

The Board of Commissioners of Fayette County, Georgia met in Official Session on March 1, 2006 at 3:30 p.m. in the public meeting room of the Fayette County Administrative Complex, 140 Stonewall Avenue, Fayetteville, Georgia.

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Greg Dunn, Chairman
 Linda Wells, Vice Chair
 Herb Frady
 Peter Pfeifer

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT: Chris Venice, County Administrator
 William R. McNally, County Attorney
 Carol Chandler, Executive Assistant
 Peggy Butler, Chief Deputy Clerk

PRESENTATION:

Members of the Fayette Heritage Project presented a water color of Starr's Mill by local artist Patsy Gullett to the Board of Commissioners.

Pete Frisina, Vice President of the Heritage group, said they had completed a project that they wanted to present to the Board of Commissioners of Fayette County. He said it was a Patsy Gullett original painting of Starr's Mill sized to fit in the framed area on the wall in the Commissioners' Chambers.

Chairman Dunn said it was a beautiful work of art from the community and the Board appreciated it very much.

NEW BUSINESS:

RENEWAL OF EMPLOYEE HEALTH AND DENTAL INSURANCE:

Guy Morrison said there were five items in the context of the Health Care Benefits Renewal. The first is broken out to say on the medical component as it relates to the plan with Blue Cross and the plan design based on our review our recommendation is to continue the program with Blue Cross/Blue Shield at a 3.75% increase terms of a year over year rate change.

He said item number two was a recommendation to include a formal wellness program. He said the reason for item two was to assist us as the County's consultants and try to encourage health and wellness in a way that is formal in nature. He said the cost of the wellness program was \$56,555 a year. He said a breakout of that had been provided. He said they had seen was a various return on investment numbers. He said the challenge with the wellness components was that they saw from two to one, five to one, and eight to one. He said it really depended on the effective of the program, the management of the program and the oversight of the program which would be done by Dr. David Rearick, which is was a member of their team.

Mr. Morrison said item number three pertained to the wellness program. He said what they had seen and what data suggested, was wellness programs and the participation, health risk assessments, was truly based on some incentive for the employee. He said their proposal was to build a benefit contribution differential for the employee where they would have a \$30 per month incentive as outlined as a contribution reduction if they participated in the health risk assessment and wellness program.

Minutes

March 1, 2006

Page 2

Chairman Dunn asked if that would reduce the county's costs. Mr. Morrison replied that the way it was set up was that if there was a 100% participation in the program, it would not. He said if there was a 90% or 80% there would be some additional money coming in through payroll contributions that could be used to fund the program, or whatever purpose the county saw fit.

Commissioner Frady asked if that was a volunteer thing. Mr. Morrison said participation in the program was voluntary.

Commissioner Wells said if they did not participate it would cost \$30 for the health insurance per month. Mr. Morrison said it would be a per month \$30 additional charge regardless of the tier the employee was in, whether an employee, two-party, family, etc. He said for the individuals who did not elect to participate, the annual cost to each employee would be \$360.

Chairman Dunn asked again what would it be if an employee did participate. Mr. Morrison said if they employee did participate, they were simply just not paying the additional \$30 month contribution.

Chairman Dunn asked about the employee's family. Mr. Morrison said the way it was going to be outlined for the employee was right now the contributions were set up as of 2005/06, an employee on the HMO they pay nothing, the county pays 100% of that cost. He said they were proposing in 2006, starting June 1, was now as an employee their decision was to either not participate in the wellness program and if they did not it would cost them \$30 per month and if they did participate their contribution stayed at 0. He said it would change depending on their status. He said if the employee was a full family their cost would be \$30 more a month if they did not participate in the wellness program. He said the way it was set up was regardless of the number of people in the plan, it was still \$30 per month. He said it was consistent regardless of what type of coverage was elected.

Chairman Dunn asked what if the employee wanted to participate and their spouse did not. Mr. Morrison said the way the program was designed was the health risk assessment was required by the employee and any dependent over the age of 18. He said that information goes into a repository and they got a report back. He said if it was he and his spouse, the two of them would need to complete the HRA to get the reduced benefit cost.

Commissioner Wells said she must have misunderstood. She said going back to Greg's question, if the employee wanted to participate and their spouse did not she would still be charged the \$30? Mr. Morrison said the way it was structured was really up to the county. He said generally, like the city across the street, tried to view it as wanting to get participation. He said this was simply the completion of the Health Risk Assessment. He said if the county decided they only wanted to require the employee to complete the HRA that was their decision. Generally, other employers have looked at it and said they would give the \$30 reduction but they wanted to have anyone that was over the age of 18 that was on the plan submit the HRA. He said the reason for that was the more data they had on plan participants the better they could define coaching for the program.

Chairman Dunn said he would not call this an incentive. He said he would call it a punishment if the employee did not take part in the program. He said because if the employee did not take part in the program he would have to pay \$360 more a year for health insurance than they did now. Mr. Morrison said that was correct.

Minutes

March 1, 2006

Page 3

Chairman Dunn asked if the spouse did not participate the employee would still have to pay \$30. Ms. Boehnke said they had limited it to the employee.

Chairman Dunn said the incentive here was, there was no incentive here, the employee does this or they pay. Commissioner Frady said that was what he heard. Chairman Dunn said some of the employees would not participate and they would get a \$360 increase for the same insurance they had last year plus 3.7% increase. Chairman Wells said providing insurance was a benefit the county decided to provide and to ensure that the employees were the healthiest possible, it was an encouragement that they participate. Chairman Dunn said he agreed with the rationale.

Commissioner Frady asked to participate in this plan you had to do what?

Mr. Morrison said the participation requirement in the program was by definition soft verses what some other employer groups were doing. He said to participate, that means not to have the \$30 up charge, was to complete either on paper form or electronically a 68 question health risk assessment which was asking life style questions, readiness to make changes, asking if they wanted a personal health coach to work with them on certain initiatives such as losing weight, managing diabetes, stopping smoking. He said that was what it meant to participate.

Mr. Morrison said they found the \$30 to be enough of an encouragement to fill out the health risk assessment. He said the reason the Board would vote to approve this program was because they would agree and believe that it could help manage the health care costs long term which as a result hopefully would keep the healthcare expenditures down for the employees as well.

Commissioner Frady said as he had talked with Mr. Morrison in a conference, this might be a good idea, but he supposed they would keep good records on this to see how much might be saved in the long run for these employees. Mr. Morrison said the thing with these programs was the definition of a wellness program was all over the board. He said their proposed program and the reason there was a cost associated with it, was they would be able to provide the county with an initial base line of data which would show what the average wellness score was for the people who complete the assessment, what the average number of risk factors were at year one. He said they would measure that against year two, year three, etc. to hopefully see that they were making progress in providing the employees and their dependents an avenue to get health coaching in areas that they may want coaching in and did not have the avenues to do so.

Commissioner Frady said short-term was it was just a preventive maintenance program.

Chairman Dunn said the requirement was to simply fill out a form and if the person did nothing else besides that they would not have to pay the \$360. Mr. Morrison said that was correct.

Commissioner Wells said that was for the first year. Mr. Morrison said subsequent years any changes to that policy would be the decision of the county. He said there was no requirement going forward that the board would have to change that requirement, which was defined as completion of the health risk assessment. He said some

Minutes

March 1, 2006

Page 4

employers decide to ask employees to participate more information so the plan has more control over future costs and expenditures. He said that was up to the county.

Dr. Dave said what they had to remember was if they implement a wellness program and pay the money for it, it was a big bill. He said if they wanted to get value for that they had to drive participation. He said if there was no incentive for the employee to participate, statistics show that there would be anywhere from a 5% to 8% employee participation. He said if \$25 was used as an incentive, participation would go up to 10-20%. He said if \$75 was used annually per employee, participation rate may go up to 40%. He said if \$200 was used annually as an incentive to participate, participation would be in the 70% plus range.

Dr. Dave said employers who have done this consistently shown that the best way to have incentive in these programs so that the county that was paying the bill was getting a real benefit was to integrate it into the benefit program. He said the best way to integrate it into the program was with a payroll differential of at least \$20 per month for participation versus nonparticipation. He said that amount of incentive was usually sufficient to drive a high participation rate.

Chairman Dunn asked what should they expect to get with \$30. Dr. Dave said they would probably see a participation rate of 70% or higher. Chairman Dunn asked what was the experience factor on how many people would actively pursue wellness with the program. Dr. Dave said the program they had chosen for the county. 20% of all the individuals that complete the HRA and are identified with a lifestyle risk factor, such as smoking, overweight, etc., 20% of them would be contacted with an outbound call by a private health coach and given an opportunity to enroll in a protocol to help them change their lifestyle. He said there was unlimited availability to the coach for as many inbound calls as possible. He said they should anticipate 20% of the population was somehow enrolled in some life style changing coaching or modification program. He said that was what they should look for.

Chairman Dunn asked through this he would have to assume they would be following HIPPA rules. He said they would not know who was participating and to what degree they were going through any specialized programs. Dr. Rearick said the board would not know the names of individuals, you would know the number of individuals that were participating, what percentage of the population were smokers, were overweight, were obese, were sedentary, had uncontrolled blood pressure, cholesterol, etc. but would know who those people were. He said they would be given a quarterly report showing the number of people enrolled in personalized private health coaching by the lifestyle risk issues they are enrolled in but would not know who those people were.

Chairman Dunn asked when they had this baseline data on the county and let's say they found had they had a numerous amount of people with these dangerous health situations, what would happen to the premiums next year.

Guy Morrison said the people who are currently generating the claim spend that BC sees everyday they would base their renewal on that activity. He said the concept behind the wellness initiative was to try to reduce the number of people who live an unhealthy lifestyle to move into the higher cost claim data.

Minutes

March 1, 2006

Page 5

Chairman Dunn said BC/BS does not know how many of our people live an unhealthy lifestyle until something happens. Mr. Morrison said the data collected from the HRA goes to a third party vendor named Wellcall. He said they were the health and wellness company. He said they would compile the data and relate it to Dr. Rearick. He said there was no data flow to BC/BS. He said BC/BS were not getting the data and if there was a situation where there were more smokers, obese people, as the broker/consultant there would be absolutely no interest in their part to provide it to BC/BS.

Commissioner Wells asked if there was a flow back to anyone or data base that maintained this information other than the company that was providing the wellness program. Mr. Morrison said there was a legal business associate agreement that the wellness provider holds and if any of the protected health information were to be released to a non authorized party, then there were legal ramifications.

County Attorney Davenport asked if the business agreement they were referring to was that something the county had with SBS as the broker. Mr. Morrison said that was correct.

Mr. Morrison said there was no scenario where the aggregate or individual data out of Fayette County could be released. He said if it was released it would be a breach of the HIPPA responsibility.

Mr. Morrison said with number two and three and the wellness program and as an organization they felt passionate about increasing the health and wellness of their clients members. He said they had discussed years ago the concept of participating in the ACCG program as it related to the health care benefits. He said at the time there was a cost if the county wanted to do that. He said from their perspective there was absolutely no value because of the size of the county. He said as they were going through the wellness discussions they found that the counties that participate the ACCG the structure now was there was no costs to the counties but there was a wellness grant for counties that decided to institute some type of wellness initiative. He said they got in writing from BC/BS that there was no financial impact at this renewal or future renewals for the county. He said they talked to the people at ACCG to understand the formula as it related to how much a grant Fayette County could receive. He said it was based on a size formula. He said they recognized that Fayette County could receive a \$3500 wellness grant, which was not going to pay for a \$56,000 program but it was money that could be used to offset any costs. He said in addition, they had some resources that related to smoking cessation kits and other wellness kits that Dr. Rearick believes he could use to incorporate into what the county was doing. He said their recommendation was to consider that because there was no cost to the county but there was at a minimum \$3500 back to support this initiative.

Commissioner Frady said that sounded good to him.

Mr. Morrison said number five was part of the Fayette County program. It is the coverage on the basic life, dependent life, AD&D, STD, LTD, dental and vision. He said last year when they negotiated this program with Guardian, they negotiated a 36 month contract so they were protected against any rate increase in this program until June 2008.

Minutes

March 1, 2006

Page 6

Motion was made by Commissioner Wells, seconded by Commissioner Pfeifer, to approve items 1, 2, 3 & 4 of the 2006 Group Benefits Recommendation Summary as presented and discussed. Motion carried 4-0. A copy of the 2006 Group Benefits Recommendation Summary, identified as "Attachment No. 1", follows these minutes and is made an official part hereof.

LIGHT UPGRADE FOR KIWANIS, MCCURRY AND BROOKS PARK:

Anita Godbee, Director of Parks and Recreation, said she was to discuss the upgrade of lighting for the county parks which included Kiwanis Park, McCurry Park and Brooks Park. She said back in 2003 a needs assessment was done and one of the things that came out of this was that they needed to upgrade some of the ball field lighting. She said at that time they put a plan in place where they could upgrade at least one field per park per year. She said each budget year they had tried to budget for park lighting upgrades. She said in 2004 they upgraded a field at Kiwanis Park and in 2005 budget year they upgraded a softball field at McCurry park and also upgraded the soccer fields. She said the difference in the soccer field lights, the softball field lights and the baseball field lights was that the fixtures and light poles were still in good shape so all they had to upgrade was the underground wiring and the panel boards.

Ms. Godbee said in this current budget year they had plans to upgrade the park lighting at Kiwanis, McCurry and Brooks parks. She said when she sent out proposals they had three companies that responded to the proposals. She said she asked them to submit proposals for both fields five and six at Kiwanis, fields one and two at McCurry, and fields one and two at Brooks. She said they only had in the budget for one field but she was trying to plan for next year's budgeting purposes. She said that was the reason she asked for two fields. She said once the proposals came back in she noticed a substantial increase from last year's pricing to this year. She said she did the same thing last year where she tried to gage what the prices would be on the field lights. She said this year what came back was Musco Lighting, M&M Electric and Southeast Electrical Contractors and the prices they had for the various fields. She said last year the M&M bid was \$40,000 and this year they increased to \$64,000. She said there was also an increase from \$36,000 to \$49,000. She said when she saw the price increases she felt they needed to look at saving the county money in the long run, so she wanted to advocate they go ahead and light all of the fields that were on the proposal.

Ms. Godbee said in order to fund this there would have to be a transfer of funds. She said at looking at the CIP budget she noticed that she was asked to put Lake Horton, Lake Kedron and Starrs Mill in the Recreation budget. She said she was also asked to maintain the \$1.5 million in CIP improvements for the parks, which meant she had to decrease the Kiwanis, McCurry and the Brooks parks funds in order to add the water parks to the current budget. She said previous years the enhancements of the water parks were paid for out of the Water Enterprise fund.

Ms. Godbee said in August 2005 the Water Committee recommended to the Board changes for Lake Horton, Lake Kedron and Starrs Mill. She said according to Tony Parrott, Water System Director, the facilities the projects at the lakes would be recommended by the Water Committee and funded through the Water Enterprise fund. She said as a result these funds would be available, and therefore she wanted to request that the money

Minutes

March 1, 2006

Page 7

from the water parks be transferred to Kiwanis Park, Brooks Park and McCurry Park for the upgrading of the sports lighting.

Ms. Gobee said she was asking for the Board's consideration for the budget adjustments and the awarding of the lighting projects.

Chairman Dunn asked if Ms. Godbee could restate why this money was available. Ms. Godbee said from her understanding the Water Committee had re-prioritized some of the enhancements at the water parks and were also going to fund enhancements through the Water Enterprise fund instead of through the CIP budget subject to the Board's approval.

Chairman Dunn said what we had been asked to do was to transfer funds from the Capital Improvement Plan to different categories and different years. He said this work had been planned and it was just a matter of when and how and which money was going to pay for it.

Commissioner Frady asked what was the total amount. Ms. Godbee replied the total price was \$75,000, \$25,000 and \$117,000.

Chairman Dunn said this would have budget impacts every year between now and 2010. Ms. Godbee said that was correct.

Chairman Dunn said he thought this was a good idea but there was one issue that he needed to look in to. He said he was not prepared to vote on this today. He said he wanted to get those lights done as quickly as they could.

In regards to the consideration of budget adjustment to increase Kiwanis Park Light Upgrade "P6004" CIP Budget by \$75,000, McCurry Park Light Upgrade "P6005" CIP Budget by \$25,000, and Brooks Park Light Upgrade "P6002" CIP Budget \$84,000 to cover additional cost needed to award lighting project to Musco Lighting, it was the consensus of the Board to table this item until the March 9, 2006 Board Meeting for further discussion. A copy of the information, identified as "Attachment No. 2", follows these minutes and is made an official part hereof.

AWARD OF PROPOSAL #P534:

Consideration of approval to award Proposal #P534 for Kiwanis Park, McCurry Park, and Brooks Park Ball Field Light Refurbishment to Musco Lighting.

It was the consensus of the board to table this item until the March 9, 2006 Board meeting for further discussion.

CONSENT AGENDA: Motion was made by Commissioner Wells, seconded by Commissioner Pfeifer, to approve the Consent Agenda as presented. Motion carried 4-0.

STREETS IN HORSEMEN'S RUN AUTHORIZED FOR USE OF MOTORIZED CART TRAVEL:

Minutes

March 1, 2006

Page 8

Consideration of approval for the specified streets in Horsemen's Run Subdivision to be authorized for the use of motorized cart travel per Ordinance 95-10. Streets include: Horsemen's Run, Houseman Drive, Denton Circle, Compton Drive, Hancock Court, Summerfield Place, Reynolds Place, Osborne Court, Addison Drive, and Fitzgerald Lane. A cop of the request, identified as "Attachment No. 3", follows these minutes and is made an official part hereof.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Members of the public are allowed up to five minutes each to address the Board on issues of concern other than those items which are on this evening's agenda. There was no public comment.

STAFF REPORTS:

Jack Krakeel: Chief Krakeel asked for approval of the contract to receive funding from the Georgia Emergency Management Agency to support the activities for the local Emergency Planning Council. He said the funds were available on an annual basis to provide for updates for the county's hazardous materials plan and to conduct a hazardous materials disaster exercise. He said the funding was in the amount of \$3,768. He said the contract had been reviewed by the legal staff.

Motion was made by Commissioner Wells, seconded by Commissioner Frady, authorizing the chairman to sign the contract. Motion carried 4-0. A copy of the contract, identified as "Attachment No. 4", follows these minutes and is made an official part hereof.

ATTORNEY DAVENPORT: County Attorney Dennis Davenport said there was a window of opportunity to settle an issue at a savings of approximately \$94,000. He said this involved medical expenses for an inmate at the jail which had amounted to \$236,874.91. He said the settled amount was \$141,903.16. He said he was asking the Board to approve the settlement of the claim for the amount of \$141,903.16.

Motion was made by Commissioner Frady, seconded by Commissioner Wells, to approve the settlement of the claim in the amount of \$141,903.16. Motion carried 4-0.

ATTORNEY DAVENPORT: County Attorney Dennis Davenport requested an Executive Session to discuss three legal items.

Motion was made by Commissioner Wells, seconded by Commissioner Dunn, to adjourn to Executive Session to consider three legal items. Motion carried 4-0.

EXECUTIVE SESSION:

LEGAL: Attorney Davenport discussed a legal item with the Board.

The Board took no action on this matter.

LEGAL: Attorney Davenport discussed a legal item with the Board.

Minutes
March 1, 2006
Page 9

The Board took no action on this matter.

LEGAL: Attorney Davenport discussed a legal item with the Board.

The Board took no action on this matter.

EXECUTIVE SESSION AFFIDAVIT:

Motion was made by Commissioner Wells, seconded by Commissioner Frady, authorizing the chairman to execute the Executive Session Affidavit affirming that three legal items were discussed in Executive Session. Motion carried 4-0. A copy of the Executive Session Affidavit, identified as "Attachment No. 5", follows these minutes and is made an official part hereof.

There being no further business to come before the Board, Chairman Dunn adjourned the meeting at 4:50 p.m.

Peggy Butler, Chief Deputy Clerk

Gregory M. Dunn, Chairman

The foregoing minutes were duly approved at an official meeting of the Board of Commissioners of Fayette County, Georgia, held on the 11th day of May 2006.

Peggy Butler, Chief Deputy Clerk