

DRAFT

INDIANA COMMISSION ON COURT APPOINTED ATTORNEYS

June 18, 2025

2:00 PM

**101 West Ohio, 18th Floor, Commission Conference Room
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204**

Members in attendance:

Mr. David J. Hensel, Acting Chair (in person)
Mr. James J. Abbs (remote)
Ms. Bernice Corley (in person)
Ms. Samantha DeWester (in person)
Hon. Mary Ellen Diekhoff (in person)
Hon. Kelsey B. Hanlon (in person)
Rep. Ragen Hatcher (remote)
Sen. Eric Koch (remote)
Rep. Ryan Lauer (in person)

Members absent:

Mr. Mark W. Rutherford, Chair
Sen. Gregory G. Taylor

Staff in attendance:

Derrick Mason
Andrew Cullen
Andrew Falk
Emily Hughey
Linda Hunter
Torrin Liddell
Jennifer Pinkston
Tristan Snell

Audience members:

Ray Casanova, Marion County Chief
Public Defender
Janice Conley, Hancock County
Gretchen Etling, Vigo County Chief
Public Defender
Janice Glotzbach, Floyd County
Jeremy Gooch, Hendricks County
Chief Public Defender
Catherine Haines, Hendricks County
Court Administrator
Matthew Lorch, Floyd County Chief
Public Defender
Deana Martin, Marion County Public
Defender Agency
Mike Moore, IPDC Staff
Savana Rhodes, Floyd County
Zach Stock, IPDC Staff
Karen Todd, Dearborn County

At 2 p.m., Acting Chair David J. Hensel called the meeting to order. Introductions of Commission members were made, and a quorum was established.

1. Approval of March 26 Minutes

There were no changes to the minutes for the March 26, 2025 meeting. Ms. Corley moved to approve the minutes and Ms. DeWester seconded the motion. The minutes were approved unanimously.

2. Approval of Vanderburgh Amended Plan (Rewritten Plan, adds Chief Deputy & Standard O)

Mr. Mason said that Vanderburgh County completely rewrote their plan to comply with the Commission's latest standards. He highlighted one section that previously required appointed attorneys to submit their bills to the court, after which the court was to approve the bill and submit it to the county for payment. Mr. Mason said that according to Chief Public Defender Steve Owens, this has never happened, and bills have always gone to his office for approval. Mr. Mason was concerned that the plan's new wording and process could result in billing disagreements being brought to the Commission. It would not be desirable for the Commission to be in this position as we have no standards and guidelines on reasonableness and appropriateness of expenses. Mr. Mason represented that Mr. Owens has no concerns with a staff recommendation that if there is ever a disagreement on a bill, the attorney could file the bill with the court for approval and payment. Thus, Mr. Mason suggested that the Commission add to D.4.d the line, "If the attorney and Chief Public Defender cannot reach an agreement regarding an attorney's bill, the attorney may ask the judge presiding in the case to review, approve, and pay the bill." He also proposed that the Commission consider adding such a provision to the Commission's Standards or Guidelines. He recommended that the Commission approve the amended plan with the added provision in D.4.d.

Judge Hanlon expressed a concern about the language of the proposed new language, stating a fear that it could be construed to mean the court would be required

to pay the bill from its budget. She recommended revising the new language to read: “the attorney may ask the judge presiding in the case to review and approve the bill for payment” instead of “review, approve, and pay the bill.” Ms. DeWester moved to approve the Vanderburgh amended plan, with the staff’s recommended addition as modified by Judge Hanlon. Judge Diekhoff seconded the motion. The motion carried.

3. Financial Status of Public Defense Fund & Title IVE Reimbursements

Mr. Mason stated that the non-capital reimbursement request was \$10,866,000 for the first quarter, but that payment could be several hundred thousand dollars less, as would be discussed later. Either way, there were sufficient funds to pay all pending reimbursement requests.

4. FY26 Internal Budget Approval

Mr. Mason presented the proposed internal budget for the Commission for fiscal year 2026. He noted the internal budget is not required but that it is the Commission’s practice to adopt one. He noted that staff salaries have stayed flat but travel and administrative costs were reduced. Other fees and costs increased. The internal budget is still about 4% of the Commission’s total operating budget.

Ms. Corley moved to approve the budget. Judge Diekhoff seconded the motion. The budget was approved unanimously.

5. County Rent Payments for County Buildings

While doing desk audits, Commission staff discovered that the Marion County Public Defender Agency (MCPDA) submitted rent costs in excess of \$1,781,000 in the first quarter of 2025. This includes what they identify as approximately two quarters of rent. In the past, the MCPDA rented private space for its offices for about \$1.7 million per year. The rent more than doubled because MCPDA moved into a new facility at the Community Justice Center.

The new office building is comprised of five floors: three for the public defender office, 1.5 for probation, and a half of a floor available for commercial lease.

The Building Authority hired Denison to manage the parking garage, which offers paid public parking as well as dedicated parking for the probation and public defender offices. The Commission has reimbursed rent on this space already.

In conversations with MCPDA, Commission staff explained that new construction is subject to the Commission's Building Related Expenses Guidelines, which allow for reimbursement of the construction cost for new public defense spaces over a 10-year period and which is capped at market rate rent. The guideline provides that the Commission may make exceptions or amend the guideline:

12/14/16 Guideline for Reimbursement on Building Related Expenses

A building related expense generally includes land purchase, building purchase, facility build-out or remodel, fixtures, and any other item that may reasonably be expected to have at least a 10 year useful life. It does not include furniture or office equipment, which are reimbursable in the same manner as all other indigent defense expenses. All building related expenses that are appropriate, necessary, and are primarily for the provision of indigent defense services, are a reimbursable expense as long as the total is comparable to, or less than, the cost if the county were to instead lease a comparable space. Eligible expenses will be reduced proportionally if only a portion of a building is being used for indigent defense. To be eligible for reimbursement for a building related expense the county must:

- 1) Verify that estimated project costs cover the entire scope of the project
- 2) Provide comparable space lease costs and, if applicable, any additional build-out expenses that would not be included in the rent to Commission staff
- 3) Once the project has been completed, the final costs shall be submitted to Commission staff for confirmation that the total includes:
 - a. Only indigent defense expenses;
 - b. That the expenses are reasonable and necessary; and
 - c. The expenses otherwise follow all Commission Standards and Guidelines.
- 4) If Commission staff denies expenses the county may appeal to the Commission as a whole.

5) If final project costs are more than the market rent of comparable leased space, the Commission will limit reimbursement to that of the comparable lease option.

Once the final, reimbursable amount is approved by staff, these expenses shall be submitted to the Commission evenly on a quarterly basis over a 10-year (40 quarter) period. Reimbursement will only begin once all expenses are final and the entire project is being used for indigent defense. Reimbursement will cease if the space is no longer used for indigent defense or the building is sold.

Building projects which total less than \$40,000 may still be submitted to the Commission for reimbursement as a lump sum in the quarter that the project is complete and is being used for indigent defense. The Commission may deny reimbursement if the county routinely submits building related projects under the \$40,000 threshold without adequate justification. The Commission, at its discretion, may make exceptions or modify application of these rules upon request.

Mr. Mason is concerned that counties could enrich themselves by charging themselves rent and collecting reimbursement from the Commission. These rent payments may be an attempt to recover construction, maintenance, and ongoing expenses but could include a variety of other costs that may not be eligible for reimbursement (such as indirect expenses assessed as a building authority's property management fees). The amount and purpose of these expenses can be difficult to ascertain.

Mr. Mason provided the Commission with a table of counties that appear to be billing the Commission for rent paid on a county structure, along with the amount billed in 1Q25, and the new total amount of reimbursement for the county if the Commission declines to reimburse these expenses for 1Q2025:

<u>County</u>	<u>Vendor</u>	<u>1Q2025 Rent</u>	<u>Reduced Reimbursement</u>
Allen	Allen County Building Authority	\$11,381.73	\$1,247,939.80
Floyd	Floyd County Building Authority	\$10,056.00	\$143,860.03
Marion	Marion County Building Authority	\$1,781,623.58	\$2,754,165.15
Vanderburgh	Evansville Vanderburgh County Building Authority	\$38,607.50	\$1,077,791.71
WCIPDO	Vermillion County Auditor	\$3,000.00	\$69,861.44

Mr. Mason shared and discussed four recommendations:

- Determine if any of these expenses should have been subject to the building related expense guideline and recoup any expenses that should have been submitted under that guideline but were instead submitted as rent.
- Withhold the above rent from reimbursement until the September meeting where we will have more information about each county’s situation.
- Create a guideline, effective for the first quarter of 2025, that the Commission will only reimburse counties that are not subject to the building related expenses guideline for actual expenses incurred for public defense offices in county spaces. Actual expenses do not include rent paid on a county structure. Further guidance on eligible expenses will be developed in preparation for the September meeting.
- For the September meeting, evaluate the Marion County PD Office project and determine if any modifications to the existing guideline are necessary in general or as an exception specific to Marion County. Evaluate reimbursement eligibility for actual expenses incurred for counties that also are receiving building related expense reimbursement.

Ms. DeWester asked if Commission staff know what Marion County Probation is paying. Mr. Mason stated that Probation does pay but the amounts are uncertain.

Mr. Mason stated that his understanding was that MCPDA signed an agreement that when they moved into the new building, the amount owed for rent would not decrease their non-rent budget.

Mr. Abbs said that Noble County just went through the building process, and he thought the process was fair and worked well; it may just take tinkering with to make it work in situations like this.

Ms. Corley asked if the Commission was involved with the process as the Justice Center was planned. Mr. Mason said that sometimes the Commission is very involved in the design and plan process, but in this situation the Commission was not. He was involved at one point when there was a discussion about whether the whole office would transition to the new facility, but that was the extent of the Commission's involvement, and he did not even know when they moved. Ms. Corley asked why this issue came up now. Mr. Mason answered that because the Marion County rent was such a large payment, Commission staff began investigating how much the counties were paying to themselves for rent.

Rep. Lauer asked if there are other county offices paying rent to county governments. Mr. Mason answered that the five counties listed above are the only ones Commission staff have identified. Rep. Lauer asked if the amount paid by MCPDA was calculated by staff size of the office. Mr. Mason said the Commission has no rules for situations where a county pays commercial rent because the county is paying market rates; there is no incentive to overcharge the public defender office.

Judge Hanlon noted that in some counties, the county provides the public defender with office space at no charge. She asked if, in Mr. Mason's institutional memory, he has seen situations like this before. Mr. Mason responded that every situation is different. For example, Delaware County started the process; the county converted an old school into an office space but also added a jail. Ultimately, they decided not to pursue it, perhaps due to the complexity of ascertaining relevant costs.

Judge Hanlon agreed, stating that she understood the sticker shock of Marion County's costs, but recognizing the value of market rate rent caps ensuring counties do not recover too much. Ms. DeWester said she does not want to hurt a county

public defender office's budget but also worries about reactions from the General Assembly, which might be concerned about too much state funding for county projects. She wants to see more information about rents and rent increases.

The Chair recognized MCPDA Chief Ray Casanova, who stated that a deal was negotiated by former Chief Bob Hill and that any increase in costs from moving would not be enforced against the MCPDA's existing budget. He is also working to find and provide the materials Mr. Mason has requested.

Several Commission members expressed the budgetary impact on the Commission if more counties decided to charge themselves rent for public defender offices and collect from the Commission. It was asked where the money for the Marion County rent went, and Mr. Casanova answered that it went into the county's general fund, not into the MCPDA budget.

Judge Hanlon moved to approve all four staff recommendations. Judge Diekhoff seconded the motion. There was no further discussion. The motion carried unanimously.

6. 90-Day Letter & Other Compliance Updates

Mr. Mason recalled that the Commission sent Jasper County a ninety-day letter after its December meeting because unqualified attorneys were being appointed to cases, despite multiple warnings from Commission staff. In response to the letter, the county informed commission staff that: 1) a judge who was a significant part of the problem is out of office, and 2) the new chief public defender assured the Commission that this would no longer be an issue.

Nevertheless, after the new Chief PD started on March 1, the trial court appointed an attorney to a murder case who is not qualified to receive the case. The Chief objected to the appointment and sought to help the attorney be qualified, but the appointment was still made and the defender declined opportunities that would have allowed him to become qualified.

Judge Hanlon suggested that this one case should be non-reimbursable but that the county's reimbursement should not be. Judge Diekhoff disagreed, saying a

message needs to be sent to the county that appointments must be qualified. She moved to send a letter stating that the county would not be eligible for reimbursement after June 30 unless these issues were resolved. Mr. Abbs seconded the motion. The motion carried.

LaGrange County

Mr. Mason requested a ninety-day letter for the county. The county does have a Chief PD in place now, but the county has had continued appointments of unqualified attorneys to CHINS and TPR cases that are not qualified, including one attorney who has been appointed off and on for four years, despite notice to the county since that time.

Mr. Abbs noted that he's been working with the county for over a year and believes they are making great progress. Judge Hanlon moved to send a ninety-day letter, including a recognition of the county's progress. Rep. Lauer seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Allen County

Commission staff discovered that Allen County has been placing hard caps on hourly appellate attorney bills, despite the Commission giving them notice several years ago that their comprehensive plan does not allow flat fees. Mr. Mason sent a letter requesting confirmation that hourly attorneys would be paid for the actual hours they worked and not a flat fee, but he has not received a response. He thus recommended a ninety-day letter. Ms. DeWester moved to send a ninety-day letter to Allen County, resolving hard caps on appeals for 1Q2025. Judge Diekhoff seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Hancock County

Mr. Mason said that Hancock County recently amended its comprehensive plan, including the adoption of Standard O, which requires pay parity for full-time staff. The County did not let the PD office immediately make the required staff-salary

changes; it approved it for 2026 but not for 2025. He noted that receiving a demand letter could ruffle feathers politically in the county when some are already suggesting the county should go back to its old system.

Judge Hanlon asked if the Chief has a position. The Chair recognized Hancock County Office Manager Janice Conley, who was attending the meeting. Ms. Conley said the temperature is much cooler in the county now. Originally only two county council members were supportive. Five members wanted to be very sure that the right positions were chosen for pay parity purposes, so the county conducted a careful study to ensure the positions are comparable. The county also conducted a feasibility study and concluded that going back to the old method would be detrimental to the county. The council now feels less aggravated with the public defender office. The council proposed coming into compliance in the 2026 budget by matching the salaries in 2026 along with a three-percent raise offered to others. Judge Diekhoff stated she approved the council plan and believed that if a county council says they'll put it in the budget, it can generally be counted on. Ms. Corley asked if it would be a good idea to put the plan in writing and send it to the county, memorializing what the Commission understood the county was agreeing to do. Mr. Mason agreed to send such a letter.

7. Status of County Compliance (Caseloads)

Mr. Mason identified issues with several multi-county attorneys, which the Commission is working to address with the relevant counties. He noted that it is hard to coordinate between judges and court reporters in multiple counties who are working with different attorneys and trying to bring them into compliance. Ninety-day letters are generally only sent when judges or attorneys refuse to comply.

Grant, Ripley, and St. Joseph counties were all only slightly out of compliance and are improving. Mr. Mason did not recommend any ninety-day compliance letters.

8. Requests for Reimbursement:

- a. 50% Reimbursement in Death Penalty Cases*

The Commission received claims from Hendricks, Madison, and Marion counties totaling \$62,226.51 (see table below). Hendricks County also submitted \$10,950.81 in late claims. Mr. Mason noted that although the Commission could deny late requests, as long as money is available and it is a first late request, the Commission tends to approve reimbursement. He recommended reimbursement for all requests. Judge Hanlon moved to approve the death penalty reimbursement requests. Ms. DeWester seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Reimbursement Requests in Capital Cases
June 18, 2025

COUNTY	DEFENDANT	TOTAL
Hendricks	Rodgers	\$22,975.33
Madison	Boards	\$37,708.80
Marion	Mitchell	\$4,042.38
TOTAL		\$62,226.51

LATE CLAIMS

Hendricks	Rodgers	\$10,950.81
TOTAL		\$75,677.32

b. 40% Reimbursement in Non-Capital Cases

Mr. Mason reported that the total reimbursement request for the first quarter of 2025, after the withheld amounts for rent as approved above, was \$10,128,442.12 (see Appendix A). Judge Hanlon was opposed to withholding the entirety of Allen County’s request due to being out of compliance on appeals and moved to approve all reimbursement requests except for the previously-agreed withheld rents. Judge Diekhoff seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously and the reimbursements were approved.

9. Misdemeanor Pilot

Mr. Mason said that the misdemeanor pilot is authorized to begin July 1 and run for four years. The Commission will collect misdemeanor data both from counties participating in the pilot as well as other counties to provide more robust data. He presented the following map showing the counties who applied for the pilot as well as counties that have begun data collection.



The bill requiring the Commission to launch the pilot allowed the selection of up to 12 counties and required the Commission to consider both population and geographic location when making its decision. Mr. Mason and Commission staff

analyzed the applications and attempted to prioritize counties that have illustrated a history of strong leadership, good communication with Commission staff, and accuracy and timeliness of their reimbursement requests and reports. Mr. Mason noted that his original recommendations changed due to budget cuts; because the pilot was to be paid from existing Commission funds, and because the General Assembly cut the Commission's budget by more than the estimated cost of the pilot, cost-cutting choices needed to be made.

Mr. Mason provided the Commission with a spreadsheet in which some counties were highly recommended, some were recommended, some had at least some level of reservation (such as cost, data concerns, location, etc.), and some counties were not recommended.

Mr. Mason noted that counties could be added during the pilot if it became feasible to do so based upon budget availability. It was also possible that participating counties would not be able to continue. Mr. Mason recommended that pilot agreements be submitted with selected counties for a more limited term, such as 18 months and reviewed for extensions based upon the Commission's budget. He assured the Commission that the agreements would provide that misdemeanor reimbursement would be provided after the initial term only so long as funds were available, with the understanding that the pilot would not threaten the regular 40% reimbursement.

Sen. Koch moved to adopt an 18-month pilot that includes the counties that were highly recommended and those that were recommended (Clark, Dekalb, Floyd, Lawrence, Perry, Pulaski, Steuben, Vigo, and Wabash).

The Chair conducted a roll-call vote:

Mr. Abbs: aye

Ms. Corley: aye

Ms. DeWester: aye

Rep. Hatcher: aye

Sen. Koch: aye

Rep. Lauer: aye

Judges Diekhoff and Hanlon abstained. The Chair did not vote. The motion carried.

10. Local Public Defender Board Appointments

Mr. Cullen said that the Commission's appointment in Fayette County resigned, so with the support of several individuals, Commission staff recommended Mike Bottomley. Mr. Cullen is still finalizing a recommendation for Marshall County, where two individuals have been put forward. The Commission Chair will make an interim appointment, and the Commission will vote on it at the September meeting. In Sullivan County, commission staff recommended Margaret "Mitzie" Badger, a retired court reporter. In White County, Commission staff recommended Libby Billue to be re-appointed to the county board.

Judge Hanlon moved to appoint the staff recommendations to their county boards. Judge Diekhoff seconded the motion. The motion carried.

11. Legislative & Policy Updates

Mr. Cullen provided the legislative update that HB 1006 did pass, which changed the terms of all the Commission members. The Commission ended up with about a 4% budget cut. The public service scholarship bill passed, and progress is being made seeking funding from Lilly Endowment or other alternatives to fund the scholarships.

12. Other Matters

The Chair thanked Ms. Corley and Mr. Abbs for their service on the Commission. The meeting was adjourned.

Appendix A

Non-Capital Claims 1Q2025 6/18/25

	Non-					Title IV-E 40%		Prior Quarter Adjustment	Total Reimburseme nt
	Total Expenditure	reimbursable Adjustment	% Adjusted	Eligible Expenditure	40% Reimbursed	CCAA portion (35520/562000/1 0000/593000)	69304/562000/10000/ 593003/025IVECHNDE F25/RECIPNT		
Adams	\$152,217.41	\$35,137.08	23.08%	\$117,080.33	\$46,832.13	\$45,913.76	\$918.37	\$46,832.13	
Allen	\$1,376,817.84	\$89,967.83	6.48%	\$1,286,850.01	\$514,740.00	\$503,071.16	\$11,668.84	\$514,740.00	
Benton	\$49,586.65	\$3,449.08	6.96%	\$46,137.57	\$18,455.03	\$18,455.03	\$0.00	\$18,455.03	
Blackford	\$100,469.87	\$17,640.79	17.56%	\$82,829.08	\$33,131.63	\$32,498.13	\$633.50	\$33,131.63	
Brown	\$64,233.69	\$21,612.09	33.65%	\$42,621.60	\$17,048.64	\$16,570.05	\$478.59	\$17,048.64	
Carroll	\$84,759.45	\$14,153.44	16.70%	\$70,606.01	\$28,242.41	\$27,170.54	\$1,071.87	\$28,242.41	
Cass	\$203,388.05	\$30,199.61	14.85%	\$173,188.44	\$69,275.38	\$67,460.30	\$1,815.08	\$69,275.38	
Clark	\$510,614.35	\$44,483.96	8.71%	\$466,130.39	\$186,452.15	\$183,853.65	\$2,598.50	\$186,452.15	
Clinton	\$105,224.74	\$25,626.58	24.35%	\$79,598.16	\$31,839.26	\$31,670.53	\$168.73	\$31,839.26	
Crawford	\$37,500.00	\$12,472.59	33.26%	\$25,027.41	\$10,010.96	\$9,699.74	\$311.22	\$10,010.96	
Decatur	\$151,907.15	\$32,841.21	21.62%	\$119,065.94	\$47,626.38	\$45,967.17	\$1,659.21	\$47,626.38	
Dekalb	\$303,629.96	\$33,245.92	10.95%	\$270,384.04	\$108,153.61	\$106,870.20	\$1,283.41	\$108,153.61	
Delaware	\$559,050.15	\$11,437.79	2.05%	\$547,612.36	\$219,044.94	\$211,633.80	\$7,411.14	\$219,044.94	
Elkhart	\$1,059,979.71	\$131,580.27	12.41%	\$928,399.44	\$371,359.78	\$366,177.99	\$5,181.79	\$371,359.78	
Fayette	\$104,138.50	\$15,240.95	14.64%	\$88,897.55	\$35,559.02	\$34,706.71	\$852.31	\$35,559.02	
Floyd	\$431,462.14	\$71,812.07	16.26%	\$359,650.07	\$143,860.03	\$139,095.91	\$4,764.12	\$143,860.03	
Fulton	\$109,811.81	\$35,659.60	32.47%	\$74,152.21	\$29,660.89	\$28,655.26	\$1,005.63	\$29,660.89	
Gibson	\$183,940.75	\$16,156.90	8.78%	\$167,783.85	\$67,113.54	\$65,765.90	\$1,347.64	\$67,113.54	
Grant	\$348,021.72	\$13,467.08	3.87%	\$334,554.64	\$133,821.86	\$130,293.06	\$3,528.80	\$133,821.86	
Greene	\$200,122.60	\$26,781.32	13.38%	\$173,341.28	\$69,336.51	\$68,187.63	\$1,148.88	\$69,336.51	
Hancock	\$321,677.54	\$28,406.30	8.83%	\$293,271.24	\$117,308.49	\$114,683.57	\$2,624.92	\$117,308.49	
Harrison	\$188,923.66	\$21,237.47	11.24%	\$167,686.19	\$67,074.47	\$66,782.83	\$291.64	\$67,074.47	
Hendricks	\$663,878.36	\$110,436.93	16.64%	\$553,441.43	\$221,376.57	\$218,941.74	\$2,434.83	\$221,376.57	
Howard	\$646,231.53	\$46,016.41	7.12%	\$600,215.12	\$240,086.05	\$236,086.30	\$3,999.75	\$240,086.05	
Jackson	\$289,724.84	\$13,157.81	4.54%	\$276,567.03	\$110,626.81	\$106,601.04	\$4,025.77	\$110,626.81	
Jasper	\$203,502.66	\$28,385.39	13.95%	\$175,117.27	\$70,046.91	\$68,487.07	\$1,559.84	\$70,046.91	
Jay	\$138,641.04	\$20,530.30	14.81%	\$118,110.74	\$47,244.29	\$44,750.67	\$2,493.62	\$47,244.29	
Jefferson	\$237,609.25	\$27,887.14	11.74%	\$209,722.11	\$83,888.84	\$81,045.42	\$2,843.42	\$83,888.84	
Jennings	\$125,641.52	\$5,584.93	4.45%	\$120,056.59	\$48,022.64	\$45,908.79	\$2,113.85	\$48,022.64	
Knox	\$262,778.29	\$41,283.68	15.71%	\$221,494.61	\$88,597.84	\$85,256.37	\$3,341.47	\$88,597.84	
Kosciusko	\$283,232.59	\$86,457.39	30.53%	\$196,775.20	\$78,710.08	\$77,275.38	\$1,434.70	\$78,710.08	
LaGrange	\$114,353.59	\$43,057.60	37.65%	\$71,295.99	\$28,518.40	\$26,178.32	\$2,340.08	\$28,518.40	
Lake	\$1,688,055.68	\$2,145.24	0.13%	\$1,685,910.44	\$674,364.18	\$674,364.18	\$0.00	\$674,364.18	
LaPorte	\$401,622.99	\$41,621.59	10.36%	\$360,001.40	\$144,000.56	\$141,265.88	\$2,734.68	\$144,000.56	
Lawrence	\$331,088.98	\$71,877.22	21.71%	\$259,211.76	\$103,684.70	\$99,010.96	\$4,673.74	\$103,684.70	
Madison	\$670,521.85	\$13,778.26	2.05%	\$656,743.59	\$262,697.44	\$255,893.90	\$6,803.54	\$262,697.44	
Marion	\$7,804,157.37	\$918,744.50	11.77%	\$6,885,412.87	\$2,754,165.15	\$2,683,549.30	\$70,615.85	\$2,754,165.15	
Martin	\$65,878.86	\$10,392.10	15.77%	\$55,486.76	\$22,194.70	\$21,139.10	\$1,055.60	\$22,194.70	
Miami	\$213,673.50	\$29,324.97	13.72%	\$184,348.53	\$73,739.41	\$71,728.02	\$2,011.39	\$73,739.41	
Monroe	\$759,331.76	\$115,894.15	15.26%	\$643,437.61	\$257,375.04	\$251,015.84	\$6,359.20	\$257,375.04	
Noble	\$321,081.73	\$53,252.16	16.59%	\$267,829.57	\$107,131.83	\$106,108.87	\$1,022.96	\$107,131.83	
Ohio	\$22,284.99	\$3,736.08	16.77%	\$18,548.91	\$7,419.57	\$7,095.79	\$323.78	\$7,419.57	
Orange	\$95,085.97	\$11,853.30	12.47%	\$83,232.67	\$33,293.07	\$32,400.04	\$893.03	\$33,293.07	
Owen	\$107,622.00	\$18,237.40	16.95%	\$89,384.60	\$35,753.84	\$34,431.97	\$1,321.87	\$35,753.84	
Perry	\$76,462.25	\$10,249.94	13.41%	\$66,212.31	\$26,484.93	\$26,068.63	\$416.30	\$26,484.93	
Pike	\$49,148.73	\$11,967.83	24.35%	\$37,180.90	\$14,872.36	\$13,234.10	\$1,638.26	\$14,872.36	
Pulaski	\$103,399.22	\$17,579.05	17.00%	\$85,820.17	\$34,328.07	\$34,328.07	\$1,442.80	\$34,328.07	
Ripley	\$72,068.17	\$8,441.29	11.71%	\$63,626.88	\$25,450.75	\$24,642.80	\$807.95	\$25,450.75	
Rush	\$126,290.58	\$23,980.27	18.99%	\$102,310.31	\$40,924.12	\$40,192.04	\$732.08	\$40,924.12	
Scott	\$109,512.26	\$17,650.33	16.12%	\$91,861.93	\$36,744.77	\$35,696.88	\$1,047.89	\$36,744.77	
Shelby	\$171,959.42	\$36,365.84	21.15%	\$135,593.58	\$54,237.43	\$52,861.91	\$1,375.52	\$54,237.43	
Spencer	\$198,572.96	\$55,603.96	28.00%	\$142,969.00	\$57,187.60	\$54,662.54	\$2,525.06	\$57,187.60	
Steuben	\$145,380.41	\$45,740.66	31.51%	\$99,639.75	\$39,855.90	\$38,856.63	\$999.27	\$39,855.90	
StJoseph	\$991,642.21	\$89,513.18	9.03%	\$902,129.03	\$360,851.61	\$352,396.84	\$8,454.77	\$354,893.25	
Sullivan	\$33,547.99	\$6,041.05	18.01%	\$27,506.94	\$11,002.78	\$10,543.22	\$459.56	\$11,002.78	
Switzerland	\$19,267.74	\$2,706.98	14.05%	\$16,560.76	\$6,624.31	\$6,474.42	\$149.89	\$6,624.31	
Tippecanoe	\$1,216,360.78	\$164,866.85	13.55%	\$1,051,493.93	\$420,597.57	\$411,040.85	\$9,556.72	\$420,597.57	
Union	\$30,352.00	\$11,707.49	38.57%	\$18,644.51	\$7,457.80	\$6,821.76	\$636.04	\$7,457.80	
Vanderburgh	\$1,177,316.69	\$66,111.45	5.44%	\$1,111,205.24	\$444,482.10	\$433,785.22	\$10,696.88	\$444,482.10	
Vigo	\$1,181,996.44	\$165,806.37	14.03%	\$1,016,190.07	\$406,476.03	\$399,216.15	\$7,259.88	\$406,476.03	
Wabash	\$166,257.99	\$22,759.03	13.69%	\$143,498.96	\$57,399.58	\$56,579.21	\$820.37	\$57,399.58	
Warren	\$23,079.90	\$6,819.07	29.55%	\$16,260.83	\$6,504.33	\$6,504.33	\$0.00	\$6,504.33	
Warrick	\$175,920.69	\$13,519.64	7.69%	\$162,401.05	\$64,960.42	\$61,466.71	\$3,493.71	\$64,960.42	
Washington	\$189,538.21	\$35,421.72	18.69%	\$154,116.49	\$61,646.60	\$61,018.19	\$628.41	\$61,646.60	
WCIPDO	\$218,140.01	\$43,486.41	19.66%	\$174,653.60	\$69,861.44	\$68,982.81	\$878.63	\$69,861.44	
White	\$88,557.33	\$18,935.52	21.38%	\$69,621.81	\$27,848.72	\$26,427.43	\$1,421.29	\$27,848.72	
TOTAL	\$28,658,249.07	\$3,321,538.41		\$25,336,710.66	\$10,134,684.25	\$9,904,075.81	\$230,608.44	-\$6,242.13	\$10,128,442.12