

**COMMISSIONER'S MEETING**  
**June 18, 2012**

The Bartholomew County Commissioners met in regular session on June 18, 2012 in the Governmental Office Building, 440 Third Street, Columbus, Indiana. Chairman Larry Kleinhenz called the meeting to order at 10:00 am. Commissioners Carl Lienhoop and Paul Franke, Auditor Barb Hackman, and County Attorney J. Grant Tucker were also in attendance. Commissioner Lienhoop gave the Invocation and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Next, Commissioner Lienhoop made a motion to approve the June 11, 2012 minutes. Commissioner Franke seconded the motion that passed unanimously.

The Commissioners Claims were presented for approval. Commissioner Franke made a motion to approve the Commissioners Claims as presented. Commissioner Lienhoop seconded the motion that passed unanimously.

Next, Chairman Kleinhenz read the New Permits Report from 6/11/2012 to 6/15/2012. Thirty-five (35) building permits were issued with a fee amount of \$2,988.00 and a valuation amount of \$931,230.

County Highway Engineer Danny Hollander presented an agreement for overlay with Milestone Contractors, LP in the amount of \$1,578,689.71. He explained that this is right under 31 miles. Commissioner Franke made a motion to enter into the agreement with Milestone Contractors, LP in the amount of \$1,578,689.71 for overlay. Commissioner Lienhoop seconded the motion that passed unanimously.

Engineer Hollander gave the weekly crew report. Last week, they put up signs, mowed, bermed roads and cut trees.

Chairman Kleinhenz questioned about entrances to the small county cemeteries with road overlays and whether the one by St. Louis Crossing can be fixed. Engineer Hollander stated that they have looked at it and it requires a major culvert.

Information Services Technology Director Jim Hartsook presented the following items from this morning's Data Board Meeting for ratification from the Commissioners. Commissioner Lienhoop made a motion to ratify the recommendations of today's Data Board meeting. Commissioner Franke seconded the motion that passed unanimously.

Department	Item Purchased	Price	Account Number	Budgeted
All Offices	Backup server software licensing	\$5,937.55	Comm - 03-60	Y
All Offices	Vmware software maintenance	\$14,521.42	Comm - 03-60	Y
All Offices	EMC 5-1000GB Drives	\$5,137.00	Comm - 04-43	Y
Auditor/Treasurer	Financial System maintenance	\$13,478.00	Comm - 03-60	Y
Code Enforcement	Permit software maintenance	\$4,338.20	Comm - 03-60	Y
Commissioners	Projector	\$1,344.84	Comm - 04-43	N
Council	Projector	\$1,344.84	Comm - 04-43	N
Court Services	ID printer replacement	\$1,010.00	Split btwn 2	N
EOC/Sheriff	OSSI software maintenance	\$62,493.39	Comm - 03-60	Y
IT	Server replacement	\$1,411.14	Comm - 04-43	Y

Prosecutor	24" monitors - 8	\$1,744.00	Comm - 04-43	N
	<b>Total expenditures</b>	<b>\$112,760.38</b>		

Mr. Hartsook added that the Data Board also recommended the approval of moving forward with the GIS upgrade to the summit package with 39° North. The total cost to the county this year was the budgeted \$18,000, which is a breakdown between Bartholomew County and the City of Columbus. There are 6 shareholders as part of the inter-local agreement. Bartholomew County makes up 2 shares of the 6 shareholders. \$4,500 went to data cleanup and installation of software and training for end users on the ESRI software, \$3900 went to the Lidar data and the remaining \$9,600 is the county's contribution to upgrade to the Summit package. Chairman Kleinhenz made a motion to accept the recommendation by the Data Board to spend the \$18,000 with 39° North. Commissioner Lienhoop seconded the motion that passed unanimously.

The next item on the agenda was the consideration of Legal Services Compensation Agreement with Gregory S. Fehribach, Counsellor at Law and Americans with Disabilities Act Consultant. Attorney Tucker explained that we are required to update the ADA plan to keep the Highway funding. Chairman Kleinhenz said that we had looked into partnering with the City, but the City already started their agreement. This contract calls for Mr. Fehribach to make an assessment of all of the County's facilities and make recommendations. The contract is for \$20,000 initially and then later getting into a multi-year contract for a small amount to review the facilities. The new

bathrooms on the 4<sup>th</sup> floor of the Governmental Office Building are already ADA compliant and the Maintenance department is currently remodeling the restrooms in the Courthouse to make them ADA compliant. Commissioner Lienhoop made a motion to enter into a contract with Gregory S. Fehribach, Counsellor at Law and Americans with Disabilities Act Consultant in the amount of \$20,000.

Next on the agenda was the consideration of an Ordinance Amending Ordinance No. 2009-12 pertaining to the Bartholomew County Personnel Policy for Purpose of Adopting and Implementing an Anti-Nepotism Policy. Attorney Tucker explained that the State Law that brought this into being becomes effective July 1<sup>st</sup> and what it requires of units of government is that they adopt this anti-nepotism policy. The State Law sets out what it must contain at a minimum. Chairman Kleinhenz opened the Public Hearing. Hearing no comments, Chairman Kleinhenz closed the Public Hearing. Commissioner Lienhoop made a motion to approve, one first reading, the following ordinance. Commissioner Franke seconded the motion that passed unanimously.

**AN ORDINANCE AMENDING ORDINANCE NO. 2009-12  
PERTAINING TO THE BARTHOLOMEW COUNTY PERSONNEL  
POLICY FOR PURPOSES OF ADOPTING AND IMPLEMENTING  
AN ANTI-NEPOTISM POLICY**

**WHEREAS**, Bartholomew County did, on the 19th day of October, 2009 adopt Ordinance No. 2009-12 which established an amended, revised and updated Bartholomew County Personnel Policy; and

**WHEREAS**, due to recent changes in State law it has become necessary to update and amend the Bartholomew County Personnel Policy to comply with the change in Indiana

Law that requires units of local government to adopt and implement an anti-nepotism policy that is consistent with the provision of Indiana law;

**NOW THEREFORE BE IT ORDAINED BY THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF BARTHOLOMEW COUNTY, INDIANA AS FOLLOWS:**

**SECTION 1:** Ordinance 2009-12 is hereby amended, revised and changed to add and include the following:

**BARTHOLOMEW COUNTY ANTI-NEPOTISM POLICY:**

a. **Purpose:** Decision about hiring, promoting, evaluating, awarding salary increases, job assignment, terminating employees, and the awarding of contracts for goods, services, and public works projects should be based on the qualifications, performance, and ability of the employee or contractor. Every attempt to avoid favoritism and conflicts of interest in employment related and contractual decisions instills confidence of the electorate in its government. The purpose of this policy is to prohibit certain individuals from being employed by Bartholomew County in a position in which a relative, as defined in this Section, provides direct supervision. Additionally, this policy regulates contracting with relatives of individuals employed by Bartholomew County for goods, services, and public works projects.

b. **Definitions.**

(1) **Break in Employment.** Termination, retirement, or resignation of an employee from Bartholomew County. A break in employment does not occur due to absence from the workplace while on a paid or unpaid leave, including but not limited to: vacation, personal days, sick or family medical leave, or worker's compensation leave, or if the employment is terminated followed by immediate re-employment by Bartholomew County without loss of payroll time.

(2) **County.** Bartholomew County and its boards and departments.

(3) **Direct Line of Supervision.** An elected officer or employee who is in a position to affect the terms and conditions of another individual's employment. Such affect may include, but is not limited to, making decisions about work assignments, compensation, grievances, advancement, or performance evaluation. Decisions and action taken by the County Commissioners or County Council regarding the passage of annual salary ordinances, annual budgets, and personnel policies are excluded from this definition.

- (4) **Elected Official.** The County Commissioners and Members of the County Council.
- (5) **Employed.** An individual who works for or is appointed to any department, office or board of the County on a full-time, part-time, temporary, intermittent, seasonal, hourly, or contractual basis.
- (6) **Relative.** For the purposes of this Section, the term includes any of the following:
  - (a) Spouse;
  - (b) Parent or step-parent;
  - (c) Child or step-child (includes an adopted child);
  - (d) Sister, brother, step-sister, step-brother (includes sister or brother by half-blood);
  - (e) Niece or nephew;
  - (f) Aunt or uncle;
  - (g) Daughter-in-law or son-in-law; and
  - (h) Sister-in-law or brother-in-law.

c. **Employment Policy.**

- (1) Individuals who are relatives, as defined in subsection b. above, of existing employees may not be employed by the County in a position that results in one (1) relative being in the direct line of supervision of the other relative.
- (2) An individual who is employed by the County on July 1, 2012, is not subject to this anti-nepotism policy unless the individual has a break in employment, as defined herein, with the County.
- (3) If an individual is employed by the county and the individual's relative begins serving a term of elected office, the individual may continue his/her employment with the County and retain his/her position or rank even if that individual's position or rank would be in the direct line of supervision of the individual's

relative.

- (4) While an individual who is employed by the County and the individual's relative begins serving a term of elected office may continue his/her employment with the County, that individual may not be promoted to a position or rank if the new position or rank would place that individual within the direct line of supervision of the individual's relative.
- (5) This policy shall not prevent a sheriff's spouse from being employed as jail matron and being in the Sheriff's direct line of supervision nor shall this policy prohibit an individual: who served as coroner, who is currently ineligible to serve as coroner under Article 6 Section 2(b) of the Indiana Constitution; who, as coroner received certification under I.C. 36-2-14-22.3; and whose successor in office is a relative of the individual from being hired as a deputy coroner and being in the coroner's direct line of supervision.

d. **Contracting Policy.** The County may enter into or renew a contract for the procurement of goods, services, or public works projects with a relative of an elected official or a business entity in which a relative has an ownership interest only if:

- (1) The elected official files with the County a full disclosure which must be:
  - (a) In writing; and
  - (b) Describe the contract or purchase to be made by the County; and
  - (c) Describe the relationship the elected official has to the individual or business entity that provides the contract for goods, services or public works projects; and
  - (d) Be affirmed under penalty of perjury; and
  - (e) Be submitted to the Board of County Commissioners prior to final action; and
  - (f) Be filed with the County Clerk and the State Board of Accounts within fifteen (15) days of final action.
- (2) The appropriate County board or department:
  - (a) Issues a certified statement that the contract amount or purchase price

was the lowest amount or price bid offered; or

(b) Issues a certified statement detailing the reasons why the particular vendor or contractor was selected.

(3) The County satisfies all other requirements of Indiana's public purchasing (I.C. §5-22) or public works projects (I.C. § 36-1-12) statutes.

(4) The elected official complies with disclosure provisions of I.C. § 35-44-1-3.

e. **Submission of Compliance Statements.** In addition to any other disclosures or certifications required by this Section, the following actions must be taken:

(1) The annual report filed by the County with the State Board of Accounts under I.C. §5-11-13-1 must include a County Commissioner's statement that the County has implemented an anti-nepotism policy with regard to employment matters and the contracting for the procurement of goods and services.

(2) On or before December 31<sup>st</sup> of each year, each elected officer shall submit to the County Commissioner's a certification in writing, subject to the penalties of perjury, that said officer has not violated the provisions of the County's anti-nepotism policy with regard to employment matters and the contracting for the procurement of goods and services.

**SECTION 2.** All existing employment policies, employee handbooks, and all ordinances or parts of ordinances to the extent that the same are in conflict with the provisions of this ordinance are hereby repealed; however, to the extent not inconsistent with the provisions of this ordinance, Ordinance No. 2009-12 shall remain unchanged in all other respects.

**SECTION 3.** This Ordinance and the corresponding changes to the Bartholomew County Personnel Policy shall be effective July 1, 2012,

**PASSED ON FIRST READING THIS 18th DAY OF JUNE, 2012.**

**BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF  
BARTHOLOMEW COUNTY, INDIANA**

S/s Larry S. Kleinhenz



Larry S. Kleinhenz, Chairman

S/s Paul Franke

Paul Franke, Member

S/s Carl H. Lienhoop

Carl H. Lienhoop, Member

**ATTEST:**

By: S/s Barbara J. Hackman

Barbara J. Hackman, Auditor of  
Bartholomew County, Indiana

Under miscellaneous, was the Veterans issues with scheduling transportation with the Veterans office. Chairman Kleinhenz asked for public comment:

County resident Larry Love was present, representing his father who was a U.S. Marine Core Veteran in World War II and was discharged in 1944 because he was diagnosed with dementia due to head bunting. In 1948, his father tried to get disability and he was denied because it said it was prior to induction, which contradicts his discharge papers. Mr. Love is interested in getting “aid and attendance” for his father who is currently at Parkside Court Assisted Living. Currently, he is getting \$457.00 from the V.A., but they will not pay for the aid and attendance because Parkside Court is not recognized as a nursing home facility. He explained that he has tried to speak with someone with the County office, but no one has gotten back with him. He feels that the problem not only lies with the County office, but with the whole region.

County resident and a Navy Veteran Dave Jones has issues with the services that the Veterans office is providing and had questions and concerns that the Office of Veterans Affairs and the position of VSO in Bartholomew County have been damaged. He had some recommendations for rectifying the grievances that will be brought before the Commissioners this morning. He said that in mid-September 2011, he was witnessed, after the fact, of a veteran being denied a ride to the Roudebush VA Medical Center in Indianapolis so he went to Mill Race Center asking someone to arrange a ride for him, a service which Mill Race Center (Senior Center) does not provide. Several days later, the Assistant Veterans Service Officer called Mill Race Center to ask if they were in a position to take over and administer the van provided by the V.A. to transport veterans to the Roudebush VA Medical Center, a call that the Assistant VSO has no authority to make. The issue of veterans being denied a ride to the V.A. Medical Center sparked an investigation by the current Mayor of Columbus. In the course of the investigation, during an interview with an investigator, the Assistant VSO said there were no problems at all with the function of the van. In a subsequent phone call to Jim Todd, Mr. Jones learned that the service was being provided at a "required minimum" and the service could be increased and until it did, the van that once took veterans to the V.A. Medical Center would not be brought back to Columbus. It was switched for a smaller sport utility vehicle at some point. If the service did sink lower than it was currently being given, the vehicle from this county and Bartholomew County Veterans would have no choice but to rely on the other counties for rides to Indianapolis. There have been so many denied transportation requests that the

surrounding counties have had to pick up the slack. One county said on uncertain terms, “stop calling our office. Why don’t you have drivers from your county?” Several veterans with concerns have taken it upon themselves to call Rick Caldwell rather than the County Veterans Administration Office with concerns about the status of the van and lack of services provided. Mr. Jones was asked to lead a small group of veterans to solicit and document any issues that the veterans of Bartholomew County had. Their goals as a group are:

- 1) Create and circulate a petition to be signed by the veterans of this county stating the following:
  - a. *We as United States Veterans are not happy with the level of service the CVSO and staff provide*
  - b. *We believe the current CVSO has neglected the veterans to this county and has inherently done harm to the office*
  - c. *We question the abilities the current VAO staff to carry out their assigned duties and upon identifying deficiencies within the staff, we ask the Commissioners to take appropriate action to correct any and all deficiencies immediately*
  - d. *We believe the position of County Veterans Service Officer should be made full time with the appropriate salary and level of staff needed to adequately provide the services required by the veterans of Bartholomew County and required by law*
  - e. *We stand united in these beliefs as veterans in Bartholomew County*
- 2) To obtain and record accounts of lack of service or outright denials of service and have them notarized for presentations to County Commissioners, County Council and Columbus City Mayor
- 3) To formulate a plan of action to be presented to the VFW, AmVets, the 40 and 8, the Ladies Auxiliaries and the American Legion that we as Veterans of Bartholomew County feel will be a viable course of action that can be taken in regards to the CVAO and the position of VSO. No criticism should be left as criticism alone and we should offer a real solution to any problems that we bring to light and want changed. If we leave it solely to the discretion of the powers at be, our voices will

be muted and unheard yet again. We as a committee have had quite an issue with getting veterans of Bartholomew County to put their names on anything that may have been presented to any county or city official. They feared if they had, they would be denied services like many others that they hear about. At this time, we would ask the Commissioners to take action based on the following information.

*An article written for Past 50 Magazine by Veteran Floyd Crouse, in the March 2008 issue states, "Technically, Judy Devening is the assistant to Matt Taylor, the Bartholomew County Veterans Services Officer appointed by the Commissioners. For at least the last four VSO's, this arrangement has endured. For reasons only perhaps known by the Bartholomew County Commissioners, this mystery continues. I go into this office regularly. Matt Taylor, who wears many hats, has never been there when I was there. Art Pickett is the Administrative Assistant in that office. My advice, work with Judy or Art. With my apologies to Matt Taylor, he is Bartholomew County Veterans Service Officer in name only. Others do the heavy lifting. Problems abound for those new to this strange situation, I am not fond to putting this in print, however, for a local veteran needing services, my advice is to call 379-1540 and work with those in the office. I know no way to sugar coat this."*

There have been several attempts by Camp Atterbury, Joint Maneuver Training Center and other organizations in Bartholomew County to include the Veterans Affairs Office in functions welcoming back and educating service members either recently separated or soon to be separated from the military about the benefits they may be eligible for. All of the benefits have been met with the same response. "Thank you, but no thank you".

- 4) Based on the above and by the job description of the County Veterans Service Officer, we ask that you, the Bartholomew County Commissioners take action.

Mr. Jones read the following "highlights" of the job description of the Bartholomew County Veterans Service Office (currently filled by Matt Taylor).

*Incumbent serves as Service Officer for Veteran's Service, responsible for providing assistance and information to eligible veterans, their spouses, dependents and/or survivors and assisting with daily clerical duties necessary to run the office.*

Duties:

*Assists veterans, their spouses, dependents and/or survivors with filing applications/claims for benefits, including interviewing, evaluating needs, providing information, literature and counseling, and completing application forms. Forwards completed application forms to Veterans' Administration (VA) or other appropriate agencies and assists with other department clerical duties.*

*Assists in obtaining supporting evidence for benefit applications as needed, such as birth and/or death certificates, divorce records and military service records. Assists in filing appeals of unfavorable decisions.*

*Supervises and directs assigned personnel, including planning/making work assignments.*

*Responds to telephone inquiries, including researching, copying and mailing information and records and making referrals to other community resources as needed. Makes public speaking presentations to various groups as requested.*

*Provides services in various locations to accommodate special needs of clients, including hospitals, detention facilities, nursing homes and residences.*

*Maintains current knowledge of regulations governing veteran benefits, maintains inventory of current reference materials and distributes brochures, forms, applications and related materials to local community organizations and individuals. Prepares/submits press releases regarding changes in benefits, as needed.*

*Ability to effectively communicate orally and in writing with co-workers, other County personnel, veterans, their spouses, dependents and/or survivors, IDVA personnel, benefit and community service agencies and the public, including being sensitive to professional ethics, gender, cultural diversities and disabilities.*

*Ability to prepare and make public speaking presentations.*

*Ability to occasionally work extended hours and occasionally travel out of town for meetings and training, sometimes overnight.*

Mr. Jones does not feel Matt Taylor is fulfilling any of these duties. He also read the following highlights from a letter that was written to the County

Commissioners from the State of Indiana Department of Veterans Affairs regarding the duties of the County Veterans' Service Officer:

*The CVSO's primary duty is to assist veterans and their dependents and/or survivors in completing forms and applications relating to federal and state veterans' benefits. The CVSO is the first line of contact between the veteran and the VA in the filing of his or her claims, applications and appeals. There is also a secondary duty to counsel those same or other veterans and offer advice concerning veterans' benefits and other veteran matters. The CVSO should also make himself/herself available to go to a veteran's home or a mutually agreed upon location, to perform these duties, schedule visits to the Posts of the local veterans' service organizations, or conduct outreach programs in local churches, schools, convention centers, civic group locations, etc. Because not all veterans can or will come to the CVSO, the CVSO should not be tied to a desk, but should be allowed to go to the veteran. Whether full or part-time, wherever and whenever the CVSO goes, he or she is considered by the public to be the County Veterans' Service Officer and they should conduct themselves accordingly.*

*It is also the policy of this Department that the Veterans' Service Officer is not intended to be a person who hands out forms to veterans. The CVSO should help the veterans and their dependents and/or survivors fill out the forms.*

Mr. Jones stated that is not necessarily a vendetta against Matt Taylor. We know he is a busy man, however, it is an appointment that he takes on willingly annually at your request and to see that position neglected as it has been is a problem to the veterans of Bartholomew County. All of this adds up to a clear and demonstrated dereliction of duty and should be rectified immediately with the dismissal of the VSO staff. He would like to be invited back later to hear what the Commissioners have done to address the concerns of the voting veterans of Bartholomew County.

Veteran Bill Pumphrey spoke up and said that he felt like this was a vendetta against Matt Taylor and wanted the Commissioners to know that not all of the Veterans are behind the above comments by Mr. Jones.

U.S. Air Force Veteran Larry Durnil stated that the problems go back even before Matt Taylor was in office. He explained that he has never used the office, but has heard complaints for several years. He feels the services should be advertised and a vehicle large enough to hold the veterans that need to go to the V.A. Medical Center should be provided.

Thom Jester, former Veterans Service Officer, stated that for the eight years that he was VSO, he did not get any complaints from the outside public. He said that the last five years, as a member of the District Service Officer of the American Legion and VFW, he was getting an average of 4 or 5 calls per week of things that were not being handled by the County Veterans Office. He would then refer the problem to the American Legion or the VFW, which has state service officers. He also stated that he feels the van is needed back in Columbus.

Mr. Jones stated that in his conversation with Jim Todd in Indianapolis, he explained that the reason that the van was taken from Bartholomew County is because there was a lack of ridership in the van. It is based on how many seats are filled per trip and if there are not enough riders in a van, they will trade vehicles out to put a van or larger vehicle in areas where it is needed the most and that van is currently in Indianapolis and is servicing the V.A. Medical Center itself.

Mr. Pumphrey asked if anyone in the Commissioners' office issued an invitation to any state government official to attend this meeting, but Chairman Kleinhenz told him no that he did not feel that was necessary. The subject brought up today was due to an email from Mr. Jones. Mr. Pumphrey also stated that he has heard many times from several that Columbus may be getting a veterans' clinic. He suggested combining a V.A. facility with all of the surrounding hospitals that would take Medicare. This way, the veterans could take the bus to the clinic here in Columbus instead of transporting them to Indianapolis. He feels the V.A. system should be eliminated.

Bill Elwood, a Bartholomew County veteran, stated that he has had an experience in the last two years with the office having to go through them with a problem and they took care of him in a timely manner.

Wendell Hauck, a Bartholomew County veteran, and a driver for the Veterans office, feels that there are issues here locally that the Commissioners should take care of and he feels that Bartholomew County is such a reputable county that it should be represented well and does not feel that the current Veterans office staff is doing that. He explained that he has spoken to Matt Taylor about the difficulties the veterans have including reports from veterans that will say they have been refused a ride to the V.A. Medical Center, but the problems were not resolved. He feels that the work of the Veterans Service Office should be recognized in the newspaper.

Floyd Crouse, a Brown County resident and the author of an article that was in the Past 50 magazine, suggested to the Commissioners to make an appointment with Ron



Higgins, the VSO for Brown County, and see how that office is run because of their excellent service.

Larry Garrity, a driver for the veterans, stated that he has not heard any complaints regarding rides, he said that the appointments can be cancelled in Indianapolis, without notifying the patient/veteran. He complained that the vehicle was too small and the fact that the veterans have to meet the transport vehicle instead of picking them up at their homes. He stated that when he was told by the Veterans Transportation Network that he was only supposed to transport veterans who were physically unable to drive or that does not have a ride. He stated that he has cancelled his own work appointments to drive the transport vehicle.

Bob Buchart, the Commander of the Color Guard, said that he had an appointment on May 10, 2012 at the V.A. Hospital and called ten days in advance to get a ride and was told the transport vehicle was full and to get another appointment. He did get a new appointment, which is for June 28, 2012 and was assured by Rhonda Sinclair that he would get a ride.

Commissioner Lienhoop stated that the Commissioners met with Mr. Todd last Fall and was told that they had to go to smaller transport vehicles. Commissioner Franke added that to get a bigger van, they would have to transport more people, but that would be impossible to do with such a small vehicle.

Wendell Hauck said that years ago the van ran five days a week, would leave as early as 6:00 a.m. and would stay there until 4:30 or 5:00 p.m. Currently the van runs

Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday, leaves no earlier than 6:30 a.m. and the return trip is no later than 1:30 p.m.

Joe Willock, a veteran, said that his experience with Judy Devening has been excellent.

Rick Caldwell, a veteran, who served 32 years of military service and then spent 15 years of driving the veterans van, stressed how important it is to take care of the veterans and thinks that it is sad that the current veterans staff is not doing this.

Floyd Crouse said that he agreed with Mr. Caldwell in that we needed to do all that we can for the veterans.

Victoria Glick stated that she supported everything that Mr. Jones, Mr. Caldwell and Mr. Durnil have presented today.

David Lock, who works with disabled veterans, says that he has not worked with the County Veterans Officer, but sees an increasing number of disabled veterans. He says he does not think that the County realizes how important someone to fill the position of VSO is because it also will bring revenue back into the county. He stated that the Brown County VSO is paid \$30,000 and he brought in \$5,000,000 to that county.

Dave Jones stated again that this is not a vendetta against Mr. Taylor, but even if one veteran says that they have been treated badly, that is one too many. And there have been many of the veterans that say they have been treated badly.

Larry Love, a veteran, agreed that we need to do everything we can to see that the veterans are getting what they deserve.

Chairman Kleinhenz thanked everyone for their comments and said that these issues would be looked into.

There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned by Chairman Kleinhenz at 11:42 a.m. The next Commissioners' meeting will be on Monday, June 25, 2012 at 10:00 a.m. in the Commissioners' Chambers.

BARTHOLOMEW COUNTY  
COMMISSIONERS

---

LARRY S. KLEINHENZ, CHAIRMAN

---

PAUL FRANKE, MEMBER

---

CARL H. LIENHOOP, MEMBER

ATTEST:

---

BARBARA J. HACKMAN, AUDITOR