

PERRY COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
April 6, 2026

The Perry County Board of Commissioners met at 9:00 a.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 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 RT. Motion carried 3-0.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

- a) None

JONATHAN BLAKE, RJL SOLUTIONS

- a) Update

Blake stated that in his handout, there is a Public Awareness and Strategic Communication Plan that his team has put together. It is a culmination of wanting to make sure the public is aware of the things the County Council and County Commissioners are doing, providing regular updates to the community, and overall increasing public awareness to be more transparent on things happening in County government.

Blake feels this is a great way to put regular updates in the Perry County News and on the website to help continue to communicate the good things that are happening in the County.

Blake stated that the results of the community survey have been sent out. 382 responses were received. It is his recommendation that those results be published on the public website and get that information out to the community. Blake stated that these responses will help RJL as they are developing strategies over the coming year.

- b) Wessler proposed scope

Blake stated that he and Commissioner Cole have had discussions regarding the I64 and the State Road 37 interchange. Talks in previous meeting concerned trying to get water and sewage out in this area for future growth.

Attending the meeting were Mary Adkins and Josh Hood, Wessler Engineering. Blake stated that RJL had solicited quotes from several engineering firms over the past couple of months to look at that area and give their opinion on the cost to evaluate that area to get utilities there and help give the County a usable strategy, identify potential funding sources to service that area, and then to begin to market that for economic growth.

Adkins stated that the folder they provided the Commissioners is a snapshot of Wessler Engineering. They have been in business for fifty years. Adkins works in the Indianapolis office, which is their headquarters, and Hood is in their Evansville office. Adkins added that she is one of the Vice Presidents, with her expertise in environmental and storm water. Hood is one of their project managers, and specializes in wastewater and drinking water.

Adkins stated that there was a proposal in the packet that was handed out, with trying to understand what the needs of the County are. The ultimate goal would be to look at getting water and sewer to that area to service that area for future development.

Adkins stated that it is their understanding that there is potentially water there already, and that sewer may be the option that the County is looking at, how to get sewer to that area. Wessler will be looking for the potential for a regional sewer district, where the County might develop their own wastewater treatment plant to treat the sewage in that area, and the steps that would be taken to support the County's own utility in that area. Adkins added that one positive about this is that the County could grow this. There are other unsewered areas in the County, so that if a regional sewer district was started, the County could grow. Adkins stated

they would look at that as an option as well as connecting to other nearby utilities; Patoka Lake is nearby as well as another utility in Tell City.

Adkins stated that it is a study that would wrap their hands around what would need to be done to get to that intersection. There will be cost estimates, as well as give the County an idea of what infrastructure might need to go in to get water and sewer to those areas for the potential for a regional sewer district.

Hood stated that from what they understand, everything is going towards Tell City as far as sewer goes. The Branchville area is going towards Tell City. It appears it might be too far to take the Saint Croix area, which is why Wessler is introducing the possibility of regional sewer districts. It is a big undertaking for the County, but they are leaving all options open to see what could be done there. RC stated the County is in the process of looking at a water project that is going to be pretty much countywide in that area. RC thought Patoka has a major line, and the County is looking at a BOT (Build-Operate-Transfer) that Blake will be bringing up in this meeting. RC stated there will be three water utilities that will have involvement in this, Patoka, And-Tro, and Troy Township. RC asked how Wessler would envision what they are proposing in the sewer to not be redundant with what is going to be required with the water project? At the same time, incorporate that so that it actually makes sense of what the County is trying to accomplish? RC also asked if Wessler is used to staying on the sewer end of it, or what was their thinking? Adkins responded that Wessler's thought was that the water would be simpler just because there is water nearby, and that the sewer would be more challenging to take a look at. Adkins added that the primary focus may be on the sewer part of it. She added that Blake had mentioned another regional project. If some reason that does not go through, this would be a study for the County to ask how it can get water and sewer to this intersection for economic development?

Part of what Wessler Engineering is going to do is to connect with nearby utilities to find out what is the infrastructure nearby, and what capacity do they have to serve? Auditor Hammack asked if the And-Tro Water study that the County already performed going to be helpful with this? RC responded they had what the interest was in the area. That is all over the whole county and that is part of this other project the County is working on. RC added that the sewer end of it is kind of an egg and chicken thing out there. The County does not have any real use or need, but no one will take a look at it without having a sewer. RC stated he and Blake have spoken about how the County could accomplish something where the County does not spend an enormous amount of money on a sewer system or something in that area that can never function properly just because it does not have volume. RC added that those are some of the County's areas of concern, but there is not a sewer then industrial prospects look away to other locations.

Blake stated that there was a previous white study that was done that ended up with a map that showed a potential sewer treatment plant. RT asked if that was the And-Tro study, and RC responded that Bernard and Lochmueller did it approximately twelve years ago. Blake stated that there were no cost estimates with that study as he understood what the implication was or what the impact would be. At the end of the process Adkins described, there would be not only potential costs, but also funding sources and different avenues that the County could go through or follow to help fund it. Blake added that at the end of the day, if does not make sense for the County to start a regional sewer district, and makes more sense to attach to an existing sewer, that is all a part of that work as well. Blake stated that they kind of bookend it and make sure that the County is covered on both ends, and not be a sole direction that would be gone down with a potential dead end.

RC stated it is his assumption from what Blake stated that Wessler Engineering will reach out, and in this case, to Tell City who has a force vein in Branchville, and find out their capacity whether they are even interested or not.

RT asked that the study that Wessler Engineering is doing is for water and sewage, and Adkins responded yes.

Hammack asked where this study will be funded from, and RC asked Adkins and Hood if there are funding sources available for this? Adkins responded there are, and Hood responded that the State Revolving Fund (SRF) through the Indiana Finance Authority, one of their big pushes recently has been regionalization. It has been septic tank elimination, eliminating the amount of NPDS permits they have. Hood recommended that the County pursue this option. Hood added that in the last three to four years, there has been a big push in regionalizing. RC asked

if that is a grant, or is it a loan? Hood responded sometimes it is both. RC stated that the County can not get to the point where sewage is unaffordable. Adkins added that RSF looks at the affordability and the income of the area. Sometimes there is household income from the census data, and sometimes there is additional funding. RC stated that the County has not qualified for OCRA (Office of Community and Rural Affairs) for a while. RT asked RC if Region 15 would be able to help the County with this? RC responded they could look at this. He added that one of the County's challenges is that under OCRA, it has to be income based. Generally, what has happened in the County is that the people with higher incomes fill out the surveys, and the ones with lower incomes do not, which skews the County high. This takes away the County's eligibility for OCRA grants. Adkins responded that even when the income part is not good, but if there is record of failing septic systems or water quality issues, that is one of the State's priorities too. They want to try to help contribute to those kinds of priorities. Adkins added that the area being looked at is more for economic development. RC responded correct, the County does not have that much development in that area currently. It is the idea that I64 runs through there. The County is one of the undeveloped interchanges on I64 in Indiana. Perry County is sort of in the middle of the State, so there is a lot of potential there. RC added the County has to have infrastructure to support it.

Adkins stated that at the end of this study, Wessler Engineering would deliver a technical memo that would talk about the options, including the option for a regional sewer district, cost estimates, figures that show where the connections are should the County decide it can connect down at Branchville. There might be a route that they will look at for how that would connect, and then give that cost estimate. Adkins added this study will be a little more detailed than what the County had before.

Adkins stated that if the County is going to submit for funding, they always ask for an engineering study for grants and loans. Having this study would take the county one step closer to having that prepared if the county would decide to move forward with funding. RC asked that this would be suitable as an engineering study? Adkins responded yes. Adkins added that they are not doing the full, assuming the County would go SRF funding. There is a lot they require for that funding, but the County could start with this study and add to it should the County decide that it wanted to go for the SRF funding, which would require a Preliminary Engineering Report (PER). There is a little more cost for the PER. The Tech memo gives the County kind of what the County would need to make some decisions at a little bit lower cost.

RC stated that one of the challenges, and would Wessler Engineering tell the County, for instance, the Tell City pressured line needs volume. That is why they have the prison on it. If the County at I64 had a warehouse facility that had 50 to 100 employees max and they only used restrooms, being limited water, and that is a four or five-mile pump. RC asked if Wessler Engineering is going to tell the County it is really going to struggle with keeping that should the County decide to take a force main from I64 to Branchville if it is acceptable to Tell City to do that? Are they going to tell the County that they do not have the volume, or have to have the volume, or where the County is actually at if they chose something like that? Hood responded at the end of the study he would then within the Tech memo let the County know that it could maybe do it. The County might try to get more volume on there, put more lift in between which nobody wants to do. Hood added that they are running into this quite a bit right now with low flow, long distance, force veins. They can be done, but are a little bit of a challenge. Hood stated they will let the Commissioners know if that is a feasible option or what it would take to make that a feasible option. Looking at it on paper, that is a long way for sewage to go and still be good sewage by the time it gets to Tell City. RT asked RC if it could come from the other way, being Patoka? RC responded that there is no sewer, there is water, but sewer is the biggest problem as well as the volume is the problem.

Adkins stated that Patoka is one other that Wessler Engineering would look at, as they do have a wastewater treatment plant. Hood stated that he believed it is a little further north. Adkins added that they could at least look at it to see if they have upgraded their capacity, and the County put all new infrastructure in, and could the County get it there. That would be looked at as a potential as well. RC asked if there are any options for low volume septic systems for commercial usage, where it could handle lower volumes of water as an alternative to grow the

area? Step two would be where the County would come in and complete whatever infrastructure, once the volume is up, to make this work with an actual processing plant. Adkins responded that could be looked at as an option. RC added if we knew what the soil conditions were up there and how the County could possibly do that, or some type of aeration.

Adkins asked RC if the County is open to a regional sewer district that the County would develop a plant and treat its own? RC responded the County is open to whatever is cost effective. If the County has to do anything utility wise, the County does not need to get into the utility business. RC added the County would have to find a partner to manage it. Adkins stated that there would be a utility board and an entity that would be the regional sewer district. It would not necessarily be the Commissioners managing that, but it would be an undertaking, and other would have to be on board. Adkins added that Wessler Engineering helped Posey County put together a regional sewer district.

RC asked that Wessler Engineering price is \$20,000, and Adkins confirmed that. RT stated this was for the basic study. RC stated that his concern always is if the County spends \$20,000 and there is no way to fund it, is the County just wasting where they would pull it from? RC stated that it would be paid out of economic development, as this is what it is.

PJ stated that her only question would be about the other water situation that maybe the County needs to figure out what is happening with that first. RC responded that this has to work in conjunction, as that is something that is a little bit ahead of the sewer line. There is no reason to duplicate it, and it needs to make sure that it coordinates.

RT asked if there is any way the County could come out of Crawford County? She does not know if Crawford comes out of Patoka as well. RC responded that there is a Patoka water line close to the interstate. RT confirmed that, stating she knew it ran down around Magnet. RC stated that he knew that And-Tro, Troy Township, and Patoka work well together. Whoever is the closest that could serve the people, there is not a territory issue there. RT responded that she is asking about the sewage, and RC responded that he does not believe there is any sewer line close. He added that the biggest problem is the distance that it has to be pumped and the volume. Pushing it the distance without volume is a problem. PJ stated that the Commissioners would gather any available information that Wessler Engineering has, being the other project that they were talking about as well any previous studies that have been done. The County could get in touch with all the other utilities to find out what kind of capacity they have, what pumping, and what size their pipes are, just to gather as much existing information that the County can, to then focus on this one goal of how to service this intersection for economic development. PJ asked RC when the County is supposed to know on the other project? RC stated that the County will need a little time, as the County may want to get the other water co-ops and have this discussion. Blake responded that they had gotten proposals that ranged from \$20,000 to \$96,000 just for this study.

Hammack asked if this ties in this other project, the \$500,000 the County did for a study for And-Tro with the ARPA money? RC responded the County did not do a study, it put water lines in. Hammack asked if that goes with this? RC stated that in this meeting, Hammack will hear where the County is looking to get a \$14 million grant, which is a partial grant and the County will have to come up with some money, to put water lines in Perry County. RC stated that And-Tro took care of 20-25 families with what they received from the County. They did not get themselves connected on the back side between their system and Troy Township to back feed those people in the event of a line failure. RC added that the Commissioners are trying to build redundancy within the County so that if Patoka has an issue, Tell City has an issue, he believes they are hooked up even to Troy, they can shoot water back through these systems so that people do not have to boil water.

c) Resolutions

Blake stated the Commissioners have two resolutions, R-C-26-1 and R-C-26-2. The grant that the County is seeking, or the funding that where congressional funding, is what R-JL is seeking. In this funding, one thing RC and he had spoken about was the opportunity to use a provisional statute that authorizes public-private agreements between municipal or county government, and private developers. Blake added this is often referred to as the BOT (Build-Operate-Transfer) Statute 5-23. What this allows the County to do is rather than following

the traditional design-build method of procurement, the County can hire an engineering firm, they design this water system, and then go out and publicly bid it. If the County would adopt 5-23, the County can send out a RFPQ (Request for Proposals and Qualifications) from qualified developers that submit a proposal to the County. There is a scoping period where the County and the developers sit down and work out details and specifications, as well as the County's budget constraints. After that, the developers go out and get proposals and bids once it is designed, and execute the project.

Blake stated this is a little unique due to typically municipalities and county governments are required to use the design-build method. With Statute 5-23, it is a way to fund projects at a lower cost.

Blake stated that with a BOT, they build it, they operate it for a period of time, somewhere between 10 and 30 days, and then it is transferred back to the County. Blake added that they can just hold it and continue to operate it in perpetuity, but is used less commonly for public infrastructure projects.

Blake stated that the first step, before the County can entertain BOT as an option for procurement, is to pass a Resolution that authorizes the County to do that.

- Authorization Resolution R-C-26-1

Blake stated that this is basically setting forth that the County would be allowed to use BOT or public-private agreements.

PJ made a motion to accept the Resolution that actually allows the County to enter into BOTs, which are Build-Operate-Transfer agreements for projects, seconded by RT.

Motion carried 3-0.

- Resolution R-C-26-2

This resolution authorizes for this specific purpose, and then creating a committee that would issue the RFPQ, review those proposals once submitted by the developers, and then make a recommendation back to the Board of Commissioners at a future meeting date.

RT made a motion to set up a committee and pursuing a \$14 million funding opportunity to put water into the county, seconded by PJ. Motion carried 3-0.

Blake stated these Resolution are separate due to first, there has to be the authority to do it, and then the second piece is setting it up for this specific project. This would be for creating a RFPQ for the Perry County Rural Water Project under 5-23 of the Indiana Statute. Blake added that as far as the RFPQ committee, Blake has tentatively listed all three Commissioners on the committee. He also placed a representative of the And-Tro Water Authority as well a blank, believing it would be good if there was at least one Council member on the committee. That committee can meet virtually or in person, review the RFPQ, and approve it to go out. RC stated the believed that Troy Township Water and Patoka would need to be added to the committee.

KIM ROBERTSON, HEALTH DEPARTMENT SANITARIAN

a) Message Board

Robertson appeared to give information on what a message board could provide for the County. Everything in the Armory Annex could be included with this message board, being EMA, Soil and Water, and Health Department, to educate the community on things that are going on or information that is needed to get out. Robertson added that being close to the school, it is a great opportunity to catch those who maybe are not so big into social media. With newspapers dying, there are other methods that the County has to look at to get information out. A message board seemed to be an effective way to do that.

RT asked Robertson if she only received one quote, and she responded that it is the only company that she knows of locally. Robertson stated that she did not reach out to another state or even bigger city. This particular company has a great warranty, which is 5 years. Training is included, as well as the program. In addition, there is access to the person who knows how to use the message board. RC stated that the County tries to get at least three quotes.

RC stated that the quote Robertson received mentioned a third-party electrician, and Robertson stated she has not reached out to anyone. She was given an estimate from the message board company, and she does have that amount allocated. Robertson asked if she would need three quotes for the electrician?

RC asked if she had an idea of how much it would cost, and Robertson responded \$1,800. RC responded the thought she would be fine. Hammack stated that the County requests at least two quotes.

RC asked who will be responsible for putting all the graphics and everything out there? Robertson responded that there is someone at the Health department that is very technically inclined, which would be ideal. Robertson added that she herself could oversee to ensure there is something proper. RC stated that one of the challenges with these signs is keeping them fresh. It is a lot of volume and a lot of work.

RC asked that Robertson plans to pay for this out of the Health First Indiana money that was set aside for an assistant? Robertson responded yes.

RT made a motion to pursue the sign, with the stipulation that two more quotes are received, seconded by PJ. Motion carried 3-0.

MINUTES

a) 03/17/2026 Public Hearing

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

b) 03.17.2026 Regular Meeting

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

c) 03.24.2026 Special Meeting

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

KRISTINIA HAMMACK, AUDITOR

a) 03.27.2026 Payroll: \$174,174.82

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

b) 03.27.2026 Payroll W/H: \$36,305.69

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

c) Vision Insurance: \$287.69

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

d) Dental Insurance: \$357.10

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

e) Life Insurance: \$1,422.86

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

f) Medical Insurance: \$157,544.69

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

g) 04.06.2026 Solid Waste Claim Docket: \$10,350.99

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

h) 04.06.2026 Accounts Payable Claim Docket: \$284,784.30

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

i) GIS Mapping

RC asked if this is concerning the hiring of WTH? Hammack responded yes.

This topic was introduced and added to the March 24, 2026 Special Meeting.

After that meeting, Deputy Auditors Nichole Senn and Leisa Ecker were in conversation with Sean Scott of WTH.

Hammack stated Senn oversees the mapping. The proposed contract was for \$6,500. Senn stated that the Auditor's office is trying to understand how all this is going to work.

Senn stated that if a layer is turned on in GIS, it shows parcels that are not tagged to anything, and does not have a parcel number. It would not be labeled to anybody. It was a concern that the County was not getting payment on those properties, however, that property is actually in the tax system, being what is called a "99" number. Parcels that begin with 62-99 in the tax system are properties that could not be plotted on GIS due to the calls are too vague. Senn stated she is not aware of how GIS plans to fix those issues, as it appears that it would take title searching. Hammack added that when speaking with Scott, WTH will not be doing any title work.

PJ asked how many parcels have the "99" issue? Senn responded there are over 300 "99" numbers in the tax system. In the GIS system, there are 30 "99" numbers, meaning only 30 of the 300 have been plotted into GIS.

RC asked Attorney Andrew Foster if he received a copy of a handout, and he responded yes. RC stated this goes back to Dan Dupont. There is a road that shows up like it is not taxable, which is what it should be, but there are little triangular pieces all over everywhere that are in addition to what the road is. RC asked how does the County clean this up? One area is the acreage, and then the next is if there is an unplotted area and has a building, it is a little vague on who gets the property tax bill. RC asked Senn that she stated that these "99" parcels are being taxed, and are the same people being taxed for the roadway? Senn responded that individual owns two pieces next to it. It was a minor piece that

somewhere within the time of deeding over and over, the legal description just got dropped, or was not descriptive enough to be plotted in.

RC stated that WTH can fix the ones that do not require searching a deed, and Senn responded that WTH has a layer that is from prior years. For instance, if a parcel was accidentally deleted, WTH can put in the underlying layer and it will show who owns that. Then GIS can draw that in for the County. RC responded that WTH can look at the old layers to see what they can correct, and then maybe a number of problems could be eliminated. Senn responded that would then leave what the County would have to figure out.

Senn explained why a tail would be left hanging on a property would be the result of a split and vertices not snapping together. She added there are approximately 300 parcels with tails that need to be cleaned up, and she has been working on them. However, it is very time consuming to do this. RC asked if this is something WTH can do? Senn responded that WTH can do it a lot faster than she can do it.

Senn stated that there is a list of five or six different issues. Hammack stated that the biggest concern that her office saw was the \$6,500. Scott and Senn worked on some things where he added some layers to her software that she did not have access to before, so that Senn can start looking at some parcels that the County can do on its own. Most of the "99" parcels are going to be issues where a title search is going to end up costing the County more money.

PJ stated that the Commissioner's goal is not to add work to Hammack's department. Senn responded that she does not believe that WTH is understanding on their quote what else has to be done.

Senn stated that Eagle View identified approximately 1,500 parcels that had issues. Some of these they could not find tax numbers for. Senn added that there are a lot of properties that are tax exempt, and Eagle View is looking for assessments. WTH, or GIS, is mapping. These are two different programs doing two different things. The mapping is not going to have tax numbers due to being exempt. Eagle View is looking for a tax number. PJ asked if the exempt parcels can have a tax number assigned to them, and Senn responded that she assumed since the tax system is not creating a bill, that is why they would not have one. PJ asked if the County could reach out to Dubois or Spencer County and ask what they do? Hammack believes this scenario is common in other counties. RC would like to manually assign tax numbers to those parcels that are an exempt. RC added that Eagle View is trying to tie a photograph to a parcel.

Hammack stated that her office will move forward working with WTH and bring the information back to the Commissioners. RC responded that sounded fair, as the County should be able to lower the number of properties that need to be researched.

RC stated that he feels to let WTH clean up as much as they can for the \$6,500.

COMMISSIONERS

a) Award 2026 Community Crossing Bid

RC stated that the State has authorized the County to enter into that contract.

RT made a motion to approve the recently bid Community Crossing to C & R Construction, seconded by PJ. Motion carried 3-0.

b) Amended Ordinance No: O-C-26-1 -- Ordinance to Vacate Public Way or Place

Foster stated that some things that were in the petition were moved into the Ordinance itself. When the Ordinance was originally written, it was referencing back to the petition. The Recorder's office and Auditor's office had some concerns regarding making sure it was very clear about who was getting the property and under what address. Foster amended the Ordinance to put that information directly into it.

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

c) Updated Animal Shelter Contract

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

d) Open Board Appointment

- Letter of Interest – Perry County Convention and Visitors Bureau Board
RC stated there was one applicant for this board, being John Wanhainen.

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

- Hammack stated she has received one phone call regarding the Health board. She asked if the Commissioners are in communication with Foster to get that information? RC responded that the question again is the

makeup of them and how they are being classified. From what RC has read, by State Statute, there has to be a physician on that board. Foster responded he was not actually given information besides the names, and he does not know what these people do. On the Health board, there are specifics what the makeup has to be. RC stated that one of the issues is that there has to be a physician who resides in the County. When the County does not have that, is there an alternative of what the County is allowed to do? RC added he knows that State Statute changed on designations. There cannot be more than four people affiliated with any specific party, with the new restrictions as far as primary voting, and that is how a designated party affiliation is determined. Foster stated that was effective in 2023. If you vote in a primary twice before your appointment, then you are considered affiliated with that party. However, if you do not, there is all kinds of statutory language about party affiliation. Foster bets that a lot of those people probably are not affiliated because they have not automatically voted. RC stated that there are several that have voted in one party and then voted in another party. Foster responded that they would not be affiliated essentially with either because it has to be two consecutive from the date of appointment. RC asked Foster what happens when there are mixed applicants? RC asked that the board cannot have more than four of them? Foster responded that if he remembered the statute correctly, it is not more than four of the same party. Foster believed they would count as not affiliated because they do not, unless they have a party's chairman's certification. RC asked if they vote one way and then vote the other, what would be the classification of the individual? Foster responded it would be unknown; they would not be affiliated with either party. RC asked if there can be seven unknowns? Foster responded yes, as long as they are not more than four of the same party; they would be Independents. RC stated that there is nothing in the statute that classifies them as Independents. He asked Foster to clarify how that is interpreted.

Hammack stated that the County has received four letters of interest for now. No appointments can be made until the Commissioners are sure the County is following the statute.

The next regular meeting is Tuesday, April 21, 2026 at 6:00 p.m.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:20 a.m. CST.

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

Randy Cole
President

Pam Janniczky
Vice-President

Rebecca Thorn

Minutes reviewed by:

Kristinia L. Hammack, Auditor

Minutes prepared by:

Leisa M. Ecker, Deputy Auditor