

**PORTER COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
MONDAY, JUNE 26TH, 2023
5:30 P.M.**

(The entire meeting is available to watch on the Porter County website.)

The Regular meeting of the Porter County Board of Commissioners convened at 5:30 p.m. on Monday, June 26, 2023 in the Commissioners' Chambers of the Administration Center.

Those present were: Commissioners Laura Blaney, Barb Regnitz, Jim Biggs and County Attorney Scott McClure; Executive Administrative Asst. Melanie Massey and Recording Secretary Kathy Merle.

Call to Order/Pledge

Com. Biggs, Good evening. This is the Porter County Board of Commissioners' meeting Monday, June 26, 2023.

CONSENT AGENDA

Opioid Resolutions:

- **Moraine House**
- **Three20 Recovery**
- **Juvenile Detention Center**
- **Portage Recovery**

Com. Regnitz, Can we approve these all together Scott?

Atty. McClure, You can because you've already approved them at the last meeting.

Com. Regnitz, Do we need to give a recap of what they are?

Atty. McClure, We do not.

Com. Regnitz, moved to approve the Opioid Resolutions for the Moraine House, Three20 Recovery, Juvenile Detention Center and Portage Recover, Com. Blaney, second, motion carried.

Com. Biggs, Why don't you just give the Reader's Digest version of what we're doing here?

Com. Regnitz, For those of you who may not be aware we have received \$2.5 million in opioid funds based on some litigation that was won. We're receiving different dollar amounts over 16 years and we've chosen to take the \$2.5 million divide it by 16 so we have under \$160,000.00 to grant every year for those 16 years. We already have a \$100,000.00 allocated for all 16 of those years and that's for the Pro Coordinator for the Sheriff's Office. This year we are looking to grant another \$60,000.00. At this point we've identified \$50,000.00 in grants. The first one is for \$10,000.00 for the roof on the Moraine House which is a halfway house located in Valparaiso. The second one Three20 Recovery is located in Chesterton. They got a two for one match. So they're getting \$40,000.00 from the state as long as they can get \$20,000.00 and Chesterton is granting them \$10,000.00 and we're granting them \$10,000.00. That is to hire a full-time recovery coach. Juvenile Detention Center we actually have \$20,000.00 for them. There is \$10,000.00 for Juvenile Jeopardy, which is a program that is brought into the different schools. They wanted to expand that to all of the schools in Porter County and another \$10,000.00 for adult mentors for the kids in the Juvenile Recovery Program. The last one is Portage Recovery Association for \$10,000.00. They are establishing a Sobar so sober Sobar. They are going to be leasing out a second bay where they can have a gathering place for those people who are in recovery. They're going to start off in a smaller capacity and they're hoping to be able to expand that to 24/7 or anytime for those people that are in recovery. It can be a gathering place where they can go instead of hanging out with people that can tend to lead them astray. So the total of that is \$50,000.00. We still have another \$10,000.00 for this year. We are hoping to be able to find an organization or some sort of either a preventative or recovery

organization in South County because all of these were either in Center District or in North County and that's where we are right now.

VLACD - Blackhawk Beach Stormwater Project – Payments in the amount to the following:

- **Antero Group – \$16,000.00**
- **Mendenhall & Assoc. – \$5,678.96**
- **Grimmer Const. - \$3,305.00**

Com. Blaney, moved to approve the contracts for the Blackhawk Beach Stormwater Project, Com. Regnitz, second, motion carried.

Puppy Mill Ordinance – Update.

Atty. McClure, The last time this event was on the agenda there was some concern about what the state was doing with the legislation. I don't believe that the legislation ended up having legs. I will have the puppy mill ordinance back on either the next agenda or the agenda after that for the first reading.

Venue Rental Policy.

Atty. McClure, The Commissioners had asked and we have some meetings concerning it about adding some mandatory rental policy provisions for our county venues and put that together in the formation of a resolution.

RESOLUTION NO. 23 - _____

MANDATORY RENTAL POLICY PROVISIONS FOR ALL
PORTER COUNTY VENUES

- I. For any event that is open to general public admittance and serves alcohol:
 1. The County venue is going to provide colored wristbands for every person that serves them an alcoholic beverage. The patrons of the events should be required to wear the wristband while drinking alcoholic beverages.
 2. Adults 18 years of age and older shall be admitted. Individuals 17 years old and younger will only be admitted with parent or guardian.
- II. For all events: Conduct and dress code
 1. Appropriate dress for family-friendly government venues required. Nudity, visible underwear or visible pasties are not allowed. Clothing that promotes profanity violence drugs or criminal activities are not allowed.
 2. Profane language, fighting, acts of violence or prohibited.
 3. Music noise must not leave your event area. The music must be family friendly not include profanity or offensive language.

Atty. McClure, I wrote it up in such a way such a way that all of our different venues have obviously significantly different contracts but these would be mandatory provisions that would need to be added to all of those venue agreements if the Commissioners were to pass it today.

Com. Biggs, Any discussion?

Com. Blaney, Has anyone talked to Dave Bagnall about music not leaving the venue, the event area stuff like?

Com. Biggs, For the fair.

Com. Blaney, The concerts out at the Expo.

Com. Biggs, I have not.

Com. Regnitz, But actually isn't the entire property the venue?

Com. Blaney, Well I can hear it from my house sometimes.

Com. Biggs, Well we can we can exempt the fair if we so choose or not.

Atty. McClure, We can. It's slightly different. They're not exactly the same type of relationship with (Inaudible).

Com. Biggs, Right.

Atty. McClure, It's an individual coming in to rent the venue. It's standing contract so it's just slightly different circumstances.

Com. Blaney, How are going to enforce this?

Atty. McClure, The people in charge of the individual their venues are going to have to institute this and that's why it needs to go in the actual venue contracts themselves. So if you're having a general admittance venue program of some kind and you're going to serve alcohol then here's the ages that are going to be admitted or the ages that will need a parent or guardian.

Com. Blaney, My problems with this are...the Tri Kappa Taste of Valparaiso event they serve alcohol. My kids go over there to try the food. They're not drinking. They're under 17. I don't feel like I need to go with them.

Atty. McClure, This would require you to have to go.

Com. Blaney, Some of the stuff I agree with but not all of it.

Com. Biggs, I don't know why a juvenile would be at an event that is serving alcohol.

Com. Blaney, Like I said they just go to taste food. I hardly think a Tri Kappa event is a dangerous, scary place for a 17 year old.

Com. Biggs, I don't know I've never been there.

Com. Regnitz, Do we want to table this until our next meeting so we have a little bit more time to think about some of the different organizations before we pass this?

Atty. McClure, Obviously as a governmental entity we have to be careful. We're not going to be able to pick and choose the events that we're either going to have these rules for or not. Frankly, the reason that I drafted it the way I did if it's a private event these rules don't apply. If it's general public admittance that serves alcohol then that where the age requirement comes in.

Ms. Giorgi, May I ask a question? Volunteers, what about high school kids volunteering at various events. Waiting tables things like that.

Com. Blaney, My daughter is in Key Club. She is 15 and they do things like that.

Com. Biggs, This is obviously a discussion we need to have and it's an issue. Scott brings up a where you get into trouble.

Com. Regnitz, It has to be consistent.

Com. Biggs, It has to be consistent. If you start cherry picking you run into trouble but at the end of the day that is a government property. We are not a private bar or private restaurant. We need to make up our minds. Are we going to run it like they would in the private sector? Are we going to, the public owns those properties and I would guess that there is a certain expectation as to what we're going to allow and what we're not going to allow there. The serving of alcohol to the general public that is going to allow children under the age of 18 years old in there without adult supervision. I personally don't have a problem with that. I know that in some venues that's going to cause an issue but if we lose that business as far as I'm concerned we lose that business. I think that there is a huge amount of liability that you take on when you're serving alcohol to the general public and you're allowing children to come in there unsupervised. That is just my opinion.

Com. Blaney, My 17 year old son can't take his 17 year old girlfriend to the Christmas show at the Opera House unless I join them. I'm just not for that.

Com. Biggs, I totally agree Laura that it throws a complexity on this that we haven't seriously considered in the past. We don't live in the past today. Things are more complicated. There is more liability now.

Com. Blaney We have some giant liability for that?

Atty. McClure, I think what Jim is referring to is having alcohol around children and the issue that surrounds it all. I can't put my finger on something specific but that would be the issue generally speaking.

Com. Biggs, Again, if we're going to manage venues that are going to compete with the private sector we need to make up our mind how we're going to do that without creating a lot of liability here. We don't own those buildings individually. They are owned by the public and what does the public expect from us.

Com. Blaney, Free speech for one.

Com. Biggs, What does free speech have to do with that?

Com. Blaney, What do you mean?

Com. Biggs, We're talking about alcohol.

Com. Blaney, There is just a lot here that you are trying to control. As a parent I can handle my kids myself. I don't need the government to tell me where they can and cannot be. And what people can wear.

Com. Biggs, I don't think the government is trying to tell anybody where they can and cannot be. What the government is trying to say is that we are responsible for these properties and we're responsible for who's coming onto those properties. That is what I'm saying. We don't run restaurants and entertainment venues here. We're a government and if we're going to get into that business we have to decide how much liability we're willing to take on to do. That's all I'm saying. It's complex. I'm not saying that you don't have a great argument. I'm just saying that we have to decide if we're all in, we're all in. If we're not you can't be halfway here.

Com. Blaney, I would see it if we've had lots of problems or something but we haven't. We haven't had any problems that I'm aware of.

Com. Biggs, Well I'm just going to say it. You know 10 years ago we weren't having drag shows that were inviting children in there at 13 and under as we do today. Things are changing and we have to prepare ourselves for that change. Nobody likes it but it's a reality Laura. We have to prepare for it. I'm not criticizing your position here. I'm just saying we have to decide who we are going to be here. And what liability we are willing to take on.

Com. Blaney, I think you said before that we already prohibit profanity. You can't be lewd. We just have very different thinking on this.

Com. Biggs, We sat here and argued about it for a couple of meetings about the virtues of allowing free speech of grown men dressing up as women in a drag show and encouraging children to show up for free. We would have never had that conversation a decade ago in county government. Never, but it's coming so we have to prepare ourselves for the inevitable.

Com. Blaney, For those crazed 12 year olds that are running around on their own without parental guidance.

Com. Biggs, We are going to table this. We will get with you Scott, Lori as well and Dave Bagnall and determine where we want to take this from here, but a decision is going to have to be made. This is a little bit more complex. Everybody has an opinion. On my side of it I'm just looking at the institution of county government. Not my own opinion. My own opinion differs greatly than what my opinion is looking after the institution of county government. And that is strictly from a liability standpoint.

FACILITIES – DANIEL SULLIVAN

Award proposals from Architectural Design Professionals. To support the Facilities Director in expanding the Health Department's Main Office at the Admin. Building.

Com. Regnitz, We advertised. We had an RFP for architectural design and construction management services for the Health Dept. expansion and remodel. We received three different responses to the RFP. We had a sealed bid. We opened up those sealed bids at our last meeting. Of the three this was the organization that came in at the lowest cost Cordagan Clark. I don't know very much about them. I've never heard of them.

Com. Biggs, I believe they are out of Lafayette, Indiana.

Com. Regnitz, Their local office is out of Lafayette, Indiana.

Com. Biggs, They have a lot of experience and a very full resume of services. Though all of the bids were close they're certainly qualified to do the work and they were the lowest bidder.

Com. Blaney, How are we handling SB4 as it relates to this?

Com. Regnitz, We're breaking this up into two phases. The first phase is to move the Coroner and Veteran's Administration to Voters Registration. And now we have a new Health Dept. Director. Once they are ready to talk about their space needs then this architectural firm will come in and do a needs assessment to help them to determine the appropriate layout for whatever their needs are.

Com. Biggs, To my understanding they are not going to start planning until conversations are had.

Com. Regnitz, Correct.

Com. Blaney, So these bids that we got cover?

Com. Regnitz, Both?

Com. Blaney, moved to approve Cordagan Clark for the Health Dept. expansion at the Admin. Building, Com. Regnitz, second, motion carried.

AUDITOR KAREN MARTIN

An Ordinance Establishing a Non-Reverting Fund for the COPS (Community Oriented Policing Services) Technology and Equipment Program Invitational Solicitation Grant – 2nd Reading.

Mr. Wichlinski, These are 2nd readings. The first one is for the COPS Grant.

Com. Regnitz, And we would love an explanation of what that is all about.

Sheriff Balon, The big part of it is saving lots of money. This grant is going to pay for about \$223,000.00 of IT equipment that normally would fall onto the county to pay for it. Those are upgrades and laptops. Different upgrades for our drug unit, computers, laptops in our cars, storage for our computer data, Meg unit computers. Things like that. It all comes to about \$223,000.00 for that aspect of it. The other remaining money is going to go towards the subscription fees for one year for our flat camera systems.

Com. Regnitz, For your?

Sheriff Balon, Flat camera system. Those are the LPR's.

Com. Regnitz, What is that?

Sheriff Balon, License plate readers.

Com. Regnitz, moved to approve the COPS Ordinance on 2nd Reading, Com. Blaney, second, motion carried.

An Ordinance Establishing a Non-Reverting Fund for the Reimbursement of COVID Related Expenses from FEMA Grants – 2nd Reading.

Mr. Wichlinski, The majority of this is going to go from the Health Dept. to the Expo Center to reimburse them for costs of using their venue during COVID for all of the different various reasons. That is what the majority of this is going to go towards.

Com. Regnitz, moved to approve the Ordinance for the Reimbursement of COVID Related Expenses from FEMA Grants on 2nd Reading, Com. Blaney, second, motion carried.

DEVELOPMENT & STORM WATER MNGMNT. – BOB THOMPSON, DIRECTOR

A Unified Development Ordinance pertaining to Section 5.69 Telecommunication Facility Standards and 5.70 Telecommunication Facility; Height Limit – 2nd Reading.

Mr. Thompson, Everyone will look at it as the cell tower ordinance. Originally the UDO had it as only in commercial and industrial districts for a special exception and nothing in the residential on that. I was trying to push for it to be special exceptions all the way across the (Inaudible) zoning district. The original UDO did not get adopted with that so the first part changes it so that a cell tower can be heard in front of the BZA with a special exception within any zoning district. The other item discusses is beyond the use of the cell towers. It goes into more of a broadband type situation where we allow it within an institutional zoning district. Even schools have microwave that bounces back and forth between each one of their schools. We set it for a height standard of 150' if it's an institutional district. It is a permitted use by the Development Review Committee and staff.

Com. Blaney, moved to approve the UDO regarding Telecommunication Facility Standards on 2nd Reading, Com. Regnitz, second, motion carried.

CITIZEN COMMENTS

Ms. Shook, Hi my name is Elena Shook. I'm from Morgan Township, Valparaiso. Two quick questions. What is the timeline for the revision of the new solar ordinance and will we as the public get an opportunity to ask questions and give our input before it's passed.

Atty. McClure, The new solar awareness is in process. We've had actually had a couple hour meeting last week with myself and the Planning director and County Commissioners. We're working on some ideas in a draft. The way that would come out the first time would be at the Plan Commission meeting where the public hearing will be held. And at that point in time that's when everyone would be able to ask their questions and that's at the stage before it gets sent to the Commissioner. At the Plan Commission stage it's an advisory Plan Commission so it's either a recommend for approval or denial or to not send because it's not ready. That Plan Commission meeting will be that opportunity for everybody to get their hands on it. To be able to help to look at it and be able to ask questions and that would be the best meeting for that to occur at. That's before it actually even comes out of Plan Commission and goes to the Commissioners for their okay. They will then also have a public meeting there's a public hearing and ability to ask questions but that Plan Commission meeting would probably be the best and the first opportunity.

Ms. Shook, Okay and there's one coming up I know.

Atty. McClure, It's not on that agenda.

Ms. Shook, So it'll be probably next month sometime.

Com. Regnitz, Elena we had targeted the end of August at that Plan Commission meeting for our first draft of that.

Ms. Shook, Okay so we'll just keep an eye out.

Com. Regnitz, Then should that get passed on to the Commissioners then first reading would be at the September Commissioner's meeting.

Ms. Shook, Okay so we have a little bit of time here. Thank you. And another question is there any current status with the NextEra solar application? It's been very quiet it's kind of like

that feeling when your kids are in the next room and it gets quiet and you know there's an impending disaster. So I'm just wondering.

Atty. McClure, The application is under review at this time.

Ms. Shook, Thank you very much.

Ms. Silvert, Hi I'm Deborah Silvert. The three Commissioners have been in receipt of an email from me. Laura I'm so sorry that you emailed me back and then I sent another email last evening. So I don't know if you saw that or not. I did sort of a lay person's deep dive into SEA-4 because I have some very serious concerns about it. I have copies because I don't have Scott's...you know some of the other people's emails so I'll give those to you.

Com. Biggs, Was this the latest email you had sent us?

Ms. Silvert, This is last night yes.

Com. Biggs, We will make sure that this gets in the hands of the Health Board and Dr. Stamp.

Ms. Silvert, They have it.

Com. Biggs, Speaking for myself I'll make sure they do their best to answer as many questions that they can at this time. We're still kind of in the early stages of this. So I don't know how much they can answer at this point.

Ms. Silvert, I really appreciate it. I beg your Indulgence that I would like to read it so the public can hear. I can't disseminate it any other way so thank you.

Com. Biggs, Sure I got nothing else

Ms. Silvert, Okay so if you don't know SEA-4 is the latest version. It stands for Senate Enrolled Act 4. It's the latest version of the Senate Bill 4. I'm not going to read verbatim what I have here because it is long but basically several sections of the SEA-4 are just simply repealing parts of Indiana code. If you don't know what Indiana code is that's our state law Indiana code mostly law that is found in Title 16. If anybody's interested I do have a few more hard copies of this or if you give me your email I can send you an electronic document and then you can click on the links because I have a lot of links in here. All of these revisions to the state law become effective July 1st, which is coming right up here. For the most part all the revisions are accommodating new provisions of the sea four amendments. I'm reading this as a layperson. I'm not an attorney. I don't have a law background but it appears to me to be a foregone conclusion that the SEA-4 is going to be the new normal in our state as of July 1st. The legislation itself SEA-4 describes itself as an act to amend the Indiana code concerning health. So it seems peculiar to me that there's any talk at all about individual counties opting into this SEA-4. I don't know what that means. Does that mean that each of Indiana's 92 counties is going to have a choice about whether it's governed by Indiana state law or not as it would be amended by SEA-4? To me this idea of opting in there's some sort of weird coercive or illusion of choice that's being put in front of the people and it just feels to me as though there's coercive intent in this legislation. I gave out a bullet point list which was captioned Digest. I put the bullet points in. When I was searching on the Indiana Government Legislative site to try to find this material like what the text of the SEA-4 I wanted to read the text. I kept clicking on details and when I clicked on details it gave me Digest, which was not what I was looking for. I was looking for the text of the bill so I finally found that it wasn't so easy. I captured here the bullet points in in my document.

There's a lot of material that's in the SEA-4 that was not bullet pointed so that was curious. I told you in the document how to find the actual text but here are some of my concerns. Specifically in Section 6 and when I mentioned these sections these are all SEA-4. In Section 6 they detail what our core Public Health Service is. There were 23 services that were specifically enumerated which doubled. Actually doubled more than what was legally required by the state to the local health departments. I've got references there that can be looked at. Before we would opt in. As I read through these services I can't imagine which of those 23 enumerated services were not doing that. We're already doing them in Porter County. I can't see why we want to be mandated to do them. It just seems peculiar that we should give up local autonomy to be mandated by the state to do things we're already doing. But what I was more concerned about was that the 23rd one read as follows: The prevention and reduction of chronic illnesses including the following obesity, diabetes, cardiovascular diseases, including hypertension and hyperlipidemia, hepatitis C and cancer. This is in the context of prevention a core Public Health Service. It's defining a core Public Health Service that is the prevention and reduction of these

chronic illnesses. And that's seeing how we can possibly prevent and reduce chronic illnesses and be legally required to do so by law. And we don't even know you know in many cases what our real causes of these. You know here we are being mandated to an outcome which just seems to me impossible. And especially since some of these are correlated to lifestyle choices. So I was very concerned about that. My feeling was that individuals should be able to continue to have the freedom to make their own lifestyle choices even if those lifestyle choices are like what I would think of is bad. I don't smoke and I'm very careful about my diet. I don't engage in promiscuous sex so those are my lifestyle choices. Maybe somebody else chooses a different lifestyle choice. That's kind of on them. It just seems like it's not a very free....if it doesn't infringe on my health. It's not granting them their freedom of choice. Section 15 here at the State Department this is very concerning. May issue guidance to the local health departments on this title and any rules promulgated by the State Department to assist with the uniform application of Public Health laws in Indiana. I don't even know what to say about this. Rules that can be made at any time by administrators downstate not elected officials but just rules that are made. And here on a local level you know we're going to have to be participating in the uniform application of Public Health laws that coming out of these rules where there's no autonomy on a local level but I think that this is really opening a Pandora's Box that kind of language is to me just dangerous and very threatening to liberty. Section 19 applies to counties that opt into the new funding paradigm and the this entire section here this entire initiative literally puts our local Health Board under the authority of the state even though in this little subsection and it says a county that accepts the funding to provide the courthouse services does not transfer any authority in operating local Health Departments of the State Department in return for the additional funding. If they're telling us nope we're not going to give up anything but in view of some of the rest of the language and the legislation that I cite going on in the (Inaudible) this clause is not giving me any comfort. You may say that but I'm not seeing where that's true. Section 20 there's another one that I'm very concerned about health and I looked at every section but I didn't tear apart every section. There were other things that I thought okay that's not a big deal these are the things I felt were very concerning. Public health personnel of local Health departments shall perform additional duties prescribed by the rules of the State Department. Okay so it's in direct contradiction to the thing I just said where you know opting into this you're not going to give up any local autonomy, because in the very next section it says your people, your local health personnel shall perform additional duties prescribed by the rules of the State Department. I don't know, it's pretty plain to me. I'd like to note the additional duties might be, what might the state make new rules about? We could have mandatory testing, quarantine, vaccines these rules are all administrative and these are not created by any elected officials. These are created by Health Department authorities. Section 43 here we see that for the purposes of funding beginning in the state fiscal year starting July 1st this year and in each state fiscal year thereafter SVI. There's an acronym. SVI means the Federal Centers for the Disease Control Social Vulnerability Index and the county executive that is this group of three County Commissioners here must vote to accept additional funding and to provide core Public Health Services. Now this is the first time anywhere in SEA-4 that they make any reference to any federal agency. I think maybe they forgot to scrub that because I think it may have been more prevalent in a previous edition of the bill. I don't know I didn't go backward but I do not know why there is any reference whatsoever made to this SVI the Social Vulnerability Index. I don't know what that is referencing. What it mean. You can't find it anywhere else in SEA-4. So I couldn't help but come to the conclusion that the whole legislation has been conceptualized by people who supported and endorse and enforce the federal lockdowns, the mandates coming out of this COVID 19-ish fiasco. There I gave a link to the Governor's Public Health Commission video which was recorded or that this Commission met June 30th of 2022. So just a year ago. And if you watch this thing it is clear. It's an hour and a half long. So it's you know commitment on your part to do it but if you watch that it's pretty darn clear that the goal is to centralize Public Health directives throughout the State of Indiana and remove local control. In Section 43 you see the acknowledged involvement of the CDC and even though it's not plainly stated in the SEA-4 it does appear there's a carte blanche delegation of authority to the CDC by way of the Indiana State down State Department of Health which is going to undermine the counties. And there's a whole administrative rule process that can play out that we folk don't ever even get to see because it's happening up in the administrative levels. They can effectively move goal posts should they wish anytime they wish and that's very concerning to me. Section 44 is talking about the local Board of Health opting out of the new funding but nowhere in the language of that section is there any provision made for legacy funding as it's been described by the Health Department. If you were here for the Health Department meeting there's no language with this legacy funding that would adjust for inflation and that's going to be a concern because I mean inflation is a thing and if we opt out and decide to go with our legacy funding you know we're going to dig ourselves into a fiscal hole with the Health Department and that's terrible. I mean if it's about public health why would you write legislation that wouldn't account for you know inflation for the delivery of Home Health Services. I don't think it's about that. But actually Commissioner

Blaney did tell me that there is not indeed, she does not see it. There's no provision for inflation written in the opt out. So that is very concerning. Section 50 this is concerning the local health boards who will opt in but here is this is very concerning this is a quote from SEA-4 if the state department determines that there are reasonable grounds to believe that a local board of health is not complying with statutory directives or rules adopted by the State Department the state department may suspend funding until its compliance is achieved as determined by the State Department. It's all there. Again, I would have to say precisely what statutory directors and rules are we talking about. It could be anything in my opinion. Administrative rules are not laws. They can be changed rapidly as I've said at the discretion of Health Department. These are unelected officials with no accountability to the people. I don't think it's a very far stretch to imagine another emerging public health threat leading to another round of restrictive restriction on individual freedom. Almost done. Sections 54, 55 and 56 all these contain references to statewide standing orders as pertains to emergency stock medications that are dispensed and maybe dispensed currently in schools and they remove liability for those emergency stock medications to be dispensed. Now currently our health code Indiana IC16 title 16 the Indiana Code which is mainly having to do with health. Its 401 pages long. It's not easy to find. My printer decided to have a little bit of a meltdown. I'm going to go through that like I went through SEA-4 which was only 30 some days or so 401 pages to go. I'm (Inaudible) so worried about this folks. Anyway

the current law provides only four epinephrine, that's your EpiPen right severe allergy. Albuterol that's your emergency rescue inhaler and Naloxone which is Narcan which is for opiate overdose.

It blocks the opiate receptors. Those are the only emergency stock medications that are right now provided for by law in school. But here with this language SEA-4 is going to open many other possibilities. You can imagine what those might be folks. Vaccines, nicotine replacements, birth control, antidepressants, any hormones as whatever might be determined necessary to assure (Inaudible) improve public health outcome. All right the last section of this act is Section 60. It's very brief. I will read it in its entirety here we go. I quote "an emergency is declared for this act". That's Section 60. That's all of section 60. No further text, no explanation. I'd like to know what emergency? Why was this emergency declared and who declared it? Because that single sentence can potentially justify anything the State Department of Health decides to impose on the counties. So I don't see how anybody can think it's a good idea to opt into this. Especially in view of this last section. See it for yourself. It's there. When I'm reading through the health statutes that I'm finding in Indiana Title 16 Indiana code Title 16 like I said I'm going to go through that with fine-tooth comb but you know on a quick perusal 401 pages Public Health Authority those three words appear over and over and over throughout the Indiana Code Title 16. I was kind of shocked actually Public Health Authority. I would have thought that in a free country built-in principles of individual liberty a public health department would be a resource for its people and not an authority. I believe we need to immediately rethink where we have been and consider dialing back both the statutory language and IC16. I think this is a bigger problem than the SEA-4. I truly do. And the philosophy behind this if we want to maintain any semblance of our individual Freedom, Health Freedom specifically. I think that a public health needs assessment should be immediately completed by our local Health Board. We need to know our own local needs and I still have not, I've been asking since June 6th to hear raw numbers percentages and rankings regarding Porter County's public health issues of tobacco and vaping use obesity, mental health, immunization, decreasing life expectancy, (Inaudible) despair, infant mortality and exercise opportunity. All I keep hearing is we don't look good on these things. Really but I want to know what the numbers are. The other thing that was very misleading when we have a Health Board meeting was that this is a county issue right now but every statistic that was cited and every point that was made about how we're in such a desperate (Inaudible) straights all that was being supported by state statistics. I don't know what they are for Porter County and I would I would venture to guess we're doing a heck of a lot better than many parts of our state. And I think there are some parts of our state that are probably doing very abysmally and that's dragging a whole state down. So I think that's something to think about. I think that we should deny the urge to micromanage our counties to the State of Indiana but I think that the CDC and the World Health Organization have made no secret of wanting total control of our health. Is if that was even a possible thing. I think the unstated goal is control at the expense of individual liberty. And I believe that during this time centralizing our health system plays right into that goal merely stating that counties are free to choose does not mitigate the many references in the legislation itself that clearly are coercive. I think this is a time to strengthen our local government in a way that supports individual freedom and not to acquiesce to government control. Thank you so much for your indulgence.

Com. Regnitz, I'm just wondering Scott and I'm not asking you to answer this right now but some portions of this happen automatically on July 1st and some only happen if we opt in. Would you be able to differentiate which portions of this bill are going to be in effect on July 1st whether we opt in or not and which ones will apply to us in the situation where we opt in or don't.

Atty. McClure, Yes I can do that at next (Inaudible) or whenever we're dealing with SB-4.

Com. Biggs, Is there any anyone else who would like to speak to the Commissioners?

Mr. Ough, Hello my name is Tim from Porter Indiana. I really dislike speaking in front of people. I despise politics. You just look at the word itself break it down poly is many, ticks blood sucking creatures. I'm not saying you guys. I'm basically speaking federal and state. A lot of politicians they like to say one thing and do the other. They're two-faced. They lie all the time. And as far as this I don't know anything about this SB-4 whatever but I'm just wondering if the people that are putting this out there are they the same ones that three four years ago told us to wear a diaper on your face everywhere you go. Are they the ones that told us you better get vaccinated for grandma? It's a bunch of lies. So whatever this bill coming up if the same people that lied to us back then if they're putting it out now I don't trust them. I mean if you want to wear a mask you can wear a mask. Sometimes I wear a mask just to be safe but that's a choice we have to make that we can make. You don't have to wear a mask if you don't want to. You don't have to get vaccinated if you don't want to. It's called choice. It's called freedom. Thank you.

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:18 p.m.

BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
PORTER COUNTY, INDIANA

Jim Biggs

Barb Regnitz

Laura Blaney

Attest: _____
Karen Martin, Auditor