DRAFT

INDIANA COMMISSION ON COURT APPOINTED ATTORNEYS

September 24, 2025

2:00 PM

101 West Ohio, 18th Floor, Commission Conference Room

Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

Members in attendance:
Mark W. Rutherford, Chair (in person)
Rep. Maureen Bauer (remote)
Ms. Samantha DeWester (in person)
Hon. Mary Ellen Diekhoff (remote)
Ms. Paje Felts (in person)
Hon. Kelsey B. Hanlon (remote)
Mr. David J. Hensel (remote)
Rep. Ryan Lauer (in person)
Sen. Rodney Pol (remote)

Members absent:
Sen. Eric Koch

Staff in attendance (participating):
Derrick Mason
Andrew Cullen

Participating audience members:
Jim Abbs, Noble County Chief Public Defender
Ray Casanova, Marion County Chief Public Defender

At 2:04 p.m., the Chair called the meeting to order. Commission members and participating staff introduced themselves, and a quorum was established.

1. Approval of June 18, 2025 Minutes

There were no changes to the minutes for the June 18, 2025 meeting. Ms. DeWester moved to approve the minutes and Rep Lauer seconded the motion. The minutes were approved unanimously.

2. Comprehensive Plan Approval

A. Approval of Madison County Amended Plan (Adds Standard O)

Mr. Mason said that Madison County has amended its comprehensive plan to include the Commission's optional standard, Standard O, which requires counties who adopt the standard to pay support staff the same as other comparable county staff. There was no other discussion. Judge Hanlon moved to approve the amended plan. Ms. DeWester seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

B. Approval of Montgomery County Amended Plan (Rewritten Plan, Creates a PD Office with F/T Chief & Standard O)

Montgomery County previously joined the Commission, Mr. Mason explained, but has not participated in the Commission for the last eleven years. Therefore, the submitted comprehensive plan is technically an amended plan, but it is completely rewritten. The county is increasing salaries for its Chief and Chief Deputy Public Defender, and it needs to remove one of its public defenders who is paid from the county's supplemental fund, which is not a permitted source of funding for regular public defense costs. The county expects to be in full compliance with Commission standards by January 1, 2026. Montgomery County has been receiving Title IV-E funds, which opened the door to rejoining the Commission for public defender reimbursement.

Mr. Hensel moved to approve the Montgomery County amended plan; Ms. DeWester seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

C. Approval of Steuben County Amended Plan (Rewritten Plan, Creates a PD Office with F/T Chief & Standard O)

Mr. Mason reminded the Commission that Steuben County was among the applicants to participate in the misdemeanor reimbursement pilot program. The Commission selected Steuben County, conditioned on the county's promise to establish an office with a full-time Chief and support staff. The county has hired a chief, and the amended comprehensive plan complies with those requirements. The amended plan also incorporated Standard O. Mr. Mason noted that after the county adopted the amended plan, a scrivener's error was found, which the county is working to address. The same error occurred in the Montgomery County plan, which will also be fixed.

Judge Hanlon moved to approve the amended plan. Ms. DeWester seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

3. Financial Status of Public Defense Fund & Title IV-E Reimbursements

Mr. Mason stated that the annual report has been completed and was provided to Commission members in their materials. In the report, a map depicts the amount of funds collected from each county pursuant to the new public defense fee allowed by legislation in 2024. There are several blanks on the map due to errors made by the county clerks and auditors. Commission staff are working with the counties to correct errors and omissions.

Mr. Mason also noted that the Commission staff just received a signed Title IV-E agreement with the Department of Child Services; without that, it was not possible to set up and plan for the next fiscal year. He also said there were sufficient funds in the public defense fund to fully reimburse counties for the second quarter.

4. From Prior Meeting:

Mr. Mason introduced the topic of expenses and reimbursement for county-owned and constructed buildings, which first arose at the June meeting. Three issues were discussed: a new guideline regarding expenses incurred for county-owned structures; an amended guideline regarding reimbursement for building-related expenses; and reimbursement for Marion County's new office and parking garage. After much discussion, each issue was voted on separately.

A. New Guideline: Expenses Incurred for County-Owned Structures

Mr. Mason recalled that at the June meeting, the Commission discussed county rent agreements. The issue arose, he said, because of a parking rent bill of approximately $1.78 million from the Marion County Public Defender Agency (MCPDA). It was unclear at the time who owned the building—whether it was the county or a third party. He has further researched the issue, and it appears the building containing the parking garage is not owned by the county. He said the initial question, however, is what should be done for county-owned buildings, because there are four county-owned facilities that are charging rent to public defender offices. The Commission has a guideline that disallows the billing of indirect expenses and at best, this is a method to cover each county office's indirect costs for being in a county building. At worst, the county could assess rent to public defender offices at rates that are unreasonable to maximize reimbursement. The goal from the previous meeting was to develop guidelines for what expenses a county could submit for reimbursement.

Mr. Mason said Commission staff developed a new proposed guideline that applies to expenses for county-owned buildings that are not new construction. He read the proposed guideline and explained it to the Commission. The proposed new guideline reads as follows:

> Guideline for Expenses Incurred on County-Owned Structures
>
> The county may not submit any rent or lease expenses associated with a county-owned structure. Counties may submit the following actual expenses, subject to caps for counties that are simultaneously receiving 10-year, building-related expense reimbursement:
>
> - For public defense spaces that are in a building shared with non-public defense entities: only expenses that are 1) incurred physically within the public defense space (e.g., pro-rata utilities or repairs that occur within the public defense space) or 2) a pro-rata share of structural expenses that occur outside of the public defense space, if the expense was required for the continued operation of the public defense space. Examples include:
>   - Groundskeeping expenses would not be allowed as the expense is neither structural nor incurred within the public defense space.
>   - A public elevator repair would not be an allowable expense if it did not occur within the public defense space because it is not a "structural expense."
>   - A roof repair may be an allowable expense if it was necessary for the continued operation of the building (vs. cosmetic purposes) because a roof is part of the building's overall structure.
>   - When determining pro-rata expenses, if a public defense office occupies 10% of the total building, by square footage, then 10% of the total expense would be eligible for submission.

- For public defense spaces that are freestanding: All reasonable and necessary expenses incurred for the continued operation and maintenance of the structure and grounds are eligible for reimbursement.

Ms. DeWester asked what is meant by "county-owned" since, as here, the parking garage is owned by the city but is operated by a third party. Mr. Mason agreed that this situation is complicated. Previously, MCPDA paid about $1.7 million in rent and up to $300,000 for parking to privately owned companies. There was no issue with reimbursing those costs because the MCPDA was paying negotiated market rates. The issue arose when the MCPDA was asked to start paying the county.

B. Amended Guideline: Reimbursement for Building-Related Expenses

The second proposed guideline, Mr. Mason said, is an update to the Building-Related Expense Reimbursement Guideline that the Commission created in 2016. The guideline was used slowly at first, with one project in 2016 and a handful in the succeeding years. In 2025, Mr. Mason has done three site visits with three more visits scheduled for building-related projects. The revised guideline still spreads the costs over ten years and caps the expenses at the market-rate lease cost. It requires that the expenses be incurred primarily for the provision of public defense. He noted that this option saves the Commission money because it pays for ten years of market-rate expenses rather than rent in perpetuity.

The proposed amended guideline is as follows:

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 public ~~indigent~~ defense expenses. All building-related expenses that are appropriate, necessary, and incurred ~~are~~ primarily for the provision of public ~~indigent~~ defense should be included in a project's cost. Building-related expenses are reimbursable ~~are a reimbursable expense~~ so long as the total ~~is comparable to, or less than,~~ does not exceed the cost if the county were to instead lease a comparable space. While a county is receiving reimbursement under this guideline, additional expenses that would be eligible for submission under the Guideline for Expenses Incurred on County Owned Structures may be submitted only to the extent the total amount submitted for reimbursement associated with the space does not exceed the comparable space lease cost.

Once the final, reimbursable amount of a building-related expense is approved by staff, the eligible 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 public defense. Reimbursement will cease if the space is no longer used for public defense or the building or land is sold.

Eligible expenses will be reduced proportionally if only a portion of a building is being used for public ~~indigent~~ defense. To be eligible for reimbursement: ~~for a building-related expense the county must:~~

1) The type of building or space must be one that would be subject to a commercial lease in the private market (e.g., office, storage space, etc.) and the county must provide comparable space lease costs.

2) The total of the public defense portion of the project cost must be at least $40,000. 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 was completed and began to be used for public defense. ~~must be one that Verify that estimated project costs cover the entire scope of the project.~~

~~3) The county must provide comparable commercial space lease costs and, if applicable, any additional build-out expenses that would not be included in the rent to Commission staff.~~

3)~~4)~~ Once the project has been completed, an in-person site visit must be conducted and the final costs shall be submitted to Commission staff for confirmation that the total includes:

   a. Only public ~~indigent~~ defense expenses;

   b. That the expenses are reasonable and necessary; and

   c. The expenses otherwise follow all Commission Standards and Guidelines.

4)~~5)~~ If the 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.

5~~6)~~ If Commission staff denies expenses or the county disagrees with staff's chosen comparable lease rate, ~~disagree to a comparable rental rate~~ the county may appeal to the Commission as a whole.

~~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 public ~~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.

Ms. DeWester asked if anything requires counties to consult with the Commission before starting a building process. Mr. Mason replied that there is not such a requirement. He went on to explain that while sometimes counties do consult, in other cases they do not – and some do not even seek reimbursement for their new construction. Ms. DeWester clarified that she does not want a county undertaking construction only to discover the Commission would not help pay for it. Mr. Mason said that the Commission provides training every year and addresses such issues, helping counties to understand what it covers and that the guidelines could potentially change.

C. Reimbursement for Marion County's New Office & Parking Garage

Mr. Mason then discussed the actual reimbursement for Marion County. The building housing the parking for the MCPDA appears to be neither a building-related expense nor a county-owned structure because it is *not* owned by the county and it is not necessarily going to be transferred to the county at the conclusion of the 20-year lease (with another 5-year possible extension). The amount of rent was determined well before the space was completed, the space was built to the county's specifications, and the county is responsible for all operating expenses associated with the space including elevator repair, HVAC repair, utilities, etc. The County also pays a property management fee. The Commission obtained market rate rents. One was listed at market rate for $20/SF as a full-service lease, and the second was a $16/SF lease but was a modified gross lease, with some operating expenses borne by the landlord and some by the tenant. The Marion County lease starts with an annual rent of $18/SF in year one and increases 2% every year for the next 20 years to $26.22/SF. This works out to be the exact average of the other two office rates, but it is essentially a triple net lease with virtually all expenses borne by the tenant.

Mr. Mason recommended that the Commission disallow expenses associated with the parking garage as the county is paying itself for the cost of building and running a county-owned structure. For the December 2025 meeting, he recommended that Commission staff work with Marion County to develop a "true up" of expenses for what is allowed, what has been billed and reimbursed already, and what has been withheld that the county should receive.

Ray Casanova addressed the Commission and provided background on why the MCPDA moved to the new facility. He asked the Commission to reimburse MCPDA for both the lease as well as the operating expenses, with a cap on the expenses. He said the garage does not generate significant income, perhaps a few thousand dollars in 2024. He thought the garage fell under guideline A, such that its cost could be spread over ten years. He did not disagree with the proposed guidelines, but he requested reimbursement up to a cap on expenses and a ten-year reimbursement for the garage.

Ms. DeWester asked the amount of the MCPDA parking reimbursement request. Mr. Mason initially stated that it was not clear because it was not broken out separately. Curious how other agencies are charged, Ms. DeWester asked Mr. Casanova how Probation was charged for parking. He answered that he assumed they were funded by the county. Mr. Mason, after reviewing his materials, answered Ms. DeWester that the county has charged MCPDA about $300,000 for parking so far this year.

D. Discussion and Vote on (A.) New Guideline: Expenses Incurred for County-Owned Structures

Mr. Hensel asked for clarification about the difference between the guidelines discussed in sections A and B. Mr. Mason acknowledged that the titles of the two were somewhat confusing. He explained that the amended guideline in section B governs reimbursement over a ten-year period to a county when the county constructs a new building. The new guideline in section A relates to expenses incurred for county-owned structures, such as ongoing maintenance or repairs to a building, not new construction. The section A guideline is a clarification for the types of expenses the Commission will generally reimburse. Anyone would qualify to receive reimbursement under section A, so long as they are not capped out at market rates for reimbursement under section B (until the ten-year period expires).

Judge Hanlon inquired whether the guideline in section B was a limitation of exposure for the Commission. Mr. Mason affirmed that that was partly the case; it was also to prevent counties from receiving a large percentage of a construction reimbursement in one year and then changing buildings the next year, as has happened before. The Commission never pays more than the equivalent of a market lease and never pays more than 1/10 of a construction project in one year, he said.

Judge Hanlon moved to adopt the section A guideline. Ms. DeWester seconded the motion. There was no further discussion. The Chair called the roll:

Judge Hanlon – aye
Mr. Hensel – aye
Judge Diekhoff – aye
Sen. Pol – aye
Rep. Bauer – aye
Rep. Lauer – aye
Ms. Felts – aye
Ms. DeWester – aye

The Chair abstained. The motion carried.

E. Discussion and Vote on (B.) Amended Guideline: Reimbursement for Building-Related Expenses

Ms. DeWester moved to adopt the section B amended guideline. Mr. Hensel seconded the motion.

Mr. Abbs was allowed to speak. He asked whether the implementation of these guidelines meant a county would not receive reimbursement for utilities if it were capped out on building expenses. Mr. Mason said that was correct. Mr. Abbs said he thought that was unfair since utilities would be incurred regardless of the building situation.

Judge Hanlon responded that the guideline provided a maximum for the physical plant that the Commission would reimburse. Mr. Mason agreed that it was about maximum exposure, saying that commercial leases could include all utilities, and more buildings are receiving caps. He clarified that this would not limit utilities for anyone not under the ten-year caps. The Chair called the roll:

Judge Hanlon – no vote
Mr. Hensel – aye
Judge Diekhoff – aye
Sen. Pol – aye
Rep. Bauer – aye
Rep. Lauer – aye
Ms. Felts – aye
Ms. DeWester – aye

The Chair abstained. The motion carried.

F. Discussion and Vote on (C.) Reimbursement for Marion County's New Office & Parking Garage

Ms. DeWester moved to adopt the staff recommendation in section C that the Commission would disallow expenses associated with the parking garage and that, for the December meeting, Commission staff would work with Marion County to develop a "true up" of expenses for what is allowed, what has been billed and reimbursed already, and what has been withheld that the county should receive. Judge Diekhoff seconded the motion. There was no further discussion. The Chair called the roll:

Mr. Hensel – aye
Judge Diekhoff – aye
Sen. Pol – aye
Rep. Bauer – aye
Judge Hanlon – no vote
Rep. Lauer – aye

Ms. Felt – aye

Ms. DeWester – aye

The Chair abstained. The motion carried.

5. 90-Day Letter & Other Compliance Updates

Mr. Mason reported good news for compliance across the board. Both Jasper and LaGrange counties were sent 90-day letters after the last meeting due to the appointment of unqualified attorneys, and both of those situations have been resolved. Allen County was sent a 90-day letter for caps on appellate fees, and the county has removed the caps and is paying back payments for appellate attorneys.

6. Status of County Compliance (Caseloads)

At the last meeting, there were six multi-county attorneys who were non-compliant for multi-county caseloads; this quarter it is down to two, and those two attorneys are very close to compliance. The individual counties are at 96% caseload compliance. Mr. Mason did not recommend any 90-day letters.

7. Requests for Reimbursement:

A. 50% Reimbursement in Death Penalty Cases

Mr. Mason reported that there are two counties seeking capital case reimbursement this quarter (see table below). Although Madison County also has a case, it is gathering information and will probably have a double-request next quarter. Ms. DeWester moved to approve the capital case reimbursement request; Mr. Hensel seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

COMMISSION ON COURT APPOINTED ATTORNEYS

Reimbursement Requests in Capital Cases

September 24, 2025

COUNTY	DEFENDANT	TOTAL
Hendricks	Rodgers	**$25,772.87**
Marion	Mitchell	**$1,337.48**
TOTAL		**$27,110.35**

B. 40% Reimbursement in Non-Capital Cases

Mr. Mason said that with the votes in Item 4, the reimbursement falls to $10,485,633.91 (see Appendix A). Once the costs for the misdemeanor pilot expenses are added and necessary deductions are made, the reimbursable amount for the second quarter of 2025 is $10,670,145.34. Ms. DeWester moved to approve the reimbursement request. Sen. Pol seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

8. Local Public Defender Board Appointments

Mr. Cullen informed the new Commission members that the Commission appoints candidates to most county public defender boards. This quarter, none of the candidates (table below) were contested. Mr. Hensel moved to approve the consensus candidates; Judge Diekhoff seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

3Q 2025: County Public Defender Board Appointments		
Action Requested: Re-appoint the following consensus candidates to County PD Boards.		
County	*Consensus Candidate for Re-Appointment*	*Consensus Candidate for Appointment*
Carroll	Ed Selvidge	
Clark	Anne Pfau	
Cass		Michael Boonstra
Floyd	Matthew Schad	
Grant	Joe Keith Lewis	
Jasper	Tim Belstra	
Jay	James Zimmerman	
Marshall		Brandon Schadek (confirm interim appointment)

9. Legislative & Policy Updates

Mr. Cullen informed the Commission that the Justice Reinvestment Advisory Council (JRAC) has released a report on indigency determinations. Included among the JRAC recommendations were standardization of forms, integration of technology, increased information about local attorney costs, and a data-driven strategy. Commission staff requested to be allowed to finish the pilot program before the JRAC committee took dramatic action because the pilot program would gather a wealth of relevant data.

He also said that MCPDA is facing a challenge with the county policy that employees must live in the county to work for the county. This is an increasingly prevalent issue due to the general attorney shortage. There is a fairness issue because the prosecutor does not have to comply with the rule. Mr. Cullen requested authorization from the Commission for Commission staff to assist MCPDA in working to change the policy such that MCPDA may hire public defenders and staff from outside the county. Ms. DeWester moved to authorize such an effort; Ms. Felts seconded the motion. Judge Hanlon abstained from the vote. The motion carried.

Finally, Mr. Cullen said that Commission staff have been working with legislators to discuss state public defender agency reorganization. The message the agencies received was that the General Assembly would like to see some consolidation and a better system, but the legislature wants the agencies to do it. Thus, the Commission has been conferring with the State Public Defender and the Public Defender Council, along with legislators, to discuss options.

10. Pilot Updates

Mr. Mason reported that, as the Commission closes out most of its At-Risk Youth & Family pilot programs, he wanted to share some of the results. In Vigo County, caseworkers and social workers worked with families (311 cases) and reduced the case length by more than two months. Children also spent an average of two fewer months outside the home. Where cases ended with a successful discharge, 73% of control cases ended with reunification, while the social-worker-assisted case resulted in reunification in 83% of cases. Vigo County has now picked up this program and will continue to fund it.

In Marion County, the pilot program (681 cases) led to a 70% decrease in detention rates (from 23% to 7%), and at disposition, the detention rate decreased by 86% (from 21% to 3%).

11. Other Matters

Ms. DeWester moved to adjourn. Rep. Lauer seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Appendix A

Commission on Court Appointed Attorneys
Non-Capital Claims 2Q2025 9/24/25

County	Total Expenditure	Non-reimbursable Adjustment	% Adjusted	Eligible Expenditure	40% Reimbursed	Prior Quarter Adjustment	Total
Adams	$138,370.62	$47,317.71	34.20%	$91,052.91	$36,421.16		$36,421.16
Allen	*$1,552,202.43*	*$111,173.01*	*7.11%*	*$1,441,029.42*	*$576,411.77*		$576,411.77
Benton	$27,242.09	$8,635.31	31.70%	$18,606.78	$7,442.71		$7,442.71
Blackford	$100,642.19	$8,455.24	8.40%	$92,186.95	$36,874.78		$36,874.78
Brown	$71,515.58	$16,896.78	23.63%	$54,618.80	$21,847.52		$21,847.52
Carroll	$57,623.44	$12,008.74	20.84%	$45,614.70	$18,245.88		$18,245.88
Cass	$279,483.27	$36,197.90	12.95%	$243,285.37	$97,314.15		$97,314.15
Clark	$547,270.21	$56,826.74	10.38%	$490,443.47	$196,177.39		$196,177.39
Clinton	$107,983.38	$33,688.73	31.20%	$74,294.65	$29,717.86		$29,717.86
Crawford	$37,500.00	$13,370.54	35.65%	$24,129.46	$9,651.79		$9,651.79
Decatur	$136,265.91	$27,073.86	19.87%	$109,192.05	$43,676.82	$971.62	$44,648.44
DeKalb	$352,947.95	$38,902.10	11.02%	$314,045.85	$125,618.34		$125,618.34
Delaware	$524,054.35	$2,373.94	0.45%	$521,680.41	$208,672.16		$208,672.16
Elkhart	$1,101,116.10	$181,002.53	16.44%	$920,113.57	$368,045.43		$368,045.43
Fayette	$117,128.53	$20,397.36	17.41%	$96,731.17	$38,692.47		$38,692.47
Floyd	*$443,587.86*	*$64,298.37*	*14.17%*	*$379,289.49*	*$151,715.80*		$151,715.80
Fulton	$112,720.92	$44,766.77	39.71%	$67,954.15	$27,181.66		$27,181.66
Gibson	$247,717.58	$24,357.21	9.83%	$223,360.37	$89,344.15		$89,344.15
Grant	$323,104.08	$5,658.95	1.75%	$317,445.13	$126,978.05		$126,978.05
Greene	$213,141.54	$34,699.17	16.28%	$178,442.37	$71,376.95		$71,376.95
Hancock	$334,015.80	$32,609.18	9.76%	$301,406.62	$120,562.65		$120,562.65
Harrison	$232,163.54	$29,112.88	12.54%	$203,050.66	$81,220.27		$81,220.27
Hendricks	$698,831.49	$136,404.85	19.52%	$562,426.64	$224,970.66		$224,970.66
Howard	$785,747.34	$53,685.81	6.83%	$732,061.53	$292,824.61		$292,824.61
Jackson	$320,385.98	$23,775.76	7.42%	$296,610.22	$118,644.09		$118,644.09
Jasper	$205,952.35	$27,723.76	13.46%	$178,228.59	$71,291.44		$71,291.44
Jay	$156,006.79	$20,813.48	13.34%	$135,193.31	$54,077.32		$54,077.32
Jefferson	$244,751.94	$26,930.43	11.00%	$217,821.51	$87,128.61		$87,128.61
Jennings	$131,144.73	$9,363.37	7.14%	$121,781.36	$48,712.54		$48,712.54
Knox	$267,172.69	$49,192.86	18.41%	$217,979.83	$87,191.93		$87,191.93
Kosciusko	$292,637.09	$88,426.72	30.22%	$204,210.37	$81,684.15		$81,684.15
LaGrange	$176,456.54	$43,430.41	24.61%	$133,026.13	$53,210.45		$53,210.45
Lake	$1,973,203.91	$1,663.12	0.08%	$1,971,540.79	$788,616.32		$788,616.32
LaPorte	$404,701.23	$42,060.99	10.39%	$362,640.24	$145,056.10		$145,056.10
Lawrence	$302,343.44	$55,996.21	18.52%	$246,347.23	$98,538.89		$98,538.89
Madison	$597,857.97	$13,267.33	2.22%	$584,590.64	$233,836.25		$233,836.25
Marion	*$7,022,916.77*	*$630,928.11*	*7.73%*	*$6,391,988.66*	*$2,556,795.46*		$2,556,795.46
Martin	$111,232.10	$17,740.72	15.95%	$93,491.38	$37,396.55		$37,396.55
Miami	$229,388.45	$25,384.56	11.07%	$204,003.89	$81,601.56		$81,601.56
Monroe	$914,980.23	$131,380.04	14.36%	$783,600.19	$313,440.08		$313,440.08
Noble	$361,310.44	$56,989.35	15.77%	$304,321.09	$121,728.44		$121,728.44
Ohio	$49,224.05	$11,821.21	24.02%	$37,402.84	$14,961.14		$14,961.14
Orange	$129,338.67	$18,757.29	14.50%	$110,581.38	$44,232.55		$44,232.55

Owen	$138,346.10	$15,705.04	11.35%	$122,641.06	$49,056.42		$49,056.42
Perry	$106,363.66	$15,681.13	14.74%	$90,682.53	$36,273.01		$36,273.01
Pike	$70,582.54	$10,593.26	15.01%	$59,989.28	$23,995.71		$23,995.71
Pulaski	$91,685.73	$23,570.27	25.71%	$68,115.46	$27,246.18		$27,246.18
Ripley	$70,186.75	$7,932.28	11.30%	$62,254.47	$24,901.79		$24,901.79
Rush	$121,621.61	$28,648.03	23.56%	$92,973.58	$37,189.43		$37,189.43
Scott	$164,040.34	$25,021.77	15.25%	$139,018.57	$55,607.43		$55,607.43
Shelby	$219,934.80	$31,250.00	14.21%	$188,684.80	$75,473.92		$75,473.92
Spencer	$182,596.11	$31,588.94	17.30%	$151,007.17	$60,402.87		$60,402.87
Steuben	$152,407.73	$35,877.03	23.54%	$116,530.70	$46,612.28		$46,612.28
StJoseph	$1,134,609.31	$108,416.37	9.56%	$1,026,192.94	$410,477.18		$410,477.18
Sullivan	$116,690.10	$17,288.34	14.82%	$99,401.76	$39,760.70		$39,760.70
Switzerland	$42,861.51	$3,513.02	8.20%	$39,348.49	$15,739.40		$15,739.40
Tippecanoe	$1,097,986.74	$166,000.74	15.12%	$931,986.00	$372,794.40		$372,794.40
Union	$22,810.30	$2,724.31	11.94%	$20,085.99	$8,034.39		$8,034.39
Vanderburgh	$1,274,521.51	$80,771.27	6.15%	$1,193,750.24	$477,500.10		$477,500.10
Vigo	$1,093,953.52	$148,382.57	13.56%	$945,570.95	$378,228.38		$378,228.38
Wabash	$169,613.51	$20,250.16	11.94%	$149,363.35	$59,745.34		$59,745.34
Warren	$34,965.67	$7,858.89	22.48%	$27,106.78	$10,842.71		$10,842.71
Warrick	$228,270.26	$22,665.43	9.93%	$205,604.83	$82,241.93		$82,241.93
Washington	$166,875.89	$24,742.09	14.83%	$142,133.80	$56,853.52		$56,853.52
WCIPDO	$197,567.39	$31,716.62	16.05%	$165,850.77	$66,340.31		$66,340.31
White	$88,742.59	$10,773.55	12.14%	$77,969.04	$31,187.62		$31,187.62
TOTAL	**$29,420,615.24**	**$3,206,530.51**		**$26,214,084.73**	**$10,485,633.91**	**$971.62**	**$10,486,605.53**

CM Pilot	Eligible Non-reimbursable Amount	CM Pilot 40% Reimbursed
Clark	$ 56,826.74	$ 22,730.70
DeKalb	$ 38,902.10	$ 15,560.84
Floyd	$ 64,298.37	$ 25,719.35
Lawrence	$ 55,061.15	$ 22,024.46
Perry	$ 15,681.13	$ 6,272.45
Pulaski	$ 23,570.27	$ 9,428.11
Steuben	$ 35,877.03	$ 14,350.81
Vigo	$ 148,382.57	$ 59,353.03
Wabash	$ 20,250.16	$ 8,100.06
CM Pilot Subtotal		**$ 183,539.81**
TOTAL		**$10,670,145.34**