

**DRAFT**

**INDIANA PUBLIC DEFENDER COMMISSION**

**December 13, 2023**

**2:00 PM**

**101 West Ohio Street, 18<sup>th</sup> Floor, Commission Conference Room  
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204**

**Members in attendance:**

Mark W. Rutherford, Chair (in person)  
Ms. Bernice Corley (in person)  
Ms. Samantha DeWester (in person)  
Hon. Mary Ellen Diekhoff (in person)  
Hon. Kelsey B. Hanlon (remote)  
Mr. David J. Hensel (in person)  
Rep. Ryan Lauer (in person)

**Members absent:**

Rep. Ragen Hatcher  
Sen. Eric Koch  
Hon. Steven P. Meyer  
Sen. Gregory G. Taylor

**Staff in attendance:**

Derrick Mason (in person)  
Andrew Cullen (in person)  
Andrew Falk (remote)  
Linda Hunter (in person)  
Stephanie Lalani (remote)  
Torrin Liddell (remote)  
Tristan Snell (in person)

**Audience members:**

Jim Abbs, Noble County Chief Public  
Defender and President, Indiana  
Chief Public Defenders' Association  
(remote)  
Ray Casanova, Chief Trial Counsel,  
Marion County Public Defender  
Agency (in person)  
Gretchen Etling, Vigo County Chief  
Public Defender (remote)  
Amy Karozos, State Public Defender  
(remote)  
Maureen Keefe, Attorney, Child  
Advocates (remote)  
Andrea Marsha, Attorney, Child  
Advocates (remote)  
Zach Stock, Legislative Liaison, Public  
Defender Council (remote)

At 2:00 p.m., Chair Mark Rutherford called the meeting to order. Introductions were made and it was established that a quorum was present.

**1. Approval of Minutes of the September 20, 2023 Meeting**

There were no changes to the minutes. Ms. Corley moved to approve the minutes. Mr. Hensel seconded the motion. The minutes were approved unanimously.

**2., 3., & 4. Approval of Amended Floyd, Shelby, and St. Joseph County Comprehensive Plans**

Mr. Mason noted that all three of the amended comprehensive plans were using a revised model plan as the foundation that incorporated various changes to better reflect the Commission's Standards and Guidelines. The Floyd County amended plan specifically changed their county's plan to include reimbursement for a county court that initially had been excluded from the plan, and also adopted the Commission's optional Standard O language. He recommended approval.

Ms. Corley asked if Mr. Mason anticipated that other counties would be similarly amending their plans. Mr. Mason said he believed they would and noted that two additional counties were currently working to amend their comprehensive plans. Ms. Corley moved to approve Floyd, Shelby and St. Joseph's amended plans. Ms. DeWester seconded the motion. Mr. Mason identified a few additional differences in the comprehensive plans: Shelby had a number of changes, but of particular note, because the county has an office, it moved to also having a chief public defender position instead of a managing public defender. Like Floyd County, both Shelby and St. Joseph County also adopted the Standard O language. There was no further discussion. All three amended county plans were approved unanimously.

**5. Approval of Standard N Language for Marion County's Amended Plan**

Mr. Mason recalled that at the September meeting, the Commission approved the entirety of the Marion County Amended Comprehensive Plan except for the language applying Standard N. The issue that previously concerned the Commission was language that appeared to exempt the Marion County Public Defender Agency (MCPDA) from paying for some support services. In particular, the MCPDA provision went beyond the Commission requirements regarding who pays and how.

Mr. Mason advised the MCPDA that the Commission would not necessarily enforce the county's language, but that he understood the county wanted to use the language as leverage.

Rep. Lauer asked Mr. Mason to summarize Marion County's language in a couple sentences. Mr. Mason explained that the Commission's standards allow for a person represented by private counsel to obtain "investigative, expert, or other services" from the public defender's office when the services are necessary and approved by the court. Marion County's original proposed language limited those services to "in-house investigative and depositions services and does not allow for attorney fees or expert expenses." After Commission members and staff expressed concerns about that language at the September meeting, Marion County proposed new language providing as follows:

Investigative, expert, or other services shall be provided for persons who have retained private counsel for trial or appeal when the person is unable to pay for such services and such services are necessary to prepare and present an adequate defense. The MCPDA will provide limited in-house investigative and deposition services contemplated by the standard. All other services contemplated by this standard, including funding for experts, shall be provided by other Marion County agencies pursuant to their obligations as set forth by case law and the Indiana and United States Constitutions. All services provided under this provision are eligible for reimbursement from the public defense if authorized by the court.

Mr. Mason recommended approval of the new language with the understanding that the Marion County language might not be something that the Commission would want to enforce since it went beyond the requirements of Standard N.

Ms. DeWester moved to approve the latest proposed language. Judge Diekhoff seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

## **6. Financial Status of Public Defense Fund & Title IV-E Reimbursements**

Mr. Mason stated there was more money available than reported in September due to corrections to the budget: the total amount to spend increased from \$55 million to \$65 million.

He also reminded the Commission that the Legislature had appropriated \$2 million per year for the biennium for At Risk Youth and Family (ARYF) projects. The Commission has been funding various projects and pilots, but still has about \$500,000 ARYF funds left. The Budget Office folded the Commission's ARYF funding request into the Commission's budget, which was then reduced by \$1 million. The ARYF line item was eliminated. Thus, the Commission has some flexibility in how much is spent on ARYF projects.

Mr. Mason requested that \$250,000 be allocated through the end of the fiscal year (June, 2024) to collect data on misdemeanor representation in certain counties. Commission staff are pursuing legislation that would permit misdemeanor reimbursement in select pilot counties, but even if those efforts are unsuccessful, Commission staff would like to have \$250,000 allocated to collect data regarding misdemeanors and the effect of misdemeanor caseload compliance and noncompliance. Unlike the proposed misdemeanor pilot projects, the data collection would not have a corrective aspect; the Commission would not be solving anything or reimbursing misdemeanor representing costs—just studying effects.

Judge Diekhoff stated that coming from a county that collects data all the time, she heartily supported the proposal. She also stated that the Supreme Court will be conducting a weighted caseload study in February, 2024. She said she believes the Commission's study on misdemeanors would be an excellent corollary to that study. She moved to approve the allocation of \$250,000 for misdemeanor data collection. Ms. DeWester seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

## **7. Status of County Compliance:**

*a. Carroll County Update, Monroe & Vanderburgh County Follow-Up*  
Monroe County

Mr. Mason reported and Judge Diekhoff confirmed that Monroe County judges have approved a list of attorneys to be appointed as public defenders. Judge Diekhoff stated a system is now in place to check attorneys' qualifications when they indicate their interest in serving as defenders.

#### Vanderburgh County

The Commission has been waiting to see what would happen with the county's budget for public defenders. Commission staff heard a few weeks ago that the county council approved partial raises for part-time attorneys but the county public defender will still be decreasing FTE for its part-time attorneys from .65 to .56 FTE. Mr. Mason noted that this provides pay parity with the prosecutor's office but with the challenges the county has already been facing with caseloads out of compliance and difficulty in hiring additional defenders, he expects the struggle to continue. Mr. Mason anticipated that Vanderburgh County would continue to require assistance from the State Public Defender.

#### Carroll County

Mr. Mason reported that there are no current issues with Carroll County but challenges seem to be pending. He noted the meeting materials contain a more in-depth description of the "Delphi case" involving Richard Allen. Mr. Mason has heard that public defender bills have potentially been lingering for long periods of time and/or not being paid altogether. He has requested information about which bills were submitted and when, the actions taken on the bills, and which bills have been paid and when. He has not received a response. Allegedly, a significant payment was made in the third quarter, but no such payment was included in the county's request for reimbursement. The Carroll County report preparer responded that no payments on the Allen case were being requested or made through her office (the court), so she could not request any reimbursements. Mr. Mason stated that he is concerned the county may not know it is missing out on a large reimbursement. He said there is no violation for not including all expenses. He suggested that the Commission could

issue the requested reimbursement and notify the county council and the public defender board that it appears they are missing these expenses for reimbursement. Alternatively, the Commission could withhold the requested reimbursement and send a letter stating that it does not appear that the reimbursement request was complete. He noted that the latter action could pull the Commission into other possible challenges with the Allen case, but that could happen anyway.

Ms. Corley inquired whether Commission staff have had any conversations with the Carroll County public defender board. Mr. Mason responded that staff had held a previous conversation with a board member about missing deposition costs, but no action was taken. Those are nominal costs compared to the expenses the county would be facing in this case. Ms. Corley further inquired if the attorneys had reported any expenses at all for the case. Mr. Mason said that none had been reported this quarter. Ms. Corley followed up by asking if the attorneys on the case had other public defense cases. Mr. Mason responded that they do not in Carroll County.

Ms. DeWester asked what would happen if the attorneys submitted a bill for half a million dollars in six months. Mr. Mason replied that if the county paid it, they would be eligible for reimbursement. Ms. Corley asked if it was permissible for the county to be reimbursed for costs incurred in previous quarters. Mr. Mason responded that the Commission only reimburses for the quarter in which the bill was paid. For example, if a bill covered the month of May but the county paid the attorney in December, the county would be reimbursed in their fourth quarter reimbursement. The Commission has temporarily withheld reimbursement in the past when bills have been submitted to the county but were not being paid in a timely fashion. Mr. Mason also noted the concern about which county would be held responsible for issues arising out of the Delphi case – Carroll since the case is theirs, or Allen because the judge is from that county and is responsible for the actions on the case. While a decision is not yet required on this issue, he recognized the potential challenges of this situation.

Mr. Mason recommended that a letter be sent, but asked whether reimbursement should be made in the meantime since this seemed to be a knowing

omission. Judge Diekhoff stated that it may *not* be a knowing omission and the Allen County judge and Allen County public defender office (that has since been assigned the case) could be taking actions about which Carroll County is not fully apprised. She opined that the Commission should pay the reimbursement request but include a letter asking if the county is aware of the expenses for which it is not seeking reimbursement. Mr. Mason clarified that the Carroll County auditor should know about the expenses. Judge Diekhoff clarified that it is possible, from her experience with special judges, that there may be less than full communication between the special judge and the county.

Ms. DeWester agreed that the county needs to be put on notice. But she stated that her biggest concern was that Mr. Allen may not get things paid for that he needs if the requests are being denied or believed to be non-reimbursable. Judge Diekhoff stated she was not concerned that Mr. Allen may not be getting what he needs, but she agreed that the situation needed to be addressed immediately to prevent future problems. Ms. Corley reiterated that she was concerned the Commission does not have enough data to provide sufficient oversight of the case. She also asked what the Commission could do about the unpaid bills. Mr. Mason responded that the unpaid bill issue was not yet fully ripe: there is not enough information yet to conclude bills have not been paid—he is still waiting on additional information.

Judge Hanlon stated her belief that the Commission should make sure everyone dealing with finances in the county knows that reimbursement requests on the Allen case should be coming to the Commission. Mr. Cullen observed that the Commission receives requests for information every quarter about costs for the case, so it would be appropriate to let the county know they will likely soon be receiving media requests, too. Judge Diekhoff agreed with Judge Hanlon and emphasized that there is much the Commission does not yet know, and it should be careful not to make assumptions. Ms. DeWester said the county needs to know that reimbursement requests must be made timely. Mr. Mason stated he was happy to make the reimbursement and send a letter stating the third-quarter request should be amended

by the fourth-quarter request deadline if they wish to include expenses for this case. No additional action was taken.

*b. Individual and Multi-County Compliance Updates*

Mr. Mason reported that it was not surprising to have issues pop up in the fourth quarter. He described several multi-county issues.

Allen County has an attorney significantly out of compliance. The county is changing how it assigns juvenile cases, which should resolve the issue.

Howard County is out of compliance for the second quarter in a row, but the county is moving in the right direction.

St. Joseph implemented a new plan last quarter, but it will take some time to take effect. One formerly out of compliance attorney is now in compliance and a second is improving.

The Commission had sent a 90-day letter to Steuben County for being out of compliance. The county has since hired a new attorney and is improving. No 90-day letters are necessary for any counties this quarter, Mr. Mason advised.

The most significant compliance issue for 3Q2023 was the multi-county caseload of Earlford “Foy” McNaughton, with his caseload at 147% of a maximum, full-time caseload between both counties. Steuben County has been limiting his caseload while LaGrange has not. Mr. Mason stated LaGrange should probably receive a letter, while Steuben is in less need of a letter, although technically it should be sent to both counties. Judge Hanlon advocated for sending letters to all parties because that would be the only way for the attorney to self-regulate. Mr. Mason noted that typically all counties with multi-county caseload issues do receive notice of non-compliance. Ms. Corley moved to send 90-day letters to both counties. Mr. Hensel seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

## **8. Requests for Reimbursement**

*a. 50% Reimbursement in Death Penalty Cases*

Mr. Mason reported there were \$74,543.57 in death penalty requests for which he would be seeking approval for reimbursement (see table below). He noted that the Clinton County request was modified to reflect the fact that the death penalty was dismissed on July 5 and to also correct other errors and omissions. The charges submitted as death-penalty costs were moved to non-death penalty costs on the reimbursement request. He recommended the Commission approve the three reimbursement requests. Mr. Hensel moved to approve the death penalty reimbursement requests. Ms. DeWester seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

**Reimbursement Requests in Capital Cases  
December 13, 2023**

COUNTY	DEFENDANT	TOTAL
Clinton	Ferrell	<b>\$21,470.24</b>
Marion	Dorsey	<b>\$13,958.58</b>
Wayne	Lee	<b>\$39,114.76</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$74,543.57</b>

*b. 40% Reimbursement in Non-Capital Cases*

Mr. Mason stated that there were a few changes to the non-capital reimbursement requests due to adjustments in several counties. In addition, Martin County was unable to submit a request this month due to a medical situation, so Commission staff expect two requests next quarter. The total reimbursement request for the third quarter of 2023 was \$9,192,158.30 (see Appendix 1). Judge Diekhoff moved to approve the reimbursement request. Ms. DeWester seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously and the reimbursements were approved.

**9. Local Public Defender Board Appointments**

Mr. Cullen stated that staff recommended the re-appointment of three candidates and the appointment of two new candidates as follows:

<b>Re-appoint Consensus Candidates</b>	
<i>County</i>	<i>Candidate</i>
Hendricks	Jennifer Stout
Rush	Kevin Snyder
Washington	Marsha Dailey
<b>Appoint New Consensus Candidates</b>	
<i>County</i>	<i>Candidate</i>
Owen	Phyllis Emerick
Harrison	Anne Walsh

Judge Diekhoff moved to appoint and re-appoint the nominated candidates. Mr. Hensel seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

## **10. Legislative & Policy Updates**

Mr. Cullen reported that while the Commission has made progress on misdemeanor reimbursement in the House, the challenge has been with the Senate. Therefore, this year Commission staff are seeking a bill to originate in the Senate. Several Senators have already agreed to author or co-author the proposed legislation. Efforts have been made to keep the proposed legislation as fiscally neutral as possible. The proposed legislation prohibits the Commission for requesting additional funds for misdemeanor reimbursement until the pilot program is complete in 2029. Among the provisions is language that would increase the fees courts may assess for partially indigent defendants' public defender fees from \$100 and \$50 to \$200 and \$100. Staff has spoken with both President Pro Tem Bray and Sen. Mishler and believes both are open to this approach.

Rep. Lauer noted that the legislation also changed the Commission's name. Mr. Cullen responded that yes, it would change to Indiana Commission on Court Appointed Attorneys to help avoid confusion with other state public defense agencies.

Judge Hanlon asked how the proposed misdemeanor pilot counties—Adams, Allen, Clark, DeKalb, Hendricks, Lawrence and Pulaski—were chosen. Mr. Mason responded that part of the consideration was picking counties with attorney legislators. Potential counties also needed to have the capability to provide reports with trustworthy data. Commission staff reviewed data from Odyssey and considered misdemeanor assignment rates and trial rates. Staff also wanted a mix of misdemeanor caseload compliant and noncompliant counties.

Ms. Corley stated she supports this legislation, but she has some concerns with the fee increase. She also stated her belief that the name was over-inclusive, covering non-reimbursable cases, while also being under-inclusive, in that the Commission does more than the name suggests. She would like the name to cover more functions, such as Commission on Defense Reimbursement & Standards.

Mr. Mason responded that even if not all case types are reimbursed, they do have to be reported so they can be factored into caseloads. With regard to the fee increase, it was not Commission staff's recommendation. Commission staff did recommend that if it were done, half of it should be provided to the State's Public Defense Fund, which is managed by the Commission.

Mr. Cullen apologized for the short notice regarding the fee change to Ms. Corley, as Commission staff only recently learned that the provision would be in the proposed legislation. One advantage, he noted, was that counties would report to the Commission about how and when the fee is assessed, which would be very beneficial to the Commission and for research purposes (since it is administered very differently in various counties).

Mr. Cullen requested approval for the proposed legislation. Ms. DeWester moved to approve it. Judge Diekhoff seconded the motion. The motion carried. Judge Hanlon was not present for vote. Rep. Lauer abstained.

Mr. Cullen called attention to the WTHR four-part series on the attorney shortage, spurred by the Commission's article on the same topic. He also noted that two issues could come up in the legislative session: first, Sen. Mike Bohacek is proposing legislation that would create a right to counsel for unlicensed caregivers in

CHINS/TPR cases. Mr. Cullen has suggested he narrow it to a pilot program, and Sen. Bohacek asked about perhaps adding his bill to the Commission's. Second, Foster Success and Rep. Julie Olthoff is proposing legislation to create a right to counsel for CHINS youth aged 14 to 23 who are placed in a residential care facility.

#### **11. Update on Support Staff Evaluation & LWOP/CR 24 Review**

Mr. Mason reminded the Commission that it previously approved updating the language of Criminal Rule 24. Mr. Mason has been meeting with a Public Defender Council sub-committee. He stated his belief that it will likely be June before the LWOP standard proposed language is ready for Commission review. He also noted that Commission staff expect to provide the Commission with a recommendation for a support staff standard sometime in 2024.

#### **12. Other Matters**

Mr. Mason noted the proposed potential meeting dates for 2024:

- Wednesday, March 27, 2023
- Wednesday, June 12, 2023
- Wednesday, September 18, 2023
- Wednesday, December 18, 2023

There were no objections to the proposed meeting dates.

Mr. Cullen shared that Mr. Mason received the Lake County Public Defender Chief's Award as a "friend who supports and shares the vision of the Public Defender Office." Ms. DeWester also recognized Chairman Rutherford's birthday and all expressed happy birthday wishes.

Mr. Mason stated staff would work on improving sound issues by the next meeting.

By consensus, the chair adjourned the meeting.

## Appendix 1

# INDIANA PUBLIC DEFENDER COMMISSION

## Third Quarter 2023 Requests for Reimbursement in Non-Capital Cases 12/13/23

County	Total Expenditure	Non-reimbursable Adjustment	% Adj.	Eligible Expenditure	40% Reimbursed	Prior Quarter Adj.	Total Payment
Adams	\$140,460.45	\$22,162.13	15.78%	\$118,298.32	\$47,319.33		\$47,319.33
Allen	\$1,241,553.13	\$89,809.49	7.23%	\$1,151,743.64	\$460,697.46		\$460,697.46
Benton	\$43,673.92	\$5,905.52	13.52%	\$37,768.40	\$15,107.36	\$707.40	\$15,814.76
Blackford	\$37,129.50	\$2,862.06	7.71%	\$34,267.44	\$13,706.97		\$13,706.97
Brown	\$52,346.52	\$17,073.28	32.62%	\$35,273.24	\$14,109.30		\$14,109.30
Carroll	\$70,782.24	\$13,661.32	19.30%	\$57,120.92	\$22,848.37		\$22,848.37
Cass	\$191,912.52	\$24,937.65	12.99%	\$166,974.87	\$66,789.95		\$66,789.95
Clark	\$407,633.68	\$30,024.41	7.37%	\$377,609.27	\$151,043.71		\$151,043.71
Clinton	\$104,232.41	\$15,036.07	14.43%	\$91,196.34	\$36,478.54		\$36,478.54
Crawford	\$37,500.00	\$10,056.20	26.82%	\$27,443.80	\$10,977.52		\$10,977.52
Decatur	\$132,106.21	\$27,346.27	20.70%	\$104,759.94	\$41,903.98		\$41,903.98
DeKalb	\$246,034.27	\$15,140.15	6.15%	\$230,894.12	\$92,357.65		\$92,357.65
Delaware	\$488,029.63	\$7,977.59	1.63%	\$480,052.04	\$192,020.82		\$192,020.82
Elkhart	\$818,753.81	\$122,441.44	14.95%	\$696,312.37	\$278,524.95		\$278,524.95
Fayette	\$110,085.10	\$14,499.13	13.17%	\$95,585.97	\$38,234.39		\$38,234.39
Floyd	\$308,164.12	\$37,722.95	12.24%	\$270,441.17	\$108,176.47		\$108,176.47
Fulton	\$88,444.04	\$30,037.18	33.96%	\$58,406.86	\$23,362.75		\$23,362.75
Gibson	\$188,994.02	\$37,289.69	19.73%	\$151,704.33	\$60,681.73		\$60,681.73
Grant	\$294,803.70	\$24,202.68	8.21%	\$270,601.02	\$108,240.41		\$108,240.41
Greene	\$151,022.53	\$21,752.58	14.40%	\$129,269.95	\$51,707.98	\$4,185.00	\$55,892.98
Hancock	\$272,619.50	\$25,641.95	9.41%	\$246,977.55	\$98,791.02		\$98,791.02
Harrison	\$180,443.91	\$22,037.30	12.21%	\$158,406.61	\$63,362.64		\$63,362.64
Hendricks	\$522,673.09	\$66,973.84	12.81%	\$455,699.25	\$182,279.70		\$182,279.70
Howard	\$482,367.67	\$35,768.93	7.42%	\$446,598.74	\$178,639.49		\$178,639.49
Jackson	\$241,120.95	\$7,257.03	3.01%	\$233,863.92	\$93,545.57		\$93,545.57
Jasper	\$108,970.00	\$31,920.49	29.29%	\$77,049.51	\$30,819.81		\$30,819.81
Jay	\$143,303.97	\$18,055.36	12.60%	\$125,248.61	\$50,099.44		\$50,099.44
Jefferson	\$223,573.59	\$25,465.38	11.39%	\$198,108.21	\$79,243.29		\$79,243.29
Jennings	\$122,323.37	\$14,287.79	11.68%	\$108,035.58	\$43,214.23		\$43,214.23
Knox	\$231,921.93	\$34,539.05	14.89%	\$197,382.88	\$78,953.15		\$78,953.15

Kosciusko	\$287,146.60	\$96,235.39	33.51%	\$190,911.21	\$76,364.48	\$76,364.48
LaGrange	\$102,598.44	\$31,864.71	31.06%	\$70,733.73	\$28,293.49	\$28,293.49
Lake	\$1,806,135.97	\$9,315.13	0.52%	\$1,796,820.84	\$718,728.34	\$718,728.34
LaPorte	\$341,652.71	\$25,856.94	7.57%	\$315,795.77	\$126,318.31	\$126,318.31
Lawrence	\$328,874.97	\$49,066.70	14.92%	\$279,808.27	\$111,923.31	\$111,923.31
Madison	\$584,492.05	\$10,712.59	1.83%	\$573,779.46	\$229,511.79	\$229,511.79
Marion	\$7,388,666.59	\$598,746.03	8.10%	\$6,789,920.56	\$2,715,968.22	\$2,715,968.22
Martin	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Miami	\$201,266.53	\$28,427.50	14.12%	\$172,839.03	\$69,135.61	\$69,135.61
Monroe	\$673,663.47	\$122,931.92	18.25%	\$550,731.55	\$220,292.62	\$220,292.62
Noble	\$291,333.87	\$54,718.54	18.78%	\$236,615.33	\$94,646.13	\$94,646.13
Ohio	\$25,804.84	\$7,018.42	27.20%	\$18,786.42	\$7,514.57	\$7,514.57
Orange	\$85,571.84	\$7,439.49	8.69%	\$78,132.35	\$31,252.94	\$31,252.94
Owen	\$71,011.25	\$13,093.53	18.44%	\$57,917.72	\$23,167.09	\$23,167.09
Perry	\$164,084.33	\$42,013.77	25.60%	\$122,070.56	\$48,828.22	\$48,828.22
Pike	\$7,200.92	\$553.08	7.68%	\$6,647.84	\$2,659.13	\$2,659.13
Pulaski	\$95,275.75	\$20,789.58	21.82%	\$74,486.17	\$29,794.47	\$29,794.47
Ripley	\$53,348.11	\$12,519.75	23.47%	\$40,828.36	\$16,331.34	\$16,331.34
Rush	\$137,019.63	\$32,947.25	24.05%	\$104,072.38	\$41,628.95	\$41,628.95
Scott	\$155,312.63	\$16,162.86	10.41%	\$139,149.77	\$55,659.91	\$55,659.91
Shelby	\$182,831.52	\$33,986.88	18.59%	\$148,844.64	\$59,537.86	\$59,537.86
Spencer	\$178,801.64	\$23,523.79	13.16%	\$155,277.85	\$62,111.14	\$62,111.14
Steuben	\$143,222.07	\$53,846.92	37.60%	\$89,375.15	\$35,750.06	\$35,750.06
StJoseph	\$908,515.60	\$102,095.86	11.24%	\$806,419.74	\$322,567.90	\$322,567.90
Sullivan	\$110,763.27	\$18,660.94	16.85%	\$92,102.33	\$36,840.93	\$36,840.93
Switzerland	\$52,353.30	\$4,096.75	7.83%	\$48,256.55	\$19,302.62	\$19,302.62
Tippecanoe	\$1,163,505.23	\$201,421.43	17.31%	\$962,083.80	\$384,833.52	\$384,833.52
Union	\$17,799.65	\$3,995.72	22.45%	\$13,803.93	\$5,521.57	\$5,521.57
Vanderburgh	\$779,432.29	\$52,376.66	6.72%	\$727,055.63	\$290,822.25	\$290,822.25
Vigo	\$1,011,874.39	\$159,001.63	15.71%	\$852,872.76	\$341,149.10	\$341,149.10
Wabash	\$113,098.93	\$9,604.90	8.49%	\$103,494.03	\$41,397.61	\$41,397.61
Warren	\$19,208.24	\$5,718.19	29.77%	\$13,490.05	\$5,396.02	\$5,396.02
Warrick	\$185,895.02	\$19,308.64	10.39%	\$166,586.38	\$66,634.55	\$66,634.55
Washington	\$202,352.06	\$30,014.51	14.83%	\$172,337.55	\$68,935.02	\$68,935.02
WCIPDO	\$207,507.06	\$44,484.93	21.44%	\$163,022.13	\$65,208.85	\$65,208.85
TOTAL	\$25,760,600.55				\$9,187,265.90	\$4,892.40 \$9,192,158.30