that possibly Perry County could use parts from it. She will go to the Highway department to share with Howell and discuss.

PJ stated that the Commissioners will meet again with Howell in thirty days to see if he has those prices. RC stated then the next question would be how quick they could put the plan together. Howell responded that he did not know how the prices will come out, but he believed that Lochmueller can do things pretty quick.

- d) Additional Appropriation Request:

Background Check \$500.00

The Auditor will hold this to take to the Council. RC stated that the background checks have went well beyond what was budgeted. The original amount was budget from the Riverboat fund. The Council will have to approve it.

PJ made a motion to approve, seconded by RT. Motion carried 3-0.

MINUTES

- a) 02.02.2026 Minutes

PJ made a motion to approve, seconded by RC. Motion carried 2-0-1 (RT abstained).

KRISTINIA HAMMACK, AUDITOR

- a) 02.13.2026 Payroll: \$182,429.57

RT made a motion to approve, seconded by PJ. Motion carried 3-0.

- b) 02.13.2026 Payroll W/H: \$39,017.42

PJ made a motion to approve, seconded by RT. Motion carried 3-0.

c) Medical Insurance: \$21,650.47

PJ made a motion to approve, seconded by RT. Motion carried 3-0.

d) 02.17.2026 Solid Waste Claim Docket: \$3,483.63

RT made a motion to approve, seconded by PJ. Motion carried 3-0.

e) 02.17.2026 Accounts Payable Claim Docket: \$923,972.17

RT made a motion to approve, seconded by PJ. Motion carried 3-0.

COMMISSIONERS

a) Snyder Curve

Sara Haunstein appeared asking what was the status of getting this property deeded to her. RC stated that Attorney Andrew Foster is working on this, and Surveyor David Lynch gave him a legal description.

PJ stated that as of this date, Foster sent Haunstein a form, Intent to Vacate, and is working on that.

b) Open Board Appointments

- RC stated that he believes the Commissioners are still waiting on Attorney Foster regarding the positions on the Health Board.
- There are still two openings on the Hospital Association.
- Hospital Board of Trustees has one opening.
- There is still one position for the Public Defender Board.
- Zoning Appeals Board has one position which has criteria. Hammack stated that there is no party affiliation requirement on this board.

Hammack stated these are all on the County website.

The next regular meeting is Monday, March 2, 2026 at 9:00 a.m.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:35 p.m. CST.

RT made a motion to adjourn, seconded by PJ. Motion carried 3-0.

Randy Cole
President

Pam Jamniczky
Vice-President

Rebecca Thorn

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